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ABSTRACT

This study investigates Educational Psychologists’ (EPs’) unique contribution within their profession when working with Ethnic Minority Clients (EMCs) when the EP is able to speak languages other than English.

The research adopted an exploratory study design and used qualitative methodology. Activity Theory (Engeström, 1987) was employed to examine the socio-cultural factors that mediate current practice and to inform future practice. Semi-structured interviews were utilised with six EPs who spoke at least one more language in addition to English.

The findings suggest that EP services may not yet have taken advantage of the opportunities that workforce diversity offers. As the EPs’ practice is varied, it is difficult to make specific recommendations to guide EPs in their work with EMCs. The study suggests that data should be collected on the other languages EPs can speak and then guidelines drawn up as to how this expertise might be used and the issues arising. Further research is needed to determine the potential benefits to the child and family when the EP speaks the same language (other than English). It would also be useful to explore whether there is value for EMC families when their EP also has English as a secondary language, even when the additional language is not shared.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction to the volume

This volume presents research undertaken for the purpose of a three year (2014-2017) Applied Educational and Child Psychology Doctorate training programme at the University of Birmingham.

It discusses the professional work of plurilingual Educational Psychologists (EPs) with Ethnic Minority Clients (EMCs) using languages other than English, through the lens of an Activity Theory framework and applied thematic analysis.

1.2 Volume structure

Chapter 1 discusses my positionality and offers clarification regarding key terminology. It then provides an overview of the national and local context of diversity, with an emphasis on UK minority populations whose ‘main language’ or ‘first language at home’ is not English, and who are ‘non-proficient’ in English. The chapter closes with a summative study rationale as a prelude to chapter 2.

Chapter 2 outlines the nature, scope and remit of the professional ‘activity’ undertaken by EPs. It then presents a review of the EP literature pertinent to the profession’s response to the increasing cultural and linguistic diversity across the client group and/or within its own workforce. The chapter closes with an overview and implications of workforce diversity.
Chapter 3 explores the concept of plurilingualism. It then discusses plurilingual EP practice within an international arena and some key implications highlighted in the existing literature.

Chapter 4 offers a detailed overview of the research methodology, including study design, overarching ontological and epistemological stance, and procedure with due consideration to ethical issues. The data collection methods are informed by Activity Theory and the data are qualitatively analysed via a thematic analysis approach.

Chapter 5 offers a presentation and discussion of the results.

Chapter 6 provides the research conclusions with implications for practice and future research. It also considers limitations to the current study and offers suggestions for improvement.

1.3 Positionality statement

One of the major criticisms of much educational research is that it is biased (Sikes, 2004). Thus the researcher's positionality ought to be made explicit (Thomas, 2013) in order to provide a transparent overview of their socio-cultural context (Bryman, 2012), as well as their ethics, personal integrity, social values and/or competency (Greenbank, 2003) that might have influenced the conduct of the study and the interpretation of findings (Edge and Richards, 1998; Foote and Gau Bartell, 2011). Specifically, Tillman (2002) suggested that where cultural knowledge is concerned, it is important for the reader to be able to verify “whether the researcher has the
This study has been conducted with the acknowledgement that in being part of it, the researcher “can[not] escape the social world to study it” (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995; p. 17) and is therefore an active agent in acquiring knowledge of the research context (Thomas, 2013). Thus, values of the researcher are assumed to exist and although it is the researcher’s responsibility to try to understand the multiple constructs of meaning and knowledge, the subjectivity is an integral part of the research (Robson, 2011).

1.3.1 Biographical information

The aim of this overview is to illustrate my direct exposure to and experience of three different cultures, albeit limited to the specific contexts and/or events I have directly experienced and/or became familiar with. It is deemed pertinent, as it contributed to the development of this project and it might have affected the nature of my interpretations.

I was born and raised in Poland, where I lived for 19 years of my life. During that period of time, I completed the government-required level of education up to the UK’s A-level equivalent. Subsequently, between September 2006 and June 2008 I participated in the ‘Au Pair’ programme regulated by the US Department of State, which offers a cultural experience with opportunities to work with children, study and travel in the US. Although I resided in Minnesota, my exposure to the American
culture was broadened through visits to other states\(^1\). During that time, I also studied cultural exchange and Psychology at college level. In September 2008, I moved to England, where I have lived, studied, and worked ever since.

1.3.2 Cultural identity

Most official registers require me to identify as Polish, in line with my country of birth. However, I view myself through a lens of the cultural fusion theory (Kramer, 2000a, 2000b), which acknowledges that elements of culture, race, language and/or ethnicity amalgamate (Kraidy, 2005), enabling the newcomers to a culture to build upon their knowledge base by integrating it with newly acquired cultural knowledge. Thus, the newcomers “adopt behaviours/traits of the dominant culture and maintain elements of their minority identity to function in the dominant culture” (Croucher and Kramer, 2017; p. 98).

Accordingly, I wish to honour the range of cultural influences that have collectively shaped my fused cultural identity through identifying myself as a ‘citizen of the world’.

1.3.3 Work experience

In addition to the US cultural exchange programme, over the last nine years (2008-2017) I have worked across both the voluntary and public sectors in England, where I have had the opportunity to work with colleagues as well as clients (children/young people [CYP] and families) from a wide range of ethnic backgrounds. Specifically,

\(^1\) California, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, New York, South Dakota, and Wisconsin
my work as an Assistant Educational Psychologist and a Trainee Educational Psychologist (TEP) have occasionally required me to negotiate my professional practice in language other than English, in order to help facilitate Polish immigrant families’ access to public services and/or resources.

I am therefore in the position of sharing some personal characteristics with those of the research participants and this study may be biased, given my personal experiences.

In particular, in my professional practice with Polish families, I have been able to reflect on potential strengths and constraints of using Polish within that context. Although I have facilitated communication with Polish families not proficient in English and subsequently relayed their views to other practitioners (e.g. via written psychological advice), I experienced some limitations in relation to using and/or translating certain words (e.g. medical and/or diagnostic terms), as well as when explaining certain procedures and/or systems (e.g. statutory assessment) in Polish. I have also learnt that information provided by other organisations is sometimes translated verbatim as opposed to taking into consideration cultural nuances, which subsequently changes its connotation and may require additional explanation, when working with EMCs.

At a service level, I started to notice that my ethnicity and/or additional language skills might have been recognised as advantageous by some of my colleagues, who would ask me for advice, request assistance in their work with Polish families (e.g. interpreting during assessment) and/or re-allocate Polish children to me. Taking into
consideration my limited experience at that point in time and my personal limitations, as well as significantly greater level of experience amongst my monolingual colleagues, I began to wonder whether I could indeed contribute something additional and/or unique when working with Polish families or whether it was simply an unsubstantiated view held by others.

1.4 Key terminology

1.4.1 Migrant, nationality and ethnic minority

The use of terms ‘migrant’, ‘nationality’ and/or ‘ethnic minority’ is highly problematic due to significant variations among data sources. Table 1.1 provides a breakdown of definitions of a ‘migrant’ represented in key government data sources and Table 1.2 provides a list of terminology used interchangeably. Correspondingly, the word ‘nationality’ has two distinct definitions, as outlined in Table 1.3.

Although it is not the purpose of this study to argue precise definitions, it is deemed important to highlight that these discrepancies pose significant challenges to data analysis, interpretation, and/or validity of comparisons between different data sources. This in turn impacts media discourses (Baker et al. 2008) and general public understanding (Anderson and Blinder, 2017).

The terms ‘migrant’ and ‘nationality’ used in this volume are consistent with the criteria employed by the respective data sources (Table 1.1). The term ‘ethnic minority’ on the other hand is considered to be any person or a group of people
Table 1.1: Definitions of a ‘migrant’ represented in government data sources (taken from Anderson and Blinder, 2017; p. 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Office for National Statistics (ONS)</th>
<th>Labour Force Survey(^2) (LFS)</th>
<th>Home Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One year (United Nations [UN])</td>
<td>✓ self-reported intent</td>
<td>can approximate with length of stay variable</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Enter [the country] in order to settle” (Dictionary)</td>
<td>× may be approximated with length of stay variable</td>
<td>can approximate with length of stay variable</td>
<td>✓ settlement grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to immigration control</td>
<td>✓ for those staying at least one year</td>
<td>can approximate by excluding European Union (EU) nationals</td>
<td>✓ for those with entry clearance visas, border entries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born resident</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign national</td>
<td>✓ staying at least one year</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>× non-European Economic Area (EEA) nationals only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) LFS is the largest household study of the employment circumstances in the UK. It is completed every three years and it provides the official measures of employment and unemployment.

Table 1.2: Alternative terminology used to describe and/or reference the concept of a ‘migrant’ (compiled from Anderson and Blinder, 2017; Baker et al., 2008; Beutin et al., 2006; Crawley, 2009; Saggar and Dreen, 2001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative ‘migrant’ terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. foreign-born UK residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. foreign nationals (or citizens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. people who have moved to the UK for a period of at least one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ethnic or religious minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. asylum seekers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.3: Dictionary definition of the word ‘nationality’ (taken from Cambridge Dictionary, no date; web page).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Synonym</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“the official right to belong to a particular country”</td>
<td>citizenship</td>
<td>citizenship can change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“a group of people of the same race, religion, traditions, etc.”</td>
<td>ethnic group</td>
<td>possibility of a dual citizenship (or dual nationality)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

whose ethnic origin is other than ‘White British’. It is therefore inclusive of migrant populations (Table 1.2) and some British citizens\(^3\), unless otherwise stated.

1.4.2 Plurilingualism

Table 1.4 outlines some of the key vocabulary in relation to language proficiency, with its corresponding implications. Likewise, Table 1.5 provides an overview of the key definitions (often used interchangeably) in relation to the context of English language acquisition.

Table 1.4: Dictionary definitions of the key terminology in relation to language proficiency (taken from Oxford Dictionary, no date; web page).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Implication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ‘Bilingual’</td>
<td>“Speaking <strong>two</strong> languages fluently”</td>
<td>Limited to <strong>two</strong> languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ‘Multilingual’</td>
<td>“In or using <strong>several</strong> languages”</td>
<td>Limited to <strong>more than two but not many</strong> languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ‘Plurilingual’</td>
<td>“Relating to, involving, or fluent in a <strong>number of</strong> languages”</td>
<td>Implies <strong>any</strong> particular whole quantity of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) e.g. second generation migrants
Table 1.5: Dictionary definitions of the key terminology in relation to the context of English language acquisition (taken from Oxford Learner’s Dictionaries, no date; web page).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Implication(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ‘English as a Second Language’</td>
<td>“refers to the teaching of English as a foreign language to people who are living in a country in which English is either the first or second language”</td>
<td>English is an official or main language of the community and the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ‘English as a Foreign Language’</td>
<td>“refers to the teaching of English to people for whom it is not the first language”</td>
<td>English is learned in environments where the language of the community and the school is not English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ‘English as an Additional Language’</td>
<td>“refers to the teaching of English in schools to children whose first language is not English”</td>
<td>The use or study of the English language by non-native speakers in an English-speaking environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The term ‘plurilingualism’ has been favoured over ‘bilingualism’ and ‘multilingualism’, as it is inclusive of these terms (e.g. it does not limit the scope of language proficiency to either two or several languages) and it is not the purpose of this study to differentiate bilingual speakers from those who are multilingual. In contrary, this study seeks to gain an insight into the work of EPs who have used at least one language other than English in their professional practice with EMCs. Thus, for the purpose of this study, ‘plurilingualism’ is understood as “the possession of skills in more than one linguistic code”, which enables the speaker to “switch from one language to another according to the situation” in line with the description proposed by the Council of Europe (Coste, Moore and Zarate, 2009; p. 19).

Similarly, this study does not intend to differentiate between individuals who might have acquired English or other language as their additional language. Thus relevance of the terms, such as ‘English as a Second Language’ (ESL), English as a
Foreign Language (EFL) and/or ‘English as an Additional Language’ (EAL) is limited to contextualising background information and/or discussing sample characteristics.

1.5 National context

1.5.1 UK population

Consistent with population increases since 2005, the total UK population was estimated to be 65.6 million in 2016, its largest ever (ONS, 2017c). The gradual increase in population over time has been attributed to births outnumbering deaths, as well as immigration\(^4\) rates outnumbering emigration\(^5\) rates (ONS, 2017a; b; c).

1.5.1.1 Migrant population

Figure 1.1 illustrates the changes in the proportion of migrants in the UK since 2000, with a significant increase of the European Union (EU) citizens noted between 2000 and 2011. The total number of non-British citizens living in the UK has reportedly increased from 5.6 million\(^6\) in 2015 (ONS, 2016) to 6 million in 2017 (ONS, 2017d).

1.5.1.2 Nationalities in the UK

Figure 1.2 illustrates the range of nationalities in the UK, as compared at two points in time. Approximately 5.85 million\(^7\) of the UK residents were estimated to have non-British nationality in 2016 (ONS, 2017e).

\(^4\) ‘Immigration’ refers to people coming into the UK.
\(^5\) ‘Emigration’ refers to people leaving the UK.
\(^6\) 3.2 million (five in every hundred) EU citizens and 2.4 million (four in every hundred) of non-EU citizens
\(^7\) One in eleven
Figure 1.1: The proportion of EU and non-EU citizens in the UK between 2000 and 2015 (BBC News, 2017; web page – based on ONS, 2017b).

Figure 1.2: Nationality of migrants living in the UK (BBC News, 2017; web page–based on ONS, 2017b).
Correspondingly, Department for Education (DfE) confirmed that the proportion of pupils from minority ethnic origins\(^8\) has been gradually increasing since 2006 (DfE, 2017a). Ethnic minority pupils accounted for 66% of the total increase in pupil numbers in primary schools between 2016 and 2017. In January 2017, there were around 30% of ethnic minority pupils in primary and secondary schools (32% and 29%, respectively\(^8\)).

1.5.2 Main languages in England and Wales

According to the England and Wales 2011 census data, just under 8% (4.2 million) of the population aged 3 and over reported language other than English\(^10\) as their ‘main language’ (ONS, 2013b). Although similar findings were demonstrated in the LFS, where 7.8% of the population in England and Wales reported using language other than English as their ‘first language at home’ in 2012 (ONS, 2013b), comparisons ought to be made with caution\(^11\). Nevertheless, the LFS data show interesting patterns since 2003, such as a gradual decrease in people speaking English as their ‘first language at home’ (ONS, 2013b).

Correspondingly, the DfE reported that the number of pupils ‘exposed to a language known or believed to be other than English in their home’ has been steadily rising

\(^8\) Pupils with ethnic heritage classed as ‘other than White British’, thus inclusive of non-White British citizens

\(^9\) It is unknown how many of these pupils were ‘non-White British’ citizens.

\(^10\) English or Welsh in Wales

\(^11\) LFS asks a question on the ‘first language at home’ rather than the ‘main language’. It also lacks sufficient numbers of respondents to capture the range and/or scope of differences shown by smaller sub-groups (Poppleton et al., 2013).
since 2006 (DfE, 2017b). For example, 21% of pupils in primary schools and 16% of pupils in secondary schools were classed as having EAL\(^{12}\) in January 2017.

Figure 1.3 illustrates the top ten most frequently spoken main languages\(^{13}\) other than English in England and Wales in 2011.

**Figure 1.3**
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Source: ONS

**Figure 1.3:** Top ten most frequently spoken main languages other than English and Welsh in England and Wales in 2011 (ONS, 2013b).

\(^{12}\) A pupil is recorded to have EAL if they are exposed to a language at home that is known or believed to be other than English (DfE, 2017a).

\(^{13}\) The ‘All Other Chinese’ category included Chinese languages except for written Mandarin Chinese and Cantonese Chinese.
1.5.2.1 English language proficiency in residents aged 3 and over

The England and Wales 2011 census data suggest that out of 4.2 million people whose main language was not English, 20% self-reported being 'non-proficient' in English, 9% being CYP aged 3 to 15 (ONS, 2013a). Of these 20%, 84% reported that they 'could not speak English well' and 16% 'could not speak English at all' (ONS, 2013b).

Figure 1.4 provides an overview of the English language proficiency in residents of England and Wales aged 3 and over. Although the proportions of people being unable to speak English well or not at all were the highest in London, the West Midlands was the second largest region (2% of the population).

1.6 Local context

1.6.1 West Midlands population

According to the 2011 England and Wales census data, the total West Midlands population was 5.6 million in 2011 with the third largest share of non-UK born residents. Foreign-born residents made up over 11% of the total West Midlands population and 8.4% of the total non-UK born population of England and Wales in

---

14 Please note that 22,000 people reported using sign language, with less than a third being 'proficient' in English. However, they have been purposefully excluded from this comparison, as ONS acknowledged that even though the respondents might have had a reduced opportunity in developing speaking skills, they might have had the ability to understand English, which was not accounted for as part of the 2011 census (ONS, 2013a).

15 Census (like other questionnaires) relies on self-reported data, which could be highly variable, especially when self-assessing skills such as language proficiency. Although it is recognised that it would not be realistic to subject respondents to a standardised assessment on such a large scale, standardised tools could provide a more consistent and/or reliable representation of language proficiency.

16 The top ten main languages other than English combined (Figure 1.3) accounted for over 60% of all those 'non-proficient' in English in 2011 (ONS, 2013b).
While the total population increased by 6% between 2001 and 2011, the non-UK born population increased by 58% (Krausova and Vargas-Silva, 2013). At a Local Authority (LA) level, Birmingham had the highest number of non-UK born citizens in 2011, who accounted for 22% of its total population and 38% of the non-UK born residents of the West Midlands region.

