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Thesis abstract

Concerns relating to the management of externalising and internalising behaviour are prevalent within UK educational policy and practice and represent a key domain for Educational Psychologist (EP) support. EP practice has been subject to change over time, following shifts in legislative approaches to managing behaviour in schools and changes to the contexts and systems within which EPs work, such as increased service trading.

A systematic literature review (SLR) sought to represent EP behaviour practices within the existing literature. 12 papers, published between 2000-2017 were identified using a PRISMA framework and evaluated for methodological quality, appropriateness and relevance of focus. An empirical investigation, utilising the Research and Development in Organisations (RADIO) model within a single-case design, was also conducted within a north-west local authority educational psychology service. A focus group with 5 EPs and the Principal EP (PEP), and an interview with the PEP, were carried out and thematically analysed.

The SLR identified a range of behavioural practices at individual, group and organisational levels, exemplifying the core functions of the EP role. Single and integrated psychological paradigms were applied, within relational and social constructionist approaches. The empirical investigation identified a range of behavioural practices, and underlying psychological paradigms, alongside ideas for future developments in behaviour service delivery and the possible facilitators and barriers to achieving this were considered. Reflections on the utility and experience of EP involvement in action research were also facilitated, with content analysis findings presented.

Links to theory and practice, and implications for future research are considered, including empirical investigation of EP practice within local contexts. The application of psychology within local contexts and service development processes, are also considered. Finally, following an exploration of the concepts of evidence-based practice and practice-based evidence, and their implications for practitioner psychologists, a dissemination strategy for sharing findings with participants and the wider EP community is proposed.
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Introduction

Research aims

The overall aim of the research was to explore the role of Educational Psychologists (EPs) in working with school-based behaviour management concerns, and to consider how this may develop within an Educational Psychology Service (EPS) context. The configurative systematic literature review (SLR) reported in Paper 1 aimed to explore the representation of the management of behavioural difficulties within EP practice and to provide an integrated overview of a range of possible approaches which can inform contextualised service delivery strategy. This was achieved through identifying, analysing and evaluating empirical research literature pertaining to how EPs work with behavioural concerns in practice. The empirical research in Paper 2 aimed to explore how EPs within a Local Authority (LA) EPS responded to the needs of their local context through behaviour management work, and how their service response and practice might develop. These aims were operationalised through the following research questions:

1. How do EPs presently respond to student behaviour management concerns?
2. What psychological theory and approaches inform these responses?
3. How do EPs envisage the development of their practice and the responses of the service to these concerns?
4. What are the facilitators and barriers to service development within this context?

Overall research strategy

A systematic review of the literature (Paper 1) revealed that EPs are involved with behaviour management concerns at individual, group and organisational levels (Fallon, Woods & Rooney, 2010), representing the core functions of consultation, assessment, intervention, research and training (Scottish Executive, 2002) and applying single or multiple psychological paradigms within their work. Whilst providing evidence of how EPs may manage behaviour concerns, and their application of psychology within practice, the literature reviewed offered isolated examples of EP practice rather than considering how EP behaviour practice responds to, and develops within, local contexts and needs. Paper 2, therefore, explored EP behaviour practice and application of psychology within a LA context, in addition to consideration of how practice might develop and the facilitators of and barriers to this. The results of this case study supported the notion that EPs work at multiple eco-systemic levels and apply a range of psychological paradigms to their work, supporting the representation configured from the studies cited in Paper 1 (Brown, Powell & Clark, 2012; Burton, 2006; Hannen & Woods, 2012; Hart, 2010; Hayes, Hindle & Withington, 2007; Hayes, Richardson, Hindle & Grayson, 2011; Hayes & Stringer, 2016; Jones, Monsen & Franey, 2013; O’Callaghan & Cunningham, 2015; Regan & Howe, 2017; Smith & Cooke, 2000; Squires, 2001). Key areas for development, such as increasing use of consultation, further multi-agency working and advocacy for children and young people, were identified, in addition to
factors which may help or impede this, such as perceptions of the remit of EPs and financial considerations. Within Paper 3, the importance of disseminating the findings of the research to research participants and other organisations linked to the research site, the wider EP profession and trainee EPs was recognised, with potential dissemination avenues identified. This may further EP understanding of how behavioural difficulties may be approached in practice, as well as highlighting possibilities for further research in this area.

**Researcher’s professional background and relevant experience**

The current researcher’s interest in behaviour stems from a professional background as a teaching assistant in mainstream primary and special needs secondary schools. In both of these settings, a key aspect of the role was supporting pupils presenting with externalising behavioural difficulties such as physical and verbal aggression towards staff and other pupils. The researcher was motivated to explore these behaviours in an attempt to understand the possible underlying factors contributing to them and to plan appropriate intervention and support. This holistic approach towards understanding and managing behaviour was further supported by professional collaboration with school EPs regarding pupils with whom the researcher worked, supporting the researcher’s aspiration to fulfil the same role through becoming an EP herself.

Furthermore, as a volunteer counsellor for a children’s charity, the researcher became familiar with internalising behavioural difficulties relating to emotional wellbeing, including self-injurious behaviours, anxiety, depression and suicidal ideation. Engagement with young people in this way contributed to the researcher’s sense of the importance of listening to and working with young people’s views and perceptions around problem situations and the behaviours which may be produced in response to these, in order to advocate for young people and help to bring about positive and meaningful change.

Therefore, a combination of understanding of behaviour through the application of psychology, and a desire to promote positive change and inclusion for young people with behavioural needs supported the researcher’s interest in behaviour and what EP support in this domain might entail.

**Rationale for engagement**

The researcher’s interest in behaviour, and the potential contributions which can be made to promoting change, understanding and inclusion by EPs, supported her engagement with research into EP behaviour practice. Upon commencing training as an EP, the researcher wished to further understand the ways in which EPs work, or could potentially work, with behaviour concerns in order to support her own understanding and practice. Furthermore, through placement experiences, it became apparent to the researcher that behaviour and social, emotional and mental health (SEMH) are areas with which EP support is frequently requested,
suggesting that understanding and knowledge of this area is also essential for the wider EP profession.

Participant engagement with the research was likely to have been based, in part, on an interest in EP behaviour practice. This was influenced by an identified developmental need within the EP service which hosted the empirical research. The adoption of a ‘part-traded’ model of service delivery (Lee & Woods, 2017) necessitated a synthesised understanding of how EPs currently worked with behaviour and how a service offer to schools and other commissioners could be developed and enhanced. Participation within the research therefore offered opportunities for both individual and service-level professional development, facilitated by an external researcher. During reflections on research participation, it was identified that participants had valued protected time to discuss behaviour practice as a team, as time restrictions do not ordinarily allow for such detailed group discussion, as well as opportunities to reflect on how psychology is applied within behaviour practice.

**Positioning for data access**

The empirical research was undertaken with qualified EPs (including the Principal Educational Psychologist (PEP), maingrade EPs and associate EPs) in one LA EPS in the North West of England. An invitation to act was issued by the service through the University of Manchester’s research commissioning process, based on an identified need for service development relating to their behaviour management offer. A research proposal was presented to the EP team, after which participants elected to be included in the research. The researcher was able to make multiple visits to the research site through the provision of a research budget and protected time allocated by their doctoral programme.

**Evaluation of ontological, epistemological and axiological stances**

Ontology refers to considerations of the nature of reality, and the lens or perspectives through which reality is considered; it debates whether reality is “of an objective nature, or the result of individual cognition” (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2018, p.5). The researcher adopted a critical realism stance (Robson, 2011) which may be regarded as a compromise position between realism and idealism or nominalism. Critical realism holds that external reality can only be imperfectly known or mediated through human perception (Maxwell, 2012); therefore, understandings of ‘reality’ are socially constructed. This stance appears most appropriate for the current research, which recognises the existence and influence of external structures on EP behaviour practice, such as diagnostic criteria, government advice and legislation, local government structures and service commissioning models, as well as the importance of individual subjective perceptions on behaviour, psychological factors relating to it and how these might best be managed.
Epistemology refers to the “bases of knowledge – its nature and forms, how it can be acquired and communicated to other human beings” (Cohen et al., 2018, p.5). It therefore refers to the data gathering strategies and methods selected, the choices of which will be influenced by one’s ontological stance. Although critical realism has been associated with mixed methods research (e.g. Cresswell & Plano Clark, 2018) in order to consider both objective reality and subjective perspectives, the researcher selected a qualitative research strategy, utilising semi-structured focus group and interview methods within an action research case study framework. As a critical realist, the researcher was required to consider how both relativist and positivist aspects could be united within qualitative data gathering methods. This was achieved through, for example, presenting focus group stimulus material which referenced government documentation and views of behaviour (DfE, 2014) as well as existing knowledge regarding levels of EP practice (Fallon et al., 2010), and devising semi-structured focus group and interview schedules containing prompts and probes to challenge and explore subjective ideas around EP behaviour practice where required.

Axiology refers to “the values and beliefs that we hold” (Cohen et al., 2018, p.3). The researcher was mindful of both their own axiological values and those potentially held by the research participants. Through previous working and EP training experiences, the researcher has developed particular values which inform their perceptions about child development and behaviour and how these might be approached and supported by adults, including EPs. These include:

- Behaviour is a response to specific circumstances and ecological factors (e.g. Annan et al., 2013), relating both to objective influences and events in a person’s life and their subjective experiences and perceptions of those experiences.
- It is therefore valuable and interesting to attempt to understand the factors and contexts which may impact a person and ‘cause’ maladaptive behaviour, in order to support inclusion (Booth & Ainscow, 2011) and social justice (Bell, 2016). This also relates to the researcher’s understanding of the EP role and the assumptions which underpin their own practice.
- Children and young people have a right to differentiated support that meets their needs and inclusion in social and educational opportunities; however, this does not necessarily relate to full inclusion through universal mainstream provision, and specialist provisions and support should be available if these are most likely to be in a child’s best interests (Norwich, 2008).
- Children and young people, as well as their parents or carers, have a right to a voice and participation in processes and decisions which concern them (DfE & DoH, 2014; UNICEF, 1989), as well as valuing the perspectives of stakeholders such as teachers and schools.

Although the research took place with qualified EPs who, as members of the same helping profession as the researcher may have held some common values, it was important to refrain from assuming that axiological values were shared. This was achieved through phrasing questions in as value-free and open a manner as
possible (e.g. referring to multiple possible psychological paradigms and approaches rather than assuming that all EPs work with behaviour homogenously, or in the same way as the researcher), including prompts and probes to access different participant perspectives if required (e.g. contrasting views on diagnosis and labelling in relation to behaviour) and utilising the facilitator/moderator role within the focus group to ensure that all participants had opportunities to share their own views and values if desired.

The researcher also adopted an inductive approach to data analysis, deriving themes from the interview and focus group data rather than deductively assigning participant responses to pre-established thematic categories (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This aimed to ensure that interpretations of participants’ responses were as removed as possible from assumptions based on the researcher’s axiological values. Inter-rater coding and member checking processes also took place, in order to increase confidence in the trustworthiness of the researcher’s data analysis.

Conclusion

The overall aim of the research is to explore how EPs work with behaviour management concerns as applied psychological practitioners, with dissemination of research findings in order to support awareness, understanding and development of the EP role within this domain. Whilst the research findings may not represent the practice of EPs beyond the localised context in which it occurred, it is hoped that the findings will promote interest and awareness amongst the broader EP profession and can be usefully applied to supporting and meeting the needs of children and young people experiencing behavioural difficulties within educational settings.
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Paper 1: The representation of the management of behavioural difficulties in
Educational Psychologist (EP) practice

Prepared for in accordance with the author guidelines for submission to the journal
Educational Psychology in Practice (Appendix 1)
The representation of the management of behavioural difficulties in EP practice

Behaviour difficulties, whether externalising or internalising, concern educational policy makers, practitioners, and educational psychologists (EPs). The present configurative systematic literature review (SLR) aims to explore EPs’ representations of their behaviour management practices and application of psychology within behaviour work, in peer-reviewed studies published between 2000-2017. Four research databases, Google Scholar, and a University Online Library were systematically searched. 29 papers were found, 12 of which met the study inclusion criteria and were deemed to be of at least medium methodological quality and relevance. A synthesis of the studies’ accounts and outcomes revealed a range of EP practices at individual, group and organisational levels, exemplifying the core functions of the role. EPs draw upon single or multiple integrated psychological paradigms and commonly adopt a social constructionist and relational approach to their work, which can be seen to empirically validate existing models of EP professional practice. Links to EP practice and implications for further research are considered.

Keywords: behaviour; social, emotional and mental health; educational psychologist; children, adolescents; psychological paradigm

Introduction

Definition of behavioural difficulties

The behaviour of pupils in schools has long concerned educational policy makers and practitioners, with schools bearing responsibility for promoting “good behaviour, self-discipline and respect” and regulating the conduct of their students (DfE, 2016, p.4). ‘Good’ behaviour is viewed as a pre-requisite for learning and academic attainment (DfES, 1989), and the ability of staff to facilitate this is integral to judgements of school effectiveness (Maguire, Ball & Braun, 2010).
Behavioural difficulties can be referred to (Lloyd Bennet, 2005; 2016) and conceptualised in various ways, covering a broad range of actions. Internationally, diagnostic manuals such as the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (American Psychiatric Association, 2013), and the ICD-10 Classification of Mental and Behavioural Disorders (World Health Organisation, 1992), provide clinical criteria for externalising behavioural conditions such as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and conduct disorder, as well as internalising behavioural conditions such as depression, self-harm and selective mutism. Within the researcher’s current context, recognition is made of both externalising behaviours, such as low-level disruption (unnecessary talking, calling out without permission, showing a lack of respect for others and being slow to start work or follow instructions) (OfSTED, 2014), externalising behaviours (aggression, anti-social behaviour and defiance) and behaviours associated with internalising conditions such as anxiety, depression, attachment disorders and deliberate self-harm (DfE, 2014).

**Legislative context for school behaviour management**

The approaches to behaviour management taken by schools, as outlined in UK legislation, have undergone changes at various points in time. The Elton Report (DfES,1989) emphasised external teacher management of disruptive and negative behaviours, specifically advocating the notion of ‘discipline’. Although this may serve preventative and supportive, as well as corrective, functions (Rogers, 1990), this nevertheless expresses a view of negative behaviour as being within-pupil and managed through external control, using approaches such as assertive discipline (Canter, 1997; DfEE, 1997). However, policies introduced by the New Labour government (1997-2010) instead emphasised relational aspects of behaviour and the roles and responsibilities of school staff and systems in promoting and facilitating positive behaviour (DfES, 2002), advocating whole-school approaches such as Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) (DfE, 2005; Humphrey, Lendrum & Wigelsworth, 2010). More recent approaches under the Coalition government (2010-2015) and the current Conservative government feature a return to the notion of ‘discipline’, including behavioural strategies to promote...
positive behaviour and respond to instances of problematic behaviours, clear and consistent behaviour policies and staff development and support (DfE, 2011; 2015; 2016; 2017a; 2017b). However, consideration is also given to the impact of children’s unmet mental health needs upon behaviour (DfE, 2014; House of Commons Education and Health Committees, 2017) and the optimisation of behaviour through school ethos and culture (DfE, 2017a; 2017b).

The inclusion of behavioural difficulties within the Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) Code of Practice (DfE & DoH, 2014) has become less explicit, with the ‘Behaviour, Emotional and Social Development’ category of need (DfES, 2001) reconceptualised as ‘Social, Emotional and Mental Health’ (SEMH) needs. However, behavioural concerns may be regarded as the result or expression of needs in one or more of the areas outlined (SEMH, Cognition and Learning, Communication and Interaction or Sensory and/ or Physical).

**Behaviour management approaches**

The causes of behavioural difficulties are likely to be multiple and complex, with a range of biological, cognitive, social and environmental factors implicated in their origin and maintenance (Krol, Morton & De Bruyn, 2004; Lloyd Bennet, 2005; 2016). ‘Behaviour management’ therefore potentially involves diverse approaches targeted towards different individuals (Rees, Farrell & Rees, 2003), groups (Hart, 2010) or systems (Luiselli, Putnam, Handler & Feinberg, 2005; Nichols, Parffrey & Burden, 1989; Sugai & Horner, 2002; 2008), based upon the application of a range of different psychological paradigms which have differed in their level of influence on behaviour management approaches over time (Cooper, 1999).

Behavioural paradigms have traditionally underpinned much behaviour management work, in approaches such as functional analyses of behaviour, effective rewards and sanctions (Payne, 2015; Williams, 2012), teaching alternative responses and self-management techniques (Eccles & Pitchford, 1997; Newman & Pitchford, 1988; Smith & Cooke, 2000; Wilkinson, 2005) and adapting teacher behaviour using techniques such as assertive discipline (Swinson & Cording, 2002). However, the sole use of behavioural approaches to manage behaviour may fail to
consider the influences of affective and environmental factors on behaviour (Hart, 2010; Roffey, 2016). As ‘difficult’ behaviours may serve a communicative function and externalise inner distress, attention must also be paid to the cognitive and affective aspects of behaviour. Approaches have included developing emotional literacy and enhancing emotional wellbeing through psychosocial methods (Miller, 2003), initiatives such as SEAL (Humphrey et al., 2010), and attachment-based approaches (Nash, Schlösser & Scarr, 2015).

Whilst diagnostic criteria for behavioural ‘disorders’ such as ADHD focus on individual, within-child factors (Lloyd Bennett, 2016; Roffey, 2016), systemic or interactionist accounts of behaviour suggest the importance of environmental factors in explaining behaviours (Cooper & Upton, 1991). These include a focus on the importance of school systems and cultures in influencing and managing pupil behaviour (Daniels, 2006). Although previous educational approaches to behaviour management have focussed on addressing the strengths and needs of individual children (Warnock, 1978), recent educational policy and government advice has highlighted the importance of school culture, leadership and ethos, as well as behavioural systems, in supporting and managing pupil behaviour (DfE, 2011; DfE, 2016; DfE, 2017a; 2017b; Haydn, 2014; Lloyd Bennett, 2016).

Over time, terminology around behaviour has shifted to incorporate a focus on SEMH needs. Theoretically, interactionist psychological paradigms, such as Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecological systems model and Madden and Senior’s (2018) bio-psychosocial approach to understanding and managing challenging behaviour, highlight that behaviours are maintained and influenced by a range of interacting factors at intrapersonal, interpersonal and systemic levels. This paradigm therefore indicates the potential importance of social, emotional and ecological factors in influencing behaviours, rather than assuming that behaviours are solely the result of individual factors. This therefore provides a relational, as opposed to deterministic, lens, through which behaviour may be regarded by agencies such as Educational Psychologists (EPs) and teachers.

Furthermore, EP focus on SEMH can be understood as a political, as well as a theoretical, development. Following the Equality Act (Legislation.gov.uk, 2010),
mental health needs are afforded the same status as physical needs. This has shifted the focus from ‘difficulties’ to be managed and contained, to ‘needs’ for which reasonable adjustments should be made. In turn, this has created a socio-political assumption of a responsibility to adopt a child-centred approach to understanding need, and to bring such needs to the forefront. This perspective may align closely with the interactionist psychological paradigms applied to understanding behaviours by EPs, resulting in analysis of SEMH needs as opposed to assessment of difficulties.

Best behaviour management practice may therefore involve the identification and consideration of a range of individual, relational and environmental factors (Cooper & Upton, 1991; Tyler & Jones, 1998, 2000; Visser, 2005) which drive and maintain problematic behaviours. These factors, and the psychological paradigms which emphasise their importance, are likely to be of interest to agencies working with schools to support effective behaviour management, including EPs, who are also likely to be influenced by the academic, research and administrative literature pertaining to behaviour management.

**Role of the educational psychologist (EP)**

The SEND Code of Practice identifies EPs as a source of support for schools to meet the needs of pupils with SEND (DfE & DoH, 2014). Fallon, Woods and Rooney (2010) described the EP role in terms of utilising psychological skills, knowledge and understanding through a range of practices, such as consultation, assessment, intervention, research and training. Furthermore, these skills may be operationalised when working with individual pupils, groups or systemically at organisational levels.

However, there may be a discrepancy between the potential range of EP work concerning behavioural difficulties and the reality of EP practice. School leaders and Special Educational Needs Co-ordinators (SENCOs) may prioritise certain aspects of the EP role, such as casework with individual pupils over systemic and organisational work (Ashton & Roberts, 2006; DfEE, 2000; DfES, 2006; MacKay & Boyle, 1994). This discrepancy between the value placed upon different facets of
the EP role may be particularly pronounced within the current context of the expansion of traded services, and the need to meet the demands and expectations of school ‘customers’ (Lee & Woods, 2017).

**Rationale and aims of the current review**

The potential role of the EP with regard to behavioural concerns is therefore diverse and wide-ranging, whilst tailored to the needs of service users and shaped by contextual factors. EP involvement can occur at different or combined ecocentric levels and is potentially informed by a range of psychological paradigms. The current configurative Systematic Literature Review (SLR) aims to explore the representation of the management of behavioural difficulties within EP practice and to provide an integrated overview of a range of possible approaches which can inform service delivery strategy in the present context.

**Method of the review**

**Literature search strategy and review process**

The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework (Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff & Altman, 2009) was used to identify and select appropriate papers for the review (Appendix 2). Between August 2016 and January 2017, the following databases were systematically searched for relevant studies: Web of Science, Psych Info, Education Resources Information Center, British Education Index, Google Scholar and the Manchester Online library.

Key search terms included behaviour difficulties, behaviour management, behaviour problems, social emotional and mental health, conduct disorder, educational psycholog* and school psycholog*. The search terms were selected to include a broad range of terminology used to describe and refer to behavioural needs. For example, “behaviour” is used in contemporary government documentation pertaining to behaviour management (e.g. DfE, 2016) whilst behavioural presentations may be discussed as part of the SEMH category of need in the SEND Code of Practice (DfE & DoH, 2014). Furthermore, terms such as
“conduct disorder” may be more prevalent in international school psychology literature or in papers referencing diagnostic classification of behavioural needs. However, as behavioural needs are referred to and described using a wide variety of terms, it is possible that the search terms selected may not be sufficiently comprehensive to capture a more complete range of literature relating to behavioural concerns. For example, if the terms “social”, “emotional” and “mental health” had been included as separate terms, rather than one combined term, then additional examples of EP practice with a behavioural focus in these areas may have been identified. This in turn may have resulted in a different configuration of the types of needs, or the prevalence of particular types of needs at different times, which EPs encounter in the behaviour domain.

Searches were conducted using single and combined terms. Reference harvesting from relevant articles was also carried out, and hand searches of Educational and Child Psychology were conducted.

2602 papers were originally sourced, of which 2573 were excluded after removing duplicates and screening titles. The remaining 29 potentially relevant papers, 27 of which were from the UK, one from the Republic of Ireland and one from the USA, were screened against the following inclusion criteria by reading the abstracts:

1. Published between 2000 and 2017, to reflect potential effects of relevant changes in government policy and guidance on EP practice
2. Written in English
3. Focus on the empirical practice of educational or school psychologists i.e. not academic investigations or evaluations
4. Include a client group with an exclusive or primary focus on behavioural difficulties
5. Subjected to peer review in an academic journal

Note that a high number of initial ‘hits’ and subsequent exclusions is not uncommon in scientific systematic literature reviews as broad initial search terms seeking to capture the widest possible evidence base are balanced against filtering by the clearly defined focus of the specific review.
At this point, a further 15 papers were excluded as they did not fully address the inclusion criteria.

**Data classification**

The remaining 14 papers were fully read and examined. The ‘weight of evidence’ (WoE) framework outlined by Gough (2007) was used to review each paper in terms of:

- methodological quality (WoE A)
- methodological appropriateness (WoE B)
- relevance of focus (WoE C)

In order to ensure that the best available evidence was included, all remaining papers were subjected to review using quality assessment criteria. Each paper was read at least twice, and an approximate 25% sample (4 papers) were read and coded by both the researcher and research supervisor, with moderation discussions of each to reach a consensus view on the quality of papers and to ensure consistent interpretation and application of the quality criteria (Appendix 3). This process indicated a high level of post-discussion agreement (average inter-coder agreement of 96%).

