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Abstract

The social justice agenda is currently at the forefront of political consciousness and the idea of ‘social justice’ has penetrated the discipline of psychology, specifically counselling and community psychology. However, there is a wealth of literature which has debated the role of social justice in psychology, and what it can and should look like.

A systematic literature review was undertaken to find and synthesise empirical research relevant to the question: ‘what is the significance of social justice in educational psychology practice?’ It was structured using the PRISMA framework and studies were examined and screened to ensure that they met the inclusion criteria. A Weight of Evidence framework was used to enhance the judgement of the quality and relevance of the identified studies, with regards to the review’s research question. Qualitative research studies were assessed for quality using a pre-existing investigative framework, whilst quantitative investigation studies were evaluated using a tailor-made framework, which referenced quantitative research guidelines. The research base was found to give positive support to the significance of the concept of social justice in US school psychology practice.

An exploratory piece of qualitative research using semi-structured interviews with qualified UK educational psychologists was conducted to explore their views of social justice. The interviews were transcribed and thematic analysis applied. Results of the research gave definition to the concept of social justice under an educational psychology lens, reasons for its importance to educational psychology practice, examples of what it looked like within educational psychology practice, and thoughts around the role of educational psychology in promoting social justice.

The concepts of evidence-based practice and practice-based evidence, and the effective dissemination of research in relation to outcomes and impact were discussed. Policy, practice and research development implications were considered, before a strategy for promoting and evaluating the dissemination and impact of the research findings, was considered. A multi-strand strategy of journal publication, presentations, and workshops will be utilised to encourage further discussion around the topic. The creation of a UK educational psychology special interest group around social justice may be of value, in order to advance interest in social justice, into action.
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Introduction

Aims of the research

The overarching aspiration of the thesis was to explore whether there was a relationship between educational psychology and the concept of ‘social justice’. The systematic literature review in Paper 1 aimed to answer the research question ‘What is the significance of social justice in educational psychology practice?’ It did this through an analysis and evaluation of current empirical research, centred on social justice and educational psychology. The empirical research in Paper 2 aimed to explore qualified educational psychologists’ views of social justice through semi-structured interviews. The research questions were: (1) How do educational psychologists define social justice? (2) How, if at all, is social justice important to educational psychology practice? (3) What does social justice currently look like within educational psychology practice? (4) What role do educational psychologists think educational psychology should play in working towards social justice?

Overall strategy

A systematic review of the literature (see Paper 1) demonstrated that there was evidence of positive support towards the significance of social justice within educational psychology practice, but the literature base was US-centric and the researcher was based in the UK. Therefore, it made sense to extend the current literature by undertaking a piece of empirical research, which investigated UK educational psychologists’ views of social justice. The results of the research supported previous findings by Winter and Hanley (2015), as well as the studies examined in the systematic literature review in Paper 1 (Briggs, McArdle, Bartucci, Kowalewicz, & Shriberg, 2009; Miranda, Radliff, Cooper, & Eschenbrenner, 2014; Moy et al., 2014; Shriberg et al., 2008; Shriberg, Wynne, Briggs, Bartucci, & C. Lombardo, 2011). It was concluded in Paper 3 that dissemination of this growing evidence base is essential in order to bring it to the attention of other interested educational psychologists, in the aim of advancing social justice interest into action.

Researcher’s professional background and relevant experience

The researcher had trained as a primary school teacher and worked as a teaching assistant for six years prior to starting on the Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology at The University of Manchester. She had worked in a range of learning environments including: the Early Years Foundation Stage, primary schools, and a special needs high school. The researcher had particularly worked with children and young people who had a range of
special educational needs, which varied from physical, to speech and language, to behavioural, emotional and social difficulties, and to cognition and learning. She had supported these pupils to overcome the barriers they experienced due to their needs, and helped them to access, engage and achieve within the learning environment. The researcher wished to continue to aid children and young people to achieve their potential but wanted to do so by utilising the psychological skills and knowledge that she had gained during her Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees, and with the tools that she would learn during the Doctorate course.

**Rationale for engagement**

The researcher held an interest in social justice due to her personal and professional experiences of the world and the education system. Previous research by Winter and Hanley (2015) had found evidence that the concept was important to UK counselling psychologists. As a trainee educational psychologist, the researcher wished to investigate whether social justice was important to other educational psychologists, or if it only held value to herself as a practitioner. The results of the studies would also help support the researcher in clarifying how her interest in social justice can impact her practice as a trainee educational psychologist. With regards to the participants, their rationale for engagement was likely to have been an interest in social justice, a desire to explore this, and wanting to raise the profile of the concept with regards to educational psychology practice. One of the participants admitted little to no knowledge of the subject, despite an interest in it from reading the research information sheet, and they had taken part for benevolent reasons.

**Positioning for data access**

The research was undertaken with qualified educational psychologists based across England in areas including: the North West, Yorkshire and the Humber, London, the East of England, and the South West. As a trainee educational psychologist, the researcher was able to advertise the research to educational psychologists in places that they were known to frequent (e.g.: the email discussion group ‘EPNET’), and through specific relevant contacts (e.g.: principal educational psychologists of educational psychology services based in the North West of England). The researcher was able to travel across the country to meet with and interview educational psychologists who had agreed to take part in the research, due to research time and a research budget that were available through her programme of doctoral study.
Evaluation of ontological, epistemological and axiological stances

Ontology refers to, “the study of being. It is concerned with 'what is', with the nature of existence, with the structure of reality as such” (Crotty, 1998, p.10), whilst epistemology is interested in, “the very bases of knowledge – its nature and forms, how it can be acquired, and how communicated to other human beings” (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007, p.7). The ontological and epistemological position that the research took, is that of critical realism. Realism can be defined as “the view that entities exist independently of being perceived, or independently of our theories about them” (Phillips, 1987, p.205). Critical realism combines two forms. The first being ontological realism which is the belief that, “there is a real world that exists independently of our perceptions, theories and constructions” (Maxwell, 2012, p.5). Reality has been moulded by social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic, and gender values, and is under continual internal influence (Scotland, 2012). The second is epistemological constructivism and relativism which is the knowledge that, “our understanding of this world is inevitably a construction from our own perspectives and standpoint” (Maxwell, 2012, p.5). However, knowledge is socially constructed and influenced by power relations that come from within society. “What counts as knowledge is determined by the social and positional power of the advocates of that knowledge” (Cohen et al., 2007, p.27). Both agree that there is no chance of reaching a single, true, precise view of the world, which is autonomous from any single point of view.

The overarching subject of the research was social justice, which Scotland (2012) claimed the critical paradigm is seeking to address, along with issues such as marginalisation, feminism, queer theory, and Marxism. Due to knowledge being culturally derived, historically situated and influenced by political ideology, it is not value free and therefore asks the axiological question ‘what is intrinsically worthwhile?’ Axiology refers to “the values and beliefs that we hold” (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011, p.3) and “relates to epistemology in two ways: It is in epistemology itself, and it is in the cultural context that informs epistemology” (Carter & Little, 2007, p.1322). The participants of the research each held their own opinions with regards to social justice. They came from different backgrounds and had individual experiences which impacted upon their view of social justice and its importance with regards to both educational psychology and the wider world. Their opinions and experiences may well differ to those of the children, young people, staff and parents that they work with, whose opinions weren’t sought as part of this research, but are just as important. It is vital to acknowledge that the researcher’s own values and beliefs may have influenced her undertaking of the research and her
interpretation of the research data, despite taking an inductive approach to data analysis. Some of the researcher’s relevant beliefs and values are as follows:

- She believes that all human beings are equal and should be treated fairly and in a non-discriminatory manner.
- She believes that society should be judged on how it treats its most vulnerable members.
- She believes that it is the role of society to distribute its resources in an equitable and fair manner that meets the needs and well-being of all of its citizens.
- She believes that all members of society should have equal access to opportunities.
- She believes that due to socio-economic status, background and environment, some members of society need a greater volume of support and resources than other members, so that all members can be equal.

Although the researcher tried to not impose her values during data collection, by keeping the questions she asked neutral but open ended (e.g.: “What, if any, importance does social justice hold within educational psychology?”), it must be presumed that the participants perceived the researcher to have an interest in social justice, due to her basing her thesis research around the concept. This may have created a social desirability bias with regards to their responses. It is also likely that the participants had an interest in the subject themselves, due to volunteering to take part in the research, and so this interest may have been accentuated during the interviews, due to social desirability. An inductive approach to data analysis was undertaken by the researcher, to try and ensure that themes were directly linked to the data itself, and not to researcher interest. However, it was impossible to completely remove the researcher’s beliefs and values from her thoughts when she undertook the analysis, so there might be some bias when interpreting and reporting the results. To try and combat this, the researcher sent the thematic maps to all participants for member checking, to ensure that there was a balance between participants’ voices and the researcher’s interpretation. Unfortunately, there may have been some aspect of social desirability in the participants’ responses.

In conclusion, as Scotland (2012) said, “the utopian aspirations of the critical paradigm may never be realized but a more democratic society may materialize”. The research aimed to explore educational psychologists’ views of social justice, in the hope of understanding how they adopted the concept within their practice, and what role it could play within educational psychology. Although the research may not have an impact in regards to
making all educational psychology practice become socially just, it may however alter the thinking and practice of some educational psychologists for the benefit of the clients that they work with.
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Abstract

The Aim: This article aimed to investigate the empirical evidence for the significance of social justice in educational psychology practice.

Method/Rationale: The social justice agenda is at the forefront of present political consciousness. The concept of ‘social justice’ has entered the discipline of psychology, in particular counselling (Winter, 2015) and community psychology (Fondacaro & Weinberg, 2002), and its relevance to psychology is debated (Arfken & Yen, 2014). Educational psychologists are situated in a prime position to promote social justice through their work with children, young people, parents and professionals. A rigorous systematic literature review was undertaken to find and synthesise empirical research relevant to the question: ‘What is the significance of social justice in educational psychology practice?’ Five databases were searched and initially 348 studies were found. After applying inclusion and exclusion criteria, this was narrowed down to five studies which were included in the final sample.

Findings: The research base gives positive support to the significance of the concept of social justice in educational/school psychology practice, highlighting themes of: advocacy, equity, inclusivity, opportunity and resources.

Limitations: The studies included investigated the views, in relation to social justice, of trainee and qualified school psychologists; however, all included studies were located in the USA.

Conclusions: Future research should extend to exploring the significance of social justice to psychologists working in educational systems in different countries and social contexts.

Keywords: social justice, educational psychologist, school psychologist, children, young people

Introduction

What is Social Justice?

In 2012, the UK government published a report outlining their strategy to promote social justice by supporting disadvantaged individuals and families (HM Government, 2012). However, circumstances such as the recent economic recession, changes to the social welfare system, the increased costs of higher education, and cuts in public services, which
are having far reaching negative consequences, could be said to be threatening the commitment to social justice in British society (Callender & Jackson, 2005; Hossain et al., 2011; Slay & Penny, 2013). It is difficult to universally define social justice because of variations in personal experiences (Todd & Rufa, 2013). For the purposes of this paper it is defined as, “full and equal participation of all groups in a society that is mutually shaped to meet their needs. Social justice includes a vision of society in which the distribution of resources is equitable and all members are physically and psychologically safe and secure” (Bell, 1997, p.3). Prilleltensky (2013) has highlighted the role of fairness on wellness and calls for psychologists to explore the link. He believes that fairness is synonymous with justice and can be divided into two main types; distributive justice and procedural justice, and a number of subtypes. Distributive justice concerns the fair and equitable distribution of resources, benefits and obligations in society such as the allocation of goods and the burdens of taxes. Procedural justice concerns having a voice and the opportunity to participate in processes and decisions which affect our lives. The subtypes include; informational (access to knowledge and transparency), interpersonal (voice and fairness in relationships), cultural (fair treatment of minorities and ethnic groups), retributive (fairness within the legal system), developmental (fair treatment between generations) and intrapersonal (behaviour towards the self). Five factors have been identified as being key to well-being; career, social relationships, community, health and finances (Rath & Harter, 2010). The Marmot Review concluded that fairer distribution of health, well-being and sustainability are important social goals because people from lower socioeconomic backgrounds tend to have poorer levels of health (Marmot, 2010). Six policy objectives were highlighted by the review: ensuring the best start in life, maximising personal capability and control, fair employment and good work, a healthy standard of living, healthy and sustainable places and communities, and ill health prevention strengthened.

*Helping Professions and Social Justice*

Organisations representing workers in helping professions such as social work, teaching and the National Health Service (NHS) directly reference social justice within their work. The Code of Ethics for Social Work states that “Social workers have a responsibility to promote social justice, in relation to society generally, and in relation to the people with whom they work.” It highlights five principles; challenging discrimination, recognising diversity, distributing resources, challenging unjust policies and practices, and working in solidarity (British Association of Social Workers: The Policy Ethics and Human Rights Committee, 2014, p.9). NHS England’s mission statement claims that “Reducing health inequalities and advancing equality are at the heart of the NHS, ensuring that NHS
organisations exercise fairness, social justice and an equitable approach across their range of activities and that no community or group is left behind” (NHS England, 2015). It addresses how characteristics including ethnicity, disability and socioeconomic status can affect access and experience of health care services, outcomes and careers. The General Teaching Council for Scotland (2012) states, that social justice is one of the core professional values and personal commitments, to being a teacher. It examines five points including “Respecting the rights of all learners as outlined in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) and their entitlement to be included in decisions regarding their learning experiences and have all aspects of their well-being developed and supported.”

Education and Social Justice

Universal education has long been seen as a driver of social justice. Individuals who have completed higher levels of education tend to earn more money, have lower levels of unemployment and poverty, report better health, are less likely to be imprisoned and more likely to participate in civic engagements such as voluntary work, blood donation and voting (Baum, Ma, & Payea, 2013; Baum & Payea, 2005). Despite universal education in the UK, socioeconomic status is the strongest predictor of educational attainment (Hills et al., 2010). Students of a lower socioeconomic status are, compared to peers from financially and socially advantageous backgrounds, more likely to: have lower cognitive skills, display greater behavioural problems upon starting school, show signs of becoming disenchanted with school, disengage from learning, not gain five A*-C grades at GCSE, not access higher education, and not be in education, employment or training after age 18 (Cassen & Kingdon, 2007; Chowdry, Crawford, & Goodman, 2009; Hansen & Joshi, 2008; Horgan, 2007). Early intervention is a means of reducing social inequality through supporting children and families before the educational attainment gap between economically rich and poor children becomes insurmountable (Sodha & Margo, 2010).

Psychology and Social Justice

Social justice has entered the discipline of psychology, in particular counselling psychology (Cutts, 2013; Vera & Speight, 2003) and community psychology (Fondacaro & Weinberg, 2002; Prilleltensky, 2001). There is a wealth of literature debating the role of social justice in psychology (Arfken & Yen, 2014; Louis, Mavor, La Macchia, & Amiot, 2014; Mays, 2000). However, Winter (2015) examined the ethical guidelines of psychological organisations in the US and UK, and found that there was no direct engagement with the term ‘social justice’ in any of their codes of practice. There was some
reference to ‘fairness’ and ‘justice’ within the APA’s ‘Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct’ (American Psychological Association, 2010). In contrast to the direct social justice references in social care, teaching and NHS profession documentation, the British Psychological Society's (2009) ‘Code of Ethics and Conduct’ and the Health and Care Professions Council's (2012a, 2012b) ‘Standards of conduct, performance and ethics’ and ‘Standards of proficiency for practitioner psychologists’ lack even these sub-textual references to social justice.

Educational Psychology and Social Justice

Educational psychologists are well placed to promote social justice, through individual and school systems work (Power, 2008), by raising awareness of the relationship between socioeconomic circumstances and diverse backgrounds on educational attainment (Rogers & O’Bryon, 2008), encouraging school staff to consider the difficulties pupils might encounter when accessing a learning environment within the context of an ecological model instead of solely within-child (Williams & Greenleaf, 2012), and working collaboratively with families, school staff and professionals to bring about change for children and young people (Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000; Shriberg & Clinton, 2016).

Review Research Question

In the US, Speight and Vera (2009) have called for a critical dialogue about the role of social justice within the field of school psychology/practitioner educational psychology. This systematic literature review aims to analyse and evaluate current empirical research centred on social justice and educational psychology, to answer the question ‘What is the significance of social justice in educational psychology practice?’ The focus will be on practitioner and trainee educational/school psychologists’ perceptions of social justice.

Method

Study Selection

The current systematic literature review is structured using the PRISMA framework (Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff, Altman, & The PRISMA Group, 2009). The following electronic databases were searched for research studies relevant to the review question: PsychINFO, Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts (ASSIA), Science Direct, Web of Science and ERIC. Studies which were included had their references harvested to identify other potential papers that met the inclusion criteria. The search terms used for
each of the electronic databases were: (a) Social Justice AND School Psychology and (b) Social Justice AND Educational Psychology. Other search terms were not used alongside those stated since the researcher did not wish to impose (their own or others’) preconceived notions as to what social justice is or involves. The PRISMA framework identified 348 records through database searching and one record via reference harvesting (see Appendix 2). The studies in this systematic literature review (SLR) were examined and screened to ensure that they met the following inclusion criteria: (a) published within a peer-reviewed journal, (b) participants were solely trainee and/or qualified educational/school psychologists, (c) the focus was on the topic of social justice, (d) it reported empirical quantitative and/or qualitative research and (e) was published in English.

After screening, 18 records’ full text was assessed for eligibility, and 13 full text articles were excluded as not meeting the inclusion criteria (see Appendix 3); reasons for exclusion included the articles not being empirical research or not involving educational/school psychologist participants. Five articles were ultimately included; one used quantitative methods, three used qualitative and the last used a mixed methods approach.

**Screening and Study Quality Assessment**

Gough’s (2007) ‘Weight of Evidence framework’ was utilised to enhance the judgement of the quality and relevance of the identified studies with regards to the review’s research question. Qualitative and quantitative frameworks acted as a generic judgement of method quality (Weight of Evidence A). Qualitative research studies were assessed for quality using an investigative framework (see Appendix 4) previously utilised by Bond, Woods, Humphrey, Symes and Green (2013). The framework incorporates 12 criteria including: appropriateness of the research design, analysis close to the data, emergent theory related to the problem, transferable conclusions and evidence of attention to ethical issues. Each study was awarded 0, ½ or 1 point for each criterion; after scoring summation, the study was categorised as either low (0-4 points), medium (5-8) or high (9-12) quality.

Quantitative investigation studies were evaluated using a framework (see Appendix 5) created by the researchers by reference to quantitative research guidelines (cf. Choi, 1998; Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007; Genaidy et al., 2007; Wallace & Wray, 2011). This framework incorporates 15 criteria including: clear research question or hypothesis, response rate/item elicitation maximised, geographic considerations, multi-level or inter-group analyses present and clear criteria for rating of findings. Each quantitative study was awarded 0, ½ or 1 point for each criterion. After scoring summation, each study was categorised as either low (0-5), medium (6-10) or high (11-15) quality. One study adopted
a mixed methods design and so both frameworks were applied, with the higher of the two scores assigned as the study quality evaluation.

Each study’s methodology was also rated as to whether it was appropriate in answering the review’s research question (Weight of Evidence B). This took into account the aim of the research, participant selection and the method of data collection. Lastly, each study was graded with regards to the focus of the evidence it produced, in answering the review’s research question (Weight of Evidence C). This took into account whether the study’s findings contributed to the overall engagement and impact of social justice within school psychology practice, rather than simply answering the individual study’s research question without any transferability. After scoring each study as being of either high, medium or low quality on each of the Weights of Evidence (see Appendix 6), a combined score was then generated which produced an overall judgement (Weight of Evidence D). One-third of the papers were independently coded by the researcher and her two research supervisors. Ratings for each paper were exchanged and discussions were held if there were disagreements. Post discussion inter-rater reliability stood at 0.92 and 0.86 for quantitative and qualitative evaluations respectively. A description of the studies can be found in Table 1.

Data Extraction and Synthesis

Research questions and results from each of the included studies were extracted; findings related to grouped research questions (taken from the studies) were then synthesised comprehensively from across all studies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and Overall Weight of Evidence D Score</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Research Questions and Methodology</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Briggs, McArdle, Bartucci, Kowalewicz &amp; Shriberg (2009) Medium</td>
<td>6 Trainee School Psychologists USA</td>
<td>RQ 1: What are participants’ personal views of social justice? RQ2: How did the programme impact these views? RQ3: How could the programme improve its impact on students’ attitudes and perspectives around social justice moving forward? Focus Group</td>
<td>Qualitative coding analysis.</td>
<td>RQ1: Equality and equity in relation to distribution of resources and opportunities. RQ2: Experiences in schools had the greatest influence on their perspectives on social justice. RQ3: Wider variety of placement types and a stronger, more explicit connection between social justice and classroom activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda, Radliff, Cooper &amp; Eschenbrenner</td>
<td>36 Trainee School Psychologists</td>
<td>RQ1: How do students in a school psychology programme that trains from a social justice framework and integrates an urban speciality focus</td>
<td>Qualitative coding analysis and descriptive</td>
<td>RQ1: Individual ratings of cultural competence (Likert scale 1-5). Mean rating for the sample was 3.85. RQ2: Commitment to a lifelong pursuit, the ecological model,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (2014) Medium  | USA  | rate their cultural competency after completing two years of coursework and a field-based practicum in an urban setting?  
| RQ2: What factors do students identify as integral to developing cultural competency?  
| RQ3: What training components do students identify as important for socially just practice?  
| Survey (Independent and small group) | quantitative analysis. | awareness and empathy.  
| RQ3: Coursework, field-based experiences, specific assignments and class activities, interactions with staff and peers, and the overall emphasis of multi-culturalism and diversity throughout the programme. |

| Moy et al. (2014) High | 37 Trainee School Psychologists USA | RQ1: How do participants define social justice?  
| RQ2: What are participants’ thoughts about how social justice may pertain to school psychology?  
| RQ3: What are participants’ evaluations of their graduate programme’s effectiveness in training for social justice? | Qualitative analysis using Consensual Qualitative Research (CQR). | RQ 1: Fairness/equity, awareness, advocacy and service.  
| RQ 2: Awareness, fairness/equity, application and advocacy.  
| RQ 3: Application, awareness, exposure, instruction, program, reflection and time. |
| Shriberg et al (2008) | Focus Groups | Qualitative data analysis using an inductive content analysis. | RQ1: Ensuring the protection of rights and opportunities for all (71%), ecological/systemic view (12%), advocacy for others (6%), non-discriminatory/inclusive (6%), personal responsibility (6%) and undefined (0%).  
RQ2: Institutional power (29%), advocacy (29%), equity (18%), culturally competent practice (12%), addressing prejudice/discrimination (6%), diversity dimensions (6%), role of school psychology (0%), other (0%).  
RQ3: Knowledge – All responses (30%), best practices (15%), law and ethics (10%), current issues (10%) and resources (5%).  
Action steps – All responses (100%), advocating for children, families and services (70%), interacting with school personnel and community (60%), systems level (50%), personal responsibility (40%) and school psychology practice (35%).  
RQ4: Likert rating scale of 1-8, with 1 = most important and 8 = least important as a barrier or opportunity.  
Lack of diversity in the field (2.57), equity of placement/services (2.79), allocation of resources (3.21), professional endorsement (4.21), testing and assessment (4.29), |
| Medium | 17 Qualified School Psychologists, judged to be cultural diversity experts USA | RQ1: What is the definition of social justice as it applies to the practice of school psychology?  
RQ2: What topics are most salient to a discussion of social justice in school psychology?  
RQ3: In what specific ways can a school psychologist be an advocate for social justice in school settings?  
RQ4: What current issues in contemporary school psychology have an effect on social justice work, either positively or negatively? Delphi Questionnaire |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shriberg, Wynne, Briggs, Bartucci &amp; Lombardo (2011)</th>
<th>214 Qualified School Psychologists, USA</th>
<th>Delphi Study</th>
<th>Quantitative data analysed for correlations, significance, means and standard deviations. Qualitative data analysed through an inductive content analysis.</th>
<th>Likert rating scale 1-7. *Significantly higher than mean rating, p &lt; .001. <em><em>Significantly lower than mean rating, p &lt; 0.01. RQ1: Protection of educational rights and opportunities * (6.70), non-discriminatory practice</em> (6.67), advocacy (6.47), culturally responsive service delivery (6.36), prevention of over identification of minority groups for special education (5.98), eliminating the achievement gap (5.66) and connecting students and families to community resources (5.50). RQ2: School psychology practice</em> (6.42), school psychology research (6.10), NASP (6.07) and professional development (5.94). RQ3: 94% agreed that consideration of institutional power is salient to the discussion of social justice within school psychology. Rationales included; (a) role of institutions in school psychology, (b) challenge of combating the way things are when the status quo supports injustice and (c) underappreciation of the saliency of institutional power.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
RQ4: Importance of topic areas: best prevention and intervention practices (6.59), ethical codes of conduct (6.56), cultural diversity issues (6.36), best assessment practices (6.34), children’s mental health issues (6.31), effective collaboration skills (6.31), education law (6.26), current education issues (6.00), school resources (5.84), community resources (5.82), consultation models (5.81), counselling skills (5.76), educational theory (5.26) and psychological theories (5.25).

