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Abstract

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) calls for education to prepare children for ‘...responsible life in a free society, in the spirit of understanding, peace, tolerance, equality of sexes, and friendship among all peoples, ethnic, national and religious groups and persons of indigenous origin’ (UN, 1989, p.9). This thesis examines the potential role of Educational Psychologists (EPs) in addressing the UNCRC call to promote community cohesion through their work in schools.

A systematic review of recent international research into the effects of psychology-based educational approaches promoting community cohesion was undertaken. The review, structured by the PRISMA framework, identified 13 studies examining the effects of approaches to community cohesion. Analysis of these studies yielded insight into approaches to community cohesion, which may be best promoted through educational approaches that have both knowledge and process-based components and through a multi-level approach, which takes into account the individual and their relationships as well as the relationships between community groups and the individual’s participation in their community.

An empirical study with an Educational Psychology Service (EPS) in the North West of England was undertaken. This consisted of an Appreciative Inquiry cycle of four focus groups exploring ways in which an EPS could envisage promoting community cohesion. Findings from the empirical study suggest that an EPS supporting community cohesion is facilitated by aspects of current EP practice including values and by EPs knowing their school communities. EPs reflecting on their own positionality regarding community and culture may also be a facilitator.

Dissemination to EP practice was considered, both at the research site as well as within the profession more generally. A multi-level approach was generated in which dissemination to practice through journal publication, conference presentations and continued contribution to a working group of regional EPSs was planned alongside dissemination through the design and delivery of training packages for schools. Deliberation over whether adopting a children’s
rights-based approach could help to maintain focus on community cohesion through times of changing government priorities was discussed.
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Introduction

Aims of the research

The overall aim of the research was an exploration of the potential role of psychology and educational psychologists (EPs) in the promotion of community cohesion. The systematic literature review described in Paper 1 was guided by the literature review questions: (1) What psychology-based activities and/or interventions do schools use to promote community cohesion? and (2) What, if any, impact do these interventions have on community cohesion? The empirical research in Paper 2 used an Appreciative Inquiry approach and aimed to address the research questions: (1) In what ways can an EPS envisage contributing to the promotion of community cohesion? and (2) What are the potential facilitators and barriers to the promotion of community cohesion through EP practice?’ Paper 3 considered the concepts of evidence-based practice and practice-based evidence and outlines a dissemination strategy for the research.

Research strategy

The researcher undertook a pilot study looking at the views of EPs of their current practice working with communities and cohesion promotion. The pilot was based in a town with high levels of segregation and community conflict in its recent history. Findings included that EPs focused primarily on individual casework and appeared to be in the early stages of developing a shared discourse on community (Jackson Taft, 2016). Initial scoping of the literature found very little published research on the role of EPs in promoting community cohesion. The existing literature was limited to theoretical pieces on how an EP may support the development of Forrest and Kearns’ (2001) ‘domains of social capital’ in an educational setting (Hayes, 2002, p.77), and anti-racist policy development (Burman, 1988). Empirical research by Smith (2002; 2005) conducted in Northern Ireland on the role of the EP in supporting community cohesion recommended the use of a narrative psychology approach (Smith, 2005), and a multi-level model (Smith, 2002), though there has been no published research on the utility of this model for practice as yet. It followed that a starting point for EPs developing community cohesion promotion could be research conducted with an educational psychology service (EPS) to
consider their current and potential work in the area. Whilst the development of practice was the focus, the research adopted an action research approach, to aim to create a tangible change at the research site, as well as to advance knowledge in this area (Lewin, 1946).

**Ontology and epistemology**

This research was undertaken with a social constructionist epistemology; hence knowledge is viewed as socially constructed. The position was taken that each individual has access to their own subjective experience and that each individual’s construction of reality is equally valid, with no account being more ‘truthful’ or accurate than another. This research was conducted with language as the primary concern; as Potter and Wetherell argue (1987) if ‘speech is a form of action performed in discourse between individuals, then we are forced to take the social context into account.’ Discourse, be it verbal or written both describes and constitutes action and is ‘therefore about what can be said and thought, but also about who can speak, when, where and with what authority. Discourses .... constitute subjectivity and power relations’ (Ball, 1990, p.17). This research takes the position that the close examination of the discourses that maintain existing power differentials can be the starting point for action and change.

The discourses around ethnicity, culture and community hold within them histories of inequality, oppression and subjugation. The author therefore acknowledges that the deployment of these terms (among others) can be problematic. This research uses some terms in favour of others, but acknowledges the historical and cultural locatedness of these terms, and anticipates that they will be viewed differently by others both now and in the future. Hence, this research does not use the term ‘race’ as this has historically been used to signify a genetic or biological component of ethnicity which lacks convincing evidence (Zack, 2002). Rather, the research uses ‘community’, ‘culture’ and ‘ethnicity’. ‘Community’ refers to groups of people living, working, socialising, worshipping or being educated alongside each other. The wider ‘culture’ connects groups of people beyond their immediate communities with culturally transmitted factors e.g. traditions, dress, language. This research uses the term ‘ethnicity’ when discussing issues that may impact on individuals differently because of their ethnic heritage, regardless of their community or culture.
Action research (AR) and social constructionism may at first glance seem incompatible. The roots of AR as defined by Lewin could be construed as being positivist, acting on a real world within which to enact a ‘concrete change’ (Lewin, Lippett & White, 1939). Lincoln (2001) argues that current AR and social constructionism share many fundamental aspects, including seeking to disrupt common modalities of power by arguing that a social world is constructed of the individual experiences of individuals. Since there is no hierarchy of subjective experience, each individual’s constructions are equal, and equally valid. Similarly action research denies that any agenda has priority over another, and seeks to empower those who have the greatest stake in the results of any research, i.e. the participants (Lincoln, 2001). It was hoped with a social constructionist prioritisation of a plurality of viewpoints, along with an AR participatory design, that issues of power and language may come to, and remain at the fore of the research.

Axiology

Inequality pervades and arguably enables the structures of society, and the researcher acknowledges the extent to which she has benefitted from this inequality. In her semi-rural village, the local school served a predominantly White British community with children from a similar socio-economic background to the researcher. Five miles away in the local town, minority ethnic communities were served by separate schools, with factors including housing policy maintaining the segregation of communities later identified in the Cantle report (2001).

Alongside many of her community peers, the researcher benefited from the academic success of her local school and went on to study for a degree. Whilst away at university in 2001, when the researcher’s home town experienced community conflict and riots, the researcher was able to watch from a safe distance on the TV. After training as a teacher, the researcher lived and worked in a large city, with its cultural and ethnic diversity and (from the researcher’s perspective) resultant community cohesion. Upon moving back to her home village, the researcher was struck by the lack of cultural diversity once more. The researcher found herself financially benefiting from living in a predominantly White British community and saw property prices rise unprecedentedly, whilst the local town centre was described as the most deprived in
the country. Long-held concern about issues of inequality were thrown into sharp relief by the guilt associated with benefiting from a system weighted (in many ways) in the researcher’s favour. The researcher admits that this guilt has resulted in frustration at the systems that support inequality.

Whilst social constructionists may be concerned with the meanings and interpretations that people ascribe to inequality (Harris, 2006) the researcher also pays heed to objective measures of socio-economic factors that would support the notion that structural, systemic inequalities pervade society. For example, 40% of people from a minority ethnic background live in low income households, twice the rate of their majority group counterparts (Department for Work & Pensions [DWP], 2014). The link between community cohesion and inequality is made clear in the Cantle review (2006), ‘It has to be accepted by all that community cohesion initiatives will not succeed while stark inequalities across and between communities remain.’ (Cantle et al., 2006).

Whilst the researcher acknowledges her positioning regarding inequalities pertaining to ethnicity and community, and that these concerns led her to select the research area, efforts were made to separate the impetus to carry out the research from the data collection and analysis processes. Utilising an Appreciative Inquiry (AI) framework, the research aimed to generate a full picture of ‘the best of what is’ within community work in the EPS. This became the starting point for imagining the ways in which an EPS might develop this work. The analysis of the data adopted a ‘bottom up’ or inductive thematic analysis with complete, orthographic coding of the data set (Braun & Clark, 2013), aiming to ensure that the analysis was data driven (see Appendix 5). The process of undertaking a systematic literature review will have inevitably influenced the data analysis however, and any researcher bias when developing themes cannot be entirely eliminated (Braun & Clark, 2006). Mitigating these effects was the aim of a final member checking meeting with the participants after initial coding and theming had occurred, with further comments on coding, subthemes and themes taken into account for the final analysis.
Alternative research designs were considered, with particular thought given to trialling a community cohesion intervention, such as those discussed in paper one. A consideration of the appropriate outcome measures for this type of research, as well as the necessity of agreeing a definition of community cohesion, yielded reflections upon the located nature of these discussions and the importance of context. This study therefore has taken a more constructionist stance, looking at the contexts which give rise to different definitions of peace and cohesion, and how psychology and psychologists may contribute to those discussions.
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Abstract

Article 29 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) and its associated General Comment (No.1), states that education for children should contain ‘...the preparation of the child for responsible life in a free society, in the spirit of understanding, peace, tolerance, equality of sexes, and friendship among all peoples, ethnic, national and religious groups and persons of indigenous origin’ (UN, 1989, p.9). One way schools can meet this requirement is through their work to promote community cohesion. This paper presents a systematic review of recent international research into psychologically based approaches that schools use to promote community cohesion within their setting. In this, any work that explicitly sets out to promote peace or cohesion or is designed to reduce community conflict is characterised as an approach to the promotion of community cohesion. From three social science databases, the review located 13 relevant studies evidencing knowledge and process-based approaches to community cohesion work across intrapersonal, interpersonal, intergroup and community levels. Community cohesion may be best promoted through educational approaches that have both knowledge and process-based components and through a multi-level approach, which takes into account the individual and their relationships, as well as the relationships between community groups and the individual’s participation in their community. Implications of these findings are discussed for both theory and practice, and future research priorities are identified.

Keywords
Community cohesion; social cohesion; peace education; school psychology; educational psychology

Introduction

The duty of schools in England to promote community cohesion first appeared in the 2006 Education and Inspections Act but was not mentioned in the 2011 Education Act and was no longer inspected by Ofsted after 2010 when the coalition government came to power. By 2010 many schools reported an increasing confidence around how to promote community cohesion
in their local context through both the curriculum and through extracurricular activities or events (Department for Education [DfE], 2011a). Since then, events in the UK have continued to highlight community cohesion issues. Domestic terrorism is on the rise with the recent Westminster and Finsbury Park mosque attacks in London, and the Manchester Arena bombing all committed by UK citizens. Following the 2016 UK vote to leave the European Union (EU) in the “Brexit” referendum, recorded racially or religiously aggravated hate crime doubled in England and Wales (Independent, 2017). Alongside increasing segregation of both housing (Guardian, 2016) and in schools (Schooldash, 2017), child sexual exploitation, racism, Islamophobia and the rise of the far right, children and young people are being affected by manifold community tensions.

Contribution of psychology

Social psychology has been, since its beginnings, ‘driven by the wish to gain basic knowledge on the social psychological dynamics of intergroup conflict, and a desire to facilitate more harmonious intergroup relations between and within societies’ (Nadler & Schnabel, 2006, p.2). Psychology offers models of both community conflict and cohesion and so is well placed to offer theoretical frameworks and an evidence base for interventions to both mitigate the effects of community conflict and to promote community cohesion. The psychology underpinning interventions to promote peace and community cohesion is geographically and historically located and is borne of different models of group processes, conflict and peace.

Models of inter-group relations

Social categorisation theory is defined by Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1985) and Self-Categorisation Theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher & Wetherell, 1987) and takes a cognitive approach based on two premises, the first being that people organise their social world by categorising, and second: by categorising, ingroup-outgroup distinctions are formed, since the individual either belongs to a group or not. The Contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954) posits that greater contact between groups will lead to greater intergroup cohesiveness. Through structured intergroup contact opportunities, group identities remain salient in order for the contact to be perceived by group members as positive intergroup, not merely interpersonal,
contact (Brewer, 1996). Policy in Northern Ireland (NI) in the late 20th century was based on Tajfel’s social identity theory and the Contact Hypothesis in that contact between Catholic and Protestant groups was hoped to promote community cohesion over time by encouraging mutual understanding (Mac Ginty, Muldoon & Ferguson, 2007). Smith (2002) conducted a case study in NI across several schools, asking teachers, pupils and parents what schools did that influenced community relations. Whilst schools operated systems of contact with different communities in practice the success of the contact between Catholic and Protestant students depended on many contextual factors such as the culture of the school, individual biases of teachers and the already-held beliefs of the pupils (Smith, 2002). Smith found that community conflict was often characterised by teachers as interpersonal or intrapersonal in order to sidestep issues of group conflict (Smith, 2002). Smith argued that when trying to bring about systemic change as in the case of promoting community cohesion, a failure to take into account the deeper cultures of the system would ultimately result in failure of the system to adopt the change. Smith recommended a multi-layered model of systemic, community intervention which takes into account the different values of the staff, children and local communities in order to bring about lasting change (Smith, 2002). In a later study a narrative approach was used by Smith (2005) to inform peace education policy by analysing children’s peace poems using narrative psychological framework.

Models of community cohesion

After the North West of England 2001 riots the UK government commissioned the Cantle report: ‘Community cohesion: a report by the independent review team’ (Cantle, 2001). In the report, cohesion is quantified using Putnam’s concept of social capital, that is ‘features of social organization, such as networks, norms, and trust, that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit.’ (Putnam, 1993). Forrest & Kearns’ eight domains of social capital build upon this definition and are termed: ‘Participation, empowerment, associational activity and common purpose, supporting networks and reciprocity, collective norms and values, trust, safety and belonging’. These eight domains are recommended by Hayes as a framework for Educational Psychologists to structure work to support community cohesion in schools (Hayes, 2002).
Identity and models of radicalisation

If radicalisation is taken to mean the ‘process by which a person comes to support terrorism and extremist ideologies associated with terrorist groups’ (DfE, 2015, p.21) then a further contribution of psychology is the way in which it can give us an insight into the processes by which an individual may come to be radicalised. Psychodynamic thinking has attempted to explain radicalisation through a ‘splitting’ process in which traumatic or dysfunctional childhoods can prevent individuals from integrating their own perceived ‘good’ and ‘bad’ traits, projecting the ‘bad’ onto others in society (Post, 1998). Identity crisis, or uncertainty around one’s identity has also been identified as a risk factor for violent extremism with those with multiple, sometimes conflicting identities potentially most at risk (Meah & Mellis, 2006). Some research suggests that those with uncertainty around their identity may be more likely to identify with a larger group with clear structures and aims (Hogg, Sherman, Dierselhuis, Maitner & Moffitt, 2007). At a group level, cognitive biases may present risk factors for extremism (Lilienfeld, Ammirati & Landfield, 2009). Cognitive biases can be present in all groups and contribute to ‘us’ versus ‘them’ thinking such as confirmation bias, i.e. the overrepresentation of evidence that supports our preconceptions (Lilienfeld et al., 2009). Moral disengagement theory describes radicalisation as a social-cognitive process through which the individuals socialised and long held morality around violence and harm to others is slowly replaced by a new morality which allows them to undertake acts that would previously have caused psychological discomfort (Bandura, 1999).

The role of schools and colleges in promoting community cohesion

In a rapid literature review on the role of colleges in promoting community cohesion the Learning and Skills Council in England found that Further Education (FE) colleges can play a key role in community cohesion through breaking down barriers to social inclusion and promoting greater participation (LSC, 2007). The review found that the colleges often facilitated contact between diverse communities through the curriculum and through extra-curricular events and made strong partnerships with external agencies to promote participation and inclusion e.g. Community Cohesion Partnerships (LSC, 2007).
In the 2010 UK government report ‘Community Cohesion and the Prevent Duty: How have schools responded?’ over 800 UK schools were surveyed about their knowledge of and response to both the Prevent duty and the duty to promote community cohesion. The study found that schools had higher levels of awareness of the statutory duty to promote community cohesion and were less aware of the Prevent duty (DfE, 2011a). These findings were replicated by Rowe, Horsley, Thorpe and Breslin (2011) in that schools were found to have responded positively to promoting community cohesion. Most schools felt that they promote community cohesion through a balance of curriculum content and one-off awareness events and had a ‘fair amount of knowledge’ about the duty (DfE, 2011a, p.30). Similar to the FE picture, since the duty had become statutory schools had developed partnerships with external organisations to promote community cohesion e.g. local charities, community groups, the police or a school with a different demographic profile (DfE, 2011a).

A further rapid literature review, ‘Teaching methods that help to build resilience to extremism’, published by the DfE in 2011, found evidence that colleges were using a variety of approaches which they categorised as ‘cognitive behavioural initiatives, mentoring and counselling approaches, knowledge based initiatives, peer mediation and conflict resolution approaches, family based approaches, community based approaches and opportunities provision’ (DfE, 2011b). They argue for a multi-modal approach, utilising partners from different agencies and working on systemic and environmental factors as well as addressing the attitudes and behaviours of at risk individuals (DfE, 2011b).

As part of the counter-terrorism strategy CONTEST, the Prevent duty calls upon professionals to ‘have due regard to the need to prevent people being drawn into terrorism’ (DfE, 2015, p.3). This duty calls upon professionals working with the public, and particularly with young people, to be vigilant to the outward signs of ‘radicalisation’ and ‘extremism’ (DfE, 2015, p.5). The Prevent strategy defines extremism as: ‘vocal or active opposition to fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect and tolerance of different faiths and beliefs.’ (DfE, 2015, p.5).
The Prevent duty became statutory in 2015 containing the requirement to promote ‘fundamental British values’ (DFE, 2015). Through the Prevent Duty, the UK government compels professionals working with children to monitor young people for signs of opposition to ‘fundamental British values’. Whilst the DfE’s advice states ‘It is important to emphasise that the Prevent duty is not intended to stop pupils debating controversial issues.’ (DfE, 2015, p.5), it may be taken as an indicator of school staff requiring more support in this area that Channel, the programme designed to identify and support those at risk of being drawn into terrorism had over 400 referrals made for children under 10 between January 2012 and December 2015 (BBC, 2016). A study undertaken into the effects of Prevent in schools and colleges found that there was ‘widespread discomfort and uncertainty’ around the teaching of ‘fundamental British values’, particularly the impact of labelling values, such as tolerance, as British. The study also found concerns about how the Prevent duty may stigmatise British Muslim children and young people (Bushe, Choudhury, Thomas & Harris, 2017).