Qualitative evaluations and investigations were coded using a framework adapted from a systematic review of the effectiveness of solution focussed brief therapy (SFBT) by Bond, Woods, Humphrey, Symes and Green (2013) (Appendix 4). This framework identified 12 criteria, including research design appropriateness, evidence of explicit reflexivity, analysis close to the data and transferable conclusions, with each paper given a score between 0 and 14 (some criteria carrying two points).

Quantitative evaluations were coded using a 6-criteria framework published in Bond et al’s (2013) review, with criteria including focus on a specific and well-defined problem, use of outcome measures with demonstrably good reliability and validity and fidelity checking; each paper achieved a score between 0 and 8 (Appendix 5).
To fairly compare scores, each score was converted to a percentage. Where studies included both qualitative and quantitative elements, the highest score was included. Reports which scored 33% or less were deemed to be low quality and were excluded from the review; 1 paper was excluded on this basis (Appendix 6). Reports which scored 34-66% were defined as being medium quality, whilst 67% and above earned a ‘high quality’ judgement.

Each study was also evaluated in terms of ‘methodological appropriateness’ and ‘focus of the study’. Methodological appropriateness criteria for evaluation studies included a clear participant group and outcomes (both of which were necessary to attract a medium quality rating) and a clear intervention. For investigations, the methodological appropriateness criteria were clearly defined behaviour, EP practice and the links between them. Scores of 0,1 or 2 were awarded for low, medium or high appropriateness (Appendix 7). All studies achieved a minimum medium quality rating. The focus of the study ratings related to the EP contribution being clear and evaluated. Scores of 0,1 or 2 were awarded for low, medium or high focus respectively. One paper attracted a low focus rating and was excluded (Appendix 6).

Data extraction and synthesis

Overall, 12 papers were deemed to be of medium or high quality and were included in the final review. The researcher read each paper at least twice and highlighted salient content to populate each category presented in Table 1 below. This information provided the basis for a broadly configurative synthesis (Gough, Oliver & Thomas, 2013) of the readings of the 12 papers.
Table 1. Data extraction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study and location</th>
<th>Study method/design</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Research aims</th>
<th>Summary of findings</th>
<th>Weight of evidence</th>
<th>Weight of evidence</th>
<th>Weight of evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EP Role</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INVESTIGATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart (2010)</td>
<td>Survey/qualitative</td>
<td>47 educational psychologists (EPs) working within one EPS</td>
<td>EP views on: effective classroom behaviour management (CBM) strategies; underlying psychological paradigms</td>
<td>Behaviourist approaches identified, at school, class, teacher behaviour, child levels</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Observe and identify effective CBM strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVALUATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Powell and Clark (2012)</td>
<td>Case study/mixed methods</td>
<td>25 pupils aged 5y1m-6y3m</td>
<td>Improve class behaviour and relationships</td>
<td>Increased behaviour target ratings post-intervention and at 12-week follow-up</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sample Description</td>
<td>Intervention Details</td>
<td>Success Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton (2006) UK</td>
<td>Case study/mixed methods</td>
<td>5 year 8 (aged 12-13) pupils (2 girls, 3 boys)</td>
<td>Support pupils at risk of exclusion to develop self-responsibility for behaviour using cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT)</td>
<td>Increased self- and teacher ratings on social skills assessment, post-intervention and at 7-month follow up</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Run and evaluate CBT group</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work therapeutically with individual pupil</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannen and Woods (2012) UK</td>
<td>Case study/mixed methods</td>
<td>One Year 8 female pupil (aged 12)</td>
<td>EP narrative therapy case example</td>
<td>Attributable gains in emotional wellbeing, resilience and behaviour</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work therapeutically with individual pupil</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Training:**
- deputy headteacher
- Group
- Jointly plan, observe and evaluate/ disseminate the project
- Support pupils at risk of exclusion to develop self-responsibility for behaviour using cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT)
- Increased self- and teacher ratings on social skills assessment, post-intervention and at 7-month follow up
- Run and evaluate CBT group
- Work therapeutically with individual pupil
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hayes, Hindle and Withington (2007) UK</th>
<th>Case study/ mixed methods</th>
<th>One secondary school</th>
<th>Develop positive behaviour management in school through an action research project</th>
<th>More positive, and fewer negative, teacher statements about behaviour; staff sharing scheme viewed positively.</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>EP role clear, but not evaluated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hayes, Richardson, Hindle and</td>
<td>Case study/ mixed methods</td>
<td>10 secondary school teaching assistants (TAs)</td>
<td>Evaluate use of video interaction guidance</td>
<td>Positive impact on TA BM skills and confidence</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Sample Description</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>EP Role</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson (2011)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>(8 female, 2 male)</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>(VIG) through impact on TA BM skills</td>
<td>Guide VIG and evaluate intervention</td>
<td>EP role clear, but not evaluated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes and Stringer (2016)</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Case studies/mixed methods</td>
<td>32 teachers from 3 primary schools</td>
<td>Evaluate impact of Farouk’s process consultation group approach in primary schools over one academic year</td>
<td>Groups gave discussion, information sharing and learning time; BM skills enhanced through strategy-sharing and teamwork</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Monsen and</td>
<td>Case study/mixed methods</td>
<td>Staff in a 2-form entry primary school</td>
<td>Evaluate effectiveness of Staff Sharing Scheme on staff</td>
<td>Changes in staff behaviour through peer support and holistic thinking</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Study Details</td>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franey (2013) UK</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>management of challenging behaviour</td>
<td>Train staff and collect pre/post training data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Callaghan and Cunningham (2015) UK</td>
<td>Case study/mixed methods</td>
<td>9 primary pupils (aged 8-11), with symptoms of anxiety/depression/low self esteem</td>
<td>Evaluate impact of ‘Cool Connections’ on anxiety, depression and self-concept</td>
<td>Statistically significant and anecdotal improvements in anxiety and depression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan, evaluate and supervise staff carrying out CBT group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regan and Howe (2017)</td>
<td>Case study/quantitative</td>
<td>1 primary school boy (aged 6)</td>
<td>Evaluate impact of video self-modelling</td>
<td>Increased target behaviours e.g. doing work, sitting in chair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Power</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Underlying Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underlying</td>
<td>psychology</td>
<td>unclear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>EP Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Individual (VSM) on challenging pupil behaviour</td>
<td>Implement and evaluate VSM intervention</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>EP role unclear but evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith and Cooke (2000)</td>
<td>Case study/mixed methods</td>
<td>1 Reception class pupil (aged 5)</td>
<td>Address needs of boy at risk of school exclusion.</td>
<td>Declines in anti-social behaviour, Future systemic friendship focus</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squires (2001)</td>
<td>Case study/mixed methods</td>
<td>3 groups of 6-9 pupils (Years 5-8, aged 9-13 approximately), in two schools</td>
<td>Evaluate group CBT intervention; self-control of behaviour</td>
<td>16/17 pupils showed improvement in at least one area; anecdotally improved self-concept and peer relations, statistical differences in self-control and classroom behaviour</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Implement and evaluate outcomes of CBT group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings

Overview of findings

The twelve best-evidence studies consisted of one investigation and eleven evaluations. One of the studies employed a survey design (Hart, 2010) whilst the remaining eleven were case studies. Eleven of the studies were conducted in the UK, and one in the Republic of Ireland (ROI) (Hayes & Stringer, 2016). All of the studies were published between 2000 and 2017.

A range of participant groups and levels of EP activity was represented across the group of studies. Three papers evaluated EP practice with individual young people (Hannen & Woods, 2012; Regan & Howe, 2017; Smith & Cooke, 2000) and one evaluated work with individual teaching assistants (TAs) (Hayes, Richardson, Hindle & Grayson, 2011). Six studies evaluated direct or indirect work with groups of staff (Hayes & Stringer, 2016; Jones, Monsen & Franey, 2013), pupils (Burton, 2006; O’Callaghan & Cunningham, 2015; Squires, 2001) or mixed staff and pupil groups (Brown, Powell & Clark, 2012). Two studies focussed on EP practice at organisational levels; one evaluated EP work at a whole-school level (Hayes, Hindle & Withington, 2007) and one investigated the behaviour management views of EPs in one local authority team (Hart, 2010).

All of the studies reported a pupil behavioural focus and rationale for EP involvement, with variation in the specific behaviours considered. Two evaluations focussed solely on internalising behavioural difficulties, such as self-harm and anxiety, depression and low self-concept. Two studies focussed solely on externalising behaviours, such as verbal and physical aggression, whilst two studies included pupils with a mix of internalising and externalising behaviours. Three studies focussed on low-level disruption and other classroom behaviour management issues such as relationships between pupils and staff, whilst the remaining three studies evaluated the development of staff approaches to managing a range of difficult behaviours, such as consultation, video interaction guidance (VIG) and peer support.
All of the evaluation studies reported positive outcomes of EP work with behavioural difficulties, although a range of outcome measures was used. Nine of the studies utilised mixed-method evaluation measures, whilst two used only qualitative methods. The single investigation study included in the review utilised qualitative data gathering methods.

The aim of the review was to explore the representation of the management of behavioural difficulties within EP practice. Two main findings were derived from the review, relating to the content of EP work (the activities undertaken) and the processes of EP work (the psychological theory and thinking which informed their conceptualisation of behavioural difficulties and how these should be addressed). The contribution of the studies to these two main findings is detailed below following the process of a configurative, rather than aggregative, synthesis (Gough et al., 2013), which should be read in conjunction with the aggregated summary of findings in Table 1. All 12 studies contributed to the findings relating to the activities undertaken by EPs and the psychological theories applied.

**Activities undertaken by EPs**

When considering the activities undertaken by EPs, the five core functions of the EP role (Fallon et al., 2010; Scottish Executive, 2002) are evident across the range of behaviourally-focussed work.

**Consultation**

Hayes and Stringer (2016) evaluated the impact of group consultation on teacher behaviour management skills within three schools over the course of an academic year. They found that consultation provided teachers with organised time to discuss behavioural concerns, share information and learn from one another, which in turn enhanced their behaviour management skills. The EP contribution was valued by staff in terms of both the structure and content they brought to the consultation groups, acting as both a facilitator to guide groups through consultation stages and also in giving advice and information around the problem situations brought to the groups. However, the value placed on the EP’s facilitative
role varied between schools, indicating that the view of the EP as an ‘expert’ advice giver was more entrenched for some participants than others.

Other studies highlighted the role of consultation within other aspects of EP behaviour management work. Consultation with schools, parents and young people was evident prior to beginning structured interventions, to identify suitable participants (Burton, 2006; O’Callaghan & Cunningham 2015; Regan & Howe, 2017; Squires, 2001) and to agree upon the aims of interventions and plan sessions (Brown et al., 2012; Burton, 2006; O’Callaghan & Cunningham, 2015; Regan & Howe, 2017; Squires, 2001). Consultation was also evident in individual casework, to clarify the needs and strengths of young people and to agree upon appropriate intervention strategies (Hannen & Woods, 2012; Regan & Howe, 2017; Smith & Cooke, 2000). EPs similarly used consultation with staff at the outset of whole-school systemic work, where school requests for EP support with developing staff behaviour management skills (Jones et al., 2013) and the development of whole-school positive behaviour management strategies (Hayes et al., 2007) were operationalised into agreed aims and actions, with clarification of EP and staff roles.

Consultation was thus presented as a key aspect of EP work with behaviour management, both as a prime mode of involvement and as a precursor to other forms of work, such as intervention, training and action research within organisations.

Assessment

One form of assessment that was evident within EP practice across studies was classroom-based observation of individual children (Regan & Howe, 2017; Smith & Cooke, 2000), or whole-class behaviour, including that of teachers (Brown et al. 2012; Hayes et al., 2007). The EP’s role was described as an external observer, able to comment on behaviours seen from a neutral ‘outside’ perspective. Observations took place prior to and following the implementation of intervention strategies and programmes, to measure impact and change, such as the frequency of positive teacher feedback in lessons (Hayes et al., 2007), and monitor increases
in positive behaviours and reductions in negative behaviours exhibited by pupils (Brown et al., 2012; Regan & Howe, 2017; Smith & Cooke, 2000).

Other forms of EP assessment were also apparent across the range of studies. Assessments were used in order to identify appropriate pupils for interventions, such as using the Beck Youth Inventory to ascertain pupils’ levels of anxiety, depression and low self-esteem (O’Callaghan & Cunningham, 2015); the assessment of readiness to change in a self-harming pupil using Prochoska and Di Clemente’s Model of Stages of Change (Hannen & Woods, 2012); self-report questionnaires to assess pupils’ self-concept, peer relations and self-control (Squires, 2001) and teacher and self-ratings of social skills (Burton, 2006). Assessments were also used to establish whether interventions led to behavioural changes (Brown et al., 2012; Hannen & Woods, 2012; O’Callaghan & Cunningham, 2015; Squires, 2001).

EP use of assessments was therefore consistently represented as information gathering related to the process of changing behaviour, and as a mode of evaluating interventions, thus serving proximal purposes within the contexts in which the concerns had been identified, rather than more distal functions such as contributions to statutory assessment or diagnostic identification.

**Intervention**

The studies described a range of interventions, including structured manualised interventions and those devised by EPs in collaboration with schools, parents and young people. Several of the studies described therapeutic interventions with individuals or groups, including cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT) principles (Burton, 2006; O’Callaghan & Cunningham, 2015; Squires, 2001), solution-focused Working on What Works (Brown et al., 2012) and narrative therapy (Hannen & Woods, 2012), whilst Smith and Cooke (2000) incorporated the relationally-based Circle of Friends into their work with a reception class pupil. Hayes et al. (2011) and Regan and Howe (2017) evaluated the use of VIG techniques with TAs and a pupil, respectively, whilst Hayes et al. (2007), Hayes and Stringer
(2016) and Jones et al. (2013) implemented staff peer support and problem-solving groups for staff in schools, as a form of intervention.

Overall, intervention appeared to be a key aspect of EP work in the management of behavioural difficulties in schools, although not exclusively targeted towards the individual pupils concerned. The work included a range of therapeutic and systemic intervention, at individual, group and organisational levels, thus demonstrating the potential range of EP intervention work in this domain.

**Training**

Several studies represented the EP role of providing staff training in approaches and processes to aid their delivery of interventions and problem-solving groups relating to behaviour management. These included the Staff Sharing Scheme (Hayes et al., 2007; Jones et al., 2013) and Farouk’s group consultation approach (Hayes & Stringer, 2016), to support staff behaviour management skills through structured problem solving and peer support. Other studies involved EPs providing training in group interventions such as Circle of Friends (Smith & Cooke, 2000), Working on What Works (Brown et al., 2012) and CBT approaches (Burton, 2006; O’Callaghan & Cunningham, 2015; Squires, 2001), and giving theoretical background to VIG approaches for work with an individual pupil (Regan & Howe, 2017) and TAs (Hayes et al., 2011).

The EP training role was also represented as fulfilling a supervisory function for staff delivering interventions, to ensure treatment fidelity and support school staff in preparing and delivering intervention sessions (O’Callaghan & Cunningham, 2015). Training was therefore presented as occurring through joint working with, and supervision of, school staff rather than solely as an initial information transfer from EP to staff. Some studies reported positive systemic benefits of this approach, such as staff being empowered to use their acquired skills and knowledge with other pupils (Burton, 2006), creating opportunities to practise and implement skills in classroom contexts (Hayes et al., 2007) and for reflection leading to positive changes in TA-pupil interactions (Hayes et al., 2011).
Research

The studies included in this review all contain aspects of research carried out by EPs, thus demonstrating a link between evidence and practice in the field of behaviour management work. Hart (2010) investigated EP views on effective classroom behaviour management practice as part of an EP team development exercise. This highlighted that multiple integrated psychological paradigms are inherent in effective classroom behaviour management, and that multiple eco-systemic levels (school, class, teacher, children and young people and responses to behaviour) are likely to be addressed in behaviour management work. Although the author highlights the small-scale nature of the research, as it occurred in one EP team and may therefore not generalise to the work or views of other EPs, the study nevertheless emphasises that research into current views and the integration of theory and practice is a key aspect of the EP role.

The remaining eleven studies in this review evaluated the outcomes of EP intervention work; although many studies highlighted the small-scale and context-bound nature of the research, this indicates that part of the EP role is to contribute evidence of effective behaviour management work within their practice to a larger body of knowledge. For example, several studies provided data supporting the efficacy of existing interventions such as Working on What Works (Brown et al., 2012), CBT-based interventions (O’Callaghan & Cunningham, 2015; Squires, 2001), narrative therapy (Hannen & Woods, 2012) and VIG (Hayes et al., 2011; Regan & Howe, 2017), in specific contexts and with particular groups or individuals displaying specific behavioural needs. This practice-based evidence was also garnered through action research projects (e.g. Hayes et al., 2007), further indicating the EP’s potentially dual role as researcher and practitioner.

The application of psychology

The studies included within this review all contained explicit reference to psychological theory underpinning the approaches adopted. Hart (2010) found that the EPs surveyed viewed behavioural approaches, such as contingency management, as being most prevalent in effective classroom behaviour
management practice, although they also highlighted a range of other psychological paradigms as relevant to behaviour management work, including attachment, eco-systemic and humanistic or child-centred strategies. This therefore indicates a potential range of paradigms underpinning EP behaviour management practice, as well as a need to integrate different approaches to reach an holistic understanding of behaviours and appropriate interventions.

This was also evident across the evaluations included in this review. Whilst many contained aspects of behaviourist psychology such as social learning (Hayes et al., 2011; Regan & Howe, 2017) and reinforcement principles (Hayes et al., 2007; Smith & Cooke, 2000), the importance of environmental factors and processes such as teacher attributions regarding the causes of behaviour (Hayes et al., 2007; Jones et al., 2013), the quality of interactions between staff and pupils (Hayes et al., 2007; Hayes et al., 2011) and positive peer relationships (Brown et al., 2012; Smith & Cooke, 2000) was also clear, alongside intrapersonal narratives and views of behaviour (Hannen & Woods, 2012; Smith & Cooke, 2000). This integration of psychological perspectives was also evident in the connection between cognitive, affective and behavioural factors inherent within CBT approaches (Burton, 2006; O’Callaghan & Cunningham, 2015; Squires, 2001).

A social constructionist approach to understanding and managing behaviour was also represented through the use of collaborative and relational approaches to conceptualising and managing behaviour in staff support and problem-solving models (Hayes et al., 2007; Hayes & Stringer, 2016; Jones et al., 2013), and through the application of solution-focussed principles to changing behaviours (Brown et al., 2012; Hayes & Stringer, 2016).

The overall view of the application of psychology within behaviour management practice represented across these studies may therefore be configured as multi-paradigmatic and interactionist, as well as social constructionist and relational.
Discussion

Summary of findings

The present study aimed to explore the representation of the management of behavioural difficulties in EP practice. This was achieved through systematically reviewing and synthesising the existing literature outlining EP practice in this field, to provide an account of the activities undertaken by EPs, and the psychological approaches which underpin their conceptualisations and practices. Although individual examples of EP behavioural management practice are present in research literature, to the researcher’s knowledge, no other systematic literature review in this area has been conducted to date. All of the included studies were rated as being of at least medium quality, with studies deemed to be of low methodological quality excluded despite being of relevance to the current review question.

In the present review, twelve studies were identified as meeting the inclusion criteria. Although this is a small sample and does not include literature from outside the UK and ROI, it represents a range of EP practices at individual, group and organisational levels, exemplifies work relating to the core functions of the EP role (Fallon et al., 2010) and refers to a range of psychological paradigms. Although some studies reported a similarity of research focus, such as the use of VIG (Regan & Howe, 2017; Hayes et al., 2011) or CBT principles (Burton, 2006; O’Callaghan & Cunningham, 2015; Squires, 2001), the overall picture of research foci was disparate, rather than programmatic or developmental. This may be representative of the wider nature of EP practice-based evidence (Fox, 2011) where EP research is dictated by context (Fallon et al., 2010) and utility considerations (Burnham, 2013) rather than by more purely academic aims.

The literature review findings indicate that EP work with behaviour management takes place across all of the core functions of consultation, assessment, intervention, research and training (Fallon et al., 2010; Scottish Executive, 2002) and that these are combined within individual, group or organisational level work. This potentially indicates a departure from traditional models of service delivery, focussing on individual assessment (Rees et al., 2003)
and individual casework (Ashton & Roberts, 2007; Boyle & Lauchlan, 2009; DfES, 2006), with emphasis on developing behavioural management capacity within organisations. Although EPs have previously contributed to this through training delivery (Eccles & Pitchford, 1997; Williams, 2012), a potential need for EPs to increasingly support the embedding of practice through joint working and in vivo supervision in future practice is indicated, as part of a broader emphasis on whole-school approaches to managing behaviour (DfE, 2016; House of Commons Education and Health Committees, 2017).

The reviewed studies presented a range of behavioural concerns, including low-level disruption (OfSTED, 2014; Wheldall & Merrett, 1988), and externalising and internalising behaviours (DfE, 2014), indicating a potential integration of ‘behaviour’ and ‘mental health’ in EP practice. This potentially conflicts with the present UK government’s approach, in which EPs are not signposted as a source of mental health support alongside agencies such as Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) (Public Health England, 2016). Although EPs may perceive that mental health needs may contribute to concerning behaviours and identify their potential contribution towards managing these difficulties, this may conflict with the views of policy makers at national and local levels and subsequently impact the types of behaviour work for which EPs are commissioned within the context of service trading (Lee & Woods, 2017).

The psychological paradigms supporting EP management of behavioural difficulties were wide-ranging across the group of studies. Although previous research and policy has highlighted the importance of behaviourist approaches including rewards, sanctions and contingency management (DfES, 2006; Hart, 2010; Merrett & Jones, 1994) the holistic view taken by EPs of behaviours also involved the application of relational (Nash et al., 2015; Visser, 2005) and eco-systemic approaches (Cooper & Upton, 1991; Sutoris, 2000; Watkins & Wagner, 2000). Therefore, whilst multiple paradigms were apparent, there was an underlying appreciation of the interactionist nature of the intrapersonal, interpersonal and environmental factors contributing to the manifestation, maintenance and management of behaviours, through a social-constructionist and relational lens.
This view of behaviour may conflict with potentially more within-child perceptions of behaviour held by policy-makers and educators, to be managed through ‘discipline’ (DfE, 2016), rather than regarded as a form of additional or special educational need.

**Links to professional practice**

The conclusions drawn above, regarding the ways in which EPs represent, construct and approach the management of behavioural difficulties, can be set within commonly used models of professional practice. These include the Division of Educational and Child Psychology (DECP) model posited by the British Psychological Society (BPS, 2002), and the Problem Analysis Framework (Annan et al., 2013; Monsen, Graham, Frederickson & Cameron, 1998; Monsen & Frederickson, 2008) utilised in the work of practitioner EPs (e.g. Ingram, 2013; Rait, Monsen & Squires, 2010). EPs’ “creative investigation of a broad range of hypotheses that builds on research from all areas of psychology” (BPS, 2002; p.24) and “critically exploring hypotheses at the levels of Biology, Cognition, Behaviour and Environment” (Monsen & Frederickson, 2008; p.83) represent both the multi-paradigmatic and interactionist approaches taken by EPs to understanding complex situations in order to bring about change.

Similarly, the application of social constructionist and relational approaches are clear through EPs’ consideration of the views of parents, carers, children and young people and other professionals when clarifying problems and generating hypotheses (BPS, 2002), and facilitating joint understandings of problem situations, leading to identification of problem dimensions and integrated conceptualisations of these (Monsen & Frederickson, 2008).

Therefore, the findings of the current research contribute to understanding of how EPs may approach their practice, through the provision of empirical validation of professional practice models that are frequently theoretically represented.
**Limitations**

Although the review initially aimed to explore the representation of the management of behaviour difficulties in EP practice internationally, the only studies found which met the inclusion criteria originated from the UK and ROI. This limited geographical spread therefore creates a more contextualised and restricted overview of practice in this context. Similarly, the localised nature of the research, conducted by or within local authority EP teams, may further restrict the statistical generalisability of the findings regarding EP behavioural management practice, particularly considering that most of the research utilised small-scale case study designs.