Importance of these areas in practicum experiences: ethical codes of conduct* (6.74), best prevention and intervention practices (6.51), education law (6.45), best assessment practices (6.44), informed on cultural diversity issues (6.37), employ effective collaboration skills (6.30), address children’s mental health (6.19), practice consultation skills (6.18), be informed on current education issues (5.91), utilise school resources (5.91), utilise community resources (5.78), practice counselling skills (5.69), practice consultation models (5.64), apply psychological theories (5.22) and apply educational theory (5.15).

Respondents rated educational law, ethical codes of conduct and best assessment practices as more important to practicum
practice (p < 0.05); they rated consultation models higher with regard to knowledge than practice (p < 0.05).

Realistic actions for school psychologists: promote school psychology best practice* (6.52), conduct culturally fair assessments* (6.47), advocate for children and families* (6.46), ensure adherence to laws (6.39), speak up when injustices are done (6.26), educate families on school and community resources (6.02), be leaders in the educational setting (5.97), build positive schools (5.80), take personal responsibility in being a social change agent (5.75), build alliances between school personnel and the community (5.52), be active outside of schools (5.25), work toward organisational change (5.23) and take personal risks in promoting institutional change** (4.73).

RQ5: Knowledge of law (5.42), community involvement (4.82), family involvement (4.71), equity of placement and services (4.31), amount of time spent in violence interventions (4.10), role of school administration (3.94), allocation of resources (3.46), lack of cultural diversity in school psychology (3.43), culturally insensitive testing and assessment (3.27), schedules (3.17), excessive testing and assessment (2.96) and school
psychologists’ caseloads (2.72).

3 most important barriers to the achievement of social justice in school psychology; school psychologists’ caseloads, role of school administration and allocation of resources. 3 barriers that should be addressed first in order to improve social justice in school psychology; allocation of resources, school psychologists’ caseloads and role of school administration. 3 barriers that most realistically can be addressed to improve social justice in school psychology; insufficient knowledge of law, role of school administration and culturally sensitive assessment.

Responses to four qualitative questions related to perceived barriers and supports toward achieving social justice in school psychology: 19.5% personal (school psychologists as individuals), 93.4% professional (school/work climate and the field’s commitment to social justice) and 11.5% societal (external conditions).
Results

The research questions contained within this results section refer to the findings of the studies rather than the review’s research question.

How is social justice defined and viewed in relation to school psychology?

Four of the five papers investigated participants’ views and definitions of social justice, highlighting three dominant areas; fairness, advocacy and non-discriminatory practice.

Fairness

Fairness included concepts of equality and equity. Equality tended to be related to the distribution of resources; “[Making] sure that everyone in my school has an equal learning opportunity and … gets all the services … and accommodations that they need to have a successful education” (Moy et al., 2014, p.330). Whilst equity was connected to meeting individual needs; “… It’s not necessarily about [equality], it’s about levelling the playing field… some students might need more than others… it doesn’t have to be equal, it just had to be allowing them to maximise their growth” (Briggs et al., 2009, p.40).

Advocacy

School Psychologists were placed in the position of advocates, working on behalf of children, young people and families. “I think it also has a lot to do with advocating for students and people in general who may not have anybody to advocate for them, whether it be educationally or economically” (Moy et al., 2014, p.330). “Advocating for the needs of children and families who are alienated and disenfranchised from the system” (Shriberg et al., 2008, p.461).

Non-discriminatory practice

Non-discriminatory practice included concepts of awareness, inclusivity, and protecting the rights, opportunities and responsibilities of all. “Making sure that we provide equal and appropriate educational services to all students regardless of their background” (Shriberg et al., 2008, p.461). “I agree [that social justice] is acting in a culturally competent way [that] involves also knowing your own limitations and biases” (Moy et al., 2014, p.331).

Briggs et al. (2009) pointed out that distributive justice (in relation to resources) was a particular focus of participants’ views of social justice but they also discussed how this connects to North's (2006) ‘three spheres of social justice’; redistribution/recognition, macro/micro and sameness/difference. The three dominant themes across all four papers
can be linked to North’s concept. Fairness and its associated concepts of equality and equity would be part of the redistribution/recognition sphere, as participants stated that resources should be linked to need. Advocacy can be linked to the macro/micro sphere as participants spoke about helping to obtain resources for those they work with (micro) or reforming systems to improve access to resources (macro). Non-discriminatory practice and its associated concepts of awareness, inclusivity, and protecting the rights, opportunities and responsibilities of all would be part of the sameness/difference sphere, as participants recognised the importance of acknowledging differences in background and cultures, whilst accepting that all children, young people and families that they work with have rights that need protecting.

What is the impact of training programmes with a social justice focus?

Trainee school psychologists were the participants in three of the five studies, highlighting three dominant areas: cultural competence, aspects of the course which positively impacted upon social justice knowledge and experience, and potential improvements to the course.

Cultural competence

Shriberg et al.’s (2008) research found that qualified school psychologists thought there was a strong link between cultural diversity and social justice (cf. Vera & Speight, 2003). Miranda et al. (2014) examined trainee school psychologists’ self-reported ratings of cultural competence and found that in general, they classified themselves as being above average to high. Participants thought the following factors integral to developing cultural competency: commitment to a lifelong pursuit, ecological model, awareness and empathy. These personal characteristics can be linked to working from a social justice perspective. For example with regards to empathy; “I think being placed in a position (practicum) where I could experience what [the students] deal with on a daily basis provided me a new perspective as well as greater understanding and sensitivity” (p.355).

Aspects of the course which were perceived to positively impact upon social justice knowledge and experience

All three papers identified that school psychology training experiences were perceived to positively impact upon participants’ knowledge and skills with regards to social justice. Trainee school psychologists highlighted that fieldwork experiences (“To me I’ve really learned by seeing what is actually going on in the field” [Briggs et al., 2009, p.41]), university work (“From the beginning, we were told to examine issues through a ‘multicultural lens’ – I feel like it is the underlying message in most of our courses”
[Miranda et al., 2014, p.355]) and interactions with professors and peers (“To come back and talk with our professors and talk with our peers […] just kind of build our repertoire of how we would handle challenging situations or things that maybe are really unfamiliar to us […] that’s really strong” [Moy et al., 2014, p.334]), all contributed to their practice becoming more socially just.

**Potential improvements to the course**

Two of the studies looked at ways in which the training courses could be improved to support trainees’ practice in the area of social justice. Overlapping themes included; diverse fieldwork experiences - particularly in regards to practise placements in communities that were underserved or had greater need (“Should try a little harder to place students in schools that have higher needs … A lot of times our students end up at a school in the suburbs for practicum and I think that’s a good experience [but] it doesn’t necessarily fit with the social justice motto” [Briggs et al., 2009, p.42]), and support in the classroom - explicit connections between social justice and classroom activities, and understanding and applying it (“Most of the professors try to include the social justice piece in their teachings … but … you have to read between the lines sometimes” [Briggs et al., 2009, p.42]).

Moy et al. (2014) proposed that a social justice mission could be considered contradictory where intern placements were in middle-class communities. However, they went on to discuss that social justice can take different forms, and opportunities to adopt and apply a social justice perspective is possible in all schools. Briggs et al. (2009) highlighted that participants preferred to hear multiple perspectives rather than professors focusing entirely on their own views of social justice and its application to school psychology. Miranda et al. (2014) used the feedback from school psychology trainees to create a social justice training model which focused on providing students with diverse practicum experiences whilst the course and its foundations had an embedded philosophy of social justice. Participants in Moy et al.'s (2014) research mentioned the absence of cultural and economic diversity among students enrolled on the programme, whilst Miranda et al. (2014) stated that after an urban speciality focus was created on their programme, they had an increase in minority applicants. Although training programmes can try to adopt a social justice focus through diverse fieldwork experiences, giving students the opportunity to hear a variety of voices, and supporting trainees to become more self-aware of their own privileges and the difficulties others face that they might not have experienced, there is an intrinsic lack of
social justice within the profession when members are homogenous and lack cultural and economic diversity amongst themselves.

What is the link between social justice and school psychology?

Three of the five papers explicitly addressed the link between social justice and school psychology, in their research questions. Shriberg et al. (2011) investigated the importance of social justice with regards to four aspects of school psychology. Qualified school psychologists rated attention to social justice in school psychology practice as being significantly more important than attention to social justice in school psychology research, the National Association of School Psychologists focusing attention on social justice issues, and taking into account social justice when planning school psychology professional development opportunities. This corresponds with both Shriberg et al.’s (2008) research with qualified school psychologists and Moy et al.’s (2014) study involving trainee school psychologists. The themes that arose when they explored the link between social justice and school psychology were centred on practice. Prevalent themes included; awareness - which includes institutional power and diversity dimensions (“Poverty – understanding how poverty exacerbates so many issues in education, including academic achievement” [Shriberg et al., 2008, p.462]), application - which involved culturally competent practice and addressing prejudice/discrimination, fairness/equity, and advocacy (“[School Psychologists can] also kind of help the kids who don’t have the parents who are knocking down the principal’s door every day, you know it’s the parents who don’t realise their kid maybe isn’t getting what they need from the school” [Moy et al., 2014, p.332]).

Although the link between social justice and school psychology practice was addressed and valued, I perceive the views of the research participants in the included studies to be almost dismissive of the important work that research, psychological associations and professional development can make in advancing the position of and adding to the current research base in regards to social justice within school psychology. I think it’s important to note that as evidence-based practitioners, research informs the work that school psychologists do and professional development opportunities allow research to be disseminated. Psychological associations publicise research both to their members and to wider society. Sharing links between social justice and school psychology, to school psychologists, educational professionals and the wider community, can potentially have a greater impact on society’s awareness of the impact of social justice on education.
How can school psychologists address institutional power and advocate for social justice?

The two Shriberg et al. (2008, 2011) studies examined institutional power and the role that school psychologists can play in advocating for social justice. 94% of qualified school psychologists in the latter article agreed that a consideration of institutional power is pertinent to the discussion of social justice in school psychology. The rationales behind their responses fit three categories; the role that institutions can potentially play in school psychologists’ work, the challenge of trying to bring about change when the status quo supports injustice, and the underappreciation of the role and affect that institutional power has (Shriberg, Wynne, Briggs, Bartucci, & Lombardo, 2011). “It is critically important for school psychologists to understand that those who have power make the rules and that those who have power are the most reluctant to make change because it will diminish their place. It maintains the status quo” (Shriberg et al., 2008, p.464). When investigating the ways in which school psychologists can advocate for social justice, participants’ answers fell into two categories; knowledge and action.

Knowledge included; law and ethics (codes of conduct, education law), current issues (cultural diversity, children’s mental health, education), resources (consultation models, counselling skills, educational theory, psychological theories, effective collaboration skills) and best practice (prevention, intervention, assessment). Action included; advocating for children, family and services (speaking up when injustices are done, educating families on school and community resources), interacting with school personnel and the community (utilising school and community resources, building alliances between school personnel and the community ), personal responsibility (in being a social change agent, take personal risks in promoting institutional change), school psychology practice (promoting best practices, conducting culturally fair assessments, be active outside of schools in regards to research and associations), and systems level (ensuring adherence to laws, be leaders in the educational setting, build positive schools, work towards organisational change).

Shriberg et al. (2011) discussed that social justice can be seen from either an individual perspective (in which the aim is to establish a society in which people conduct their own lives with little or no intervention from government or other formal systems), or from a wider systemic point of view (which involves active manipulation of social systems to meet specific goals). Participants favoured the latter approach due to their opinion that institutional power can hinder social justice, which needs addressing through school psychologists taking on an advocacy role. In this way, they will be able to support the rights and opportunities of all children and families that they work with. I would like to
note that although the forms of advocacy work discussed in these pieces of research are honourable in their intentions, I feel that it places school psychologists as experts and their clients as being powerless and voiceless. Therefore, advocacy work needs to include listening to children and families, and supporting them to use their own voices to bring about change.

What are the current issues affecting social justice work in school psychology practice?

Both of the Shriberg et al. (2008, 2011) research papers investigated current barriers and opportunities towards social justice in school psychology practice. Although one study focused on investigating the views of school psychologists who were experts in cultural diversity and the other study did not place such limitations on its recruitment of school psychologists, both identified similar barriers and opportunities. Participants’ responses fell into three main categories; personal (cultural competency, interpersonal skills/relationships, individual’s commitment to social justice), professional ([a] School/work climate; school politics, role of the school psychologist, administrative support, interactions with parents and the community, resources, equity of placement/services, multiculturalism, [b] the school psychology field’s commitment to social justice; knowledge base, cultural proficiency, influence of professional organisations, drive/willingness to rock the boat, advances in the field, lack of diversity within the field), and societal (federal laws, cultural context).

There were however disagreements between the two studies as to which barriers were most important. Shriberg et al. (2011) found that caseloads, allocation and resources, and the role of school administration were the top three barriers and those which participants thought should be addressed first. However, role of school administration, culturally insensitive assessment and insufficient knowledge of law were considered to be the barriers which could be most realistically addressed. Community involvement, lack of cultural diversity in the field and schedules were noted as being the barriers which could less realistically be addressed. Shriberg et al.’s (2008) participants said that lack of diversity in the field, equity of placement/services and allocation of resources were the top three most important barriers.

The majority of barriers fit into the professional category. As Shriberg et al. (2011) pointed out, although this is probably a true reflection of the real world, the larger number of professional responses in comparison to personal and societal is notable and informative. They discussed how models of social justice place importance on both the position of self-awareness and on the impact that systems of oppression have upon all in society. The lack
of responses to school psychologists’ self-perceived personal limitations and to the wider social and political influences that work against social justice indicates a potential conundrum. Despite school psychologists valuing social justice as a worthwhile aspiration, Shriberg et al. stated this does not mean that they have made the association between social justice as a goal to aspire to, with the necessary process of critical self and societal exploration, which are crucial towards achieving this aspiration.

Professional barriers can be perceived as being beyond the reach of school psychologists and as mentioned previously, participants considered institutional power as being important when discussing the role of social justice in school psychology. If professional barriers are present because of institutional influences, then they are going to be difficult or impossible to overcome. As Shriberg et al. highlighted, it is important to look at the areas in which school psychologists can adopt social justice into their practice. Some of these may require taking personal risks which not all school psychologists will feel prepared to accept but all are able to engage in self-reflection and make adjustments to their practice, within the systems that they work.

**Conclusions and recommendations for future research**

Advocacy, non-discriminatory practice and fairness were judged to be central to the definition of social justice. When considering the link between social justice and school psychology, participants tended to focus on distributive forms of social justice, in relation to their own practice. Cultural diversity was acknowledged as a factor but was rated more highly by some participants than others. Differences such as; gender, sexuality, class and race, create diversity which often leads to inequality, biases and prejudice. A social justice agenda can work to overcome these issues and support diversity. As acknowledged in the studies, the school psychology field is homogeneous and lacks diversity (Curtis, Castillo, & Gelley, 2012). However, there was an awareness that the profession is advocating and serving groups that are not adequately represented in the field, which can create difficulties in understanding the backgrounds and needs of children and families that school psychologists are trying to support.

The frameworks created by Miranda et al. (2014) and Briggs et al. (2009) to embed social justice into school psychology training, try to overcome this barrier through providing trainee school psychologists with a range of experiences, the opportunity to hear a variety of voices and discussing their thoughts and experiences with peers and course tutors.
Further research has proposed a participatory culture-specific model in order to increase the effectiveness of social justice programmes in school psychology (Graybill, Varjas, Meyers, Greenberg, & Roach, 2013). Pillay's (2014) article argues that a social justice framework needs to be entrenched within a rights-based agenda to promote children’s universal rights (UNICEF, 1989) in African countries at systemic levels. Shriberg and Desai (2014) have also examined the overlap between social justice and children’s rights in relation to school psychology practice. They pointed out that both frameworks address the micro/macro sphere and call for action to ensure basic levels of respect, rights and opportunities for children and families, no matter their background.

Although advocacy was a reoccurring theme, the role of institutional power as a barrier was highlighted. Participants did not feel this was a realistic barrier to overcome and appeared reluctant to take personal and professional risks. This is supported by research from McCabe and Rubinson (2008) who investigated the behavioural intention of school psychology, school counselling and education trainees, to advocate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered (LGBT) youth. Despite students having strong, positive attitudes towards some social justice themes which included race, class and language, they held inadequate attitudes and knowledge of the issues that are faced by LGBT youth. They did not identify LGBT as being an oppressed group and considered it acceptable to ignore LGBT slurs in schools. They acknowledged their own biases but did not appear to find it necessary to challenge or change them, in order to become advocates for LGBT youth in prejudiced environments. Trainees did not feel comfortable raising incidents of LGBT discrimination to school staff and it was not a subject that was given much coverage by their university tutors. If opportunities to advocate for LGBT youth experiencing harassment did arise, trainees felt that heavy workloads, lack of support from school staff, chaotic school environments and a lack of resources would prevent them from intervening.

Moy et al. (2014) stated that if school psychology trainees are supported to identify injustices, they are better positioned to advocate for alternative practices. However, if they are not trained to recognise areas of injustice, this can result in them engaging in practices that maintain the status quo. In the United States, Briggs et al. (2009) concluded that when considering the implementation of social justice in school psychology training, it is important to ask: What perspectives are there? How should they be presented? How could an explicit social justice focus be embedded effectively throughout university and field placement experiences? To be able to advocate for children, young people and families, school psychologists must be aware of all forms of discrimination and feel empowered to work with schools to address and overcome them.
It should be noted however, that the role of US school psychologists is different in many ways to that of UK educational psychologists (Jimerson, Oakland, & Farrell, 2007). Further research needs to explore the significance of social justice in school psychology in countries outside of the United States, to investigate how and whether such differences affect philosophies and practices relating to the concept of social justice. Accordingly, the researcher has recently embarked upon empirical research to explore the views of educational psychologists based in England; a full report on this work will be published in the near future.
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Abstract

Aim and focus: Despite social justice being at the forefront of present political consciousness in the UK, a recent systematic literature review found little evidence of talk about social justice in UK educational psychology, particularly in contrast to US school psychology (Schulze, Winter, Woods, & Tyldesley, 2017). Therefore, this qualitative interview study explored nine UK educational psychologists’ perspectives on the place of social justice within their practice. Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed before being thematically analysed.

Findings: Social justice was defined in terms which included: discrimination, disadvantage, equality, and equity. Reasons for its importance to educational psychology practice covered current cuts to public services and problems with the educational system. Within educational psychology practice, social justice involved supporting others and having an awareness of personal biases and prejudices. Despite thinking that educational psychology should actively work towards social justice, participants were uncertain whether there was a profession-wide commitment to the concept. These findings and the implications arising are discussed in the context of wider literature.

Keywords: social justice, educational psychologist, school psychologist, children, young people

Introduction

Current political context

Within the United Kingdom (UK), social justice is currently playing an active role in the political agenda. The 2010-2015 Conservative and Liberal Democrat coalition government released a report, which set out their strategy to promote social justice. They proposed that they would do this through supporting disadvantaged individuals and families in the UK, via prevention and a ‘second chance society’ (HM Government, 2012). Within the UK, the government’s austerity agenda has been in place since the financial crash of 2008. This has led to cuts in funding of public services such as health, education, and educational psychology services. This reduction in public funding has been done in the aim of reducing the UK’s debt. The cuts have forced many educational psychology services to change from being core funded to becoming either semi or fully “traded”. Core funding means that educational psychology services receive funding from their local government authority to
deliver statutory (legal) work as well as early intervention work. Semi-traded services continue to receive funding to deliver statutory and some early intervention work, whilst fully traded services only receive funding to deliver statutory work. All other work is paid for directly by nurseries, schools, colleges, universities, and voluntary organisations such as charities, many of whom are suffering their own cuts in funding from local and central government (Adams, 2017; Allcock Tyler, 2016; Burns, 2017; Coughlan, 2017; Weale, 2017).

There has been a lot of backlash against the austerity agenda which has led to public marches and the formation of groups such as ‘Psychologists for Social Change’ who have an ongoing campaign called ‘Psychologists Against Austerity’. They have released a briefing paper which directly links the impact of cuts to public services, to people experiencing mental health problems (Psychologists Against Austerity, 2015). Whilst some commentators state that the UK has reached socially acceptable limits of austerity (Laws, 2017) and others say that austerity was never an appropriate response to the financial crisis (Krugman, 2015), there are many people still arguing that austerity is necessary for the future economic prosperity of the UK (Bourne, 2017; Winder, 2015). However, the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (2016) have said that, “The Committee is seriously concerned about the disproportionate, adverse impact that austerity measures introduced in 2010 are having on the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights by disadvantaged and marginalized individuals and groups” (p.4).

**Defining Social Justice**

There are difficulties in providing a definitive definition of social justice due to personal experience resulting in it meaning different things to different people (Todd & Rufa, 2013). However, to provide a starting point to this research, Bell's (1997) definition was used. She suggested that social justice involves the following: “full and equal participation of all groups in a society that is mutually shaped to meet their needs. Social justice includes a vision of society in which the distribution of resources is equitable and all members are physically and psychologically safe and secure” (p.3). When considering the well-being of citizens, Rath and Harter (2010) stated that career, social relationships, community, health, and finances were fundamental elements. A report from Oxfam has stated that in 2014, the richest 1% of the world’s population held 48% of the total global wealth (Hardoon, 2015). Within the UK, the richest 100 citizens have as much combined wealth as the poorest 30% of households, which is approximately 18,900,000 people (Equality Trust, 2014). Financial inequality has been shown to negatively impact upon all
areas of life; relationships, mental and physical health, education, crime, and social mobility (Wilkinson & Pickett, 2010). It would therefore suggest that the current unequitable distribution of resources within UK society, emphasised particularly by austerity, is not simply affecting individuals’ financial situations, but their general well-being too.

Schulze, Winter, Woods and Tyldesley (2017) pointed out that the link between fairness and wellness has been discussed by Prilleltensky (2013). “He believes that fairness is synonymous with justice and can be divided into two main types; distributive justice and procedural justice, and a number of subtypes. Distributive justice concerns the fair and equitable distribution of resources, benefits and obligations in society such as the allocation of goods and the burdens of taxes. Procedural justice concerns having a voice and the opportunity to participate in processes and decisions which affect our lives. The subtypes include; informational (access to knowledge and transparency), interpersonal (voice and fairness in relationships), cultural (fair treatment of minorities and ethnic groups), retributive (fairness within the legal system), developmental (fair treatment between generations) and intrapersonal (behaviour towards the self)” (Schulze, Winter, Woods, & Tyldesley, 2017, p.57-58). Therefore, to refer back to Bell’s definition, social justice is not simply concerned with the equitable distribution of resources but also with the fair and equal treatment and participation of individuals, within society. If individuals were given equitable resources but some groups were marginalised and their voices suppressed, society could not be said to be fair and just.

The Role of Education in Social Justice

Schulze, Winter, Woods and Tyldesley (2017) have pointed out that universal education is considered to be a driving force for social justice. In their review they highlight that previous research has shown that people who are more educated are more likely to be: higher earners, not suffering from unemployment and/or poverty, living with better health, not imprisoned, and engaging in civic participation activities like voluntary work, blood donation and voting (Baum et al., 2013; Baum & Payea, 2005). Although all children and young people in the UK have access to universal education, future educational attainment can be most reliably predicted by a child’s socioeconomic status (Hills et al., 2010). Those students who come from lower socioeconomic backgrounds are less likely to gain five A*-C grades at GCSE (Cassen & Kingdon, 2007). The probability of young people being not in education, employment or training (NEET) after age 18 is over seven times greater for those who come from the financially poorest fifth of households, compared to the richest
fifth (Chowdry, Crawford, & Goodman, 2009). Young people who gain GCSE results that are above the national median but have a socioeconomic background which has meant that they were eligible for free school meals, are much less likely to access higher education than their affluent peers who achieve the same GCSE results.

Children from economically disadvantaged families tend to have lower cognitive skills and display greater behavioural problems upon starting school, than children from more educated parents and economically advantaged backgrounds (Hansen & Joshi, 2008).

Research has shown that boys as young as 9 and 10 years of age, from financially poorer backgrounds, are showing signs of becoming disenchanted with school and are starting to disengage from learning (Horgan, 2007). A recent report from the Social Mobility Commission (2017) has declared that the last two decades of the UK Government’s effort to improve social mobility, has failed to adequately break the link between socioeconomic background and social progress. In particular; child poverty has risen, there is a continued educational attainment gap between economically poor and rich children, labour market outcomes for young people are feeble and their wages have fallen to below 1997 levels, living standards are falling, and the highest and most well paid jobs continue to be held by an elite group in society.