Since the duty to promote community cohesion moved from the agenda there is little research around what schools currently do to promote community cohesion and what psychological theory and research this is based upon. This literature review aims to find out what psychology-based interventions to promote community cohesion are being used in education settings and what, if any, is the impact of these interventions.

**Method**

**Systematic literature review questions**

1. What psychology-based activities and/or interventions do schools use to promote community cohesion?

2. What, if any, impact do these interventions have on community cohesion?
Data sources and literature search strategy

The literature review used the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework (Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff & Altman, 2009) to structure the search and review of papers.

The electronic databases Education Resources Information Centre (ERIC), ETHOS and PsychInfo were searched for published articles with theses and dissertations on psychology-based interventions to promote community cohesion during December 2016. The following search terms were used:

Table 1: Search Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group One</th>
<th>Group Two</th>
<th>Group Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school OR teacher OR college OR</td>
<td>Anti-bias OR anti-racism OR community cohesion OR</td>
<td>psychology OR psychological OR psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community cohesiveness OR citizenship OR equali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ty OR multiculturalism OR peace education OR racism OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social cohesion OR social cohesiveness OR peace OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these articles reference harvesting was undertaken, and relevant journals were also hand searched.
Table 2: Inclusion Criteria

1. The research evaluates education-based work to promote community cohesion.
2. The community cohesion work or intervention is based on or refers to a psychological approach.
3. The research involves primary data.
4. The research focuses on interventions delivered through an educational institution i.e. school, college or university.
5. The research is published in a peer-reviewed journal or is a doctoral thesis or dissertation.
6. The research was published between 2010 and 2016.

All studies meeting the inclusion criteria in Table 2 were subject to three levels of evaluation; as outlined in Gough (2007). The studies were first evaluated in terms of their methodological quality (weight of evidence A), second in terms of their methodological appropriateness (weight of evidence B) and finally according to the appropriateness of their focus in light of the literature review questions (weight of evidence C) (Gough, 2007).

The methodological quality was assessed using the research quality criteria checklists devised and used by Bond, Woods, Humphrey, Symes and Green (2013) which have been extensively used in a range of recent systematic reviews (e.g. Bond & Robinson, 2017; Fayette & Bond, 2017). For reliability, 25% of the papers were rated by the researcher and her supervisor, with subsequent discussions to achieve consensus. Papers were evaluated as being of low, medium or high methodological quality by being allocated the lower, middle or higher third of the available total points respectively.

Methodological appropriateness was assessed using the devised criteria in Table 3 and a rating of low was assigned for 50% or fewer of criteria achieved, medium for 75% and high for 100%. The appropriateness of focus was assessed using the criteria in Table 4. The three scores for each paper were then combined to give an overall high, medium or low grade.

22 studies met the inclusion criteria and of these 13 studies were judged to be of high or medium quality and so were included in the literature review.
Table 3: Methodological appropriateness (Weight of Evidence B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigation</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Clearly defined participant sample</td>
<td>- Clearly defined participant sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clearly defined aims/measures</td>
<td>- Clearly defined outcome measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inclusion of qualitative data</td>
<td>- Clearly described intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Intervention implemented by school staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Appropriateness of focus (Weight of Evidence C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>An evaluation of the impact of an intervention delivered in a school or other educational setting.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>An investigation with some links to interventions delivered through an educational setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>An investigation with no explicit links made to an intervention.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

The numbers of articles found and screened are shown in the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow chart (Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff & Altman, 2009) (Figure 1).

Figure 1: PRISMA Flow Chart of Included and Excluded Studies

13 papers were yielded through the process: one quantitative study, two mixed methods studies and ten qualitative papers. Of these, five were doctoral theses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study and location</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Research aims</th>
<th>Activity (Level)</th>
<th>Summary of findings</th>
<th>Weight of evidence A</th>
<th>Weight of evidence B</th>
<th>Weight of evidence C</th>
<th>Overall weight of evidence D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frizzell (2016)</strong></td>
<td>Twenty 10 and 11-year-old students; one classroom teacher; elementary school.</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Student views on peace education unit.</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Positive student response with increase in literacy skills, understanding of conflict. Students felt ambivalent about adult arbitration and vulnerable during resolving conflict.</td>
<td>Medium 8.75/14</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Haas (2016)</strong></td>
<td>Five teachers using IWitness</td>
<td>Qualitative (narrative) interview study</td>
<td>Teacher views on the impact of IWitness on the development of empathy</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Gains in empathy through deeper historical understanding and care for others in society.</td>
<td>Medium 9/14</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study and location</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Research aims</td>
<td>Activity (Level)</td>
<td>Summary of findings</td>
<td>Weight of evidence A</td>
<td>Weight of evidence B</td>
<td>Weight of evidence C</td>
<td>Overall weight of evidence D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akar (2016) Lebanon</td>
<td>435 students from 13 Lebanese private schools</td>
<td>Social constructionist open inquiry</td>
<td>Impact of civic education on students concept of citizenship</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Typical civic education pedagogy contradicted students notions of active citizenship Civics curriculum</td>
<td>High 9.5/14</td>
<td>Medium – no clearly defined outcome measures, participant sample from private schools only</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosen &amp; Salomon (2011) Israel</td>
<td>956 tenth grade Israeli-Jewish students from seven Israeli and 9 Palestinian high schools</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental factorial design with a pre-test-post-test-repeated measures design.</td>
<td>Investigate changes in core and peripheral beliefs after a year-long peace intervention</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Peripheral beliefs about the others’ collective narrative changed and changed back in the post-test. Core beliefs unchanged. Pathways into Reconciliation, a 10th grade program to increase tolerance, acceptance of other side, mutual respect of rights, equality and social justice.</td>
<td>High 4.75/8</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study and location</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Research aims</td>
<td>Activity (Level)</td>
<td>Summary of findings</td>
<td>Weight of evidence A</td>
<td>Weight of evidence B</td>
<td>Weight of evidence C</td>
<td>Overall weight of evidence D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voight (2015) USA</td>
<td>Teams of 6-8 students, one each from grades 6, 7, and 8 (ages 11 to 14)</td>
<td>Single case, holistic study design</td>
<td>Evaluate student voice programme impact on school climate</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Gains in citizenship competencies, relationships with staff. But possible ingroup-outgroup dynamic with participants and others. Youth participatory student voice programme.</td>
<td>Medium: Qualitative: 8.5/14 Quantitative: 4.5/8</td>
<td>Qualitative - low (no outcome measures; intervention implemented by researcher) Quantitative - low (no qualitative data linked to the quantitative data)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, Hunter &amp; Hollywood (2015) UK, Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Trainee teachers in sixteen schools</td>
<td>Thematic analysis of qualitative data.</td>
<td>Staff perceptions’ of using Epartners as a means to encourage community cohesion</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Teachers focused on non-contentious work and on task completion rather than on more difficult aspects of community cohesion arising from the collaborative work. Epartners - an ICT project designed to facilitate collaboration through ICT between schools.</td>
<td>Medium 6.5/14</td>
<td>Medium - outcome measures not clearly defined.</td>
<td>Medium - little evaluation in terms of promoting community cohesion</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study and location</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Research aims</td>
<td>Activity (Level)</td>
<td>Summary of findings</td>
<td>Weight of evidence A</td>
<td>Weight of evidence B</td>
<td>Weight of evidence C</td>
<td>Overall weight of evidence D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aly, Taylor &amp; Karnovsky (2014) Australia, Perth region</td>
<td>15 and 16 and involved in the gifted and talented programme; in the Islamic school some modules were trialled with year 9 (age 14).</td>
<td>Qualitative evaluation</td>
<td>Student and staff evaluations of the Beyond Bali Education Programme</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Increased empathy with victims and self-efficacy in resisting violent extremism influences. Programme uses moral disengagement theory and moral development theory to build resilience to extremist narratives.</td>
<td>Low 1.75/14</td>
<td>Medium - Participant sample and outcome measures not clearly defined</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauritzen (2013) Kenya</td>
<td>One district; two rural schools, two urban schools; staff and students.</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Evaluating role of education in peace building in Kenya</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Some influence on peace building. Barriers: perceived relevance, ownership of peace education; perception of national policies; drivers of conflict in schools. Taught curriculum of themes including patriotism, inclusion/exclusion, communication, emotions, empathy, conflict resolution.</td>
<td>High 10/14</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study and location</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Research aims</td>
<td>Activity (Level)</td>
<td>Summary of findings</td>
<td>Weight of evidence A</td>
<td>Weight of evidence B</td>
<td>Weight of evidence C</td>
<td>Overall weight of evidence D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Najjuma (2011) Uganda, Northern district</td>
<td>Local government staff and staff and students from two primary schools</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Evaluating the peace education part of an education reform programme (REPLICA)</td>
<td>Systemic</td>
<td>Minor gains in awareness of consequences of violence and nonviolent conflict-resolution strategies but no evidence of changes in empathy, or other competences for nonviolent conflict resolution.</td>
<td>High 9.25/14</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd, Spanierman &amp; Poteat (2011) USA</td>
<td>538 White undergraduate college students</td>
<td>Multilevel longitudinal growth modelling</td>
<td>Investigating the 'psychosocial costs' to white students (white fear, guilt and empathy)</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Diversity experiences were associated with the psychosocial costs.</td>
<td>High 11.5/15</td>
<td>Medium - no qualitative data</td>
<td>Medium - investigation with some links to 'diversity' courses and experiences.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study and location</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Research aims</td>
<td>Activity (Level)</td>
<td>Summary of findings</td>
<td>Weight of evidence A</td>
<td>Weight of evidence B</td>
<td>Weight of evidence C</td>
<td>Overall weight of evidence D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meshulam &amp; Apple (2014) USA</td>
<td>Staff, parents and founders of an anti-racist school</td>
<td>Ethnographic case study</td>
<td>To evaluate staff attitudes in an anti-racist school.</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Successful where issues of power were reflected on. Less successful in tackling inequality in the wider society. Anti-racist, two-way bilingual, multicultural school.</td>
<td>Medium 5.5/14</td>
<td>Medium – no clearly defined aims</td>
<td>Medium - the 'intervention' is the setup of the school as an anti-racist school.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engel, Kington &amp; Mlezcko (2013) UK, West-Midlands</td>
<td>Staff at infant and junior school</td>
<td>Critical communicative research case study</td>
<td>As part of cross-national EU funded study investigated strategies for inclusion and social cohesion</td>
<td>Systemic</td>
<td>Gains in school, family, community relationships improved cohesion in the wider community. Barriers included lack of space, funding issues and legislation around safeguarding in schools. Initiatives including inviting parents and the local community to participate in school activities, providing family and community education classes.</td>
<td>High 9.5/14</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium - some links made to the interventions employed.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall quality of the included studies varied with seven high quality studies, five medium quality studies and one study of low methodological quality. Of the included studies only two were investigations and the rest (eleven studies) were evaluations of an intervention or approach to the promotion of community cohesion. Sample sizes ranged from five teachers (Haas, 2016) to 956 tenth-grade students (Rosen & Salomon, 2011). Interventions varied from whole school approaches to classroom delivered interventions and small group work. The outcome measures used were mostly qualitative which renders comparison of the different approaches more difficult.

Findings

The studies included in this review vary greatly in terms of their psychological content and approach, duration and type of work to promote community cohesion as well as differences between the target groups. This review will therefore group the studies into knowledge-based or process-based approaches. Process-based approaches will then be grouped according to whether they target the intrapersonal (through internal processes), the interpersonal (processes between individuals), intergroup (the processes between groups) and participatory (those that link the individual to their community).

Knowledge-based

Recent studies include interventions that are knowledge-based, including taught content around historical conflict. In Kenya, Lauritzen, (2013) evaluated the impact of Kenya’s Peace Education Programme (PEP) which was developed in response to the post-election violence of 2007-2008 in Kenya. Through a case study design, the study found that a taught curriculum of themes including patriotism, inclusion and exclusion and communication could have a positive impact on ‘peace-building’ but that some schools included in the study were undertaking activities that could potentially fuel conflict, including the avoidance of the direct teaching of politics and the dominance of ‘teacher-centred’ classrooms in which young people were not encouraged to participate or share their views. Lauritzen distinguishes between schools ‘preaching peace’ (delivering ideas), ‘teaching peace’ (equipping young people with skills) and
‘practising peace’ (fostering peace on all levels: inner peace, peace within interpersonal relationships and democratic involvement of young people in decisions that affect them) (Lauritzen, 2013, p.196). Lauritzen’s research found that when all three levels are employed then peace education is most effective and ‘preaching peace’ alone is the least effective.

There is further evidence to suggest that a teacher-centred approach may not be appropriate in promoting community cohesion. Akar (2016) collected data from 435 young people in Lebanon on their notions of active citizenship and found that most conceptualised citizenship as participation in community building activities. The study also found evidence that the teacher-centred classrooms through which the civics curriculum was delivered appeared to directly undermine the civic values of democratic participation that it set out to teach (Akar, 2016). The author recommends that the teaching of citizenship should incorporate ‘engagement with individualised conceptualisations of active citizenship that students, almost inevitably, bring with them into the classroom.’ (Akar, 2016, p.309).

Similarly, Najjuma (2011) found that in Ugandan peace education lessons those participants who only experienced direct teaching of peace principles were more passive in the classroom and struggled to distinguish the content of peace education lessons from humanities lessons such as sociology. Those students who also participated in a ‘Peace Club’ in which discussion and creative expression was encouraged were more likely to take up an active role in their learning and develop skills for peace building.

Process-based

Rather than focusing on imparting knowledge around peace and community cohesion, several studies adopted a more process-based approach, focusing on intrapersonal, interpersonal or group processes.
Intrapersonal - affective

In Uganda, Najjuma (2011) used a case study approach to evaluate the effectiveness of a peace education programme (PEP) in Northern Uganda, designed to promote peace. The REPLICA-PEP (Revitalising Education Participation and Learning in Conflict affected Areas - Peace Education Programme) aims to develop cultures of peace in part by developing pupils’ emotional competencies through affective education. The study found that in practice many teachers avoided the emotional (and behavioural) content of the lessons in favour of the more cognitive and knowledge-based approaches (Najjuma, 2011). Najjuma also found that the assessment techniques for REPLICA-PEP often served more of a classroom management function than an affective function.

Intrapersonal - Identity

Makaiau (2011), in a study undertaken in a culturally diverse college in Hawaii, evaluated a bespoke curriculum intervention in which themes of identity are explored and shared by college students. The study analysed the identity narratives produced by the participants using a grounded theory approach and the findings suggest that identity is a socially constructed phenomenon. The participants explored identity through a narrative process and their identities incorporated ethnic, place and gender elements (Makaiau, 2011). Makaiau argues that in a multicultural society, individuals are more concerned with integrating aspects of wider society than individuals in a more culturally homogenous group, who may be more preoccupied with establishing their own uniqueness in their identity. The author recommends that identity interventions would ‘benefit from the professional expertise of psychologists’ due to the ‘emotional intensity’ of identity exploration for some students (Makaiau, 2011, p.299).

Intrapersonal - Cognitive

Aly, Taylor & Karnovsky (2014) conceptualise the processes behind radicalisation using Bandura’s Moral Disengagement Theory and evaluate an Australian curriculum-based
intervention, ‘Beyond Bali’ aimed at preventing radicalisation. The authors propose that an intervention to build resilience to violent narratives should address Bandura’s model of radicalisation as a ‘cognitive restructuring (of) the moral value of killing’ (Bandura, 1990, p.164) and so should:

- **Construct violent extremism as morally unjust and inhumane;**
- **Empathize with victims of violent extremism;**
- **Develop self-efficacy;**
- **Regard the harmful or negative effects of violent extremism.** (Aly et al., 2014, p.377)

The study lacks outcome measures but shows some anecdotal evidence for a positive impact on promoting empathy. The authors report that most students found interactive lessons and class discussions most useful and report some positive feedback with the caveat: ‘these excerpts are by no means a measure of the success or otherwise of the program’. (Aly et al., 2014, p.382).

**Interpersonal - conflict resolution**

Several studies outlined work to promote community cohesion through the management of personal relationships and equipping young people with the skills to address conflict through direct teaching of conflict resolution. Conflict resolution plays a large part in the PEPs evaluated by both Najjuma (2011) and Lauritzen (2013), both developed as government initiatives in response to violence in society and the consequent legitimation of violence as a means to solve interpersonal conflicts. Najjuma (2011) reported that whilst participants increased awareness of nonviolent conflict resolution strategies they did not show increased empathy, self-control or other competences for nonviolent conflict resolution. Najjuma recommends that for conflict resolution teaching to be effective it must include:

‘**Structured educational activities to build skills and values needed for conflict resolution and competencies using participative experiential approaches and facilitated storytelling and dialogue led by specially trained teachers**’ (Najjuma, 2011, p.316).

In Lauritzen’s case study schools, conflict resolution teaching had most success when delivered as part of a wider programme of initiatives facilitating the practice of the skills for conflict resolution, rather than taught as a concept (Lauritzen, 2013).
In a case study with primary aged children in the USA, Frizzell (2016) found that a peace education unit comprising a bespoke series of 12 lessons on conflict transformation was able to effect positive change on:

- Literacy and relationship skills,
- Students’ perception of themselves, their peers and the classroom culture, (Frizzell, 2016).

The students also reported feeling:

- ‘Ambivalent about adult arbitration’ which the author reported was linked to students feeling disempowered, and
- Vulnerable around resolving conflict and uncertain about the reception they might receive when using conflict transformation skills (Frizzell, 2016, p.122).

The author concludes by recommending that children and young people should be empowered to resolve conflicts independently by decreasing ‘adult arbitration’. The study acknowledges that conflict transformation requires children and young people to show vulnerability and recommends that schools should aim to ‘create a culture that is safe for vulnerability’ through conflict resolution-trained school leaders and high quality training for school staff (Frizzell, 2016, p.134).