Furthermore, the present review was limited to research published by practitioner EPs in peer reviewed journals. Therefore, potentially relevant research relating to EP behaviour practice presented in other formats such as book chapters, or grey literature such as unpublished theses or EP practice accounts, was not considered, and this omission of unpublished doctoral theses from the present configurative SLR is acknowledged as a significant limitation.

**Link to future research**

Future similar research, incorporating EP doctoral theses relating to practice and views regarding behaviour may provide a valuable extension to the findings of the current study. With the exception of Hart (2010), the identified research in this review focussed on reports of behaviour management work carried out by EPs. Future empirical investigation, utilising action research models, could potentially allow the direct exploration of behaviour management practice with EPs, alongside opportunities to link such perceptions and explanations to the local contexts which shape their work, and ideas for future development.

This project was funded through England’s Department for Education (DfE) National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL) ITEP award 2012-2015.
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Prepared for in accordance with the author guidelines for submission to the journal Educational Psychology in Practice (Appendix 1)
Reviewing and developing a psychological service’s response to managing behavioural difficulties

Educational or school psychologists (EPs/SPs) can offer support with behaviour concerns at the levels of individual, group or organisation. Their practices, whilst being psychologically-based, must be responsive to local contexts and needs. To explore behaviour practice in a real-world context, and to consider how development in this domain might occur during the adoption of a ‘part-traded’ service delivery model, an empirical investigation was conducted within one English local authority (LA) educational psychology service (EPS). Using the Research and Development in Organisations (RADIO) framework, data were gathered through a focus group with 6 EPs (including the Principal EP (PEP)) and an interview with the PEP. Current behaviour practices, psychological approaches and future development priorities were identified, as well as perceived facilitators and barriers to change and the EPs’ reflections on professional development through research participation. Implications for EP practice and future research are considered.

Keywords: behaviour difficulties; social, emotional and mental health; educational psychologist; school psychologist

Introduction

The management of behavioural difficulties

The management of behavioural difficulties in schools has been highlighted as an area of concern within educational policy, research and practice. Behavioural difficulties in schools are wide-ranging, including externalising or ‘acting out’ behaviours (e.g. aggression, anti-social behaviour and defiance), internalising behaviours (e.g. anxiety, depression, deliberate self-harm) (DfE, 2014) and low-level disruption (e.g. talking out of turn, calling out and disobeying teacher instructions) (OfSTED, 2014). 4-14% of children are reported to exhibit some form of school-based behavioural difficulties (DfE, 2014), whilst Public Health England reports that 10% of 5-16 year olds experience clinically significant mental health needs, such as anxiety, depression, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) or conduct
disorder (Public Health England, 2016). These diverse behaviours are also concerning in terms of their impact upon pupils, parents and families. The equivalent of up to 38 days of teaching time are lost to disruptive behaviour annually (OfSTED, 2014), indicating a potentially negative effect on learning and attainment. Furthermore, behavioural difficulties can also be detrimental to teacher and pupil emotional wellbeing (Axup & Gersch, 2008) and are a source of conflict between schools and families (Romi & Freund, 1999).

Whilst it is clear that behavioural difficulties are a source of concern, legislation, guidance and psychological approaches to managing these have been subject to change over time. The Elton Report (DoES, 1989) presented a view of behaviour as being ‘within-pupil’, to be externally ‘disciplined’ (Rogers, 1990) by teachers through behavioural approaches such as rewards and sanctions. However, Miller (2003) observes that this gave way under the 1997 Labour government to an increased focus on relational factors and the facilitation of positive behaviour through staff roles and whole-school systemic approaches. There is evidence that the present UK Government has returned to advocating ‘discipline’, with behavioural approaches used to respond to concerning behaviours and promote positive ones, alongside emphasis on consistent behaviour policies and school culture (DfE, 2011;2015;2016; 2017a, 2017b). Currently, the mental health of children and young people is also implicated within advice and policy surrounding behaviour (DfE, 2014), suggesting that mental health and behaviour are related needs grouped under the category of Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) in the Special Educational Needs (SEN) and Disabilities Code of Practice (DfE & DoH, 2014).

**The role of educational psychologists**

Educational psychologists (EPs) are a professional group that can support children, schools and families with SEN, including difficult behaviours, working at the level of the individual young person, group, or system, utilising consultation, assessment, intervention, research and training (Fallon, Woods & Rooney, 2010). The researcher and research supervisor’s (*In press*) systematic literature review identified examples of EP practices at each of these levels within the context of behaviour management.
work, with emphasis on developing behavioural management capacity within organisations such as through training, co-delivering and supervising interventions and action research. Furthermore, whilst multiple psychological paradigms were applied across the studies reviewed, EPs were found to adopt an holistic overview of behaviours, considering relational and systemic factors as well as ‘within-child’ aspects. EPs were regarded as responding to context, considering the behaviours presented by young people and the development needs of organisations, suggesting that the nature of referrals and the levels of concern about behavioural issues may vary according to time and place. Therefore, service responses to behaviour must be adaptable and responsive to context.

**The present context for EP work**

Increased service trading has required educational psychology services (EPSs) to be responsive to context in order to generate income from commissioners such as schools or other children’s services e.g. virtual schools (NCTL, 2014). Lee and Woods (2017) found that service trading increased the range of work that might be requested of EPs and the types of skills utilised within their practice. Different service commissioners may value different contributions from EPs, potentially departing from a predominance assessing individual children (Ashton & Roberts, 2006). Furthermore, the unique needs of different contexts mean that work can be individually contracted and negotiated, broadening the range of skills and practices EPs may utilise. Therefore, whilst EP practice is partly determined according to national agendas and legislation, EPs’ responsiveness to local context and individual service commissioner needs is also apparent.

**Aims of the present study**

Although previous research has explored the role of EPs in working with behaviour management concerns (e.g. Brown, Powell & Clark, 2012; Burton, 2006; Hannen & Woods, 2012; Hart, 2010; Hayes, Hindle & Withington, 2007; Hayes, Richardson, Hindle & Grayson, 2011; Hayes & Stringer, 2016; Jones, Monsen & Franey, 2013; O’Callaghan & Cunningham, 2015; Regan & Howe, 2017; Smith & Cooke, 2000; Squires, 2001; Swinson, 2010; Williams, 2012), this exemplifies individual pieces of
work carried out by practitioners rather than exploring broader service responses to context. The present study therefore aimed to explore how a Local Authority (LA) EPS responded to the needs of its contemporary local context in relation to behaviour management work.

Current EP conceptualisations of behavioural needs include a broad range of presentations and related or underlying needs, such as externalising behaviours, low-level disruption, internalising behaviours and social, emotional and mental health needs. Furthermore, EP practices within this domain can be wide-ranging across and within services. The developmental needs and commission of the research site provided a theoretically and practically useful focus on behaviour within this wide domain. Therefore, practice relating to behaviour was selected as the focus of the research, which reflected the commission and invitation to act that had been presented by the service concerned.

An exploratory case study approach was adopted, structured using the Research and Development in Organisations (RADIO) model, to explore behaviour management ideas and practices, contextual factors that shaped service development, and to provide a basis for future service development. The following research questions were considered:

(1) How do EPs presently respond to student behaviour management concerns? 
(2) What psychological theory and approaches inform these responses? 
(3) How do EPs envisage the development of their practice and the responses of the service to these concerns? 
(4) What are the facilitators and barriers to service development within this context?

**Method**

*Epistemological position*

The research was underpinned by a critical realism stance (Maxwell, 2012), which posits that external reality is only imperfectly known and mediated by human
perception. Situated between realist and constructionist paradigms, this position incorporates features of emancipatory approaches, particularly the importance of participant perspectives (Robson, 2011), which were integral to the research undertaken.

**Design**

A case study design, utilising the RADIO model, was adopted to answer the research questions. This model was selected owing to its structural incorporation of investigation and development (Ashton, 2009) and its documented use in organisational research (Douglas-Osborn, 2017; Timmins, Bham, McFayden & Ward, 2006; Timmins, Shepherd & Kelly, 2003). This model therefore provided the means of exploring and synthesising current behaviour management practice within the EPS and identifying, and potentially implementing, ideas for future development. Although RADIO can be used as an action research model, in this study it was used as an adapted process framework to support organisational change. An overview of the RADIO structure can be found below.

**Table 2. RADIO model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Awareness of a need</th>
<th>A local EPS presented to the university a perceived need for exploration of how their service responded to behaviour management concerns and how their offer to schools could be developed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) Invitation to act</td>
<td>Research commissioning process within university and further discussions with link EP from the service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Clarifying organisational and cultural issues</td>
<td>Discussions between link EP, researcher and research supervisor e.g. change of Principal Educational Psychologist (PEP), adoption of a part-traded model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Identifying stakeholders in area of need</td>
<td>Identified major stakeholders i.e. PEP, EPs in the EPS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants

An invitation to act was given by an EPS in the north of England, due to an identified need in exploring current behaviour management practice and developing service responses to behaviour concerns referred by schools within the LA context (Phases 1 and 2). Following discussions between the researcher, research supervisor and a link EP from the service (Phases 3 and 4), all qualified EPs working within the EPS were invited to participate, and to contribute to agreement of the research aims and data gathering methods (Phases 5 and 6). Participants were therefore recruited through self-selecting purposive sampling (Robson, 2011), and included one Principal Educational Psychologist (PEP), three maingrade EPs and two associate EPs.
Data gathering

A pilot study with EPs in a different LA utilised a focus group method (Barbour, 2007) for exploring current and previous practice in relation to externalising behaviour management, aspirational future directions and possible facilitators and barriers to service development. This method was therefore felt to be appropriate for gathering similar information from the EP team during Phase 7 of the RADIO model (Appendices 8 & 9). In order to explore contextual issues around service development from a managerial perspective, a semi-structured interview was also carried out with the service’s PEP (Appendix 10).

The service’s PEP therefore participated in two data gathering activities within the study. During the EP focus group, she contributed to discussions around EP practice with, and conceptualisations of, behaviour (e.g. perceived value of therapeutic group work, theoretical alignment with Human Givens frameworks) as well as how she envisaged her future practice as an EP within an overall service development agenda (e.g. increasing use of consultation). During the semi-structured interview, an alternative focus was taken to explore managerial aspects of change, such as facilitators and barriers to change at an organisational, rather than practitioner, level (e.g. meeting team’s developmental needs, expanding the range of roles within the team and recruiting staff to fulfil these). The PEP’s dual participation role thus provided a wider and more representative view of team practices and perspectives than if she had not participated in the focus group with the rest of the EP team, in addition to offering a managerial perspective on what service development might look like and how this might be achieved.

However, there were potential ethical considerations of the PEP participating within the focus group. For example, it is arguable that the PEP’s involvement in both aspects of the research allowed more opportunities for her to express her views than were available to the rest of the team, which may suggest possible inequality of opportunity between participants. This was addressed through contracting the parameters of each discussion with the PEP during Phases 5 and 6 of the RADIO model and prior to each data gathering activity, to avoid
replication of views within the two activities. This meant that undue emphasis was not placed upon the PEP’s views compared to those of other EPs. A second potential ethical issue arose from the PEP’s inclusion within the focus group, in that it is possible that other participants may have experienced feelings of discomfort or pressure regarding sharing their practices and views owing to reputational concerns from discussing these in a group context with their manager present. Participants may therefore also have exercised greater selectiveness or self-censoring of their views and practices within the focus group, meaning that the perspectives offered may be less representative of the real views held by the EP team. However, attempts were made to protect participants through collaboratively contracting the focus and scope of each research activity with them during Phases 5 and 6, along with parameters around participation such as confidentiality regarding the views shared and that the research focus was on service, rather than individual, development. Therefore, due consideration was given to contracting informed consent and protecting participant wellbeing throughout the research.

Both the focus group and interview were audio-recorded and fully transcribed (Appendix 11). Notes were also made by the researcher during data gathering, to supplement the recording and as a contingency for recording being inaudible or unsuccessful (Appendix 12).

Although Phases 10-12 were not fully realised within the timeframe of the research, key findings regarding current practice, future directions and salient facilitators and barriers were analysed from the focus group and interview data and fed back to participants (Appendix 13). Participants were then asked to reflect on the process of engagement in the research, and what outcomes and next steps they felt would be appropriate and feasible (Phases 8 and 9). A partial transcription of the recorded reflection section of the feedback meeting was produced, in order to capture participant responses (Appendix 14), supplemented by written reflections provided by participants (Appendix 15).
Data analysis

Data from the focus group and interview were thematically analysed using Braun and Clarke’s (2006) six-stage model (Appendix 16). An inductive approach, rather than a pre-existing framework, was used to code the data and produce basic, organising and global themes (Attride-Stirling, 2001). Initial coding was carried out manually, to gain familiarity with the data (Appendix 17), and then using NVIVO software to identify themes across the two data sets (Appendix 18). Inter-rater coding was also carried out with a suitably experienced independent researcher, showing inter-coder agreement of 77% (Appendix 19). Emergent themes were then reviewed with the research supervisor (Appendix 20) and re-named and restructured as necessary following discussion of how best to represent the data and structure feedback to participants.

A content analysis (Cohen, Mannion & Morrison, 2011) of the reflective responses was carried out, using the categories of ‘process reflection’ and ‘future directions’.

Ethical considerations

The research was granted University ethical approval (Appendices 21 & 22). The ethical guidelines outlined in the British Psychological Society Code of Ethics and Conduct (2009) and the Health and Care Professions Council’s Standards of Conduct Performance and Ethics (2016) were adhered to throughout the research.

Potential participants were presented with provisional research aims and processes at an information meeting prior to the start of the research (Phases 5 and 6; Appendix 23), along with a participant information sheet (Appendix 24) and given opportunities to ask questions before deciding on participation. Written opt-in consent was obtained from all participants (Appendix 25) who were reminded that they could withdraw at any time.

As the researcher was aware of potential reputational concerns stemming from group discussion of EP practice, boundaries around confidentiality and anonymity were constructed with participants. The researcher’s facilitative role
maintained focus on service development rather than that of individual practitioners. Benefits of participation, such as group reflection and practice-sharing opportunities, as well as service development and continued professional development (CPD), were also identified.

Results

Four global themes, with associated organisational and basic themes (Attride-Stirling, 2001) were derived from thematic analysis of focus group and PEP interview data (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Appendix 26). Data analysis is presented by global theme, with representations of relevant organising themes.

**EP views of behaviour**

![Figure 1. EP views of behaviour](image)

EPs reported applying a wide range of psychological perspectives to support their understanding of presenting behavioural needs. These included cognitive and neurobiological factors e.g. “executive functioning”, attachment and relational psychodynamic psychology, humanist approaches e.g. Human Givens, behaviourist approaches, and eco-systemic considerations of contexts and interacting factors. A range of psychological paradigms, therefore, may be relevant to understanding and intervening with behavioural difficulties, and EPs may situationally apply different paradigms or integrate multiple perspectives, whilst avoiding the “temptation” to rely on favoured or better-known approaches. This paradigmatic flexibility was regarded as “distinctive” to the EP role compared to other behaviour support
agencies. EPs also referred to adopting positive psychology, in exploring strengths and preferred futures (“what do we want to see”), rather than focussing on deficits.

When considering the types of behavioural needs encountered in practice, EPs identified both externalising and internalising behaviours. These include concerning sexualised behaviours, persistent lying, school refusal and non-attendance, behaviours associated with autism spectrum conditions (ASC), quiet and withdrawn behaviour and mental health needs. Despite identifying distinct types of behaviours, EPs commented that “behaviour” (i.e. externalising behaviours) and “SEMH needs” (i.e. behaviours associated with internalising conditions or needs) are connected:

we had a big discussion on where does behaviour end and social emotional mental health start? And actually we’re saying it’s a continuous cycle

Therefore, behaviour may be regarded as wide-ranging and not limited to externalising behaviours such as persistent disruption or anti-social behaviour.

Although EPs referred to diagnosable conditions with behavioural implications, such as ADHD, differing views on the appropriateness and utility of behavioural ‘labelling’ were reported. Diagnosis and labelling could potentially facilitate early intervention and access to appropriate support; furthermore, it was suggested that labelling “helps the person externalise the behaviour from themselves” and may therefore avoid apportioning blame to parents, carers, teachers or children. However, behavioural labels were also regarded as potentially “static” and “within-child”, with concerns that they “then become [the child’s] definition of themselves”. Therefore, although EPs were aware of behavioural labels, these may not, to them, represent a completely useful or sufficient approach to understanding and intervening with behavioural concerns. Instead, the importance of “unpicking” behaviours to explore underlying causes (“what’s driving it, what’s unmet, what’s happening here”), contextual influences (“we know that behaviour’s in context”) and what the behaviour communicated (“I would see behaviour as a communication, as an expression of something that’s going on”) was emphasised. This contextualisation and exploration of behaviour may contribute to
creating “an empathy for the child” and implementing appropriate interventions that address potential underlying causes of behaviours:

unless we...look at what’s causing the behaviour...whether it’s language...inappropriate support at home, or something’s gone on at home maybe, or a learning need...without understanding that, I don’t think you can just...put the support in at the end of it.

Contextualising behaviour in order to understand and intervene appropriately was also considered important due to contextual changes that occur between primary and secondary schools, such as reduced information sharing, pupils being taught by multiple staff and increased exam pressure. These contextual changes may correspond with differences in the type and frequency of behavioural difficulties observed by EPs in secondary settings:

...in high school, I see more mental health needs...sort of further up the year groups in high school. More self-harming, higher levels of anxiety...

**EP views of behaviour practice**

EPs also discussed their behaviour practice in terms of how their role is distinctive from that of other behaviour support agencies and practitioners. Crucially, EPs viewed their distinctiveness as “giving away” psychological knowledge to empower others, rather than framing themselves with an “expert” role in managing behaviour. The processes, as well as the content, of EP behaviour practice were therefore emphasised. This includes adopting holistic overviews of contexts within which problematic behaviours occur, and “unpicking” interacting factors, rather than taking medicalised, within-child perspectives:
...we go more for the context... and clinicals [clinical psychologists] go more for the “those symptoms add up to that checklist there

The distinctiveness of the EP approach was also thought to lie within a solution-focussed emphasis on working towards change. This entails creating empathy for the child, helping schools and families to reframe their ideas on what could cause concerning behaviours and supporting problem-solving processes towards achieving desired outcomes. However, the importance of doing so sensitively and with empathy for adult stakeholders was conveyed:

...we’ve got to understand what they’re facing on a daily basis...if we go straight in and go “What’s underneath the behaviour for that child?”...it’s going to be a you against them sort of thing

These underlying principles and processes for working with behavioural concerns were located within a range of practices. These included carrying out individual casework, one-off assessments and statutory work as “most of what we would do”, and the utility of this work was acknowledged:

I enjoy doing traditional casework...because I do feel that we have that influence there

However, limitations of working with behavioural concerns at the individual level were also identified, such as reports not being read and disseminated amongst those supporting pupils and a sense that such work was frequently only requested at crisis points, when pupils were at risk of exclusion or there was a perceived agenda to remove pupils with challenging behaviours:

it becomes within-child, saying “Look, we need them out because...they keep hitting people and biting

It was also acknowledged that the EP role with behaviour could extend beyond one-off, individual assessment and reactive responses. EPs referred to the importance of consultation with adult stakeholders as a means of sharing expertise, exploring interacting factors and joint problem-solving around challenging behaviours, thus enabling more solution-focussed and holistic practice. Other behaviour work included intervention with individuals and groups (e.g. resilience building, narrative therapy, developing classroom behaviour management practices) and practice at systemic levels, such as contributing to multi-agency
processes within the LA. Furthermore, instances of working preventatively, such as transition planning and developing support systems within schools, were identified as essential for capacity building within organisations as well as meeting individual needs:

you can’t be there all the time and giving them snapshots. Because that’s what they need, it’s a system themselves, to support themselves

The EP role with behaviour was therefore regarded as fulfilling different functions, and occurring at multiple eco-systemic levels, despite a current prevalence of individually-focussed practice.

It was apparent that changes in the EP role with behaviour occur over time, indicating the importance of current context in shaping practice. EPs reported less involvement in individual and group therapeutic work, and systemic work such as training and multi-agency conferences on behavioural topics. Furthermore, EPs identified ways in which behavioural practice could develop in the future. This included a broader general focus upon behaviour alongside other areas of need:

this is what most of us are feeling now...we need to get into behaviour with specific attention to challenging behaviours linked to prevalent needs within the LA, such as those associated with ASC, child sexual exploitation (CSE) and concerning sexualised behaviours. At individual and group levels, EPs expressed a wish of increasing their use of consultation and therapeutic work. Increased systemic working within schools and the LA was also identified as a preferred future direction for the service, such as expanding the strategic role of the EPS including participation in multi-agency early intervention and support systems for young people with challenging behaviours and contributing to decisions regarding future provision. Working more preventatively, and with greater multi-agency liaison and co-operation, were therefore regarded as being key areas of EP practice to develop in the future.

Overall, the following key areas for service development were highlighted by the PEP, which could form the basis of service action plans to be implemented and evaluated:
• Increased input with behaviours associated with ASC and sexualised behaviours
• Increased consultation and intervention within schools, as opposed to a model of one-off assessment
• Advocacy for children and young people, with assessment including consideration of gaining their voices, views and feelings to “get a handle on their behaviour”
• Earlier intervention and more multi-agency working to ensure holistic understandings of young people’s needs and the involvement of different services

Facilitators of behaviour practice and service development

- Changing perceptions of the EP role with behaviour
- Good relationships with schools
- Positive perceptions of the EPS
- Utilising opportunities and challenges
- Developing the EP team
- Multi-agency work

Figure 3. Facilitators of behaviour practice and service development

Numerous factors were identified which EPs felt facilitated their current behaviour practice and would support future development. Although the EP role had historically been understood by schools, families and other agencies as primarily carrying out learning assessments, it was felt that a broader understanding of the EP role, including with behaviour, was being constructed and more widely recognised.

[we are] getting away from just having WISCs and WIATs [psychometric assessments] really, forging ahead. On the whole, so far, the feedback has been from schools that they’re quite pleased with this idea
In turn, this leads to schools commissioning further behaviour work from EPs, and creates opportunities to practise in preferred ways:

we’ve got schools to buy us in for transition work and ...for risk assessments, and for critical incidents as well. So it is swinging slightly more towards behaviour

It was also identified that EPs could demonstrate their range of work through “making the most of opportunities” and challenges that arise circumstantially within the LA and schools, such as responding to critical incidents. Successes with such work not only showcase EP skills and practices beyond carrying out individual learning assessments, and therefore promote positive perceptions of the EPS, but also increase the likelihood of similar future work being commissioned, as understanding of the scope of the EP role expands:

once you’ve had something go well, people want more of it

This shared understanding was felt to be supported through the development of good relationships with schools, where EPs were trusted to practise in broader ways, and had greater influence within schools to ensure that practice was implemented:

it might just be about relationships with people and schools, so that we can do systemic work in schools around behaviour, or that we can write a report and feel that we know that the SENCO’s really going to pass this on to the right people

Contextual factors relating to the development of the EPS were also identified as supporting a wider range of behaviour work. Increasing the size of the team, and introducing positions for associate, assistant and trainee EPs enables the delivery of “a greater range of things”, including more systemic and group work and evaluating the impact of behavioural and therapeutic interventions. Although demand for individual casework and statutory work is likely to continue, increased team capacity means that EPs have time to work more broadly alongside fulfilling statutory duties and carrying out individual casework. Furthermore, the diversity of roles and experiences created by team expansion supports “bringing new things in to us” which, alongside continued professional development opportunities, develops the range of skills and practices that can be offered.
Opportunities for multi-agency working and support from co-ordinated LA responses to managing behavioural concerns were also thought to facilitate EP practice, through creating “that context of...a local authority that takes it seriously”. This joined-up approach assists in raising the profile of particular needs and types of behaviours, and also highlighting the contribution made by EPs in responding to these. Therefore, facilitating factors occurring at a range of eco-systemic levels were identified.