Education, despite being accessible to all, is clearly not acting as a driver for social mobility for children and young people from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. If the gap between pupils has begun before children start school, then early intervention is an important approach to reducing social inequality, through supporting children and families before the educational attainment gap between economically rich and poor children becomes insurmountable (Sodha & Margo, 2010). Recent UK governments have put into place free childcare and education for 15 hours a week for all three to four year olds (some can receive 30 hours depending on eligibility), whilst two year olds from families in receipt of particular welfare support, can also receive it. However, a report by the House of Commons’ Committee of Public Accounts (2016) stated that only 58% of entitled two years olds were taking up places in 2015, many providers said that they were not being paid enough by local government to cover the costs of delivering free places, and providers were struggling to recruit high quality, qualified staff. Early intervention can only be put into place and succeed if there is appropriate resource (financial and human) to do so, and if it reaches those who it is targeted towards.
Schulze, Winter, Woods, & Tyldesley (2017) examined the literature of organisations and bodies, who represent workers in helping professions across the UK, and found that many directly cite the role of social justice. With regards to social workers, their code of ethics says that, “Social workers have a responsibility to promote social justice, in relation to society generally, and in relation to the people with whom they work.” It points out that this involves: challenging discrimination, recognising diversity, distributing resources, challenging unjust policies and practices, and working in solidarity (British Association of Social Workers: The Policy Ethics and Human Rights Committee, 2014, p.9). For health care workers, the mission statement for National Health Service (NHS) England states that, “Reducing health inequalities and advancing equality are at the heart of the NHS, ensuring that NHS organisations exercise fairness, social justice and an equitable approach across their range of activities and that no community or group is left behind.” (NHS England, 2015). In order to meet its objective, the NHS has a constitution which sets out its key, guiding values. Lastly, the General Teaching Council for Scotland (2012) declared that for teachers, social justice is a core professional value and personal commitment. For example, they note the importance of, “Respecting the rights of all learners as outlined in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) and their entitlement to be included in decisions regarding their learning experiences and have all aspects of their well-being developed and supported.” Social justice therefore appears to be of particular importance to public services that are concerned with the health, well-being, and education of its citizens.

**Social Justice within Psychology**

It has been highlighted by Schulze, Winter, Woods and Tyldesley (2017) that social justice has penetrated psychology as a discipline but most particularly in the areas of counselling (Cutts, 2013; Vera & Speight, 2003; Winter & Hanley, 2015) and community psychology (Fondacaro & Weinberg, 2002; Prilleltensky, 2001), although there is an abundance of literature arguing the presence of social justice in psychology and what it can and should look like (Arfken & Yen, 2014; Louis, Mavor, La Macchia, & Amiot, 2014; Mays, 2000). The American Psychological Association’s (APA) President made an address in an edition of the journal American Psychologist (Vasquez, 2012) which focused on the importance of applying psychology to social issues. Despite this, an investigation into the codes of practice of psychological organisations in the US and UK by Winter (2015), discovered no reference to the term social justice, although there was some mention of ‘fairness’ and
‘justice’ within the APA’s ‘Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct’ (American Psychological Association, 2010). However, the British Psychological Society's (2009) ‘Code of Ethics and Conduct’ and the Health and Care Professions Council's (2012a, 2012b) ‘Standards of conduct, performance and ethics’ and ‘Standards of proficiency for practitioner psychologists’ lacked even these nebulous social justice references. It should be noted that the Health and Care Professions Council has since updated their ethical standards (Health & Care Professions Council, 2016) but there is still no explicit reference to social justice. The results of Winter’s investigation is in stark contrast to the publications of other helping professions in the UK who directly reference the term ‘social justice’ and how it can be achieved, within their professional ethics and standards.

**Social Justice within Educational Psychology**

Schulze, Winter, Woods and Tyldesley (2017) have pointed out that educational psychologists (EPs) are appropriately placed to be involved with early intervention and the promotion of social justice, through individual and school systems work (Power, 2008). They are able to do this through raising awareness of the connection between socioeconomic circumstances and diverse backgrounds, on educational attainment (Rogers & O’Bryon, 2008). EPs can encourage school staff to reflect and act on the difficulties pupils might encounter when accessing a learning environment, within the context of an ecological model, instead of using a solely within-child approach (Williams & Greenleaf, 2012). They are also in a position to work collaboratively with families, school staff and professionals, to bring about change for children and young people (Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000; Shriberg & Clinton, 2016).

A recent systematic literature review aimed to answer the question ‘What is the significance of social justice in educational psychology practice?’ (Schulze et al., 2017). The literature base was found to be small and US-centric (Briggs, McArdle, Bartucci, Kowalewicz, & Shriberg, 2009; Miranda, Radliff, Cooper, & Eschenbrenner, 2014; Moy et al., 2014; Shriberg et al., 2008; Shriberg, Wynne, Briggs, Bartucci, & Lombardo, 2011). The studies identified advocacy, non-discriminatory practice, and fairness to be fundamental to the definition of social justice. When examining the connection between social justice and school psychology, the focus tended to centre on distributive forms of justice within school psychologist practice. Although cultural diversity was recognised as a factor, it was rated highly by some school psychologists more than others. It was acknowledged that differences including gender, sexuality, class, and race, create diversity
but this can often lead to inequality, biases, and prejudice. However, a social justice agenda was thought to be able to endeavour to conquer these issues and support diversity. The studies highlighted that the US school psychology field is homogeneous and lacks diversity (Curtis, Castillo, & Gelley 2012), whilst its members are advocating and serving groups who are not sufficiently represented in the profession. It was acknowledged that this can create issues when school psychologists are trying to understand the backgrounds and needs of children and families, who they are striving to support.

Other research within the US school psychology field has provided commentary on the presence of social justice within school psychology (Nastasi, 2008; Rogers & O’Byron, 2008; Speight & Vera, 2009), discussed the bridging of social justice and children’s rights (Shriberg & Desai, 2014), looked at the issues of diversity and advocating for minority groups (Bartolo, 2010; Li & Vazquez-Nuttall, 2009; McCabe & Rubinson, 2008), examined possible models of social justice within school psychologist training programmes (Burnes & Singh, 2010; Grapin, 2017), and investigated how well recently qualified school psychologists are adopting their social justice principles into their practice (Jenkins, Shriberg, Conway, Ruecker, & Jones, 2017). With regards to research looking outside of the US, there has been a paper examining the application of social justice principles to global school psychology practice (Shriberg & Clinton, 2016), as well as a study looking at a social justice framework for school psychologists in Africa (Pillay, 2014).

Although it can be said with certainty that some US school psychologists see social justice as being part of their role, it is unclear as to whether UK EPs hold the same views, due to lack of published research. The current study aimed to expand on a pilot study by the researcher, which involved a single focus group of qualified EPs based in the north-west of England. This was done by further exploring UK EPs’ views of social justice using methodology that allowed for a wider and deeper range of thoughts and opinions, in order to inform future research, discussion, and practice. The research questions were as follows: (1) How do educational psychologists define social justice? (2) How, if at all, is social justice important to educational psychology practice? (3) What does social justice currently look like within educational psychology practice? (4) What role do educational psychologists think educational psychology should play in working towards social justice?
Methodology

Participants

Nine qualified EPs were recruited to participate in the research through purposeful convenience sampling. This involved contacting educational psychology services in the north-west of England and through the UK educational psychology email discussion group ‘EPNET’ (see Appendix 12). Trainee EPs were not approached due to wanting to build on the current research base, which has mainly focused on trainee school psychologists. Information sheets and consent forms were sent to EPs who responded to the call for participants (see Appendices 13 and 14). Before the interviews were undertaken, a short questionnaire (see Appendix 15) was sent to participants to gain demographic data as well as information about personal confidence, interest and engagement with social equality and justice, using the Social Issues Questionnaire (Miller et al., 2009). This helped to situate the sample of participants, therefore providing an extra dimension to the data when inferences were made both by the researcher and those reading this paper (Elliott, Fischer, & Rennie, 1999). There were 3 men and 6 women, who ranged from 28 to 55 years of age. Six participants identified as White British, one as British Pakistani, one as British Black African, and one as White Irish. Their experience ranged from 1 to 17 years, post qualification. At the time of the research, four were employed in semi-traded services, two in traded services, one in a core funded service, one in a social enterprise, and one was self-employed. For those who had been employed in other services, these had mostly been core-funded by the local authority.

Participants’ results on the social justice self-efficacy scale of Miller’s Social Issues Questionnaire, ranged from 93 to 150 out of 180 (M = 126.56). The higher the score, the more increased confidence participants had in performing social justice advocacy behaviours. Results on the social justice outcome expectations scale ranged from 57 to 84 out of 90 (M = 67.23), with higher scores being indicative of higher levels of expected positive outcomes, associated with engaging in social justice advocacy. With regards to the social justice interest scale, participants’ results ranged from 17 to 75 out of 81 (M = 53.56), and higher results represented a higher degree of interest in social justice. Results on the social justice commitment scale ranged from 11 to 27 out of 27 (M = 19.57), with higher scores indicating a stronger commitment to social justice engagement in the future. Lastly, results on the social supports and barriers to social justice engagement scale ranged from 26 to 42 out of 45 for supports (M = 36.78), and 5 to 23 out of 36 for barriers (M = 13.11), with higher scores on each of the two scales representing greater perceived social
supports and social barriers, to social justice engagement. It should be noted that whilst eight of the nine participants expressed an interest in social justice prior to taking part in the research, one participant admitted little to no knowledge of the subject and was taking part for benevolent reasons.

Data collection

The research adopted an exploratory qualitative design. Data was collected through semi-structured interviews to yield individual, in-depth insights that might not have been possible were questionnaires or a focus group used instead. The purpose of the interviews was conceptual clarification, importance, and position within current and ideal practice (Kvale, 2007). Therefore the questions asked explored the meaning and the conceptual dimension of the term (social justice), as well as its position and links within the discipline (educational psychology). The interviews were semi-structured to provide a focus as well as flexibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Each was recorded using a digital audio recorder and then transcribed by the researcher to produce an anonymised written transcription.

Data analysis

Thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) was used but it adopted some of the principles of grounded theory (Charmaz, 2003) and thematic networks (Attride-Stirling, 2001). The analysis process was as follows.

1. The audio-recordings were transcribed by the researcher in order for them to become familiar with the data.

2. Initial, open coding was undertaken on a line by line basis because it helped the researcher, “to refrain from imputing [her] motives, fears, or unresolved personal issues to [the] respondents and to [the] collected data” (Charmaz, 2003, p.94).

3. This was followed by focused coding which allowed the text to be explored more deeply in the form of larger segments, whilst using critical and/or recurrent earlier codes to support combing through large volumes of data. It involved making decisions about which initial codes made the most analytical sense when intelligently and comprehensively categorising the data.

4. Basic themes were identified from the codes.

5. Similar basic themes were grouped together to create organising themes.

6. Similar organising themes were grouped together to create global themes.
7. The global themes (and their corresponding organising themes) were then examined and assigned to the research question they linked to and answered.

An inductive approach to thematic analysis was undertaken, meaning that themes identified were linked to the data itself, so they could potentially not bear much relation to the questions asked during the interview and they were not driven by theory or researcher interest. Although it was impossible for the researcher to completely remove her theoretical and epistemological viewpoints from the analysis, the aim of the research was to explore the opinions of others rather than the opinion of the researcher, and therefore a deductive approach was not taken.

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness is important in qualitative research to communicate to readers about the validity and reliability of the research methods, data and results. Williams and Morrow (2009, p.577) state that, “there are three major categories of trustworthiness to which all qualitative researchers must attend: integrity of the data, balance between reflexivity and subjectivity, and clear communication of findings”. The researcher participated in a bracketing interview (Rolls & Relf, 2006), undertaken by a member of the university who was familiar with social justice, prior to undertaking interviews with participants. This allowed the researcher to pilot the interview schedule to ensure that they were gathering information that answered the research questions, and explored the researcher’s own experiences and assumptions around the topic. This provided the opportunity for reflection and increased awareness of any biases or assumptions. Although all transcripts were analysed by the researcher, the wider research team examined sample transcripts, along with elements of the analysis and networks. This provided further opportunities for reflection and checks for the coherence of the analysis. One of the research supervisors was a counselling psychologist with a personal interest in social justice, whilst the other was an experienced university-based EP researcher. This provided a good balance in terms of knowledge of social justice and the educational psychology profession. Thematic maps were given to all participants for member checking and triangulation purposes, so that they could feedback their thoughts, extend their ideas or provide details which they deemed important but were not covered during their interview. Participant feedback also acted as a, “check that the researcher has achieved the desired balance between the participants’ voices (subjectivity) and the researcher’s interpretation of the meaning (reflexivity)” (Williams & Morrow, 2009, p.579).
Ethics
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Findings

In this section findings of the research are presented in relation to each of the questions outlined above, before situating this analysis within the research literature. Direct quotes are used to illustrate themes, using pseudonyms in order to preserve anonymity of participants.

Research Question 1: How do educational psychologists define social justice?

When discussing how they would define social justice, the participants’ comments fitted into eight global themes: (1) action, (2) fairness, equality and equity, (3) diversity and inclusion, (4) discrimination, disadvantage and marginalisation, (5) vision or values, (6) evolving within current context of society, (7) unobtainable and at odds with society, and (8) power and privilege.

Social justice was judged to be necessary because differences between people were perceived to create power and privilege, on an individual and systemic level. Differences were also considered to generate discrimination, disadvantage and marginalisation, which are experienced in different ways by different groups. Social justice was also observed to involve diversity and inclusion; British society was acknowledged to be diverse and complex, and participants thought differences should be treated in an inclusive manner, with compassion and respect. Participants characterised social justice as having an element of action, specifically with regards to involving an active, motivated, ongoing movement. Social justice was defined as trying to bring about fairness, equality and equity for all, though it was highlighted that equal and equitable do not necessarily mean the same thing. However, it was recognised that social justice is always evolving within the current context of society, due to the changing nature of society itself. There will always be differences between people, but what is deemed acceptable and unacceptable, will shift. Social justice
was considered to be unobtainable and at odds with society due to differing viewpoints, agendas, power imbalances, and current ideas within society. There were some conflicting opinions as to whether social justice should be perceived as a vision or a set of values, as vision was perceived to be passive whereas values were considered to be more lived, which more appropriately matched participants’ view of social justice as being an active concept.

“I’ve always understood it to be I guess like our value system almost or... j- at least trying to cultivate awareness of some of the factors that are- may be barriers to different erm... a- ahh- groups in the population. Erm... in terms of social mobility. Erm... a- a sort of sense of erm... of everyone having equal rights and I suppose I probably link it quite closely to sort of human rights and feeling that- that everyone’s born equal and deserves you know, the- the sort of erm right conditions to kind of make the best of- of their own lives I think. So that’s kind of how I see it in a- in a rambling way.” (Luna)

Research Question 2: How, if at all, is social justice important to educational psychology practice?

Eleven themes were identified in relation to the second research question: (1) labelling and medicalisation, (2) importance, (3) traded services, (4) impact of cuts to public services, (5) duty and responsibility, (6) politics, (7) link between personal and professional, (8) EPs can be part of the problem, (9) problems with the education and special educational needs (SEN) systems, (10) attitudes and perspectives, and (11) issues around voice. Although participants considered social justice to be important to their personal practice, and many expressed the view that it was important to the profession because of the intrinsic nature of what EPs do, it was acknowledged that not all EPs might feel this way and the profession can often be about things other than social justice. Participants highlighted certain areas as being important at the present time, with regards to social justice needing to exist within educational psychology practice. The current right-wing political climate in the UK was perceived to have a political agenda of “othering” people and being anti-state, which has made things more difficult for children and families, rather than easier. The decisions being made by the government with regards to the SEN and education system, were considered to be coming from an uninformed, detached position, which lacked appropriate knowledge. The current political context was considered by participants to be having a negative impact on educational psychology practice, and the people that EPs work with.

“Erm... the kind of... difficult agendas there are erm... ... [sighs] the ways of othering people. Erm... ... and I guess I’m- I f- I’ve been thinking about those in terms of the whole
kind of political context at the moment. And it’s been quite a- an interesting and difficult
time that’s across the whole world- that’s all sort of ticking there for me. So I think these
are things that are happening now that are contributing to- to probably making things dif-
more difficult for- for families and- and young people, rather than easier [Laughs]. So
that- there’s that.” (Luna)

The government’s austerity programme has led to cuts in public services, particularly
education, health, and outreach services such as educational psychology (Lepper, 2013;
Whittaker, 2017). Participants found that reductions in funding meant that children were
not receiving support, particularly in the early years, so many are starting school with
unidentified needs. This puts extra pressure on to schools that participants are working
with, who are struggling due to low funding and so schools are seeking extra resources
from local authorities to plug gaps. Despite guidelines being in place for applying for extra
funding for children with SEN, participants thought that schools are often asking for
support for children who may not need it, and are losing sight of the importance of school-
based interventions. Many of the educational psychology services that participants worked
in are stretched because they are receiving less money, and like their fellow professional
colleagues in the education system, EPs were experiencing personal and professional
difficulties. Cuts to public services had led to many educational psychology services partly
or wholly separating from the local authority, and becoming traded services, who were
paid to do statutory work by the local authority and all other work is paid for directly by
schools. Participants felt that this was creating issues because schools had little money to
pay for extra services, and when they did buy in educational psychology time, it was often
for a narrow range of work that was outcome focused, rather than being concerned about
the needs of children and families. However, some participants who worked for traded
educational psychology services thought that not all traded services were the same, and
they operate in different ways based on their values and beliefs. Cuts to public services due
to the austerity agenda, did not appear to fit participants ideas of social justice, particularly
within their practice.

“Being a traded service. Although it’s probably not as bad as I thought it would be. Erm...
but I think… you have- I don’t know. I think whereas I might have just done some
additional work in the past, erm… now I think ooh do I really need to do this- is this right?
Are school willing to pay for this? Erm… and I do, do it if I think it’s important. But it’s…
I guess it’s higher… makes me question more being traded, when schools have to pay for
us to do things. Erm… and I think we do a narrower range of work. Well, we’re fighting
against it but we could easily do a narrower range of work erm… I don’t think- I guess
that is part of social justice erm… permanently-fighting out if they want a cognitive assessment- they need a cognitive assessment. And they need more than that and it’s trying to sort of build that bigger picture and they’re entitled to more than that“.

(Hermione)

Problems within the education and SEN systems centred on traditional assumptions, theories, and narratives, which participants felt needed challenging. The national discourse around education was regarded by participants to be failing to take into account the needs of children and families (Ross & Gibson, 2006). They felt that the best schools were considered to be those with the highest results and not those with the happiest children, which turns children into numbers. Participants perceived the focus on assessment and attainment to be missing the individual needs of children and young people. Despite the current educational climate being thought not to be conducive to treating children as individuals, participants were of the opinion that all children are different and so have varying needs, which requires them to be treated as individuals. However, the labelling of individual children’s needs was not always considered to be appropriate and participants were concerned that decisions were being made by professionals who do not always have the whole picture. Labelling often leads to medicalisation which participants considered led to a narrowing of focus on children’s needs, in particular areas. Participants perceived the current educational environment to be focused on difficulties being within-child, and not concentrated on considering the home, school and community environments that children are living within (Winter, Burman, Hanley, Kalambouka, & McCoy, 2016). This contributed to a position in which children are seen as the problem, rather than the educational system. Participants highlighted that not all children and young people learn in the same way and so the educational system needs redressing. Systemic and structural issues within the education and SEN systems were considered to be getting in the way of social justice and participants believed these factors were not being addressed. Participants thought that early years provision was often lacking, children with SEN were not always receiving appropriate education and support, particular groups of children were experiencing poorer educational outcomes, and there were difficulties in implementing social cohesion and justice within educational settings. Disadvantaged families were often struggling to navigate bureaucratic SEN systems, school-parent relationships could be difficult, external sanctions (for example: fining the parents of non-attending children) regularly cause more harm than good, and families are frequently being forced into decisions that are undesirable to them, but are better for schools and/or local authorities. Legislation does not always support social justice. For example, Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) which are part of the Children and Families Act (HM Government,
are supposed to be beneficial in supporting children with the most severe SEN, but are often one-off, product focused pieces of work that narrow thinking around children. The current educational and SEN systems were perceived by participants to be failing to meet their ideas of social justice, due to the issues mentioned above.

“Erm, and I think that- that so many of- of the children and families here are disadvantaged by systems. So they lack the erm, the sort of knowledge about how you work the system, how you find your way through what is a very bureaucratic special needs system, how you access support, how you even- how you ac- how you gain access to things like erm health appointments. Erm... and I think that we’ve seen it a lot more as- as budgets have been cut in public services. I mean, even before that it- it was evident.”

(Ginny)

Attitudes and perspectives were considered by participants to be both a barrier and a facilitator to social justice. Parents, schools and local authorities perceive children and resources in different ways, and EPs have to work between these different systems. It was mentioned that schools can often subtly and unconsciously discriminate against children with SEN in mainstream environments, whilst the current far right political agenda does not fit well within social justice and educational psychology practice. Issues around the voice of children and families were also debated. By acting as a voice for these groups, participants thought that EPs were being perceived to be reinforcing the idea that the only way children and families can be heard, is through them. Although it was acknowledged that children may not want to use their voice or become disengaged when they do and nothing changes, EPs should act as advocates for children, rather than a mouth piece.

Participants considered inclusion to be important to social justice but the way in which people’s perspectives and voices are included, appears to be important both to social justice and to educational psychology practice.

“And I certainly know working with some young people and especially a lot of children in care, they’re fed up of having their own voice. Some of them just want people to go on and make the decisions- not always- and not sometimes- but they don’t want to keep telling people erm... ... so I think it’s an interesting one, the voice. You can’t force people to have the voice- not everyone wants that. Or not done the way that systems are in place about it. And I think people get really fed up because actually they have shared their voice but in their perception, nothing’s changed.”

(Neville)

Participants recognised that as EPs, they might well be part of the problem. As professionals, they have influence and power, and their word carries weight, particularly
with regards to resources, whether they want to be seen as gatekeepers or not. EPs can get stuck in the role of experts, even though participants acknowledged that people are the experts of their own lives. Participants admitted that they can be complicit with systems that disadvantage children when they do not speak up, offer alternative ways of working, or use their professional competencies and knowledge. In particular, school staff’s expectations of educational psychology involvement can be focused on cognitive assessments and EHCPs. Assessment was considered by participants to be both a barrier and a facilitator to meeting the needs of children. Dynamic assessment was thought to be a more positive way of assessing pupils whilst cognitive assessments were perceived to contribute to the labelling of children, which can create issues. It was highlighted that EPs can become married to cognitive assessments which hinder their practice and social justice, and they need to expand their work and not hide behind cognitive assessments. Participants also mentioned issues around the lack of diversity within the profession as hindering social justice. However, despite acknowledging that they can be part of the problem, participants were emphatic in not wanting to be so. They perceived their role as having a duty and responsibility to those that they work with, especially with regards to acting in the best interests of children, even when EPs are considered to be barriers to resources and support.

“And I was asked to erm... to become involved and- and do some work with this young man. And... everyone was saying and- and CAMHS were involved as well and- and they were- everyone was basically going ohhh the- the- the remit of your role is come here, do a cognitive assessment and then vanish. And it really, ahhh I don’t know whether it was because of social justice or because I really disliked the way CAMHS approached... What they felt my role was. Erm, so it could be a combination of the- of both but erm... you know, I refused to do the cognitive assessment. I thought no, that’s not what he needs right now. And my... you know, I spent about seven or eight sessions with him, about 40 minutes to an hour each session and we just talked. And it- eventually it came to light, you know, that all of this was coming out, you know so the only reason I could tell you how like all, you know, the kinds of relationships had been really difficult, fraught relationship between him and adoptive family- not adoptive family but the family who- who had special guardianship. The difficulties with his mum who was incarcerated, he’d- he had no idea she was incarcerated. So all this stuff was going on for him but... if I were to just, go and do the cognitive as- cognitive assessment and vanish, I would have been part of the problem.” (Ron)

Participants identified a strong link between the personal and professional, in relation to social justice and educational psychology. Personal experiences influenced participants’
ideas around social justice as well as acting as motivators to enter the profession. Family, friends, faith, political views, ethnicity, culture, and personal beliefs were observed to influence participants’ personal and professional lives. The interface between personal and professional was highlighted, as it was noted that people do not stop being themselves at work. Participants stated that their motivations around bringing about social justice were personal, as was their promotion of it within their role. They recognised that you cannot force someone to champion social justice or work in a particular way that encourages it.

“It’s kind of quite an engaged faith. So- the- the- the- it’s about trying to create value erm... as a- so I used that term before but it- it’s sort of like a- that’s sort of kind of fundamental thing. So I suppose... that- that’s quite erm- because it’s a practice for me, it- it- is- in- inevitably, it- it’s part of kind of who I am. Is obviously- obviously part of who I am. But then who- who I am in my job and what I bring to my work, alongside immigrant parents, b- brought up in that area you know. Do you know what I mean? And I think... and again it’s been sort of making that explicit for myself... on a daily basis really but erm... and that thing I said about you know, bringing your whole self. So not- I wouldn’t necessarily say to- well, I don’t say to people but, you know. Do you know what I mean? Well- well I don’t- you know, I don’t say it you know, I voted remain or whatever. You know, you don’t... but... it’s still part of... I think anyway. Well the type of professional that I want to be is part of what you... are in that meeting, if you know what I mean?”

(Angelina)

Research Question 3: What does social justice look like within educational psychology practice?