Interpersonal – Empathy

Whilst several studies implicitly reference empathy, three studies explicitly outline work to promote community cohesion through the development of empathy. Haas (2016) (USA) evaluates the implementation of an e-learning programme (IWitness) designed to promote empathy through the direct engagement with personal testimony of Holocaust survivors and witnesses. Results showed that the teachers described increases in student empathy through perspective taking and a developed historical understanding, but the study lacks data from the students themselves. Makaiau’s (2011) study used a community service module in which students were required to undertake a project in a community other than their own over the
duration of the course, designed to build empathy with other cultures and though the results of this were not analysed alone the study as a whole found that students undertaking the identity intervention demonstrated increased empathy with different social groups.

Rosen and Salomon (2011) posit that in long-standing intractable conflicts such as in the Middle East, having empathy with the ‘other side’ or the ‘legitimation (of) the other’s collective narrative’ (Rosen & Salomon, 2011, p.136) is an indicator of peace. In a quasi-experimental evaluation of a curriculum-based intervention designed to promote empathy and understanding of the other’s narrative in the Israeli-Palestine conflict, the authors found that the year-long peace education programme was more likely to change peripheral beliefs and much less likely to change more centrally held beliefs about the ‘other’, and that these more strongly held beliefs are more likely to influence behaviour. They also found after a period of time that these peripheral beliefs that had been changed by the PEP are then likely to change back after the intervention comes to an end.

Intergroup Contact

Several studies included in this review take an approach to community cohesion that focuses on inter-group relationships and contact between diverse groups. Austin, Hunter and Hollywood (2015) evaluated the use of a structured ICT-based programme in which Catholic and Protestant schools in Northern Ireland worked together on a project through an online learning platform ‘Epartners’. The evaluation focused on the student-teachers who delivered the intervention and their university tutors rather than collecting data from the young people. The authors reported that the programme’s benefits were ‘largely instrumental’, and that any impact on community cohesion was a by-product but that the focus of the teachers on task-completion facilitated working together with other communities (Austin et al., 2015, p.6).

Todd, Poteat & Spanierman (2011) found some evidence that friendships between college students from different cultural or ethnic backgrounds promote community cohesion. Todd et al. (2011) conducted a longitudinal study into the psychosocial ‘costs’ of racism to white
students which they term ‘white guilt, empathy (and) fear’ (Todd et al., 2011, p.510). They found that whilst the student’s previously held attitudes about diversity mediated these affective costs, the diversity experiences that students experienced in college were correlated with changes in these costs. The authors found that friendships between diverse students were associated with reduced ‘white fear’ and greater ‘white empathy’. Diversity experiences through increased contact with ‘other’ communities had different impacts depending on previously held views and sometimes increased ‘white fear’. The authors state that although ‘contact and relationships under the right conditions decrease prejudice’ (Todd et al., 2011, p.519), ‘exposing individuals to diversity in and of itself does not automatically lead to positive change’ and that ‘without certain conditions of contact (see Allport, 1954), detrimental consequence may ensue’ (Todd et al., p.518). This reinforces that contact opportunities may not be enough to promote community cohesion and that thought should be given to how to the structure of contact between communities and to the already-held beliefs of the individuals.

Even carefully structured contact within an explicitly ‘anti-racist school’ can encounter difficulties in promoting community cohesion due to inequalities in wider society. In their ethnographic case study, Meshulam and Apple (2014) found that a school created on the premise of being a multicultural, bilingual school had some positive impact on community cohesion within the school by teaching about multiculturalism through diversity but also by equipping young people with the skills to interrogate the structures of power that create and recreate inequality. The authors report that the school ‘sought to generate and facilitate parental participation and representation’ as well as the participation of the wider community in curriculum development (Meshulam and Apple, 2014, p.656). Despite the schools’ ideals and success in some areas, the authors report that the school still faced challenges in addressing inequality due to structural inequality in the wider society and in socio-economic factors.
Community Participation

Recent studies have emphasised the need to include a participatory element to their work to promote community cohesion. As this review has already outlined, Lauritzen (2013) found that the participatory element of the PEP in Kenya, the ‘Peace Club’, was crucial to the success of peace education as a whole. Other studies have set out to promote community cohesion through a participatory framework. In a study investigating how a student voice initiative could be used to bring about a positive school climate in a middle school in the USA, Voight (2015) found that by using a youth participatory action research process it was possible to influence school policy changes and to develop citizenship competencies such as empathy within the school council (Voight, 2015). The author found that there were barriers to bringing about meaningful systemic change (such as changing teaching practices) rather than trivial change (Voight, 2015). The study also highlighted concerns about the student council creating intergroup tension between the student council and the rest of the student body and as a result the authors recommend that when considering a student-voice initiative “care should be taken to diversify team membership (...) it may benefit the process to include students with different behavioural records” (Voight, 2015, p.322).

In their longitudinal case study, Engel, Kington and Mleczko (2013) researched the interaction between policy at a national level and the local practice of a junior and infant school in the UK Midlands. The study found that the school system increased community and family participation by having an open-door policy, some bilingual staff and through a structured program of interventions targeting all the community and especially migrant families and women (Engel et al., 2013). The authors report that the school facilitated community and family learning on the school premises with courses on subjects such as English, adult numeracy and confidence building. The school was able to have a positive impact upon cohesion in the local community through strong leadership and a clear strategy, but there were barriers to engaging parents and the community including:
- The difficulty of appointing a culturally diverse governing body due to cultural factors such as working hours,
- Balancing an open-door policy with safeguarding concerns and police record checks,
- Relying on a consistent funding stream to support community cohesion work at a national level (Engel et al., 2013).

The authors conclude that by facilitating the participation of parents and the local community in school life the school was able to bring about increased community cohesion despite practical barriers and changes in national policy.

**Discussion**

**Overview of findings**

Whilst all 13 studies included in this review employ different approaches to promoting community cohesion through educational interventions, there are some common elements to each approach. Diversity awareness events and increased contact between people from different communities can increase empathy, but can also have the detrimental effect of increasing fear of other communities, depending on the previously held beliefs and attitudes of the individual (Todd et al., 2011). A structured approach to contact with other communities can have a positive impact on intergroup relations as a by-product of task completion (Austin et al., 2015).

Approaches which involve direct teaching through the curriculum can have the impact of contradicting the values at the heart of democratic participation (Akar, 2016) but there is some evidence to suggest that curriculum content can promote community cohesion when supported by participation in small discussion groups (Lauritzen, 2013) or when coupled with experiential learning (Aly et al., 2014). There is a note of caution: though some attitude change can be expected as a result of a structured peace education programme, this change may be superficial and not affect more deeply held beliefs which are more strongly linked to behaviour (Rosen & Salomon, 2011).
The findings of the review also provide some evidence that whilst a participatory approach to the promotion of community cohesion can benefit those involved, it can also be divisive if participatory groups are not perceived to be representative of all groups (Voight, 2015). Participatory approaches may be less effective where power sharing is not explicitly defined and supported throughout the education setting (Voight, 2015). Approaches to the promotion of community cohesion which concentrate on psychological processes, such as identity development and cognitive resilience to radicalisation, are linked to increased reports of awareness of these processes but were not linked to wider measures of community cohesion (Makaiau, 2011; Aly et al., 2014).

The wider context was found to be influential on work to promote community cohesion, either as a barrier or a facilitator. In studies of single-site practice-based research, the participants found their developing skills difficult to apply in a wider context, e.g. in their peer group or in the school (Frizzell, 2016; Voight, 2015). Furthermore, where the government agenda supports the promotion of community cohesion, there is evidence to suggest that this supports the generalisation of skills outside the classroom (Najjuma, 2011; Rosen & Salomon, 2011; Lauritzen, 2013; Aly et al., 2014; Austin et al., 2015); and, as indicated above, government directed curriculum content may not alone be enough to promote community cohesion (Akar, 2016). Even where government initiatives support the community in promoting cohesion, changing government priorities and the associated inconsistencies in funding have been a barrier to providing a legacy of long lasting approaches for community development (Engel et al., 2013).

The involvement of parents, carers and the wider community can not only promote community cohesion within the education setting (Lauritzen, 2013; Meshulam & Apple, 2014; Rosen & Salomon, 2011) but may also have positive effects on cohesion in the wider community (Engel et al., 2013). Where the drivers for social cohesion come from within the school, the school itself can be a beacon of social cohesion but the issues of inequality in the wider society can still
loom large and, if not addressed directly, can be replicated and upheld through the systems in and around the school (Meshulam & Apple, 2014).

Conceptualising psychological approaches to education-based work to promote community cohesion

It would seem that process-based approaches to community cohesion are more successful than those approaches which require learners to passively absorb information through a knowledge-based approach (Akar, 2016). Process-based approaches can be divided further into those that are targeted at one or more levels of the intrapersonal, the interpersonal, the intergroup and finally societal, through civic or democratic participation. Each of these levels of approach is underpinned by different conceptualisations of conflict and peace. Peace work at the intrapersonal level can be viewed as thought-, emotion- or identity-based. These processes can then be assumed to be amenable to intervention at a cognitive level (Aly et al., 2014), through an emotional regulation approach (Najjuma, 2011), or an identity development approach (Makaiau, 2011). Interpersonal approaches aim to achieve peace through relationships between individuals by equipping young people with greater empathy (Haas, 2011), or with tools for conflict resolution (Lauritzen, 2013; Frizzell, 2016). Long-standing conflicts such as Israel-Palestine and ‘the Troubles’ in Northern Ireland can engender a view of peacebuilding as a largely intergroup process, with positive intergroup relationships encouraged through empathy with another’s collective narrative (Rosen & Salomon, 2011), or through structured intergroup contact experiences (Austin et al., 2015). Where homeland peace has prevailed for decades, often in the Global North, community cohesion can be viewed as predicated on the contract between the individual and the state through democratic or civic participation (Lauritzen, 2013; Voight, 2015; Engel et al., 2013)

It may be that the most effective means to promote long-lasting community cohesion transcend these levels of intervention. Notably, studies within the present review showing clearer evidence of positive community cohesion outcomes, involve both knowledge and process-based approaches, and more than one level of intervention (Meshulam & Apple, 2014;
Najjuma, 2011; Lauritzen, 2013). Echoing the findings of Smith (2002), this review would argue that any approach aiming to have a significant and lasting impact on community cohesion should adopt a multi-level approach, addressing peace at each level: the intrapersonal, interpersonal, intergroup and at a community level through civic participation (see Figure 2).

Figure 2: A Multi-Level Approach to the Promotion of Community Cohesion

The current review posits that there is a role for school psychology in supporting the application of research to practice in the promotion of community cohesion through education-based interventions. School psychologists are uniquely placed to select, implement and evaluate interventions targeting intrapersonal, interpersonal and intergroup processes due to their interpersonal skills training, group work management experience and independence (see Woods & Harding, in press). The school psychologist is also well placed to offer strategic input at systemic and policy level around community cohesion through the adoption of a community psychology approach and by using models of organisational change (Woods et al., 2013; Matthews & Singh, 2015). Renewed focus on the United Nations Convention on the Rights of
the Child (UNCRC) may help school psychologists to continue to maintain focus on issues of community cohesion against a backdrop of changing governmental priorities (Woods & Harding, *in press*; Hart & Hart, 2014). It may be useful for future research to explore the potential role that school psychology can play in this area, perhaps through a participatory action research model to develop practice around promoting community cohesion.

**Limitations of the review and future research directions**

To make explicit the psychological approaches underpinning conceptualisations of peace, conflict and group processes the current literature review focused solely on approaches to the promotion of community cohesion which applied an element of psychology. As such, the review may have focused on a narrow range of community cohesion approaches. Though all of the included studies in this review have some psychological underpinnings to community cohesion, future research may focus on making these more explicit. In addition, the selection of the search terms used to find relevant research was verified between the researcher and her supervisor, but a wider process of consultation may have produced an expanded conceptualisation of community cohesion and resultant search terms. Broader search terms may also have returned more studies which evaluated intervention for community cohesion and so may have facilitated easier comparison of outcomes. This review included doctoral theses (Makaiau, 2011; Frizzell, 2016; Haas, 2016; Najjuma, 2011; Lauritzen, 2013) in which examiners are nominated, rather than through the blind peer review process of a journal, which could be considered a more rigorous form of peer review; however, this potential limitation is to some extent mitigated by this review’s independent quality assessment of each research report.
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Abstract

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of a Child (UNCRC) calls for education to prepare children for ‘...responsible life in a free society, in the spirit of understanding, peace, tolerance, equality of sexes, and friendship among all peoples, ethnic, national and religious groups and persons of indigenous origin’ (UNCRC, 1989, p.9). The current study examines the potential role of Educational Psychologists (EPs) in addressing the UNCRC call to promote community cohesion through their work in schools. Through an Appreciative Inquiry cycle EPs considered facilitators of and barriers to working with communities. Facilitators included EP practices, skills and knowledge and seeing schools as communities in themselves. Barriers included public service funding and aspects of service delivery. A multi-level approach to promoting community cohesion is put forward, including acknowledgement of the context within which the work takes place as well as positing a continuum of community cohesion to community conflict.

Introduction

This year sees the seventeenth anniversary of the 2001 riots in northern England, and with segregation still on the increase in communities and in schools, (Schooldash, 2017; Guardian, 2016) and recent attacks in London and Manchester exemplifying a rise in domestic extremism, the question of community cohesion is high on the agenda. Psychology has been concerned from its outset with the ways in which individuals and groups interact and so those hoping to promote community cohesion may look to psychological theory, frameworks and language to inform this work. This study explores the ways in which educational psychologists (EPs) can envisage promoting community cohesion and highlights ways in which EPs might begin to develop their practice in this area.

Community cohesion & education

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), which was adopted by almost every country worldwide in 1989 provides an imperative for those working in education to promote community cohesion. Article 29 and its associated General Comment (No.1) states
that education for children should contain ‘...the preparation of the child for responsible life in a free society, in the spirit of understanding, peace, tolerance, equality of sexes, and friendship among all peoples, ethnic, national and religious groups and persons of indigenous origin’ (UNCRC, 1989, p.9). Lauritzen (2013) outlined approaches to peace education and distinguished between schools ‘preaching peace’ (delivering ideas), ‘teaching peace’ (equipping young people with skills) and ‘practising peace’ (fostering peace on all levels: inner peace, peace within interpersonal relationships and democratic involvement of young people in decisions that affect them) (Lauritzen, 2013, p.196).

A rapid literature review conducted by the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) in England found that Further Education (FE) colleges played a vital role in community cohesion by facilitating greater participation, promoting contact between diverse communities, and through forming partnerships with external agencies e.g. Community Cohesion Partnerships (LSC, 2007). Schools were found to have developed their practice and responded positively to the duty to promote community cohesion (Rowe, Horsley, Thorpe & Breslin, 2011). The 2011 UK government report ‘Community Cohesion and the Prevent Duty: How have schools responded?’ described a survey of over 800 UK schools and found that they had developed higher levels of awareness of the duty to promote community cohesion. Schools described that they had promoted cohesion through one-off events, curriculum content and how they had developed partnerships with external organisations e.g. police, charities community groups and local schools serving other communities (Department for Education [DfE], 2011a).

A further driver for schools to consider their role in promoting community cohesion has been the UK Government’s ‘Prevent’ duty. As of 1st July 2015 all professionals working with children were subject to a duty to have ‘due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism’ (DfE, 2015, p.3). The Prevent duty guidance calls for professionals working with children to be vigilant to the outward signs of ‘radicalisation’ and ‘extremism’ (DfE, 2015, p.5). The Prevent duty defines extremism as: ‘vocal or active opposition to fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect and tolerance
of different faiths and beliefs.’ (DfE, 2015, p.5). A recent report found that staff in schools and colleges felt ‘widespread discomfort and uncertainty’ about teaching ‘fundamental British values’ alongside concerns that the Prevent duty can stigmatise British Muslim children and young people (Busher, Choudhury, Thomas & Harris, 2017).

The review ‘Teaching methods that help to build resilience to extremism: Rapid Evidence Assessment’ identified strategies including ‘cognitive behavioural initiatives, mentoring and counselling approaches, knowledge based initiatives, peer mediation and conflict resolution approaches, family based approaches, community based approaches and opportunities provision’ which built resilience to ‘extremism’ (DfE, 2011b, p.14). A multi-modal approach, which addresses environmental or systemic factors alongside the individual’s behaviours and attitudes has been identified as having the greatest impact (DfE, 2011b). An international literature review of the ways in which schools and colleges use psychology-based interventions to promote community cohesion found that best practice in this area adopted educational approaches that have both knowledge and process-based components (Jackson Taft & Woods, 2018). The study favoured a multi-level approach, which takes into account the individual and their relationships, as well as the relationships between community groups and the individual’s participation in their community (Jackson Taft & Woods, 2018).

Community cohesion & psychology

Social psychology offers a perspective on intergroup processes, including conflict, with an emphasis on the promotion of cohesion within and between communities (Nadler & Schnabel, 2008). Social Identity Theory posits that individuals organise their social world through categories which form in-groups (categories to which the individuals belongs) and outgroups (categories to which the individual does not belong) (Tajfel & Turner, 1985). Greater contact between groups has been thought to lead to greater intergroup cohesiveness (Allport, 1954). For contact to be perceived by group members as intergroup, not merely interpersonal, group identities must remain salient through structured contact opportunities (Brewer, 1996).
A model of community cohesion, based on social capital (Putnam, 1993), was put forward by Forrest and Kearns (2001) and included eight domains of social capital: Participation, empowerment, associational activity and common purpose, supporting networks and reciprocity, collective norms and values, trust, safety and belonging. These eight domains were recommended by Cantle (2001) for promoting cohesion in communities and by Hayes (2002) as a framework for educational psychologists to structure work to support community cohesion in schools (Hayes, 2002).

Psychology can offer models of community cohesion, but also models to conceptualise community conflict. These have been used to understand the processes through which an individual can come to be ‘radicalised’ or engaged in violent extremism. ‘Radicalisation can be interpreted through a psychodynamic process of ‘splitting’ by which the experience of a traumatic childhood may cause an individual to project their own perceived ‘bad’ traits onto others in society whilst believing their own traits to be intrinsically ‘good’ (Post, 1998).