**Barriers to, and pressures on, behaviour practice and service development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers and pressures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuts to services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges of multi-agency co-operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the EPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different perceptions of the EP role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4. Barriers to, and pressures on, behaviour practice and service development**

Conversely, EPs also identified various barriers to effective and developing behaviour practice within the contexts of the EPS, schools and the LA. Financial constraints were described as prevalent, in terms of the EPS being required to income generate within the adoption of a part-traded model of service delivery. This creates subsequent pressure to provide work that schools perceive as value for money, particularly as schools currently experience funding pressures and therefore prioritise their EP time for high-need individual learning cases:

> if the schools have just, say, one session, and they have one or two pupils either with learning or social, emotional, behavioural needs, and they want to push forward for an EHCP, their hands are tied

Not only does this limit the range of behaviour work for which EPs are commissioned, but the effectiveness of such work may be compromised due to school budget and staffing cuts which subsequently impacts implementation of EP advice:

> they’re going to lose ten members of staff, and then how are they going to say “Yeah, we’ll do that intervention and we’ll do this, that and the other”
This is further compounded by time restraints on both schools and EPs. Large allocations mean that EPs are limited in the amount of time available for individual settings. Not only does this affect the EP-school relationship required to develop trust for contracting broader ranges of work, but also limits the types of work that EPs can deliver in the available time, including therapeutic and systemic work:

If I said to a school now, ‘I’ll come in and shadow a pupil for the day, or for the morning”, that’s all their time gone

Similarly, time constraints upon schools can result in barriers to effective practice, such as unavailability of staff for consultations, and work not being embedded or fully implemented by schools following EP input.

However, as LA services are reduced due to “the wider picture of cuts to services”, the EPS “have more behaviour cases coming our way” due to a lack of alternative support. Therefore, the EPS experiences opposing pressures of increased demand for services but reduced capacity and financial support to meet demand, alongside restrictions on the types of work for which they are commissioned and school capacity to implement measures to promote change.

Although the EPS experiences increased demand for behaviour work, with growing recognition of their contributions in this domain, other agencies’ persistent views of the EP role as restricted to learning support can limit EP opportunities for behaviour work (“The schools might know we do behaviour but maybe just those who make decisions about us don’t”). This can also limit opportunities to collaborate with other agencies, or for involvement with particular types of behavioural needs:

CAMHS are saying that they’ll be driving mental health... the context of “no, it’s for us, it’s for us” is a huge barrier

Furthermore, the context of service cuts is perceived to create a climate of inter-agency competition for work, rather than collaboration to achieve joined-up early intervention:

When... it’s coming down to those two people for one job, which is what’s happening...they don’t work together and they’ll...undermine each other
This competitiveness can, in turn, create an atmosphere of protectiveness surrounding the remit of different agencies, meaning that “the pressures of competition then squeeze the perceptions of what we can do”. Therefore, perceptions of what needs EPs can support with and opportunities to collaborate with other agencies are restricted further, in opposition to the EPS’s desire of broadening their behavioural remit and multi-agency work.

Furthermore, changes within the EPS and the LA can also represent barriers to change and development. Although a consensus was expressed regarding the need for EPs to work with behaviour concerns, individual differences in approaches to practice and preferred ways of working were evident. Therefore, implementing changes to service delivery, such as increasing the use of consultation, can be experienced anxiously by EPs which in turn can contribute to a skill atrophy limiting the range of behavioural practices used:

the longer you don’t do something, the less confident you feel at then restarting doing it

These concerns regarding practice development may be heightened by contextual changes occurring within the EPS and wider LA, such as changes to management personnel and structures, and LA statutory assessment processes. Therefore, a period of creating stability and familiarisation with new processes is essential before implementing desired changes in behaviour practice.

**EP reflections on research participation**

EPs further identified advantages of participation in the research in terms of both its processes and applications to future service development.

**Research processes**

Participation in the focus group and interview was thought to create protected time and a reflective space for considering individual and service approaches to behaviour practice in detail. Time pressures experienced by EPs frequently prevent this, and so the EPs appreciated the opportunity to share experiences, to identify
commonalities and differences in practice. and to consider their application of psychology within behaviour work. Furthermore, participants also commented that participation in the research had generated interest in both the processes of carrying out research, and in wider EP behaviour practice as documented in the literature.

**Research contributions to service delivery and development**

As well as synthesising current practice and service development, and identifying individual CPD needs, the research will also support the EPS annual plan. This will include identifying priority development areas, evidencing the need for behaviour to be a service delivery focus and for multi-agency work, and identifying what skills and practices are, or could be, offered by the team. Consideration of facilitators and barriers may also support service development. Finally, the synthesis of findings relating to behaviour practice and relevant psychological paradigms may form the basis of designing and delivering promotional events to schools to support their understanding of behaviour and the potential contribution of EPs.

**Discussion**

**Summary of findings**

This research explored the views of EPs in one LA regarding the types of behaviour difficulties encountered, the practices utilised to support and manage these, and the psychological paradigms which EPs apply to aid their understanding of behavioural concerns and inform intervention. As a piece of action research, ideas for future service development in this domain, and the potential facilitators and barriers to change, were also considered.

**Research question 1: How do EPs presently respond to student behaviour management concerns?**

The EPs reported working with both internalising and externalising behavioural concerns (DfE, 2014) at multiple eco-systemic levels of individual, group and organisation (Fallon et al., 2010), and exemplified the core functions of...
consultation, assessment, intervention and training within their practice (Scottish Executive, 2002). However, much of their current practice involves responding reactively to concerns regarding individual pupils, typically at times of crisis such as school exclusion risk. Whilst the EPs identified the benefits of individual casework (Boyle & Lauchlan, 2009), other useful processes and activities were identified including consultation to identify interacting factors underlying concerning behaviours and to promote solution-focussed working towards change (Hayes & Stringer, 2016). Significantly, EPs identified ways in which their responses and approaches to behaviour concerns could be regarded as distinctive from that of other agencies, indicating a concern to define a unique role for EPs (Ashton & Roberts, 2006). However, this was situated within value for multi-agency collaboration (Gaskell & Leadbetter, 2009) and empowering others by donating and applying psychological knowledge to support understanding and effect change.

*Research question 2: What psychological theory and approaches inform these responses?*

The EPs identified a range of psychological paradigms which may be applied to their conceptualisations of behavioural needs and which inform the responses made to these. Although some EPs reported preferences for particular approaches, such as executive skills or the Human Givens frameworks, the need to apply psychology within context was strongly emphasised. Therefore, different approaches may be integrated, combined or prioritised depending upon the specific context and presenting needs of those within it (The researcher and research supervisor, in press). This view may contrast with previous findings that EPs tend to associate behaviourist psychology most frequently with effective behaviour management (Hart, 2010).

*Research question 3: How do EPs envisage the development of their practice and the responses of the service to these concerns?*

EPs regarded behaviour work as a crucial, and increasing, aspect of their role. EP involvement with particular behaviour concerns was identified as necessary on account of prevalent issues within the LA e.g. challenging behaviours associated
with ASC, sexualised behaviour and internalising behaviours associated with SEMH needs. The latter may also reflect an increasing national trend for EP support with internalising and mental health needs (DoHSC & DfE 2017). Furthermore, EPs identified opportunities to develop and expand the types of activities undertaken when supporting with behavioural concerns, such as consultation (Hayes & Stringer, 2016), therapeutic work (Atkinson, Squires, Bragg, Wasilewski & Muscutt, 2013; O’Callaghan & Cunningham, 2015) and systemic work within schools (Hayes, Hindle & Withington, 2007) and the wider LA to promote joined-up working and early intervention to meet needs (DfE & DoH, 2014). Equally, the importance of advocating for children and young people, and incorporating their views into decision-making processes (Harding & Atkinson, 2009; UNCRC, 1989), was identified as an important future direction for development.

*Research question 4: What are the facilitators and barriers to service development within this context?*

Increasing recognition of the scope of the EP role, to incorporate behaviour work, was identified as a key facilitator to service development. This reflects a broader remit for EPs beyond learning and may increase the opportunities available to them to engage in work such as critical incident support (Lockhart & Woods, 2017; Posada, 2006) and participation in multi-agency processes. However, barriers to service development within the EPS, schools and the LA were also identified, such as threats to professional identity creating an ethos of protectiveness rather than inter-agency collaboration (Hymans, 2008). Crucially, the implications of cuts to services and the necessity of adopting a part-traded service delivery model (Lee & Woods, 2017) may limit capacity for the broader range of behaviour practices desired by EPs, indicating the relevance of time and financial constraints on practice within local contexts.

*Implications of the current research*

A key consideration of the present research was how EPs apply psychology within their own service and local contexts (Frederickson & Miller, 2008). Participants within the study identified a benefit of research participation as having the
opportunity and reflective space to consider their application of psychological
theory to behaviour practice, suggesting that conscious consideration may not be
routinely given to how, and what, psychological theory is applied within daily
practice. Haring, Lovitt, Eaton & Hansen’s (1978) learning hierarchy model posits
movement through accuracy, fluency, generalization and adaptation within
competent skill acquisition and the application of psychology within EP practice
may conform to this model, with practice becoming more automatic over time.
However, EPs may have cause to explicitly consider the application of psychology
within practice (Lunt & Majors, 2000; Norwich, 2000) with professional practice
frameworks providing models for integrating theory and practice (Annan et al.,
2013; BPS, 2002; Monsen & Frederickson, 2008; Gameson, Rhydderch & Carroll,
2003; 2005; Rhydderch & Gameson, 2010). The current research findings, whilst
primarily considering EP practice relating to behaviour in one local context, may
therefore illustrate a broader question of how EPs apply their psychological
knowledge to practice, and exemplify their potential to reflect more explicitly upon
this through CPD opportunities.

The present research may also have implications for service development.
As more services adopt traded models of delivery in response to national and local
changes (Lee & Woods, 2017), EPs may seek to meet the needs of their
commissioners by adopting practices informed by research and knowledge of the
practices undertaken by EP colleagues within other services. The current research
was undertaken by an outsider researcher working in a LA with a different ‘local
offer’ in relation to behaviour management, which created opportunities for cross-
service development through sharing practice and research findings.
Developmental cross-service collaboration has recently been observed more
broadly, for example in joint psychological service responses to critical incidents
such as the Manchester Arena bombing and the Grenfell Tower fire. Therefore, the
effectiveness of service responses to need may be enhanced through inter-service
collaboration, in addition to exploration and reflection within EP teams.
Limitations of the research and future research directions

The current findings from within one service may be limited in their generalisability to the behaviour practice of EPs more widely. Different views of behaviour practice, and development ideas, may be offered by EPs working within other geographical areas, with different local pressures and needs. Furthermore, although the participants varied in the length of their experience as EPs and included both male and female EPs, the representativeness of the participant group is not established precisely.

Although the research followed an action research model, its scope was limited by researcher and participants’ time constraints to identification of initial development possibilities. Therefore, the action planning, implementation and evaluation phases of the research were not tracked through on this occasion, meaning that a more nuanced and complete case example of service development relating to behaviour management practices was not realised.

EPs within the current research identified the benefits of action research participation, as individual reflective practitioners and for the identification of future service development needs. It may be useful for similar research to be conducted in other EP services, in order to identify a potentially broader range of EP practices in relation to behaviour, the psychological approaches applied to behaviour work and the directions, facilitators and barriers for service development in this domain. Additionally, the findings of the current research in relation to EPs’ behaviour management practices could form the basis of a survey instrument to gather more extensive information from across a broad range of psychological services, to illustrate the full breadth of practice development possibilities for services and practitioners.

This project was funded through England’s Department for Education (DfE) National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL) ITEP award 2012-2015.
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Paper 3: The dissemination of evidence to professional practice
The dissemination of evidence to professional practice

Introduction

The following paper will consider the significance of Papers 1 and 2’s findings for professional educational psychologist (EP) practice and reflect upon possible approaches for disseminating these. Initially, the concepts of evidence-based practice and practice-based evidence will be considered, particularly within the context of EP practice, followed by exploration of the evidence for, and models of, research dissemination and impact. The significance of the findings from Papers 1 and 2 for the research sites and their implications at organisational and professional levels will then be discussed. Finally, strategies for disseminating and evaluating the impact of the research described in Papers 1 and 2 will be presented.

Evidence-based practice (EBP) and practice-based evidence (PBE) in the field of educational psychology

EBP can be defined as “the integration of the best available research with clinical expertise in the context of patient culture, characteristics and preference” (American Psychological Association (APA), 2006, p.273). Initially developed within health and medical sectors, EBP aims to provide consistent standards of care (Fox, 2003), avoid variations in treatment availability and ensure cost-effectiveness of treatments (APA, 2006). It aspires to improve outcomes for clients through using and applying systematically researched methods, approaches and interventions rather than simply basing practice on unsubstantiated judgements or opinion.

The question of what constitutes ‘best available research’ has been conceptualised as an evidence hierarchy (Scott, Shaw & Joughin, 2001), with the strongest forms of evidence situated at the top (Table 3).
Randomised controlled trials (RCTs), wherein large numbers of participants are randomly allocated to experimental or control groups to explore the efficacy of an intervention or treatment, have frequently been regarded as the ‘gold standard’ of research evidence. However, this view is not consistently shared; Robson (2011) argues that “Privileging RCTs...is a serious distortion of the nature of scientific activity...and carries with it an inappropriately narrow view of what constitutes evidence” (p.99). What is regarded as appropriate evidence may be dependent upon context and the proposed purposes of research (Frederickson, 2002), meaning that large-scale RCTS which provide general efficacy trends may not be appropriate for exploring individual differences or applying to specific idiographic contexts. There may, therefore, be cause to consider other forms of evidence from further down the evidence hierarchy when applying research within practice.

The concept of EBP has become increasingly prevalent within EP practice. In a UK context, the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) stipulates that practitioner psychologists must “be able to assure the quality of their practice” by “[engaging] in evidence-based and evidence-informed practice, evaluate practice systematically and participate in audit procedures” (HCPC, 2015, p.12). Similarly, a “growing emphasis on accountability” (Dunsmuir, Brown, Iyaduri & Monsen, 2009, p.53) means that EPs must consider the basis of their practice and systematically evaluate outcomes for service-users. Utilising EBP may also assist in preventing potentially unequal outcomes owing to local variations in EP service delivery (Gulliford, 2015).
However, questions regarding the nature and use of EBP within EP work have been raised. Fox (2003) identifies several potential objections which EPs may have towards EBP, including constructions of professional identity as a practitioner not a researcher, meaning that professional expertise is derived from experience rather than research; services and contexts within which EPs practise advocating professional experience over research when establishing good practice; and that the research hierarchy may not be appropriate for use within EP practice. Difficulties surrounding the use of RCTs within EP practice have also been identified elsewhere; Frederickson (2002) highlights the difficulty of identifying well-defined participant groups within real-world contexts and greater practice variations than are found in the experimental conditions established by efficacy studies. Therefore, quasi-experimental research and case studies, although regarded as lesser forms of evidence within the research hierarchy, may be regarded as appropriate within educational research (van Daal, 2015) and EP practice. This is evident within the research included in the systematic literature review of EPs’ behaviour practices outlined in Paper 1, all 12 of which utilised a case-study design.

Furthermore, whilst RCTs may provide useful starting points regarding general trends and the efficacy of particular approaches, these findings can only provide “likely efficacy, not a prescription” (Birch, Frederickson & Miller, 2015; p.21) within the unique contexts and interacting systems (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) within which EPs practise. This further highlights potential disparities between the social constructionist and pragmatic epistemological positions frequently occupied by EPs (Burnham, 2013) and the positivist epistemology within which RCTs may be regarded as falling.

EP concepts of appropriate EBP may therefore incorporate not only consideration of an external research base but also the contribution of professional experience and the need to adapt practice to meet the needs of individuals within context (APA, 2006; Dunsmuir & Kratochwill, 2013; Miller & Frederickson, 2006). For example, Burnham (2013) found that most of a sample of EPs interviewed were ambivalent about the scientific research basis of their practice and would primarily consider its utility in context. Although the study only included 7 participants, and
its findings may not be generalisable to the broader profession, a study of school psychologists in the US found that 83% of respondents reported reliance on professional experience to inform practice, compared with 47% who reported using journal articles (Bramlett, Murphy, Johnson, Wallingsford & Hall, 2002). EBP in the context of EP work may therefore be regarded as evidence informed (Nevo & Slonim-Naov, 2011) and integrated with professional experience.

EPs may also be regarded, not only as consumers and appliers of research, but as producers of ecologically-valid and contextualised evidence which can, in turn, contribute to a broader evidence base for the field (Fox, 2011). This may involve safely trialling and adapting techniques in practice in order to create “an inclusive, practitioner-led research base” (Woods, McArdle & Tabassum, 2014, p.34), otherwise known as practice-based evidence (PBE). PBE creates provision for EPs to utilise techniques and interventions in practice that may be effective but do not yet have a firm evidence base, as well as identifying emerging areas for further research. EP use, and production, of PBE therefore aligns with the APA definition of EBP, suggesting that the ‘evidence’ considered by EPs is a combination of available research, professional experience and adaptation to meet localised needs.

The empirical study described in Paper 2 appears to be situated within practice-based research. This research explored the behaviour practices of EPs in one local authority (LA) team, their application of psychology within behaviour work and their ideas for service development in this area, including perceived facilitators and barriers to change. The research focus was agreed in response to an identified emergent need within a localised context, leading to exploration of psychological concepts and practices relating to behaviour as documented in existing literature (e.g. practices at individual, group and organisational levels (Fallon, Woods & Rooney, 2010)) and research-evidenced designs and data gathering and analysis methods. The outcomes of this research were then disseminated amongst participants, as a means of supporting service delivery. Although this research was small-scale and inherently context-bound, meaning that its generalisability to the practices and conceptualisations of other EPs may be limited, it provided opportunities for reflection and development within the research context.
Furthermore, as ideas for further research were identified, such as future case studies in other EP services or a large-scale survey of EP practices based on the research findings, the research may arguably contribute to the development of the evidence base relating to EPs and behaviour management.

The effective dissemination of research: outcomes and impact

Recent focus on the use of EBP within the field of educational psychology (e.g. Lilienfield, Ammirati & David, 2012) aims to enhance the profession’s reputation through the application of a rigorous and systematic knowledge base which ultimately bridges the gap between research and practice. Therefore, the processes of sharing research evidence with practitioners, and evaluating the real-world impact of research, are crucial.

The transfer of research and knowledge to practice can be referred to using a range of terms, including diffusion, dissemination, implementation, knowledge transfer, knowledge mobilisation, linkage and exchange and research into practice (Wilson, Petticrew, Calnan & Nazareth, 2010). For the purposes of this paper, the term “dissemination” will be used. Harmsworth and Turpin (2001) define dissemination as “the delivering and receiving of a message, the engagement of an individual in a process and the transfer of a process or product” (p.3). It is not, therefore, a passive transfer of knowledge but also involves active uptake of research by research consumers (Lawrence, 2006). Within EP practice, these consumers may also include national and local policy makers, education sector workers, parents and carers or even children and young people (Sherrod, 1999).

It is important, therefore, that research dissemination is conceptualised more broadly than solely journal publication or conference presentations. Whilst being valuable means of dissemination, with peer review processes arguably contributing to research rigour, dissemination through these traditional routes may not only potentially restrict the range of research consumers to journal subscribers and other academics but publication biases may restrict the range of available published research (Kicinski, 2013; Scargle, 2000). Lately, increasing consideration has been given to ‘alternative metrics’ (altmetrics) within dissemination practices, with a
view to increasing research visibility and broadening access to research through a wider range of dissemination outlets (Van Noorden, 2014). In a review by Sugimoto, Work, Larivière and Haustein (2017), a range of dissemination tools utilising social media platforms was identified, including social networking (e.g. Facebook, LinkedIn and ResearchGate), social bookmarking and reference management (e.g. Mendeley), social data sharing, video, blogging, micro-blogging (e.g. Twitter, Wikis), and social recommending and reviewing. Sugimoto et al. (2017) identify several criticisms of using such approaches to disseminate research, including lack of peer review, unfamiliarity with the technology, risks of platforms closing down, the blurring of personal and professional boundaries and the unequal use of such tools amongst different researcher demographics making it difficult to establish prevalence of use. Similarly, altmetrics may be regarded as “indicators of attention and popularity” (p.2046) rather than impact indicators. However, social media platforms are an emerging and increasingly popular means of disseminating research, the potential contributions of which should arguably be considered.

Harmsworth and Turpin (2001) propose three aspects of dissemination. The first is dissemination for awareness, which aims to make a target audience aware of the presence of the research and its outcomes, without their requiring detailed knowledge of it. This type of dissemination may utilise a word of mouth approach. The second, dissemination for understanding, aims to provide target audiences with a more detailed understanding of the research findings in the hope that they might benefit from them. The third, dissemination for action, aims for the research to impact practice and lead to changes based on the knowledge, findings, materials or approaches it offers. These audiences therefore require the most in-depth knowledge of the research in order to effect change within organisations. When planning dissemination strategies, it is therefore crucial to consider the target audiences of dissemination and the level of information, skills or products required by them, and to match dissemination strategies to these accordingly.

Dissemination frameworks may be of use in supporting researchers to formulate dissemination plans. In a systematic scoping review of conceptual frameworks, Wilson et al. (2010) identified twenty possible frameworks that had been used to
guide dissemination activity in a diverse range of research fields. The most frequently cited of these was McGuire’s Persuasion Communication Matrix (1969), which identifies five variables that influence the impact of persuasive communications (source of communication, the message to be communicated, the channels of communication, audience/receiver characteristics and the destination or setting of the received communication). Other included frameworks were Social Marketing (Kotler & Zaltman, 1971) and the Diffusions of Innovations Theory (Rogers, 1962), which proposes that the characteristics of ideas or innovations determine the extent to, and rate at, which they are adopted, through a five-phase process (knowledge, persuasion, decision, implementation and confirmation).

Harmsworth and Turpin (2001) identify a dissemination framework with theoretical origins in McGuire’s Persuasion Communication Matrix and emphasise the importance that must be attached to dissemination planning and implementation as part of the research process. In order to identify dissemination content, audiences and appropriate tools and strategies for dissemination, Harmsworth and Turpin suggest that the following questions should be used to plan and structure dissemination and evaluate the research’s impact:

**Table 4: Dissemination planning questions, adapted from Harmsworth and Turpin (2001)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What is dissemination?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What do we want to disseminate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Who are our stakeholders and what are we offering them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>When do we disseminate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>What are the most effective ways of disseminating?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Who might help us disseminate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>How do we prepare our strategy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>How do we turn our strategy into an action plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>How do we cost our dissemination activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>How do we know we have been successful?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whilst dissemination can involve a range of activities such as mailing lists, newsletters, reports, websites, conferences, workshops and roadshows, Harmsworth and Turpin argue that a multi-strand dissemination strategy that is tailored to the identified target audiences and the messages which are to be conveyed and received, is most likely to be effective. Similarly, the importance of evaluating the impact of research must be considered. In EP practice, this may be achieved through defining desired outcomes and measuring progress in relation to a baseline using clear success criteria, using approaches such as Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS) (Kiresuk & Sherman, 1968) or Target Monitoring Evaluation (TME) (Dunsmuir et al., 2009). A similar approach may be useful to identifying both the desired, and achieved, impacts of research as part of the dissemination process.

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

The present research, conducted by a trainee educational psychologist (TEP) as part of the Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology, provides an exploration of EP practice within the domain of behaviour management. The findings have been outlined in two papers.

**Overview of findings**

Paper 1 presents a systematic literature review (SLR) which aimed to represent the management of behavioural difficulties in EP practice as presented in existing peer reviewed literature. 14 studies met the inclusion criteria, with 12 considered to be best evidence and included in the final narrative synthesis. It emerged that EP practice in this area can be located at individual, group or organisational levels (Fallon et al., 2010) and exemplifies the core functions of consultation, assessment, intervention, research and training (Scottish Executive, 2002). EPs were found to apply single or multiple integrated psychological paradigms and commonly adopted social constructionist and relational approaches to their work, validating existing models of EP practice. These findings provided an initial theoretical overview of EP behaviour practice, which indicated an opportunity for future empirical research with EPs regarding their behaviour practice within a local context and ideas for future development of service delivery in this area.
Paper 2 reports the findings of an empirical case study carried out with a local authority EP team utilising the Research and Development in Organisations (RADIO) action research model. A focus group with 5 EPs and the Principal EP (PEP), and an interview with the PEP, were conducted and thematically analysed, along with a content analysis of participant reflections on, and future directions for, the research. Data suggested that EPs employ a range of practices in behaviour work and regarded their processes and approaches as distinct from those adopted by other agencies. A range of psychological paradigms were applied to conceptualisations around behaviour, which were integrated, combined or prioritised depending upon the context and situation at hand. Various approaches for service development were identified, including greater involvement with prevalent behaviour concerns within the local area, increased consultation, systemic work and multi-agency working and further advocating for children and young people. Finally, facilitators and barriers to service development were identified. EPs also identified the benefits of practice reflection and applying psychological theory to practice, as well as furthering their knowledge of broader EP behaviour practice.