**Figure 1.4**

*Figure 1.4: English language proficiency in England and Wales in 2011 (ONS, 2013a).*

**1.6.2 Main languages and English language proficiency in West Midlands**

Just under 400,000 residents spoke a language other than English as their main language in 2011, accounting for 7% of the total West Midlands population aged 3
and above. Panjabi (17%) was the most commonly spoken language at that time, followed by Polish (13%) and Urdu (13%).

The 2011 Census Detailed Characteristics data (table DC2210EWr) also suggest that over 100,000 West Midlands residents were ‘non-proficient’ in English (28% of the residents who spoke language other than English as their main language). Among those residents 23% reported ‘not being able to speak English well’ and 5% reported they ‘could not speak English at all’. Figure 1.5 illustrates top ten languages with the highest number of residents ‘non-proficient’ in English. Nation-wide, Birmingham had the largest population of CYP aged 3 to 15 who were ‘non-proficient’ English speakers and whose main language was other than English (3,300; ONS, 2013a).

**Figure 1.5**
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*Source: 2011 Census Detailed Characteristics table DC2210EWr*

**Figure 1.5**: Top ten languages with the highest number of West Midlands residents 'non-proficient' in English in 2011.
The largest prevalence of ‘non-proficiency’ in English language was across Asian languages, with 46% of all West Midlands residents speaking Pakistani Pashari (with Mirpuri and Potwari) reporting being ‘non-proficient’ English speakers, closely followed by residents whose main language was Vietnamese (43%). Figure 1.6 illustrates top ten languages with the highest prevalence of ‘non-proficiency’ in English in West Midlands in 2011. Although Polish was the third largest group ‘non-proficient’ in English (Figure 1.5), the prevalence of Polish citizens resident in West Midlands reporting being ‘non-proficient’ in English was 31%\(^{17}\) \((9^{th}\) highest). These trends correspond with the literature, which suggests that people who speak Asian languages may find it more difficult to acquire and/or become proficient in English, as the linguistic distance\(^{18}\) between these languages is greater (Chiswick and Miller, 2005).

### 1.7 Study rationale

The concept of a ‘culture’ is very broad and multilayered, as it refers to “the way of life, especially the general customs and beliefs, of a particular group of people at a particular time” (Cambridge dictionary, no date; web page). Kramsch (2003) asserted that cultures are fundamentally heterogeneous and they change over time, as they are the “product[s] of socially and historically situated discourse communities […] created and shaped by language” (p. 10). Correspondingly, Williams and O’Reilly (1998) offered that diversity can be perceived as “any attribute that another person

---

\(^{17}\) This is directly related to the total number of Polish citizens resident in West Midlands, which was 49,965 in 2011.

\(^{18}\) A measure of how different one language is from another.
Figure 1.6: Top ten languages with the highest level of prevalence of ‘non-proficiency’ in English in West Midlands in 2011.

Source: 2011 Census Detailed Characteristics table DC2210EWr
may use to detect individual differences” (cited in Mannix and Neale, 2005; p. 31). Thus, it can be conceptualised in terms of factors underlying the division (e.g. class, race, gender, age, language) or proportions of minority (Kravitz, 2005), as discussed above.

Due to the nature and scope of the information required to contextualise the current study, the above statistics have been largely derived from the 2011 England and Wales census (see Table 1.6 for an overview of key strengths and limitations). Although other sources of information on UK population characteristics (e.g. LFS and DfE) were also referred to and relevant figures reported for comparison, the data in relation to cultural and linguistic demographics appear to be sparse and difficult to locate. Nevertheless, the above statistics illustrate that today’s Britain is a global society where diversity and plurilingualism are far more prominent aspects of everyday life than ever before.

Consequently, it is increasingly common for practitioners to work with clients from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, who do not speak English or are not proficient in English. Exploring multilingual capacities and integrating culturally and/or linguistically diverse perspectives is therefore progressively more important (Aalberse et al., 2011; Athanasopoulos, 2016; Johnson et al., 2012) across a wide range of fields, including education, health and/or management (Byram, 1997; Earley, 1987; Finney et al., 2014; Kosoko-Lasaki et al., 2008).

---

19 Although it is important to refer to other sources of data to update the information between censuses, other sources are likely to have significant sampling limitations and large margins of error, especially at the local level (Krausova and Vargas-Silva, 2013).
Table 1.6: Key strengths and limitations of census (adapted from Krausova and Vargas-Silva, 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Currently the most thorough source of</td>
<td>1. Conducted once every 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information about the population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aims to include the entire population</td>
<td>2. Margin of error 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Based on a count of people and households</td>
<td>3. Specific confidence intervals are not always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and/or immediately available for certain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>census data (e.g. country of birth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supplemented by a survey to detect and</td>
<td>4. Reliance on self-reported and/or self-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estimate those who are missed at first</td>
<td>assessed data (e.g. language proficiency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Useful for obtaining population estimates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for small geographical areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Useful for obtaining information on the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small geographical area population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Self-report measure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, professionals often do not have time or capacity to study foreign cultures and/or languages in addition to their work-related areas of expertise (Liu and Evans, 2016). Although plurilingual practitioners could offer a valuable insight into their cultural and/or linguistic knowledge and skills utilised when working with EMCs using language other than English, the initial reading of the literature highlighted that their views and/or resources have been notably overlooked. This is discussed further in chapters 2 and 3.

20 For example, ONS (2012) reported the following relative confidence intervals at the 95% confidence level:
- 0.15% (83,000 people more or less than the estimate) for England and Wales; and
- 1.81% for Birmingham LA (95% probability that the true value of the total Birmingham population was between 1,053,623 and 1,092,467 people).
Although it is acknowledged that culture and language are inter-dependent, this study will focus primarily on issues related to the use of language other than English in EP practice, with a view that language plays a major role in the perpetuation of culture (Kramsch, 2003). For example, the words that we use help us to express thoughts, ideas, facts and/or events, as well as to reflect attitudes and beliefs in relation to our knowledge about and/or understanding of the world. Thus language embodies, expresses and symbolises cultural reality. The use of language on the other hand is inadvertently shaped and socialised through culture (e.g. sanctioned by cultural conventions). Nevertheless, the concept of a ‘culture’ in its broad sense (as defined above) and/or exploration of specific cultural differences (diversity) is beyond the scope of the current study.
Chapter 2: Educational Psychology profession

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an outline of the role and remit of EP practice in England. It then discusses the EP response to the increasing cultural and linguistic diversity across the client group and/or within its own workforce. The chapter closes with an overview and implications of workforce diversity.

2.2 Role and remit of EP profession

The term ‘School Psychologist’ (SP) was first used in English at the end of 19th century by Munsterberg (Kagan, 2005), who situated the “Consulting School Psychologist” (1898; p. 131-32) within the American classroom, emphasising the importance of evidence-based practice and applied research in relation to classroom organisation, teaching and the curriculum (Boyle, MacKay and Lauchlan, 2008). However, it was not until 1913 when the first EP21 was appointed in London and not until 1937 when the first Child Psychology Service was established in Glasgow.

EP practice is governed by a range of professional codes of standards, ethics and/or conduct (e.g. British Psychological Society [BPS], 2009; Health and Care Professions Council [HCPC], 2016). It is also influenced by “the prevailing goals, values and understanding embedded in the legislation” (Boyle, MacKay and Lauchlan, 2008; p. 33) and the initiatives from central government (Beaver, 2011), which can impose changes on the ways that EPs work (Winward, 2015). Although

21 Cyril Burt
the use of EP skills is deemed reflective of the complex, challenging and ever-changing socio-political context (Cameron, 2006; Stobie, 2002), Fallon, Woods and Rooney (2010) reported that the key reviews of EP role, remit and/or its ‘distinctive contribution’ evidence consistency over time (e.g. Ashton and Roberts, 2006; Cameron, 2006; Farrell et al., 2006; Frederickson and Miller, 2008).

Educational Psychology “promotes learning, attainment and the healthy emotional development of children and young people [...] through the application of psychology, by working with early years settings, schools (and other education providers), children and their families, other local authority officers, practitioners, and other agencies” (Department for Education and Skills [DfES], 2005; p. 1). It is concerned with the application of psychological theory and research in practice when working directly with CYP and/or indirectly with the immediate system (e.g. parents/carers, teachers and/or other professionals) around them (Beaver, 2011). EPs are therefore scientist-practitioners who work at an individual, group, systemic or an organisational level (Fallon, Woods and Rooney, 2010; National College for Teaching and Leadership [NCTL], 2014; NCTL and NHS Health Education England [HEE], 2016).

At present, LAs employ the majority of EPs who work in stand-alone Educational Psychology Services (EPSs) or in multi-agency teams (NCTL, 2014).

22 DfES existed until 2007 when it was replaced by the Department for Children, Schools and Families and the Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills.

23 According to the latest Educational Psychology Workforce Survey (EPWS), the total number of qualified EPs on a permanent contract with the LA-based EP services was 1,799 across 115 out of 152 LAs in 2013, compared to 1,955 EPs across 126 LAs in 2012 (NCTL, 2014). However, the total number of EPs registered with the HCPC with home postcodes in England was 3,078 in 2013 (NCTL, 2014) and 3,390 in October 2016 (HCPC, 2016a).
Farrell et al. (2006) highlighted five core functions of the EP role, namely assessment, consultation, intervention, training, and research. As EPs’ work has traditionally focused on a wide range of Special Educational Needs (SEN), the Education Act 1981 assigned them a statutory duty of providing psychological advice to the LA on the SEN of CYP who make less than expected progress despite additional evidence-based support. Although this responsibility remains today and has recently been extended to young adults up to the age of 25 (DfE and Department of Health [DoH], 2015), some argue that a high level of involvement in statutory assessment may restrict EPs from expanding their work (Farrell et al., 2006; Woods, 2012).

In addition to assessment, EPs may plan and carry out interventions and research activities which aim to explore, differentiate and further improve ways of supporting CYP in education, in order to raise achievement and to promote inclusion (DfES, 2001). EPs may also be called to advise professional and/or government-based working groups concerned with organisation and planning of policy (Boyle, MacKay and Lauchlan, 2008). Thus their knowledge of the educational system and relevant policy is thought to be of value to educational settings (DfES, 2001), as they may contribute to capacity building of other practitioners by training the wider workforce. Nevertheless, Rumble and Thomas (2017) suggested that the extent to which EPs are able to perform the range of their core functions is variable both within and between EPSs due to differences in approaches employed by individual EPs and different models of service delivery.
Although most definitions and/or descriptions of the EP role do not specifically address and/or differentiate EPs’ professional responsibility in relation to working with EMCs, in the 1960s Burt proposed that EP practice should be concerned with “the welfare of [...] the individual child and of the community as a whole” (1964; p.1). Baxter and Frederickson (2005) further argued that EPs ought to be widening their practice and client population beyond SEN to promote positive outcomes for all CYP and/or young adults. Correspondingly, Cameron (2006) cited the 2005 EPNET24 debate amongst EP practitioners, who acknowledged that EPs “primarily address issues within children’s development and learning, whilst supporting equal opportunities relating to removal of barriers in culture, race, gender, disability and social disadvantage, ultimately promoting inclusion at all these levels” (p. 291).

However, it was not until recently when professional codes of standards, ethics and/or conduct were updated to include and/or specify certain competencies required of EPs in relation to their knowledge and understanding of issues pertinent to, as well as communication with, EMCs. These are outlined in Table 2.1.

2.3 EPs’ response to cultural and linguistic diversity

Despite EP practice being concerned with ‘removal of barriers in culture, race, gender, disability and social disadvantage’, the review of the Educational Psychology literature offers a limited account of EPs’ response to cultural and/or linguistic diversity of the client group and/or that within its own workforce.

24 A forum for the exchange of ideas and information among University research/teaching staff working in the field of Educational Psychology and Educational Psychologists throughout the UK and elsewhere.
Table 2.1: Professional competencies and standards of knowledge and understanding, as well as communication required of EPs relevant to working with EMCs, set by professional codes of standards, ethics and/or conduct (taken from BPS, 2009 and 2015; HCPC, 2015 and 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Knowledge and understanding</th>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards for the accreditation of educational psychology training (BPS, 2015)</strong></td>
<td>By the end of their training programme, TEPs will demonstrate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | • “appreciation of diversity in society and the experiences and contributions of different ethnic, socio-cultural and faith groups.” | • “the ability to communicate assessment results and their interpretation to diverse audiences, clearly, concisely and effectively.”
(Psychological assessment and formulation; p. 22) |
| | • understanding and application of equality and diversity principles and actively promote inclusion and equity in their professional practice. | • “effective interpersonal communication skills across a range of settings and activities (including use of interpreters, taking account of the strengths and limitations).”
(Transferrable skills; p. 24) |
| | • [the ability to] take appropriate professional action to redress power imbalances and to embed principles of anti-discriminatory and anti-oppressive practice in all professional actions. | |
| | • knowledge and understanding of different cultural, faith and ethnic groups, and how to work with individuals from these backgrounds in professional practice. | |
| | • understanding of the impact of inequality, socioeconomic and cultural status and disadvantage and the implications for access to resources and services.”
(Diversity and cultural differences; p. 21) | |
| **BPS** | | |
| **Code of Ethics and Conduct (BPS, 2009)** | Psychologists should: | |
| | • “Respect individual, cultural and role differences, including (but not exclusively) those involving age, disability, education, ethnicity, gender, language, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, marital or family status and socio-economic status.”
(Standard of general respect; p. 10) | • “Ensure from the first contact that clients are aware of the limitations of maintaining confidentiality, with specific reference to [...] the possibility that third parties such as translators or family members may assist in ensuring that the activity concerned is not compromised by a lack of communication.”
(Standard of privacy and confidentiality; p. 11) |
| | • “Engage in a process of ethical decision making that includes [...] analysing the advantages and disadvantages of various courses of action for those likely to be affected, allowing for different perspectives and cultures.”
(Standard of ethical decision making; p. 13) | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HCPC Standards of proficiency for Practitioner psychologists (HCPC, 2015)</th>
<th>Be able to communicate effectively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be aware of the impact of culture, equality and diversity on practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “understand the impact of differences such as gender, sexuality, ethnicity, culture, religion and age on psychological wellbeing or behaviour”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• understand the requirement to adapt practice to meet the needs of different groups and individuals” (p. 8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrant practitioner psychologists must:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be able to communicate effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “understand how communication skills affect assessment of, and engagement with, service users and how the means of communication should be modified to address and take account of factors such as age, capacity, learning ability and physical ability” (p. 9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “understand the need to assist the communication needs of service users such as through the use of an appropriate interpreter, wherever possible […]”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• understand explicit and implicit communications in a practitioner–service user relation” (p. 10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HCPC Standards of Conduct, Ethics and Performance (HCPC, 2016)</th>
<th>You must:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote and protect the interests of service users and carers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “not discriminate against service users, carers or colleagues by allowing your personal views to affect your professional relationships or the care, treatment or other services that you provide.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• challenge colleagues if you think that they have discriminated against, or are discriminating against, service users, carers and colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• keep your relationships with service users and carers professional.” (p. 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate appropriately and effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “give service users and carers the information they want or need, in a way they can understand”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• make sure that, where possible, arrangements are made to meet service users’ and carers’ language and communication needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• work in partnership with colleagues, sharing your skills, knowledge and experience where appropriate, for the benefit of service users and carers.” (p. 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| • “Undertake such consideration with due concern for the potential effects of, for example, age, disability, education, ethnicity, gender, language, national origin, race, religion, marital or family status, or sexual orientation, seeking consultation as needed from those knowledgeable about such effects.” (Standard of protection of research participants; p. 19) |

| • “understand the impact of differences such as gender, sexuality, ethnicity, culture, religion and age on psychological wellbeing or behaviour” |
| • understand the requirement to adapt practice to meet the needs of different groups and individuals” (p. 8) |

| • “keep within your scope of practice by only practising in the...” |
areas you have appropriate knowledge, skills and experience for.” (p. 6)

**Maintain and develop your knowledge and skills**
- “keep your knowledge and skills up to date and relevant to your scope of practice through continuing professional development.
- keep up to date with and follow the law, our guidance and other requirements relevant to your practice.” (p. 7)

**Delegate appropriately**
- “only delegate work to someone who has the knowledge, skills and experience needed to carry it out safely and effectively.” (p. 7)

**Be honest and trustworthy**
- “make sure that your conduct justifies the public’s trust and confidence in you and your profession.
- be honest about your experience, qualifications and skills. [...] 
- declare issues that might create conflicts of interest and make sure that they do not influence your judgement.” (p. 9)
In 1985 Desforges, Goodwin and Kerr discussed the challenges of working with multilingual communities. The authors called for EPSs to review whether their practices towards EMCs were inclusive and reflected the multi-ethnic composition of the country. They recognised that language competency tended to be the only skill considered with regard to EP communication with EMCs, and greater effort should be made to “recruit individuals with knowledge and experience of child development and the education system as well as the ability to speak the mother tongue of particular minority groups” (p. 11). They also argued that “the needs of the clients and the needs of professional workers need to be balanced” (p. 11) due to a risk of reducing opportunities for Continued Professional Development (CPD) by limiting case allocation to CYP from culturally and linguistically compatible background to that of an Ethnic Minority Practitioner (EMP).

Three issues of the Educational and Child Psychology (ECP) journal were also found and considered relevant to the current study. Although the ‘Challenging Racism and Inequality in Education and Child Psychology’ (1999) issue explored matters that might affect EPs in their work with and around minority populations (e.g. conceptualisations of race, equality, the effects of racism in schools and/or in the EP work), only three articles discussed aspects of a ‘culturally sensitive’ and/or plurilingual EP practice relevant to the current study.