Individuals with uncertain identity, particularly with multiple, conflicting identities, may be more likely to become ‘radicalised’ (Meah & Mellis, 2006) or to identify with a larger group with clear structures and aims (Hogg, Sherman, Dierselhuis, Maitner & Moffitt, 2007). Cognitive biases may also be a risk factor for ‘radicalisation’ and can contribute to ‘us’ versus ‘them’ thinking (Lilienfeld, Ammirati & Landfield, 2009). Radicalisation can also be conceptualised as a social-cognitive process of ‘moral disengagement’ in which morality regarding harm to others can be replaced by a new morality in which violence can be undertaken with less psychological discomfort (Bandura, 1990). There may be a role for educational psychology in translating these psychological models into support for schools to identify and prevent radicalisation.

Educational psychology and community cohesion

Little research exists into the role of educational psychology in promoting community cohesion. Much of what does exist emanates from Northern Ireland, against the backdrop of the ‘Troubles’ and a largely segregated society. One case study found that although schools used
systems of intergroup contact between Catholic and Protestant communities to promote cohesion, the success of this contact depended on factors such as the culture of the school and the already-held beliefs and biases of teachers and pupils (Smith, 2002). A multi-layered model of systemic, community intervention which takes into account the different values of the staff, children and local communities was recommended in order to bring about lasting change (Smith, 2002). In a later study Smith recommended a narrative approach, in which policy makers reflected on the peace narratives of young people to develop their practice of promoting community cohesion through peace education (Smith, 2005).

Issues of community conflict and cohesion are often fraught with fear of doing more harm than good and Reed (1999) argued that intergroup sensitivity can render discussion ‘extremely risky’ (Reed, 1999, p.91). Notably, Smith (2002) found that a ‘culture of silence’ and avoidance of discussion of issues of community inequality and conflict can perpetuate a failure to address issues crucial to community development. Silence on this topic could contribute to the inequalities that continue to pervade our society (Reed, 1999). These inequalities continue to manifest within the distribution of wealth whereby 40% of people from a minority ethnic background live in low income households, twice the rate of their majority group counterparts (Department for Work & Pensions [DWP], 2014). It follows then that recent British Psychological Society (BPS) guidelines state explicitly that ‘Psychologists need to understand the discrimination suffered by people from diverse and/ or minority ethnic and religious backgrounds’ as a result of ‘the maintenance of the colour-blind approach in service where ‘one size fits all’, resulting in a lack of formal recognition of the varied diverse needs as well as these needs being ignored, unacknowledged or assumed to be the same’ (BPS, 2017, p.33). However, it may be argued that EP practice in this area continues to be hampered by a lack of research.

Rationale and research questions

Since EP practice in this area is developing, the few studies that have explored the role of EPs in promoting community cohesion are theoretical (Hayes, 2002) or have been undertaken in the specific context of The Troubles in Northern Ireland (Smith, 2002; Smith, 2005). The current
study aimed to explore the ways in which an Educational Psychology Service (EPS) in England could envisage promoting community cohesion in a context of their work with schools in a local authority. This research was guided by the following research questions:

1. In what ways can an EPS envisage contributing to the promotion of community cohesion?
2. What are the potential facilitators and barriers to the promotion of community cohesion through EP practice?

Method

Design

A social constructivist epistemology underpinned the research design, in which issues of language and power were considered throughout. An Action Research (AR) model was selected as the developing practice of an EPS was the object of the study. AR, as defined by Kurt Lewin, was originally positivist in its epistemological roots with the action researcher conducting experiments in the field, both informed by and informing research (Lewin, Lippett & White, 1939). This symbiotic relationship between research and practice mirrors the day-to-day work of an EP, being informed as it is by both research and practice-based evidence. The current study adopted a participatory approach in order to prioritise the narrative accounts of participant researchers. The EP participant researchers were the key stakeholders in the research outcomes and therefore co-constructed the research as it developed (Lincoln, 2001). Issues of ownership were considered at every stage in order ‘to stimulate a participatory process of change’ without it ‘becom(ing) a form of reliance, not empowerment.’ (Townsend, 2013, p.336).
Appreciative Inquiry

An Appreciative Inquiry (AI) approach was adopted in order to identify the strengths within the EPS and build upon them to bring about change (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2001). The five stages of AI used by this study were ‘Define, Discover, Dream, Design, and Delivery’ and were delivered following an initial introductory meeting (see Appendix 3), through four focus groups (see Appendix 4). Throughout each stage the development of a shared language was an ongoing priority. The AI framework was adopted due to its suitability for identifying the experiences and resources within the EPS and building change based upon those strengths, as opposed to other AR approaches which could be viewed as deficit-based (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2001). It was felt by researcher and participants that a strengths-based approach would be suitable, due to the EPS being in the early stages of considering how to promote community cohesion.

Participant selection

The participating EPS was in a local authority in the North West of England. Six qualified EPs and three trainee EPs attended the initial focus group, all of whom were female. Two further female EPs joined for the final two focus groups, one returning from leave and one being newly employed by the EPS and one trainee was only present for focus group 1. Informed consent was gained from each participant.
Data analysis

Data analysis occurred cumulatively, with a summary of areas that had been discussed at the end of the focus group, and each subsequent focus group beginning with a summary of the previous focus group content. Further data analysis was conducted after the focus groups were all completed. Each focus group was recorded, transcribed and then coded using a pen and paper complete coding method (Braun & Clark, 2006). Analysis adopted a cumulative approach, with the first focus group coded in full, with the codes produced for the first focus group used for the second focus group along with new codes where necessary. This process continued until all focus groups were coded (see Appendix 6). These codes were organised into subthemes, which then were organised into themes which were then ultimately organised into overarching themes. All four transcripts were then re-read with initial codings checked against the
subthemes and themes (see Appendix 7). This led to a restructuring of themes into further subthemes that were felt to be more generally representative of the data. Thematic analysis from a social-constructivist perspective was utilised, ‘which examines the ways in which events, realities, meanings, experiences and so on are the effects of a range of discourses operating within society’ (Braun & Clark, 2006, p.81). Since this has been an under-researched area this study aimed to generate a rich picture of the entire data set, representing the key themes present in the focus group discussion. The research adopted a balanced approach to the analysis, with the review of the literature influencing initial codes through a top-down (deductive) approach alongside the inductive, or bottom-up, approach of completely coding the data set so that a broad picture of the range of views was generated. The research ‘sculpted’ the themes, rather than discovered them, since the process of coding is necessarily subjective (Braun & Clark, 2006). Further analysis involved reading for themes latent in the data, and looking for ‘broader assumptions, structures and/or meanings are theorised as underpinning what is actually articulated in the data’ (Braun & Clark, 2006, p.85).

In order to maintain validity, member checking was undertaken both informally through summarising within the focus groups, and then more formally at the beginning of each subsequent focus group. Final member checking of the themes and structure was undertaken after the analysis had been completed through a process of ‘sharing and dialouging with participants about the study’s findings, and providing opportunities for questions, critique, feedback, affirmation and even collaboration’ (Tracy, 2010, p.844). The elaboration on the themes informed further analysis and some structuring of themes.

Ethical considerations

The current study followed standards outlined in the University’s Ethical Practice Policy and Guidance (see Appendix 8). The data generated from transcribed focus groups with participants was stored securely on encrypted data sticks with only the author and academic supervisor having access to it. Informed consent was elicited from all participants and the right to withdraw, partially or fully was made explicit. The researcher aimed to be mindful of participant
safety and comfort due to the level of personal engagement entailed by the elicitation of constructs around community, culture and ethnicity. However, as psychologists, the participants were expected to have considerable professional experience in maintaining professional and personal boundaries, and in maintaining a neutral and inclusive professional persona.

Findings

Across the four focus groups, the participants discussed aspects of current good practice around working with communities, before developing ideas around what a preferred future may look like with regard to promoting community cohesion. Due to extensive overlap between the themes discussed in each focus group, the data themes are considered in their entirety. An overview of the focus group structures is shown in table 6 followed by a narrative description of each theme. The themes and subthemes are shown in table 7.

Table 7: Description of phases of Appreciative Inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>AI phase/s</th>
<th>Foci of discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dawn / Definition</td>
<td>Project outline and key concepts of community work and community cohesion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discover / Dream</td>
<td>Existing good practice within the EPS, particularly in the area of community psychology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Motivators to develop community cohesion work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Deliver</td>
<td>Next steps and key partners in developing work to promote community cohesion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Themes and subthemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EP practices &amp; skills</td>
<td>Working with communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casework and strategic work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power &amp; Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Threats and change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community cohesion in society</td>
<td>Segregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools as communities</td>
<td>Cohesion in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Segregation in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incohesion in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology of community cohesion</td>
<td>Skills - psychological understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preaching &amp; Teaching Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practising peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Psychology as culturally located</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EP Practices & Skills**

All focus groups contained some discussion of existing *EP practices* that were facilitative of community work in general, and could be drawn upon in work to promote community cohesion. Perhaps due to the structure of AI, most of the data extracts pertaining to this theme occurred in focus group 2, ‘discovery’, in which the strengths of the EPS were discussed in relation to this area of work. *Working with communities* was identified as an example of how EP working practices could effectively support the promotion of community cohesion. Knowing your community was generally considered to be a strength of EP practice, whereas there was a consensus that EPs cannot be expected to have rich knowledge of all of the communities in their respective local authorities. EPs noted with caution that sometimes a perceived knowledge of communities can lead to incorrect assumptions. EPs considered working with the systems around children and young people, including families and schools, with a range of working practices supporting this such as home visits, the patch system (in which an EP works consistently with their own patch of schools) and person-centred working:
‘I know the schools that I’ve had for a long time and some of them I’ve been in schools for ten, over ten years, I’ve got a feel of how that community works from conversations I’ve had with other teachers, conversations I’ve had with other parents and I think that makes my support in school richer somehow.’ (Participant 7, Focus group 1)

EPs also reflected on their own communities and the practices that constitute communities as well as what it means to be an EP in their own community.

Participants considered the balance of undertaking casework and strategic work in relation to community cohesion, with a general sense that strategic work can have a greater impact. One EP related an instance in which a colleague at a conference had challenged her working practices:

‘He immediately tackled me with, “Don’t you think that, that EPs should be doing strategic work?” and I was thinking “Yeah, I mean absolutely, but it’s not necessarily an either/or”. And it got me thinking about it...we can offer a lot of change potentially, strategically, can’t we?’ (Participant 1, Focus Group 2)

Whilst systemic work was acknowledged as having a greater impact, there was also a feeling of needing to ‘prove yourself’ to school staff through individual casework. EPs discussed that casework can inform strategic work through the identification of school practices in a way that impacts on more than the individual child or young person. With reference to work in the area of community conflict and the implementation of the Prevent Duty, there was consensus that intervention through individual casework can be ‘too little, too late’, as this extract illustrates:

‘I think my experience is that as an EP we come in when a lot of that conflict, that racism, that inappropriate language, is seriously embedded (...) what do I do with this individual who is antisocial who is presenting as racist or is presenting as radicalised who is now in the PRU and where do we put them (...) yeah it’s got to the point where you know (...) the conflict has happened and what do we do with these individuals now (...) rather than how do we deal with the conflict and prevent it’ (Participant 6, Focus Group 1).
Discussions around *EP Practices* included considerations of *power and values*, such as the influence EPs can have when working with senior leadership teams in schools, as well as when influencing policy.

‘I work in a school where I, I’ve worked there for quite a long time but, but the Headteacher was the SENCo and I had a very sort of close-the-door, have a laugh conversation with her as the SENCo, then she became the deputy, then she became the head. Now my capacity as an agent of change in that school is so different.’ (Participant 6, Focus group 2).

*Interpersonal skills* were considered, including the practice of multidisciplinary working was referred to as perhaps being useful for community work, with the sense that when a range of professionals come together, different viewpoints on communities can be shared, thus enabling effective support. As one EP reflected on a project, ‘*It was multi-agency working, I worked with partners in health, I worked with parents and actually made a difference.*’ (Participant 6, Focus group 2). Building relationships was identified as a practice that could be drawn upon for work in communities. Challenging views that may be the result of community conflict drew upon the EP skill of unpicking attitudes through reasoned debate and ‘*trying to find some common ground.*’ (Participant 6, Focus group 1).

Throughout the four focus groups EPs identified barriers to working in this area. Conversations which began in identifying strengths sometimes turned to identifying *threats and change*. A sense of the balance between autonomous working practices and the scrutiny of local authority management was considered. There was also a discussion of barriers to community work presenting in the form of time constraints, due to traded work and the demands of evidencing impact and value for money. Change over time was discussed with particular reference to cuts in funding to public services, and the impact this has had on the practices of the EPS. This was discussed as a barrier to the promotion of community cohesion: ‘*I’m not being cynical, but we just haven’t got the funding.*’ (Participant 8, Focus group 3).
Community cohesion in society

The EPs reflected across all four focus groups on the factors influencing community cohesion in society. A 2017 report by Schooldash had found that segregation in schools in the Local Authority had increased in the period between 2011 and 2016. This had placed segregation high on the agenda of both the EPS and the Local Authority. Reflections on this topic focused on the processes influencing segregation (including policy at both a local and national level) as well as the socio-political backdrop, and specifically the recent ‘Brexit’ vote.

There were discussions around the idea that to some extent it could be expected that people would form separate communities due to factors such as language and convenience, as one EP related: ‘there wasn’t any sort of racist agenda behind it was just this is my best mate and I’m going to sit next to my best mate and he’s my neighbour as well and we play football and we go out together’ (Participant 1, Focus group 1). Socio-economic factors of segregation were also discussed. This included consideration of house prices, house sizes, employment opportunities, and social mobility. There were challenges to the assumption that a school with an ethnically homogenous pupil population would represent a lack of community cohesion.

Socio-economic influences, including sport (particularly football) and the impact of deprivation in White British communities were considered. Reflecting on the culture of White British communities and the impact of socio-economic deprivation gave rise to discussions around how a community is defined: ‘I do wonder if there are certain areas that aren’t culturally defined but are very different.’ (Participant 6, Focus group 1). Community conflict in society was discussed in respect of Islamophobia and the way that terrorism had been depicted in the media.

Community cohesion in schools

Whilst in the first focus group there was a hesitation in making assumptions in defining communities, later reflections were that EPs could have a role in supporting cohesion in schools:
‘Look, you know, we can build a community around a school, we can build resilience’. (Participant 1, Focus group 2).

In three of the four focus groups EPs noted that the knowledge of school staff about the communities they serve may promote community cohesion. It was discussed that this knowledge can be gained through different means, for example by employing staff from the local area, or from engagement with outreach community work (e.g. through running a food bank or through the promotion of good family-school relationships). There was also the acknowledgment that schools sometimes serve changing communities due to sometimes swift changes in demographics in their local area.

Barriers to community cohesion in schools were discussed around the theme of segregation in schools with the impact of an increase in the number of faith schools reflected upon by the group:

‘How do you balance community cohesion and that view with a systemic encouraging of opening faith schools? And I know community’s not around faith but you know we’re almost, we’re almost segregating aren’t we?’ (Participant 1, Focus group 1).

EPs reflected on changing demographics in their schools, with one EP relating that ‘the only school that’s ever mentioned it to me was a head teacher who was concerned that white families were not wanting to come to his school.’ (Participant 3, Focus group 3). A narrative was built around the idea that school success can have an impact on segregation, via the movement of aspirational/affluent families into catchment areas of schools deemed more successful, perhaps by Ofsted:

‘I think the aspirational families of whatever background will move to get that, a particular school, so certainly I know people move because [name of school] is currently outstanding, they’ll move to that area to get there’ (Participant 3, Focus group 3).

There were also reflections on the idea that forcing communities together can have a detrimental effect on community cohesion.
Further discussions in the first and second focus groups considered other barriers, or incohesion in schools with discussions of anti-social behaviour and cultural conflict in the playground. There was also an acknowledgement that practices within settings may become less inclusive and cohesive as children and young people become older, with greater levels of exclusion:

‘It’s almost like a slope isn’t it? In early years, in high levels of inclusivity, cohesion (...) and as the pressure in results increases it goes down.’ (Participant 7, Focus group 2).

A narrative was generated about some children and young people being vulnerable to radicalisation and so conceptualising the Prevent Duty as a safeguarding measure. There was a reflection that in cases where radicalisation had occurred, the Prevent Duty can be too little, too late:

‘It sounded like those issues were incredibly entrenched and that instead of regarding him as sort of a primary school child who needed protecting from other influences, he was the one they saw as influencing others from quite a young age.’ (Participant 6, Focus group 1)

The psychology of community cohesion

EPs identified broad skills of psychological understanding that enabled and facilitated community work and their work with members of different communities. Discussions included how a person-centred approach, when supported by curiosity and non-judgement, can help the EP to understand the child or young person within their individual context.

‘I've been working with a young man and everybody else regards him as having mental health issues because he is a very unusual boy but I find him very interesting and because my start point is always tell me about that, that's really interesting and what exactly do you do there.’ (Participant 6, Focus group 1).

EPs reflected on the application of psychology to different aspects of community cohesion work, as well as how to understand community conflict. There were discussions of preaching and teaching peace with the sense that community cohesion is about the practices and atmosphere of a school, rather than the inclusion of ‘British Values’ lessons within the curriculum:
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'our work – that’s community cohesion but we’re doing ‘British Values’ but it, to me it’s, it’s, that’s not how I would measure community cohesion (...) “Have you sat through a ‘British Values’ lesson? Have you got a tick at the end of it, have you got a, you know, an A-Star in” – it’s about what the schools, the message the school’s actually portraying when they open that door.’ (Participant 7, Focus group 2). The narrative continued across all four focus groups that teaching skills such as ‘tolerance and respect for others’ (Focus group 4) was important in the promotion of community cohesion. Practising peace permeates the whole atmosphere of a school, and begins with the welcome that people receive at the door of the school, through the maintenance of an open door policy for parents and community members and through valuing diversity. One EP noted if ‘I feel welcomed as a stranger coming to your school, then that tells me a lot about your school’ (Participant 7, Focus group 2). Practices of encouraging children and young people to tell their stories and feel listened to were identified as promoting community cohesion: ‘they asked the children had they enjoyed the experience they enjoyed being listened to and celebrating where they were from rather than feeling like they just had to fit in with (...) this new community.’ (Participant 7, Focus group 1). There were also considerations of understanding intergroup processes and the benefits of contact between communities for promoting community cohesion. One EP reflected that ‘if your schools are as diverse as your communities (...) then that breeds tolerance and understanding and people sharing different views.’ (Participant 8, Focus group 1). This was illustrated further with the view that Social Identity Theory of in-groups and outgroups could explain some community conflict when coupled with a backdrop of cuts to public services: ‘We naturally as human beings have in groups and outgroups, don’t we? That feeds on your out groups, so you start blaming your out group (...) politically it makes sense to feed that outgroup because you’re not actually looking at what the real issue is (...) in terms of resources, in terms of unemployment, in terms of poor housing etc.’ (Participant 1, Focus group 4)
Through all four focus groups EPs reflected on educational psychology as culturally located, including situations in which cultural sensitivity was balanced against other values they held professionally, personally or by virtue of their status as local government employees. EPs discussed cultural sensitivity versus cultural norms, acknowledging the different value and expectations placed on education in different cultures. EPs shared knowledge of working with different communities and acknowledged that their position within the local authority can conflict with cultural sensitivity:

‘The traveller community, they very rarely go to secondary school because once you learn to read and write (...) and you know basic, functional numbers, you don’t need anything more now (...) if you are...supposed to be non-judgmental,(...) it’s a conflict isn’t it? How do we then say (...) ‘yeah, that’s fine, but...we...there is an expectation for you to go to secondary school.’ But on the other hand if I’m non-judgmental and value-free...in terms of culturally, your expectations and your values...yeah, once you’ve got functional reading, writing and numeracy...what else do you need?’ (Participant 1, Focus group 4)

There was an acknowledgment that sometimes personal values can come into conflict with cultural sensitivity; ‘I feel...people should be free to make their own decisions and if it’s not up to you...to have a view on that, but that wars with a view I have about...women being vulnerable and needing to be empowered’ (Participant 6, Focus group 4).