**Research implications**

An important initial stage of Harmsworth and Turpin’s (2001) dissemination framework is to identify key stakeholders to whom the research should be disseminated. Implications of the current research for stakeholders at the research site, organisational level and professional level are outlined below.

**Research implications at the research site**

There are both individual and group implications for the participants at the research site outlined in Paper 2. EPs who participated in the research activities were able to discuss their current and preferred behaviour practices, psychological approaches they apply and perceived facilitators and barriers to development, with a view to informing service development. It was therefore useful for synthesised findings to be disseminated with the EP team in order to facilitate future action planning and service development.
An additional finding, derived from the participant reflection session, was that EPs valued having protected time to discuss their practice and how they apply psychology, facilitated by an external researcher, as ordinarily time for engaging in such activities may not be available. Therefore, the research potentially highlights the benefits of structured peer support and discussion sessions, in order for participants to share practice and learn from one another, thus providing an opportunity for individual continued professional development (CPD) and ongoing support as well as service development.

Although the findings of Paper 1 were not directly linked to the Paper 2 research site, participants requested information about the Paper 1 findings in order to increase knowledge of behaviour practice in the wider EP profession. As evidence-based practitioners, it appeared that EPs at the research site were concerned with ‘what the literature says’ about EP behaviour practice, indicating the importance of both disseminating results that were bespoke to the empirical research context but also providing information to enable participants to relate their practice to wider knowledge and research conducted elsewhere.

Research implications at an organisational level

As a LA service with a developing model of part-traded service delivery, the EP service referred to in Paper 2 exists both as a discrete organisation but also as part of a wider LA system with links to other organisations e.g. schools. Therefore, not only are the research findings and implications from both papers useful for individual practice and EP service development but may be of use in helping the EPS to define and advertise the role of the EP with behaviour management to other organisations. This may be particularly relevant as increased multi-agency working was identified as a key service development area; role clarification and examples of potential EP behaviour involvement at different levels may help to facilitate EP work with other organisations. Furthermore, as EPs reported the potential for a broader range of EP work than reactive individual level work, knowledge of the group and organisational level practice possibilities may be included in literature shared with other organisations regarding potential EP contributions, such as schools, the LA and other service commissioners e.g. service brochures,
development of a local offer website or leaflets. The findings from both papers may therefore not only be of relevance to the EPS as a research site and organisation, but in supporting their ongoing development in relation to other organisations.

*Research implications at a professional level*

There are additional implications of the findings of both papers for the wider EP profession, both within a UK context and internationally. The SLR (Paper 1) findings relating to exemplified EP behaviour practices and application of psychology are likely to be of interest to qualified EPs and school psychologists working within other services and contexts. For example, within the researcher’s own EPS, an overview of Paper 1’s findings formed the basis of a team CPD activity based upon consideration of how EPs might work with behaviour concerns, comparison with their own practice and subsequent analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to individual, group and organisational level EP practice (Appendix 27). Therefore, a synthesis of representations of EP behaviour management practices may be of professional interest to the wider EP community and may support identification of development opportunities e.g. training in particular approaches such as Video Interaction Guidance.

The second paper’s findings, although firmly located within a specific idiographic context, may also be of interest to the wider profession. Not only may it provide insights into how other EPs work with behaviour, as with Paper 1, but the contextual issue of developing service trading models is one which UK-based EP services may have cause to consider. Therefore, the facilitators and barriers to development identified by participants may also be of interest and relevance to EPs exposed to similar contextual constraints and who may also be required to consider their role and how this can be conveyed to others in order to secure service commissioning.

It is also likely that the findings of both papers may be of interest to trainee EPs (TEPs) enrolled on doctoral training courses. Paper 1 provides an updated synthesis of EP behaviour management practice, as well as consideration of applying psychology to practice and with links to professional practice models, all of which
may be relevant to EP training. Paper 2’s findings may also provide information regarding EP behaviour management, as well as insight into service development in the current context of increased service trading. Furthermore, both papers may exemplify research models and processes (e.g. systematic literature review processes, action research, thematic and content analysis) which may be relevant to TEPs embarking upon their own research.

Both Paper 1 and Paper 2 highlight useful directions for further research. The implications of this research, therefore, particularly those outlined in Paper 2, may also be of interest to TEPs and researchers with an interest in conducting further research into the EP role with behaviour management. For example, a large-scale survey into EP behaviour practices, based on the findings of Papers 1 and 2, could be conducted and, indeed, has already been discussed as a research commission with a Programme Director of an initial training Doctorate for EPs.

Fallon et al. (2010) suggest that, as occupiers of a “strategic vantage point” (p.3), EPs are well placed to work within a range of contexts and roles; the capacity for such work may therefore include organisational and systemic-level work (Baxter, 2000; Fox, 2009; Sharp, Frederickson & Laws, 2000; Stoker, 1992). The empirical research described in Paper 2 highlights the potential for EPs to act as change agents at organisational levels, supported by the application of a change process framework. This case study could be conceived as the initial stages of an action research process to facilitate change and development within an organisation.

Action research incorporates principles of collaboration with, and empowerment of, those working within organisations by making them integral to change and development processes (Simm & Ingram, 2008), both of which were present throughout the current research and may be a valuable aspect of EP practice (Stoker & Figg, 1998).

As an action research model, the Research and Development in Organisations (RADIO) model may be of particular utility to EP practice as it incorporates both exploration and development phases and emphasises collaboration with key stakeholders. This model has underpinned numerous examples of EP organisational change work, such as early years setting development (Douglas-Osborne, 2017),
teacher use of consultation (Timmins, Bham, McFayden & Ward, 2006), high school transition preparation (Ashton, 2006) and teacher use of solution-focussed approaches (Simm & Ingram, 2008).

Alternatively, other action research models, such as appreciative inquiry (Lewis, Passmore & Cantore, 2016) may be of benefit to EP organisational change practice (e.g. Oakes, 2010) due to a potential alignment of social constructionist approaches and values of participant empowerment (Burnham, 2013). As reflective practitioners with skills to identify numerous interacting factors which contribute to particular situations, EPs may also be well placed to conduct further organisational and strategic work across, as well as within, organisations (e.g. at LA levels) through exploring strategic drivers and barriers to change, using processes such as force field analyses (Lewin, 2013) or rich pictures (Waring, 1996).

Directions for future research and EP practice may therefore include further involvement in organisational change and development, utilising the skills and frameworks outlined above. This may occur as an extension of the current research, or within other contexts and with different development foci.

**Research dissemination and impact evaluation strategy**

Dissemination plans may help to support the effective dissemination of research findings to stakeholders and monitor their impact within practice. Table 5 below outlines a potential dissemination plan for the current research, drawing on Harmsworth and Turpin’s (2001) framework. This includes identification of key stakeholder groups, namely the EP team at the research site, organisations linked with the EPS research site, and the wider EP profession, including TEPs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissemination outcome</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Dissemination method</th>
<th>Time scale</th>
<th>Responsibility held by</th>
<th>Resource considerations</th>
<th>Desired impact/ Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Awareness and understanding of the main study findings at the research site (Paper 2)</td>
<td>EP team</td>
<td>To increase awareness of current and future behaviour practice</td>
<td>Feedback meeting/presentation</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>EL (researcher) Link EPs at research site</td>
<td>Travel costs, printing materials, room availability at venue, EP team availability, refreshments</td>
<td>EP team will have a shared understanding of the synthesised behaviour practices, ideas for future development and perceived facilitators and barriers/ Observation data and qualitative feedback shared during meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Awareness of the main SLR findings (Paper 1) at the</td>
<td>EP team</td>
<td>To increase awareness of behaviour management practices in</td>
<td>Feedback meeting/presentation</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>EL (researcher) Link EPs at research site</td>
<td>Travel costs, printing materials, room availability at research site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| empirical research site | the wider EP profession, in order to promote evidence-based practice | | | venue, EP team availability, refreshments | documented in the literature and psychological approaches which inform these *Observations and qualitative comments from feedback meeting*

EP team will be able to identify some ways in which the SLR findings might impact their future practice e.g. core
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Other organisations linked to the LA policy makers; service</th>
<th>To increase awareness of the scope of</th>
<th>Letter/ written summary</th>
<th>December 2018</th>
<th>EL (researcher)</th>
<th>Printing materials,</th>
<th>Service commissioners will be able to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>functions of EP role, eco-systemic levels of work/ Inclusion of practices in service development plan and documentation advertising range of work to service commissioners e.g. brochure, Local Offer, service website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research site will be aware of the main research findings (Papers 1 and 2)</td>
<td>commissioners</td>
<td>the EP behaviour management role and how this might develop</td>
<td>Presentation and advertising by EP team e.g. to schools</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>EP team</td>
<td>stamps, envelopes</td>
<td>identify some ways in which EPs can work with behaviour concerns/Inclusion of practices in descriptions of EP role used in commissioner literature e.g. SEN policies, Local Offer, analysis of commissioned work on LA electronic system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPs will be aware of the main study findings (Paper 2)</td>
<td>Qualified EPs and school psychologists (nationally and globally)</td>
<td>To develop awareness of possible EP practices and service development processes</td>
<td>Journal article, social media sharing</td>
<td>Roadshow/ workshops with different EP teams – presentation and development activity</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>EL (researcher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPs will be aware of the main study findings (Paper 2)</td>
<td>Qualified EPs and school psychologists (nationally and globally)</td>
<td>To develop awareness of possible EP practices and service development processes</td>
<td>Journal article, social media sharing</td>
<td>Roadshow/ workshops with different EP teams – presentation and development activity</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>EL (researcher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPs will be aware of the main SLR findings (Paper 1)</td>
<td>Qualified EPs and school psychologists (nationally and globally)</td>
<td>To develop awareness of possible EP practices and paradigms relating to behaviour and EP practice</td>
<td>Journal article</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>EL (researcher)</td>
<td>KW (research supervisor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadshow workshop with different EP teams – presentation and development activity</td>
<td>January 2018 (own EPS)</td>
<td>RH (placement supervisor) and CR (PEP)</td>
<td>EL (researcher)</td>
<td>EP teams</td>
<td>Venue, equipment (e.g. projector, flip chart paper and pens), printing and travel costs, time to liaise with services</td>
<td>Impact statistics and altmetrics e.g. citations, article downloads, social media sharing/ Written activities and evaluation sheets with qualitative comments and goal attainment scaling (GAS) data to indicate what participants have gained from the workshop and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. TEPs will demonstrate understanding of how EPs may respond to behaviour concerns (Papers 1 and 2). TEPs studying on initial EP training courses will develop understanding and EP practice. Seminar input and activities will be held in July 2020. EL (researcher) Programme and curriculum directors of EP training courses will provide feedback and evaluation sheets with quantitative and qualitative data gathering. TEPs will be able to summarise key findings relating to EPs and behaviour management and identify ways in which this might impact their practice.
|   | TEPs will use the recommendations in the papers to conduct a large-scale data investigation of EP behaviour practice (Papers 1 and 2) | TEPs at the University of Manchester | To promote further research into EP behaviour work | Seminar input TEP research | July 2020 | EL (researcher) KW (research supervisor) CA (Curriculum director) Year 2/3 TEPs | Venue, equipment, printing and travel costs, liaison and delivery time | Future research into EP behaviour work, linked to the ideas for further research identified in Paper 2, will be conducted/ TEP survey, potential publication of results |
The principal aims of the dissemination strategy are

- increasing study participant awareness of the EP role relating to behaviour management work with the potential of developing their service and individual practice, as well as that of related organisations
- developing understanding of behaviour management practice amongst the wider EP profession
- developing TEP awareness of EP responses to behavioural concerns
- furthering research into EP behaviour management work, potentially on a larger scale

Harmsworth and Turpin (2001) suggest that adopting a range of dissemination activities, relevant to stakeholders, increases the likelihood of research findings being attended to and impacting practice. Therefore, a range of dissemination strategies have been used, or are planned for use, with different groups.

In order to disseminate findings amongst research participants (the EP team) a presentation was given to outline the main research findings (Paper 2) and an account of wider EP behaviour practices (Paper 1) (as indicated in rows 1 and 2 of Table 5). Qualitative feedback as to the potential use and impact of these findings was included in Paper 2 and has led to ideas for further dissemination to other organisations linked to the research site, such as members of the EP team suggesting that presentations could be given to schools in order to outline the range of the EP role in behaviour work. Although a primary aim of the Paper 2 research was to contribute to service development and has been incorporated into a draft service plan by the EPS, other outputs may also be generated such as revisions to EPS documentation to more formally showcase the range of behaviour practices that can be offered. This may include a service brochure and online forums such as the LA local offer and the EPS website. Letters to heads of other services who may be likely to commission work from the EPS, such as the virtual school, could also be produced in order to offer an overview of findings relating to the EP role (as indicated in row 3 of Table 5).
Consideration was also given as to how to disseminate the research findings to the wider EP profession (rows 4 and 5 of Table 5). Paper 1 has already been accepted by the journal Educational Psychology in Practice, which has a high subscription rate amongst the UK EP community and is available online. It is hoped that Paper 2 will also be published in this journal. As the research focussed heavily on practice development, it was felt that an interactive means of dissemination that included reflection by EPs on their own work with behaviour relative to the findings, would be most likely to lead to practice impact. The researcher has conducted a CPD activity within the EPS currently hosting their training placement, which involved a short presentation of the Paper 1 findings followed by group activities on behaviour practice at individual, group and organisational levels and analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT analysis) of service development at each of these levels. It is hoped that similar activities could be conducted based on the combined findings of Papers 1 and 2, in a range of psychological services.

It is also regarded as important to disseminate the findings amongst TEPs, as behaviour work will likely be a key aspect of their training and practice as qualified EPs (see row 6 of Table 5). This could be achieved through delivery of a university seminar with opportunities to explore resources, link psychological theory to practice and identify practices that will be used in future. Furthermore, discussions have been held with Professor Kevin Woods, Programme Director of the Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology at The University of Manchester, regarding commissioning of a large-scale data gathering and evaluation project to be carried out by TEPs (Table 5, row 7). This would draw on the findings of EP practices with behaviour outlined in Papers 1 and 2 to form a survey or questionnaire exploring EP behaviour work more widely, a recommendation for future research suggested in Paper 2. This would not only increase awareness of EP behaviour practices but would also contribute to the furthering of research into the EP role with student behaviour management concerns.
Conclusion

The current paper has outlined the concepts of evidence-based practice and practice-based evidence, whilst making a case for the importance of these ways of working within EP practice. These links between research and practice can only be achieved through effective dissemination and active uptake of research in order to impact practice. The main findings of Papers 1 and 2 have been outlined, and a potential strategy suggested to a) support the dissemination of these to the research site, wider EP profession, and to TEPs, and b) contribute to further research within the domain of EP behaviour practice. These dissemination activities are currently ongoing and will be monitored and evaluated over time with reference to the criteria and impact measures outlined in the dissemination plan.
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Appendix 2: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework

PRISMA framework adapted from Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff & Altman (2009)
# Appendix 3: Quality criteria moderation discussion example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Agree coeff.</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Agree coeff.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of the research design</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>Student input missing, constructive intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear sampling rationale</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>Large N, No, no overlap, Overall, doesn't make sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well executed data collection</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>Overall, doesn't make sense, Need more data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis close to the data</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>Some quotes not coded, Need more data analysis, in line with research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent theory related to the problem</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>Need more data, Need more data analysis, in line with research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of explicit reflexivity e.g. impact of researcher, limitations, data validation (e.g. inter-coder validation)</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>No evidence, need more evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensiveness of documentation e.g. schedules, transcripts, thematic maps</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>No evidence of how data was collected, need more data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative case analysis</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>Need more data, Need more data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity and coherence of the reporting</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>Need more data, Need more data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of researcher-participant negotiation</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>Need more data, Need more data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferable conclusions</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>Need more data, Need more data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of attention to ethical issues</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>Need more data, Need more data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Max Score:** 14

**Mean coeff.** 0.91

**Mean coeff.** 0.91
Appendix 4: Qualitative investigation/evaluation review framework
(Bond, Woods, Humphrey, Symes & Green, 2013)

D.Ed.Ch.Psychol. 2017
Review framework for qualitative evaluation/investigation research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of the research design e.g. rationale vis-à-vis aims, links to previous approaches, limitations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear sampling rationale e.g. description, justification; attrition evaluated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well executed data collection e.g. clear details of who, what, how; effect of methods on data quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis close to the data, e.g. researcher can evaluate fit between categories/themes and data.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of explicit reflexivity e.g. impact of researcher, limitations, data validation (e.g. inter-coder validation), researcher philosophy/stance evaluated.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensiveness of documentation e.g. schedules, transcripts, thematic maps, paper trail for external audit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative case analysis, e.g. e.g. contrasts/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Mean % Agree</td>
<td>Mean % Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contradictions/ outliers within data; categories/ themes as dimensional; diversity of perspectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity and coherence of the reporting e.g. clear structure, clear account linked to aims, key points highlighted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of researcher-participant negotiation of meanings, e.g. member checking, empower participants.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent theory related to the problem, e.g. abstraction from categories/ themes to model/ explanation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid and transferable conclusions e.g. contextualised findings; limitations of scope identified.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of attention to ethical issues e.g. presentation, sensitivity, minimising harm, feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Max 14</td>
<td>Mean % agree</td>
<td>Mean % agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 5: Quantitative evaluation review framework
(Bond, Woods, Humphrey, Symes & Green, 2013)

D.Ed.Ch.Psychol. 2017
Review framework for quantitative evaluation research

Author(s):  
Title:  
Journal Reference:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of a randomised group design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on a specific, well-defined disorder or problem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison with treatment-as-usual, placebo, or less preferably, standard control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of manuals/ protocol/ training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity checking procedure/ supervision of intervention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample large enough to detect effect (from Cohen, 1992)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of outcome measure(s) that has demonstrably good reliability and validity (2 points if more than one measure used).</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendix 6: Studies excluded after assessment for eligibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study and author(s)</th>
<th>Reason(s) for exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Appendix 7: Weight of Evidence (WOE) B and WOE C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria (evaluations)</th>
<th>Weight of Evidence C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clear participant group</td>
<td>Relevance of focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clear outcomes</td>
<td>1. EP contribution to behaviour management is clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clear intervention (both 1 and 2 required to attract medium quality rating)</td>
<td>2. EP role evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria (evaluations)</td>
<td>3. Application of psychological theory evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Clearly defined behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clearly defined EP practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clear links between behaviour and EP activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria (investigations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 3 criteria met (score = 2)</td>
<td>All criteria met (score = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria 1 and 2 met (score = 1)</td>
<td>2 criteria met (score = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 or 1 criteria met (score = 0)</td>
<td>0 or 1 criteria met (score = 0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8: EP focus group schedule

Introduction – rationale and ethics (5 minutes)

- Research and policy demonstrate that behaviour management is both a key concern to schools and an integral aspect of EP work.
- However, there have historically been changes in psychological understandings of behavioural difficulties and policy attempts to manage these, with implications for how EPs might work with schools on these issues.
- Current changes in context for EP work – adoption of service trading practices.
- Aims of FG – to explore what we mean when we talk about ‘behaviour’; gain insight into what is already being done in relation to behaviour management and how you envisage the future development of the service in this area.
- All personal details will be anonymised and you can withdraw at any point.
- Although examples from your practice are actively encouraged, please bear confidentiality in mind by not using the names of any pupils, adults or schools.
- We have around an hour to 90 minutes for this focus group, so I may need to move us on in order to keep to time. OK to record?
- Perhaps we could start off by introducing everyone, please could we go around and say your name, role and perhaps how long you have been practising for?

RQs 1 and 2 – Current EP responses to behaviour management concerns and psychological theory/approaches underpinning these (up to 45 minutes)

- **EP conceptualisations of behavioural difficulties**
- What do we mean by behavioural difficulties?
- Present stimulus material (list of behaviours from gvt. docs) – EP views? Any additions/amendments?
- What forms EP views on what is meant by behaviour problems e.g. research, initial training, practice experiences, CPD?
- **EP responses to behavioural difficulties**
- What are examples of current EP practice with regards to what we think of as ‘behavioural difficulties’?
- Present stimulus material (quadrant, left side) – explore examples of current practice at individual, group and systemic levels
- If any gaps/negative examples are cited, note these in the right-hand column
- **What psychology are we applying?**
- Use facilitator role to summarise, draw attention to underpopulated areas, include quieter participants etc.

**PROMPTS**

- Types of referrals seen (internalising, externalising, age/gender trends etc)
- Frequency/number of referrals
- Views on needs of schools relating to behaviour
• Views on labelling of behavioural needs? Diagnosis?
• Do EPs ‘do’ behaviour management? What would you do if a teacher asked about class control issues or if a school had widespread behaviour management problems?
• LA practices around behavioural concerns – any other services involved? Multi-agency work?
• Roles taken by EPs in behaviour management concerns e.g. consultation, individual assessment, therapeutic work, training, systemic work
• Theories/ paradigms that underpin understandings of behavioural concerns
• Basis of views – experience? Initial training? CPD?

RQ3 and RQ4 – Development of practice and service responses, facilitators and barriers to development (30-40 minutes)

• Stimulus material – right hand column of quadrant
• How might the service develop in the future?
• Any identified gaps/ areas for development?
• Barriers to development/ success factors? What are the facilitators and barriers to this happening?
• Hopes and aspirations for the future/ from involvement in the research
• Risks to acting/ not acting? How great? (e.g. scaling)

Conclusion (5-10 minutes)

• Anything else that hasn’t been covered?
• Thank you for your time and your responses
• Outline procedures and next steps – data analysis, dissemination, group to discuss future directions
• Remind participants again of right to withdraw.
Appendix 9: Focus Group Stimulus Material

The focus group discussion will centre on:

- EP conceptualisations and experiences of behaviour difficulties in school settings
- The approaches EPs may take to respond to these issues at individual, group and organisational levels.
- Identified gaps or future developments for practice

The focus group will therefore be discursive and will be divided into three main sections. Stimulus material for the discussions will be visible on the day, and is presented here for your consideration.

Section 1 – EP views of what constitutes ‘behavioural problems’.

The following list has been derived from the government documents ‘Mental Health and Behaviour in Schools’ (2014) and ‘Below the radar: low-level disruption in the country’s classrooms’ (2014). Please consider whether this list seems to encompass what you would categorise as behavioural problems, and if you would make any additions or amendments.

1. ‘Clinical’ cases e.g. ADD, ODD, CD
2. Verbal and physical aggression
3. Non-compliance and defiance
4. Persistent disruption
5. Anti-social behaviours e.g. stealing, fire setting
7. Sensory disorders – hyperkinetic e.g. ADHD

Section 2

This part of the focus group will ask you to discuss examples of your practice at individual, group and organisation levels in relation to the behaviours discussed earlier. The sections of the quadrant below can be populated in any order and examples added as participants feel able to discuss them.