Usmani (1999) acknowledged that EPs would rarely bias the assessment procedure and/or its findings purposely. However, he argued that it can be done subconsciously, as “it is not possible to interpret [information] which has been
omitted from consideration” (p. 44). He highlighted the following implications for White and/or monolingual EPs:

a) their ability to detect, understand and/or value a bilingual/bicultural CYP’s range of thinking skills;
b) the issue of language being construed as a barrier to accommodate bilingual parents; and
c) the possibility of wrongful conclusions in a ‘culturally sensitive’ assessment dismissive of a wider context.

Thus he suggested that EPs should endeavour to increase their sensitivity to the experiences of EMCs and engage in reflective practice to explore the impact of their own anxieties on attitudes and/or judgement when working with EMCs.

Reed (1999) on the other hand acknowledged that the following issues had already been identified and raised within the literature:

a) ethnic minority parents’ need to relate to professionals at a confidential level without the barrier of an interpreter (Fish, 1985);
b) ethnic minority parents’ limited understanding of the EP role, the process of formal assessment and/or the review system (Chaudhury, 1988); and
c) ethnic minority parents’ tendency to accept professional opinion without challenging it (Rehal, 1989).

Therefore, she highlighted the importance of shifting power from ‘White EPs’ to colleagues who ‘can speak from an alternative perspective’. For example, she argued that EMPs might be better-placed to help improve EP practice in relation to
institutional racism due to their invaluable cultural and linguistic expertise that cannot be quickly (if ever) acquired to a comparable level. She suggested that future EPSs’ commitments should be centred on the following:

a) respecting the values of cultural perspectives;

b) endorsing the special role EMPs can offer in promoting ‘cultural transfer’ and bilingual development; and

c) cultural and linguistic matters to address in EP practice and training.

Although she did not offer specific examples of what this would comprise and/or how it could be executed in day-to-day practice, she echoed Desforges, Goodwin and Kerr’s (1985) concern for balanced practice and EMPs’ need for CPD to further develop their range of skills.

M’gadzah, Saraon and Shah (1999) discussed the benefits and constraints of plurilingual EP practice from the unique perspective of plurilingual practitioners, based on a piece of work carried out by Black and Asian EP consultants. They talked about the concept of bridging the divide between the LA and the multicultural community through working together to meet the educational, cultural and linguistic needs of the community. They highlighted the benefits of combining EP skills with cultural and linguistic awareness and advised that EMPs should be actively involved in promoting effective LA services. However, they stressed the need to recognise individual differences (e.g. the variation in EMPs’ cultural and linguistic awareness) and engage in anti-oppressive practice, as there is “a danger of placing a heavy burden of expectation on all Black and Asian consultants if [they] are [...] assumed to hold expertise in a particular culture, language or faith simply by virtue of [their]
ethnic origin” (p.77); especially in the absence of forums and/or support groups for EMPs to enable information sharing and/or peer supervision.

Although it took 16 years for EPs to re-visit and respond to some of the matters mentioned above, the follow-up ‘Race, Culture, Ethnicity’ (2015) issue demonstrated a socio-political shift towards actively engaging CYP and/or families in the co-production of public services, in line with the new Code of Practice (DfE and DoH, 2015). However, only two articles reflected concerns pertinent to the current research in relation to the complexities of applying psychology when working with culturally and linguistically diverse communities around behaviour, learning and/or mental health.

In their study on the experiences of Pakistani pupils in an English primary school, Rizwan and Williams (2015) highlighted that school experiences are interwoven with peer relationships, community culture and home environment in developing CYP’s identity. Thus they further reinforced a previously recognised role for EPs in raising awareness of “the link between school engagement and the appreciation of the first language and cultural values” (p. 44). Additionally, they reflected on the potential impact of the practitioner’s ethnicity on the research process and findings, especially when contextualising subtle cultural nuances. Hence they proposed that EPSs may benefit from opportunities to reflect on discourses around EMCs with sensitivity to their culture, e.g. by liaising with members of the same community.

Rupasinha (2015) on the other hand conducted a multiple embedded case study with three EPs in which he investigated their considerations of ethnic minority
cultural factors (EMCF) in assessment for autism. Although he did not disclose the ethnic make-up of his non-representative sample, he found that EPs rarely considered EMCF in a systematic manner informed by evidence-base. Instead, they tended to draw upon heuristics and idiographic knowledge based on a repertoire of casework within multicultural communities. Additionally, Rupasinha found that EPs disproportionately viewed EMCs having EAL as a challenge to the assessment, especially when unable to understand linguistic interaction. As EPs acknowledged that some of their personal characteristics (e.g. accent or gender) could affect their assessment style, method and/or selection of tools, Rupasinha questioned their confidence in undertaking assessment of ethnic minority CYP and called for more research to explore considerations of EMCF in EP practice with EMCs.

‘Bilingualism and Language Diversity’ (2014) offered a form of acknowledgement that EPs work increasingly often with plurilingual EMCs. However, the majority of articles focused on the assessment considerations (e.g. involved complexities, understanding literacy difficulties and obtaining information about plurilingual CYP’s English language learning ability) and only two articles raised points relevant to the current study.

Lauchlan (2014) reviewed the literature in relation to advantages and disadvantages of plurilingualism in CYP. He stressed that it is inevitable for EPs to work with EMCs whose main language is other than English and reinforced the need for research into

25 Rupasinha’s (2015) sample included “a diverse range of practitioners who could evidence particular experience with ASC. The three participants [...] were drawn from different geographical regions” (p. 81).
perspectives of plurilingual people who move between languages and cultures, as previously suggested by Bialystok (2001).

Cline, Crafter and Prokopiou (2014) on the other hand addressed the challenge of effective communication between professionals and EMCs faced by public services, due to a lack of “adequate, readily available professional interpreting facilities across the range of home languages” (p. 33) spoken in the UK. Although they did not account for the perspectives of plurilingual practitioners, they conducted a survey in which they investigated the views of teachers (n=63) and ex-CYP language brokers (n=25). They found that language brokers from within the family “act as mediators or advocates on behalf of their own family [and] they may go beyond translating word for word in order to provide background [...]. They may even deliberately mistranslate details in order to prevent misunderstanding” (p. 34). Thus they argued that in addition to working knowledge of two languages, language brokers require “a sensitive appreciation of the cultural hinterland [...] and an ability to anticipate the gaps that will need to be filled when explaining what one has said to the other” (p. 42). However, technical vocabulary and conceptual content were highlighted as potentially problematic to translate, especially within the context of school meetings with EPs – something that plurilingual practitioners who move between cultures and languages may be able to mediate.

Although sparse, the EP literature raises important issues and reflects attempts to find ways of gaining insight into the experiences of EMCs in order to improve EP

26 Children who interpret for their parents in schools because their parents do not share a language with their teacher.
practice. However, despite acknowledging that EPs are working with culturally and linguistically diverse clients with varied but increasing frequency, the existing literature does not provide sufficient evidence to suggest that the EP profession has successfully acted on any of the above recommendations, some of which have been repeated for over 30 years.

Furthermore, five out of eight of the articles discussed above are reflective and/or literature review pieces as opposed to research studies. Yet, the few studies drew their conclusions based on the views of ethnic minority CYP (Rizwan and Williams, 2015), other practitioners (Cline, Crafter and Prokopiou, 2014) or a (presumably) partly or fully monolingual sample of EPs (Rupasinha, 2015). The existing literature also appears to be heavily skewed towards the benefits of having the knowledge of child development and the education system in addition to cultural and language competency, largely dismissing potential limitations.

Thus the current study intends to address the gap in the literature by exploring the unique perspectives of plurilingual EPs who move between cultures and languages, and who could offer an insight into strengths and limitations of plurilingual EP practice, especially within the current context of traded services and a national shortage of EPs (NCTL and NHS HEE, 2016).
2.4 EP workforce

2.4.1 Workforce diversity

Historically, there have been a handful of global (e.g. Oakland and Cunningham, 1992; UNESCO, 1948; Wall, 1956) and/or a single nation sample-based endeavours (e.g. Bolton and M’gadzah, 1999; Curtis et al., 1999; Curtis et al., 2002; Graden and Curtis, 1991) to gather data in relation to the status of and/or trends within the Educational Psychology profession (also referred to as School Psychology within the international arena). Specifically, it has not been until recently when academics recognised the need to record demographic characteristics of EPs beyond their age, gender, qualifications, work pattern, years of experience and/or context of practice.

Similarities in the demographic characteristics across international sample-based studies suggest that there has been a relatively consistent ethnic profile of the School Psychology profession over time (Jimerson et al., 2006), described as predominantly ‘White’ (Fagan, 2004).

However, the data collection systems and/or databases make it difficult to reliably contextualise the UK-based EP profession with respect to its cultural and/or linguistic diversity. For example, the HCPC27 provides the nationality breakdown of its registrants, which excludes EPs. A recent request for a breakdown of nationality in relation to the EP registrants under the Freedom of Information Act (2000) resulted in a comprehensive overview of Practitioner Psychologist nationalities across all professional modalities, except for a single modality EPs (Appendix A). It was later

27 A professional regulatory body set up to protect the public that keeps a register of health and care practitioners who meet standards for training, professional skills, behaviour and health. All practising EPs are required to be registered with HCPC.
confirmed that whilst there were 4,380 single modality EPs registered with HCPC in October 2017, there were no data regarding their nationality. The same request sent to the Association of Educational Psychologists (AEP)\textsuperscript{28} resulted in no response.

Specifically, data regarding the linguistic characteristics of School Psychologists (SPs) and/or EPs are deficient (Proctor et al., 2014). For example, sample estimates of the US-based SPs fluent in language other than English vary from 10.7% (Charvat, 2008) to 47.6% (Curtis, Castillo and Gelley, 2012; Proctor et al., 2014). Table 2.2 provides an account of the reported linguistic characteristics of SPs within the international arena, based on the International School Psychology Survey\textsuperscript{29} (ISPS) data gathered on behalf of the International School Psychology Association\textsuperscript{30} (ISPA). Although Jimerson et al. (2004 and 2006) managed to systematically collect information from practising SPs and/or EPs in multiple countries, their estimates are also based on a sample population and are therefore not fully representative.

Thus, while the mainstream psychology profession continues to be criticised for its complacency in tackling the underrepresentation of psychologists from culturally and/or linguistically diverse backgrounds (Grapin, Lee and Jaafar, 2015; Guishard-Pine, 2015; Proctor et al., 2014), it is extremely difficult to ascertain a reliable estimate of practising plurilingual SPs and/or EPs and their professional use of language other than English from currently available sources (Proctor et al., 2014).

\textsuperscript{28} A professional association and a trade union for registered EPs practising in the UK.
\textsuperscript{29} The ISPS was developed through the collaborative efforts of international practitioners involved in the ISPA Research Committee.
\textsuperscript{30} The ISPA Research Committee explores the diversity of the School Psychology profession and promotes the exchange of information and/or resources around the world.
Table 2.2: International overview of the linguistic characteristics of SPs (Jimerson et al., 2004; p. 265 and Jimerson et al., 2006; p. 12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jimerson et al., 2004</th>
<th>Jimerson et al., 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% plurilingual SPs</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages spoken fluently</td>
<td>Albanian English French, Italian, French, German</td>
<td>Greek, English, French, Russian, French</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.2 Implications of limited workforce diversity

A lack of workforce diversity is deemed particularly problematic (Curtis, Grier and Hunley, 2004), as SPs and/or EPs have been recognised as key providers of psychological services to minority CYP (e.g. Curtis, Castillo and Gelley, 2012; Proctor and Truscott, 2012; Zhou et al., 2004), often under-represented in accessing support (Malek, 2011; Trotter, 2012).

The literature advises that the experiences of CYP whose first language is not English are likely to be different to those of their monolingual peers (Rhodes, Ochoa and Ortiz, 2005; Sattler, 2001). Accordingly, the process of psychological assessment and/or intervention is considered to be particularly difficult when CYP and their family are ‘non-proficient’ in English and their culture and/or language are not understood by those carrying out the assessment (Cloud, 1991; Desforges and Kerr, 1984; Hamayan and Damico, 1991; Krashen and Terrell, 1983; Kretschmer, 1991; Desforges, Mayet and Vickers, 2007). Thus a high level of diversity in the school age CYP population (see chapter 1) and limited understanding of their cultural and linguistic heritage challenges practitioners to direct “the education of the child to [...] the development of respect for the child’s parents, his or her own cultural identity, language and values, for the national values of the country in which the child is living, the country from which he or she may originate, and for civilizations different from his or her own.” (UNICEF, 1989; Article 29), especially if their own cultural knowledge and/or understanding are limited.
Yet, a diverse workforce is thought to increase the likelihood of a more accurate needs assessment, as well as reaching previously ‘hard to reach’ and/or underserved populations (Rogers and Molina, 2006). Grapin, Lee and Jaafar (2015) further argued that cultural and/or linguistic homogeneity in the workforce may limit the range of perspectives, experiences, and/or abilities essential to promote creativity and innovation. It has also been attributed to the paucity of multicultural research (Miranda and Gutter, 2002), ignorance in relation to the impact of professional activity on minority populations (Newell et al., 2010; Proctor and Truscott, 2013) and delayed acknowledgment of social justice (Speight and Vera, 2009).

Although there is some evidence of efforts to increase diversity among SP students (e.g. National Association of School Psychologists’ [NASP] advocacy) and/or recruitment of plurilingual SPs in the US (e.g. Bidell et al., 2007; Brown, Shriberg and Wang, 2007; NASP, 2009; Proctor and Truscott, 2012; 2013), there has been a long-standing absence of literature that explores the ability to provide culturally competent services by practitioners from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds in the UK.

2.5 Chapter summary

This chapter provided an insight into the role and remit of EP practice in England. It also reviewed the EPs’ response to the increasing cultural and linguistic diversity, and discussed key issues in relation to workforce diversity. Chapter 3 will focus on the concept of plurilingualism and plurilingual EP practice.
3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the shift in perspectives on plurilingualism. It then introduces the concept of plurilingual EP practice with its key implications highlighted in the literature.

3.2 From deficit to strength-based perspectives on plurilingualism

The concept of plurilingualism has a strong presence within the literature, as it has been subjected to a vast amount of cognitive and language-specific enquiries into it as a phenomenon.

In a 1915 Swiss study on the relationship between bilingualism and thought, Epstein concluded that multilingualism ‘slows down’ the thought processing and is therefore “une plaie sociale” [a social ill] (p. 210, cited in Pavlenko, 2011). Similarly, based on a comparison of the IQ test scores of bilingual and monolingual speakers from rural Wales, Saer (1923) suggested that monolingual English speakers were advantaged over plurilingual speakers due to “the difference in mental ability [being] of a permanent nature” (Saer, Smith and Hughes, 1924, p. 53).

A major turning point in the history of plurilingualism was attributed to Peal and Lambert’s (1962) study on cognitive abilities of bilingual CYP. Their findings were contrary to the earlier beliefs and suggested that bilingualism presented an

---

31 As revealed by inner speech, mental translation and calculations
advantage in intelligence, as ‘balanced’ bilingual children performed better than their monolingual peers on tasks that required mental or symbolic flexibility and concept formation. Although their methodology was criticised, subsequent studies have been vastly consistent in finding advantages of plurilingualism, such as greater metalinguistic awareness (Ianco-Worrall, 1972), storage and retrieval of information (Coffeen, 1982), creative thinking (Lauren, 1991), arithmetic and mathematical skills (Bialystok and Codd, 1997; Clarkson, 2006; Lauchlan et al., 2013) and executive control (Bialystok, 2001; 2009). However, Cummins (1987) argued that these skills can only be demonstrated when plurilingual speakers reach the minimum level of language proficiency in all languages, as it determines the extent to which they can effectively transfer their thoughts between different languages. Correspondingly, some argue that cognitive advantages reported in plurilingual speakers may be enhanced by the pattern of their communicative behaviours (Athanasopoulos, 2016), as they are often studied in areas where plurilingualism is well-established and code switching between languages is frequent (Costa et al., 2009).

Back in the 1950s Whorf proposed that “users of markedly different grammars are pointed [...] toward different types of observations and different evaluations of externally similar acts of observation” (1956, p. 221). However, it was not until the 1990s and early 2000s when the researchers became more interested in the idea that speakers of different languages may think differently (Levinson, 1996; Lucy, 1992; Roberson et al., 2000). Although a study by Berlin and Kay (1969) found that

32 Children able to speak both languages to a similar degree of proficiency
33 Peal and Lambert did not account for the cognitive consequences of different levels of bilingualism.
34 Ability to use knowledge about language (e.g. in relation to meaning and structure)
35 Suppression of additional language interference at the word selection stage
native speakers of twenty foreign languages displayed English-like category prototypes, suggesting the possibility of linguistic universality, recent studies found that plurilingual speakers are influenced by their additional language competency when identifying category prototype and categorising colours (Athanasopoulous, 2009), as well as when perceiving and conceptualising motion events (Bylund and Athanasopoulous, 2014; Gullberg, 2011). Thus studies have continued to support the view that plurilingual speakers are independent multi-competent thinkers with a unique mental representation of the world (Athanasopoulous, 2006 and 2011; Cook, 2002; Cook and Bassetti, 2011; Cook et al., 2006; Grosjean, 1998; Jarvis, 2011; Pavlenko, 2011), subsequently disputing the view that using more than one language does not affect and/or limits a person’s thought processing (Baker, 1995; Bialystok, 1988; Regier and Kay, 2009).