When discussing what social justice looks like within educational psychology practice, the participants’ comments fitted into thirteen global themes: (1) doing what’s right, (2) support for EPs, (3) voice, (4) legislation and ethical codes, (5) awareness of own biases and prejudices, (6) supporting others, (7) ideal world, (8) consultations, (9) challenging, (10) EPs having a wide and varied role, (11) psychological skills and knowledge, (12) child-centred approach, and (13) relationships. Participants stated that EPs are driven by good intentions and doing what they think is right within their practice. On a personal level, this involves having an awareness of their own biases and prejudices, as everyone has them and it would be dishonest for anyone to claim that they do not. By understanding their own biases and prejudices, and how this affects the language that they use and how they respond to people, as well as learning about, valuing, recognising and accepting,
diversity and differences between people, participants thought EPs can work towards being more socially just within their practice.

“Erm... and I think part of what needs to happen though, I think is us p- as professionals is to be kind of clear and honest about your own stuff that's going on as part of that because it’s not about... pfff, not having prejudices or making assumptions. We all do. We all have. You know that’s just how it is. But it’s not about that is it? It’s about having your own awareness of the stuff that gets in the way for you or... affects yo- your judgements about things and so I think there’s work that we need to do as individuals as part of our professional work. And that might come through supervision, just might become through- come through reflect- being reflective in your work. But it- it definitely is about being honest about stuff that goes on for you and then once you are able to do that, then I think you are then... erm... able then, or better able to facilitate erm, dialogue that is... you know, sort of open, inclusive, that allows people voice, that’s respectful.” (Angelina)

Participants highlighted tools that supported social justice within their practice: legislation, professional codes of ethics and conduct, information, evidence, frameworks, knowledge, being able to change their approach depending on the situation, and interpersonal, listening, psychological and professional skills. It was also acknowledged that EPs are in a privileged position due to their skills and knowledge, their position as information holders, and access to different people. The change from a Masters to a Doctoral degree, followed by a mandatory two year working period, was theorised to bring a vocational element to the profession, as it now takes trainees longer to train and qualify. It was speculated that this vocational element meant that EPs desire to use their skills to bring about change and were less afraid of using their skills and being seen as the expert.

“And so with that vocational element I think you get a lot more... sort of... coherence and understanding about the power and the value and the impact of educational psychology. Certainly the newly qualifieds, myself included, and the trainees that are in the service are very... sure and confident that we can do stuff. That it’s- you know, that our role is not to just sit there, in a consultation and sort of, try to say... There is that view that those- those people in those consultations have the skills and the knowledge within themselves to effect change. But there’s also I think the view from- from the newly qualifieds in this service and- and the trainees that... we’ve trained for a long time, we have a lot of knowledge about stuff and it’s okay to say that. It’s okay to say no I’m sorry I don’t agree with what you’ve just done. That behaviour approach that you’ve taken is- obviously you wouldn’t say this but that behaviour approach you’ve taken is ludicrous. Nothing in the
psychological behavioural literature app- like sort of supports the approach you’ve taken. And I think there’s a growing confidence and a growing awareness that we do have something good to offer. We can offer it well. We can create positive change.” (Harry)

EPs were perceived by participants to have a wide and varied role, which involves working with a range of people, and moving beyond educational settings, into the local community. With regards to the presence of social justice within educational psychology practice, consultations in particular were illuminated as being important opportunity to work with others to recognise achievements, problem solve, find solutions, overcome barriers, change mind-sets, and come to a shared understanding. The role of EPs in consultations was thought to involve listening, believing, facilitating, changing thinking, asking questions, addressing other people’s perceptions of children’s needs, and challenging. The importance of relationships was highlighted, as it was considered that clients would be more open to working with people who they felt a connection with. Clients were considered to be parents, teachers or children. Where there were difficulties between families and schools, EPs were thought to be in a prime position to support links between the two. Despite EPs aiming to have positive, collaborative relationships with schools, it was pointed out that they need to be prepared to have difficult conversations where necessary. A child-centred approach to consultations and educational psychology work was deemed crucial. This involved being holistic and looking at the whole child within the context of different environments, including children in mainstream settings where possible as it was not thought to always be appropriate to put children with SEN into special schools. A child-centred approach was thought to be concerned with improving outcomes for children by supporting them to progress and move forward, through equitable support, so that children with SEN have the same opportunities and access as those without. Although participants acknowledged that schools are doing fantastic things to meet the individual needs of children and young people, the wider impact of using consultations to look at positively changing things for the whole class through changes to teaching and the learning environment, were also discussed.

“It’s like I had a- a- a lady that took her child home for lunch every day. And it was- it was really, really important to her that he went home for his lunch. Socially school were battling with that because he wasn’t getting the social skills at lunch times, sitting with his peers. But it- it stemmed from a- a community, a cultural thing that once we sat down and actually discussed it all together and came up with a- we had to balance it out a bit. Cause actually mum didn’t really understand where school was coming from and school didn’t understand where mum was coming from. They just were worlds apart. And I think
Participants perceived EPs to have a role in engaging, supporting, facilitating participation, connecting and advocating for those that they work with. This included helping parents to ensure that they received appropriate support and access to resources, working with local authorities to support community cohesion, and educating and supporting school staff who want to make a difference, to meet children’s needs. The importance of parental engagement and contribution was highlighted, particularly with regards to parental voices being supported, listened and appropriately responded to. EPs were considered to be a voice for others. However, there was conflict as to whether people need to make an effort to listen to the voices of children, or whether EPs need to be a voice for children due to others not listening to them. The significance of EPs using their own voice to challenge the status quo, challenge schools to ensure that they are meeting their responsibilities to pupils, and challenging, fighting and questioning others to secure that the needs of children and young people are met, was emphasised. Participants also pointed out that social justice issues are emotive, so it’s important for EPs to work in supportive educational psychology services and make efforts to maintain their own emotional well-being.

“So erm... yeah... errr, so I think actually things can be quite subtle and I think you need to... probably think things through and a- is this fair for the child? And the system and the- and the people involved? And have the confidence to... challenge it when it isn’t really.” (Lavender)

All participants were asked what social justice would look like within their practice, within an ideal world. Discussions included: an ideal world in which social justice is not needed, isn’t possible, in an ideal world EPs might not be needed, in an ideal world there would not necessarily be a need for social justice due to society being more equitable, and in an ideal world people would have access to the resources they need to meet their needs. With regards to the educational psychology role, in an ideal world participants thought that they would be doing a greater range of work including more multi-agency work and systemic work, which would bring about positive outcomes for a greater number of children and young people. School targets would not exist and consultations would be positive, collaborative, problem solving opportunities which would have an ongoing impact for children and young people. It was also thought that social justice might not be explicit in educational psychology practice, but would be implicit in the work that EPs do.
“I suppose in an ideal world... the issues wouldn’t be there, would they? At all. So... you- you wouldn’t have to... kind of fight for the- for what you think should be equitable. Erm... but then I suppose would we have jobs? Cause in a way [Laughs]. The- that would mean everybody understanding everybody’s needs wouldn’t it? And... what they need to do- well maybe not, what they need to do to get to the end point but I think... I suppose if things were all equal and resources were equit- equitable... then perhaps we wouldn’t be needed as much.... But that’s hard isn’t it?” (Lavender)

Research Question 4: What role do educational psychologists think educational psychology should play in working towards social justice?

When discussing what role they thought educational psychology should play in working towards social justice, the participants’ comments fitted into four global themes: (1) action, (2) politics, (3) conflict, and (4) professional organisations. Although participants considered that professional organisations such as the Association of Educational Psychologists (AEP) and the British Psychological Society (BPS) have a role in promoting and supporting social justice issues, they thought that the educational psychology profession as a whole needs to become more organised in its activism of social justice. Despite educational and clinical psychology being perceived by participants to be connected to social justice, other areas of psychology were considered to be more outcomes focused, rather than people focused. However, participants stated that the British Psychological Society in general has a role in encouraging psychology to become more political. Educational psychology was considered to be influenced by left-wing politics in the 1970s, when it experienced its largest growth in membership. Participants stressed that EPs, like other professionals, have political views which influence their practice. As local authority employees, they are often not allowed to express their political views but participants felt that it was unethical to not acknowledge their opinions. Educational psychology was judged to be able to influence governmental policy but it was acknowledged that this required people being in positions of influence. Participants thought that they could promote social justice through action; living their values and modelling them in their practice. It was highlighted that EPs are evidence-based practitioners but research tends to come from academic EPs. The importance of a future evidence-base covering the needs of marginalised groups such as the LGBT population was emphasised, to support EPs to become more socially just in their practice.

“Yeah. I mean I think there’s a real... attitude and- and you know I think we’re at the cusp of a bit of a... changing tide in psychology generally at the moment. You know there’s been
two successive presidents of the BPS who have been very vocal about psychology... stepping up and being political. Because as individuals we are all political. We all have our own political preferences and values and ideas. And to then say that, you know Harry as an individual has politics you know that align itself with the Green Party for example, to suggest that, that doesn’t influence my practice I think is unethical. You know it really, really does. You know I- I don’t have politics that align with far right you know ideals. And that is important for my practice and- and- you know both Jamie Hacker Hughes and Peter Kinderman are very much talking about, you know we need to accept that we are political. And we also need to be brave. I think psychology for a long time has shied away from suggesting that we have anything good to offer and that when we do offer it, positive change can happen.” (Harry)

There was however, a great deal of conflict around challenges and barriers to social justice within educational psychology practice. Participants highlighted that EPs have responsibilities such as family, which can often get in the way of them taking chances and challenging unjust practices. The difficulties in defining social justice were underlined, as to begin being more socially just, EPs need to know what that would look like. Participants also talked about the problems they had in knowing how and where to start becoming more socially just within their practice. Being more socially just was considered to be hard and EPs often find it difficult to tell whether they’re making a difference. It was also debated whether being more socially just was worth it, although if it was considered not to be, then participants thought they might be in the wrong profession. There was a great deal of conflict between the ideals and aspirations of social justice within educational psychology practice, and the reality of the situation. Participants thought that there needed to be honesty about what EPs can and choose to do. Although they felt there had to be a commitment from educational psychology to social justice, there was concern that it might not be important to the profession at large. The participants themselves were invested in social justice and felt that their colleagues were too, but were worried that they might be stuck in echo chambers which might be contributing to confirmation bias.

“And that’s not the way revolution starts right. Revolution in- in- or- or- or being... having enough of a belief is that you don’t need the other people to be willing to dig their heels in. Right but as much as I’m- as I’m an idealist, I’m also a realist, right? And I recognise that. I’ve got a family to support as well. So, at the same time as wanting to dig my heels in, I’m thinking about them and their well-being. And what’s the knock on effect on them? And that’s what’s stopping me being the first, or even the tenth, or maybe even the fiftieth person to dig my heels in. But when I think... you know, when the moment- when
there’s enough momentum in the movement, that- I’d be more than happy to join at that stage. But at the moment my- I’m being selfish because I’m looking after myself and my family. As well as being an EP and empowering other people.” (Ron)

Discussion

Schulze, Winter, Woods and Tyldesley (2017) found that research on social justice in US school psychology practice highlights three themes in social justice definitions: fairness, advocacy and non-discriminatory practice. The current research also identified similar areas in UK educational psychology: fairness, equality and equity; discrimination, disadvantage and marginalisation; diversity and inclusion; and action. Briggs et al. (2009) noted that distributive justice (in relation to resources) was a particular focus of participants’ views of social justice and examined how this linked to North’s (2006) ‘three spheres of social justice’; redistribution/recognition, macro/micro and sameness/difference. The current research can also be linked to North’s concept. Fairness, equality and equity fall under the redistribution/recognition sphere, as participants talked about creating a level playing field through ensuring equity of access and opportunity. Action would be part of the macro/micro sphere, as participants talked about fighting for social justice on an individual level (micro) as well as being motivated to achieve social justice through a wider, ongoing, evolving movement (macro). Diversity and inclusion, and discrimination, disadvantage and marginalisation, would fall under the sameness/difference sphere, as participants identified the value of the UK being a diverse and complex society made up of different communities, whilst recognising the importance of an inclusive approach to society and social justice.

Previous research (Briggs, McArdle, Bartucci, Kowalewicz, & Shriberg, 2009; Miranda, Radliff, Cooper, & Eschenbrenner, 2014; Shriberg et al., 2008) has highlighted the importance, specifically within US school psychology training programmes, of cultural competence and diverse fieldwork experiences. Although the current study involved only qualified UK EPs, participants talked about their role involving working with a range of people, and the significance of being aware of their own biases and prejudices, with regards to other cultures. Moy et al.’s (2014) research noted the lack of cultural and economic diversity among students enrolled on the school psychology programme. Participants in the current research also mentioned issues around the lack of diversity within the UK educational psychology profession. This can also be examined from the demographic information of the EPs who took part in this research project. Two thirds were women and seven of the ten participants were white, which is far from a true
reflection of UK society. This lack of diversity could mean that trainee and qualified EPs need support to become self-aware of their own privileges, and understand difficulties that other groups experience, that they may well have not.

The current research base specifically addresses the link between social justice and school psychology. Shriberg et al. (2011) examined the value of social justice in relation to four aspects of school psychology: practice, research, the National Association of School Psychologists, and professional development opportunities. School psychologists perceived attention to social justice in school psychology practice as being significantly more important than the other three areas. This is almost dismissive of the work that research, psychological associations and professional development can have in progressing the position and current research base, in relation to social justice within school psychology. The current research also highlighted the importance of the connection between social justice and educational practice. However, it took a different position to the importance of research and psychological associations. It highlighted that the future evidence-base needs to do more to cover marginalised groups such as the LGBT population, and professional organisations such as the AEP and the BPS have a role in promoting and supporting social justice issues. EPs, like school psychologists, are evidence-based practitioners and so research informs the work that they do, whilst professional development opportunities provide chances for research dissemination. Psychological associations are able to publicise research both to their members and to wider society through traditional print and television media, as well as social media. By sharing links between social justice and educational psychology, the profession can hopefully increase society’s awareness of the impact of social justice on education.

Two articles by Shriberg et al. (2008, 2011) have investigated institutional power and the role that US school psychologists can have in advocating for social justice. Within the current research project, power and privilege was highlighted, as was systemic difficulties within the educational and SEN systems that can take away power from children and families. When talking about what social justice looks like within educational psychology practice, participants discussed the importance of EPs challenging the status quo, schools, and other professionals, to ensure that the needs of children and young people are met. They also spoke about EPs supporting others to use their voice, whilst being a voice and advocating for them. The research by Shriberg declared that advocating fell into two groups for school psychologists: knowledge and action. Participants in the current research project highlighted the importance of legislation and ethical codes as well as their psychological skills and knowledge in adopting social justice into their educational
psychology practice. They also talked about action in relation to consultations, challenging, having a child-centred approach, and supporting others. Shriberg et al. (2011) said that social justice can be seen from either an individual or wider systemic point of view. Their participants preferred the latter approach because they perceived institutional power as obstructing social justice. Within the current study, participants mainly talked about their own individual approaches because they were not sure whether social justice was important to the profession as a whole. However, when discussing what role they thought educational psychology should play in working towards social justice, they were conflicted about how much they could do on their own, and thought that the educational psychology profession needed to become more organised in its activism. Future research needs to continue to explore the significance of social justice in UK educational psychology, and what role the profession can and should play.

Both of the Shriberg et al. (2008, 2011) studies examined current barriers and opportunities with regards to the advancement of social justice within school psychology practice. Their findings covered three main areas: personal, professional, and societal. The cultural differences between the US and the UK, as well as the dissimilarities in the school/educational psychology profession between countries meant that the barriers and opportunities in the current study differed slightly to those in previous research papers. Individual commitment to social justice, resources, school politics, school/work climate, the profession’s commitment to social justice, influence of professional organisations, willingness to rock the boat, lack of diversity in the field, and cultural context, were some of the similarities between the US and the UK. Differences included the current austerity agenda and its impact on cuts to public services, which have affected the way in which educational psychology services are delivered. This topic has begun to be explored in other papers (Gibbs & Papps, 2017; Lee & Woods, 2017; Szulevicz & Tanggaard, 2014). Although the majority of barriers fell into the professional and societal categories, personal barriers were identified too. In particular, participants in the current study had an awareness of how educational psychologists can be part of the problem, and identified how they can stop being complicit with systems that encourage social injustice. However, when talking about the role that EPs should play in working towards social justice, there was a great deal of conflict at the personal level, with regards to not knowing where to start, having responsibilities that they felt prevented them from trying to become more socially just within their practice, and feeling that it was hard to know whether they were making a difference.
Frameworks have been devised by Miranda et al. (2014) and Briggs et al. (2009) to adopt social justice into school psychology training, whilst Graybill, Varjas, Meyers, Greenberg and Roach (2013) have suggested a participatory culture-specific model, to try and increase the effectiveness of social justice programmes in school psychology. Pillay (2014) has argued that any social justice framework has to be rooted within a rights-based agenda in order to promote children’s universal rights (UNICEF, 1989). Some of the participants in the current research reflected on university tutors and the knowledge gained during their training impacting upon their social justice perspective, nevertheless, only one participant talked about their doctoral training having any specific social justice focus. If social justice is considered to be of importance to educational psychology, then the research base could benefit from investigating its presence within UK educational psychology training programmes.

The results of this research also reflect the findings of social justice focused investigations in other areas of psychology. For example, Winter and Hanley (2015) explored the views of UK counselling psychologists. Their participants defined social justice as involving empowering disadvantaged or oppressed groups in society, equality of resources and opportunities, and issues of power. They referenced the political nature of social justice, the relevance of social justice to counselling psychology, and personal connections to issues of social justice. With regards to action, participants spoke of collaboration, using their power to change things for the better, engaging in broader community interventions, and social justice being a fundamental part of their practice. They cited barriers to social justice in their work, in particular time and the environmental contexts of their work. There was also mention of a general lack of evidence of interest in social justice within the profession, values not translating into action, and the topic not being broached during their training. The similarities between this and the current paper, indicates that perceptions, actions, and issues around social justice cross the different branches of UK applied psychology. It is important for the research base to extend beyond the US and the UK into other countries around the world, to examine whether social justice holds value to other psychology services. It should be noted that there are limitations with regards to the current study. In particular, the participants were a self-selecting group who had a clear interest in social justice (bar one participant who volunteered for purely benevolent reasons and admitted to knowing very little about social justice). The research might have benefited from actively seeking out participants who thought that social justice had no place in educational psychology practice, in order to provide a more rounded view. This means that the results cannot be generalised to UK educational psychologists as a whole.
In conclusion, the UK educational psychologists interviewed for this research define social justice in similar ways to US school psychologists and global psychologists in other branches of applied psychology. Social justice was considered by participants (who had an interest in the topic) to be important to educational psychology practice for a variety of reasons, some of which are due to the current context of UK society (impact of cuts to public services, and the changing nature of educational psychology services), whilst others have a deeper, personal basis (duty and responsibility, and the link between personal and professional). Within UK educational psychology practice, social justice was considered by participants to involve a range of approaches from the personal (having an awareness of personal biases and prejudices) to the professional (supporting others, and challenging the status quo). Although participants thought that educational psychology as a profession should actively work towards social justice, there was conflict as to what this action would involve, uncertainty as to whether there was a profession-wide commitment to the concept, and concerns around a clash between social justice action and ongoing personal responsibilities to educational psychologists’ own families.
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Paper 3: Dissemination of evidence to professional practice
Introduction

This paper begins with an evaluation of the concepts of evidence-based practice and practice-based research. It will then broadly discuss the effective dissemination of research in relation to outcomes and impact. A discussion of the implications of papers 1 and 2 at the research site, organisation level, and professional level, will follow. The paper will then conclude with a strategy for promoting and evaluating the dissemination and impact of the research discussed in papers 1 and 2.

Section 1: Overview of evidence-based practice and practice-based research

Evidence-based practice in psychology (EBPP) can be defined as “the integration of the best available research with clinical expertise in the context of patient characteristics, culture, and preferences. This definition of EBPP closely parallels the definition of practice adopted by the Institute of Medicine (2001, p.47) as adapted from Sackett and colleagues (2000). The purpose of EBPP is to promote effective psychological practice and enhance public health by applying empirically supported principles of psychological assessment, case, formulation, therapeutic relationship, and intervention” (APA Task Force on Evidence-Based Practice with Children and Adolescents, 2008, p.5). Dunsmuir and Kratochwill (2013) point out that psychology and education’s research bases are large and cumbersome, therefore making it laborious to navigate them. The authors state that in order for research to effectively inform practice and policy decisions, it “needs to be accessible, have practical relevance, show methodological rigour, and be conducted to the highest standards” (p.64). The APA Presidential Task Force on Evidence-Based Practice (2006) argues that although there is a broad agreement of the importance of psychological practice being based on evidence, research does not always suit all practice needs. With regards to integrating research in day to day practice, the APA Presidential Task Force points out concerns such as: (a) how much weight is placed on different research methods, (b) how representative research samples are, (c) how research results are used to guide practice at different levels, (d) whether results are generalizable and transportable from research to practice settings, (e) whether judgements can be made about treatments/interventions when testing is limited, and (f) whether results which have shown efficacy and effectiveness, can be generalised from primarily white samples to minority and marginalised populations. The traditional hierarchy of evidence which is often used in evidence-based medicine and psychology, ranks methodological approaches as follows: (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, and (7) individual opinion (Frederickson, 2002). Despite systematic reviews of randomised control trials being perceived as the epitome of research rigour underpinning the validity of findings, multiple research designs contribute to EBPP and different research designs can be more appropriately suited to address and answer particular questions (Greenberg & Newman, 1996). It can be concluded that although the evidence base for educational psychology practice is potentially large, unwieldy and utilises a variety of methodological designs, the varying practice needs of educational psychologists and their clients benefit, rather than are restricted, by this.

The Health and Care Professions Council's (2015) standards of proficiency for practitioner psychologists highlights the importance of educational psychologists being able to, “use professional and research skills in work with service users based on a scientist-practitioner and reflective practitioner model that incorporates a cycle of assessment, formulation, intervention and evaluation” (p.22). However, there has been a lot of discussion around whether educational psychologists are truly scientist-practitioners. Burnham (2013) undertook research with seven educational psychologists, and a thematic analysis of the interviews found that most of the participants were ambivalent about the scientific basis of their work and the contribution of peer reviewed research to their practice. Instead they considered the utility or social value of their professional practice as being more essential than its congruence with a known/published evidence base. There was a blurred boundary between the personal and the professional, with participants perceiving their role as being, “primarily an articulation of personal attributes, value and beliefs whose development preceded professional training rather than being acquired as a part of that training” (p.23). Miller and Frederickson (2006) have pointed out that despite educational psychologists having previously undertaken psychology degrees, usually as undergraduates, until recently they had to train as teachers before entering professional educational psychology training, and little value is placed within teaching on having a scientific mind-set. They also highlight that statutory work forms a large part of educational psychology practice, which often reinforces an individual approach to identification, assessment and provision of needs. The participants in Burnham (2013)’s research all qualified under the old master’s programme and none had gone on to complete the post-qualification doctorate. The change from the one year master’s degree to the three year doctorate may have changed the attitudes and perspectives of educational psychologists with regards to EBPP. Trainee educational psychologists are no longer required to have qualified and worked as teachers prior to training, whilst during training they now have to complete an original
piece of doctoral level research, as well as having an extra two years of study to reflect on research and their practice. Investigation of the views of educational psychologists, who have trained under the doctorate system, would hopefully bring further illumination to this area.

Clarke (2004) has called attention to dilemmas faced by educational psychologists when they do try to work as evidence-based practitioners. In particular, he states that research is often incomplete or inappropriate when trying to understand the complex problems that educational psychologists are presented with. Also, there is frequently an imprecise and tentative relationship between assessment and intervention within professional practice. A paper by Fox (2003) has identified five fundamental challenges to evidence-based practice for educational psychologists: (1) they are practising psychologists and not researchers, so can often be intimidated by research design and statistical analysis, whilst not always being certain as to what good research looks like. (2) The research base can be contradictory and so educational psychologists often do not have the time to read and make sense of differing viewpoints, to come to appropriate conclusions. (3) The research hierarchy is not appropriate for educational psychology due to it being based on a medical model of information, which can conflict with educational psychology’s more humanising style of practice. (4) Educational psychology services often do not operate on an evidence-based paradigm and so would rather their educational psychologists use their professional experience over research. (5) Educational psychologists’ professional practice comes through reflection rather than evidence-based research. This is also tied in with their values as educational psychologists, as they may not recommend interventions that are perceived to be best practice from research evidence, if they contradict the educational psychologist’s personal and professional values.

Further discussion by Fox (2011) has emphasised the role of practice-based evidence within the educational psychology field. He states that it is important that educational psychologists strengthen their own evidence bases through practice-based evidence by turning their own experiences into professional expertise. In particular he points towards Dutton (1995)’s model in understanding the transformation of experience to professional practice, which involves three strategies: (1) “pattern recognition” whereby an individual client’s story is analysed to recognise familiar patterns to compare them to those of previous clients. (2) “Knowing-in-action” whereby conventional routines such as assessment or consultation techniques, which have been gained from experience, are used to resolve the difficulties identified in pattern recognition. (3) “Naming and framing” whereby psychological theories and frameworks are utilised to clarify problems, in ways
which indicate solutions. However, Fox does point out that when educational psychologists are each working from their own individual, professional perspective, their clients might have different frames of reference or see issues from a different point of view. He states that is the responsibility of the educational psychologist to come to a shared understanding with the client, so that they can better understand the basis for the recommendation of particular interventions. Fox identifies that there is also a potential difficulty with regards to the educational psychologist’s frame of mind being fixed. If they are continually seeing and responding to problems in a particular way, their practice can suffer due to issues including validity effect, primacy effect, and confirmation bias.