Section 3

The final section, which may be discussed alongside section 2, concerns how you feel your EP practice could develop, and areas in which the service’s delivery of support to schools could progress.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUAL PUPIL</th>
<th>CURRENT PRACTICE</th>
<th>FUTURE DIRECTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROUP AND SYSTEMIC</td>
<td>CURRENT PRACTICE</td>
<td>FUTURE DIRECTIONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 10: Semi-structured interview schedule

Introduction

- Purpose of interview – follow up to the focus group exploring what EPs within the service currently do in relation to behaviour
- Aims – to explore the current contextual factors of the EPS and PEP ideas for future directions that the service might take in relation to behaviour practice
- Ethics – confidentiality, recording of data, right to withdraw

Introductory questions

- PEP role – what it entails, how long PEP has been in this role (this and other services)
- Overview of the service - staffing composition (EPs, assistants, associates etc), model of service delivery, any recent/ planned changes, how referrals are made to the EPS, socioeconomic features of the area

Semi-structured interview framework

- Looking at the ‘future directions’ aspect of the research from a service manager, rather than EP practitioner, perspective
- Thinking not just about ‘what’ could be done, but ‘how’ this might happen
- PEP views on the focus group – lots of ideas emerged from it relating to current and future practice as well as facilitators and barriers, interested now in her views of what’s feasible and how might change happen
- VISION
  - What came out of the FG for her?
  - What impressions did she come away with?
  - What changes/ developments would she like to see implemented?
- CONTEXT
  - Capacity for commissioning the services EPs/ PEP want to give
  - What’s preventing or facilitating this?
  - How easy is it?
  - How would it happen? E.g. Who needs to agree? With whom do conversations need to be had?
  - How easy is it to facilitate change compared to other services/ LAs that PEP has worked in/ is aware of practice in?
- DRIVERS FOR CHANGE
  - What might these be? E.g. reputation, needs of local area, visibility of EPS within the LA, vision for the future of the EPS

Closing

- Any other points to make?
- Outline next steps – analysis of interview and FG data; action planning meeting as part of a development day in the Autumn term (date to be confirmed)
Appendix 11: Focus group and interview transcription extracts

Focus group

3 - I was just thinking about things like those...maybe it would come under mental health needs...but you know those very quiet, withdrawn sort of children...I’m not so sure whether that’s...does that come under any of those?...I suppose mental health needs, but maybe a little bit more?

M – Yeah?

3 – Or different from that?

M – So perhaps a less clinical approach?

3 – Yeah

4 – I think, again, it’s those teacher perceptions of observable behaviours whereas our role is more to think about, well what’s driving it? I would see behaviour as a communication, as an expression of something that’s going on, and it just seems a bit “tick listy” doesn’t it, very much like a SENCO would say, “Oh I want you to see this kid because he’s done this, this many times”, so for me, the idea of social emotional mental health and behaviour, it’s all a big cycle, there’s not a making it into two different categories really

M – Mmm

2 – And I think these kinds of definitions are, like, quite within-child, they are you, and they’re static, “that’s what you’ve got, you’ve got depression”, and we often see kids...we’ll see kids a lot who’ll say “I’ve got anger issues!”

4 – (laughing) Yes!

2 – And that to them, then becomes their definition of themselves.

M – So perhaps that categorisation and that labelling may not be something that sits particularly comfortably within some EP’s practice?

5 – It becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy doesn’t it?

3 – I was going to say, it becomes something then that can’t change...

5 – There’s those expectations then aren’t there, fitting into those categories

3 – Mmmm...I’ve seen that, “I’ve got terrible anger problems”, so I’ll say “OK, what are we going to do about it?” whereas they kind of see it as, “OK, that explains what I’m doing then”, and we’re going, “No, what are we going to do about that then, what changes can we make?”. But yeah, I know where you’re coming from with that list.

1 – Yeah, I mean, it does encompass a lot of behaviours really...it’s probably not really what...I wouldn’t have that list in my head going in anywhere, but that’s what we...that’s what we’re presented with, so it encompasses a lot of the behaviour that we might be presented with on the referral form
Interview

R – So, the idea of the interview today is as a follow-up to the focus group that was done with the wider team, just to get your views as the principal of the service rather than as a practitioner EP. So, what you think were the key things to come out of the focus group, and what sorts of things you would like to see happening with behaviour in the future. But I was also hoping to start off with getting a bit of contextual information about the service, so things like what your model of service delivery is, how many EPs you’ve got working there, what different roles you have within the service.

PEP – So, at the moment we’ve got five qualified psychologists and we’ve got two assistant psychologists. And we’ve also got, let me think...we’ve got four associates as well.

R – And is that an expansion of the team?

PEP – Yes, and I’d like to take on a trainee as well. So we’ll have people in every decade, we’ll have a mixture of young people in their twenties right through to a couple of people in their seventies, so I think that gives a good balance between experience and people learning new things and bringing new things in to us, just as, well, even more importantly.

R – Great. And what about your model of service delivery? Are you a consultation-led service for example, or do you follow another model?

PEP – OK, so since March we’ve been told...well, we were told we had to go 100% traded, and I resisted that and said that we were 60% statutory. So the centrally-funded time allocation for schools, it’s usually three sessions per term so they get that for statutory work. So I’ve been meeting the heads and the SENCOs, and saying that there’s far more that you can do, there’s preventative stuff especially around transitions as children get anxious around that, and you can also do consultations about specific behaviours or about specific learning, you know, show new pieces of work and say “Where do you think we go from here?”.

PEP – We’ve also been massively involved in critical incidents, you can’t plan for that, didn’t know it would happen. We’ve had four major critical incidents including the fallout from last week’s Manchester bombing. So things don’t always go to plan, we’ve been central in the critical incidents, there’s been a political battle, but “what are the behaviours we expect to see after a critical incident” has been a huge focus. So we’ve got to do a whole day’s training, practically every week one or two of us have been involved in critical incidents.

R – Hmm

PEP – Which has then...it’s kind of altered our profile, with people going “Oh, I didn’t know educational psychologists could talk to parents about behaviour!”

PEP – Which has then...it’s kind of altered our profile, with people going “Oh, I didn’t know educational psychologists could talk to parents about behaviour!”, which was a strange perception, and it’s altered the perception that we don’t just do learning difficulties. So people have been really pleased about that, you know in the team, and at the same time, we’ve managed to sell some consultations on risk assessments with behaviour and I’m really pleased about that. So schools didn’t realise [laughs] for some reason that we could talk about behaviour and have a framework about what’s driving behaviour.

R – Mmm

PEP – So this is our first term of getting away from just having WISCs and WIATs really, forging ahead. On the whole, so far, the feedback has been from schools that they’re quite...
pleased with this idea, that we can do things, so we’ve got schools to buy us in for transition work and we’ve got schools to buy us in for risk assessments, and for critical incidents as well. So it is swinging slightly more towards behaviour
Appendix 12: Notes made during data gathering

Types of behaviour concerns

1. ‘Clinical cases’
   e.g. O.D.D, A.D.H.D

2. Verbal and/or physical aggression

3. Non-compliance / defiance

4. Anti-social behaviours
   e.g. stealing, fire-setting

5. Persistent disruption

6. Mental health needs
   e.g. anxiety, depression,
   self-harm, attachment disorders,
   eating disorders, substance misuse,
   post-traumatic stress

7. Sensory disorders
   - hyperkinetic

- May not need to
  - Increase sensory
  - Movement
  - Manipulation
  - Can accommodate
    to specific environment

- Underlying needs
  - Sensitivity
  - Sensory
  - Behaviour

- Non-compliance
  - Sensory
  - Sensory
Appendix 13: Participant feedback and member checking materials

Global Theme One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Theme</th>
<th>Organising Theme</th>
<th>Basic Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Psychologists’ (EP) views of behaviour</td>
<td>Psychological perspectives on behaviour</td>
<td>Psychodynamic (attachment, relational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neurological and executive functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humanistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eco-systemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Behaviourist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interactionist – flexible, needs and context dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural needs e.g. ASC</td>
<td>Internalising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Externalising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Link between behaviour and social, emotional and mental health (SEMH) needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views on labelling</td>
<td>Positive aspects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative aspects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualisation</td>
<td>Create empathy for child or young person (CYP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Underlying causes and drivers of behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behaviour as communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific contextual influences on behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning appropriate intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences between primary and secondary schools</td>
<td>Contextual changes leading to behaviour changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevalence of behaviour cases in secondary schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased mental health needs in secondary schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Global Theme Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Theme</th>
<th>Organising Theme</th>
<th>Basic Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EP views of behaviour practice</td>
<td>Distinctive contribution of EP</td>
<td>Focus on change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contextualised and holistic view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional support and empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past practice</td>
<td>More group and systemic work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therapeutic work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current practice</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-off assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statutory assessment and individual casework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systemic and organisational work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reactive work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preventative work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferences for working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future directions</td>
<td>Organisational development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More therapeutic work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More preventative work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More systemic work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broaden behavioural role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More joined-up, multi-agency work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities for development</td>
<td>More consultation and intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on specific targeted behaviours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child-centred approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joined-up, multi-agency work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Global Theme Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Theme</th>
<th>Organising Theme</th>
<th>Basic Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changing perceptions of the EP role with behaviour</td>
<td>Increasing acceptance of EP involvement in behaviour work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td>Good relationships with schools</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Broader range of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive perceptions of the EPS</td>
<td>Demonstrating previous successes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valued within the LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive response to work from schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilising opportunities and challenges</td>
<td>Critical incident work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OfSTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing the EP team</td>
<td>Associate EPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant EPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing size of team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-agency work</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Theme</td>
<td>Organising Theme</td>
<td>Basic Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers and pressures</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>EPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuts to services</td>
<td></td>
<td>CYP’s needs being missed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of specialist services and provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced capacity in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges of multi-agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-operation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of co-ordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the EPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part-traded funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different perception of the EP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Differing views of behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role</td>
<td></td>
<td>EP remit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purposes of EP involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Narrowing and misperception of EP role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EHC process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited opportunities for EP and schools to develop good working relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited range of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work not embedded in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff not released</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 14: Reflection activity transcription extract

P1 - As a team, we’ll all probably have slight differences in how we approach things, or even big differences, but generally there’ll be a lot of commonality in how we view behaviour, and unless you get round the table talking about it...

P2 – You don’t know that

P1 – And it can feed in then, presumably, into a service plan, “this is what we...this is the approach we take”

P3 – I hope it does [laughing] it’s supposed to reflect what we’re thinking! Yeah, and to me it will be good to say to people “It was driven by some doctoral research which has helped us formulate our ideas around that” so making it quite pragmatic. For me, it’s quite interesting as well to compare what’s happening out there in other authorities and what’s the literature, so you’re saying that psychologists have moved more towards behaviour and we’re thinking “Oh, alright, where do we stand with that?” I think it’s interesting to see the research process but that’s me, I’m a swot [laughs], you know, seeing how you’ve made sense of what we’ve been saying...

P3 – I think it does, because sometimes you talk through things but you don’t see that in a plan and you think, actually, yeah we’ve made sense of it now...sometimes you think it’s just things going in or coming out, and it’s so nice to have an organised plan...

P2 – I think that’s one of our skills as an EP, so I have parents who comment to me, and say exactly that, that you’ve...made sense of all that information that I gave you...you’ve made sense of it and it’s down in a...kind of a coherent manner really

P1 – And I suppose likewise, in any other way we might do, for all the talking that we might do in a consultation, or the suggestions that we have, although we are saying different things at different times there probably are themes about we talk about, and the constructs or perspectives that we hold, you know, that we’re not sort of contradicting ourselves entirely in two different cases, there are some commonalities and common themes. So that’s good to know, on that side too.

P3 – Because when you’re looking for implications for practice, I think what [P2] said is just right, by doing thematic analysis and examining what a group of people have said and what all this information is, to come out with a bit of clarity, that’s a skill that you need in the job isn’t it, so the research impacts on what the job’s going to be.

R – Is there anything anyone else wants to add about that first point, the experience of doing the research and being participants?...So if we perhaps move on to that second point then, and this is more about the research process, we’ve sort of done the findings, what utility might that have going forward thinking about behaviour and how you might develop that as a service?

P4 – It was interesting for me to hear past, current, future practices, particularly future directions as I think it’s important to have that in mind for some of us.

P2 – I think that’s what we said, so just looking at what the pressures and barriers are, it gives clarity about what we’d like to do to move forward.
Appendix 15: Reflection activity participant written responses

Reflection 1
What was interesting/useful about taking part in this research?
  eg. as an EP as part of the EPS
What might have made the research more interesting/useful?
  eg. to you as a practitioner to the development of the EPS

Reflection 2
In what ways might this research support the planning of next steps for service delivery?
Appendix 16: Thematic analysis stages

Braun and Clarke’s (2006) six stages of thematic analysis were used to guide the qualitative data analysis process for the focus group and interview data. Attride-Stirling’s (2001) thematic network structure was used to group themes as basic, organising and global to create final thematic networks that represented the data and supported reporting of findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Braun and Clarke’s stage</th>
<th>Activity undertaken</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Data familiarisation</td>
<td>Listen to recordings</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fully transcribe focus group and interview</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read through transcripts</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note initial ideas for codes/ themes on paper copies and record in research journal</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Generation of initial codes</td>
<td>Import transcription documents to NVIVO 11</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Code data</td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Check sample of initial coding with a suitably experienced</td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Searching for themes</strong></td>
<td><strong>See Appendix 18 for inter-coder checking materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collate initial codes by transferring each code to an index marker</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Initial codes" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sort initial codes into potential themes (codes into basic themes, basic under organising themes, organising under global themes)</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Initial codes grouped under basic themes" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial codes grouped under basic themes</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Basic themes grouped under organising theme" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Review themes</td>
<td>Create draft thematic networks/ lists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review drafts with research supervisor and make required changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple organising themes constructed from basic themes (constructed from initial codes)

Organising themes grouped under global theme

Draft Global Theme 1 map
5. Define and name themes

- Create thematic networks
- Carry out member checking with research participants

Draft thematic network

See Appendix 25 for final full thematic networks and Appendix 12 for participant feedback and member checking materials

6. Produce the report

- Write up findings into Paper 2

See Paper 2
Appendix 17: Thematic analysis manual coding process

Focus group

eating disorders and post-traumatic stress’, and then they’re just going round and round and
nobody’s helping them. It’s really a contextual political thing, and children are not being supported,
and then sometimes they become school refusers... → ride - lack of family co-rale
2 – The separation between SENCO and behaviour support is also a difficulty, because somehow we
are linked to SENCO not behaviour support, so...and then there’s that kind of perception that we’re,
we just do the SENCO-type, academic element...
1 – Also I’ve found that you don’t, with high schools particularly...because usually you haven’t met
the...at the primary school you’ve met the SENCO at the planning meetings, you’ve got the initial
information about the child usually from the referral form, and then you’ll meet the teacher. But at
high school you don’t tend to meet the teachers and I often send the report back thinking “Who is
going to read this, is the music teacher who really needs to read this going to read this or be given
any information about it, or...” so you just have that feeling sometimes where your assessment, or
you’re writing a report based on your assessment, how’s this going to help in that?
4 – Yeah, there’s something systemic there, definitely.
3 – I was going to say, that’s quite interesting because I think all of the high school cases that I get at
the moment are the two schools, well I call them three schools, the two that I cover most of the time
are in very different areas, but for both of them, the majority of the cases that I get I would say are
behaviour → more high school casework around behaviour
5 – And do you get a lot of information around them?
3 – It varies from school to school, but some of them, as I say, they come under the remit of the
school but they’ve already been hospitalised, so it might come via, say...I’m looking at [X] because he
covers the PRU and the vulnerable pupil unit, because that tends to be the way that they get back
into school, if they get back into school.
1 – I sometimes feel that they get you involved at the point where they’re thinking ‘We need to shift
this person on’, so you’re writing the report that just covers how bad he or she is, so that we can
move them on or get support or whatever, rather than... So then I hear about kids who’ve been
excluded, who are in the PRU, who I’ve never heard mentioned
4 – Because it’s that perception isn’t it, with the scores, you’re the academic, what would you know
about sexualised behaviour, or self-harm, yet I was given a case when I first started where they said
‘Can you do an assessment of this child’s mental health in the PRU?’. He’d already got a place
somewhere else, they’d not even asked me for a report, it doesn’t count at all, but there are ways
round that... But yes, it is the way that people perceive our role, and we’re going through a system
now where we’re going to be putting out the SLA, the agreements with schools, and the director has
decided we just do cognitive assessments! That’s what the offer was. But it’s a misperception of our
role that obviously we do get involved in behaviour, behaviour and learning and wellbeing and
achievement, it’s all linked in
1 – And historically there was a behaviour support team...

151
PEP interview

PEP – I think it’s the allocation and I think it’s a confidence thing as well, a defensive… a defensive mechanism with some of the psychologists as well. “Oh, we can’t do that because…” really, what you’re saying is “I feel too anxious to try that”. Well then you think, that’s a training need, and I’ve got to deal with that, they’ve got to go on courses or they’ve got to try it with support, before you can let them go. Obviously it’s easier with assistants and new people and associates that I know, “just try this”, whereas people that are wary of change and don’t want it to happen, that’s going to take long time.

R – Yes… And then, the last thing that I wanted to ask about really, and I think we have covered some of it, is the drivers for change within the service and within the local authority. So you mentioned OFSTED and the drive for more multi-agency working, and sort of, the pressures of having to go at least partly traded. Can you think of any other things that are driving these changes in relation to behaviour and how you work with it?

PEP – Do you mean behaviour as a team, or the way in which we approach behaviour? (32:28)

R – I think both.

PEP – So, I would say, after people left the boat was rocking a lot, you have to steady that. My vision for how psychologists should be working, and some of the other people, that vision, that is what’s driving it really, because you need to be feeling that you’re doing a job that’s worthwhile, that we don’t just do reading tests, whereas other people are resisting because, for them, work means something else, and so it’s finding out the personal motivations of each member of the team. You can’t push it too much because it’s, you’re going to get rebellion, but on the other hand, this is what most of us are feeling now, come on, we need to get into behaviour. We’re psychologists, we need to be doing this kind of work. So then you get, you get different comments from people, “Oh great, our service is really getting a bit more high-profile now, but the fallout of this is I can’t always do everyone’s time sheets and approve leave and all the nitty-gritty that way, so some people think that’s more important than having this high profile, you know, we’re going to be doing this, we’re going to be doing that. Bringing new tests and assessments, and ways of working…” I’d say we’re now in the majority, most of us are now going “Oh do you know what, that looks quite a good way of doing it”, we have got these new things in and we are going to do some training on consultation as well. So, it’s…it is hard. People have to emotionally accept themselves that we’re going to be doing new things… Plus, selling it to the people at the top as well, you’ve got the context, the political context of CAMHS and voluntary agencies wanting to do that, we’ve got “Yeah but we need to get the money!” and then you’ve also got “Ooh, can I do this, can I do this, I’ll just go into my little…I’ll do a WISE”… So it’s all very messy.

R – What sorts of things help when it comes to selling it to people at the top?

PEP – I think… once you’ve had a success, and you get some feedback, they like to go on the back of that. So, in a way we’ve been quite lucky because when we’ve had these horrible incidents, and managed to do good work and then that gets fed back right to the top, that’s what’s raised our profile. And that sounds horrible, but it was extremely hard work. Once you’ve given the chance, plus the anxiety conference was a big success, so once you’ve had something go well, people want more of it.

R – Yeah

PEP – And it’s just that push to do it in the first place isn’t it?

R – Having to use the opportunities that arise.
Appendix 18: Thematic analysis NVIVO 11 coding screenshots
Appendix 19: Thematic analysis inter-coder agreement checking

Focus group

Coder 1 (researcher)

PEP - I think it’s the allocation and I think it’s a confidence thing as well. I’ve done, like, a deficiency mechanism with some of the psychologists as well. “Oh, we can’t do that because...” really, what you’re saying is “I feel too anxious to try that.” Well then think, that’s a training need, and I’ve got to deal with that, they’ve got to go on courses or they’ve got to try it with sensors, before you can do it. Obviously it’s much more an external and then we get a feedback, and we’ll be talking about that as well, because that’s where the real problem is. We can’t talk about what’s wrong and don’t want it to happen, that’s where the training is needed. The second point is need to meaning and quick moving in working. I think we’ve covered some of it, it’s driven for change within the team and within the local authority. So you mentioned CHIEF and the drive for more multi-agency working, and part of that pressure to get at least partly trained. Can you think of any other things that are having these changes in relation to behaviour and how you work with it?

Coder 2 (experienced researcher colleague)

PEP - Do you mean behaviour at all or the way in which we approach behaviour? [32:28]

Coder 1 (researcher)

PEP - So, I would say, after people left the floor and it was interesting to see how they deal with that. My vision for how psychology should be working, and some of the other people, that vision is what it’s driving it really, because you need to be feeling that you’re doing a job that’s worthwhile, that we don’t just do reading tests, whereas other people are missing because, for them, work means something else, and so it’s bridging the perceived motivation of each member of the team. You can’t push it too much because then you’re going to get resistant, but on the other hand, this is what most of us are feeling now, isn’t it, we need to get into behaviour. We’ve selected the need to be doing this kind of work. So then you do, you get different elements from people, “Oh, great, our service feels really busy,” “I would’ve done high-stakes more, but the focus of this is working with people.” How do you use... everyone’s time sheets and approve leave and all the gritty gritty that way, so some people think that’s more important when doing this high-priority, you know, you’ve got to be doing this, working, finding new tools, and new ways of working. I’d say we’re here to take the majority, most of us are now going, “Oh, we know what you mean, that looks like a good way of doing it,” we’ve got these new things to do, we’re going to do it. What do you think about psychology training?

Coder 2 (experienced researcher colleague)

PEP - I have to have some questions.

Coder 1 (researcher)

PEP - What sorts of things happen when it comes to selling it to people at the kids? What’s the process?

Coder 2 (experienced researcher colleague)

PEP - I think, once you’ve told a story, and you get some feedback, they take it on the back. So, it’s a way we’ve been quite lucky because we’ve had these terrible incidents, and then they’ve had to do good work and then the police feel right in the too, that’s where the input come from. And that’s how it works, but it makes extremely hard work. Once you’ve given the chance, then the training conference was a big success, so once you’ve had something go well, people want more of it.

Coder 1 (researcher)

PEP - And it’s just that push to do it in the first place isn’t it?

Coder 2 (experienced researcher colleague)

PEP - Yeah

Coder 1 (researcher)

PEP - And that’s just push to do it in the first place isn’t it?

Coder 2 (experienced researcher colleague)

PEP - Having to use the opportunities that arise.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data extract</th>
<th>Coder 1</th>
<th>Coder 2</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...I wouldn’t not do an observation...</td>
<td>EP use of observation</td>
<td>EP observations</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...then you can say “Well I noticed him do this”</td>
<td>Coming to a joint understanding of behaviour</td>
<td>Explanation of behaviour</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will do observations if I think I need to unpick it or there’s something that just isn’t sitting comfortably with me</td>
<td>Need to unpick behaviour</td>
<td>EP questions</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to spend a proportion of time with the adults who support behaviour...</td>
<td>Importance of working with adults around behaviour</td>
<td>Adults input important</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...for them to make changes in the environment really</td>
<td>Systemic approach to behaviour work</td>
<td>Systemic approach</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjoint behaviour consultation...meeting with the teacher and parent at the same time</td>
<td>Consultation, meet jointly with parent and school, joint understanding</td>
<td>Develop joint understanding</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...meeting with the parent or carer and teacher together and just sort of trying to level the playing field by getting everyone to bring their own expertise to the table</td>
<td>Recognition that stakeholders have different areas of expertise</td>
<td>Developing joint understanding from different experiences</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found that this was a good way in a couple of situations where...they don’t always have great links with the parents</td>
<td>Developing links between home and school</td>
<td>Home-school partnership</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We’d also look at some of the other issues about why that behaviour might be occurring...looking at what everyone else is doing as well, that might be influencing the behaviour</td>
<td>Unpicking context, holistic overview, factors driving behaviour</td>
<td>Holistic approach</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There’s structured approaches to that...Ford wheel...highly formulaic but it shifts them from within-child to looking at context, and I think multi-element plans kind of do that as well</td>
<td>Approaches to thinking systematically about behaviour</td>
<td>Systemic approach to behaviour</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use interventions....give extra time to do interventions, say a drama group for self-harmers</td>
<td>Use of group interventions, group level EP work</td>
<td>EP use of interventions</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement of school staff in interventions</td>
<td>Involve staff</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>....they then get a different insight from a school’s perspective</td>
<td>Develop and reframe understanding of behaviour</td>
<td>Developing joint understanding</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...the interventions then tie people in and become part of an assessment</td>
<td>Intertwining of assessment and intervention</td>
<td>Intervention for assessment</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...you have to invest the extra time</td>
<td>Barrier – time needed for work</td>
<td>Time needed</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but I’ll do that so I can hook a school in</td>
<td>Using success to get a school more invested</td>
<td>Not coded</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...at least then you help them generalise a skill</td>
<td>Benefit of involving staff, skill generalisation</td>
<td>Skill generalisation beyond intervention</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Especially if it’s a pastoral lead as well</td>
<td>Linking pastoral and behavioural issues</td>
<td>Involving pastoral staff in interventions</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview

CODER 1: I'll start with a question and I want you to describe what you think is going on in your head when you think about the software design and implementation process. What are you thinking about when you think about this?