However, critics pointed out that the majority of research on linguistic relativity does not seem to account for the use of more than one language in everyday life or the differences in cognitive abilities and mental representations between plurilingual and monolingual speakers (Athanasopoulous, 2016). There have also been mixed claims in relation to the level of linguistic distance and/or conceptual equivalence across different languages (Chiswick and Miller, 2005; Cook, 2002). Whilst cognitive enquiries seem to suggest that languages are largely equivalent conceptually (Costa, 2005; de Groot, 1992; Kroll and Stewart, 1994), language-specific enquiries

36 Please note that their sample of US immigrants was neither controlled for the variation in the levels of acculturation ("the process of learning a culture different from the one in which a person was originally raised" [Berelson and Steiner, 1967; p. 16]), nor for proficiency in English.
argue that words do not always have the same representation and cannot be simply mapped onto the same language-independent schema across different languages (Ameel et al., 2005), as there is “systematic cross-linguistic variation in conceptual representation of a range of different domains of experience” (Athanasopoulos, 2016; p. 369).

Although it is not the purpose of this study to investigate and/or argue about the cognitive abilities of plurilingual EPs, the existing cognitive and language-specific literature exemplifies the complex nature of plurilingualism. Hence exploring culturally diverse perspectives continues to be important to gain a better understanding of the plurilingual speakers’ capacities, experiences and/or their unique representation of the world (Baker, 2007; Bialystok, 2001).

3.3 Plurilingual practice within the School Psychology profession

Despite a substantial body of research in relation to language, bilingualism, multilingualism, ESL and/or EAL, the presence of ‘plurilingual practice’ in the literature is relatively new and extremely limited, especially within the context of School and/or Educational Psychology. Less than a handful of US-based studies, albeit highly relevant to the current research, were found through the literature search.

O’Bryon and Rogers (2010) conducted a survey of bilingual members of NASP (n=276) who self-reported speaking language other than English fluently (see Table 3.1 for participant characteristics), in which they explored bilingual SPs’ (BSPs) assessment practices with English language learners (ELLs).
Table 3.1: Participant characteristics (adapted from O’Bryon and Rogers, 2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-reported ethnicity</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional languages</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Sign Language (ASL)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than two languages</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience in relation to working with ELLs</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>practical cases</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internship cases that involved ELLs</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-service course*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilingual supervision**</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD in relation to assessing ELLs***</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*An average of one pre-service course (SD = 1.5, range 0–7) about assessing ELLs.
**Although approximately 57.6% (n=159) BSPs reported not working with a bilingual supervisor, those who did rated the quality of supervision as ‘satisfactory’.
***An average of 3.2 CPD efforts in relation to assessing ELLs (SD = 2.4, range = 0–11); an average of approximately 30 hours over a period of 5 years.

Tables 3.2 and 3.3 outline some of the key findings pertinent to the current study in relation to the language proficiency and acculturation assessments conducted by BSPs with EMCs.

O’Bryon and Rogers’ (2010) findings suggest that even though BSPs reported the use of a wide range of approaches and ‘above average’ knowledge of language acquisition, they identified experiencing a level of discomfort when assessing EMCs’

---

37 Although O’Bryon and Rogers (2010) stated that participants reported speaking 24 languages other than English fluently, the languages reported in Table 3.1 are the only languages with % values provided by the authors.
Table 3.2: O’Bryon and Rogers’ (2010) key findings in relation to language proficiency assessment* (adapted from p. 1024-1026).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills assessed</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native and second language use in the ELL’s home</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native and second language skills in interpersonal and academic settings</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive and receptive English language skills</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral, written and/or reading skills in the ELL’s native and second language</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods used</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodcock–Muñoz Language Survey</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Verbal Ability Test</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodcock–Johnson III</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batería III Woodcock-Muñoz</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent interviews</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student interviews</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student observations</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher interviews</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of records</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language samples</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work samples</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklists or questionnaires</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EAL vs. SEN discrimination**</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examining the results of language assessments in both languages</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing educational records, including academic assessment results</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors considered in the selection and use of measures when sharing language</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standardisation sample</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychometric properties of the measure</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research conducted on the measure</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP’s test-taking experience</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other***</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of assessment used when sharing language</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal assessment instruments</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm-referenced instruments, using the standardized norms</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm-referenced instruments, using norms representative of the student</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum-based assessment</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion-referenced assessment</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic assessment</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Please note that only 14.9% BSPs indicated that they were performing language proficiency assessments.

**n=228

***Sample responses included: consider reports from teachers, the child’s history of instruction in native language, reason for referral
Table 3.3: O’Bryon and Rogers’ (2010) key findings in relation to acculturation assessment (adapted from p. 1026).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods used</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple methods</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., observations, record review)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

language skills. In addition to gathering information about CYP’s expressive and receptive language\(^{38}\), 84% (n=232) reported assessing CYP’s acculturation - the skill which they reportedly had developed through internship training, practice and bilingual supervision.

Interestingly, BSPs were likely to use more measures to gather information when they shared language with CYP, suggesting that additional language competency might have increased their confidence in using a broader range of tools. Nevertheless, O’Bryon and Rogers (2010) pointed out that BSPs may not always be selecting measures on the basis of best and/or evidence-based practice, as only 80% (n=221) admitted to reviewing standardisation samples, 76% (n=210) to examining psychometric properties, and 67% (n=185) to considering research. However, BSPs’ engagement in relevant CPD increased the likelihood of:

a) good practice when determining which assessment measures to use;

b) the use of multiple ‘best practice’ approaches; as well as

c) the use of many measures to assess language proficiency when sharing language with ELLs.

\(^{38}\) Including oral, written and/or reading skills
Correspondingly, BSPs who received high quality supervision from bilingual supervisors and gained substantial experience of working with ELLs during their pre-service training were likely to use a multifaceted approach to assess CYP’s acculturation.

Although O’Bryon and Rogers’ (2010) findings are interesting, they are limited to the views of US-based NASP members who self-assessed and self-reported their language competency in language other than English as ‘fluent’. It is not transparent whether 10.5% (n=29) of multilingual practitioners provided a collective account of their experiences in several languages or focused on one specific language. Also, 10% (n=28) of the sample reported using ASL. As ASL users may require different considerations to those of other linguistically heterogeneous BSPs, it is not clear if and how their practices compare and/or generalise to the wider workforce. Correspondingly, even though the vast majority of respondents (71%; n=196) indicated working in public schools, a third of the sample reported working in other settings\(^39\). As this further increases the heterogeneity of the sample, it is not clear if the experiences of plurilingual practice amongst these practitioners are comparable and/or to what extent. However, despite some additional design-related limitations\(^40\), O’Bryon and Rogers’ (2010) study further reinforces the multitude of complexities involved in working with EMCs using language other than English and it is one of the first to shed light on plurilingual practice within the context of School Psychology.

\(^39\) Private schools, private practice, hospitals, the state department, and/or university

\(^40\) For example, some answers in relation to language proficiency assessment practices (e.g. factors considered in the selection and use of measures) were donated to the BSPs through the use of multiple choice questions.
In 2016 O'Bryon and Rogers followed up by conducting semi-structured telephone interviews with a purposive sample\textsuperscript{41} of 11 BSPs (see Table 3.4 for participant characteristics). Although they did not explore BSPs’ experiences of plurilingual practice per se, they provided another rare insight into little-known perspectives of BSPs who consult about ELL students. Table 3.5 outlines key findings in relation to required skills and challenges encountered.

Table 3.4: Participant characteristics (O’Bryon and Rogers, 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-reported ethnicity</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European American/White</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional languages</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O’Bryon and Rogers (2016) found that BSPs’ involvement with teachers around ELL students tended to be concerned around ELLs’ academic performance. In addition to knowledge of interventions, relationship building and problem identification skills were identified as essential. The findings also suggest that BSPs may feel a sense of responsibility towards ELLs, as they reported actively seeking and engaging in a wide range of CPD opportunities\textsuperscript{42} in order to ensure that they can competently

\textsuperscript{41} Participant criteria: training in working with ELLs, working with a concentration of ELLs, self-reported ‘fluency’ in language other than English, and having a consulting caseload with teachers concerning ELLs

\textsuperscript{42} Familiarising themselves with research, attending and organising training, as well as active involvement in relevant state organisations
**Table 3.5:** O’Bryon and Rogers’ (2016) key findings (adapted from p. 229-233).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers’ referral concerns</th>
<th>Academic concerns</th>
<th>General academic concerns (EAL vs. SEN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading-specific concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managing classroom disruptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations to teachers</td>
<td>Expectations regarding second language acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific instructional techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting challenges about ELL issues</td>
<td>Scarcity of trained professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher interpersonal challenges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competing school priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need to meet ELLs’ diverse needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation to consult about ELL issues</td>
<td>Helpful Preparation (helpful content acquired through continuing education, pre-service education and training, and on-the-job training)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing from preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Everything or almost everything</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nothing or nearly nothing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting skills most needed</td>
<td>Relationship building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of relevant interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well-developed problem identification skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations to monolingual colleagues</td>
<td>Seeking out resources related to language and culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seeking out relevant professional development opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engaging in consultations with BSPs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional reflections on ELL-related consulting</td>
<td>Passion for supporting ELLs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissatisfaction with the current state of bilingual School Psychology and service delivery to ELL students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

advocate for ELLs within the school system. Yet, the most common challenges included the shortage of plurilingual practitioners, teacher bias, and the stress of competing school priorities. Specifically, BSPs recognised difficulties promoting inclusion within the exclusive socio-political environment at certain schools, with whom they do not share the same political views. Thus they advised that practitioners should seek culture and language specific resources and pursue
relevant CPD opportunities (including consultations with BSPs), in order to develop their practice and strive to improve ELL’s outcomes.

Sotelo-Dynega and Dixon (2014) on the other hand raised an issue of differentiating formally qualified from ‘self-professed’ bilingual practitioners. They surveyed 323 US-based SPs and found that 12% of the sample self-identified as bilingual or multicultural practitioners, 60% of whom did not know if an additional qualification was required by their state to practise as a BSP. Only approximately 7% reported that a specific credential was essential in their area. Amongst specific requirements, BSPs reported that they had to demonstrate proficiency in language other than English, as well as complete coursework and supervised practice.

As a follow-up, Sotelo-Dynega (2015) conducted a national survey of 51 School Psychology credentialing agencies in which she investigated the credentialing procedures for and qualifications of the growing sub-specialism of BSPs practising in the US. She found that plurilingual practitioners are likely to be ‘self-professed’ on a basis of their ability to communicate in a language other than English in the majority of the US states, as only two states offered specific qualifications for BSPs. Sotelo-Dynega (2015) also investigated the criteria considered in the training of BSPs across these two states (Table 3.6), which emphasised absence of standards and/or guidelines regarding how BSPs should be trained. She subsequently called for more research and collaboration within an international arena to help to identify who bilingual practitioners are, how they are trained, and/or what methods they use in their practice with EMCs, especially in countries that have experienced large waves of immigration. Although she acknowledged the risk of ‘self-professed’ BSPs
### Table 3.6: Criteria for gaining credential to practice as a BSP (taken from Sotelo-Dynega, 2014; p. 253).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Illinois</th>
<th>New York</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bilingual education knowledge examination</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>Must demonstrate knowledge of bilingual education foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Language proficiency examination in English</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>Must demonstrate proficiency in listening, speaking, reading, and writing in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Language proficiency examination in the target language</td>
<td>Must demonstrate proficiency in reading, writing, and listening in the target language</td>
<td>Must demonstrate proficiency in listening, speaking, reading, and writing in the target language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coursework</td>
<td>Must successfully complete 1 of 2 courses:</td>
<td>15 semester hours:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Assessment of the bilingual child</td>
<td>– Cultural perspectives (bilingual education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Psychological/educational assessment of the limited English proficient student with disabilities</td>
<td>– Theory and practice of bilingual/ multicultural education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Methods of providing service in the native language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervised fieldwork</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>Supervised professional experience with culturally and linguistically diverse CYP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

potentially engaging in practices beyond the boundaries of their professional competencies, she also stressed the need for adequate CPD options, including development of relevant training programmes (e.g. adequate tutor preparation).

Although sparse and limited, the literature demonstrates recent attempts to investigate the little-known and largely unofficial 'sub-specialism' of plurilingual SP practice to further the knowledge and understanding of the impact of practitioners’ cultural and linguistic background on EMCs’ outcomes. Thus, even though the above studies are specific to the experiences and implications of plurilingual practice
amongst US-based SPs, and may not be fully (if at all) generalisable to other countries, they are highly valuable to the current research. In response to O’Bryon and Rogers (2010) and Sotelo-Dynega (2015), this study intends to explore the current plurilingual EP practice in England.

3.4 Chapter summary

This chapter introduced the concept of plurilingualism, including its application within the context of School Psychology. The next chapter will discuss research methodology and design of the current study.
Chapter 4: Research Methodology and Design

4.1 Research aims and questions

4.1.1 Research aims

The purpose of this research is to gain familiarity with a phenomenon, namely professional practice of plurilingual EPs. The current study aims to acquire insight into how plurilingual EPs construct their unique contribution within the profession by providing an account of their individual experiences of working with EMCs using language other than English.

It is hoped to increase the knowledge base about the benefits and constraints of EP practice using language/s other than English and to indicate areas for development, in order to ensure that the educational, social, emotional and mental health needs and outcomes of EMC are appropriately identified, met, and increased.

4.1.2 Research questions

The following research questions were devised having considered the existing literature, social constructionism epistemology, exploratory study design, and Activity Theory methodology:

1) What do plurilingual EPs recognise is their unique contribution within their professional role in relation to working with EMCs using language other than English?

2) What do plurilingual EPs perceive supports or constrains their practice in relation to providing services to EMCs using language other than English?
Sub-questions:

A. What are the socio-cultural factors that mediate the plurilingual EPs’ approaches and/or unique contributions to working with EMCs using language other than English?

B. What new ways of working do plurilingual EPs propose may further enhance EP practice and services offered to EMCs?

4.2 Research methodology

4.2.1 Activity Theory framework

Although Activity Theory (AT) was formulated by Vygotsky, Luria and Leont’ev in 1920s and 1930s (Smidt, 2009), it developed over the years after Vygotsky’s death up until 1990s when its application by multidisciplinary researchers increased vastly (Leadbetter, 2008). It has therefore been subject to debates about its origin, definitions, functions and/or relationship to other concepts (Leadbetter et al., 2007). The current research employs Engeström’s interpretation of AT as a tri-generational framework (Engeström, 1999b) - a structure that involves “a set of parts that sit or work together” (Kelly, 2008; p. 18) which can be applied to bring together a wider or more specific meaning and application.

Despite AT being derived from a dynamic model of learning and sociocultural theory aiming to facilitate positive individual and/or systemic change (Kelly, 2008), its main focus is the ‘activity’ (Smidt, 2009). Vygotsky and colleagues proposed that an ‘activity’ is comprised of a ‘subject’ and an ‘object’, mediated by an ‘artefact’.  

43 A person or a group of people engaged in the activity  
44 What the ‘subject’ is interested in, exploring and/or working on
The ‘object’ gives the activity its direction and all relationships between an individual and objects/events in the environment are mediated by tools/artefacts. Hence an activity system “has a complex mediational structure” (Engeström, 2008; p.5), as activity is both object-oriented and artefact-mediated (Smidt, 2009). Engeström (1999b) illustrated this with the use of a simple triangular model (Figure 4.1). The top of the triangle (artefact) demonstrates the mediation between the subject and the object in order to achieve an outcome (Leadbetter, 2008).

Figure 4.1

![Figure 4.1: First-generation Activity Theory model (Engeström, 1999b; p.30).](image)

Nevertheless, whilst accepting mediation as central to the activity system, Engeström recognised that wider social, cultural, historical, and/or other contextual factors were also relevant and equally important (Leadbetter, 2008). Thus, he extended the above model and proposed the second-generation AT (Engeström, 2008).

---

45 Cultural tool
46 Emphasis on opportunities of concrete experience
47 Through the use of cultural tools
Leont'ev differentiated between *individual action* and *collective activity* (Smidt, 2009). He identified that in order “to understand why separate actions are meaningful, one needs to understand the motive behind the whole activity” (Leont'ev, 1978; p. 62-63). Therefore, “individuals may well be involved in different actions, but the group must share a common goal for the event to be regarded as an Activity Theory” (Smidt, 2009; p. 92).

Thus, the second-generation AT model enables an exploration of systems of activity at a macro level, which Engeström represented by adding the following nodes: ‘Rules’, ‘Community’ and ‘Division of labour’ (see Table 4.1 for description of each node). He also placed the object in an oval shape to symbolise its ambiguity, as

---

48 What an individual does on their own
49 What people do when they work together
50 Collective/community
object-oriented actions are open to interpretations and carry the potential for change (Engeström 1999b).

This research employs the second-generation AT as a conceptual framework to enable facilitation of awareness development regarding the unique contribution of plurilingual EPs. Hence for the purpose of this study, ‘activity system’ is understood as professional practice of plurilingual EPs with EMCs using language other than English.

Engeström continued to develop AT and offered the third-generation model (Figure 4.3).