In conclusion, it is important for educational psychologists to not become too attached to particular theories, frameworks, and perspectives, within the course of their practice. They can do this through being open to EBPP and seeing the role of research as not restricting their practice and the interventions that they can recommend, but instead ensuring that they have a wider range of knowledge of theory and intervention, with which to make decisions.

Section 2: Overview of effective dissemination of research

Dissemination can be defined as, “a planned process that involves consideration of target audiences and the settings in which research findings are to be received and, where appropriate, communicating and interacting with wider policy and health service audiences in ways that will facilitate research uptake in decision-making processes and practice” (Wilson, Petticrew, Calnan, & Nazareth, 2010). Harrison and McNeece (2001) state that, “without dissemination, there is no knowledge building, theory confirmation, or benefit to clients”. They also point out that research studies are of little value if their findings are not disseminated because they do not add to the knowledge base. All findings, even those which are not significant, add to the knowledge base and help support the development of further research. Harrison and McNeece highlight that findings need to be shared in a timely manner otherwise they run the risk of becoming out of date and not benefitting their target audiences. Wilson et al. (2010) point out that there are overlapping and interrelated, concepts and practices to dissemination, which include: diffusion, implementation, knowledge transfer, knowledge mobilisation, linkage and exchange, and research into practice. Dissemination can be thought about in three ways: awareness, understanding, and action (Harmsworth & Turpin, 2000). Awareness involves creating a general knowledge of the activities and outcomes of the research, to help spread “word of mouth” type dissemination and support the building of an identity and profile within the researcher’s target community. Understanding refers to the engagement of target audiences, whom the
researcher thinks will benefit from a deeper understanding of the research. Action, otherwise known as research impact (Kostoff, 1995), concerns a change in practice as a consequence of the adoption of recommendations from the research’s findings, and involves targeting people who are positioned to influence and bring about change within their organisations. To be able to effectively implement the research’s findings, this target audience will have to be equipped with the necessary skills, knowledge, and understanding of the work. Target groups include: other researchers, practitioners, policymakers, and the consumers of services (Harrison & McNece, 2001).

Harrison and McNece (2001) highlight methods of dissemination which include: (1) scholarly journals, (2) monographs, books, and book chapters, (3) professional presentations, (4) newsletters, and (5) the internet. They state that journals are generally agreed to be the most important and prestigious avenues for researchers when they are looking to disseminate their research. However, they also acknowledge that the process of submitting an article to a peer-reviewed journal can be intimidating and long, and most practitioners do not read research journals. By focusing purely on academic journals, the dissemination of research can end up being restricted to a target group of academics. Keen and Todres (2007) argue that qualitative research needs to move beyond simply being disseminated through “the ubiquitous journal article” (p.2). They talked about the communication of research now being an obligation, and undertook a review of the literature around the dissemination of qualitative research findings. This highlighted that the main features of successful dissemination strategies are: (1) tailoring approaches to the target audience, in regards to the content, message and medium, (2) paying attention to the source of the message and (3) enabling active discussion of research findings. Keen and Todres’ findings discussed the need to go beyond the traditional forms of dissemination that serve academic communities, by attempting to communicate research findings to the people that the research is actually concerned with. Harmsworth and Turpin (2000) declared that forms of dissemination can include: postal mailing lists, e-mail lists, newsletters, reports, websites, briefings, workshops, roadshows, conferences, one-to-one, and the media. By utilising these forms of dissemination, research can reach a wider range of people. However, it’s important to target audiences using the most appropriate form of dissemination, in order to have the best chance of success.

Rogers’s (2003) ‘Diffusion of Innovations’ model involves three stages for the transfer of knowledge/programmes into practice: adoption (the decision to commit), implementation (carrying out), and institutionalisation (integration and sustainability over the long term, through policy and practice). It also identifies five categories of participants: innovators
(around 2.5% of people), early adopters (13.5%), early majority (34%), late majority (34%), and laggards (14%). Roger’s model identifies five characteristics which affect how readily an innovation will be adopted. These are: relative advantage (how much it is perceived as being better than currently available ideas/programmes), compatibility (how much it is consistent with the values, experiences and needs of potential adopters), complexity (how difficult it is to understand or use), trialability (how much it can be experimented with on a limited basis without large investment), and observability (how much the results are visible to others). Greenhalgh, Robert, Macfarlane, Bate and Kyriakidou (2004) have added further characteristics: reinvention (how it can be adapted, refined or modified to suit the adopter’s needs), fuzzy boundaries (adaptiveness of the organisational structures and systems needed for full implementation), risk (balance between risk and benefit), task issues (relevancy to the performance of an adopter’s work, chances of it improving task performance, and feasibility, workability and ease of use), knowledge required to use it (can it be codified and transferred from one context to another), and augmentation/support (is it supplied with customisation, training, help). Greenhalgh et al. (2004) point out that the characteristics are not stable features or sure determinants of adoption. Instead, the most important factor when determining the adoption rate, is the interaction among the findings/innovation, the intended adopter, and the context.

**Section 3: Summary of policy, practice and research development implications from research**

When examining the policy, practice and research development implications of the research from papers 1 and 2, it is important to do so at the different levels of practice. 

**Personal**

The participants involved in paper 2’s research were qualified UK-based educational psychologists and the study involved exploring their views of social justice using semi-structured, individual interviews. The process of taking part in the interviews will have acted as a form of reflection and self-evaluation, as participants considered: (1) how social justice could be defined, (2) the importance of social justice to educational psychology practice, (3) the current role of social justice within their practice, and (4) the potential role educational psychology could play in working towards social justice. It is likely that participants reflected upon their answers, post-interview, and by being sent the thematic maps for member checking and triangulation purposes, this will have encouraged further thought around the topic. A response from one participant stated “Reading through your
thematic maps has helped remind me what the point of it all is...something that can get lost in detail of day to day work. It’s helped me stop and think about what I am doing right now, even for a specific case”.

The research in papers 1 and 2 is aimed at educational psychologists both within the context of the UK and globally. It is hoped that the dissemination of the findings will encourage other educational psychologists who were not involved in either the original research or the studies examined in the systematic literature review, to consider the concept of social justice and its potential relevance to their own work. By doing so, they may make changes to their own practice which will then impact, hopefully positively, the practice and lives of their clients. This could involve: (1) being aware of their own biases and prejudices, (2) challenging others to ensure that the needs of children and young people are being met, (3) working with others through consultations to recognise achievements, problem solve, find solutions, and overcome barriers, (4) having a child-centred approach, (5) establishing good relationships with clients, (6) using their psychological skills and knowledge to support children, schools, families, and communities, (7) supporting and advocating for those they work with, and (8) listening to the voices of others and being a voice for them when they do not want to use their own.

Organisational

Neither the research in papers 1 or 2 was specifically set in one organisational setting, but rather across different educational psychology services and universities. However, the implications of the research are not restricted to any one particular setting because they examine social justice within the context of education. Therefore, socially just practice and principles can be adopted by individual educational psychologists, educational psychology services, nurseries/schools/colleges/universities, local authorities, and the government. For example, supporting diversity and inclusion and fighting against discrimination, disadvantage and marginalisation. In one of the interviews, the needs of transgendered pupils and how best schools could support them, when faced with the questions of other parents, were discussed.

“I’ve worked with a young person recently who’s eight, nine? And ummm... was born a girl but considers himself a boy. And has done for the last four years and- and helping school really to- helping school to help parents to- to understand what’s going on so you know they don’t have gender toilets at that school anymore, they’re all unisex toilets and they have, you know, unisex changing and things like that. And- and just supporting the school to- cause the school were- were well up for supporting him and- and you know they
had queries from parents, well- well why is this happening? And you know just- just affirming to the head teacher that- cause her I- her, excuse me, her stance with that was to say to the other parents, it’s none of your business. You know if your child had special needs- and I don’t mean in an educational sense- but any form of difference or need, I wouldn’t be discussing that with someone else. And- and so affirming to the head teacher that that’s fine to say- You know... actually it’s none of your business.” (Harry)

This particular school adopted a social justice stance by changing the toilets and changing areas from being gendered to unisex, and refusing to discuss the needs of particular pupils with the parents of other children. The educational psychologist was also able to support this organisation by affirming to them that their approach was correct.

Professional

The findings from papers 1 and 2 can be considered by a variety of professional organisations including: the Association of Educational Psychologists (AEP), the British Psychological Society (BPS) Division of Educational and Child Psychology (DECP), host organisation for the Initial Training for Educational Psychologists (ITEP) (currently the National College for Teaching and Leadership – NCTL), the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), and the International School Psychology Association (ISPA). Paper 1 was a systematic literature review that examined the current research base around social justice and educational psychology. As all the qualifying papers had research which was undertaken within the US, the findings may be of particular importance to NASP, although they could be generalised and applied to educational psychology practice in other countries. Participants who took part in the original research in paper 2, talked about the role of the AEP and the BPS in promoting social justice. They stated that although these professional organisations could provide support with social justice issues, they felt that the educational psychology profession as a whole needed to become more organised in its activism. Although participants said that they could promote social justice through living their values and modelling them in their own individual practice, there was a reluctance to make themselves vulnerable by moving beyond a certain level, until there was an established momentum, which could come from a professional level. Social justice was seen by many participants as being political but participants felt obliged to be non-political due to their status as local authority employees. They said that it was unethical to not acknowledge their political views and the BPS had a role to play in encouraging psychology to become more political. By professional organisations adopting social justice principles and values, this would indicate to the profession as a whole that it is important,
and individual educational psychologists who support the concept of social justice, are not stuck in echo chambers but are instead embracing views that are established within the profession itself.

Trainee US school psychologists were part of the studies included in paper 1 and attention was given to universities which had adopted social justice frameworks as part of their courses. With regards to paper 2, although participants were qualified UK educational psychologists, one participant mentioned the social justice focus that their doctoral university had. The ITEP and individual training providers could consider the findings of both papers when thinking about the structure of educational psychology doctoral training courses. This might not go as far as adopting a social justice focus across the entirety of the training programme, but instead consideration might be given to delivering a seminar on social justice within educational psychology practice, or discussing the explicit implementation of social justice principles within some areas of training.

**Section 4: Strategy for promoting and evaluating the dissemination and impact of research**

The dissemination strategy for promoting the research findings from papers 1 and 2 will involve the following.

*Journal articles*

Although it has been established that journal articles often only reach an academic target audience (Harrison & McNeece, 2001), by publishing both papers in academic journals, there is the possibility that they will be viewed by educational professionals in the UK and beyond. This will support the dissemination of findings to educational psychologists who are working in other countries who might not be as easily accessible to the author, if using other forms of dissemination. Although there is no set opportunity for interaction between reader and author, the inclusion of the author’s contact details means that interested readers, who want to ask questions or enter into a discussion with the author, would be able to do so via email or post. Although information about the numbers of views and citations articles have had, are readily available, it would be difficult to judge the impact of the research on educational psychology practice, simply from this.

*Briefings*

One of the participants in the original research contained in paper 2, is the principal educational psychologist of an educational psychology service. They expressed a desire for
the author to visit the participant’s service, in order to feedback the findings of the research to the participant’s team. By briefing the results of the research in this manner, it would allow for interaction and discussion between the author and educational psychologists within the service, who are potentially interested in social justice. Although the author would be able to establish some idea of the educational psychology service’s interest in their findings, it would be difficult to judge the impact of this going forward on the educational psychologists’ practice, unless they were to directly to contact the author or undertake their own published research.

Conferences

Dissemination could take the form of attending local (e.g.: North West Educational Psychology CPD Conference), national (e.g.: British Psychological Society’s Division of Educational and Child Psychology’s Annual Conference, Association of Educational Psychologists’ Annual Conference), and/or international conferences (e.g.: International School Psychology’s Annual Conference), and delivering either a presentation or a workshop. As with the briefings, this would allow for direct contact between the author and educational psychologists who work in the UK and/or globally. A presentation would allow for straightforward communication by the author, about the findings of the papers, and some opportunity for questions and discussions afterwards. However, a workshop would encourage greater interaction between the author and potentially interested educational psychologists. It would stimulate thinking and encourage attendees to think and reflect on the role of social justice within their practice, and how they could adapt their practice to be more socially just. As well as hearing the author’s thoughts, it would also provide opportunity for discussion between attendees of the workshop. When attending a conference, there are multiple presentations and workshops available, and attendees make their own decisions as to which ones they want to attend. It would therefore suggest that anyone who attended a presentation or workshop on social justice, would have an interest in the subject and want to learn more. As mentioned previously, it would be difficult to establish the impact of attending the presentation/workshop on attendees’ educational psychology practice, unless they were to contact the author or undertake their own published research.

Internet

The findings of papers 1 and 2 could be discussed in a blog post on relevant websites such as https://edpsy.org.uk. This would involve disseminating the research in a format in which it’s accessible to a general audience, because the website is available to the general public.
As well as those who regularly access the website, any article written would come up in search engine results, which means that it will be accessible to a range of people who are specifically looking for information about social justice and educational psychology. The difficulty with this method of dissemination is that it does not encourage much interaction between author and reader. The most obvious and easily available form of communication is for readers to leave a comment below the article, but this level of interaction is not likely to elicit significant intellectual/professional engagement. Readers could send an email using the address available on the website, which would allow for greater depth of comment, but it may be unlikely that readers would put this level of effort into interacting with the author. Although information about the number of post views might be readily available, it would be difficult to judge the impact of the research on educational psychology practice, from only this information.

*Special Interest Group*

The British Psychological Society’s Division of Counselling Psychology within the past couple of years has established a ‘Social Justice Networking and Special Interest Group’. They state in the launch message on their website that, “*Counselling Psychology has a long-standing relationship and ethos around social justice and connected values. As a profession, it emphasises a holistic view, choosing to see individuals within their social context rather than in isolation. This group has a commitment to continue to cultivate this holistic frame and encourage a wider social justice perspective in counselling psychology and beyond. There is a lot of good work in this area which is already ongoing and has been conducted in the history of counselling psychology as a profession, and this Networking and Special Interest Group aims to facilitate dissemination and discussion of these ideas, in addition to promoting further action and developments in line with the philosophy of counselling psychology*” (British Psychological Society, 2015). Paper 2 stated that participants thought there needed to be more organised activism within the profession but they were not sure what form this action should undertake. By the author creating an educational psychology social justice interest group either within the British Psychological Society’s Division of Educational and Child Psychology, or within the Association of Educational Psychologists, this would provide an opportunity for a more organised approach with greater interaction between the author and educational psychologists interested in social justice. Educational psychologists would independently choose to attend due to an existing interest in the subject and a desire to advance this interest into action. By meeting with other interested educational psychologists, it would encourage discussion around the area, generation of strategies, and collective action.
Meetings involving all members would not necessarily need to be held with great regularity, but could instead take place once a year during a professional annual conference. More regular meetings could be held regionally, which would encourage interested educational psychologists to take the lead in promoting social justice, rather than the responsibility lying entirely with the researcher. This form of dissemination would facilitate dissemination from the author to interested educational psychologists, and then to other educational psychologists and professionals. A special interest group would provide the greatest opportunity to establish the impact of the author’s research on the group’s educational psychology practice, as there would be ongoing discussions during group meetings.

**Limitations**

The dissemination plan detailed above is dependent upon resources. On a personal level, limitations for the author would include time and money. As a newly qualified educational psychologist, the author will be likely to be working full time and balancing this with their home life. Presenting at a conference for example, would require the author preparing for their presentation/workshop, and then attending it. Although many conferences offer discounted attendance rates to presenters, the author would have to account for the cost of travel and accommodation. With regards to interested educational psychologists, their adoption of social justice principles within their practice may be dependent upon organisational factors. For example, they may wish to embrace an ecological and less within-child focused approach to their practice. This could involve moving away from cognitive assessments to utilising dynamic assessment. However, if the educational psychology service and/or local authority they work in insist on the use of cognitive assessments as part of educational psychologists’ general practice, it might be difficult to convince them to allow educational psychologists to work in a different way. On the other hand, there might be interest in the use of dynamic assessment within the educational psychology service/local authority but unless there is a willingness to invest in training educational psychologists to deliver this method of assessment, and to provide them with the necessary tools and materials, this interest will struggle to advance to action.

**Key impact indicators**

Key impact indicators of the research would include: (1) publication of papers 1 and 2 within appropriate academic, peer-reviewed journals within 12 months, (2) presentation of the research at local and national conferences within 12 months, and (3) a social justice interest group functioning with at least eight regular members, 24 months following the
publication of the second paper. Success criteria would include interested educational psychologists: (1) having an increased awareness of social justice, (2) being able to define what social justice means to them and their practice, (3) applying social justice principles to their practice and evaluating the impact, and (3) discussing social justice values and issues within education, with other educational psychologists and professionals.

Conclusion

The concepts of evidence-based practice and practice-based evidence, and the effective dissemination of research in relation to outcomes and impact have been discussed. With relation to social justice, which has been the main focus on papers 1 and 2, the topic has a small research base (although areas associated with social justice, such as inclusion, have a wide range of literature), so the findings would benefit from wider and focused dissemination. This would hopefully encourage further research, which would provide a greater understanding of the place of social justice within educational psychology practice, which in turn would benefit the evidence base, both for educational psychologists, other professionals, and the clients that they work with.
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Appendix 1: Educational and Child Psychology author guidelines

Guidance for Contributors

These guidelines are provided to assist Authors, Referees and Editors. Compliance in all respects is appreciated. Manuscripts are accepted for consideration on the understanding that they consist of the authors’ original unpublished work that is not being submitted for consideration elsewhere.

The Abstract

All papers should include an Abstract (of not more than 250 words) and up to five ‘keywords’. The Abstract must be structured and presented under subheadings that indicate: The Aim(s); Method/Rationale; Findings; Limitations; Conclusions.

Length

The main body of text in papers should usually be 3500–5000 words in length although papers outside this range may be considered at the Editor’s discretion. Authors must indicate the word-length of papers with and without the reference section, excluding any tables or figures.

Any one issue of the publication will usually consist of a maximum of eight papers. Referees’ comments and Editors’ judgement of the balance and salience of papers will determine which papers are finally selected for publication.

Style

Overall, the presentation of papers should conform to the British Psychological Society’s Style Guide. Non-discriminatory language should be used throughout. Spelling should be anglicised when appropriate. Text should be concise and written for an international readership of applied psychologists. Abbreviations, acronyms and unfamiliar specialist terms should be explained in the text at least once. Referencing should follow the current Society formats.

For example:


The Editorial Board reserve the right to amend text to achieve conformity with *Educational & Child Psychology*’s aims and style.

**Manuscripts**

An electronic copy should be sent to the Editor for a specific issue, by emailed attachment (in MS Word or rich text format). We are unable to consider papers that are not submitted for a specific issue. Graphs, pictures or diagrams, etc., must be submitted in a format suitable for printing in black-and-white. The cover page must provide the full title of the paper, all authorial details and address (postal and email). The body of the paper, starting on page 2, should include the title and abstract, but omit any detail by which the author(s) may be identified. Text should be in at least 12 point Times New Roman and double-spaced. The submission must confirm that all authors approve the submission and that the paper is their original work and not under consideration elsewhere. Manuscripts that do not conform to these requirements will be returned to the author(s).

**Refereeing**

All papers are usually read by two referees in addition to the Editor. The refereeing process is anonymous. It is important, therefore, that all submissions conform to the above guidelines.

The referees’ comments will, at the Editor’s discretion, be passed to the authors.

The Editorial Board is always pleased to consider suggestions for themed editions. Anyone wishing to propose a theme and to assist as a ‘Guest Editor’ should contact the General Editor, Dr Simon Gibbs, at the School of Education, Communication and Language Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle-upon-Tyne NE1 7RU, or by email to s.j.gibbs@ncl.ac.uk.
Appendix 2: PRISMA Framework

Identification
348 records identified through database searching
1 record identified through other resources

287 records after duplicates removed

Screening
287 records screened
269 records excluded

Eligibility
18 full text article assessed for eligibility
13 full text articles excluded, with reasons

Included
1 mixed methods study included in synthesis
3 studies included in qualitative synthesis
1 study included in quantitative synthesis
### Appendix 3: Excluded studies and reasons for exclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Reason for exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillay, J. (2014). Advancement of children’s rights in Africa: a social justice framework</td>
<td>Participants not school psychologists but academics, policy analysts, directors of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Review framework for qualitative evaluation/investigation research
(Bond, Woods, Humphrey, Symes & Green, 2013)

Author(s):

Title:

Journal Reference:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of the research design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear sampling rationale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well executed data collection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis close to the data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent theory related to the problem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of explicit reflexivity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensiveness of documentation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative case analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity and coherence of the reporting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of researcher-participant negotiation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferable conclusions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of attention to ethical issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Max 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: Review framework for quantitative investigation research

Author(s):

Title:

Journal Reference:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data gathering</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear research question or hypothesis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate process for participant/item identification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate data gathering method used</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive data gathering method</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of bias within participant recruitment/item selection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate/item elicitation maximised</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population subgroup data collected (e.g.: participant gender; item context)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time trends identified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic considerations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate statistical analyses (descriptive or inferential)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-level or inter-group analyses present</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data interpretation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear criteria for rating of findings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations of the research considered in relation to initial aims</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications of findings linked to rationale of research question</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6: Weights of Evidence B and C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight of Evidence B</th>
<th>Weight of Evidence C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**Is the research appropriate in answering the review’s</td>
<td>**Does the focus of the research answer the review’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research question?</td>
<td>research question?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the aim of the research compliment the review’s</td>
<td>• Do the research’s findings contribute to the overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research question?</td>
<td>engagement and impact of social justice within school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is the participant selection appropriate with regards</td>
<td>psychology practice, rather than simply answering the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the research’s aim?</td>
<td>individual study’s research question without any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is the method of data collection appropriate with</td>
<td>transferability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regards to the research’s aim?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strong evidence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met all 3 criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td><strong>Some evidence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met 2 criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td><strong>No evidence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met 0 or 1 criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7: Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation author guidelines

Instructions for authors

The *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation (JEPC)* provides a forum for improving the scientific understanding of consultation and for describing practical strategies to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of consultation services. Consultation is broadly defined as a process that facilitates problem solving for individuals, groups, and organizations. The journal publishes articles and special thematic issues that describe formal research, evaluate practice, examine the program implementation process, review relevant literature, investigate systems change, discuss salient issues, and carefully document the translation of theory into practice.

Examples of topics of interest include individual, group, and organizational consultation; collaboration; community-school-family partnerships; consultation training; educational reform; ethics and professional issues; health promotion; personal preparation; pre-referral interventions; prevention; program planning; implementation, and evaluation; school-to-work transitions; services coordination; systems change; and teaming. Of interest are manuscripts that address consultation issues relevant to clients of all age groups, from infancy to adulthood. Manuscripts that investigate and examine how culture, language, gender, race, ethnicity, religion, and exceptionality influence the process, content, and outcome of consultation are encouraged.

The journal publishes both empirical investigations AND qualitative studies that use methodologies such as case studies and ethnography, as well as conceptual/theoretical articles. Regardless of the methodology or type of manuscript, the focus of the submission should be directly on some aspect of consultation.

In addition to general articles, *JEPC* publishes one peer-reviewed column. The *Consultant's Corner* column provides a forum for papers that explore new ideas or discuss content areas that are of interest to consultants. Often these manuscripts are the result of pilot studies or conceptual pieces focused on new or understudied consultation areas. *Consultant's Corner* articles should be no longer than 20 double-spaced pages, inclusive of all references, tables, and figures.

We understand how important it is for authors to receive a timely response when they submit their work to academic journals. Accordingly, JEPC aims to turn around all manuscripts within three months of receipt. Approximately 90% of manuscripts receive
a decision within three months and JEPC's average turn-around time is approximately two months. Prospective authors are encouraged to contact Editor David Shriberg by phone at 312-915-7087 or via e-mail at dshribe@luc.edu to discuss suggestions for manuscripts and special issues, as well as questions regarding the appropriateness of papers for the journal.

Submission of Manuscripts

Manuscripts should be prepared according to the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA; 6th edition, 2009). All components of the manuscript should be double-spaced, including the title page, abstract, text quotes, acknowledgements, references, appendices, tables, figure captions, and footnotes. The abstract should be 100-150 words in length. To enable authors to address their topics comprehensively, manuscripts of up to 35 pages of text (excluding references, tables, and figures) will be considered. Articles for the Book and Material Reviews, Consultant's Corner, and Consultation in Societal Context columns should be no more than 15 double-spaced pages.

Authors of empirical treatment and/or quantitative studies are asked to include information regarding the quality of the implementation process and about intervention fidelity. Papers describing qualitative investigations should carefully document procedures for data collection and data analyses.

All manuscripts must address implications for the practice of consultation by a broad, interdisciplinary audience. The content should be original and should not have been published (in whole or in part) in any other journal or source. The journal will be publish one or two guest-edited special issues each year.