CODER 2: Well, when I think about the software design and implementation process, I think about the steps involved in the process and the decisions that need to be made. I also think about the tools and techniques that can be used to facilitate the process. Additionally, I consider the stakeholders involved and how their needs and expectations must be addressed.

CODER 1: And what are the challenges you face in this process?

CODER 2: The main challenge I face is ensuring that all the stakeholders are aligned and have a clear understanding of the project goals. Additionally, I need to manage the project timelines and budgets effectively to ensure the project is completed within the expected timeframe and within the budget constraints.

CODER 1: And how do you overcome these challenges?

CODER 2: To overcome these challenges, I use various strategies such as conducting regular meetings with the stakeholders to ensure they are aligned, using project management tools to keep track of the timelines and budgets, and effectively communicating with the stakeholders to address any issues that arise.

CODER 1: Finally, what is your opinion on the future of software design and implementation process?

CODER 2: I believe that the future of software design and implementation process will be driven by the needs of the stakeholders and the advancements in technology. The increasing emphasis on agile methodologies will continue to shape the process, and the use of artificial intelligence and machine learning will play a significant role in improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data extract</th>
<th>Coder 1</th>
<th>Coder 2</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think it’s the allocation</td>
<td>Allocation, types of work that EPs are asked to do</td>
<td>School allocation/ allocation of EP work</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And I think it’s a confidence thing as well</td>
<td>EPs having confidence to try certain types of work</td>
<td>EP confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a defensive mechanism with some of the psychologists as well...”I feel to anxious to try that”</td>
<td>Barrier, psychologists not having confidence to try certain ways of working</td>
<td>EPs not having confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they’ve got to go on courses or they’ve got to try it with support</td>
<td>EPs’ need for training and joint working to build confidence</td>
<td>Develop EP confidence with training</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people that are wary of change and don’t want it to happen, that’s going to take a long time</td>
<td>Barrier – resistance to change</td>
<td>Wary of change in EP team</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After people left the boat was rocking a lot, you have to steady that</td>
<td>Current work, create stability within the service</td>
<td>Not coded</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My vision for how psychologists should be working...that’s what’s driving it really</td>
<td>Driver – having vision for service development</td>
<td>Vision from PEP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You need to be feeling that you’re doing a job that’s worthwhile, that we don’t just do reading tests</td>
<td>Facilitator – feeling that the job is worthwhile</td>
<td>Feeling EP job is worthwhile</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whereas other people are resisting because, for them, work means something different</td>
<td>Not coded</td>
<td>Resistance to change</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and so it’s finding out the personal motivations of each member of the team</td>
<td>PEP role, finding out how individuals want to work</td>
<td>Personal motivations of EP team</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we need to get into behaviour. We’re psychologists, we need to be doing this kind of work</td>
<td>Feeling that more work with behaviour is needed</td>
<td>Developing EP role in authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the fallout of this is I can’t always do everyone’s time sheets and approve leave and all the nitty-gritty</td>
<td>Not coded</td>
<td>Lack of time for admin for PEP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’d say we’re now in the majority, most of are now going “Oh do you know what, that looks like quite a good way of doing it”</td>
<td>Facilitator – gaining consensus on future directions</td>
<td>Majority of EP team on board</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people have to emotionally accept themselves that we’re going to be doing new things</td>
<td>Barrier – people accepting change</td>
<td>Accepting change</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we are going to do some training on consultation as well</td>
<td>New direction, consultation, facilitator is training</td>
<td>More training for staff</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...the political context of CAMHS and voluntary agencies wanting to do that</td>
<td>Barrier – inter-agency competition to do the same work, having to define roles</td>
<td>Not coded</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we’ve got “Yeah but we need the money!”</td>
<td>Driver, traded services, trying to income generate</td>
<td>Not coded</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus selling it to people at the top as well</td>
<td>Have to have agreement for work at LA managerial level</td>
<td>Need senior leaders on board</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once you’ve had a success and you get some feedback, they like to go on the back of that</td>
<td>Facilitator, examples of previous successes</td>
<td>Previous success helps</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once you’re given the chance, plus the anxiety conference was a big success, people want more of it</td>
<td>Being able to demonstrate success creates more opportunities</td>
<td>Previous success helps</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When we’ve had these horrible incidents and managed to do good work, and then that gets fed back right to the top, that’s then raised our profile</td>
<td>Facilitator – making the most of opportunities to show good work</td>
<td>Support from senior leaders raises profile of EP team</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall 39 codes  
Agreement on 30= 76.92% (77%)
Appendix 20: Emergent themes review

Candidate themes were discussed with research supervisor before constructing final thematic networks. Amendments made can be seen below, including changes to candidate theme names and ordering of themes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Theme One</th>
<th>Organising Theme</th>
<th>Basic Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Psychologists' (EP) views of behaviour</td>
<td>Behavioural needs</td>
<td>Internalising, Externalising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Link between behaviour and social, emotional and mental health (SEMH) needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Underlying psychological approaches</td>
<td>Psychodynamic (attachment, relational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neurological and executive functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humanistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eco-systemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Behaviourist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interactionist – flexible, needs and context dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views on labelling</td>
<td>Positive aspects</td>
<td>Negative aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualisation</td>
<td>Create empathy for child or young person (CYP)</td>
<td>Underlying causes and drivers of behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Behaviour as communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specific contextual influences on behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning appropriate intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences between primary and secondary schools</td>
<td>Contextual changes leading to behaviour changes</td>
<td>Prevalence of behaviour cases in secondary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased mental health needs in secondary schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Global Theme Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Theme</th>
<th>Organising Theme</th>
<th>Basic Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EP views of behaviour practice</td>
<td>Distinctive contribution of EP</td>
<td>Focus on change&lt;br&gt;Contextualised and holistic view&lt;br&gt;Emotional support and empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agency views of EP role</td>
<td>EP remit&lt;br&gt;Purposes of EP involvement&lt;br&gt;Increasing acceptance of EP involvement in behaviour work</td>
<td>Paker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current practice</td>
<td>Consultation&lt;br&gt;Observation&lt;br&gt;One-off assessment&lt;br&gt;Statutory assessment and individual casework&lt;br&gt;Group work&lt;br&gt;Intervention&lt;br&gt;Systemic and organisational work&lt;br&gt;Reactive work&lt;br&gt;Preventative work&lt;br&gt;Preferences for working</td>
<td>Future directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities for development</td>
<td>More consultation and intervention&lt;br&gt;Early intervention&lt;br&gt;Focus on specific targeted behaviours&lt;br&gt;Child-centred approach&lt;br&gt;Joined-up, multi-agency work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Global Theme Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Theme</th>
<th>Organising Theme</th>
<th>Basic Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barriers and pressures</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>EPS&lt;br&gt;Schools&lt;br&gt;LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuts to services</td>
<td>CYP's needs being missed&lt;br&gt;Lack of specialist services and provisions&lt;br&gt;Reduced capacity in schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of multi-agency cooperation</td>
<td>Competition&lt;br&gt;Lack of c-ordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the EPS</td>
<td>Management&lt;br&gt;Staffing&lt;br&gt;Part-traded funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different perception of the EP role</td>
<td>Differing views of behaviour&lt;br&gt;Narrowing and misperception of EP role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA changes</td>
<td>Academisation&lt;br&gt;EHC process&lt;br&gt;Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Limited opportunities for EP and schools to develop good working relationships&lt;br&gt;Limited range of work&lt;br&gt;Work not embedded in schools&lt;br&gt;Staff not released</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Global Theme Four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Theme</th>
<th>Organising Theme</th>
<th>Basic Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td>Good relationships with schools</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Broader range of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilising opportunities and challenges</td>
<td>Critical incident work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OFSTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive perceptions of the EPS</td>
<td>Demonstrating previous successes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valued within the LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing the EP team</td>
<td>Positive response to work from schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-agency work</td>
<td>Associate EPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant EPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing size of team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other agencies</td>
<td>The LA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EP views of behaviour

- Behavioural needs
  - Unlabelled psychological adrocracy
  - View on labelling
  - Contextualisation
  - Differences between primary and secondary schools

### EP views of behaviour practice

- Distinctive contribution of EP
- Other agency views of EP role
- Past practice
- Current practice
- Future directions
- Priorities for development

### Learners and pressures

- Financial
- Cuts to service
- Lack of multi-agency co-operation
- Changes to the EPS
- Different perceptions of EP role
- Local authority changes
- Time

### Facilitators

- Good relationships with schools
- Utilising opportunities and challenges
- Positive perceptions of the EPS
- Developing and expanding the EP team
- Multi-agency work

### Additional changing perceptions of EP role

- Changing perceptions
- A multi-agency approach
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SECTION A - SUMMARY OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL
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<table>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7. Year of Study</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10. Title of Project:</td>
<td>An investigation into educational psychologists’ intervention for behavioural difficulties in school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11. Project Submission Date:</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12. Fieldwork visit dates</td>
<td>Start Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13. Geographic location(s) where the project will be carried out:</td>
<td>... Educational Psychology Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14. Student Signature:</td>
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</tr>
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</table>

The following section to be completed by the SUPERVISOR
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>A15. Assessed Risk Level</th>
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<th>High</th>
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<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
<td><strong>A17. Date</strong></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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**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 EPs presently respond to student behaviour management concerns?
2. What psychological theory and approaches inform these responses?
3. How do EPs envisage the development of their practice and the responses of the service to these concerns?

**Academic justification:**

Psychological conceptualisations of, and political responses to, behavioural difficulties have been subject to change, with a present emphasis on discipline and regulating student behaviour in schools. Although educational psychologists (EPs) may support schools with these issues, there is a mixed picture in the research literature over how this may be achieved e.g. work with individual pupils, groups or systemic organisational work (Fallon, Woods & Rooney, 2010). Previous unpublished research by this researcher has found that EPs frequently work reactively with individuals and feel there is a place for more preventative, systemic work; however, this can conflict with the expectations of school practitioners. Furthermore, as the context of EP work changes with an increase in service trading, it may be that EPs must explicitly outline what work they can offer to schools, in order to negotiate their involvement and agree on aims and outcomes collaboratively. This research aims to explore what EPs in one service already do with regard to behaviour management, and explore and implement possibilities for service development in their delivery of behaviour management support to schools.

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

**Project Design:**

The project will be conducted in one local authority (LA) educational psychology service, taking an action research design and using the Research and Development in Organisations (RADIO) framework (Timmins et al., 200 and 2006). This was selected as an appropriate means of both investigating practices within the organisational context of an educational psychology service and developing the service’s behaviour management provision, in collaboration with the EPs working there.

**Data Collection Methods:**

- Initial semi-structured interview with the principal educational psychologist (PEP) of the service, to explore the organisational context and priorities/capacity for service development.
- Semi-structured focus group with EPs working in the service to explore conceptualisations of behavioural difficulties, how EPs presently respond to them, and ideas for how the service might develop its’ provision. Focus group chosen as a means of exploring individual experiences and views in a supportive environment to facilitate sharing of ideas as a team.
- Working group to discuss findings from interview/ focus group and agree on ideas for development.
- Unstructured research journal to record observations and reflections throughout the research, which can be viewed on request by participants.

**Sampling:**

Purposeful convenience sampling of EPs working within the LA, on an opt-in basis.

**Method(s) of Analysis:**

Interview and focus group data will be audio-recorded, transcribed and analysed using Braun and Clarke’s (2006) stages of thematic analysis.

**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/](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

- 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)

6
1

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

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

---

* The person with learning difficulties has appropriate support within the setting from accredited support workers or family members.

6 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.
* You must complete a separate Fieldwork Risk Assessment form C.1 Fieldwork visits \(^7\) (If you will not make any fieldwork visits, tick the alternative items in C.2)

## 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.

### Fieldwork Statement

I confirm:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>✔️</th>
<th>I will not travel outside the UK or my home nation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>I will not visit any country where the Foreign and Commonwealth Office has issued a warning against travel (^8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>the fieldwork does not require overnight stays in hotels or other types of public temporary accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>public and private travel to and from the research location(s) are familiar to me and offer no discernable risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>I will carry only necessary personal items when travelling to, and within, research locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>no specific vaccinations are required / I have had specific vaccinations required to undertake this research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>first aid provision and a trained first aider are available where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>the fieldwork will be carried out within normal working hours (^9) at a time convenient to participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>I will not give out personal telephone information to participants, or owners of secondary data resources, in relation to the research project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>I am fully aware of, and sensitive to cultural and religious practices of participant groups, and will act accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>this research will not involve fieldwork visits to private homes, other than to those of friends or relatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^7\) Fieldwork visits involve travel to research locations off campus to collect data.


\(^9\) For example, in the UK normal working hours are between 8am and 6pm Mon-Fri inclusive.
this research will not involve fieldwork visits to organisations’ premises, other than those with which I have an existing established relationship through placement, employment or volunteering.

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

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

OR

I am making fieldwork visits but I am unable to tick ALL the criteria above, I have therefore completed a separate full Fieldwork Risk Assessment (FRA).

C.2 No Fieldwork visits

Fieldwork Statement

I confirm:

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

C.3 Student Declaration:

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

Signature:

[Signature]

Date: 18/07/16

Name (in capitals): CONSTANCE ELEANOR LAW

C.4 Supervisor Declaration:

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

Signature:
LOW Risk Fieldwork Declaration:

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 authorised viewing.

For full details see http://www.hra.nhs.uk/resources/applying-for-reviews/
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 \(^{11}\)) and all supporting documents \(^{12}\), 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](mailto: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.

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 \(^{13}\).
- 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 \(^{14}\) 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

---

\(^{11}\) [http://www.seed.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/miestudenthome/integrityethics/](http://www.seed.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/miestudenthome/integrityethics/)

\(^{12}\) Supporting documents’ include recruitment adverts/emails, draft questionnaires / interview topic guides, information sheets and consent forms.

\(^{13}\) This does not include research in locations where children are present if they are not the focus of the research.

\(^{14}\) 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
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)\(^\text{15}\) and all supporting documents\(^\text{16}\), 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](mailto: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.

---

**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\(^\text{17}\)

---

\(^{15}\) This document and guidance can downloaded from [http://www.seed.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/miestudenthome/integrityethics/](http://www.seed.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/miestudenthome/integrityethics/)

\(^{16}\) ‘Supporting documents’ include recruitment adverts/emails, draft questionnaires / interview topic guides, information sheets and consent forms.

\(^{17}\) A reasonable person would agree that the study includes no issues of public or private objection, or of a sensitive nature.
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

D 3.3 Research context

I confirm (tick as appropriate):

√ I am not in a position to coerce potential participants/secondary data owners

√ the research involves no vulnerable group (as indicated in question B3).

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)18 and all supporting documents19, 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

---

18 This document and guidance can downloaded from http://www.seed.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/miestudenthome/integrityethics/

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

**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**

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

**Researcher skills/checks**

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

**Rights of participants**

- √ participant information sheets (PIS), consent forms, questionnaires, and all other documentation relevant to this research have been discussed with supervisor/tutor named in A.5
- √ PIS and consent forms have been confirmed with the supervisor named in A.5, as covering required headings illustrated in the MIE Participant Information and consent templates, AND that they are 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

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

Research output

- √ the only publication/output from this research on my practice or research methods study will be my assignment or dissertation.
- √ 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\(^{20}\) do not correspond to ALL items in the LOW Risk Fieldwork Declaration, a separate Fieldwork Risk Assessment form has been completed and approved.
- This secondary research assignment/project has appropriate resource or database access permissions.
- I will act as custodian for data used for any study that results in a publication (Masters/PhD dissertation or other output) and will arrange for archiving of data with MIE for a minimum period of 5 years.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please specify:</th>
<th>Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number submitted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed RREA form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student research proposal, or equivalent, on which the assessment is based(^{21})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed and approved Fieldwork Risk Assessment form - 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

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.

\(^{20}\) Fieldwork visits involve travel to research locations off campus to collect data.

\(^{21}\) 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 (e.g., assignment description) is required.
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.

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:

---

22 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.
This ethical approval application form has been revised to incorporate changes made to the new University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) Form. It has been designed to incorporate prompts for information needed to ascertain whether the proposed research matches MIE’s research template pre-approved by UREC and to facilitate completion of the form to a standard that will allow speedier review, and approvals, by RIC members. Please follow all directions contained in this document.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Student:</th>
<th>Constance Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student ID (quoted on library/ swipe card):</td>
<td>7103154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:constance.law@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk">constance.law@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Supervisor:</td>
<td>Kevin Woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kevin.a.woods@manchester.ac.uk">kevin.a.woods@manchester.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme (PhD, Prof Doc, Med, PGCE, MSc, BA etc):</td>
<td>D.Ed.Ch.Psychol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year of Study</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</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>An investigation into educational psychologists’ intervention for behavioural difficulties in school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Recruitment and Data Collection** | **Start Date:** On receipt of confirmation of ethical approval  
**End Date:** |
| **Location(s) where the project will be carried out:** | ... Educational Psychology Service |
| **Student Signature:** | ![Signature] |
| **Supervisor Signature:** | **Date:** |

** Supervisor signature confirms that the student has the relevant experience, knowledge and skills to carry out the study in an appropriate manner
SECTION 2: PROJECT DETAILS

(Please write your answers in the boxes provided. Boxes will expand to fit answers as necessary)

1. Aims and Objectives of the Project

1.1 Research Question

(1) How do EPs presently respond to student behaviour management concerns?
(2) What psychological theory and approaches inform these responses?
(3) How do EPs envisage the development of their practice and the responses of the service to these concerns?

1.2. Academic justification

Psychological conceptualisations of, and political responses to, behavioural difficulties have been subject to change, with a present emphasis on discipline and regulating student behaviour in schools. Although educational psychologists (EPs) may support schools with these issues, there is a mixed picture in the research literature over how this may be achieved e.g. work with individual pupils, groups or systemic organisational work (Fallon, Woods & Rooney, 2010). Previous unpublished research by this researcher has found that EPs frequently work reactively with individuals and feel there is a place for more preventative, systemic work; however, this can conflict with the expectations of school practitioners. Furthermore, as the context of EP work changes with an increase in service trading, it may be that EPs must explicitly outline what work they can offer to schools, in order to negotiate their involvement and agree on aims and outcomes collaboratively. This research aims to

2. Methodology

2.1 Project Design:

The project will be conducted in one local authority (LA) educational psychology service, taking an action research design and using the Research and Development in Organisations (RADIO) framework (Timmins et al., 200 and 2006). This was selected as an appropriate means of both investigating practices within the organisational context of an educational psychology service and developing the service’s behaviour management provision, in collaboration with the EPs working there.

2.2 Data Collection Methods:

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

2.2.1. Interviews  
Yes  √  No
Initial semi-structured interview with the principal educational psychologist (PEP) of the service, to explore the organisational context and priorities/capacity for service development (see Appendix 1). Semi-structured focus group with EPs working in the service to explore conceptualisations of behavioural difficulties, how EPs presently respond to them, and ideas for how the service might develop its provision. Focus group chosen as a means of exploring individual experiences and views in a supportive environment to facilitate sharing of ideas as a team. To include discussion around stimulus materials (see Appendix 2) and will cover areas outlined in provisional focus group schedule (see Appendix 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2.2. Questionnaires</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>√</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No questionnaire element to research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2.3. Observations</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>√</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No observations planned at the present time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2.4. Diary</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unstructured research journal to record observations and reflections throughout the research, which can be viewed on request by participants (see Appendix 4).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2.5. Intervention</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>√</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No intervention element involved in research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2.6. Assessments</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>√</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No assessment element involved in the research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2.7. Other</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>√</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No additional research methods to be used other than those stated above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2.8. Does data collection use video or still image?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>√</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If Yes, complete the VASTRE documentation - Available from: <a href="http://www.seed.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/miestudenthome/integrityethics/stillimageresearch/">http://www.seed.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/miestudenthome/integrityethics/stillimageresearch/</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.9 Research Experience
2.3 Sampling

What type of sampling method do you propose to use?

2.3.1. Statistical

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

Statistical sampling will not be used, owing to the small-scale context for the research which will involve participants in one educational psychology service only.

2.3.2. Other

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

As an invitation to act has been issued from this educational psychology service as part of the research commissioning process within the D.Ed.Ch. Psychol programme, it has been decided that participation in the research will only be open to practitioner psychologists working within this service. Therefore, purposive opportunity sampling will be used, in that all members of this team will be issued with an invitation to participate, but participation will be on an opt-in basis and will only include those practitioners who are willing to take part. The proposed sample size will be between 4 and 7 participants, including the PEP of

2.4 Analysis method

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

2.4.1. Quantitative analyses

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

No quantitative data analysis will be used.

2.4.2. Qualitative analyses

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

Interview and focus group data will be audio-recorded, transcribed and analysed using Braun and Clarke’s (2006) stages of thematic analysis.
2.5 Ethical Issues

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

Informed consent: prospective participants will be provided with information sheets (Appendices 5 and 6) detailing what their involvement with the research would be, as well as being informed about the research by the researcher in a team meeting. There will be opportunities to address questions to the researcher, and participation will be opt-in (Appendices 7 and 8). Consent will be informed and voluntary.

Beneficence: participation in the research provides a continued professional development opportunity for practitioners as well as ensuring that they are involved in changes and future directions for service delivery. Behaviour management is also an issue of interest to the EP profession more widely and this research will hopefully have real-world utility.

Anonymity: in order to protect the identity of the service, practitioners and any service users referred to, all identifying information will be anonymised and known only to the researcher. This also supports participants in their dual role as psychological practitioners, who need to be mindful of the interests and protection of their service users.

Protection from harm: no sensitive issues will be discussed throughout the research and participants will be reminded of their right to withdraw from the research without attracting negative consequences. The research will be presented to participants as being free from judgement of the work done by the service or individuals, and that the aim is not to evaluate or critique their performance as practitioners but to involve them in meeting a pre-identified service development need.

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>4-7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>Male and female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age group(s)</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location(s)</td>
<td>Practitioner psychologists working within the identified service</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

No vulnerable groups will be asked to participate in the research.

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

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

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

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

I will immediately notify the AEF if my DBS status changes

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

See Appendix 9 for confirmation of intention to proceed from link EP at the organisational fieldwork site.
4.2 Participant recruitment

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

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

Invitation to work with the service has been issued from a practitioner working there, as part of the research commissioning process on the researcher’s programme of study.

4.2.2. Who will the potential participants be?

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

I have met with the link practitioner from the service, along with my university supervisor, on three occasions to discuss possibilities for the research and to share updates from the service and university. No other professional or personal relationships between the researcher and potential participants exist.
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>[ ]</td>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ √ ]</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Website/internet (including Facebook/other social media site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ √ ]</td>
<td>Presentation at meeting or similar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| [ ] | Other (describe here):  

I will attend a team meeting at the service and speak to potential participants about the research, give all relevant information and provide an opportunity to ask questions.

This will be followed up by providing emailed or hard copies (as preferred by the service) of a participant information sheet containing all relevant information and contact details for the researcher and supervisor (Appendix 5).

Consent will be obtained through a written consent form (Appendices 7 and 8) which will be returned to the researcher by email or in hard copy as preferred by participants prior to data gathering beginning.

See Appendices 10 and 11 for email to participants text and notes for presenting research at a team meeting.

### Append text of letters / emails/ posters / advertisements / presentation etc

Information giving will be undertaken by:

| [ √ ] | the researcher |
| [ ] | someone in a position of authority |
| [ ] | a neutral third party to known or named client groups |
| [ √ ] | Other (describe here): Link psychologist working within the service, who presented original research pitch during the research commissioning process. |
4.2.5 Information accessibility

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

The researcher will consult with participants about their preferred method of communication and whether augmentation or alternative means of any kind will be necessary.