**Figure 4.3**

![Third-generation Activity Theory model](image)

**Figure 4.3: Third-generation Activity Theory model (Engeström, 2001, p.136).**

The third-generation AT recognises that any single and/or distinct activity system operates in relation to other systems, meaning that there are networks of interacting systems that may operate with different (sometimes competing) objects (Leadbetter, 2008). Thus, new objects may need to be negotiated, leading to the formation of a
Table 4.1: The description of each node of the Activity Theory (Leadbetter, 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Subject</td>
<td>“This position can be taken up by an individual, group or dyad taking action.” (p. 198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Object</td>
<td>The object is “what is being worked on, acted upon or the focus of activity.” (p. 198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Outcome</td>
<td>The outcome is “the result” (p. 198) of mediation between the nodes of the Activity Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rules</td>
<td>The rules are supportive and/or constraining factors that “impinge on activities” (p. 200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Community</td>
<td>Who else is involved in the activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Division of labour</td>
<td>“Role demarcation and expectation”, e.g. “how work is shared out and why” (p. 200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tools/Artefacts</td>
<td>“The mediation that takes place between the subject and the object in order to achieve an outcome. The artefacts (or tools) might be concrete (such as an object, machine or instrument) or may be abstract (the most common being language, but also including processes or frameworks).” (p. 199)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: A set of principles in relation to the current state of Activity Theory (adapted from Daniels, 2001b; p. 93-94; Leadbetter, 2008; p.201-202; and Smidt, 2009; p. 93).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Primary unit of analysis</td>
<td>A collective, object-oriented and artefact-mediated activity system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Multi-voiced systems</td>
<td>Any activity is made up of different points of view, traditions and/or interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Historical (Historicity)</td>
<td>Activities are always situated in history and need to be understood in terms of their history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Contradictions</td>
<td>Sources of change and development that play a central role in activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Transformations and change</td>
<td>Both transformations and change are possible through activity systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
new object for action (illustrated as object 3 in Figure 4.3) and subsequent transformation of networks of activity (Daniels, 2008).

Table 4.2 provides an overview of the key principles in relation to the current state of AT, which is drawn on ‘dialogicality’\textsuperscript{51}, multivoicedness\textsuperscript{52}, and the importance of analysing the interactions within and between the seven nodes of the framework (Daniels, 2004b). Through identifying and analysing systemic contradictions\textsuperscript{53} that may be contributing to ‘instability’ within a system, change can be enacted to restore balance to the system and to improve its effectiveness.

Leadbetter (2008) suggested that AT “can be applied to any situation where human action is taking place [as it] provides an Interactionist, socially and culturally embedded model through which activities can be viewed, analysed and worked upon” (p. 215). Accordingly, the current research employs a socio-cultural AT, which views human activity as “motivated within the socio-cultural and historical processes [...] and comprises (mediated) goal-directed action” (Jaworski and Goodchild, 2006; p. 355).

The key strength of the AT is that it is recognised as a solid theoretical framework, underpinned by a strong cognitive and social psychology rationale (Leadbetter, 2008). The multidisciplinary influence of theoretical and empirical research within the fields of philosophy, sociology, linguistics, history and/or curriculum studies is believed to have further enhanced its profile over the years (Edwards and Daniels, 2004b).

\textsuperscript{51} The formation of ideas in dialogue
\textsuperscript{52} A recognition that actions/ideas are informed by many voices
\textsuperscript{53} Both within and between the seven nodes of the Activity Theory
2004). However, some argue that it is not yet a clearly defined theory (Holzman, 2006), which is likely to “turn into an eclectic combination of ideas before it has the chance to redefine its core” (Engeström, 1999b; p. 20).

As an analytic tool, AT helps to make sense of complex situations, interactions and/or systems through its principle of historicity. For example, it considers how change might have resulted in new objects/tools/possible contradictions, which in turn helps to better understand why activities take place as they do (Leadbetter, 2008). Correspondingly, it acknowledges that “transformations occur through processes in which we both shape and are shaped by the opportunities available to us as actors in our social worlds” (Edwards and Daniels, 2004). Thus it promotes “engaging with organisations to examine and expand efficient working practices” (Leadbetter, 2008; p. 209) by encouraging transformation through identification of systemic contradictions and provision of tools and/or artefacts. However, Engeström’s understanding of transformation as “inevitably tied to an ethic of improvement” (Martin and Peim, 2009; p. 132) implies it is synonymous with linear, unambiguous, specific and/or predictable developmental growth, and therefore dismisses the possibility of its unpredictable nature (Steinnes, 2004). The prospect of change may also be threatening to the person’s identity and/or their professional practice (Engeström, 2005).

Although it puts an emphasis on the individuals within the activity system (Engeström, 2001), AT reinforces the importance of considering a wider context alongside individual factors. It also highlights the importance of mediation to extend a person’s learning and/or capabilities in a range of interactions and/or environments.
(Leadbetter, 2008). However, its focus on local systems (Avis, 2007; Peim, 2009), constrains the possibility “to accommodate the macro-social perspectives and processes that act on, shape and inform local dilemmas” (Martin and Peim, 2009; p. 133). Therefore AT proposes that not all issues can be fully understood and resolved by (or within) activity systems at a local level, especially if they are driven or managed by the wider socio-political structures which position and often constrain subjects of the local system (e.g. through division of labour). Consequently, AT fails to address power relationships and social antagonisms that derive from these macro-social and political contexts (Avis, 2009; Daniels, 2004b). Finally, despite acknowledging the importance of language and discourse, methods for understanding and analysing language within AT are still underdeveloped (Leadbetter, 2008).

With due regard to its strengths and limitations, AT is considered ‘fit for the purposes’ of this study, which intends to explore and understand the professional practice of plurilingual EPs with EMCs using language other than English. It was chosen purposefully to tackle the “issues of subjectivity, experiencing, personal sense, emotion, embodiment, identity, and moral commitment” (Engeström and Sannino, 2010; p.1) in respect of each individual’s involvement with EMCs, in order to ensure that learning opportunities are maximised to help improve the EP practice and subsequently the outcomes for ethnic minority CYP whose first language is other than English, and/or who are non-proficient in English.
4.3 Ontology and Epistemology

"If ontology is the study of what there is or what exists in the social world, epistemology is the study of our knowledge of the world - how do we know about the world that we have defined ontologically?" (Thomas, 2013; p. 120).

There are two dominant ontological traditions, namely positivism and interpretivism. Positivist ontology is underpinned by the notion that there is a single objective reality (Hudson and Ozanne, 1988) and the social world “can be observed, measured and studied scientifically” (Thomas, 2013; p. 107). As it is focused on causal relationships demonstrated through empirical regularities (Kelly, 2008), positivism implies that all observers share a similar view of the reality, dismissing the effects of perspective (Chalmers, 1982; Outhwaite, 1987). Thus positivism has been questioned with regard to its credibility and applicability to the study of the human mind and/or behaviour (Burr, 2003).

This research is positioned within the interpretivist paradigm, which views the world and our knowledge of it as interdependent (Grix, 2004). It is characterised by a concern for the individual and understanding of their subjective account of experience (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011; Crotty, 1998). The image of reality is therefore based on people’s own preferences and prejudices (Check and Schutt, 2012), participation in the world and the role they play in shaping it (Heron and Reason, 1997) through language (Frowe, 2001) and interactions embedded within the historical and cultural contexts (Creswell, 2009). This view rejects the positivist belief that there is a concrete, objective reality that can be measured and understood through the use of scientific methods (Lynch and Bogen, 1997). Instead, “objects
and events are understood by different people differently, and those perceptions are the reality or realities that social science should focus on” (Rubin and Rubin, 1995; p. 35).

Accordingly, knowledge in this study is viewed as ‘provisional’ – “the best in the circumstances, [which may be] superseded if other information or insights come to light” (Thomas, 2013; p. 123). This is reflected via the notion that the experience of plurilingualism is constructed by individuals as they pursue their lives/careers and is therefore a “reflection of their social paths” (Coste, Moore and Zarate, 2009; p. 17), as well as cultural, and historical factors\(^\text{54}\) (Daniels, 2004b). The epistemological stance is therefore underpinned by that of social constructionism with an emphasis on the world of experience as it is lived, felt and/or undergone by individuals (Schwandt, 2007). Consequently, methods compatible with the interpretivist perspective are employed, with the focus on exploring the phenomenon of plurilingual EPs’ practice with EMCs using language other than English.

4.3.1 Social constructionism

Social constructionism further extends the interpretivist philosophy by “challeng[ing] the view that conventional knowledge is based upon objective, unbiased observation of the world” (Burr, 2003; p. 3), as it acknowledges that “development, responses and outcomes are a product of a complex system of interactions and transactions” (Kelly, 2008; p. 23).

---

\(^{54}\) The relationship between how people think and feel and the social and cultural organisation of their environment
For example, social constructionism emphasises that “the ways in which we commonly understand the world [...] are historically and culturally specific” (Burr, 2003; p. 3-4), as they are the “products of historically situated interchanges among people” (Gergen, 1985; p. 267). Hence social constructionism is focused on “fluid, volatile and always open to change” (Burr, 2003; p. 44) meaning, “shaped by conventions of language and other social processes” (Schwandt, 1998; p. 240).

Consequently, the concept of reality is multilayered and complex (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011), as the knowledge and truth are a result of perspective (Schwandt, 1998) created by various stakeholders in a social setting (Guba and Lincoln, 1989). Thus there are as many valid perspectives and/or interpretations as individuals (Kelly, 2008; Scotland, 2012) and a ‘social construction’ of a particular culture or society is natural, objective and valid to those who accept it (Berger and Luckmann, 1991).

The main criticism of social constructionism is related to its conceptualisation of the two polarised ontological stances - realism and relativism (Andrews, 2012), as well as corresponding variations across definitions (Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2009). Realism claims that although knowledge about reality can be gained through perceptions, thoughts and/or language, these representations may not necessarily be accurate reflections of reality (Burr, 2003). Relativism on the other hand suggests that only various multiple representations of the world can be obtained, as the reality as a whole is not accessible. In other words, nothing can ever be known for definite (Burr, 2003), as there is no way of judging one account of reality as better than

55 An invention or artefact
another (Bury, 1986). Correspondingly, Hansen (2004) argued that if reality is always viewed as "a social interpretation, and there is no conception of true reality against which to judge these interpretations, we have no criteria to evaluate various constructions" (p. 134). However, Andrews (2012) counter-argued that the social constructionists’ view of knowledge being created (Schwandt, 2003) does not necessarily reject the notion that it may correspond to something real in the world (also Berger and Luckmann, 1991). Andrews also asserted that although social constructionism shares common philosophical roots with interpretivism, it makes no specific ontological claims and as such it does not aspire to measure the objective reality of the natural world (also Hammersley, 1992). Instead, it is concerned with the construction and understanding of knowledge (epistemology) through investigation of a person’s subjective experience of socially defined reality, in order to make sense of what it is to be human (Steedman, 2000).

Although historically independent, social constructionism complements the AT framework (Holman, Pavlica and Thorpe, 1997) as it acknowledges that ‘action’ arises “within socially created situations and social structures” (Chamraz, 2008; p. 398). Correspondingly, this study endeavours to explore the phenomenon of EP practice with EMCs using language/s other than English, as constructed by plurilingual EPs. It is underpinned by the notion that “each person perceives the world differently and creates their own meanings from events” (Burr, 2003; p. 201). Thus plurilingual EPs hold multiple constructs of meaning and knowledge due to their active role in creation of experience56. The investigated world57 is therefore

56 Professional practice using language other than English
57 The research context
“already interpreted [...] by the actors, undermining the notion of objective reality” (Cohen, Manion et al. 2011; p. 225).

Accordingly, this study adopts the claim that knowledge about experiences and views of plurilingual EPs regarding their individual experiences can be obtained via an in-depth conversation with concerned individuals, who are the only agents to construct that ‘reality’ (Blumer, 1969; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011; Thomas, 2013).

4.4 Research design
4.4.1 Exploratory study
Stebbins (2001) proposed that social science exploration is “a broad-ranging, purposive, systematic, pre-arranged undertaking designed to maximise the discovery of generalisations leading to description and understanding of an area of social or psychological life” (p. 3). Babbie (2007) added that exploratory studies aim to satisfy the researcher’s curiosity and desire for a better understanding, test the feasibility of undertaking a more extensive study, and/or develop the methods to be employed in any subsequent research projects. Hence exploration is particularly applicable within the context of a group, process, activity, and/or situation that has received very little or no systematic scrutiny, has been largely examined using prediction and control, and/or has substantially changed over time.

Table 4.3 provides an overview of four different types of exploration.
**Table 4.3:** Four senses of exploration (adapted from Stebbins, 2001; p. 2-3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of exploration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigative exploration</td>
<td>Inquisitive process of examining/investigating</td>
<td>Describes what social science explorers do in general terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative exploration</td>
<td>Testing or experimenting to create a particular effect/product</td>
<td>The goal is to gain only the degree of familiarity that is needed to manipulate the properties of substances/procedures to achieve the desired effect/product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration for discovery</td>
<td>Search for everything of importance for describing and understanding the area under study</td>
<td>Aims to be as broad and thorough as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited exploration</td>
<td>Systematic search for something in particular</td>
<td>Innovation and broad discovery are secondary, as the explorer knows what to look for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main goal of exploratory research is to “find out how people get along in the setting under question, what meanings they give to their actions, and what issues concern them” (Check and Schutt, 2012; p. 11), which complements the social constructionist epistemology. It also endeavours to address the questions ‘who’ (is doing thinking, feeling), ‘what’ (with, for, about), ‘whom’ (with and/or who about), as well as ‘when’ and ‘where’ the action is taking place. In that sense it compliments the AT framework, as the information sought about the group, activity, and/or situation under investigation is inclusive not only of the descriptive facts, but also the cultural artefacts, structural arrangements and/or social processes (Stebbins, 2001).
A high level of flexibility in exploratory designs allows the research to address all types of research questions\textsuperscript{58}, providing an opportunity to gain knowledge and understanding which might be helpful in defining new terms, clarifying existing concepts and/or formulating hypotheses in order to establish priorities for further investigation (Check and Schutt, 2012).

Nevertheless, instead of providing definite answers to research questions and/or satisfactory clarification of the area under investigation, the conclusions of the exploratory studies often result in more questions (Check and Schutt, 2012). As one of the areas for exploration could be to determine which method would best fit the research problem in order to provide more definite answers, flexible exploratory research designs may also lack rigor applied to methods of data gathering and/or analysis. Similarly, some argue that although a small sample of participants in this type of research can hint at the answers, they may not necessarily be representative of the larger population (Babbie, 2007). Additionally, little attention and/or value has been given to the concept of exploration in the social sciences (Stebbins, 2001) despite exploratory studies being well-suited to yield new insights into a topic of research (Babbie, 2007; Blumer, 1969).

With due regard to its strengths and limitations, this research is conducted in line with Stebbins’ (2001) understanding of scientific exploration, which occurs when the researcher explores a phenomenon \textit{“when they have little or no scientific knowledge about [it], but have reason to believe that it contains elements worth discovering”} (p. 58).

\textsuperscript{58} e.g. ‘what’, ‘why’ and/or ‘how’
Accordingly, this study seeks to explore the currently unfamiliar phenomenon of plurilingual EPs’ professional practice with EMCs using language other than English. Due to the requirement for an exploratory stance, a qualitative approach and a flexible design are deemed complementary to helping obtain relevant information (Bryman, 2012).

Whilst the nature of the relationship between theory and research in deductive approaches is such that the key variables are laid out in advance (Babbie, 2007) and theory guides research (Bryman, 2012), researchers working from inductive approaches “proceed on the basis of many observations gathered from experience to derive a general principle” (Thomas, 2013; p. 122). Stebbins (2001) argued that exploration and inductive reasoning are important in science, because “deductive knowledge alone cannot uncover new ideas” (p. 8; also Urdang Associates, 1985). In an attempt to increase rigorous standards applied to data analysis, this research is guided by the AT framework and enables a two-stage sequential data analysis. Specifically, data obtained inductively will be deductively matched with the corresponding nodes of AT. Thus this research combines the elements of exploration for discovery (inductive stage of data analysis) with limited exploration (subsequent deductive phase bound by AT framework).

4.5 Research methods

4.5.1 Ethical considerations

Ethical implications with corresponding actions to address any potential issues that could arise in the process of undertaking this study were comprehensively addressed through the University of Birmingham Application for Ethical Review
(AER) form (Appendix D). The application was reviewed by the University of Birmingham Ethics Committee and granted approval in April 2016.

The research was conducted in accordance with guidelines set in the British Educational Research Association (BERA) Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research (BERA, 2011), the BPS Code of Ethics and Conduct (BPS, 2009), the BPS Code of Human Research Ethics (BPS, 2014), as well as the HCPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics (HCPC, 2016). Table 4.4 provides an overview of the key procedures undertaken to ensure the research followed ethical guidelines.