In both the first and last focus groups EPs took the opportunity to discuss the conflict of cultural sensitivity versus psychological assumptions and reflected that psychology is not ‘culturally neutral (...) it’s created by white, middle class Americans’ (Participant 1, Focus group 4). One EP reflected that the assumption that parents should play with their children was not culturally neutral.

Another EP noted that when delivering training on counselling skills, facial coverings of some participants may have presented a barrier to non-verbal communication. The assumption that non-verbal communication will necessarily include facial expressions was balanced with cultural
sensitivity, and thrown into sharp relief when considering the potential consequences of
addressing the issue and how this may contribute to the culture of silence:

A: Can you imagine that going wrong and if you do sort of allude to it...as a leader of
course, can you imagine that somebody would take offense and not be happy with that?
B: Yes, I do...yes I do...I do and you will have been in a very difficult position.
A: And that’s when you just avoid it. (Participants 1 and 3, Focus group 4).

In three of the four focus groups EPs reflected on the culture of silence around issues of
community cohesion – that it is ‘the elephant in the room’. EPs noted that it wasn’t something
they discussed: ‘get the perception that, that actually “it isn’t something we talk about
generally, it’s not something we talk about in the Local Authority, it’s not a conversation
anybody starts’ (Participant 6, Focus group 3).

Reflection on the process of Appreciative Inquiry

The study used an Appreciative Inquiry design in which participants highlighted strengths in
their current practice in order to develop the promotion of community cohesion. With
community cohesion work being in its very early stages it was decided by the participants and
researchers that a strengths-based approach was best placed to facilitate discussion of how
current practice already addresses issues of community and cohesion. It was acknowledged
within the focus groups that this positive tone could jar with the participant’s views. Issues of
ownership and the direction of the research required frequent discussion and negotiation due
to the researcher acting as facilitator rather than participant. Factors external to the research
engendered the development of further community cohesion strategic work, including a
project following the Manchester Arena attack in 2017. For this work, a group of EPSs were
funded by the DfE to develop resources for schools in two strands: Critical Incident Response &
Trauma, and Community Cohesion with the first meeting of the Community Cohesion subgroup
taking place after the ‘task and finish’ group meeting. As such the sourcing and development of
resources to offer schools which began in the ‘task and finish’ meeting continued both within
and between the meetings with representatives from other EPSs (see Table 9). The researcher
contributed to the discussions and development of the resources, including an audit tool and training packages, as part of this group and then in a further meeting with the EPS in which the research took place.

Table 9: Description of meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>AI phase/s and other content</th>
<th>Foci of discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dawn / Definition</td>
<td>Project outline and key concepts of community work and community cohesion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discover / Dream</td>
<td>Existing good practice within the EPS, particularly in the area of community psychology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Motivators to develop community cohesion work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Deliver</td>
<td>Next steps and key partners in developing work to promote community cohesion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Task &amp; Finish</td>
<td>Resources including audit tools, types of intervention and whole school approaches to promote community cohesion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Development of training materials for the DfE funded project</td>
<td>Resources to support understanding of intergroup dynamics and the role of participation in community cohesion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

This research has explored some of the ways in which members of an EPS team can envisage a contribution to the promotion of community cohesion and has outlined some facilitators and barriers to the development of this work. EPs within this study identified typical EP practices and skills, such as using a systemic perspective and the ability to build and maintain relationships when working with communities, as particular facilitators of community cohesion.
development work. A balance of casework and strategic work, with casework informing and gaining ‘buy in’ for strategic work, was also seen as a facilitator of this work. Psychological understanding e.g. person-centred working, values and interpersonal skills were identified as practices facilitating the promotion of community cohesion. However, cuts to public services, time constraints within a traded service delivery model, and some local authority management processes, were all considered to be barriers to work promoting community cohesion, which is necessarily protracted and less amenable to evidencing of impact.

Challenges to community cohesion in society were identified including the current UK socio-political backdrop (e.g. the representation of terrorism by the media, Islamophobia) and increasing segregation in schools and communities (Schooldash, 2017; Guardian, 2016). Whilst EPs raised the question of ‘who defines a community?’ and shared concerns about assumptions about communities, they also asserted that schools are themselves communities, providing an opportunity for EPs to work to support schools in promoting cohesion within their setting. School level practices manifesting as barriers to community cohesion included pupil exclusion and the discrete teaching of ‘fundamental British values’ as a ‘tick box’ exercise. EPs discussed types of community cohesion work in schools, drawing a distinction between ‘preaching peace’, as in the teaching of ‘fundamental British values’, and ‘practising peace’ (Lauritzen, 2013), which EPs described as a pervasive welcoming atmosphere supported by work with families and communities.

At the research site, change through the process of the research entailed a reappraisal of the current work of the EPS through the lens of community cohesion and a development of the conceptualisation of issues raised by working with communities through schools. One outcome was that an appreciation that educational psychology is culturally located can be a facilitator to EP work in this area. EPs reflected upon the conflict that can arise between culturally sensitive practice (BPS, 2017) and their own personal values (e.g. cultural sensitivity versus the belief in gender equality). By acknowledging personal values and biases, EPs may be better placed to reflect on their own practice and act ethically (Schulze, 2017). EPs also reflected on the impact
of their culturally located position of power, within and without a local authority context. Whilst engaging with the tensions between values, current psychological practice and aspirations of cultural sensitivity, EPs considered how they may play out in daily practice.

Understanding the EP role in respect of community cohesion work: Implications for practice

This study has identified that existing EP practices and skills, models of consultation, and person centred practices may lend themselves to the promotion of community cohesion. The psychological understanding that underpins EP practice can also support and inform community cohesion in schools. Since intergroup relations at local, national and international levels have an impact on community cohesion, EPs may also wish to consider less frequently used models of psychology, including Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1985) and models of intergroup contact (Allport, 1954; Brewer, 1996). These models have been drawn upon extensively to support education policy and practice in contexts such as Northern Ireland (Smith, 2002; 2005) and could offer a framework for EP engagement with intergroup processes and dynamics.

The drivers for EPs to become involved with community cohesion may come in the form of requests for support from schools or from other sources. In the DfE-funded project work following the Manchester Arena attack, the promotion of community cohesion is linked to EPSs directly supporting those affected, and the question remains as to the extent to which such a link is needed to drive EPs’ involvement in promoting community cohesion. However, Article 29 of the UNCRC and its associated General Comment (No 1), which call for education to prepare children and young people to participate in a cohesive society, arguably should sustain this work through changing governmental priorities (Jackson Taft & Woods, 2018). Drawing from the findings of this study, the researchers are proposing a working model for the development of community cohesion practice for an EPS (see figure 3 below) as a starting point for EPs and EPSs to begin to work proactively to consider their current and potential practice to promote community cohesion.
EPs expressed trepidation about labelling and making assumptions about communities. By viewing the school as a community in itself, EPs may, to an extent, mitigate such trepidations in order to support schools to encourage cohesion within their setting. It is hypothesised that this, in turn, may serve to promote cohesion in the wider local community through the influence of children, young people and their families as well as through the school as a community hub, as seen in the ‘contagion effect’ of children’s rights-based education in schools (Covell, Howe & McNeil, 2010). However, it should be remembered that a perception of ignoring issues of conflict within the wider community may serve to reinforce tensions and undermine efforts to promote cohesion (Smith, 2002). Therefore, EPs undertaking work to promote community cohesion may wish to consider the particular school context for this work, acknowledging social, economic, political, media and policy influences, at both local and national levels.

Whilst the development of practice at an EPS level may be informed by the elements in figure 3, the work to promote community cohesion may look very different in different settings. In some settings where issues of conflict have arisen, a more targeted approach may be necessary, whereas in other settings a universal and preventative approach may be adopted. Community cohesion work can be at the levels of intra- and inter-personal, as well as intergroup and community levels (Jackson Taft & Woods, 2018). In light of the findings from the current study, a further refinement of this model is proposed, which incorporates a dimension from community conflict to community cohesion. When viewed in this way,
interventions and approaches aimed at each level can also be refined according to whether they are universal approaches or more targeted interventions (see Figure 4). It should be noted, however, that there are discrete interventions at each level, and that this model should not be seen as a continuum of graduated response.

Figure 4: A multi-level continuum approach to promoting community cohesion

Limitations and future research directions

Whilst the above models may offer a level of utility for an EPS beginning work to promote community cohesion, two potential limitations of the current study are identified. First, the cycles of Appreciative Inquiry, whilst generating reflection and discussion, fell short of outlining concrete ways forward for the EPS at the level of action planning. This was influenced by several practical elements of working in an EPS such as participants joining at later stages of the research and the timings of the focus groups which may have affected the progress of the discussions. Discussions followed a spiral of development, with issues of community cohesion being revisited with new participants and in light of further thinking. This may be seen as evidence of participants’ desire to comprehensively evaluate their current position and
potential developments, whilst establishing elements of current practice and initiatives that already contribute to community cohesion. At certain points in the research, uncertainty around issues of ownership and direction of the research may have held back the development of an action plan. Second, although this study is necessarily limited by its focus within a single EPS, its findings offer a degree of ‘analytic generalisibility’ by illuminating some key themes relevant for EPs wishing to develop work in this area (Yin, 2009).

Having established a potential model for an EPS that may wish to develop its work in this area, future research directions may include an investigation of the utility of this model, using a case study of an EPS developing work in the area of community cohesion. The promotion of community cohesion may be in its early stages in the EPS in the current study but there has been little research about whether and to what extent UK EPSs are engaging in this work. A large scale survey of practising EPs would give a clearer picture of the prevalence of community cohesion promotion and the ways in which EPs are using psychology in this area. At the same time, research to evaluate the materials developed by EPs through the DfE-funded project following the Manchester Arena attack would provide a useful dissemination of the possible EP role.
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Evidence-based practice and practice-based evidence

Evidence-based practice

Evidence-based practice (EBP), or the systematic informing of daily working practices by the latest and best research evidence, can be argued to have revolutionised fields of applied science such as medicine, agriculture and technology, over the course of the 20th century (Slavin, 2002). The use of EBP attempts to address two questions - ‘does this intervention cause this effect?’ and, if there are alternative approaches, ‘what works best?’ (Bower & Bilbody, 2010). In recent years, EBP has continued to spread from the aforementioned disciplines to the helping professions such as social work and education (Dunsmuir, Brown, Iyadurai & Monsen, 2009). Recent calls for education to use research evidence to identify and use ‘what works best’ have come from Goldacre (2013) and gained ground with the UK government which made commitments to use research evidence not just in education but policy development more generally (Cain & Allen, 2017).

Using research evidence to inform practice where there are perceived contradictory findings in the evidence base (Fox, 2003) begs the question as to what constitutes the best evidence. Using the evidence hierarchy well established in medicine, larger sample sizes are considered better evidence since the results ought to better represent the population. Randomisation and the use of controls can reduce the possibility of bias by randomly assigning participants to a treatment group or better yet, to a treatment group or a control group. Still better are the meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials, which gather data from multiple participants in multiple studies and aggregate the results. The hierarchy can be summarised as follows:

- A systematic review of randomised controlled trials;
- At least one randomised controlled trial;
- At least one controlled study without randomisation;
- At least one other type of quasi-experimental study;
• Non-experimental descriptive study, such as comparative study, correlational studies, case-controlled studies;
• Evidence from expert committee reports or opinions and/or clinical experience of respected authorities. (Fox, 2003, p. 93).

Some would argue that the use of the evidence hierarchy, in particular the expansion of the use of meta-analyses by the Cochrane Institute has revolutionised medicine (Oakley, 2002). Similarly, there have been calls to use EBP to inform practices in education by increasing the use of ‘rigorous experiments evaluating replicable programs and practices’ (Slavin, 2002, p.15). In some quarters this has been countered by the assertion that this revolution may not have the same applicability within the ‘caring professions’, since quantitative analysis may not adequately convey the complexity of human experience (Fox, 2003; Biesta, 2007). Furthermore, others would argue that the transferability of interventions is so often impacted by contextual factors that an approach that works in one context may not work in another (Cain & Allen, 2017).

The requirement for an educational or school psychologist to act with due regard to evidence from research is clearly stated from professional bodies. Professionals registered with The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) must ‘be able to engage in evidence-based and evidence-informed practice’ and ‘evaluate practice systematically’ (HCPC, 2015, SoP 12.1). The British Psychological Society guidelines state that ‘it is important to distinguish the nature and quality of the evidence underpinning any knowledge or techniques being applied.’ (BPS Professional Practice Guidelines, 2017, p.11). Evidence-based practice in psychology has been defined by the American Psychological Association (APA) as ‘the integration of the best available research with clinical expertise in the context of patient characteristics, culture and preferences’ (APA Presidential Task Force on Evidence-Based Practice, 2006, p.273).

Issues of deciding what constitutes best evidence may be problematic in both education and psychology. Whilst some educational research has attracted criticism for being ‘unscientific,
non-cumulative, uncollaborative and inaccessible’ (Oakley, 2002, p.278), calls to strengthen the evidence base through research synthesis (Slavin, 2002) have been questioned on different grounds, including that ‘evidence’ in education is different to ‘evidence’ in medicine (Biesta, 2007). In psychology practice, a definition of ‘best evidence’ is also debatable as whilst RCTs may well be towards the top of the hierarchy for medicine, they may not be practical or ethical for the practice of educational psychology (Frederickson, 2002). Further difficulties arise when considering the ontological and epistemological assumptions of large-scale aggregative trials, which may tend towards positivism, since educational psychologists (EPs) may identify with incompatible paradigms such as social constructivism (Biesta, 2007; Fox, 2003; Moore, 2005).

With EPs increasingly designing interventions and being involved in their delivery (Robinson, Bond & Oldfield, 2018) the extent to which evidence based interventions (EBIs) are used and adapted becomes pertinent. When designing and delivering interventions for children and young people with autistic spectrum disorders, EPs reported that individual and contextual factors were most influential on their choice of intervention, followed by children’s and parents’ views with evidence from the research coming below these factors (Robinson et al., 2018). The extent to which, if at all, EPs use EBP suffers from a lack of research (Lilienfeld, Ammirati & David, 2012). One study of 370 school psychologist members of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) found that 83% relied on personal experiences to inform intervention practices with only 62% and 47% using reference books and journal articles respectively (Davison & Lazarus, 2007). The school psychologists using reference books may have coincided with those using journal articles leaving a potentially significant minority using personal experience alone (Lilienfeld et al., 2012). With personal experience being subject to influence by cognitive biases, such as confirmation bias, groupthink and illusory correlation to name but a few (Lilienfeld et al., 2012), this leaves practices at risk of being ineffective, and at worst perhaps dangerously ill-informed.
Practice-based evidence

Where psychologists may feel that the adoption of some aspects of evidence-based practice, in particular the ‘gold standard’ of randomised controlled trials is problematic within educational psychology, or where there is little research evidence for an intervention, educational psychologists can use practice-based evidence to adopt a scientific approach to their practice. Barkham and Margison (2007) define practice-based evidence as

‘The conscientious, explicit, and judicious use of current evidence drawn from practice settings in making decisions about the care of individual patients. Practice-based evidence means integrating both individual clinical expertise and service-level parameters with the best available evidence drawn from rigorous research activity carried out in routine clinical settings.’ (p.446).

The HCPC’s Standards of Proficiency require professionals to ‘be aware of the principles and applications of scientific enquiry, including the evaluation of the effectiveness of interventions and the research process’ (HCPC, 2015, SoP 13.2). Lilienfeld et al. (2012) propose that rather than seeing scientists and practitioners as mutually exclusive, there are two continua: first, scientific to non-scientific and second, research to practice. This facilitates the definition of a non-scientific practitioner and a scientific practitioner, introducing the distinction: “even school psychologists who conduct no research can in effect act as scientists in the clinical setting” (Lilienfeld et al., 2012, p.8). It is this adoption of an approach of ‘scientist-practitioner’ to daily practice, in which interventions are selected based on the best available evidence and subsequently evaluated, that generates practice-based evidence (Spring, 2007).

Dissemination of research

Disseminating research

To address the gap between research and practice both EBP and practice-based evidence have been proposed. In order to support EBP, researchers must consider the ways in which practitioners become aware of, consume and utilise their research. These processes have been termed diffusion, dissemination, implementation and knowledge transfer, among others.
(Wilson, Petticrew, Calnan & Nazareth, 2010) and this paper will adopt the term dissemination as ‘a planned process that involves consideration of target audiences and the settings in which the research findings are to be received and, where appropriate, communicating and interacting with wider policy and health service audiences in ways that will facilitate research uptake in decision-making processes and practice.’ (Wilson et al., 2010).