Where any such need arises, it will be possible to utilise disability access facilities at the service location.

Please confirm:

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

4.2.6 Decision period

Participants will be given two weeks after being provided with information in the team meeting and distribution of information sheets and consent forms, to make decisions about participating.

4.2.7 Incentives
4.2.8 Avoiding coercion

No vulnerable groups will be approached to participate in the study. However, all prospective participants will be informed that their participation is entirely voluntary and that consent is on an opt-in, not opt-out, basis. They will also be informed of anonymity and confidentiality safeguards in place and that they can withdraw from the research at any point.

4.3. Consent

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

- Implied consent - return/submission of completed questionnaire
- ✔ 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:

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

4.3.2 Special arrangements

There are no special arrangements for consent taking that are pertinent to this study.

5. Participation in the research

5.1 Duration

Principal educational psychologist will be asked to take part in one semi-structured interview, which will last 30-60 minutes.

Other practitioners working within the service will be invited to take part in one semi-structured focus group, lasting between 60 and 90 minutes.

All participants will be given the opportunity to take part in a working group, which would meet to hear feedback on the findings from the interview and focus group (30-60 minutes), and collaboratively identify next steps for development and actions to plan, implement and evaluate (number and length of meetings to be agreed by the group). It is anticipated that time allocated for CPD within the service would be made available for these meetings to take place.

5.2 Benefits to participation
Opportunities for CPD and involvement in service development, as well as broader professional interest in the area of behaviour management and an opportunity to discuss practice with colleagues.

5.3 Deficits to participation

No benefits or services would be withheld from participants as a consequence of participation. All data gathering would take place during working hours at the service office, in order to minimise inconvenience to participants.

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

No risks of potentially adverse physical effects, inconvenience or changes in routine to participants have been identified.

6.1.2 Safeguards

Health and safety guidelines at the service’s office (e.g. fire regulations, comfort breaks) will be adhered to at all times.

6.2 Psychological risks

6.2.1 Potential

No topics of a personal nature will be discussed during the interview or focus group, with discussions focusing on practice and individual perspectives. It is possible, although not deemed likely, that discussions around practice could cause some discomfort to participants, particularly if it is felt that their approaches are being negatively questioned or judged by colleagues or the researcher.

6.2.2 Safeguards

Potential participants will be made aware of the aims and format of the research before making decisions about participation, and it will be made clear that the research does not aim to evaluate the performance of the service or individuals and that no judgements are being made. Opportunities will be given for participants to ask questions and time will be made to build rapport between the researcher and participants (e.g. when collecting consent forms), in order to promote emotional safety and reduce risks of psychological harm. Participants will have the right to withdraw from the research at any stage, and will be encouraged to seek appropriate supervision should any emotional or practice issues arise during the research. All identifying information of participants, the service and any service users referred to, will be anonymised, and an expectation of confidentiality to time and place will be established at the beginning of the interview and focus group.

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.

Please see attached RREA form.

There are no specific identified physical or psychological risks to the researcher undergoing this research, and all measures identified in the RREA will be adhered to, including safe travel arrangements, carrying a contact card and seeking supervision with my University supervisor throughout the research process.

6.4 Early termination of the research

6.4.1 Criteria

The PEP of the service withdraws permission for the study to take place or continue.
Less than one third of the team members elect to take part in the research.

6.4.2 Please confirm, by ticking here, that:

√ 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
- √ Publication of direct quotations from respondents
- Publication of data that might allow identification of individuals
- √ 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?

- Manual files
- Home or other personal computers
- √ Laptop computers
7.2 Confidentiality of personal data

After consenting to participate, participants will be assigned a number which will be used to replace their name in all written records throughout the research. Any names and other identifying information will be changed or anonymised.

All data collected will be stored on an encrypted data stick, which will be kept by the researcher and submitted to the University supervisor as the data custodian once the research has been completed.

7.3 Research monitoring and auditing

Please confirm:

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

No other arrangements are in place

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:

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

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

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

**n/a**  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

No other arrangements apply.

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

No other arrangements apply.

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

No other arrangements apply.

7.8 Use of data in future studies

Will the data be stored for use in future studies?

- Yes
- No

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

8. Reporting Arrangements

8.1 Dissemination

How do you intend to report and disseminate the results of the study?

(Tick all that apply)

- Peer reviewed scientific journals
- Book / Chapter contribution
- Published review (ESRC, Cochrane)
- Internal report
- Conference presentation
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>National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Contact</td>
<td>NCTL, Piccadilly, Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Approximately £32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>36 months</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>Total Number</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection instruments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft copy of <strong>each</strong> data collection instrument named in Q2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Questionnaire, Interview guide, etc)</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes focus group stimulus material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video and Still Image Recording Declaration (VASTRE)</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant recruitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter(s) of permission to conduct research within <strong>each</strong> organisation</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment advertisement(s) specified in Q4.2.1</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(poster/email/letter/presentation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Information giving – one <strong>for each</strong> participant type specified in Q3.1</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Information sheet/letter/email/script)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consent taking – one **for each** participant type specified in Q3.1 (Consent form or alternative procedure) | ✓
---|---
Fieldwork risk assessment | 1
Fieldwork Risk Assessment Form (approved) | ✓
REA form Low Risk Fieldwork Declaration (Section C) completed | ✓

SECTION 3: MINOR AMENDMENT TO RESEARCH PROJECT

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.

**Application for Approval of Minor Amendment** 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.

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

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.

---

23 Minor amendments are those that do not alter the character of the research or the participant groups
Appendix 22: Ethical approval confirmation email

Ethics Approval Application - CONFIRMATION for Medium Risk

Ethics Education <ethics.education@manchester.ac.uk>

Max 15/06/2016 11:21
Constance Law Kevin Woods <kevin.woods@manchester.ac.uk>

Flag for follow up. Completed on 27 April 2016.

Dear Constance
Ref: PGR/71091546-Thesis
Project Title: An investigation into educational psychologists’ intervention for behavioural difficulties in school.
I am pleased to confirm that your ethics application has now been approved by the School Research Integrity Committee (RIC) against a pre-approved UREC template.
If anything untoward happens during your research then please ensure you make your supervisor aware who can then raise it with the RIC on your behalf.
This approval is confirmation only for the Ethical Approval application.
Regards,
Georgia Irving
Appendix 23: Prospective participant information meeting presentation

Behaviour Management Action Research

...EPS

Introductory Session 01/11/16

My background and interests

• Trainee Educational Psychologist (Year 2) – studying at Manchester University and on placement with ... EPS.

• Previous work experience as a ChildLine counsellor, and a TA in a mainstream primary and SEN secondary school – all involved the support of young people with different internalising and externalising behavioural difficulties.

• Sparked in interest in the topic of behaviour management.

• UoM Research Commissioning Process – identified a topic relating to the role of the EP with regards to behaviour management.

Rationale for present research

• Prevalence of behaviour problems in schools (4-14% of pupils) according to DfE, 2010: up to 38 days of teaching time lost per school year (DfES, 2014) and negative outcomes associated with these: e.g. loss of teaching time and lower academic attainment, teacher stress, long-term negative outcomes for pupils and poor relationships between teachers, pupils and families.

• DfE 2016 – Schools have a responsibility to “promote good behaviour, self-discipline and respect” – connotations of external control and behavioural regulation.

• How this is to be achieved by schools is debatable – policy “swings” between external control and behavioural measures to consideration of social/ emotional wellbeing and improving quality of teacher/ pupil relationships.

What are the implications for EPs?

• Literature identifies that EPs may work at different levels – individual, group, organisation – with the application of varying psychological paradigms.

• Although EPS are an identified support service for schools in relation to behaviour management, there is therefore a mixed picture as to how this is achieved at present.

• Coincides with changing context of EP work – increased service trading and needing to meet the needs of school “customers”) provide “value for money” as well as “market” the possibilities effectively.

• Raises overall questions of how are EPs currently working with behavioural difficulties, and what might future directions for practice be?

AI

• Initial exploratory research project as a pilot for thesis research

• Focus group with 3 EPS in a large rural service

• Aims were to explore EPS views on externalising behaviour management difficulties and their role in supporting pupils, schools and families around these.

Key findings included:

• Mixed perceptions as to the utility of ‘labeling’ behaviour

• EPS can make a distinctive contribution by re-framing behaviours in new ways: facilitating alternative understandings of ‘difficult’ behaviours through taking holistic and developmental perspectives, challenging negative constructs of behaviour

• EPS can be involved with behaviour at a range of levels – individual pupil, group and organisational levels – and in preventative and reactive capacities. However, various barriers mean that the EP role is often invited to reactive work with individual children rather than systemic, capacity building work

• The identification of future areas for practice, including an increase in preventative and systemic work (including schools placing increased value on these aspects of EP work), greater individualisation of curriculum and behaviour measures to meet individual needs and an increased emphasis on emotional safety in schools.

• An unanswered question was how EPS services might develop to meet perceived needs, nor did the study consider internalising difficulties/ mental health.
Research Questions

1. How do EPs presently respond to student behaviour management concerns?

2. What psychological theory and approaches inform their responses?

3. How do EPs envisage the development of their practice and service responses to these concerns?

4. What are the facilitators and barriers to service development in this area?

- Research design and methodology
  - Action research using Research and Development in Organisations (RADIO) model
  - Has previously been used to good effect in EP systemic work
  - Investigative and developmental phases – scope to both explore what is already being done by the team, consider how the service’s offer to schools could be developed and establishing future directions

- Data gathering methods
  - Investigative phase – interview with principal or senior EP/ focus group with EP participants – used to explore existing approaches and practice, contextual factors and gather views on future practice
  - Feedback on findings to participant group
  - Developmental phase – using findings, group to discuss ideas for future practice e.g. packages to offer schools, with scope to develop, implement and evaluate this work

- What are the benefits to taking part in the research?
  - Opportunities to share and discuss current practice with colleagues – peer supervision element
  - Opportunities to contribute to service development agenda – CPD aspect
  - Support of the TEP and university supervisor (Kevin Woods) over the course of the project

Next steps...

- Ethical approval has been granted
  - Distribute participant information sheets - hard copy and electronically
  - Opportunity to consider the information and ask questions
  - If you would like to participate, then please complete the consent form and return it to me via email or in person on subsequent visit
  - Liaison over dates for initial data gathering
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EP Participant Information Sheet

An investigation into educational psychologists’ intervention for behavioural difficulties in school

You are being invited to take part in a research study as part of a student project. This project will explore educational psychologists’ approaches to behaviour management concerns and future directions for practice, and 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 taking the time to read this.

Who will conduct the research?

Eleanor Law, a Trainee Educational Psychologist at the University of Manchester.

What is the purpose of the research?

The project will take an action research design, and will both investigate current practice around behaviour management support within the service, and explore ways in which the service might develop its offer to schools. It therefore aims to explore the views and experiences of some practitioner EPs regarding how they conceptualise behavioural difficulties, some of the behavioural problems they may encounter in practice, the approaches they may take to supporting and managing such concerns, and their ideas for the development of service delivery in this area.

Why have I been chosen?

You have been chosen because you are currently working as an educational psychologist within the local authority.

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

You would be asked to take part in a focus group, alongside other EPs within your service. The discussions will centre on some of the behavioural concerns that you have experienced within your practice, the approaches you may have taken in these cases, and your thoughts on future developments for practice within the service. It is not anticipated that there will be any risks towards participants who take part in the research. Should any distress or discomfort occur, participants are free to withdraw from the research and are advised to seek supervision regarding practice issues.

Following the focus group, you would be invited to participate in a group meeting where findings from the data will be disseminated, which would be followed by group discussions regarding further developments of the service’s offer to schools, and to plan and implement agreed actions as a team.

What happens to the data collected?

The data will be digitally recorded, transcribed by the researcher and analysed for themes. Written notes from the discussions, which will be recorded anonymously on a large sheet in view of participants, will also be used to support the exploration of themes and an overall
view of the experiences described. This data will be written up as an article for publication, forming part of the researcher’s thesis.

**How is confidentiality maintained?**

It is requested that participants do not refer to schools, adults or pupils by name. All recorded data will only be heard by the researcher, and will be transcribed anonymously so that individual participants cannot be identified from the transcript. Digital recordings will be deleted after transcription. All data and personal information will be securely stored.

**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 financial reward is offered for participating in the research.

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

Your participation will principally be to take part in the focus group which should between 60 and 90 minutes. Once the data from this focus group and an interview with the PEP of the service has been transcribed and analysed, participants will be invited to attend a dissemination meeting and participate in a working group to summarise what is already being done in relation to behaviour management, what the needs of service users are understood to be, and to agree actions for developing service delivery in this area.

**Where will the research be conducted?**

The research will be conducted at the Educational Psychology service, at a date and time which is mutually convenient for participants and the researcher.

**Will the outcomes of the research be published?**

The outcomes of this piece of research will be written up in the form of an article for publication.

**Who has reviewed the research project?**

Ethical approval has been obtained from the University of Manchester Research Ethics Committee.

**What if something goes wrong?**

Participants will have the right to withdraw from the research at any time, and are not required to supply contributions to the focus group unless they feel comfortable to do so. Any questions regarding the research are welcomed, and can be addressed to the researcher. Should any issues arise regarding practice, participants are advised to seek supervision within their service.

**What if I want to complain?**

If there are any issues regarding this research you should contact the researcher in the first instance at constance.law@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk. However, if you would prefer not to
discuss with the researcher, please contact the research supervisor at kevin.a.woods@manchester.ac.uk.

If you wish to make a formal complaint about the conduct of the research you can contact a Research Governance and Integrity Manager, Research Office, Christie Building, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL, by emailing: research.complaints@manchester.ac.uk or by telephoning 0161 275 2674or 275 8093

How can I contact you?

Eleanor Law: constance.law@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk
Kevin Woods: kevin.a.woods@manchester.ac.uk 0161 275-3512
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You are being invited to take part in a research study as part of a student project. This project will explore educational psychologists’ approaches to behaviour management concerns and future directions for practice, and 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 taking the time to read this.

Who will conduct the research?

Eleanor Law, a Trainee Educational Psychologist at the University of Manchester.

What is the purpose of the research?

The project will take an action research design, and will both investigate current practice around behaviour management support within the service, and explore ways in which the service might develop its offer to schools. It therefore aims to explore the views and experiences of some practitioner EPs regarding how they conceptualise behavioural difficulties, some of the behavioural problems they may encounter in practice, the approaches they may take to supporting and managing such concerns, and their ideas for the development of service delivery in this area.

Why have I been chosen?

You have been chosen because you are currently working as the principal educational psychologist within the local authority.

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

You would be asked to take part in an individual interview, lasting around one hour. The discussions will centre on the organisational context of the service, what the needs of service users relating to behaviour management currently are and how they are responded to by EPs and your thoughts on future developments for practice within the service. It is not anticipated that there will be any risks towards participants who take part in the research. Should any distress or discomfort occur, participants are free to withdraw from the research and are advised to seek supervision regarding practice issues.

Following the interview, you would be invited to participate in a group meeting where findings from the data will be disseminated, which would be followed by group discussions regarding further developments of the service’s offer to schools, and to plan and implement agreed actions as a team.

What happens to the data collected?

The data will be digitally recorded, transcribed by the researcher and analysed for themes. Written notes from the discussions, which will be recorded anonymously on a large sheet in view of participants, will also be used to support the exploration of themes and an overall
view of the experiences described. This data will be written up as an article for publication, forming part of the researcher’s thesis.

**How is confidentiality maintained?**

It is requested that participants do not refer to schools, adults or pupils by name. All recorded data will only be heard by the researcher, and will be transcribed anonymously so that individual participants cannot be identified from the transcript. Digital recordings will be deleted after transcription. All data and personal information will be securely stored.

**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 financial reward is offered for participating in the research.

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

Your participation will principally be to take part in the interview which should last around one hour. Once the data from this interview and an EP focus group has been transcribed and analysed, participants will be invited to attend a dissemination meeting and participate in a working group to summarise what is already being done in relation to behaviour management, what the needs of service users are understood to be, and to agree actions for developing service delivery in this area.

**Where will the research be conducted?**

The research will be conducted at the Educational Psychology service, at a date and time which is mutually convenient for participants and the researcher.

**Will the outcomes of the research be published?**

The outcomes of this piece of research will be written up in the form of an article for publication.

**Who has reviewed the research project?**

Ethical approval has been obtained from the University of Manchester Research Ethics Committee.

**What if something goes wrong?**

Participants will have the right to withdraw from the research at any time, and are not required to supply contributions to the focus group unless they feel comfortable to do so. Any questions regarding the research are welcomed, and can be addressed to the researcher. Should any issues arise regarding practice, participants are advised to seek supervision within their service.

**What if I want to complain?**

If there are any issues regarding this research you should contact the researcher in the first instance at constance.law@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk. However, if you would prefer not to
discuss with the researcher, please contact the research supervisor at kevin.a.woods@manchester.ac.uk.

If you wish to make a formal complaint about the conduct of the research you can contact a Research Governance and Integrity Manager, Research Office, Christie Building, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL, by emailing: research.complaints@manchester.ac.uk or by telephoning 0161 275 2674 or 275 8093

How can I contact you?

Eleanor Law: constance.law@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk

Kevin Woods: kevin.a.woods@manchester.ac.uk 0161 275-3512
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Appendix 25: Participant consent forms
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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 project 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 and without detriment to my treatment/service/self.

3. I understand that my data will remain confidential

4. I understand that the focus group will be audio-recorded.

5. I agree to the use of anonymous quotes.

I agree to take part in the above project

Name of participant ____________________________ Date ____________________________ Signature ____________________________

Name of researcher ____________________________ Date ____________________________ Signature ____________________________

This Project Has Been Approved by the University of Manchester’s Research Ethics Committee [PGR-7103154-Thesis].
An investigation into educational psychologists’ intervention for behavioural difficulties in school

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

Please initial box

1. I confirm that I have read the attached information sheet on the above project 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 and without detriment to my treatment/service/self.

4. I understand that my data will remain confidential

4. I understand that the interview will be audio-recorded.

5. I agree to the use of anonymous quotes.

I agree to take part in the above project

Name of participant ____________________ Date _______________ Signature ________________

Name of researcher ____________________ Date _______________ Signature ________________

This Project Has Been Approved by the University of Manchester’s Research Ethics Committee [PGR-7103154-Thesis].
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Appendix 26: Full thematic networks

**Key**

Thematic network structure adapted from Attride-Stirling (2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global theme 1</th>
<th>EP views of behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global theme 2</td>
<td>EP views of behaviour practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global theme 3</td>
<td>Facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global theme 4</td>
<td>Barriers and pressures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EP views of behaviour practice

Distinctive contribution of EP

Focus on change

Contextualised and holistic view

Emotional support and empowerment

Past practice

Training

Therapeutic work

Systemic and organisational work

More group and systemic work

Group work

Reactive and preventative work

Statutory assessment and individual casework

Current practice

Observation

Intervention

More preventive work

Organisational development

More therapeutic work

More consultation

Possible future directions

More systemic work

More joined-up, multi-agency work

Priorities for development

More consultation and intervention

Early intervention

Focus on specific targeted behaviours

Child-centred approach

Joined-up, multi-agency work

Past practice

Therapeutic work

Reactive and preventative work

Systemic and organisational work

Current practice

Training

Group work

Observation

Intervention

Potential directions

Organisational development

More therapeutic work

More joined-up, multi-agency work

Priorities for development

More consultation and intervention

Early intervention

Focus on specific targeted behaviours

Child-centred approach

Joined-up, multi-agency work

Past practice

Training

Group work

Observation

Intervention

Potential directions

Organisational development

More therapeutic work

More joined-up, multi-agency work

Priorities for development

More consultation and intervention

Early intervention

Focus on specific targeted behaviours

Child-centred approach

Joined-up, multi-agency work

Past practice

Training

Group work

Observation

Intervention

Potential directions

Organisational development

More therapeutic work

More joined-up, multi-agency work

Priorities for development

More consultation and intervention

Early intervention

Focus on specific targeted behaviours

Child-centred approach

Joined-up, multi-agency work

Past practice

Training

Group work

Observation

Intervention

Potential directions

Organisational development

More therapeutic work

More joined-up, multi-agency work

Priorities for development

More consultation and intervention

Early intervention

Focus on specific targeted behaviours

Child-centred approach

Joined-up, multi-agency work
Facilitators

- Changing perceptions of the EP role with behaviour
  - Increasing acceptance of EP involvement in behaviour work
    - Trust
    - Transparency
    - Broader range of work

- Good relationships with schools
  - Demonstrating previous successes
  - Valued within the LA
  - Positive responses to work from schools

- Positive perceptions of the EPS
  - Critical incident work
  - Networking
  - OfSTED

- Utilising opportunities and challenges
  - Increasing capacity and range of activities
  - Broadening and expanding the workforce

- Developing the EP team
  - Collaborative relationships with other agencies
  - Strategic role within the LA

- Multi-agency work
  - Professional development
Barriers and pressures

Financial constraints
- EPS
- Schools
- LA

Cuts to services
- CYPs' needs being missed
- Lack of specialist services and provisions

Challenges of multi-agency co-operation
- Competition

Changes to the EPS
- Staffing structure and management changes

Different perceptions of the EP role
- Differing views of behaviour

LA changes
- Changes to systems and processes

Time
- Limited opportunities for EP and schools to develop good working relationship

Limited range of work
- Limited staff availability and capacity

Limited range of work
- Reduced capacity in schools

Part traded funding
- Purposes of EP involvement

Management
- Limited range of work
Appendix 27: Dissemination CPD activity materials

Slide 1

CPD Input
EPs and Behaviour

Slide 2

University of Manchester
Thesis Structure
Prepare 2 papers for publication
• Systematic literature review (T1)
• Empirical report (T2)
• Dissemination paper (T3)
• CPD focus on T1
• “The representation of the management of behavioural difficulties in EP practice”

Slide 3

Background
• Broad and varied definitions of behaviour
• Key approaches to managing behaviour and underlying psychological paradigms are subject to change over time
• Implications for agencies working to support children, schools and families with these concerns
• T1 focus – how do EPs represent their behaviour work in the literature?
Slide 4

**T1 scope**
- Peer reviewed papers published between 2000-2017
- Final review included 12 studies
  - 1 investigation
  - 11 evaluations

---

Slide 5

**Key findings**

**Levels of EP activity (Fallon, Woods & Rooney, 2010)**

**Individual level work**
- Individual child e.g. video self-modelling (Regan & Howe, 2017); narrative therapy (Hannen & Woods, 2012)
- Individual teaching assistants e.g. video interaction guidance (Hayes, Hindle & Grayson, 2011)

**Group level work**
- Teachers e.g. group consultation (Hayes & Stringer, 2016)
- Therapeutic groups for pupils e.g. CBT (Gilligan & Cunningham, 2011; Squires, 2001)
- Whole class (Brown, Powell & Clark, 2012)

**Organisational level work**
- In schools e.g. behaviour management action research (Hayes, Hindle & Withington, 2007)
- In EP teams (Hart, 2010)

---

Slide 6

**Key findings**

**Core functions of the EP role**
- **Consultation** – discrete activity (group consultation), pre-intervention with staff and pupils
- **Assessment** – pre- and post-intervention measures; establishing levels of needs
- **Intervention** – individual, group, organisation
- **Research** – professional development activities, action research, contributing to evidence-based practice
- **Training** – knowledge transfer, coaching, in vivo supervision of staff to build capacity
Key findings
Psychological paradigms

- Hart, 2010 – prevalence of behavioural approaches, but also systemic, relational, attachment, humanist etc.
- Integrative, multi-paradigmatic approaches adopted by EPs – context dependent, apply what is most helpful
- Prevalence of relational and social constructionist psychology

Implications

- Range of possible approaches, with application of multiple paradigms and social constructionist/ relational perspectives – links to models of professional practice
- EP practice affected by contextual factors – needs, staffing, service trading
- Integration of behaviour/ SEMH

Activity 1

- Reflections on own practice at individual, group and organisational levels
Activity 2

• 3 groups (individual, group, organisation)

• SWOT analysis of EP behaviour practice for one of the above levels