**Table 4.4:** An overview of key procedures undertaken to ensure the research followed ethical guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All participants were informed about the purpose of the research.</td>
<td>Appendix E-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. All participants were informed about how the data would be stored and for how long.</td>
<td>Appendix F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All participants were informed about how the data would be used.</td>
<td>Appendix F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Participant voluntary consent forms were obtained prior to the interviews.</td>
<td>Appendix H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. All participants were made aware of their time-limited right to withdraw.</td>
<td>Appendix F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. All data were anonymised and analysed collectively, so that individual participants could not be identified.</td>
<td>Appendix F and H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.5.2 Procedure**

Table 4.5 provides a chronological overview of the research procedure with corresponding time scales.
Table 4.5: An overview of the research procedure and corresponding time scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Research activity</th>
<th>Time scale</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Development of the research idea</td>
<td>September 2015 – January 2016</td>
<td>Execution through academic supervision at the University of Birmingham</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Initial participant scoping email</td>
<td>November-December 2015</td>
<td>In agreement with and under supervision of the university tutor (research supervisor), the LA-based EP services across the West Midlands region were approached in November 2015 via email, asking for approximate numbers of plurilingual EPs to ensure the feasibility of conducting this study. Eight out of fourteen services responded, indicating that there were at least eight known plurilingual EPs working within the West Midlands region at that time. Five potential participants contacted me directly, indicating their interest in participating in this study on a voluntary basis - there was no further contact until the ethical approval was granted by the University of Birmingham Ethics Committee.</td>
<td>Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Presentation of the research proposal to the research panel</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Academics from the School of Education scrutinised the research proposal in order to ensure rigorous design.</td>
<td>Appendix C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Application for Ethical Review (AER) submitted</td>
<td>8th April 2016</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Appendix D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Full ethical approval granted</td>
<td>18th April 2016</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Research advertisement</td>
<td>6th June 2016</td>
<td>A research advertisement and study information sheet were distributed to PEPs in West Midlands LA-based EPSs via email, asking for distribution across their teams and for potential participants to volunteer. The study information sheet was also sent directly to the five potential participants who had already put themselves forward during the initial scoping phase in November 2015.</td>
<td>Appendix E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Participants volunteer to take part in this study</td>
<td>6-13th June 2016</td>
<td>Six participants volunteered by making direct contact with the researcher via email.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview piloted with one participant</td>
<td>22nd June 2016</td>
<td>The semi-structured interview was piloted with one plurilingual EP.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>30th June 2016</td>
<td>Discussion with the research supervisor.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Pre-interview email sent to each participant</td>
<td>22nd June – 27th July 2016</td>
<td>Although no preparation was required, a pre-interview email was sent to each participant with a brief overview of what to expect. It was hoped to reduce any potential anxiety in relation to the exploration of participants’ personal constructs of culture and/or diversity within their EP practice. Appendix G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Individual semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>22nd June – 27th July 2016</td>
<td>Individual interviews were conducted with all EPs who responded to the research advertisement and offered their voluntary participation in the current study. The interviews were held at a location of each participant’s choice, which included a quiet room in their respective workplace or in the School of Education at the University of Birmingham. As far as possible all settings were private to reduce the potential for the interviewee to be overheard (Bryman, 2012). Each participant was given the participant information sheet (Appendix F) to read with additional opportunity to ask any questions prior to giving their written consent. All of the interviews followed the same order, as determined by the Activity Theory framework. Once each participant had agreed to continue by signing the informed consent, they were given a copy of the interview schedule (Appendix I) to enable them to refer directly to the text as and when needed (e.g. to process and respond to the multiple-step questions and/or to verify the vocabulary due to the researcher’s foreign accent). Appendix I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Data transcription</td>
<td>August 2016</td>
<td>N/A Appendix J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>December 2016 – February 2017</td>
<td>See Table 4.8 Appendix J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject - Object - Outcomes – Rules – Community - Division of Labour - Tools and/or Artefacts
4.5.3 Sampling

In order to ensure that those sampled would be relevant to the research questions (section 4.1.2), the ‘gold standard’ random sample was rejected. It was deemed largely irrelevant and incapable of contributing to this study (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011) due to its lack of an in-depth awareness of specific issues relevant to plurilingual EP practice using language other than English. Instead, a non-probabilistic purposive sample was employed, in order to access people with clearly specified characteristics\(^{60}\) who possess knowledge about particular issues by virtue of their professional role, expertise and/or experience (Bryman, 2012; Guest, MacQueen and Namey, 2012).

As the main concern of purposive sampling is to acquire in-depth information from those who are in a position to give it (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011), it does not profess to be representative (Thomas, 2013) and does not seek to generalise findings to the wider population (Bryman, 2012; Robson, 2011). However, Teddlie and Yu (2007) suggested that purposive sampling is indeed undertaken to increase representativeness, as its focus on specific issues and aim to generate information through the gradual accumulation of data may enable relevant comparisons to be made.

Due to the target population being limited, there were no exclusion criteria in relation to the participants’ country of birth, nationality, ethnicity and/or additional language

\(^{60}\) Being a fully qualified EP and having used language other than English in professional practice with EMCs
acquisition. A total of six female participants volunteered to take part in this study. Tables 4.6 and 4.7 provide an overview of relevant participant information and sample characteristics, respectively.

Table 4.6: Participant information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of highest qualification</strong></td>
<td>Doctorate in Educational Psychology</td>
<td>Masters in Educational Psychology</td>
<td>Doctorate in Educational Psychology</td>
<td>Masters in Educational Psychology</td>
<td>Masters in Educational Psychology</td>
<td>Doctorate in Educational Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First language</strong></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7: Sample characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Number of languages (in addition to English)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of plurilingualism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingualism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilingualism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-4[^62]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acquisition of language(s) other than English</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main language at home</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired later in life</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Languages spoken in addition to English</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirpuri</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjabi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^61]: Whether English was participants' first or additional language
[^62]: Please note that one participant reported speaking two languages other than English and three participants reported speaking four languages other than English.
Although there is no definitive guidance from the qualitative research community regarding sample size (Bryman, 2012), qualitative researchers “generally study many fewer people [than quantitative researchers], but delve more deeply into those individuals, settings, subcultures, and scenes, hoping to generate a subjective understanding of how and why people perceive, reflect, role-take, interpret, and interact” (Adler and Adler, 2013; p. 8). The literature suggests that a larger sample is needed to reflect the heterogeneous population, whereas a smaller sample is appropriate when the studied population is relatively homogeneous (Bryman, 2012). Adler and Adler (2013) clarified that even though between six and a dozen people may offer interesting insights, it may be that as many people to whom one can gain access are sufficient, especially when studies are restricted by the availability of the target population and time for data-gathering. Although the participant pool was restricted by the study’s aim to investigate a very narrow population amongst a relatively small professional group, all eligible volunteers were included.

Despite possible cultural heterogeneity amongst the research participants, the sample was deemed homogeneous in relation to participants’ membership of the EP occupation and their use of language other than English in their professional practice. Data collection and analysis further confirmed that participants were also homogeneous with respect to their country of birth and self-reported first language (Table 4.6).

**4.5.4 Semi-structured interviews**

Interviews are a widely used tool for data collection in social research (Bryman, 2012; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011), as they are designed to obtain
information relevant to investigating a scientific question (Bartholomew, Henderson and Marcia, 2000). Thus they have a clear purpose and are conducted within a particular context.

There are three commonly used types of research interviews, namely *structured*, *semi-structured* and *unstructured*. They are distinct in relation to the degree of standardisation and the ‘depth’ of response sought (Robson, 2011). The use of the structured interview was rejected due to its requirement of standardisation (Bryman, 2012) to ensure uniformity across interviews (Thomas, 2013). Although it can be administered relatively quickly and the interviewee’s responses can be easily coded, it was deemed too restrictive for the current study. In contrast, an unstructured interview was rejected due to its highly informal nature (Bryman, 2012) and reliance on the interviewee setting the agenda for a conversation around the general topic of interest (Thomas, 2013), which was incompatible with the use of AT.

Instead, a semi-structured interview format was employed to gather participant views, as it is considered to offer “the best of both worlds [...] , combining the structure of a list of issues to be covered together with the freedom to follow up points as necessary” (Thomas, 2013; p. 198). In this type of approach, the interview schedule serves as an aide-memoire to remind the interviewer of what they want to cover, whilst allowing them to deviate, in contrast to structured interviews and/or self-administered questionnaires (Robson, 2011). If it is felt that the interviewee has already answered the forthcoming point, there is no need to repeat it (Bryman, 2012; Thomas, 2013). This approach is deemed particularly beneficial when the researcher is beginning the investigation with a fairly clear focus (Bryman, 2012; Stebbins,
2001), which corresponds with the nature of this study. It also compliments the social constructionist epistemology, as there is an emphasis on how the interviewees construct and understand their experiences (Bryman, 2012).

The interview schedule (Appendix I) contained a wide range of questions in line with the second-generation AT framework (Engeström, 1987). As this study aimed to gain an account of personal experiences and views, data were collected at a single point in time. The interviews varied in length from one hour and four minutes to two hours and twelve minutes. Whilst variation in the amount of time that interviews take in qualitative research is very common (Bryman, 2012), all interviews fitted within the most frequently cited time frame of ‘half an hour to several hours’ (DiCicco-Bloom and Crabtree, 2006) or ‘typically one to two hours’ in length for a single interview (Guest, MacQueen and Namey, 2012). The average length of the interviews (mean time) was one hour and twenty-nine minutes. Despite longer interviews being valued, as they may provide more data (Bryman, 2012), Robson (2011) suggested that the interviewees may consider an interview much over one hour unreasonable. Participants were therefore informed about the anticipated time frame of one to one and a half hour in advance. The lengthiest interview was bound by the interviewee’s engagement.

Although it is not a necessary requirement for research interviews to be audio-recorded and/or transcribed (Bryman, 2012), in this instance interviews were both audio-recorded using a Dictaphone and transcribed for the purpose of data analysis. Table 4.8 provides an overview of key advantages and disadvantages of recording and transcribing interview data. Despite warranting a permanent record of an
Table 4.8: Key advantages and disadvantages of audio-recording and transcribing research interviews (compiled from Bryman, 2012; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011; and Heritage, 1984).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It helps to correct the limitations of the interviewer’s memories (minimises distortion).</td>
<td>1. It can increase the interviewee’s apprehension about speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It prevents the loss of ‘core’ data.</td>
<td>2. It can constrain interviewee’s responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It prevents reduction of complexity.</td>
<td>3. It does not prevent the inevitable loss of some aspects of data from the social encounter during the interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It allows more thorough examination of what participants say.</td>
<td>4. It is immensely time-consuming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It permits repeated examinations of the interviewee’s responses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It opens up the data to public scrutiny (e.g. secondary analysis).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It enables the researcher to counter-argue the influence of their values or biases on data analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It allows the data to be reused in other ways from those intended by the original researcher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
interview in case of the hardware malfunction, note-taking was rejected, in order to ensure that full attention was given to the participants (Bryman, 2012).

4.6 Pilot study

Where possible, the first stage of data gathering should involve a pilot study (Robson, 2011) “to refine or modify research methods or to test out research techniques” (Thomas, 2013; p. 173) in order to increase their reliability, validity and/or practicability (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011; Oppenheim, 1992). Bryman (2012) added that piloting an interview schedule can provide useful experience of using an interview schedule by enabling the researcher to identify questions that may cause respondents to feel uncomfortable or those that are misunderstood.

Bryman (2012) also suggested that pilot studies should employ people who are comparable to the members of the population from which the full study sample will be taken. Thus due to the narrow target population and flexible design, this project incorporated piloting within the study itself (Robson, 2011) in order to trial the semi-structured interview schedule.

One participant agreed to pilot the semi-structured interview and was informed that their data would be included in the whole project analysis unless significant changes were required that would subsequently invalidate the interview schedule. As only a
few minor alterations\textsuperscript{63} were made in line with the semi-structured interview standard, the pilot and full research project followed the same methodology. It was therefore appropriate to include the pilot data in the analysis.

4.7 Data analysis

4.7.1 Thematic analysis

A thematic analysis was applied to the data in order to identify key areas in response to the research questions (section 4.1.2). Although it is one of the most flexible and therefore the most commonly used method of qualitative analysis (Robson, 2011), it is not tied to an identifiable heritage or explicitly defined in terms of its distinctive techniques (Bryman, 2012). Thus there is no clear agreement about what it is and how to perform it (Braun and Clarke, 2006). However, it is considered to be the most useful in capturing the complexities of meaning within the textual data, as it focuses on identifying and describing both implicit and explicit ideas (Guest, MacQueen and Namey, 2012). It is therefore compatible with the exploratory study design (Guest, MacQueen and Namey, 2012) and the constructionist epistemology, as it “seeks to theorise the socio-cultural contexts and structural conditions that enable the individual accounts that are provided” (Braun and Clark, 2006; p. 14).

The current study adopts the Braun and Clarke’s (2006) six phase approach to thematic analysis, which offers a useful guidance on how to begin and organise such an analysis. Table 4.9 provides an overview of each phase with a corresponding outline of its execution in this study.

\textsuperscript{63} It was deemed beneficial to move some questions around to improve the overall flow of the interview schedule and a few questions required greater precision in relation to discussing EMCs in general terms or specific to EP practice using language other than English.
Table 4.9: The six phases of thematic analysis by Braun and Clarke (2006; p. 87).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Braun and Clarke’s description of the process</th>
<th>Execution in the current study</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Limitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Familiarising yourself with the data | Transcribing data, reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas. | – Prior knowledge of the data gained during the data collection phase  
– Transcription  
– Checking transcripts against the original audio recordings for accuracy  
– Repeated reading of the data to increase the level of familiarity (depth and breadth) with data  
– Initial searching for meanings, repeated patterns etc. | – Foundation for the analysis  
– An interpretative Act where meanings are created (Lapadat and Lindsay, 1999) | – Time consuming process |
| 2. Generating initial codes         | Coding interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code. | – Systematic working through the entire data set  
– Identification of interesting aspects in the data  
– Production of initial codes from the data | – Organisation of data into meaningful groups (Tuckett, 2005) | – |
| 3. Searching for themes            | Collating codes into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme. | – Sorting the codes into potential themes with the use of a table (visual representation)  
– Collating all the relevant coded data extracts within the identified themes  
– Analysing the relationship between codes, themes, and different levels of themes | – Gaining a sense of the significance of individual themes | – |
<p>| 4. Reviewing themes                | Checking if the themes work in relation to the coded | – Refinement of themes (collapsing vs. Breaking down themes) | – An awareness of what different themes are, how they fit together, | – |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|  | extracts (level 1) and the entire data set (level 2), generating 'thematic maps' of the analysis under each code. | Re-reading the collated extracts for each theme to review whether they form a coherent pattern  
Re-reading the entire data set to ascertain whether the themes are representative of the data set  
and the ‘story’ they tell about the data |
| 5. | **Defining and naming themes** | Ongoing analysis to define the specifics of each theme, and the overall story the analysis tells, generating clear definitions and names for each theme.  
Defining and further refining of the themes for final analysis  
Analysing the data within the themes  
Reviewing different theme levels  
Identification of what is interesting about themes and why |
| 6. | **Producing the report** | The final opportunity for analysis. Selection of vivid, compelling extract examples, final analysis of selected extracts, relating back of the analysis to the research question and literature, producing a scholarly report of the analysis.  
Write-up  
Choice of vivid examples or extracts that capture the essence of the point being demonstrated  
Analytic narrative beyond description of the data |
It is important to add that this research involves a two-stage sequential analysis. Due to its descriptive and exploratory orientation (Guest, MacQueen and Namey, 2012), the initial inductive stage involved eliciting the themes strongly linked to the raw data (Patton, 1990) without paying much attention to the themes that previous research might have identified (Braun and Clarke, 2006). However, Guest, MacQueen and Namey (2012) offered that although in exploratory studies “the researcher carefully reads the data, looking for key words, trends, themes, or ideas [...] before any analysis takes place” (p. 7-8), applied research initiatives are indeed based on theory, which gives direction to what is being examined. Since thematic analysis is not tied to any pre-existing theoretical framework, it can be used flexibly within various different frameworks (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Hence the second stage of data analysis was deductive, driven by the AT framework, which helped to reduce the data into pre-existing coding frames (the seven nodes). Although this type of analysis decreases the depth and complexity of data, a rich overall description of the information related to each AT node is maintained, which is considered particularly useful when investigating an under-researched area (Braun and Clarke, 2006).

Whilst a ‘code’ is “the most basic segment, or element, of the raw data or information that can be assessed in a meaningful way regarding the phenomenon” (Boyatzis, 1998; p. 63), a ‘theme’ “captures something important about the data in relation to the research question, and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set” (Braun and Clarke, 2006; p. 10). Thus themes are broader and often contain sub-themes, which provide structure, especially to large and/or complex themes (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Although repetition (recurrence within a data set) is one of the most common criteria for establishing themes, Bryman (2012)
argued that it can be insufficient on its own. Accordingly, a theme should not be dependent on quantifiable measures, but on the researcher’s judgement to determine whether it is relevant to the research questions (Braun and Clarke, 2006). The themes were coded and identified at the ‘latent’ level.

Although the method most commonly associated with exploratory qualitative analysis is Grounded Theory (Guest, MacQueen and Namey, 2012), this approach was rejected due to the use of the AT framework. Even though one could argue that themes generated through the inductive thematic analysis explain what is central in the data (Robson, 2011) and therefore could be recognised as a form of ‘theory’, the latter part of the analysis was deductive and governed by a pre-determined format. Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) was also rejected due to its relatively limited variability in how the method is applied (Braun and Clarke, 2006), as well as its focus on an in-depth case-by-case style of analysis about a particular participant’s experiences, as opposed to a more general account focussed on a specific population (Smith and Osborn, 2008).

4.8 Reliability and validity

Although quantitative and qualitative paradigms study different phenomena (Sale, Lohfeld and Brazil, 2002), reliability and validity originate from positivist paradigm (Bryman, 2012). Thus their relevance for qualitative studies has been questioned (Auerbach and Silverstein, 2003; Corbin and Strauss, 2008; Golafshani, 2003), as “the canons of reliability for quantitative research may be simply unworkable for qualitative research” (LeCompte and Preissle, 1993; p. 332).
For example, reliability\textsuperscript{64} relates to the concept of replication. Thus the current study acknowledges its relevance in relation to defining the codes and themes in thematic analysis (Guest, MacQueen and Namey, 2012) and endeavours to maximise it through the use of the Braun and Clarke’s (2006) systematic approach to data analysis. However, the aim of this study is to explore the participants’ constructs of their practice using language other than English, which are likely to differ and may be impossible to replicate. Reliability is therefore incompatible with the social constructionist epistemology, which claims that there can be several accounts of ‘truth’ (Guba and Lincoln, 1994), as “all knowledge is provisional and contestable, and accounts are local and historically/culturally specific” (Burr, 2003; p. 158).

Correspondingly, some argue that qualitative studies should be evaluated differently (Bryman, 2012). For example, Hammersley (1987) proposed that “an account is valid or true if it represents accurately those features of the phenomena that it is intended to describe, explain and theorise” (p. 69). Validity could be therefore replaced with the notions of authenticity (Guba and Lincoln, 1989; Maxwell, 1992), relevance, trustworthiness, plausibility, credibility and/or representativeness (Winter, 2000), which should in turn reflect the researcher’s “confidence in the truth of the findings, including an accurate understanding of the context” (Ulin, Robinson and Tolley, 2005; p. 25).