Not only is there a requirement for professionals to conduct research, but also to disseminate it to practice as the HCPC Standards of Proficiency require them to ‘be able to work with key partners to support the design, implementation, conduct, evaluation and dissemination of research activities and to support evidence-based research (HCPC, 2015, SoP 14.56). Good dissemination could be described as the most effective process by which research is translated into practice and so cannot just be disseminated to other academics, it must be consumed in some form by the practitioners whose practice it aimed to change. For many qualitative research studies, dissemination beyond a journal article does not occur (Keen & Todres, 2007) which can limit impact on practice. Harmsworth and Turpin (2000) propose three levels of engagement for dissemination: dissemination for awareness, dissemination for understanding and dissemination for practice. Dissemination for awareness can often be through informal processes and the audience may not need technical and detailed knowledge of the research, rather an overview of key points (Harmsworth & Turpin, 2000). Dissemination for understanding requires a higher level of engagement, perhaps with the findings of the research and dissemination for practice requires a level of engagement such that policy and/or practice is changed as a result of the findings of the research (Harmsworth & Turpin, 2000). Each of these levels of dissemination have potentially different target audiences, different communication methods and therefore strategies.

Factors impacting dissemination

There are several factors that researchers have identified that influence the ways in which research is disseminated. Consideration should be given to factors that impact the access, understanding and implementation of the research at the level of the individual and
organisation (Harmsworth & Turpin, 2000). A literature review conducted by the Department of Education in Northern Ireland to identify the most effective ways of disseminating best practice in education found that ‘transfer of knowledge’ such as peer mentoring was rated better than ‘transmission methods’ e.g. reading reports, publications, listening to and receiving information from seminars etc.’ (National Children’s Bureau [NCB], 2017, p.2). Even though less than half of respondents had used action research or other transformative methods of dissemination, over a third of total respondents rated these methods (alongside peer review and feedback) as the most effective (NCB, 2017). Respondents rated the top three factors impacting effective dissemination as:

- ‘School ethos / culture regarding shared learning.
- School leadership / management support
- Teacher attitude.’ (National Children’s Bureau [NCB], 2017, p.37).

This would suggest that factors at both the level of the individual (such as attitudes) as well as the organisation (leadership and ethos) may be key to effective dissemination to education practice in schools.

Models of dissemination

Several models to describe and structure dissemination have been proposed, and these can be categorised in different ways, including source-based and user-based (Wandersman et al., 2008). Source-based dissemination can be described as a linear, researcher or science driven process starting with the innovation and then bringing it to the audience or practitioners and may be termed ‘research to practice’ (Wandersman et al., 2008, p.173). User-based dissemination begins with a research need or gap in the practice of the research consumers and continues to the adoption of the innovation into practice and may be termed a community-based model (Wandersman et al., 2008, p.173). Both of these types of models are critiqued by Wandersman et al. (2008) due to ‘most of them focus(ing) primarily on the functions that take place as a part of the dissemination and implementation process (e.g., exposure, selection, adoption), not on the infrastructure or systems that support and carry out these functions’ (p.173).
In a systematic literature review, Wilson et al. (2010) identified 33 research articles with a clearly outlined dissemination strategy of which the majority were informed by one or more of the research models: ‘persuasive communication, diffusion of innovations theory’ (Wilson et al., 2010. p.13). Diffusion of innovations theory proposes that the take up of an innovation relies on intrinsic characteristics of the innovation and is based on five stages: knowledge, persuasion, decision, implementation, and confirmation. Persuasive communications theory takes into account McGuire’s (2001) stages: ‘the source of communication, the message to be communicated, the channels of communication, the characteristics of the audience (receiver), and the setting (destination) in which the communication is received’ (Wilson et al., 2010. p.9). Similarly, but with a greater focus on the adoption of innovation into practice, Glasgow, Vogt and Bowles (1999) model ‘RE-AIM’ stands for the five stages it consists of: ‘reach, efficacy, adoption, implementation, and maintenance.’

Dissemination of action research

It could be argued that action research (AR) by its very nature may tend towards a more user-based or community centred dissemination strategy (Wandersman et al., 2008). Lewin suggested three goals for the dissemination of AR, not just the advancement of knowledge but also the tangible improvement of a concrete situation alongside the development of scientific methodology (Lewin, 1946). To achieve these ends, Sommer (2009) recommends that the findings of AR should be published in journal articles to communicate advancements in knowledge, in methodologically-focused journals to communicate development of AR, as well as in less formal publishing outlets such as magazines to inform practitioners and the public. Though the substantive change will largely occur at the research site, research based on an Appreciative Inquiry (AI) framework as used in paper two, could be argued to necessitate a greater level of participant involvement in the dissemination strategy to the wider practice community (Forchuk & Meier, 2014). A dissemination strategy for AR may have user-based or community-centred elements when making concrete change at the research site as well as source-based elements regarding methodological developments (Wandersman et al., 2008;
Lewin, 1946). Dissemination strategies regarding advancement of knowledge may also wish to adopt a participatory approach in order to continue the participatory processes and ensure the widest possible audience for the research findings (Forchuk & Meier, 2014).

Research implications of paper one and paper two

The implications of the findings for both papers one and two will be discussed in regard to practice, policy and future research. The current research consisted of a systematic literature review (SLR) on psychology-based educational approaches to the promotion of community cohesion (paper one) and an empirical study with practising EPs using an AR model to consider the ways in which an educational psychology service (EPS) might promote community cohesion (paper two).

The SLR conducted in paper one elicited 13 research studies meeting the inclusion criteria and the results were synthesised to create a model of community cohesion approaches in which different levels of intervention were identified: intrapersonal, interpersonal, intergroup and community levels. Intrapersonal aspects of community cohesion included metacognitive, cognitive and affective approaches, interpersonal included the support for positive peer relationships and conflict resolution, intergroup included work on contact between different groups, and community elements included participation and belonging. In an emerging area of EP and school practice, there may be a place for the separation of different elements of practice that support and promote community cohesion in order to identify current areas of strength and begin to consider areas for development.

Paper two describes an AR empirical research project with a local authority EPS which adopted an AI framework to identify areas of current EP practice that promote community cohesion and consider future developments of this work whilst building on the strengths identified through the initial ‘Discover’ phase. A number of facilitators to this work were highlighted in the research including: EP practices and skills such as knowing communities, person-centred
approaches and multi-agency working, psychological understanding including understanding trauma and intergroup dynamics as well as viewing schools as communities in themselves.

The implications of the findings for both paper one and paper two will necessarily look different to different target audiences, so they will be considered separately at the research site, at the level of the organisation and at the level of the profession more generally.

Implications for practice at the research site

During the research project, issues of cultural awareness and competency arose and EPs expressed that they appreciated having dedicated time to share knowledge about communities in their local authority and to reflect on their own positionality regarding the local community. EPs reflected on the ways in which communities are defined and found defining schools as communities within which to promote community cohesion useful.

During the research the local area was affected by the Manchester Arena bombing, and the principal EP subsequently became involved in a project funded by the Department for Education (DfE) consisting of two strands, one focused on developing materials to support schools following a critical incident and the other strand focusing on supporting schools with the promotion of community cohesion. Both the principal EP and the researcher contributed to the community cohesion working group by developing resources including training packages and an audit tool for schools. As the researcher adopted a dual role in this working group, representing the EPS on which she was on placement as well as working with the EPS in which this research took place, the development of work in the working group was both informed by and informed the research at the research site. As the research came to an end, conversations between the researcher and the participant EP that took on the responsibility for community cohesion in the local authority continued. At the point of writing, future collaborative work is planned around the continued development of the DfE-funded project resources.
Implications for practice at the organisational level

The implications from paper one could support schools to highlight their current provision and begin to consider developing knowledge-based and process-based approaches to community cohesion. It may also be useful to use a multi-level approach to audit and/or evaluate approaches to support cohesion at the levels of intrapersonal, interpersonal, intergroup and community cohesion. ‘Preaching peace’ or transmission teaching of cohesion issues was found to be less effective than ‘teaching peace’ (the teaching of skills and using participatory classroom practice) and ‘practising peace’ (work to develop ethos and involve the school and wider community) (Lauritzen, 2013). With widespread discomfort in schools around the teaching of ‘fundamental British values’ as required by the Prevent duty (Bush, Choudhury, Thomas & Harris, 2017), the findings from the SLR could support schools to consider the development of their practice of teaching and practising peace. School leaders may wish to use this framework to identify elements of good practice whilst considering areas in which the school could further develop cohesion within their school community.

The research findings from paper two suggest that for an EPS beginning to consider developing its work in the area of promoting community cohesion some areas could be considered including areas of existing practice that facilitate community work as well as looking at the psychological understanding that can support work with different communities. Engaging with the psychology of intergroup processes was identified as an area that could support future developments in this area but may not yet be an area of embedded practice of an EPS. The process of developing a shared language and understanding of issues around community as well as some knowledge of the communities present in the local authority was also considered a facilitator of community work. Reflecting on cultural competence and positionality may also support community work. Since the work from the DfE-funded project took place in each of the local authority EPSs in the region, the researcher was able to continue development work in the EPS in which she was on placement, beginning with facilitating group discussions on community positionality and awareness of community knowledge factors that may affect EP practice in different schools.
Implications for practice at the professional level

Findings from paper one suggest that the wider context around a school can be a facilitator and a barrier to the promotion of community cohesion within the school. Approaches to promote peace and community cohesion have been facilitated by local and national policy backing the work (Najjuma, 2011; Rosen & Salomon 2011; Lauritzen, 2013; Aly et al., 2014; Austin et al., 2015). However, findings from both papers one and two found that through changing local and national government priorities, work to promote community cohesion can move up and down the agenda in the UK. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) offers a consistent impetus to work in this area to meet the requirements of Article 29 and its associated general comment number one as it calls for the education of children and young people to adequately prepare them for ‘...responsible life in a free society, in the spirit of understanding, peace, tolerance, equality of sexes, and friendship among all peoples, ethnic, national and religious groups and persons of indigenous origin’ (UNCRC, 1989, p.9).

The dissemination to Trainee Educational Psychologists may have a substantial impact over time on the profession. Input on the Doctorate in Child and Educational Psychology could contain in the future a greater focus on cultural competency and awareness due to the recent changes to the BPS professional practice guidelines, which explicitly reject ‘the maintenance of the colour-blind approach in service where ‘one size fits all’,’ as this results in ‘a lack of formal recognition of the varied diverse needs as well as these needs being ignored, unacknowledged or assumed to be the same’ (BPS, 2017, p.33). Reflecting on their own awareness, competency and positionality regarding culture and community may enable trainees to evaluate whether and to what extent the services within which they are on placement adopt a ‘colour-blind approach’ and feel better empowered to challenge this where appropriate (BPS, 2017, p.33).

Devising a strategy for dissemination and impact

In order to support evidence-based practice in educational psychology researchers should define a clear dissemination strategy (Wandersman et al., 2008). The adoption of a theory-driven strategy for dissemination could further develop evidence-based practice through the
comparison of dissemination frameworks to investigate whether they result in different levels of uptake amongst practitioners (Wilson et al., 2010). The AR design of paper two arguably began the dissemination process in the immediate research site and the coinciding developments regarding the DfE-funded project work expanded the reach of the ‘action’ to a wider group of EPs and therefore EPSs.

The dissemination strategy may be outlined by the stages of dissemination proposed by Lewin for AR: a ‘concrete change’ at the research site, an advancement of knowledge and reflections on the methodology of AR and AI (Lewin, 1946).

At the research site, material change occurred both as a result of the research and due to factors extraneous to the research which contributed to changing practice within the EPS regarding community cohesion. Initial member checking to inform the process of developing and structuring the themes was undertaken in December 2017. This gave participants a further opportunity to both form and reflect on their input to the research, alongside a number of processes that had already begun during the appreciative inquiry cycle. A report into the levels of segregation in UK schools between 2011 and 2016 had recently been published and showed that schools in the local authority had become more segregated in this period (Schooldash, 2017). This had become a topic of conversation in the local authority and concurrently, a Community Cohesion Officer had been appointed. An EP had at this time been designated community cohesion lead. The researcher intends to present at the North West Continuous Professional Development (CPD) conference for EPs alongside both the lead EP on community cohesion and Community Cohesion Officer.

Dissemination of the research findings will continue as the author continues to contribute to the discussions of EPs in the DfE-funded working group in developing EPS ‘offers’ in the area of community cohesion in local authorities in the region. The funding for this work from the DfE is contingent on the materials generated being offered to all schools in the region. The outcomes will be both the resources produced and evaluations of the resources from school staff.
attending both the pilot training in the spring term 2018 and subsequently take up the training as it is delivered across the region. The evaluation of the resources may also form the basis of a future research commission, see below. This ongoing engagement at EPS level with the collaborative development and piloting of training materials, could be argued to amount to a transformative approach to research dissemination, which may facilitate greater dissemination of research findings than both transmission and transfer of knowledge approaches (NCB, 2017). This transformative approach necessitates engagement with the systems that will support the dissemination (i.e. the EPS service delivery models and their approach to training and continuing professional development) and so may facilitate greater changes to practice (Wandersman et al., 2008).

Though a transmission approach may be less preferable for changing practice (NCB, 2017) the wider profession of educational psychology may access the research findings through published journal articles. Paper one (SLR) has been submitted to the International Journal of School and Educational Psychology as this has an international readership and so may reach wider audiences. Paper two will be submitted to Educational Psychology in Practice as it has a clearer UK focus. However a blog that summarises the main findings may be more accessible to time-pressed EPs and may direct them towards the journal articles. The researcher intends to summarise findings from both the SLR and the research paper in online blogs with links to the research papers.

Dissemination to the EP profession for both awareness and understanding may be facilitated through delivering seminars or workshops at professional conferences (see Appendix 11). Thought should be paid to the style of delivery at the conferences, as participatory teaching practices are recommended by the SLR for teaching community cohesion (Jackson Taft & Woods, 2018) therefore the seminar may incorporate participatory activities. Future research directions may be supported by the University’s Doctorate in Child and Educational Psychology programme through its research commissioning process. The evaluation of the materials, including training packages and an audit tool, of the DfE-funded project may be evaluated by
future Trainee Educational Psychologists. The researcher may contribute to the process in an advisory capacity.

The outcome of changing practice in schools may be the ultimate aim of dissemination (Harmsworth & Turpin, 2000) and this may be more difficult to measure and see. Since the SLR focused on how schools use psychology-based approaches to promote community cohesion the findings may be best disseminated to teachers, including school leadership teams through an education-specific journal or magazine (Lewin, 1946). This will be supported by dissemination of the key findings through a blog, supported by social media including Twitter.
Table 10: Dissemination strategy - based on Harmsworth & Turpin (2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Method for dissemination</th>
<th>Timing &amp; Responsibility</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The EPS within which the research took place</td>
<td>Awareness, understanding of SLR findings; awareness &amp; understanding of the research paper findings &amp; changes to practice</td>
<td>Member checking</td>
<td>The researcher, 06.12.17</td>
<td>Through email evaluation with EPS CPD conference presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contact with community cohesion lead and establish link with LA Community Cohesion Officer; present to regional conference Joint work through DfE-funded project</td>
<td>The researcher, December 2018</td>
<td>Email evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The researcher, from summer 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional EPSs</td>
<td>Awareness &amp; understanding of both SLR and research paper findings</td>
<td>Joint work through DfE-funded project Present research findings at conferences: Catalyst - 27.04.18 North West CPD conference</td>
<td>The researcher, from summer 2018</td>
<td>Email evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The researcher, 27.04.18</td>
<td>Evaluation of conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The researcher, December 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wider EPS profession</td>
<td>Awareness, understanding</td>
<td>Publish papers one and two in Educational or School Psychology specific journals Support the development of future research commissions Support input on community cohesion on the doctoral training course.</td>
<td>The researcher</td>
<td>Citations and altmetrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The researcher and research supervisor The researcher, from autumn 2018</td>
<td>Research commissioned with continuing focus on community cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wider teaching profession</td>
<td>Awareness of SLR findings and changing practice to promote community cohesion.</td>
<td>Publish further paper in a teaching / pastoral specific journal</td>
<td>The researcher</td>
<td>Citations and altmetrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Use social media to promote research papers Write a blog about the findings</td>
<td>The researcher, upon publication, 2018</td>
<td>Likes and retweets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The researcher, summer 2018</td>
<td>Citations and altmetrics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluating impact

The dissemination strategy, based on Harmsworth and Turpin (2000) outlines the ways in which the researcher intends to disseminate the research findings to each target audience. The evaluation of impact will have to adopt multiple approaches across different audiences. As discussed in papers one and two, defining community cohesion may not be unproblematic and measures of both community conflict and cohesion may be beyond the scope of this research. The impact at the research site may be measured by ongoing conversations with both the Principal EP and with members of the team. Email feedback will also be elicited. The impact of the contributions to the DfE-funded project will be evaluated both through the piloting process and potentially through the Doctoral program if a future Trainee EP takes up this thesis proposal. The distal impact of the research findings will be evaluated through citations, and altmetrics associated with journal entries and the social media output. Insofar as there may be a culture of silence (Smith, 2002) around issues of community as professionals may seek not to cause offense, one measure of change may be the emergence of more conversations around this topic. Through developing conversations with a shared understanding and language about the communities both constituted by and served by the profession, the practices supporting the promotion of community cohesion can develop.
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Appendix 3: PowerPoint slides from initial discussion with EPS

**Exploring the role of the Educational Psychologist in promoting community cohesion**

Leanne Jackson Taft

---

**Rationale - Community conflict**

Greater Manchester hate crime reports rise by 50% (BBC, 30/6/16)

Segregation in schools increasing (DEMOS, 2015)
Rationale - The UN CRC

---

Article 29 and its associated General Comment (No.1) states that education for children should contain ‘...the preparation of the child for responsible life in a free society, in the spirit of understanding, peace, tolerance, equality of sexes, and friendship among all peoples, ethnic, national and religious groups and persons of indigenous origin’ (UN, 1989, p.9)

---

Rationale - The Prevent duty

---

Professionals should ‘have due regard to the need to prevent people being drawn into terrorism’ (DfE, 2015, p.3).