Each manuscript must be accompanied by a statement that it has not been published elsewhere and that it has not been submitted simultaneously for publication elsewhere. Authors are responsible for obtaining permission to reproduce copyrighted material from other sources and are required to sign an agreement for the transfer of copyright to the publisher. As an author, you are required to secure permission if you want to reproduce any figure, table, or extract from the text of another source. This applies to direct reproduction as well as "derivative reproduction" (where you have created a new figure or table which derives substantially from a copyrighted source). All accepted manuscripts, artwork, and photographs become the property of the publisher.
Online Submission Only

The *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation* receives all manuscript submissions electronically via its ScholarOne Manuscripts site located at http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jepc. ScholarOne Manuscripts allows for rapid submission of original and revised manuscripts, and facilitates the review process and internal communication between authors, editors, and reviewers via a web-based platform. ScholarOne technical support can be accessed at http://scholarone.com/services/support. If you have any other requests, please contact David Shriberg, Editor-in-Chief, at dshribe@luc.edu.

Blind Submissions

To facilitate anonymous review, AUTHORS' NAMES AND AFFILIATIONS SHOULD NOT APPEAR ON THE TITLE PAGE, HEADERS, AUTHORS' NOTES, FILE NAME, OR ANYWHERE ELSE IN THE MANUSCRIPT FILE. Instead, these will be keyed into the system, as well as placed on a separate page in the cover letter file if desired. It is the authors’ responsibilities to make every effort to see that the manuscript itself contains no clue as to their identity.

Financial Conflict of Interest (FCOI) Statements

All authors must submit an FCOI statement, including each author of a multiple-author manuscript or article. Each author must truthfully and faithfully disclose whether the author personally, and/or his/her affiliated institution or employer, whether on a full-time, part-time, contract, grant-related, and/or consultant basis, has financial or personal relationships or affiliations that could influence or bias the author's decisions, work, or manuscript—regardless of amount or value. All authors are required to disclose all potential conflicts of interest, including specific financial interests and relationships and affiliations (other than those listed in the title page of the manuscript) relevant to the subject of their manuscript. Authors should consider any potential FCOI relationships as occurring within the past five years and for the foreseeable future.

Authors without FCOIs should make a statement to that effect, declaring that no FCOIs exist.

Authors should err on the side of full disclosure and should contact the editorial office if they have questions or concerns.
Tables and Figures

Tables and figures should not be embedded in the text, but should be included either as separate sheets or files or at the end of the manuscript. A short descriptive title should appear above each table with a clear legend and any footnotes suitably identified below. All units must be included. Figures should be completely labeled, taking into account necessary size reduction. Captions should be typed, double-spaced, on a separate sheet.

Please follow current conventions for data graphs. Some specific guidelines follow:

(a) If more than one set of data appears on a graph, each should be represented by a different symbol. A legend or labels should be used to describe the sets used.

(b) No more than 3 data paths should be plotted in a single line graph when possible. A bar graph might be a better alternative.

(c) To indicated phrases or conditions, use dashed vertical lines between the last session in one condition and the first session in another. Data points should NOT be connected across conditions.

(d) Each condition needs a brief, descriptive condition label placed above the data path, centered between dashed lines.

Illustrations

Illustrations submitted (line drawings, halftones, photos, photomicrographs, etc.) should be digital files. Digital files are recommended for highest quality reproduction and should follow these guidelines:

- 300 dpi or higher
- sized to fit on journal page
- EPS, TIFF, or PSD format only
- submitted as separate files, not embedded in text files

If the use of color art is desired, please contact the publisher for print and online publication costs.
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Author Descriptions

If a submission is accepted for publication in *JEPC*, every author should be prepared to submit a statement of no more than 3 sentences, to describe the following (where applicable):

- current position(s) and affiliation(s) (including accreditation/approval, if desired)
- certification(s) or licensure(s) currently held
- significant past positions or honors
- the academic institution from which his/her highest degree was obtained
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Appendix 8: Ethical approval email

Dear Joanne,

Ref: PGT/134074-RP

I am pleased to confirm that your ethical approval application for your Research Paper - “Exploring Educational Psychologists’ Views of Social Justice” has been submitted as Low Risk by your supervisor.

Please accept this email as confirmation that you are now able to carry out your research. If anything untoward happens during your research then please ensure you make your supervisor aware who can then raise it with the School Research Integrity Committee on your behalf.

Best regards,

Joseph Smith
Joseph Smith Administrative Assistant (Applied and Distance Learning) I School of Environment, Education and Development I Ellen Wilkinson Building I Room 3.8a I The University of Manchester I Manchester I M15 6JA I 0161 275 7631
Joseph.smith-2@manchester.ac.uk
Appendix 9: Minor amendments email

From: Kevin Woods  
Sent: 13 April 2016 18:43  
To: Ethics Education; Georgia Irving  
Subject: FW: Joanne Schulze

Hi Georgia,

Is there any update on this minor amendment of low risk or can I assume that it’s OK to go ahead as supervisors have approved it. Does it need any email confirmation of it being filed?

Best wishes

Kevin

Professor Kevin Woods  
Director of Postgraduate Research,  
Director of Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology,
Hi Kevin

I’m not really sure what has happened but we have had some staff sickness here. As you have approved it, you can tell her to go ahead.

Thanks

Georgia
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-contentious.

The form guides you in assessing the research against each of these risk levels in turn. Agreement to proceed with research at each of these levels is provided by an appropriate University Research Ethics Committee, a MIE Research Integrity Committee member, or by the supervisor/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 exists. A separate Fieldwork Risk Assessment (FRA) form must be completed if you will be making fieldwork visits but are not able to agree with ALL the criteria in the LOW Risk Fieldwork Statement (Section C). This is so you can plan how safety issues will be responded to during fieldwork visits. The FRA

---

1. A reasonable person would agree that the study includes no issues of public or private objection, or of a sensitive nature.
2. For courses with approved templates see: http://www.seed.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/miestudenthome/integrityethics/
form is available on the MIE ethics intranet. Instructions on this and subsequent stages of the RREA process are provided within each of the following sections.

ANY student

- Section A – Summary of Research Proposal (page 1)
- Section B – Description of Research (page 2)
- Section C – LOW risk Fieldwork Declaration (page 3)
- Sections D.0-D.1 – Criteria for HIGH risk research (page 6)
- Section D.2 – Criteria for MEDIUM risk research (page 7)
- Section D.3 – Criteria for LOW risk research (page 8)

LOW Risk UG / PGT / Doctorate Pilot studies/Research Papers only

- Section E.1 – Criteria for LOW risk ethical approval (page 10)

Supervisors and tutor approvals of LOW risk student research

- Section E.2 – Supervisor confirmation that research matches LOW risk criteria (page 11)

Minor amendments to MEDIUM OR LOW risk approvals

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

It may be appropriate for supervisors and students to review and discuss responses to these questions together from the outset.
### SECTION A - SUMMARY OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>A1. Name of Person/Student:</strong></th>
<th>Joanne Elizabeth Schulze</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2. Student ID (quoted on library/ swipe card):</strong></td>
<td>7134074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A3. Email Address:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:joanneschulze@gmail.com">joanneschulze@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A4. Name of Supervisor:</strong></td>
<td>Prof. Kevin Woods and Dr Laura Winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A5. Supervisor email address:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:kevin.a.woods@manchester.ac.uk">kevin.a.woods@manchester.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:laura.winter@manchester.ac.uk">laura.winter@manchester.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A6. Programme (e.g. PhD, MEd, MSc, PGCE, BA etc):</strong></td>
<td>Professional Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A7. Year of Study</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A8. Full/Part-time</strong></td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A10. Title of Project:</strong></td>
<td>Exploring Educational Psychologists’ Views of Social Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A11. Project Submission Date:</strong></td>
<td>May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A12. Fieldwork visit dates</strong></td>
<td>Start Date: 1/10/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13. Geographic location(s) where the project will be carried out:</td>
<td>Potential locations are the University of Manchester buildings, UK Educational Psychology Service buildings and buildings belonging to other universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14. Student Signature:</td>
<td>J. Schulze</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>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>HRA reqd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A16. Supervisor Signature</td>
<td></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).

Principal Research Question(s):

1. How do educational psychologists define social justice?
2. How, if at all, is social justice important to educational psychology practice?
3. What does social justice currently look like within educational psychology practice?
4. What role do educational psychologists think educational psychology should play in working towards social justice?

Academic justification:
Early intervention is an essential means of reducing social inequality through supporting children and families before the educational attainment gap between financially rich and poor children becomes insurmountable (Sodha & Margo, 2010). Educational psychologists are well placed to be involved with early intervention and the promotion of social equality. Despite the rise of social justice within psychology, there is very little literature focusing on social justice specifically within the context of educational psychology even though Speight and Vera (2009) have called for a critical dialogue about the role of social justice within the US field of school psychology. The handful of articles that do exist have focused on the views of practising US school psychologists (Shriberg et al., 2008; Shriberg, Wynne, Briggs, Bartucci, & C. Lombardo, 2011) and trainee school psychologists (Briggs, McArdle, Bartucci, Kowalewicz, & Shriberg, 2009). A pilot study by the researcher (Schulze 2015) used an exploratory survey to investigate UK educational psychologists’ views of social justice. Findings showed that with regards to social justice, participants want their role to be one of advocacy for children and young people within the educational system. This research aims to expand on the pilot study by further exploring UK educational psychologists’ views of social justice using methodology that allows for a wider and more in-depth range of thoughts and opinions, to inform future research, discussion and practice.
### Project Design
The research will adopt a qualitative design. It has no propositions because the gap in research literature means that the study is exploratory in nature. However, the research will be judged successful if views are successfully sought and a greater understanding of the role of social justice within educational psychology practice is obtained.

### Data Collection Methods
Individual interviews will be used as the main form of data collection due to the desire to yield individual, in-depth insights that might not be possible if questionnaires or a focus group were used instead. The researcher has some knowledge of social justice and what she wishes to find out but due to only having a year’s experience within the role of a trainee educational psychologist there might be many things that she is not yet aware that she doesn’t know, therefore the interviews will be semi-structured (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

### Sampling
Participants in the study will be recruited through the process of purposeful convenience sampling and snowballing. Educational psychology services and educational psychologists who have a known interest in social justice will be approached. The researcher will initiate contact with one at a time to ensure that they don’t have more potential participants than required. If they are finding it difficult to recruit participants by directly contacting educational psychologists and educational psychology services, the researcher will also consider placing advertisements on the website of the Association of Educational Psychologists (http://www.aep.org.uk) and on the email discussion list EPNET (https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A0=EPNET). The researcher will also consider presenting their pilot study research at relevant conferences (e.g.: The North-West Educational Psychology Conference) to recruit potential interested participants.

### Method(s) of Analysis
Thematic analysis will be used to interpret the data and thematic networks applied to organise the findings (Attride-Stirling, 2001). With regards to coding of the data, the framework that will be devised will adopt some of the principles of grounded theory (Charmaz, 2003) ie: initial, open coding followed by focused, in-depth coding.

---

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

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

OR

X None of the above groups are involved in this study

B4. Total number of expected research participants.

Number of different participant groups
(e.g. Teacher, parents, pupils = 3 groups requiring differentiated information/consent sheets)

8 to 20

1

3 The person with learning difficulties has appropriate support within the setting from accredited support workers or family members.
B5. The research will take place (tick all that apply):

X within the UK

within the researcher’s home country if outside the UK

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

* You must complete a separate Fieldwork Risk Assessment form

C. LOW Risk Fieldwork Statement and Declaration

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

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

Fieldwork Statement

I confirm:

[ ] I will not travel outside the UK or my home nation.
[ ] I will not visit any country where the Foreign and Commonwealth Office has issued a warning against travel
[ ] the fieldwork does not require overnight stays in hotels or other types of public temporary accommodation.
[ ] public and private travel to and from the research location(s) are familiar to me and offer no discernable risk.

4 The researcher’s ‘home country’ is defined as one in which (1) the researcher holds a current passport through birthright or foreign birth registration, (2) a country where the researcher has 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.

5 Fieldwork visits involve travel to research locations off campus to collect data.

6 This can be checked on this website http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travel-and-living-abroad/travel-advice-by-country/
I will not travel through, or work in research locations which have known hazards to health or safety such as unlit areas, derelict areas, cliffs, or local endemic diseases.

I will carry only necessary personal items when travelling to, and within, research locations.

No specific vaccinations are required / I have had specific vaccinations required to undertake this research.

First aid provision and a trained first aider are available where appropriate.

I will only operate machinery / electrical equipment / workplace vehicles, or handle / work with animals, at the research location(s) where I have clear competence to do so / will be under close supervision from a qualified person.

The fieldwork will be carried out within normal working hours\(^7\) at a time convenient to participants.

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

I am fully aware of, and sensitive to cultural and religious practices of participant groups, and will act accordingly.

This research will not involve fieldwork visits to private homes, other than to those of friends or relatives.

This research will not involve fieldwork visits to organisations’ premises, other than those with which I have an existing established relationship through placement, employment or volunteering.

I will provide a regularly updated fieldwork visit schedule to a nominated University contact, unless visits only involve travel to the homes of friends or relatives.

I will carry a Manchester Institute of Education Emergency Contact Information Card during all fieldwork visits, unless visits only involve travel to the homes of friends or relatives.

\(\text{OR}\)

:\n
\(^7\) For example, in the UK normal working hours are between 8am and 6pm Mon-Fri inclusive.
C.2  No Fieldwork visits

Fieldwork Statement

I confirm:

- this research **does not** involve fieldwork visits of any kind
- I will not give out personal telephone information to participants, or owners of secondary data resources, in relation to the research project

**LOW Risk Fieldwork Declaration:**

Students and Supervisors please complete C.3 / C.4 respectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.3  Student Declaration:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By signing this declaration, I declare that the completed statement above is accurate to the best of my knowledge and that I will complete any actions that I have indicated I will complete.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature:

J. Schulze

Name (in capitals): JOANNE ELIZABETH SCHULZE  
Date: 28/07/2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.4  Supervisor Declaration:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By signing this declaration, I confirm that I have reviewed the health and safety aspects of this research with this student and that the completed statement above is accurate to the best of my knowledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature:

Name (in capitals):  
Date:
SECTION D – RESEARCH RISK ASSESSMENT

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

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

☐ The study involves primary research with adults who are unable to self consent

☐ The study involves primary research with NHS patients

☐ The study involves primary research with prisoners/young offenders

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

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

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

I confirm that this research:

☐ involves vulnerable or potentially vulnerable individuals or groups as indicated in B3

☐ addresses themes or issues in respect of participant’s personal experience which may be of a sensitive nature (i.e. the research has the potential to create a degree of discomfort or anxiety amongst one or more participants)

☐ cannot be completed without data collection or associated activities which place the participants at personal risk

☐ requires participant informed consent and/or withdrawal procedures which are not consistent with accepted University practice

☐ addresses an area where access to personal records (e.g. medical), in collaboration with an authorised person, is not possible

☐ involves data collection on an area of public or social objection (e.g. terrorism, paedophilia)

☐ makes use of video or other images captured by the researcher, and/or research study participants, where the researcher cannot guarantee controlled access to

For full details see http://www.hra.nhs.uk/resources/applying-for-reviews/
authorised viewing.

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

**ACTIONS – HIGH RISK RESEARCH**

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

2. You should then complete the University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) form (available on the MIE (RIC) ethics intranet site\(^9\)) and all supporting documents\(^{10}\), and give these to your supervisor for review and feedback.

3. When satisfied with the application, your supervisor will submit:
   1. This completed RREA form
   2. Your completed UREC form – appending ALL supporting documents.
   3. Your completed and approved Fieldwork Risk Assessment (FRA) form - where indicated

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

In doing so, supervisors confirm that they have agreed the assessed risk level and that the documents are complete and correct. The Ethics Administrator will arrange School authorisation for your documents to be submitted to UREC.

---

\(^{9}\) [http://www.seed.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/miestudenthome/integrityethics/](http://www.seed.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/miestudenthome/integrityethics/)

\(^{10}\) ‘Supporting documents’ include recruitment adverts/emails, draft questionnaires / interview topic guides, information sheets and consent forms.
D.2 – Criteria for research classified as MEDIUM RISK (tick any that apply)

I confirm that this:

- is research involving children or other vulnerable groups which involves direct contact with participants.\(^{11}\)
- study is on a subject that a reasonable person would agree addresses issues of legitimate interest, where there is a possibility that the topic may result in distress or upset in rare instances.
- is research which involves substantial direct contact\(^ {12}\) with adults in non-professional roles (eg parents).
- is research which focuses on data collection from professionals responding to questions outside of their professional concerns.
- is research with practitioners involving topics of a sensitive nature which are not personal to these participants.
- involves visits to site(s) where a specific risk to participants has been identified, and the researcher may not be closely supervised throughout

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

**ACTIONS – MEDIUM RISK RESEARCH**

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

2. You should then complete the MIE Ethical Approval Application form (available on the MIE Ethics Intranet)\(^ {13}\) and all supporting documents\(^ {14}\), and give these to your supervisor for review and feedback.

---

\(^{11}\) This does not include research in locations where children are present if they are not the focus of the research.

\(^{12}\) 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.

\(^{13}\) This document and guidance can be downloaded from http://www.seed.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/miestudenthome/integrityethics/
3. When satisfied with the application, your supervisor will submit:

1. This completed RREA form
2. Your completed MIE form – appending ALL supporting documents.
3. Your completed and approved Fieldwork Risk Assessment (FRA) form - where indicated

**These documents should be submitted by your supervisor to:**

Ethics.Education@manchester.ac.uk

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

---

14 ‘Supporting documents’ include recruitment adverts/emails, draft questionnaires / interview topic guides, information sheets and consent forms.
D3 – Criteria for research classified as LOW RISK

D 3.1  **NO human participants**

I confirm that this research (tick as appropriate):

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

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

D3.2  **Human participants**

I confirm that this (tick as appropriate):

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

---

15 A reasonable person would agree that the study includes no issues of public or private objection, or of a sensitive nature.
D 3.3  **Research context**

I confirm (tick as appropriate):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>I am not in a position to coerce potential participants/secondary data owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>the research involves no vulnerable group (as indicated in question B3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Doctoral THESIS Students ONLY  UG / PGT / Doctorate Pilot study or Research papers involving ONLY LOW RISK CRITERIA, go to Section E.1.

If ONE OR MORE of the LOW risk criteria above have been selected, ethical approval must be sought from the Manchester Institute of Education (MIE) Research Integrity Committee (RIC).

**ACTIONS – LOW RISK DOCTORAL RESEARCH**

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

2. You should then complete the MIE Ethical Approval Application form (available on the MIE Ethics Intranet)\(^\text{16}\) and all supporting documents\(^\text{17}\), and give these to your supervisor for review and feedback.

3. When satisfied with the application, your supervisor will submit:
   1. This completed RREA form
   2. Your completed MIE form – appending ALL supporting documents.
   3. Your completed and approved Fieldwork Risk Assessment (FRA) form - where indicated

*These documents should be submitted by your supervisor to:*

Ethics.Education@manchester.ac.uk

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

---

\(^{16}\) This document and guidance can be downloaded from http://www.seed.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/miestudenthome/integrityethics/

\(^{17}\) ‘Supporting documents’ include recruitment adverts/emails, draft questionnaires / interview topic guides, information sheets and consent forms.
SECTION E. Ethical Approval Application for LOW risk research

UG / PGT Research OR Doctorate Pilot Studies/Research Papers

Section E.1 to be completed by students. Section E.2 to be completed by supervisors/tutors

### E. 1 Research ethics criteria

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

I confirm:

#### Codes of Practice

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>I have read and understood the Manchester Institute of Education Ethical Practice and Policy Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>I will abide by the Manchester Institute of Education’s Ethical Protocol detailed therein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>I am aware of and will abide by any organisation’s codes of conduct relevant to this research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Researcher skills/checks

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>all necessary training procedures for this research have been completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>all appropriate permissions have been obtained to use any database or resource to be analysed in Secondary research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>all relevant enhanced DBS or other checks have been completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>I will inform the Ethics Administrator if my DBS (or related) status changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>permission to be on the site to conduct research has been received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Rights of participants

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PIS and consent forms have been confirmed with the supervisor named in A.5, as covering required headings illustrated in the MIE Participant Information and consent templates, AND that they are written in an accessible way for each proposed participant group.

I understand 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

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

Research output

- [NA] the only publication/output from this research on my practice or research methods study will be my assignment or dissertation.
- [X] the only publication/output from this research on professional practice / market research / questionnaire survey will be my assignment or dissertation unless consent has been obtained from participants for further dissemination.

ACTION: LOW RISK RESEARCH

1. **You** should email your final, completed RREA form (with ALL required supporting documents appended to it, **including your research proposal, or equivalent** document giving full details of the research) to your supervisor.

2. **Your supervisor** will first agree that this is LOW risk research. They will then, confirm that your proposed research matches our LOW RISK ethics criteria and that in doing so, that it is approved under our UREC ethics templates.
3. Your supervisor will send you an email to confirm this assessment.

4. The ethics administrator will send formal confirmation of approval once all relevant documents have been received.
E.2 Supervisor confirmation that research matches LOW risk criteria above.

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

**SUPERVISOR ACTION: LOW RISK RESEARCH**

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

   I confirm:

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

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

   - This research will not address issues of public or social objection, or of a sensitive nature.
   - Information giving and consent taking processes follow Manchester Institute of Education guidance.
   - Where fieldwork visits involve travel to research locations off campus to collect data.
   - 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.
   - This secondary research assignment/project has appropriate resource or database access permissions.
   - I will act as custodian for data used for any study that results in a publication (Masters/PhD dissertation or other output) and will arrange for archiving of data with MIE for a minimum period of 5 years.

---

Fieldwork visits involve travel to research locations off campus to collect data.
**Confirm** that the proposed research matches the low risk ethics criteria (indicated in E.1) and that the documents supplied are complete and correct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please specify:</th>
<th>Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Completed <strong>RREA form</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student research <strong>proposal, or equivalent</strong>, on which the assessment is based(^{19})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed and approved <strong>Fieldwork Risk Assessment form</strong> - where indicated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supporting documents:**

- Draft questionnaire / interview topic guide / other data collection tools
- Recruitment email / advertisement
- Participant Information Sheet / page / letter (PIS) for **each** group
- Consent form (or alternative) for **each** participant group

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

3. **Submit** for confirmation of Approval to ethics.education@manchester.ac.uk:

To validate this confirmation of approval a full set of documents must be submitted electronically for archiving and audit.

**NB:** The Ethics Administrator **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.

---

\(^{19}\) 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, therefore the study proposal or an equivalent document giving full details (eg assignment description) is required.
F.1 Minor amendments to LOW risk research design

Any minor amendment to low risk approved research submissions should be detailed below.

LOW risk research amendments should be checked and agreed by the supervisor as constituting a ‘minor’ change then signed-off below. Substantial changes to research will require a reassessment and revised ethical approvals. This revised copy of the RREA showing the approved amendments, and any amended/additional supporting documents, should be forwarded electronically to the ethics administrator at ethics.education@manchester.ac.uk.

The Ethics 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 amendment to assessed research agreed (1):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details of amendment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| Supervisor’s signature: | Date: |

---

20 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.
FIELDWORK risk ASSESSMENT

Manchester Institute of Education, University of Manchester

This form should be completed by anyone planning research which is to be conducted off campus or involves conducting interviews alone, and does not correspond to the RREA 'low risk' fieldwork criteria as detailed on the RREA form.

The form has two main functions:

1. it provides guidance and asks questions that will encourage staff, students and supervisors to think systematically through a range of potential risks in ways that should help them to avoid difficulties.

2. it provides evidence that potential risks to personal safety are being appropriately managed.

Students, should:

1. complete the Fieldwork Risk Assessment in discussion with supervisors.

2. send the FRA (and RREA or MIE or UREC form for information) to the Authorised Fieldwork Risk Assessor (Alan Jervis alan.jervis@manchester.ac.uk) for approval.

3. Once approval has been gained, this FRA should be submitted along with the RREA, and other research documents, for ethical review.

Staff, should:

1. complete the Fieldwork Risk Assessment in collaboration with co-researchers

2. send the FRA (and UREC form for information) to the Authorised Fieldwork Risk Assessor (Alan Jervis alan.jervis@manchester.ac.uk) for approval.

3. Once approval has been gained, the FRA should be submitted along with the UREC documentation for in-house review and subsequent University Research Ethics Committee ethical approval.

NB: Your Fieldwork Risk Assessment (FRA) should be treated as a ‘living document’ and updated as necessary throughout your fieldwork period. When a FRA is updated, students should send a copy should to their supervisor who will take any further action necessary. Staff should send an updated copy of their FRA to the MIE Research Support Officer (Paul Rowbotham).
## YOUR RESEARCH PROJECT DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Exploring Educational Psychologists’ Views of Social Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research type (circle one)</td>
<td>Staff 21 PhD Masters Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher(s) name(s)</td>
<td>Joanne Elizabeth Schulze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor(s) name(s) (where relevant)</td>
<td>Prof. Kevin Woods and Dr Laura Winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>28/07/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

21 For staff research to be undertaken by Research Assistants/Associates, please list the names of the RAs involved and complete this form in collaboration with them.
This form is divided into three sections. Please indicate which of the Fieldwork risk sections, listed below, are relevant to your project.