Respectively, validity refers to “whether a researcher can gain an accurate or true impression of the group, process, or activity under study and, if so, how this can be...”

\textsuperscript{64} “An ability to measure consistently” (Black and Champion, 1976; p. 232)
accomplished” (Stebbins, 2001; p. 48). It is therefore problematic in exploratory research due to potential effects of the researcher’s subjectivity and their ability to witness all relevant aspects of the phenomenon under investigation (McCall and Simmons, 1969), especially when a lone researcher conducts interviews employing an open-ended design (Stebbins, 2001). However, Winter (2000) clarified that validity in qualitative research may be addressed through the transparency of the researcher, the participants approached, as well as honesty, depth, richness and scope of the data achieved. Stebbins (2001) added that the most effective way to ensure validity in exploratory research is to situate it within the relevant area of study in order to enable scrutiny of claims and/or arguments.

The current study endeavours to maximise its validity via transparency in relation to my positionality (chapter 1, section 1.3), methodology (section 4.2) and methods (section 4.5), as well as data analysis (section 4.7). Effort was also made to situate this study in the existing literature (chapters 1-4). However, the degree of validity (Gronlund, 1981) in that respect is constrained by the limited scope of relevant research. Additionally, this study does not intend to claim the external generalisability of its findings. Instead, it seeks to represent the phenomenon under investigation fairly and fully (Winter, 2000) and one “will have to wait for future explorations before the tale of validity is fully told” (Stebbins, 2001; p. 49).

4.9 Chapter summary

This chapter offered a critical appraisal of the research methodology and design. Chapter 5 offers presentation and discussion of results.
Chapter 5: Results and Discussion

5.1 Introduction

Chapter 5 presents the results and offers discussion of the most pertinent findings in relation to the research questions (chapter 4, section 4.1.2). The results are presented in line with the Activity Theory framework, supported by quotes from semi-structured interviews. The findings relevant to current practice are discussed with reference to the literature considered in chapters 1-4.

5.2 Findings and discussion

Figure 5.1 provides an overview of the research findings in relation to the current ‘activity’ (plurilingual EP practice using languages other than English), which is discussed in detail in sections 5.2.1-5.2.8. Figure 5.2 offers a summative account of plurilingual EPs’ perceptions of past practice, whereas Figure 5.3 offers an outline of the findings related to future practice.

Figure 5.4 provides the key for colour coding applied throughout this chapter.

Figure 5.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Theory node</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overarching theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-sub-theme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.4: The colour key for the representation of themes.
Figure 5.1: Findings in relation to the current practice (see sections 5.2.1-5.2.8 for details).
Figure 5.2: Findings related to the past practice.

7. What tools and/or artefacts were used in the past? What historical factors have influenced their use?
   - Increased use of consultation
   - Increased use of dynamic ways of working
   - Attitude to standardised tests has changed over time
   - Experience over time
   - Tools designed through research
   - Focus on community-based work

2. What were people working on in the past?
   - Dependent on presenting needs
   - Language assessment (e.g. EAL vs. SEN)

4. What historical factors have influenced activity?
   - Experience over time and professional development
   - Government priorities and/or initiatives
   - Changes in legislation
   - Austerity
   - Increase in ethnic minority populations
   - Increase in workforce diversity
   - Service delivery
   - Increase in private practice and/or school-based EPs
   - Political climate

1. Whose perspective?
   Plurilingual EPs

3. What was achieved in the past?
   - Similar to present outcomes vs. outcomes changed over time due to different governing ‘rules’

5. Who else was involved in the past?
   - Specialist and/or community-based services
   - Adult Education

6. How was the work shared in the past?
   - Same approach over time – emphasis on collaborative working
   - Positive discrimination
   - Interpreter over EP during EP training
   - Scope for private work through self-referrals
Figure 5.3: Findings related to the future practice.

7. What tools would be useful for the future? What factors may influence their use?
   - Culturally sensitive resources reflective of the group of people that services cater for (e.g. cultural background information on different minority populations)
   - Practical resources focusing on social skills, survival language / teaching basic English (re-visiting EAL)
   - More information on language acquisition and potential loss
   - Recommendations for multilingualism
   - Courses in languages other than English for families
   - Stronger inclusion policy

2. What will people be working on in the future?
   - Likely to stay as it is
   - Supporting ethnic minority CYP’s integration into school and community
   - Statutory work

3. What will be achieved in the future?
   - Similar to present outcomes
   - Informed by presenting need and CYP’s best interest
   - Dependent on funding
   - Dependent on the outcomes of the current initiatives

4. What factors will influence future activity?
   - Personal and/or professional development
   - Increased workforce diversity
   - Changes to governing bodies
   - Policies and/or guidelines
   - Service delivery
   - Government priorities
   - Austerity
   - Political climate
   - Britain’s departure from the EU
   - Increased diversity within and across ethnic minority populations
   - Increasing demands on EP time

5. Who else might be involved in the future?
   - Multi-agency working
   - Charities
   - Less services due to Britain’s departure from the EU

6. How will the work be shared?
   - Likely to stay as it is
   - Increased multi-agency collaboration
   - Review of EP specialisms relevant to working with EMC
   - More recognition for EPs with additional skills


Figure 5.3
5.2.1 Subject

The subject of an activity system is the person whose perspective is being investigated. Figure 5.5 provides a detailed account of the key characteristics of the EPs who have used language other than English in their professional practice with EMCs and volunteered to offer their perspective in this study.

The findings suggest that the pool of plurilingual EPs in the West Midlands region includes practitioners who have additional language competencies in a mixture of European, as well as South Asian and Middle Eastern languages, ranging from a ‘basic conversational’ to ‘competent’ self-reported skill level across these languages. Similarly, the level of their self-reported cultural competency ranges from ‘comfortable’ to ‘strong’ and has been gained through various personal and/or work-related experiences.

Plurilingual EPs also reported receiving some general training (CPD) in relation to working with EMCs, but no input on providing EP services using language other than English (specific).

“There is work done around safeguarding and working with ethnic minority families more generally, but in terms of developing the skills that I personally have, I would say no. I don’t think I have had any specific experience or CPD around that.” ~ EP 3

Thus, similarly to Sotelo-Dynega and Dixon’s (2014) findings about US-based BSPs, plurilingual EPs practising in the West Midlands are likely to be ‘self-professed’ rather than formally trained and/or qualified to use language other than English in their practice. This could subsequently pose a risk of practitioners potentially
Figure 5.5: Overview of the themes for the 'subject' node.
engaging in practices beyond the boundaries of their professional competencies (Sotelo-Dynega, 2015).

5.2.2 Object

Themes identified within the object node are presented in Figure 5.6.

**Figure 5.6**

![Figure 5.6: Overview of the themes for the 'object' node.](image)

Due to possible conflicts between what clients are looking for and what EPs can and/or want to offer (Kelly and Gray, 2000), the object can be one of the most difficult elements to define within the activity system (Leadbetter, 2008). Nevertheless, findings from the thematic analysis suggest that provision of EP services to EMCS using language/s other than English is in line with what is considered ‘standard’ EP practice (see chapter 2, section 2.2). This suggests that there is consistency across the client population, as the focus of the activity is within the boundaries of the EP role (Fallon, Woods and Rooney, 2010). Participants identified that the majority of this type of work is delivered as part of their statutory responsibility, which is centred on the following:

a) needs assessment of CYP newly arrived to the country;
b) distinguishing EAL from SEN (corresponding with O’Bryon and Rogers, 2016); and/or
c) assessment of CYP with complex needs, further reinforcing EPs’ role in working with CYP who have severe, complex and/or challenging needs (Farrell et al., 2006).

Due to more services working within a traded model of service delivery (Islam, 2013), EPs also recognised undertaking occasional individual casework identified and paid for by schools.

5.2.3 Outcome

Themes identified within the outcome node are presented in Figure 5.7.

**Figure 5.7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological formulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-school liaison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.7**: Overview of the themes for the ‘outcome’ node.

EPs identified formal and informal provision of psychological advice (psychological formulation and information sharing, respectively), as well as securing
resources, as specific outcomes they hope to achieve as a result of their work with EMCs using language/s other than English. Although these findings correspond with the ‘object’ and EPs’ statutory responsibility laid out in the Education Act 1981 and the Code of Practice (DfE and DoH, 2015), the ‘gate-keeping’ aspect of the EP role has been criticised due to its potential to distort the EP role (Miller and Frederickson, 2006; Woods, 1994) and/or to restrict the development of its other functions (DfEE, 2000; Farrell et al., 2006; Norwich, 2000). However, EPs also emphasised that their work involves, and can therefore result in, rapport building (BPS, 2015; HCPC, 2015) and/or signposting (HCPC, 2016), both of which could subsequently help to reduce power imbalance and/or promote social inclusion (DfES, 2001).

“I think that one of the key outcomes of working with ethnic minority families is gaining trust and gaining that familiarity with them, so that they start to recognise that although you are a professional you are there to support them.” ~ EP 3

Whilst it can be difficult to ascertain to whose advantage the EP role should work (Ashton and Roberts, 2006), as demands of various clients may differ (MacKay, 2002; Tizard, 1978); participants acknowledged that provision of EP services using language/s other than English is centred on the presenting need (needs-based) of the CYP and/or families (Department for Children, Schools and Families [DfCSF], 2007), suggesting that they are considered to be the primary client (Cameron, 2006). It could therefore be viewed as language-independent, as it is consistent across the wider client population (Fallon, Woods and Rooney, 2010).

“The outcomes generally are the same as they would be for any client […] Generally, it is on needs basis.” ~ EP 6
5.2.4 Rules

The vast amount of data within the rules node reflects the complex socio-cultural context of plurilingual EPs’ practice with EMCs using language/s other than English (Cameron, 2006; Stobie, 2002). Due to its pertinence to the research questions, the rules node is divided into the following levels: ‘individual’, ‘local/community’, and ‘national and/or cultural’. For ease of reference, each level is discussed separately.

Research questions:

- What do plurilingual EPs perceive supports or constrains their practice in relation to providing services to EMCs using language other than English?

- What are the socio-cultural factors that mediate the plurilingual EPs’ approaches and/or unique contributions to working with EMCs using language/s other than English?

5.2.4.1 Individual level

Themes identified within the rules (individual level) node are presented in Figure 5.8.

5.2.4.1.1 Supportive

Plurilingual EPs identified their skills and competencies, knowledge and understanding, as well as practitioner positionality as key rules that support their work with EMCs using language/s other than English. These findings correspond with Beaver (2011), who highlighted skills and knowledge as two key elements to the EP role. Respectively, EPs acknowledged that their range of skills and competencies enables engagement and promotes relationships with EMCs.
Figure 5.8: Overview of the themes for the ‘rules’ node in relation to an individual level.
(Beaver, 2011). For example, cultural and religious competency beyond that acquired through living in multicultural Britain, may increase plurilingual EPs’ sensitivity and relatedness to the unique experiences of EMCs (Usmani, 1999).

“…being an ethnic minority myself, a person of ethnic minority, might help on an individual level. So I might understand a little bit more about the situations or how somebody may feel.”
~ EP 6

“It wasn't until I went to [the country] that I really felt like I could relate. I suddenly felt very much ‘at home’, feeling like ‘this is familiar’ even though I had never been to [the country] before.” ~ EP 2

It can also compensate for certain skill deficiencies.

“I speak the language. I have been to the country as well […] I have lived there for a little bit […] That is an advantage which might compensate for my lack of grammatical correctness perhaps.” ~ EP 6

EPs highlighted that additional language competency gives them a sense of being ‘in control’, which enables them to:

a) modify their approach to meet the needs of different individuals, whilst demonstrating an understanding of “how communication skills affect assessment of, and engagement with, service users” (HCPC, 2015; p. 9);

“sometimes being much more formal […] is a conscious decision on my part […] to ensure that there are clear boundaries for parents and that they understand that even though I am speaking in your language, that doesn't mean we have broken down the professional-personal barrier.” ~ EP 3

b) recognise and contextualise cultural and/or linguistic nuances (Rizwan and Williams, 2015), whilst demonstrating their awareness of the characteristics and consequences of explicit and implicit communication (HCPC, 2015); and
“It is nuances that it is really hard to put your finger on, but when you have lived in a country and you have picked up on the language and you speak the language, you can take a lot from expressions and the way people talk.” ~ EP 6

c) monitor what and how has been relayed to the families through an interpreter, trying to assure the quality of their practice (HCPC, 2015).

“I am able to understand the interpreter and I will ask the interpreter ‘well can you ask the parent this, this and this because you missed this out’.” ~ EP 5

Similarly to M’gadzah, Saraon and Shah (1999), EPs reflected on some benefits of combining their range of skills in relation to:

a) their own practice; and

“I think I get a richer picture by using my language and using my culture with those particular families. I get a richer understanding of how this child functions within that context […] It just allows me to almost have like an aerial view of the family.” ~ EP 5

b) possible benefits to EMC, further reinforcing their concern for and focus on client-centred practice (Cameron, 2006; DfCSF, 2007).

“There is a hierarchy between a parent and a professional and being able to converse in the home language or maybe talk about one or two cultural aspects of their functioning enables them to feel more comfortable.” ~ EP 5

EPs also differentiated between theoretical and practical knowledge and understanding (see section 5.2.7 for more details), both of which provide the foundation for making sense of situations, understanding processes that promote change, and/or informing interventions (Beaver, 2011). Whilst the theoretical knowledge and understanding sub-theme relates to that acquired through EP training in psychology (BPS, 2015) and/or relevant CPD, the practical sub-theme
reflects the valued knowledge of systems and/or procedures (DfES, 2001). Nevertheless, despite being required by HCPC (2015) to “understand the structures and functions of UK service providers applicable to the work of their domain” (p. 13), the findings suggest that the scope of plurilingual EPs involvement with EMCs may sometimes be beyond their role and/or remit, which exemplifies their commitment to EMCs who do not share language with the majority of the UK population.

“*I was able to tell her where the local library was and to direct her, signpost her to other things that she could do while she was waiting for the school place. [...] I also had to broker the organisation over transport for her because she had physical difficulties.*” ~ EP 4

“I have ended up filling out various DLA\(^{65}\) forms or giving them various phone numbers just really to support them.” ~ EP 4

Furthermore, EPs stressed the importance of their development as a **reflective practitioner** (required by BPS and HCPC) and its impact on professional identity formation. They explained that critical reflection has enabled them to address some of their own anxieties, values and/or attitudes when working with EMCs (Usmani, 1999), in order to ensure that they do not engage in unfair or prejudiced practice (BPS, 2009).

“*Developing my own assertiveness as a professional and that is about feeling confident in my role and understanding what my role is has helped [...] When I look back at my past cases, there have been so many cases now, everyone shapes and changes [you], not just the ethnic minority but the other cases as well. They shape you as a practitioner and shape your approach to working with families.*” ~ EP 3

“I think I have had to consciously be aware of what I bring to the table in terms of my use of my culture, religion you know what is acceptable, what isn't acceptable. I have had to quite

\(^{65}\) Disability Living Allowance
consciously put those things to one side and sometimes there are stereotypes that you know that I go in with.” ~ EP 3

Plurilingual EPs also reiterated that sharing knowledge and/or expertise through liaising with ethnic minority colleagues (O’Bryon and Rogers, 2016; Rizwan and Williams, 2015) can inform and promote EP practice with all EMCs. Interestingly, this finding seems to reflect the HCPC’s (2016) standard of conduct, performance and ethics, which requires EPs to “work in partnership with colleagues, sharing [their] skills, knowledge and experience where appropriate, for the benefit of service users and carers” (p. 6).

“I am quite happy to share my cultural and religious beliefs and my awareness of those things and as I say colleagues feel quite comfortable to come and ask me.” ~ EP 3

“We all feel it is not fair for [Somali EP] to have all the Somalis. We all have some Somalis, but we could ask him about Somalis.” ~ EP 2

However, they stressed that it tends to happen informally within EPS teams, further reinforcing the lack of formal CPD opportunities within the area of plurilingual EP practice (Sotelo-Dynega and Dixon, 2014).

“I am really close to some of my colleagues […] we would have those conversations [about cultural norms and/or key characteristics of minority communities] quite naturally […] But maybe I have not really done it in the platform of formally.” ~ EP 1

5.2.4.1.2 Constraining

Nevertheless, the findings from the thematic analysis suggest that additional competencies may pose a barrier to EP practice using language/s other than English due to:

a) context-specific limitations, further reinforcing the notion of diversity within a
culture; and

“there might be several EPs who work who appear to be from the same cultural background if you like; their heritage is similar, but it is about how much they feel as a person are embedded in that culture as well.” ~ EP 3

“even though I do know some of the processes in terms of the education system in [the country], I don’t know everything about those people and what mindset they are coming to the table with […] So although I have a cultural awareness it could be a lot better.” ~ EP 6

b) reliance on other people’s understanding (e.g. of imperfect language/dialect), which could subsequently compromise EPs’ ability to effectively monitor and/or evaluate the quality of their practice (HCPC, 2015).

“when I speak to parents in Mirpuri, the way I describe it is like somebody from [the Black Country region] trying to speak to somebody who has a really thick Scottish or Liverpool accent. You can understand, but if you haven’t lived in that part of the world and you haven’t picked up on the dialect, it can be like speaking to somebody in a different language.” ~ EP 3

Practitioner’s personal characteristics on the other hand may trigger unhelpful assumptions and/or expectations (see section 5.2.6 for more details on expectations) in relation to their cultural, religious and/or linguistic competencies (M’gadzah, Saraon and Shah, 1999). This could in turn have an impact on the relationship building and/or maintaining appropriate professional boundaries with service users, as required by HCPC (2016).