The Prevent strategy defines extremism as: ‘vocal or active opposition to fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect and tolerance of different faiths and beliefs.’ (DfE, 2015, p.5)
Methodology

Action research

Participatory

Appreciative Inquiry

5 Phases of Appreciative Inquiry

**Dawn:** building relationships to lay the foundation for change

**Discovery:** finding the ‘best of what is’

**Dream:** imagining an ideal future

**Design:** planning for and committing to collaborative change

**Delivery:** creating the future through innovation and action
Timeline / data gathering / data analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data gathering activity</th>
<th>Analysis method</th>
<th>Date completed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPS focus group meeting 1</td>
<td>Thematic analysis</td>
<td>24.12.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPS focus group meeting 2</td>
<td>Thematic analysis</td>
<td>12.12.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR group meeting notes</td>
<td>Thematic analysis</td>
<td>12.12.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers diary</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
<td>01.12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual interview transcript (Principal EP)</td>
<td>Thematic analysis</td>
<td>12.12.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations records</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
<td>20.02.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action plans for intervention</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
<td>22.05.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members reflection focus groups</td>
<td>Thematic analysis</td>
<td>18.02.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Content’ - The EP role in communities in conflict


Cantle report – eight domains of social capital are termed: ‘Participation, empowerment, associational activity and common purpose, supporting networks and reciprocity, collective norms and values, trust, safety and belonging’. (Forrest & Kearns, 2001)

Contact hypothesis and Tajfel’s social identity theory

‘Vulnerability’ to radicalisation
Ethics - ‘hot potatoes’

Race, ethnicity, culture, identity and personal positioning

Shared discourse

Next steps

Ethics

Autumn term focus group – email

Appreciative Inquiry action group
Appendix 4a: Framework for ‘Dawn / Definition’ focus group discussion

Focus Group Schedule 05/10/16

Introduction (5 mins)
- Thanks
- Intro
- Introduce Appreciative Inquiry - Discover phase
- About getting an idea of where your service feels it is up to in terms of working within your local communities and an idea of the kinds of things you have seen or thought about regarding community cohesion.
- I would also like to set aside ten minutes at the end for us to discuss, as a group, where you would like to go next with this project and what you would like to get out of it. Then we will spend a bit of time thinking about what that will look like and what the next steps are.

5 Phases of Appreciative Inquiry

- It will last no more than one hour so I might have to move us on so we get through the questions.
- All personal details will be anonymised, and I will remind you that you have the right to withdraw at any time.

Stimulus materials
- Focus group questions
- Appreciative Inquiry diagram (see above)
- Prevent duty summary
- UNCRC summary
Focus group questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main questions</th>
<th>Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Think about a time you have completed some community psychology-type work. Can you talk a bit about it? What were the facilitators for community work?</td>
<td>Principles of community psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you understand about the Prevent Duty? How, if at all, has it impacted upon your current practice or the practice of the professionals you encounter in your day to day role?</td>
<td>Stimulus material - Prevent Guidance Has there been any training? Delivered by whom? Any positives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your current role, or in any previous roles, have you encountered any issues of community conflict within the communities you work? If you don’t mind talking about it, how did you deal with this?</td>
<td>How much does intergroup conflict or racism come up in your casework? What helps when dealing with it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about the Prevent duty, how are schools be supported by EPs in preventing radicalisation (define) in their students?</td>
<td>Does community psychology have anything to offer? Radicalisation - definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What, if anything, do you think the contribution of psychology could be in the promotion of community cohesion?</td>
<td>What might be the facilitators? Barriers?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debrief
- If anyone wants to talk about the issues raised I’m here for the next couple of hours.
- My email is on the info sheet
- You still have the right to withdraw
- Thank you so much for your time and for participating.
- Outline next steps for participation
## Appendix 4b: Framework for ‘Discover and dream’ focus group discussion

### Appreciative Inquiry for community cohesion - Discover and Dream

Focus group 11/1/17

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discover</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>What do you love most about working in (local authority)? What first drew you here and what has most encouraged you to stay?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | 2 | In your time working in (local authority), there will have been high and low points. What stands out for you as a high point of being part of this service?  
   |   | \* What happened and who was involved?  
   |   | \* What difference were you able to make?  
   |   | \* What were the strengths that you drew upon?  
   |   | \* What contributed to the success of the effort?  
   |   | \* What did you learn about change from the experience? |
| **Dream** | 3 | Imagine a future in which (local authority) EPS are a beacon of good practice in promoting community cohesion.  
   |   | \* What might EPs be doing?  
   |   | \* What are the strengths of the team that will be drawn upon?  
   |   | \* How will we know it is working? |
Appendix 4c: Framework for ‘Design’ focus group discussion

Appreciative Inquiry for community cohesion - Design

Focus group 06/04/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Discover</th>
<th>Recap of key points and member checking.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dream</td>
<td>What are the areas that you feel this EPS could have the biggest impact in promoting community cohesion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Who might be the interested partners in enhancing the EPS contribution to community cohesion? Why do you think they would be interested?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>What do you think is the best reason that (local authority) EPS should invest their time in promoting community cohesion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What communication (or other) structures would need to be put in place to draw attention to this investment?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4d: Delivery phase group ideas

Appreciative Inquiry for community cohesion - Delivery

Focus group 03/05/17

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intro</td>
<td>Member checking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Provocative propositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Create an action plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-session thinking task:

Could you think how you might finish this provocative proposition (without caveats):

(Local authority) Educational Psychology Service will promote cohesion in the local community by ________________________________.
Appendix 5: Initial coding example

B: and it really gave me pause. But it’s like you say that you’re always looking at it from your point of view.

A: well if you think about SEND culturally, we have a very meritocracy around attainment around, but if you look at other cultures it’s around your skills to live.

B: yeah

A: isn’t it, rather than your sort of your reading skills your maths skills, how many GCSEs you’ve got etc, it’s more around your skills to live.

M: mmm

A: so their sort of interpretation of that is very different as well isn’t it.

B: I had a parent get really really cross; she was complaining to me cause early years were in to assess her child’s development cause she thinks he is fine and she was saying ‘come on, he is fine isn’t he?’ and I’m thinking ‘no’ I said ‘he’s lovely’, but I – I knew her well enough that I could have that conversation with her. I said two and a half year olds are saying a lot more than he is he’s only got; but she had no frame of comparison in that way.

A: it was [local area] and I do wonder if there are certain areas that aren’t culturally defined but are very different. I remember talking to a group on [local area] and then even within [local area] there are some divisions of communities that regard themselves as separate and different to other ones so the ones round St [saint]’s, regard themselves as very different to the ones round [local area] and [local area 2] and [local area 3] are quite close but regard themselves very very differently and do behave differently and it’s that’s tiny, but they do regard themselves as communities.

M: mm

B: and I and I think that’s interesting

M: so it sounds like in terms of kind of what helps there’s certain things that you find out about communities when you work more closely with the communities that you might not have seen from a distance, something about not making 19.45 assumptions.

B: or even about what is a community.

M: yeah

A: how they view, how they define themselves.

M: how they, yeah, is that kind of important that communities define themselves, we’re not defining communities.

F: I know you don’t want us to talk about school work but I’m struggling obviously, (inaudible) you know cause I haven’t got as much experience as perhaps some other people to say about pieces of casework that are outside of school I’m thinking of my knowledge of community of (LA) that I know the schools that I’ve had for a long time and some of them I’ve been in schools for ten, over ten years. I’ve got a feel of how that community works out (inaudible) from conversations I’ve had with other teachers, conversations I’ve had with other parents and I think that makes my support in school richer somehow because I have an awareness of what it’s like to live in that community, okay I go home at five o’clock but I know some of the support staff in that school live in that community I have conversations about what it’s like to live in a flat on a certain estate cause she lived there for a couple of years and I have that experience and when I’m talking to
Appendix 6: Initial codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychology as culturally located</th>
<th>Schools value EP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Know your community</td>
<td>Teaching peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills - interests / person centred</td>
<td>School identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills – consultation</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills - openness non-judgment/curiosity</td>
<td>Who defines community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidisciplinary</td>
<td>Cultural ideas of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP knowledge of school community</td>
<td>Isolation of SEND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of EPS / LA</td>
<td>Refugees and trauma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA reputational risk</td>
<td>White British communities / deprivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual casework- too little too late</td>
<td>Anti-social behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Demographics/ Segregation - policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Natural segregation - ‘birds of a feather’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Segregation of communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>Segregation- socio-economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with families</td>
<td>Cultural homogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s bad out there!</td>
<td>Segregation - schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome measures / exclusions</td>
<td>Segregation-school success/aspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try something new - innovation</td>
<td>Segregation - unsegregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casework versus Strategic work</td>
<td>EAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proving yourself through casework</td>
<td>Radicalisation vulnerability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling stories / being listened to</td>
<td>Prevent duty - too little too late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems around a CYP</td>
<td>Prevent - safeguarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic work</td>
<td>Valuing diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuts</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Demographics/ Segregation-Historical backdrop / Brexit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

137
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work-life balance</th>
<th>National agenda / terrorism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traded work - time constraints</td>
<td>Sport/football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Casework - too little too late</td>
<td>Islamophobia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of LA</td>
<td>Developmental perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPs influencing policy</td>
<td>Valuing diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental perspective</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing psychology IRL</td>
<td>Challenging stereotypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting values - cultural sensitivity vs. personal values</td>
<td>Elephant in the room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting values - cultural sensitivity vs. psychological assumptions</td>
<td>Welcome - practising peace?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting values - cultural sensitivity vs. cultural values (including power / dominant)</td>
<td>Open door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural understanding of SEND</td>
<td>Parenting support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation of SEND</td>
<td>Primary vs secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family -school relations</td>
<td>Working with SLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School policy - exams</td>
<td>Preaching peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging / moving school</td>
<td>Cultural conflict in the playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools knowledge of their community</td>
<td>School community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School serve changing communities</td>
<td>Feeling valued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7a: Evidence of initial thematic analysis
Appendix 7b: Example of initial thematic map

- Against community cohesion
  - Isolation of SEND
  - Belonging/moving schools
  - Outcome measures/exclusions
  - Cultural conflict in the playground

- In schools
  - In society
    - National media/terrorism
    - Segregation
      - White British communities and deprivation
      - Anti-social behaviour
    - Socio-economic segregation
    - Homogeneity
    - Community segregation
    - Natural segregation?
    - Changing Demographics
      - Islamophobia
      - Sport/football
    - Schools
      - Faith schools
      - Who defines community?
      - Schools serve changing communities
      - Segregation of schools
      - ‘Unsegregation’ of schools
      - School success/aspiration
      - Schools know their community

- Segregation
  - Schools as communities
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**Method(s) of Analysis:**
The data will be analysed primarily through the thematic analysis of transcriptions of focus groups and notes from meetings. Both the initial and follow up focus groups will be fully orthographically transcribed (Braun & Clark, 2013) in order to keep the analysis close to the data. The transcripts will be thematically analysed from a social constructionist perspective.
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---
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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.
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Fieldwork Statement
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<p>| | | |</p>
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<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
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This research will not involve fieldwork visits to private homes, other than to those of friends or relatives.

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

L Jackson Taft

Name (in capitals): Leanne Jackson Taft

Date: 13/07/16
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Students and Supervisors please complete C.3 / C.4 respectively
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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).^9

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.

^9 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[^10] ) and **all supporting documents**[^11], and give these to your supervisor for review and feedback.
3. When satisfied with the application, your supervisor will submit:
   1. **This completed RREA form**
   2. Your completed UREC form – appending **ALL supporting documents**.
   3. Your completed and approved **Fieldwork Risk Assessment (FRA) form** - where indicated

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

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

[^10]: http://www.seed.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet/miestudenthome/integrityethics/

[^11]: 'Supporting documents' include recruitment adverts/emails, draft questionnaires / interview topic guides, information sheets and consent forms.
D.2 – Criteria for research classified as MEDIUM RISK (tick any that apply)

I confirm that this:

- is research involving children or other vulnerable groups which involves direct contact with participants.¹²
- 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 with adults in non-professional roles (e.g., parents).
- is research which focuses on data collection from professionals responding to questions outside of their professional concerns.
- is research with practitioners involving topics of a sensitive nature which are not personal to these participants.
- involves visits to site(s) where a specific risk to participants has been identified, and the researcher may not be closely supervised throughout.

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

**ACTIONS – MEDIUM RISK RESEARCH**

1. You and your supervisor should first agree this risk assessment.
2. You should then complete the MIE Ethical Approval Application form (available on the MIE Ethics Intranet) and all supporting documents, and give these to your supervisor for review and feedback.

¹² This does not include research in locations where children are present if they are not the focus of the research.

¹³ 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.
3. When satisfied with the application, your supervisor will submit:
   1. This completed RREA form
   2. Your completed MIE form – appending ALL supporting documents.
   3. Your completed and approved Fieldwork Risk Assessment (FRA) form - where indicated

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

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

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

D 3.1  NO human participants

I confirm that this research (tick as appropriate):

☐ is Secondary research (i.e. it will use material that has already been published or is in the public domain).

☐ is Secondary data analysis (i.e. it will involve data from an established data archive)

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

D3.2  Human participants

I confirm that this (tick as appropriate):

☐ research does not constitute high nor medium risk to the participants, as indicated by the criteria provided in sections D.0, D.1 and D.2 respectively.

☐ a reasonable person would agree that the study addresses issues of legitimate interest without being in any way likely to inflame opinion or cause distress\(^\text{16}\)

☐ 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.

\(^{16}\) A reasonable person would agree that the study includes no issues of public or private objection, or of a sensitive nature.
is a Pilot Study

D 3.3 Research context

I confirm (tick as appropriate):

- [x] I am not in a position to coerce potential participants/secondary data owners
- [x] the research involves no vulnerable group (as indicated in question B3).
If ONE OR MORE of the LOW risk criteria above have been selected, ethical approval must be sought from the Manchester Institute of Education (MIE) Research Integrity Committee (RIC).

**ACTIONS – LOW RISK DOCTORAL RESEARCH**

1. You and your supervisor should first agree this risk assessment.
2. You should then complete the MIE Ethical Approval Application form (available on the MIE Ethics Intranet)\(^\text{17}\) and all supporting documents\(^\text{18}\), and give these to your supervisor for review and feedback.
3. When satisfied with the application, your supervisor will submit:
   1. This completed RREA form
   2. Your completed MIE form – appending ALL supporting documents.
   3. Your completed and approved Fieldwork Risk Assessment (FRA) form - where indicated

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

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

---

\(^{17}\) 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/)

\(^{18}\) ‘Supporting documents’ include recruitment adverts/emails, draft questionnaires / interview topic guides, information sheets and consent forms.
SECTION E. Ethical Approval Application for LOW risk research

UG / PGT Research OR Doctorate Pilot Studies/Research Papers

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

E. 1 Research ethics criteria

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

I confirm:

Codes of Practice

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

Researcher skills/checks

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

Rights of participants

- X 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
- X 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.
- X I understand the Data Protection Act and the University Data Protection Policy and all data will be handled confidentially and securely, including storage on encrypted devices.
Research Integrity

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

Research output

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

ACTION: LOW RISK RESEARCH

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

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

**SUPERVISOR ACTION: LOW RISK RESEARCH**

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

   I confirm:

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

   AND one or more of the following as appropriate:

   - This research will not address issues of public or social objection, or of a sensitive nature.
   - Information giving and consent taking processes follow Manchester Institute of Education guidance.
   - Where fieldwork visits 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></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

19 Fieldwork visits involve travel to research locations off campus to collect data.
1. Completed RREA form

1. Student research proposal, or equivalent, on which the assessment is based\(^{20}\)

Completed and approved Fieldwork Risk Assessment form - where indicated

**Supporting documents:**

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

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

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

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

**NB:** The Ethics Administrator can only provide formal confirmation of ethical approval via email to both student and supervisor when a complete set of documents are supplied. Copies of all documents should be retained by the supervisor.

---

\(^{20}\) For audit purposes, a person unfamiliar with the research outlined in Section B must be able to ascertain the full details of the student project, therefore the study proposal or an equivalent document giving full details (eg assignment description) is required.
F.1 Minor amendments to LOW risk research design

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

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

The Ethics Administrator will provide formal acknowledgement of approval of the change by email. A copy should be retained by the supervisor.

To be completed if/when applicable:

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

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

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

Manchester Institute of Education

Ethical Approval Application Form

21 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>Leanne Jackson Taft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student ID (quoted on library/ swipe card):</td>
<td>9866515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:leanne.jacksontaft@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk">leanne.jacksontaft@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Supervisor:</td>
<td>Dr 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>Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year of Study</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full/Part-time</strong></td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title of Research Project:</strong></td>
<td>Exploring the role of the Educational Psychologist in promoting community cohesion</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:** | L Jackson Taft |
| **Supervisor Signature:** | **Date:** |

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

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

1. **Aims and Objectives of the Project**

1.1 **Research Question**

State the principal research question(s).

1. In what ways can an Educational Psychology Service envisage contributing to the promotion of community cohesion?

2. How might EPs empower those working with children and young people to promote community cohesion through a children’s rights approach?

1.2 **Academic Justification**

The adoption of children’s rights-based practice by schools and EP services has not been consistent (Woods & Harding, in press). The Prevent Duty adds further responsibilities to those professionals by requiring them to monitor and refer those who oppose ‘fundamental British values’ (DfE, 2010, p.5). Where EPs are working with schools and other communities, a model for community psychology may be appropriate, as outlined by Juras et al., (1997) but may encounter barriers in the forms of austerity and traded services (Hammond, 2013). EPs working within communities already experiencing conflict may find further barriers, in the deeper cultures of school staff and the local community as Smith found in Ni (Smith, 2002). Smith (2002) offers a useful multi-layered model in supporting community change, which has, as yet, not been implemented in further research. Against a social-constructionist framework there are several psychological approaches available for the promotion of community cohesion. Smith (2005), recommended a narrative psychological approach to examine understandings of ‘peace’. Forrest & Kearns’ (2001) eight domains of social capital offer a useful framework which Hayes (2002) enhanced with examples of work that can be done in schools to address them. Current EP practice in a northern town with a history of segregation was found to focus primarily on individual casework and appeared to be in the early stages of developing a shared discourse on community (Jackson Taft, 2016). This research aims to find ways in which EPs can envisage undertaking work in promoting community cohesion, and how a children’s rights-based approach could facilitate this.
2. **Methodology**

2.1 **Project Design:**
This research will be undertaken within a social constructionist paradigm and will use an Appreciative Inquiry action research framework and be undertaken with practising EPs, researching in their context within the Educational Psychology Service (EPS). This research will use the four ‘D’ model, using the stages ‘Discover, Dream, Design and Delivery’.