Tick any that apply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1:</th>
<th>Travel overseas(^{22}) (not to your home country)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 2:</td>
<td>Off campus fieldwork visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(not vocational placement, or regular employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>settings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3:</td>
<td>Conducting fieldwork alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please now complete the fieldwork risk assessment items for each section you have ticked. Finally, complete the Declaration Section.

\(^{22}\) Richard Fay or Charlotte Woods are happy to act as points of contact for student and supervisor queries regarding conducting research abroad.
Section 1 - Travel overseas (not in your home country)

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

1. Governmental Advice about the Proposed Destination

What advice do the UK authorities (i.e. FCO) give regarding the proposed destination? Summarise the main points below and for each separate point indicate what implications their advice has for you and your study.

For example, do the FCO advise that you register with them during your visit to this location? If so, have you now done so? Do they advise that you avoid certain regions within the country concerned? If so, have you stated that your visit will indeed avoid such regions?

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

The following sections may pick up on issues already raised but you should nonetheless complete all sections below.
2. University Advice about the Proposed Destination (this up-to-date advice may also be helpful for staff)

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

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

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

4. Health Considerations

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

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

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

For example, what risks might be associated with locally-prepared food and how will you minimise these risks? What risks are associated with local drinking water supplies and what can you do to minimise these risks?
6. Physical Hazards

What potential risks can you identify given the range of climates and type of terrains you will be spending some time in during your proposed visit? Use the box below to identify such risks and to indicate what measures you are taking to reduce these risks wherever possible.

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

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Biological hazards overseas

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

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Potential stressors when travelling overseas

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

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

Complete all sections below –

Where you do not foresee any risks relating to a particular item, please state ‘No risks identified’, do not leave the item blank.

1. Belongings

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

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

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

As above. I will also carry a mobile phone and a digital audio recorder. I will minimize risks by ensuring that they are kept in a secure bag and keeping the bag on my person at all times.
2. Accommodation

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

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

| No risks identified because at the moment I don’t foresee having to spend the night in any accommodation. |
3. Fieldwork visits

Wherever possible, investigators should study a map of the area, or visit the location in advance to plan their journey. Do you know the location of **hubs of activity** such as shops, pubs, schools or the local police station which may provide you with a possible escape route should this be necessary?

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**I am not yet sure of the exact areas where I will be conducting my fieldwork because they are subject to participant engagement in the research. However, I am initially conducting my search for potential participants in the north-west of England of which I am familiar having lived in the area all my life. I will look into the areas where I will be undertaking research gathering before arriving there, identifying any risks and minimising them where possible.**
4. Activities

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

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

No risks identified because at the moment I don’t foresee that there are any risks undertaking the interviews that are over and above what are included in the RREA form.
5. Equipment Considerations

What potential health risks can you identify regarding any equipment you intend to use during your proposed fieldwork visits? Use the box below to identify such risks and to indicate what measures you are taking to reduce these risks wherever possible.

For example, do you need to have any specialist skills for such equipment? Do you have these skills? Are there any maintenance and repair issues to be considered?

No risks identified because I am familiar with the equipment that I need to use (digital audio recorder).

6. Personal safety during fieldwork visits

In addition to the areas already covered, what other risks might there be to your safety and well-being? Use the box below to identify such risks and to indicate what measures you are taking to reduce these risks wherever possible.

For example, what Accident and Emergency provision is in place? Are they are any possible risks associated with social unrest? Or local crime?

As I am not sure yet where I will be undertaking my research I cannot identify any precise risks to personal safety that might occur because of the areas. However, because I will be unfamiliar with the areas, I will ensure that both relevant personnel at university as well as my partner are aware of where I am going, what time I expect to arrive and the time I expect to leave. I will text/phone them upon arriving and leaving the building where the interview is taking place.

7. Intercultural Challenges

Spending time living in another society, or conducting research with cultural groups different from your own, brings with it the need to be prepared for possible intercultural challenges during your interactions. The Study Abroad Unit has relevant advice in this area, which may be helpful to those conducting research with different cultural groups both
outside and within the UK. Use the box below to identify the possible cultural backgrounds you expect to encounter and to indicate what measures you are taking to become familiar with these cultural backgrounds wherever possible.

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

No risks identified at the moment because I don’t yet know the cultural backgrounds of the educational psychologists that I will be interviewing. When I do know, I will conduct research into their cultural backgrounds so that I am aware of any practices, behaviours, dress etc that might cause challenges.
Section 3: Conducting fieldwork alone

NB: Personal Safety

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

You SHOULD NOT:

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

Complete all sections below –

Where you do not foresee any risks relating to a particular item, please state ‘No risks identified’, do not leave the item blank.

1. Understanding Interviewees

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

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

No risks identified because at the moment I don’t yet know the backgrounds of my interviewees. However, they are fellow professionals working within the same profession and I will be undertaking research with them on their work premises or at the university or on the premises of another university.
2. Maintaining Contact

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact’s name</th>
<th>Mike Peereboom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your relationship to contact(^{23})</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{23}\) If a family member or friend is the nominated contact then the School Research Development Manager must be informed of their identity and contact details – see Declarations below.
Checklist of details needed by your nominated contact

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

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

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

I can confirm that I will follow the guidelines above.
3. On Arrival

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

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

If at any point during the interview, you feel unsafe; you should excuse yourself, go to another room, and use your mobile to call for assistance. You may wish to consider introducing codes in case of a threatening situation. For example, phoning to ask the contact to check if you have left a ring-binder on the desk could be a code for "I do not feel safe; please send someone to the house."

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

I can confirm that I will follow the guidelines above.
4. On Completing an Interview

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

The nominated person should be instructed to:

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

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

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

I can confirm that I will follow the guidelines above.
Declarations

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 the actions that I have indicated I will complete.

Signature: J. Schulze

Date 28/07/2015

Name (in capitals): JOANNE ELIZABETH SCHULZE

Student ID: 7134074

Manchester Institute of Education (MIE) Emergency Contact Information Card:

All who conduct research off campus must carry a MIE Emergency Contact Information Card at all times. Please confirm that you will do so.

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

Signed J. Schulze

Date 28/07/2015

Please also provide the following information, as appropriate:

Travel details (to fieldwork destination)

1. Date of departure: Currently unknown

Details of itinerary: Currently unknown

2. Date of return: Currently unknown

Details of itinerary: Currently unknown
Contact information

1. I can be contacted as follows during fieldwork:
   Email address: joanneschulze@gmail.com  Phone: 07903661629

2. Contact person at destination (overseas travel / accommodation):
   Name: Currently unknown.
   Relationship to you: Currently unknown.
   Email address: Currently unknown. Phone: Currently unknown.

3. Contact person for fieldwork visits (as nominated in item 2):
   Name: Mike Peereboom
   Email address: peereboom.mike@gmail.com Phone: 07850181403

________________________________________________________________________________

 Supervisor sign off (where appropriate)

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

Supervisor signature  Date

Supervisor signature  Date

________________________________________________________________________________

On Behalf of the Manchester Institute of Education:

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

Authorised Fieldwork Risk Assessor

Authorised Signature  Date

Name (print)
Manchester Institute of Education

Ethical Approval Application Form

This ethical approval application form has been revised to incorporate changes made to the new University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) Form. It has been designed to incorporate prompts for information needed to ascertain whether the proposed research matches MIE’s research template pre-approved by UREC and to facilitate completion of the form to a standard that will allow speedier review, and 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><strong>Name of Student:</strong></th>
<th>Joanne Elizabeth Schulze</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student ID (quoted on library/ swipe card):</strong></td>
<td>7134074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email Address:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:joanneschulze@gmail.com">joanneschulze@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Supervisor:</strong></td>
<td>Prof. Kevin Woods and Dr Laura Winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor email:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:kevin.a.woods@manchester.ac.uk">kevin.a.woods@manchester.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:laura.winter@manchester.ac.uk">laura.winter@manchester.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme (PhD, Prof Doc, MEd, PGCE, MSc, BA etc):</strong></td>
<td>Professional Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year of Study</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full/Part-time</strong></td>
<td>Full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title of Research Project:</strong></td>
<td>Exploring Educational Psychologists’ Views of Social Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruitment and Data Collection</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start Date:</strong></td>
<td><em>On receipt of confirmation of ethical approval</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End Date:</strong></td>
<td>July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location(s) where the project will be carried out:</strong></td>
<td>University of Manchester, the buildings of other universities and/or Educational Psychology Service buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Signature:</strong></td>
<td>J. Schulze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor Signature:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supervisor signature confirms that the student has the relevant experience, knowledge and skills to carry out the study in an appropriate manner**
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).

1. How do educational psychologists define social justice?
2. How, if at all, is social justice important to educational psychology practice?
3. What does social justice currently look like within educational psychology practice?
4. What role do educational psychologists think educational psychology should play in working towards social justice?

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?)

Early intervention is an essential means of reducing social inequality through supporting children and families before the educational attainment gap between financially rich and poor children becomes insurmountable (Sodha & Margo, 2010). Educational psychologists are well placed to be involved with early intervention and the promotion of social equality. Despite the rise of social justice within psychology, there is very little literature focusing on social justice specifically within the context of educational psychology even though Speight and Vera (2009) have called for a critical dialogue about the role of social justice within the US field of school psychology. The handful of articles that do exist have focused on the views of practising US school psychologists (Shriberg et al., 2008; Shriberg, Wynne, Briggs, Bartucci, & C. Lombardo, 2011) and trainee school psychologists (Briggs, McArdle, Bartucci, Kowalewicz, & Shriberg, 2009). A pilot study by the researcher (Schulze 2015) used an exploratory survey to investigate UK educational psychologists’ views of social justice. Findings showed that with regards to social justice, participants want their role to be one of advocacy for children and young people within the educational system. This research aims to expand on the pilot study by further exploring UK educational psychologists’ views of social justice using methodology that allows for a wider and more in-depth range of thoughts and opinions, to inform future research, discussion and practice.
2. **Methodology**

2.1 **Project Design:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project Design:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please briefly outline the design and methodological approach of the project, including the theoretical framework that informs it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research will adopt a qualitative design. It has no propositions because the gap in research literature means that the study is exploratory in nature. However, the research will be judged successful if views are successfully sought and a greater understanding of the role of social justice within educational psychology practice is obtained.

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

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

Individual interviews will be used as the main form of data collection due to the desire to yield individual, in-depth insights that might not be possible if questionnaires or a focus group were used instead. The researcher has some knowledge of social justice and what she wishes to find out but due to only having a year’s experience within the role of a trainee educational psychologist there might be many things that she is not yet aware that she doesn’t know, therefore the interviews will be semi-structured (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The interviews will be recorded using a digital audio recorder and then transcribed by the researcher to produce an anonymised written transcription.
2.2.2. Questionnaires

Yes [x]  No [ ]

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

Before the interviews are undertaken, a short questionnaire will be emailed/posted to participants to gain demographic data as well as information about personal confidence, interest and engagement with social equality and justice, using the Social Issues Questionnaire (Miller et al., 2009). They will be collected from participants either by email or through pre-paid postal envelopes.

2.2.3. Observations

Yes [ ]  No [x]

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):

2.2.4. Diary

Yes [ ]  No [x]

If Yes, describe the context for use of the diary and what participants will be asked to do. (Append copy of the Diary instructions and format):

2.2.5. Intervention

Yes [ ]  No [x]

If Yes, describe the intervention and what participants will be asked to do. (Append a detailed description and any images necessary to support the description):
2.2.6. Assessments  
Yes ☐  No ☒

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

2.2.7. Other  
Yes ☐  No ☒

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

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

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

I have previously undertaken semi-structured interviews when undertaking research for my dissertation when I completed the MEd Psychology of Education at the University of Manchester during 2007/2008.
2.3 Sampling

What type of sampling method do you propose to use?

2.3.1. Statistical

Yes [ ] No [x]

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

2.3.2. Other

Yes [x] No [ ]

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

The study aims to enlist between 8 to 20 qualified educational psychologists (EPs) to participate in the research. Trainee educational psychologists will not be approached due to a lack of prolonged and varied experience within the role compared to their qualified peers. Participants in the study will be recruited through the process of purposeful convenience sampling and snowballing. Educational psychology services and educational psychologists who have a known interest in social justice will be approached. The researcher will initiate contact with one at a time to ensure that they don’t have more potential participants than required. If they are finding it difficult to recruit participants by directly contacting educational psychologists and educational psychology services, the researcher will also consider placing advertisements on the website of the Association of Educational Psychologists (http://www.aep.org.uk) and on the email discussion list EPNET (https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A0=EPNET). The researcher will also consider presenting their pilot study research at relevant conferences (e.g.: The North-West Educational Psychology Conference) to recruit potential

2.4 Analysis method

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

2.4.1. Quantitative analyses

Yes [ ] No [x]
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2.4.2. Qualitative analyses

If Yes, please give details:

Yes [x] No

Thematic analysis will be used to interpret the data and thematic networks applied to organise the findings (Attride-Stirling, 2001). With regards to coding of the data, the framework that will be devised will adopt some of the principles of grounded theory (Charmaz, 2003) ie: initial, open coding followed by focused, in-depth coding.

2.5 Ethical Issues

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

The participants in this research will be educational psychologists who adhere to strict codes of ethics and practice related to the profession (Health & Care Professions Council, 2012a, 2012b; The British Psychological Society, 2002, 2009). Hopefully it can be safely assumed that the participants would apply those same codes when participating in the research and not break any confidences when discussing professional experiences. As evidence-based practitioners they will have previously undertaken and participated in research so they will be familiar with appropriate approaches and how to keep themselves safe during the individual interviews. There might be ethical issues in undertaking the interviews at the participants’ place of work, which is why there will be the opportunity to undertake the interviews at the University of Manchester instead, or at a different university premises which is subject to permission being granted.

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>8 to 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>Male and Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age group(s)</td>
<td>All age groups</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)

☐ Children under 16 in school, youth club or other accredited organisation.

☐ Adults with learning difficulties in familiar, supportive environments

☒ NONE OF THE ABOVE (go to item 4.)

3.2.2. Inclusion of vulnerable groups

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

3.2.3. Research in UK with vulnerable groups

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

DBS* Yes ☐ No ☐ NA ☐

Other Yes ☐ No ☐ NA ☐
*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 □

NA □

4. Recruitment

4.1 Permissions

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

4.1.1. The organisation where the research will take place

(e.g. School head etc)?

Yes □ NA □

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

Yes □

NA □

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

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

- [X] Letters/emails and follow up phone calls to organisations
- Posters/Advertisements
- [X] Website/Internet (including Facebook/other social media)
- [X] Known or named client groups (students, etc).
- [X] 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.

The Educational Psychology Services approached will employ educational psychologists who are my target participants. The Association of Educational Psychologists website and the EPNET email list will contain members who are educational psychologists who are my target participants. Recommendations of potential participants from existing participants and presenting my pilot study at relevant conferences, will hopefully identify potential interested educational psychologists. Some of the educational psychologists at my placement provider have also expressed interest in taking part in the research.

I do not have permission as of yet because I don’t know the educational psychology services that my participants will work for. I will seek permission from the services as soon as I know who they are before I undertake any interviews on their premises. If I need to use the premises of a different and more local university to the participant, I will contact that university to gain permission to undertake the interviews there before beginning data gathering.
### 4.2.2. Who will the potential participants be?

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

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

Some of the tutors on my course have offered to put me in touch with potentially interested participants and some of the educational psychologists at my placement provider have also expressed interest in taking part in the research.

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


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

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

I will contact potential participants by post to educational psychology services, through specialist email lists, through website advertisements and potentially through presenting my pilot research study at relevant research conferences. Information sheets will be posted/emailed to them and they will be able to contact me by email.

**Append text of letters / emails / posters / advertisements / presentation etc**
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:**

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

Append text of recruitment letters / emails / information sheet to this application
Information giving will be undertaken by:

- 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:

I will fully inform potential participants about the study through the information sheet and I will be available to answer any queries through email.

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)

The participants I am contacting will be able to read standard English due to the requirements of their profession.

Please confirm:

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

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.

2 weeks.
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.*

None. If the interviews are held on premises that aren’t the participants’ places of work, then participants’ travel costs will be reimbursed using money from the research budget.

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)?

I am not approaching vulnerable individuals as potential participants.

4.3. Consent

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

- Implied consent - return/submission of completed questionnaire
- X Written consent form matching University template
- Verbally (give details of how this will be recorded)
- Other method (give details here):

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

Please confirm: X My consent taking procedures are relevant to each participating group

X The consent taking 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.

Not applicable.
5. **Participation in the research**

5.1 **Duration**

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

Individual interview of one hour and 15-30 minutes to complete a pre-interview questionnaire.

5.2 **Benefits to participation**

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

None.

5.3 **Deficits to participation**

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

None.

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?

None.

6.2 Psychological risks

6.2.1 Potential

Will any topics discussed (questionnaire, group discussion or individual interview) potentially be sensitive, embarrassing or upsetting, or is it possible that criminal or other disclosures requiring action could take place during the project?

None.

6.2.2 Safeguards

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

None.

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:

The risks are low and mainly involve personal well-being due to travel and undertaking research at unfamiliar locations.
6.4 Early termination of the research

6.4.1 Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the criteria for electively stopping the research prematurely?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the participant wishes to stop or appears to be distressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

- Electronic transfer by email or computer networks
- Use of personal addresses, postcodes, faxes, e-mails or telephone numbers
- [X] Publication of direct quotations from respondents
- Publication of data that might allow identification of individuals
- [X] Use of audio/visual recording devices
- Sharing data with other organisations
- Export of data outside EU

Will the study store **personal** data on any of the following?

- [X] Manual files
- Home or other personal computers
- Laptop computers
- University computers
- Private company computers
- NHS computers
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?

Physical data will be anonymised and kept securely. Electronic data will be securely kept on an encrypted memory stick.

7.3 Research monitoring and auditing Please confirm:

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

X

If other arrangements apply please specify:

7.4 Data Protection

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

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Fairly and lawfully processed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Processed for limited purposes as outlined in this application and only used in the way(s) for which consent has been given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Adequate for the purpose, relevant and not excessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Not kept longer than necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Processed in accordance with the participant’s rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Secure – <strong>on an encrypted storage device</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Only transferred to other settings with appropriate protection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Data Protection Policy (UDPP): I confirm

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

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

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

7.5 Privacy during data analysis Please confirm:

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

If other arrangements apply please describe:

7.6 Custody and control of the data Please confirm:

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

If other arrangements apply please describe:

7.7 Access to the data

- The student researcher will have access to the data
- The student’s supervisor(s) will have access to anonymised data
7.8 Use of data in future studies

Will the data be stored for use in future studies? Yes  X  No  

If Yes, confirm this is addressed in the information giving/consent taking process by ticking here. X

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)
[ ] Internal report
[ ] Conference presentation
[X] Thesis/dissertation
[ ] Other e.g Creative works (describe here):

8.2 Participant and community feedback

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

9. Research Sponsorship

9.1 External funding

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

- External Funding
- No external funding

If you have funding please provide details:

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

- 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:*

☐ 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><strong>Data collection instruments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft copy of <em>each</em> data collection instrument named in Q2.2 (Questionnaire, Interview guide, etc)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video and Still Image Recording Declaration (VASTRE)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant recruitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter(s) of permission to conduct research within <em>each</em> organisation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment advertisement(s) specified in Q4.2.1 (poster/email/letter/presentation)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Information giving – one <em>for each</em> participant type specified in Q3.1 (Information sheet/letter/email/script)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent taking – one <em>for each</em> participant type specified in Q3.1 (Consent form or alternative procedure)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fieldwork risk assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork Risk Assessment Form (approved)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RREA form Low Risk Fieldwork Declaration (Section C) completed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3: MINOR AMENDMENT TO RESEARCH PROJECT

Application for Approval of Minor Amendment\textsuperscript{24} to a Research Study

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

Supervisor Declaration

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

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

Supervisor’s signature*  
Date.

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

\textsuperscript{24} Minor amendments are those that do not alter the character of the research or the participant groups.
Appendix 11: Ethics minor amendments

F.1 Minor amendments to LOW risk research design

Any minor amendment to low risk approved research submissions should be detailed below.

LOW risk research amendments should be checked and agreed by the supervisor as constituting a ‘minor’ change then signed-off below. Substantial changes to research will require a reassessment and revised ethical approvals. This revised copy of the RREA showing the approved amendments, and any amended/additional supporting documents, should be forwarded electronically to the ethics administrator at ethics.education@manchester.ac.uk.

The Ethics 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 amendment to assessed research agreed (1):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details of amendment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

To undertake interviews by skype or telephone when it is not possible to arrange in person interviews.

To undertake interviews at the home of a participant who is a HCPC registered practicing educational psychologist, and whose employer/employment is known to the researcher and to their supervisors.

| Supervisor’s signature: | Kevin Woods | Date: | 16th March 2016 |

---

25 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.
SECTION 3: MINOR AMENDMENT TO RESEARCH PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application for Approval of Minor Amendment to a Research Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details of proposed amendment (please give as much detail as possible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To undertake interviews by skype or telephone when it is not possible to arrange in person interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To undertake interviews at the home of a participant who is a HCPC registered practicing educational psychologist, and whose employer/employment is known to the researcher and to their supervisors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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>Kevin Woods</th>
<th>Date.</th>
<th>16th March 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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.

---

26 Minor amendments are those that do not alter the character of the research or the participant groups.
Appendix 12: Call for participants email

Dear______,

My name is Joanne Schulze and I’m a trainee educational psychologist at the University of Manchester. As part of my thesis, I’m undertaking a piece of research which is exploring educational psychologists’ views of social justice.

Social justice can be defined as “full and equal participation of all groups in a society that is mutually shaped to meet their needs. Social justice includes a vision of society in which the distribution of resources is equitable and all members are physically and psychologically safe and secure” (Bell, 1997, p.3).

I’m currently looking for participants and wanted to ask if you would consider participating in the research. If you would like an information sheet or further information, you can contact me at this address joanne.schulze@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk.

Kind regards,

Joanne Schulze

Year 2 Trainee Educational Psychologist

The University of Manchester
Appendix 13: Information sheet

*Exploring Educational Psychologists’ Views of Social Justice*

Participant Information Sheet

You are being invited to take part in a research study as part of a thesis project – exploring the role of social justice in the field of educational psychology, which will form part of a Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology. 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 to take part. Thank you for reading this.

**Who will conduct the research?**

*Joanne Schulze – Trainee Educational Psychologist.*

**What is the aim of the research?**

*It is hoped that an insight will be gained into educational psychologists’ perspectives on the place of social justice within their practice, what it looks like and the role that they would like it to play. It is difficult to universally define social justice because personal experiences result in it meaning different things to different people. One definition however is “full and equal participation of all groups in a society that is mutually shaped to meet their needs. Social justice includes a vision of society in which the distribution of resources is equitable and all members are physically and psychologically safe and secure”* (Bell, 1997, p.3).

**Why have I been chosen?**

*You have been chosen because you are actively working as an educational psychologist within the UK and have responded to an invitation expressing your interest in the research.*

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

*You would be given a pre-interview questionnaire to complete and return before taking part in an individual interview. The questionnaire is for demographic and informational purposes and will not affect your participation in the research. The interview would take*
place during 2016 at either the University of Manchester, your place of work or a neutral venue (e.g.: a hired office space) at a time that suits both you and the researcher. These details will be discussed if you agree to take part.

What happens to the data collected?

The data will be collected using a digital audio-recorder, transcribed by the researcher and then analysed for themes which have emerged during the interview. This data will then be written up into an academic paper which might be published in a relevant journal.

How is confidentiality maintained?

All data that is recorded will only be listened to by the research team. The transcription of the interview will be anonymised and the digital audio recording will be deleted once the academic paper has been written and the recording is no longer needed. All data and personal information will be encrypted, anonymised, stored safely and securely, and will only be accessible by the research team.

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 and without detriment to yourself.

Will I be paid for participating in the research?

No, there will be no compensation (monetary or otherwise) for participating in the research but your travel costs will be reimbursed if applicable.

What is the duration of the research?

The research will consist of one interview that will last approximately one hour. You are free to leave the interview at any time for any reason.

Where will the research be conducted?

The interview will be conducted in a meeting room either at the university, your place of work or at a neutral venue (e.g.: a hired office space), at a date and time that is convenient to you.
Will the outcomes of the research be published?

There is a chance that the research will be published. If it is, the researcher will get in touch to let you know.

Contact for further information

You can contact me by email at joanne.schulze@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk.

Prof. Kevin Woods and Dr Laura Winter are supervising the research and can be contacted by email at kevin.a.woods@manchester.ac.uk and laura.winter@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.
Appendix 14: Consent form

*Exploring Educational Psychologists’ views of social justice*

CONSENT FORM

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

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

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

3. I understand that the interviews will be audio-recorded.

4. I agree to the use of anonymous quotes in any write ups of the research.

5. I agree that any data collected may be passed to other members of the research team.

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

7. I agree that the data generated may be used in future research.
I agree to take part in the above project

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of person taking consent</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 15: Pre-interview questionnaire

Pre-Interview Questionnaires

Please could you fill in the following questionnaires before the interview for demographic purposes as well as providing me with some basic information about your personal confidence, interest and engagement with social equality and justice.

Name:

Date of Birth:

Gender:

Ethnicity:

Time spent working as an educational psychologist:

Current service:

Current service type (Core/semi-traded/traded/independent):

Previous service type experiences as an educational psychologist (Core/semi-traded/traded/independent):
I am interested in learning about your knowledge of issues related to social inequality (e.g., poverty, historically underserved populations, oppression, sexism, discrimination, racism, religious intolerance) and engaging in social justice activities that seek to reduce and eliminate social injustice and inequality.

Your responses are anonymous so please answer as honestly as possible.

**Part I. Instructions:** The following is a list of social justice activities. Please indicate how much confidence you have in your ability to complete activity. Use the 0–9 point scale below to indicate your degree of confidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Confidence at All</th>
<th>Some Confidence</th>
<th>Complete Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much confidence do you have in your ability to:

1. respond to social injustice (e.g., discrimination, racism, religious intolerance) with nonviolent actions. ____

2. examine your own worldview, biases, and prejudicial attitudes after witnessing or hearing about social injustice. ____

3. actively support needs of marginalized social groups. ____

4. help members from marginalized groups create more opportunities for success (e.g., educational, career) by developing relevant skills. ____

5. raise others’ awareness of the oppression and marginalization of minority groups. ____

6. confront others that speak disparagingly about members of underprivileged groups. ____

7. challenge an individual who displays racial, ethnic, and/or religious intolerance. ____
8. convince others as to the importance of social justice. _____

9. discuss issues related to racism, classism, sexism, heterosexism, and ableism with your friends. _____

10. volunteer as a tutor or mentor with youth from an underserved and underprivileged group. _____

11. support efforts to reduce social injustice through your own local fundraising efforts. _____

12. identify the unique social, economic, political, and/or cultural needs of a marginalized group in your own community. _____

13. encourage and convince others to participate in community-specific social issues. _____

14. develop and implement a solution to a community social issue such as unemployment, homelessness, or racial tension. _____

15. challenge or address institutional policies that are covertly or overtly discriminatory. _____

16. lead a group of coworkers in an effort to eliminate workplace discrimination in your place of employment. _____

17. serve as a consultant for an institutional committee aimed at providing equal opportunities for underrepresented groups. _____

18. advocate for social justice issues by becoming involved in local government. _____

19. address structural inequalities and barriers facing racial and ethnic minorities by becoming politically active (e.g., helping to create government policy). _____

20. raise awareness of social issues (e.g., inequality, discrimination) by engaging in political discourses or debates. _____
**Part II. Instructions:** Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Confidence at All</th>
<th>Some Confidence</th>
<th>Complete Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engaging in social justice activities would likely allow me to:

1. reduce the oppression of certain groups. _____
2. help provide equal opportunities for all groups and individuals. _____
3. fulfill a sense of personal obligation. _____
4. fulfill a sense of moral responsibility. _____
5. fulfill a sense of social responsibility. _____
6. make a difference in peoples’ lives. _____
7. do work or activities that are personally satisfying. _____
8. get respect from others. _____
9. be more competitive in applying for school or work. _____
10. increase my sense of self-worth. _____
**Part III. Instructions:** Please indicate your degree of interest in doing each of the following activities.

Use the 0–9 scale to show how much interest you have in each activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much interest do you have in:

1. volunteering your time at a community agency (e.g. Big Brother/Big Sister; volunteering at a homeless shelter). _____

2. reading about social issues (e.g., racism, oppression, inequality). _____

3. going on a weeklong service or work project. _____

4. enrolling in a course on social issues. _____

5. watching television programs that cover social issues (e.g., history of marginalized group). _____

6. supporting a political candidate on the basis of her or his stance on social issues. _____

7. donating money to an organization committed to social issues. _____

8. talking to others about social issues. _____

9. selecting a career or job that deals with social issues. _____
Part IV. Instructions: Using the scale below, indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

1. In the future, I intend to engage in social justice activities. _____

2. I have a plan of action for ways I will remain or become involved in social justice activities over the next year. _____

3. I think engaging in social justice activities is a realistic goal _____
Part V. Instructions: Many factors can either support or hinder an individual’s plans for engaging in social justice activities. We are interested in learning about the types of situations that could help or hinder your plans if you were to continue on in social justice activities. For the questions below, assume that you wanted to pursue some type of social justice activity. Using the 0–9 scale, show how likely you believe you would be to experience each of the following situations.

Not at All   A Little   Moderately   Quite   Extremely
Likely       Likely     Likely     Likely     Likely     Likely
0     1       2       3       4       5       6       7       8       9

If you were to engage in social justice activities, how likely would you be to:

1. have access to a role model (i.e., someone you can look up to and learn from by observing). _____

2. feel support for this decision from important people in your life. _____

3. feel that there are people “like you” engaged in the same activities. _____

4. feel that your family members support this decision. _____

5. have access to a mentor who could offer you advice and encouragement. _____

6. receive negative comments or discouragement from friends and family members about your engagement in social justice activities. _____

7. worry that getting involved would require too much time or energy. _____

8. feel that you didn’t fit in socially with other people involved in the same activities. _____

9. feel pressure from parents or other important people to change your mind regarding your decision to engage in social justice activities. _____
Appendix 16: Interview schedule

Interview Schedule

1. Before the session
   - Test the digital audio recorder to make sure that it is working correctly.
   - Make sure that all relevant paperwork is prepared.

2. Preparing to start the session (5-10 minutes)
   - Once settled with the participant in the interview room, explain that the session will be digital audio recorded and a transcript produced but that all experiences and opinions expressed during the session will be anonymised and the transcript will only be accessible to the researcher and relevant university staff.
   - Explain that they are free to withdraw from the interview at any time.
   - Ask for and answer any queries that the participant has.

3. Introduction to the session (10 minutes)
   - Thank the participant for coming and offering their time.
   - Explain the aim of the research (exploring EPs’ views of social justice) and what it will involve (participation in the interview but they don’t have to answer any questions that they don’t feel comfortable with).
   - Explain the rationale for research (interest from government, not for profit organisations and other areas of psychology such as counselling and clinical).

4. Question 1 - How would you define social justice?
   - After getting thoughts from the participant, read out and display on a piece of paper Bell’s (1997) definition of social justice. Social justice can be defined as “full and equal participation of all groups in a society that is mutually shaped to meet their needs. Social justice includes a vision of society in which the distribution of resources is equitable and all members are physically and psychologically safe and secure”.
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• Prompts - Do you agree with the definition given? What would you change? What would you add? What would you remove?

5. Question 2 - What, if any, importance does social justice hold within educational psychology?

• Prompts – Is it important to you personally? Or to the profession at large? Or to those who access the service? Why is it important/unimportant?

6. Question 3 – Does social justice exist within your practice? If yes, what does it look like? If no, why not?

• Prompts – How do you incorporate social justice? What does this look like? What does it involve? Does it require the assistance of other people? Does it involve the use of relevant legislation? What are the facilitators/barriers? How do you utilise/overcome them? Do systems impact positively/negatively? Do people impact positively/negatively? Are your opinions due to your own previous experience or perceptions from hearing other people’s experiences or from somewhere else? What would social justice look like within your practice in an ideal world?

7. Question 4 – What, if any role, do you think educational psychology should play in social justice?

• Prompts – How should educational psychology promote social justice? What would this look like? What would it involve you/others doing? Is social justice part of educational psychology or is educational psychology part of social justice?

8. Question 5 – Is there anything else relating to social justice and educational psychology practice that you would like to say?

• Prompts – Are there any areas we haven’t discussed? Is there anything that has popped into your head that you haven’t had chance to say? Is there anything you’ve mentioned that you would like to extend? Do you still think the same way that you did before we began the session? Have you learnt anything new today? Has this discussion potentially impacted upon your future practice?

9. Ending the session
• Summarise what happened during the interview.

• Thank the participant for their time and involvement.

• Explain that once transcription and analysis of the audio recording has been completed, a list of the emergent themes will be emailed for member checking and triangulation purposes, so that they can feedback their thoughts, extend their ideas or provide details which they deem important that weren’t covered during the interview.
Appendix 17: Sample of coding system in NVivo
Appendix 18: Sample of thematic networks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Themes</th>
<th>Organising Themes</th>
<th>Global Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Everyone’s born equal and deserves the right conditions to make the best of their lives</td>
<td>Fair society where everyone has equal, human rights and deserves the right conditions to make the best of their lives</td>
<td>Fairness, equality and equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social justice is about human rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social justice is about equal rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social justice is about living in a better world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social justice is about things being fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social justice is about a fairer distribution of resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Social justice is about fair access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Everyone has equal rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Everyone has human rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Everyone deserves the right conditions to make</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the best of their own lives

11. Everyone has the right to opportunities to access

| 1. Social justice is about equal access to opportunities within the context of society, regardless of race, gender, sex etc |
| 2. Social justice is about ensuring we have equity in our society |
| 3. Social justice is more about equity than equality |
| 4. Some people disadvantaged by equality e.g.: people with disabilities in terms of the physical environment |
| 5. Everyone’s starting from a different place |
| 6. Need equity to level the playing field through distribution of resources and ensuring that |

Equality and equity within society
people have what they need to succeed and achieve, like someone who’s started ahead of them due to personal resources

1. Confusion between what is equitable and what is equal
2. Equitable doesn’t mean everyone getting the same or there being little variation
3. Equal distribution of resources doesn’t necessarily take out imbalances in starting points
4. Equitable distribution of resources is about creating a level playing field
5. What do you mean by equitable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Creating social justice</th>
<th>Creating and promoting an equal society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Creating conditions to which society is open and available but being aware that due to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disadvantaged positions, some groups are less able to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Promoting social justice in terms of full and equal participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Promoting equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Everyone being able to access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Everyone having the same opportunity to access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Marginalised/disadvantaged groups needing more opportunities for access, than people who have more resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Addressing/redressing outcomes and access for disadvantaged groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>People having equal access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>People having the same opportunities to access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Creating a level playing field through ensuring equity of access and opportunity
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Access being comparable between people within a country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Not same access or same opportunities but opportunities to same access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Everyone having sufficient but some people might need more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Disadvantaged groups having access too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Marginalised and disadvantaged groups need more opportunities for access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>People having equality of opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>People having fair access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>People not getting the same thing but having the same starting point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>People having a level playing field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 19: Thematic maps

How do educational psychologists define social justice?

Fair society where everyone has equal, human rights and deserves the right conditions to make the best of their lives

Equality and equity within society

Equal and equitable don’t mean the same thing

Creating a level playing field through ensuring equity of access and opportunity

Fairness, equality and equity

Motivated and striving to achieve social justice through an ongoing, evolving movement

Creating and promoting an equal society

Social justice is a vision that isn’t patriarchal but is society’s vision

Creating a level playing field through ensuring equity of access and opportunity

Fighting for social justice

Action

Active approach to social justice

Physical, contextual and interpersonal differences between people

Resources and services not always available or accessible to all

Discrimination, disadvantage and marginalisation

Vision or values

Social justice is a vision that isn’t patriarchal but is society’s vision

Social justice is about values because they’re more lived than a vision

Understanding, recognising and addressing/redressing barriers and injustices for different groups

Social justice is where vision meets the personal and you get values

Different groups experiencing discrimination and disadvantage, in different ways

Social justice is needed because of disadvantage, marginalisation, inequality and injustice

Resources and services not always available or accessible to all

Social justice is a vision that isn’t patriarchal but is society’s vision

Social justice is about values because they’re more lived than a vision

Understanding, recognising and addressing/redressing barriers and injustices for different groups

Equal and equitable don’t mean the same thing

Creating a level playing field through ensuring equity of access and opportunity

Fair society where everyone has equal, human rights and deserves the right conditions to make the best of their lives

Equality and equity within society

Equal and equitable don’t mean the same thing
How do educational psychologists define social justice?

Diversity and inclusion

- Britain is a diverse and complex society made up of different communities
- Inclusive approach to society and social justice
- Accepting differences and treating others with compassion and respect

Power and privilege

- Awareness of differences, disadvantage, power, and privilege
- Including all members of a diverse society and ensuring that everyone has an equal say

Evolving within current context of society

- Social justice like human beings, is constantly evolving all the time
- There will always be differences between people but social justice is an ideal and a tool, to help us understand we’re not where we should be as a society

Unobtainable and at odds with society

- Social justice is unobtainable because it means different things to different people
- Full and equal participation not possible due to differing views, agendas, power imbalances and impairment
- Current societal ideas that are at odds with a social justice agenda

Acknowledging and equalising power imbalances that lead to injustice

- Issues around systemic privilege within society
- Differences between people creates power and privilege
How, if at all, is social justice important to educational psychology practice?

**Importance**

- Social justice exists within educational psychology practice to varying degrees
- Not all educational psychologists think social justice exists within, or should be part of, their practice
- Social justice might not be important to the profession as a whole
- Educational psychology and social justice don’t always go together, as educational psychology can be about other things

**How, if at all, is social justice important to educational psychology practice?**

- Social justice is a core philosophy for educational psychology. It’s often implicit rather than explicit in the work that educational psychologists and associated professional organisations do
- Can’t be an educational psychologist without having an awareness of social justice, and wanting to help and support, children and young people
- Not all traded services are the same. The way EPSs operate is influenced by their values and beliefs
- Traded services have narrowed the range of EP work and are becoming focused on outcomes and making money, rather than the needs of children and families
- Labelling and medicalisation
  - Labelling children’s needs is not always appropriate and decisions aren’t always made by professionals with the whole picture
  - Current medicalisation agenda narrows focus on children’s needs. Requires convincing people to look at other areas
  - Issues around schools having to pay for EP services
  - Traded services have narrowed the range of EP work and are becoming focused on outcomes and making money, rather than the needs of children and families

**Traded services**
How, if at all, is social justice important to educational psychology practice?

Educational psychologists can be part of the problem

* Systemic difficulties in education and local authorities due to lack of resources, services, money, and time
* Austerity causing cuts to public services and education
* Educational Psychology Services are stretched due to lack of funding, time and capacity
* Personal and professional difficulties that EPs and their colleagues are experiencing due to cuts in public services and education
* Reductions in funding are negatively impacting the support children are receiving, especially in the early years

Educational psychologists have influence and power, and their word has weight, even though they don’t like to be seen as gatekeepers to resources

School staff’s expectations of educational psychology involvement can be focused on cognitive assessments and EHCPs

Assessment can be a facilitator or barrier to meeting the needs of children

Educational psychologists getting stuck in the role of expert when people are the experts of their own lives

Issues around lack of diversity within EP profession

EPs not wanting to be part of the problem

Sometimes EPs feel like they’re part of the problem rather than the solution

Educational psychologists can become married to cognitive assessments. Need to expand practice and not hide behind them

In a time of low funding, schools are seeking extra funding, resources and EHCPs for children who may not need them. Losing sight of importance of school-based interventions

Austerity causing cuts to public services and education

Educational Psychology Services are stretched due to lack of funding, time and capacity

Personal and professional difficulties that EPs and their colleagues are experiencing due to cuts in public services and education

In a time of low funding, schools are seeking extra funding, resources and EHCPs for children who may not need them. Losing sight of importance of school-based interventions

Reductions in funding are negatively impacting the support children are receiving, especially in the early years

Educational psychologists have influence and power, and their word has weight, even though they don’t like to be seen as gatekeepers to resources

School staff’s expectations of educational psychology involvement can be focused on cognitive assessments and EHCPs

Assessment can be a facilitator or barrier to meeting the needs of children

Educational psychologists getting stuck in the role of expert when people are the experts of their own lives

Issues around lack of diversity within EP profession

EPs not wanting to be part of the problem

Sometimes EPs feel like they’re part of the problem rather than the solution

Educational psychologists can become married to cognitive assessments. Need to expand practice and not hide behind them
How, if at all, is social justice important to educational psychology practice?

**Duty and responsibility**
- Everyone has a social responsibility to help others, particularly those who are less fortunate
- Educational psychologists have a duty and a responsibility to those that they work with
- Educational psychologists have a duty and responsibility to those that they work with to act in their best interests, even though they’re sometimes seen as being a barrier to resources and support

**Interface between personal and professional**
- Don’t stop being yourself at work

**Motivated as an individual to bring about social justice**
- Promotion of social justice is a personal thing and you can’t force someone to champion it or work in a particular way

**Link between personal and professional**
- Personal experience and feelings motivate EPs to enter the profession
- Personal experiences influence ideas around social justice

**How, if at all, is social justice important to educational psychology practice?**

**Politics**
- Current political agenda of othering people and being anti-state, doesn’t support social justice as it’s making things more difficult for children and families, rather than easier
- Governmental decisions have an effect on people but MPs are often detached from their citizens and lack knowledge of the SEN system

**Duty and responsibility**
- Everyone has a social responsibility to help others, particularly those who are less fortunate

**Educational psychologists**
- Educational psychologists have a duty and responsibility to those that they work with

**Politics**
- Current political agenda of othering people and being anti-state, doesn’t support social justice as it’s making things more difficult for children and families, rather than easier

**Governmental decisions**
- Have an effect on people but MPs are often detached from their citizens and lack knowledge of the SEN system

**Link between personal and professional**
- Don’t stop being yourself at work

**Motivated as an individual to bring about social justice**
- Promotion of social justice is a personal thing and you can’t force someone to champion it or work in a particular way

**Link between personal and professional**
- Personal experience and feelings motivate EPs to enter the profession
- Personal experiences influence ideas around social justice

**How, if at all, is social justice important to educational psychology practice?**

**Duty and responsibility**
- Everyone has a social responsibility to help others, particularly those who are less fortunate

**Educational psychologists**
- Educational psychologists have a duty and responsibility to those that they work with

**Politics**
- Current political agenda of othering people and being anti-state, doesn’t support social justice as it’s making things more difficult for children and families, rather than easier

**Governmental decisions**
- Have an effect on people but MPs are often detached from their citizens and lack knowledge of the SEN system
How, if at all, is social justice important to educational psychology practice?

- Children with SEN not always receiving appropriate education and support
- All children are different with varying needs. Need to be treated as individuals
- Systemic and structural issues within education and SEN systems get in the way of social justice
- Assumptions, theories and narratives around education are traditional and need challenging
- National discourse around education fails to take into account children and families
- Current educational climate is not conducive to treating children as individuals and considering the environment before looking within-child
- Difficulties in trying to implement social cohesion and justice in educational settings
- Parents being forced into decisions that are undesirable to them, but are better for schools or local authorities
- Focus on the best schools being those with the best results and not those with the happiest children, turns children in to numbers
- External sanctions don’t always work with parents of non-attending children, and can cause further harm
- Focus on assessment and attainment misses the individual needs of children and young people
- Disadvantaged families trying to navigate a bureaucratic special needs system

Problems with the education and SEN systems

Legislation doesn’t always support social justice

EHCPs are often one-off, product focused pieces of work that narrow thinking around children

Not all children and young people learn the same way, and the educational system needs re-dressing

Children are seen as the problem rather than the educational system
How, if at all, is social justice important to educational psychology practice?

Problems with the education and SEN systems

Particular groups of children experiencing poorer educational outcomes

Difficulties around school-parent relationships

Early years provision can be lacking

Attitudes and perspectives

Parents and schools seeing resources in different ways. Parents see resources as a means to an end whilst schools are focused on them

People have different attitudes and perspectives which can be a facilitator and a barrier to social justice

Schools often subtly and unconsciously discriminate against children with SEN in mainstream environments

Current far right agenda doesn’t fit well with social justice and EP practice

Educational psychologists working between school and local authority systems, who have different perspectives

Educational psychologists should advocate for children rather than giving them a voice

Issues around voice

Children may not want to use their voice or become disengaged when they do and nothing changes

Reinforces the idea that the only way someone can be heard is through a professional
What does social justice look like within educational psychology practice?

Support for educational psychologists

Social justice issues are emotive so it’s important for educational psychologists to look after their own emotional well-being.

Legislation and ethical codes

Legislation as tools to support social justice in educational psychology practice.

Voice

Parental voices being supported, listened, and appropriately responded to.

Parental engagement and contribution

EPs are a voice for others.

Does a child have their own voice which we need to listen to or do EPs need to be a voice for children?

Awareness of own biases and prejudices

Need to learn about, value, recognise and accept diversity and difference between people.

EPs need to have an awareness, clarity and honesty with regards to their own prejudices, baggage, biases, the language they use, and how they respond to people.

Educational Psychology Services are supportive environments for EPs.

Doing what’s right

EPs are driven by good intentions.

Educational psychologists doing what they think is right within their practice.
What does social justice look like within educational psychology practice?

Supporting others

Local authorities working to support community cohesion

Parents receiving appropriate support and access

School staff support parents and children because they want to make a difference

Educational psychologists can educate and support school staff to meet children’s needs

Educational psychologists engage with, support, connect and advocate for the people they work with

Consultations

Consultations are important and are an opportunity to change mindsets and come to a shared perspective

Working with others to recognise achievements, problem solve, find solutions, and overcome barriers

EP role in consultations is to listen, believe, facilitate, change thinking, ask questions, and challenge

Educational psychologists having a wide and varied role

EP role is wide and varied, and involves working with a range of people

EP role extends beyond educational settings into the local community

Consultations

Educational psychologists challenging the status quo

EPs challenging the status quo

EPs challenging, fighting and questioning others, to ensure the needs of children and young people are met

Educational psychologists challenging schools to ensure that schools are meeting their responsibilities to their pupils
In an ideal world, educational psychologists might not be needed

In an ideal world, social justice might not be explicit but it would be implicit in the work that educational psychologists do

In an ideal world, social justice is not needed, isn’t possible

In an ideal world, educational psychologists might not be needed

An ideal world in which social justice is not needed, isn’t possible

In an ideal world, there wouldn’t necessarily be a need for social justice due to society being more equitable

In an ideal world, there wouldn’t be school targets

In an ideal world, there wouldn’t be school targets

In an ideal world, people would have access to the resources they need to meet their needs

In an ideal world, consultations would be positive, collaborative, problem solving opportunities, which would have an ongoing impact for children and young people

What does social justice look like within educational psychology practice?

Relationships

School-EP relationship is collaborative but EPs have to be prepared to have difficult conversations

Clients can be parents, teachers or children

Educational psychologists can support links between families and schools

Relationships and connection are important
Educational psychologists are in a privileged position due to their psychological skills and knowledge, and their position as information holders and access to different people.

Educational psychology doctoral courses have brought a vocational element to the profession, and doctoral EPs want to use their skills to bring about change.

Schools are doing fantastic things to meet the individual needs of children and young people but they need to look at positively changing things for the whole class.

Inclusion of children in mainstream settings. Not always appropriate to put children with SEN into special schools.

Equitable support for children with SEN so that they have the same opportunities and access as children without SEN.

Educational psychologists using their interpersonal skills.

Educational psychologists have psychological and professional skills to support children, schools, families, and communities.

Educational psychologists using information, evidence and frameworks to support social justice in their practice.

Listening skills of educational psychologists is important.

Educational psychologists need to change their approach, depending on the situation.

Importance of a holistic approach that looks at the whole child within the context of different environments.

Social justice is about listening to children and young people and acting on their views.

Important of a holistic approach that looks at the whole child within the context of different environments.

Educational psychologists have a role in addressing other’s perceptions of children’s needs.

Progress and moving children forward.

Improving outcomes for children.

Psychological skills and knowledge

What does social justice look like within educational psychology practice?

Child-centred approach
What role do educational psychologists think educational psychology should play in working towards social justice?

**Professional organisations**
- AEP has less of a role as a trade union and more of a role in promoting and supporting social justice issues around SEN, but it can’t do it alone.
- BPS has a role in promoting social justice and encouraging psychology to become political, as part of a broader landscape.

**Politics**
- Educational psychologists have political views which influence their practice, and despite many being local authority employees, it’s unethical to not acknowledge this.
- Educational psychology can influence government policy but it requires people being in a position of influence.

**Action**
- Educational psychologists promote social justice through action; living their values and modelling them in their practice.
- Future evidence-base from academic EPs needs to cover marginalised groups e.g.: LGBT.

**Social justice**
- May be connected with educational and clinical psychology but it’s not necessarily connected with other areas of psychology.

**Although professional organisations can provide support with social justice issues, the EP profession needs to become more organised in its activism.**

**Educational psychologists**
- Educational psychology influenced by left-wing politics during 1970s.

**Educational psychology**
- Can influence government policy but it requires people being in a position of influence.

**What role do educational psychologists think educational psychology should play in working towards social justice?**
What role do educational psychologists think educational psychology should play in working towards social justice?

It’s hard to define social justice but you need to, to begin being more socially just in your practice

Becoming more socially just as EPs requires starting but it’s difficult to know how and where to start

There has to be a commitment but is social justice important to the educational psychology profession? Or are interested educational psychologists stuck in echo chambers?

Educational psychologists have responsibilities which prevent them from trying to become more socially just in their practice

Being more socially just is hard and it’s difficult for EPs to tell whether they are making a difference

Is being more socially just in your practice worth it?

Conflict between ideals and aspirations, and the reality of the situation

Being honest about what you can and choose to do

Conflicts

Conflict