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 x  
  - No

Focus groups will be conducted in order to generate a broad picture of the range of views. The focus groups will be recorded using two data recorders, to ensure a full, audible recording is produced. This will be fully transcribed and anonymised in order to facilitate thematic analysis. The focus groups will be conducted according to the Focus group schedules (see appendix 1).

- **2.2.2. Questionnaires**
  - Yes x  
  - No

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

- **2.2.3. Observations**
  - Yes x  
  - No

If Yes, describe the context for the observation and what participants will be engaged in. (Append copy of any observation framework or other data collection guide to be used):

- **2.2.4. Diary**
  - Yes x  
  - No
2.2.5. Intervention

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

If Yes, describe the intervention and what participants will be asked to do. (Append a detailed description and any images necessary to support the description):

2.2.6. Assessments

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

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

2.2.7. Other

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

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

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

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

2.2.9 Research Experience

My assignment one for the Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology involved a focus group of EPs. This focus group was recorded and fully transcribed and analysed using Braun & Clark’s thematic analysis (Braun & Clark, 2013). This was undertaken and justified from a social constructionist perspective.
2.3 Sampling

What type of sampling method do you propose to use?

☐ 2.3.1. Statistical  Yes  No  x

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

☐ 2.3.2. Other  Yes x  No

This research will be using convenience sampling -

2.4 Analysis method

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

☐ 2.4.1. Quantitative analyses  Yes  No  x

If Yes, please give details:

☐ 2.4.2. Qualitative analyses  Yes x  No

The data will be analysed primarily through the thematic analysis of transcriptions of focus groups and notes from meetings. Both the initial and follow up focus groups will be fully orthographically transcribed (Braun & Clark, 2013) in order to keep the analysis close to the data. The transcripts will be thematically analysed from a social constructionist perspective.

The researcher will keep a diary; this along with consultation records and action plans created with schools will be analysed using content analysis. Content analysis will be used in order to ‘determine trends and patterns of words
used, their frequency, their relationships, and the structures and discourses of communication’ (Vaismoradi et al., 2013, p.400).

2.5 Ethical Issues
This research will follow the standards outlined in Ethical Practice Policy and Guidance set by the Manchester Institute of Education (The University of Manchester, 2014). The data generated will be from transcribed interviews or focus groups with the EP / EPs involved, potentially followed by transcribed focus groups and/or meetings with school staff and students. Data will be stored securely on encrypted data sticks and only the researcher and university supervisor will have access to it. Informed consent will be elicited from all participants. Issues of culture, community and ethnicity may arise during the course of data gathering with the participants. This can be a topic in which participants will already have a position in relation to since most people identify as part of a particular community group. This will bring a level of engagement with professional issues that the research will need to be mindful of in terms of ensuring participant safety and comfort.

3. Participant Details

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>6 female 2 male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age group(s)</td>
<td>25 - 60</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

x NONE OF THE ABOVE (go to item 4.)

3.2.2. Inclusion of vulnerable groups

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

3.2.3. Research in UK with vulnerable groups

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

☐ DBS*   Yes   No   NA

☐ Other   Yes   No   NA

If Other, please describe

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

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

☐ I will immediately notify the AEF if my DBS status changes

☐ NA

4. Recruitment
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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  x  NA

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

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

See appendix 3 - permission email

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

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

Describe the nature of these routes to identify your pool of potential participants.

4.2 Participant recruitment
4.2.2. Who will the potential participants be?

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

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

4.2.3. How will you approach potential participants? (tick all that apply)
Indicate how information about your study will be delivered to potential participants and how they will (directly or indirectly) let you know they would like to take part in your research.

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

See appendix 4 (email) & 5 (presentation)
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**

  **See appendix 6 (Participant Information Sheet / consent form) & appendix 5 (presentation to EPS)**
Information giving will be undertaken by:

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

Provide details on how you will fully inform potential participants about your study:

Information will be shared via email (see appendix 4), presentation (see appendix 5) and Participant Information Sheets (see appendix 6)

4.2.5 Information accessibility

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

The participants are all practising Educational Psychologists and as such should be familiar with academic language and English up to Level 7.

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
4 weeks

4.2.7. Incentives

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

There will be no financial incentives and participants will be informed that this is a Continuing Professional Development (CPD) opportunity.

4.2.8 Avoiding coercion

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

The participants are all practising Educational Psychologists and so do not necessarily belong to the above stated vulnerable groups. In order to avoid coercion the potential participants will be contacted individually in order to inform them that their participation is entirely voluntary.

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.

(see appendix 6)

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

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

The consent taking procedures follow the guidance provided in the University of Manchester Consent Form Template

5. Participation in the research

5.1 Duration

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

Each participant will be expected to take part in meetings and focus groups totalling between 2 and 6 hours.

5.2 Benefits to participation

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

Participants will be informed that this is a Continuing Professional Development (CPD) opportunity and an opportunity to develop their practice in an area identified as important by the Principal Educational Psychologist (PEP)

5.3 Deficits to participation

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

Some time will be taken from team meetings. This will be discussed with the PEP to ensure the benefits of participating in the research are worth the commitment of time from the EPS.

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

6.1 Physical risks
6.1.1 Potential

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

There are no identifiable physical risks.

6.1.2 Safeguards

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

The research will take place in the EP's usual place of work within the existing meeting times.

6.2 Psychological risks
6.2.1 Potential

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

Since the topic of the research is community cohesion there may be a risk of some discomfort during discussions on community conflict.

6.2.2 Safeguards

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

The research will operate a distress policy in which during more sensitive conversations the researcher will pause to see if the participant wants to carry on or withdraw.

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.

All of the Low Risk Fieldwork assessment criteria were ticked and so the Fieldwork I intend to undertake is Low Risk.

6.4 Early termination of the research

6.4.1 Criteria

What are the criteria for electively stopping the research prematurely?

The research will be electively stopped if an adverse event with regard to either the researcher or research participants occurs that renders the research untenable.

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 MIERC 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 data that might allow identification of individuals
7.2 Confidentiality of personal data

The focus group will be recorded using two data recorders. This will be fully transcribed and anonymised then stored securely with only the researcher and university supervisor having access to it. The recording will be deleted after transcription.

The meeting notes and consultations records will be anonymised before storage or email transfer with
pseudonyms used for participants. Data will be securely stored by the researcher’s university supervisor for five years after which it will be destroyed.

7.3 Research monitoring and auditing Please confirm:

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

Data will be securely stored by the researcher’s university supervisor for five years after which it will be destroyed.

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

*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
- [x] Analysis will take place in a private study area

7.6 Custody and control of the data Please confirm:

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

7.7 Access to the data

- [ ] The student researcher will have access to the data
- [x] The student’s supervisor(s) will have access to anonymised data

7.8 Use of data in future studies

- [ ] Will the data be stored for use in future studies? Yes No [x]

- [ ] If Yes, confirm this is addressed in the information giving/consent taking process by ticking here.
8. Reporting Arrangements

8.1 Dissemination

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

- Peer reviewed scientific journals
- Book / Chapter contribution
- Published review (ESRC, Cochrane)
- Internal report
- Conference presentation
- Thesis/dissertation

Other e.g. Creative works (describe here):

8.2 Participant and community feedback

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

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

9. Research Sponsorship

9.1 External funding

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

- External Funding
- No external funding
If you have funding please provide details:

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

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

- [ ] The University of Manchester  
- [ ] 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:*
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Does your department/the University receive payment (apart from costs)?

If so, please provide details:

x NONE of the ABOVE APPLY

Thank you
This is the end of the form

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

CHECKLIST

Please tick to indicate whether the document is APPENDED OR NOT APPLICABLE for this application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Appended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection instruments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft copy of each data collection instrument named in Q2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Questionnaire, Interview guide, etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video and Still Image Recording Declaration (VASTRE)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant recruitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter(s) of permission to conduct research within each organisation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment advertisement(s) specified in Q4.2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</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>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Information sheet/letter/email/script)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent taking – one <strong>for each</strong> participant type specified in Q3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Consent form or alternative procedure)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fieldwork risk assessment**

| Fieldwork Risk Assessment Form (approved) | x |
| RREA form Low Risk Fieldwork Declaration (Section C) completed | 1 |
### 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><strong>Supervisor’s signature</strong>*</th>
<th><strong>Date.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

---

22 Minor amendments are those that do not alter the character of the research or the participant groups
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Appendix 8b: Ethical approval confirmation

**Ethical Approval – CONFIRMATION for Low Risk**

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

Wed 03/08/2016, 09:27

Leanne Jackson Taft;

Kevin Woods;

Dear Leanne,

Ref: PGR-9866515-RP

I am pleased to confirm that your ethical approval application for your project – ‘Exploring the role of the Educational Psychologist in promoting community cohesion’ has been submitted as Low Risk by your supervisor.

The approval for this is on condition you supply all supporting documentation relevant to your research i.e. consent and participation forms, interview schedules, questionnaires.

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

This approval is only for the Ethical Approval application, you are still required, if necessary, to have received approval from the Fieldwork Risk Assessment before carrying out any research.

Regards

Georgia Irving

Administrator for Collaborative Provision and Centre for Equity

Room BG13

School of Environment, Education and Development

The University of Manchester

Tel: 0161 275 3785

Email: Georgia.irving@manchester.ac.uk
Exploring the role of the Educational Psychologist in promoting community cohesion

Participant Information Sheet

You are being invited to take part in a thesis research study which will be submitted as part of the researcher’s Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology at the University of Manchester. 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?
Leanne Jackson Taft
Manchester Institute of Education
School of Environment, Education and Development (SEED),
Ellen Wilkinson Building,
The University of Manchester,
Oxford Road,
Manchester,
M13 9PL

What is the purpose of the research?
This research aims to find out about the current and potential practice of Educational Psychologists (EPs) regarding community conflict and the promotion of community cohesion.

Why have I been chosen?
You have been chosen as a participant because you are a currently practising EP.

What would I be asked to do if I took part?
You would be asked to take part in a focus group discussion about your current and potential practice which will take approximately one hour. This will be followed by an opportunity to take part in an action research group, facilitated by the researcher, on the ways in which EPs can promote community cohesion. This action group will meet half termly for the academic year 2016/2017.

This research will be participatory, and so the direction and end results will be negotiated and co-created with the researcher and participants. Since the topic of the research is community cohesion there may be a risk of some discomfort during discussions on community conflict.

What happens to the data collected?
The focus group will be recorded and transcribed. The anonymised transcript will be seen by the researcher and their university supervisor. The meeting notes from the action group will be analysed, as well as the consultation records from work with schools pertaining to the research.

How is confidentiality maintained?
The focus group will be recorded using two data recorders. This will be fully transcribed and anonymised then stored securely with only the researcher and university supervisor having access to it. The recording will be deleted after transcription. The meeting notes and consultations records will be anonymised before storage or email transfer with pseudonyms used for participants. Data will be securely stored by the researcher’s university supervisor for five years after which it will be destroyed.

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

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

Will I be paid for participating in the research?

There will be no payment for taking part in this research.

What is the duration of the research?

There will be two hour long focus groups and 4 hour long action group meetings, held half-termly over the course of the academic year 2016/2017 and should be complete by September 2017.

Where will the research be conducted?

The meetings will be held at:

Educational Psychology Team
Schools and Education

Will the outcomes of the research be published?

Provide details of anticipated outcomes in respect of publication of findings.

Disability and Barring Service (DBS) Check (if applicable)

The researcher has undergone a satisfactory DBS check.

Who has reviewed the research project?

The project has been reviewed by the University of Manchester Research Ethics Committee 1.

What if something goes wrong?

If you would like to contact me regarding any problems with the research, my email address is leanne.jacksontaft@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk.

The research will operate a distress policy in which during more sensitive conversations the researcher will pause to see if the participant wants to carry on or withdraw.

What if I want to complain?

If there are any issues regarding this research you should contact the researcher in the first instance at leanne.jacksontaft@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk. However, if you would prefer not to discuss with members of the research team, please contact 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?

My email address is leanne.jacksontaft@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk or you can leave a message with the university at 0161 275 3511

This Project Has Been Approved by the University of Manchester’s Research Ethics Committee 9866515
Exploring the role of the Educational Psychologist in promoting community cohesion

CONSENT FORM

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I understand that my data will remain confidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I understand that the interviews will be audio-recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I agree to the use of anonymous quotes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I agree to take part in the above project

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

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

This Project Has Been Approved by the University of Manchester’s Research Ethics Committee 9866515
Appendix 11: Slides and notes from presentation to conference

Community Cohesion - a children’s rights issue?

Leanne Jackson Taft (Trainee Educational Psychologist, University of Manchester)

Why community cohesion?

- National hate crimes up 100% on last year (Independent, 2017)
- Greater Manchester hate crime reports rise by 50% (BBC, 30/6/16)
- Segregation in schools increasing (DEMOS, 2015; Schooldash, 2017)
- Department for Education funding for community cohesion work after the Manchester Arena bombing.

- Issues of community conflict appear to be on the increase: global and ‘home grown’ terrorism, child sexual exploitation, racism, Islamophobia and the rise of the far right.
- The EU referendum was a bit of a flashpoint in terms of highlighting community divisions, as the subsequent rise in hate crime figures shows. Hate crimes have risen in the period since against the LGBTQI community, Jewish community, children with SEND.
- There is also increasing segregation in our society and schools. The school dash report measured the difference between the ethnic heritage of children and young people in schools and compared them to their immediate local area and found that segregation is increasing. The demos integration hub published a report in 2015 which found that 60% of year one pupils from a minority ethnic background attended a school in which children from a white british background were in a minority (DEMOS, 2015).
After the Manchester Arena bombing, there are potentially thousands of children, young people and their families affected by the after effects of trauma, and thousands more suffering from anxiety.

There has been funding provided by the DfE for EPs in the NW to develop materials to support schools to prepare for critical incidents, and to support and promote cohesion in school settings.

The evidence from my thesis literature review suggests that CC promotion works best when supported by local and / or national policy. But the political drivers for community cohesion work ebb and flow.

After the riots in the North of England in 2001, the Cantle report was commissioned and funding provided for cc initiatives. After the 7/7 bombings in London, CC was once again a focus. It is likely to be so again.

To maintain focus on work in this area, we need look no further than the United Nations Convention on the Rights of a Child.
- My research first looked at **the research evidence** for what psychology-based approaches are schools using to promote CC in their setting.

- What’s interesting is CC promotion looks different in different countries. In Northern Ireland, Kenya, Uganda, places with recent conflicts, it’s peace education. In the rest of Europe, it’s social cohesion, and more about the individual’s contribution to society. In the UK and US, it’s more about the contract between the individual and the state.

- In my research project, working with an EPS on how they thought Educational psychology would contribute to CC, we talked at length about what CC looks like.

- When it’s going well it looks like lots of other things: resilience, belonging, participation, extended schools, inclusion. This quote illustrates the frustration with the part of the Prevent duty for schools that requires the explicit teaching of ‘FBV’. A report in 2017 found that there was widespread discomfort around elements of Prevent including teaching that some values such as ‘tolerance’ are British. There was also a feeling that Prevent stigmatises some communities. Is that recognised in your schools?

- An SLR found that approaches to community cohesion can be targeted at different levels of intervention and that approaches that target more than one level may have the greatest impact.

- Process-based may be useful alongside knowledge-based approaches.

- Processes can be at the level of individual, interpersonal, intergroup & community.

- Participation essential on every level, classroom approaches should take into account and challenge existing views. Participatory classrooms can generate open discussion to challenge and debate views.
Research found that whilst CC sounds like a new area of practice, so many existing EP practices and skills support it - working with schools, developing relationships, multi-agency working, group consultation, working at a systemic level, using a person-centred approach.

- Considering context - national socio-political landscape, local policy, community, family, school factors.

- Psychological understanding including cognitive (CBT - challenging thoughts) affective - emotional regulation, understanding trauma, intergroup processes such as social identity formation, ingroups and outgroups.

- EPs shared concerns that by aiming to learn more about the different communities in their area there may be a danger of making assumptions or using stereotypes.

- Echoes the work of Ron Smith, an educational psychologist in NI who reported a ‘culture of silence’ in schools around issues of community. If we allow discomfort to prevent us from having conversations with children and young people, where are views able to be expressed.

- EPs found considering schools to be communities and supporting schools in the amazing work that they do in serving and knowing their local community, they could promote CC in that way.
As part of the findings of the research project, EPs reflected on there being different approaches to community cohesion depending on whether a proactive or reactive approach was taken. If issues of conflict had arisen, more targeted approaches might be appropriate.

There was also a question that schools were finding if a young person had been referred to Channel (the scheme to channel people away from “radicalisation”) and had not met the threshold for Channel involvement then schools were left without a clear way forward. EPs wondered what a graduated approach might look like.

This model uses the levels of intervention from before along with a continuum from universal to targeted and is a way to organise thoughts about what might seem like a vast area.

So we have along the intrapersonal continuum, metacognitive approaches across to understanding and monitoring for risk factors for radicalisation.

Interpersonal encompasses the spectrum from positive peer relationships to conflict resolution.

At the intergroup level contact between different groups and communities might look different in different settings, e.g. in a schools serving mainly one community, contact with other schools could be arranged. In schools where children or young people socialise mainly within their community groups, how can positive intergroup contact be fostered? Where there is intergroup conflict, e.g. gang violence, there may be a role for psychologists to support in understanding the processes of how individuals join gangs.

And at a community level, how can we foster genuine power sharing and participation?

Smith recommended a narrative approach, of sharing our stories. That study asked young people to write a poem about what peace meant to them. The researcher then brought together the peace poems and asked policy makers to analyse them to inform policy development.
• In a local school, which had a few students who were INA, they asked the children to say one thing they missed about the country they had left and one thing they didn’t miss. One of the children described a family party and there was an argument and somebody threw something, and the adults took a while to work out it was a grenade. And staff valued that insight and young people reported feeling **valued and listened to**.

• Ultimately, **schools are hubs of community cohesion**, bringing together members of communities as stakeholders in the school. Is there a role for educational psychologists to support schools to celebrate and build on their strengths as well as identifying ways to grow their provision?