“I can’t speak Somali but my name is Arabic, so [EMCs] assume that I can speak Arabic or I have the same cultural but/or religious background as they” ~ EP 5

“Sometimes what makes it difficult I suppose in some respects is that you are the same identity in maybe in terms of the race or ethnicity and the religion […] I think sometimes I have noticed they try and get too friendly with me.” ~ EP 1
Correspondingly, **dual nature of the role** (EP and an interpreter) may confuse EMCs’ understanding of **professional versus personal role boundaries**, which could in turn pose a threat to practitioners having their privacy invaded.

“For some parents they have never experienced working with a professional who have spoken their own language, so immediately in their mind my role shifted from somebody who came in speaking English as a professional to somebody who came in speaking in the home language and was quite friendly and chatty and almost became more like a family friend rather than a professional.” ~ EP 3

“I have actually on more than one occasion had parents ask me whether I was born in England or whether I was born in Pakistan and whether they could tell me what part of Pakistan my family have come from, my ancestors if you like. Although it is not divulging totally personal information, I do still feel as though there is that boundary, why do they need that information for? But I think part of that is that they can feel comfortable in order to talk to me but it does make me feel uncomfortable at times.” ~ EP 3

Therefore, **dual nature of the role** is complex, as it places a number of additional **demands** on plurilingual practitioners.

“When you are talking to parents in a different language, you are not just talking in a different language, you are taking on all the cultural and social roles that come with that as well.”

~ EP 3

“sometimes it is quite hard to play psychologist and then also to be speaking a different language and it is sometimes a bit more complicated” ~ EP 6

In particular, EPs highlighted added pressure on their **time** and **increased level of involvement** required to effectively and appropriately communicate information, advice, instruction and/or opinion to EMCs (HCPC, 2015), so that they have “the information they want or need, in a way they can understand” (HCPC, 2016; p. 6).

“It can take more time I think. It takes more brain energy for me because mainly I use English with my husband, I use English with my friends, I use English with my mum and dad
to be honest nowadays. [...] I probably speak more home language professionally when I need to.” ~ EP 1

“It does seem to take a bit longer when you are having to work with families who are new to the country and you are having to speak in [a language other than English] [...] I think it is more than just translating it is you also have to explain a lot more perhaps” ~ EP 6

“I ended up having a lot of phone calls so really it did have a really significant impact on my role because over time the girl was ringing directly and asking me ‘when am I going to find a school place?’ and obviously I was the person she had met from the local authority.” ~ EP 4

5.2.4.2 Local/Community level

Themes identified within the rules (local/community level) node are presented in Figures 5.9a and 5.9b.

5.2.4.2.1 Supportive

Participants distinguished a wide range of factors that support plurilingual EP practice in relation to schools, local community, EPS and the LA. For example, they recognised that diversity (reflective of statistics discussed in chapter 1) within and across West Midlands schools, has increased cultural awareness and expertise amongst school practitioners.

“There is a level of expertise in the schools now [...] their experience has gained as it is not a new thing so much anymore to have children come in from different countries quite suddenly.” ~ EP 6

Thus schools are now more likely to identify the need for and to request EP involvement with EMCs.
Figure 5.9a: Overview of the themes for the supportive ‘rules’ node in relation to a local/community level.
Figure 5.9b: Overview of the themes for the constraining ‘rules’ node in relation to a local/community level.
One of the key threads at a local/community level was in relation to safeguarding role boundaries, which could subsequently help to emphasise plurilingual practitioners’ EP identity over that of an interpreter. For example, findings suggest that:

a) access to **resources** (e.g. **interpreters**) can help to decrease demands on plurilingual practitioners;

> “I think it is useful if there is a native [nationality] there and her level of language is better than mine that they use her because then I can concentrate and stand back from the situation as well and do my assessments and things like that.” ~ EP 6

b) **information sharing** can help to protect the remit of plurilingual EP practice within the EPS, especially if managers are aware of and have a good understanding of the range of additional skills across the EPS;

> “what has facilitated my role is that early on as people became aware in the service that I could speak these languages there was an influx of ‘could you help me with this case’ and ‘could you interpret here’ and I was quite lucky that the Principal was able to kind of bring that back and say ‘make sure you know you have a distinct role to play’ and I could have quite easily have been taken up with being just a glorified interpreter.” ~ EP 3

c) **a traded model of service delivery** can help to protect and/or differentiate the role boundaries within the context of providing plurilingual EP services to trading partners (e.g. schools), especially for fully qualified EPs; and
“As a Trainee I wasn’t a very expensive resource but as an EP that is a very expensive visit and I think schools are more hesitant now [to use me as an interpreter] because they know it is going to cost money to have me there.” ~ EP 3

d) multi-agency working can help to reinforce the role boundaries when providing plurilingual EP services to EMCs.

“if [a home visit] has been with another professional it seems to be that parents recognise that there is a professional role here and we need to stick with it.” ~ EP 3

Despite the literature implying that the statutory role may limit the scope of EP work and prevent it from expanding (DfEE, 2000; Farrell et al., 2006; Maliphant, 1997; Norwich, 2000; Woods, 2012), plurilingual EPs’ recognition that most of their work using language/s other than English is part of their statutory responsibility (as highlighted under the ‘object’ node in section 5.2.2), suggests otherwise. Participants also acknowledged that occasional skill and/or demographic-based school allocation may indeed promote plurilingual EP practice by enabling practitioners to use their range of skills more effectively. This finding highlights that plurilingual EPs are not only aware of, but also committed to making a contribution to the wider society (in line with BPS, 2009 and 2015; HCPC, 2015).

“I am placed in a culturally diverse [area] and I feel I am able to bring in that cultural experience into the meetings I have with the parents and it is more effective use [of my skills] I think.” ~ EP 5

“that comes back to the fact that the service understood what my skills were and it is much more beneficial for me to be the EP [for that school] do some more systemic work rather than have individual cases passed on to me where I would be working at an individual level and that wouldn’t have been very useful in the longer term” ~ EP 3
Likewise, EPs recognised that multi-agency working can allow more effective joint action planning, highlighting their understanding of the Children Act 2004, Children and Families Act 2014 and/or HCPC’s (2015) standards of proficiency, all of which advocate working in partnership with other professionals for the benefit of service users.

“[multi-agency practitioners] come in with their different experience and expertise and it just builds a better picture of that child’s needs and how we can move forward with the child in terms of interventions and strategies.” ~ EP 5

Although professional standards require EPs to “understand the power imbalance between practitioners and service users” (HCPC, 2015; p. 7) and to “take appropriate professional action to redress power imbalances and to embed principles of anti-discriminatory and anti-oppressive practice in all professional actions” (BPS, 2015; p. 21), plurilingual EPs recognised that power dynamics can sometimes increase EMCs’ openness to advice.

“I think these parents [...] value power and they see professionals as experts. So as soon as you say you are an Educational Psychologist they want to listen.” ~ EP 1

5.2.4.2.2 Constraining

However, EPs also acknowledged that power imbalance can constrain plurilingual EP practice, as it poses a risk of:

a) EMCs’ fear of the unknown; and

“I think sometimes a professional can automatically seem like an expert [and] it can instil a level of fear or worry that they don't know anything about their child.” ~ EP 1

“I think there is a fear [...] of people who have authority and I think part of that comes down to not understanding what people’s professional roles are” ~ EP 3
b) EMCs accepting professional opinion without challenging it (Rehal, 1989; Reed, 1999).

“I think there is an issue here certainly with the Pakistani families that I have worked with about the slight just not understanding what the systems are and tending not to be on the whole very vocal about, […] just accept what you say and not really terribly challenging because they don't understand what the systems are and what the options are.” ~ EP 4

EPs also talked about a high level of diversity across and within communities (discussed in chapter 1), which challenges practitioners to accurately assess the needs of EMCs (Desforges and Kerr, 1984; Desforges, Mayet and Vickers, 1995), further reinforcing the importance of recognising individual differences (M'gadzah, Saraon and Shah, 1999).

“In terms of constraints at a community level we work with very diverse communities with very diverse needs so it is not like they are all Kashmiri and all they are all Pakistani and they're maybe Kashmiri and they're maybe Pakistani and they're maybe Indian and they're Bengali, so they all have different needs at a community level” ~ EP 5

Correspondingly, EPs asserted that the following limitations are likely to further constrain their practice using language other than English:

a) limited cultural understanding amongst school practitioners due to EPs being reliant on feedback/information from other people; and

“schools don't always understand. […] People don't understand where they are coming from and it is really hard and it is really complicated trying to fit…what is the saying…square pegs into round holes.” ~ EP 6

“PE teacher said she can't go swimming because she had to wade through a sea of dead bodies. When we actually talked about it to her through the interpreter we found out that [...] somebody had a heart attack while swimming, they pulled him onto the beach and unfortunately they tried to revive him but he had passed away” ~ EP 2
b) the LA’s limited understanding of the difference between life opportunities and SEN, especially when determining whether the needs of CYP are underpinned by EAL or SEN and considering the most suitable educational provision.

“I think I spoke about maybe the local authority not having enough awareness about lack of education and opportunities versus Special Educational Needs and that is definitely constraining in terms of the outcomes for the pupils. Although it doesn’t impact my work directly, it does impact it to some degree because there are only so many options for these children.” ~ EP 6

EPs also identified austerity as a key constraining factor which has contributed to reduced power given to the LA, limited services to signpost to (including limited specialist provision), as well as questionable training and/or practice of some practitioners.

“I think the government is ploughing more money into these academies and almost undermine local authorities.” ~ EP 2

“I think with the local authorities being given less power, I think potentially that is an issue. […] I think that lack of a strong message from local authorities potentially in the future, depending upon what is going to happen, I can see that becoming more fragmented in a way.” ~ EP 4

In addition, EPS’ priorities being driven by the government and/or LA may pre-occupy service delivery and subsequently restrict opportunities for CPD relevant to plurilingual EP practice. Likewise, EPS’ limited knowledge of specialisms/interests and/or additional skills across the team may suggest that there is the lack of a unified response to EAL (Rumble and Thomas, 2017) across the West Midlands EPSs.
“I mean I didn't really recognise that my colleague was using her other language as much and even lots of EPs that might use like an Asian type of language.” ~ EP 6

“There is nobody for example who has got a remit of necessarily looking at bilingual of having a remit of key EP for bilingualism […] I think we are a little bit loose around the edges sometimes of those sorts of things. And I don’t know for example who might have an interest in another team. Now that would be helpful to know. I think it is because there are so many different projects going on but it tends to shift a little bit as to whatever the business plan is.” ~ EP 4

Yet, EPs acknowledged that autonomy and sole working with EMCs when using language/s other than English can make it difficult to maintain their focus and/or professional boundaries.

“When I have gone on my own, I could quite easily be there for a couple of hours, getting very side tracked and then having to bring parents back so yeah that definitely doesn't help with the role.” ~ EP 3

They also highlighted that the following resources might be limited and/or of poor quality, and can therefore constrain successful delivery of EP services using language other than English, further emphasising the need for professional expertise when working with EMCs (Lauchlan, 2014):

a) schools’ in-house interpreters;

“…it could also be to our disadvantage is that there are in-house translators and interpreters within schools and that will do your job but in terms of the quality it is not always good.” ~ EP 5

“the translators are not always brilliant to be honest. They put […] their own thoughts on the response.” ~ EP 6

b) EPS’ resources, including time capacity; and
“You don’t really have that capacity, but you kind of make that time because you think ‘well actually it is for the family’” ~ EP 1

c) LA services.

“a lot of the parents I work with can’t go on [courses] because they don’t have the English skills to be able to connect.” ~ EP 1

“...there are groups and things, parent support groups, ‘Triple P’, those kind of groups that if parents are having difficulty with children you would recommend but I have to be very conscious and I always have been that these are the parents that typically one parent might go who maybe is more proficient in English or maybe neither parent will go so we don’t have the resources at the moment.” ~ EP 3

5.2.4.3 National and/or cultural level

Themes identified within the rules (national and/or cultural level) node are presented in Figure 5.10.

5.2.4.3.1 Supportive

The findings from the thematic analysis suggest that certain sources of guidance and/or specific contexts at a national and/or cultural level impose changes on the ways that EPs work (Winward, 2015), and can therefore support and/or promote plurilingual EP practice. For example, policy and legislation as well as a national leadership’s positive stance in relation to inclusion, tolerance and/or equality, can subsequently inform the LA’s priorities.
Figure 5.10: Overview of the themes for the 'rules' node in relation to the national and/or cultural level.
“I suppose just general policies of inclusion, you know general equal opportunities you know national policies I think that is really really important that those are very much there and stressed, and anti-racist policies, definitely inclusion policies, community cohesiveness. I mean there is a lot going on nationally, isn't there in terms of projects? That I think are really important to give that very strong message nationally but also that is echoed at a local authority level.” ~ EP 4

“I think it is really important that the message is that some of the politicians are putting out about tolerance and treating people equally and anti-racist.” ~ EP 4

Thus policy and legislation can be helpful when negotiating the type and/or scope of EP involvement, especially within the context of traded services (Islam, 2013).

“If I am saying to a school ‘that is going to be a 2-hour consultation for these parents, because I really need to take the time’, they might be like ‘what is the point of that?’ [...] I might have to refer back to the DfE guidance around the importance of engaging with parents [...] I might need to reflect and relate back to those sorts of policies and legislation which highlight that I guess.” ~ EP 1

Although not explicitly, EPs also recognised the important role of political and historical knowledge, which can help to contextualise EMCs’ life circumstances and subsequently inform their practice.

“when the [nationality] first came over they were refugees. [...] they were invited over to work and the work that was offered was coal mining, steel work, not easy work [...] That community was very ‘we have got to preserve the old culture because it has disappeared’ [...] it was very much a communist style so therefore the [nationality], I suppose, were refugee culture or an isolated culture.” ~ EP 2

Likewise, EPs suggested that being raised and/or living in a multi-cultural society can also increase one’s cultural awareness.
“having been brought up in quite a multi-cultural society, understanding people who speak Panjabi, might be Sikh or Hindu - those different religions. I have a better grasp of them now”
~ EP 3

Although participants spoke about family work primarily at a local/community level, the emphasis on the whole family approach and family intervention has been driven by an overarching national agenda (e.g. ‘Troubled Families’ Programme 2015-2020), which offers wider context for EP service delivery. This finding demonstrates EPs’ awareness of the role of initiatives from central government that influence their practice (Beaver, 2011; Boyle, MacKay and Lauchlan, 2008). In particular, EPs’ recognition of the importance of family work highlights their understanding that despite a diverse range of needs and/or demands of various families (DfCSF, 2007; MacKay, 2002; Tizard, 1978), “working with parents is central to good practice, due to their role in the development, learning, emotional care and adjustment of their children” (Dunsmuir, Cole and Wolfe, 2014; p. 7).

“There is emphasis on working with family’s work at a service level and so there is so many different diverse range of families. What does family definition mean? What your definition mean might be very different. So it is being able to if we need to progress we need to be able to understand how different families and different structures function and be able to relate to that. It is like one rule does not fit all you know.” ~ EP 5

A recent emphasis within the national agenda on schools and childcare providers’ safeguarding duties in relation to protecting CYP from the risk of radicalisation (DfE, 2015) was also mentioned as an initiative that could be supportive of plurilingual EP practice. It was developed in response to the rapidly growing ideology of extremism and the threat of terrorism “not just from foreign nationals but also from terrorists born and bred in Britain” (HM Government, 2011; p. 1). DfE guidance
reinforces schools’ duty to actively promote the fundamental British values\textsuperscript{66} in order to ensure that CYP leave education prepared for life in modern Britain.

\begin{center}
\begin{quote}
	\textit{“there is a great emphasis on you know Muslim youngsters being radicalised and how professionals can support that”} \textendash{} EP 3
\end{quote}
\end{center}

\textbf{5.2.4.3.2 Constraining}

Nevertheless, the current political climate was mentioned as potentially constraining, in particular due to increased reports of racism and nationalism post the EU referendum in June 2016, which in turn might have impacted on increased anxiety amongst some immigrant families.

\begin{center}
\begin{quote}
	\textit{“also now it is horrible right wing business after the EU voting. [...] It is all the racism come into the fore”} \textendash{} EP 2
\end{quote}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{quote}
	\textit{“…particularly with Brexit some of those issues have increased - racism and more nationalist approaches”} \textendash{} EP 4
\end{quote}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{quote}
	\textit{“with all this Brexit and this political shift around immigration a lot of families that may be like first generation immigrants are going to feel quite insecure about their position really. [...] I have actually had parents that say that really, ‘You know we have come, we came here 10 years ago, we settled here and we will be going back’. So there is an element of anxiety amongst parents.”} \textendash{} EP 5
\end{quote}
\end{center}

Additionally, since 2014 there has been an emphasis on building CYP’s resilience through “promoting fundamental British values” (DfE, 2015; p. 5) as part of their spiritual, moral, social and cultural (SMSC) development (DfE, 2014). Although the British values agenda offers that CYP should “develop and demonstrate skills and attitudes that will allow them to participate fully in and contribute positively to life in

\textsuperscript{66} Values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs (DfE, 2014)
modern Britain” (OFSTED, 2017; p. 40), EPs suggested that lack of clarity regarding cultural assimilation (e.g. in relation to language acquisition) may constrain their practice.

“I wonder whether if we are encouraging ethnic minority parents whose home is English to speak English, will [speaking home language] then decrease? Does that fit in to where the political climate is going anyway about being, you know, simulating with British values and things? I don’t really know, but I think it is important for us to be aware of. But then the challenge with that is [...] my dad really wanted to integrate in the culture and everything when he first came here and he used to speak English, but he had really poor broken English, so as children we were picking up, you know, very bad English which is you know well, actually, wouldn’t he had been better just to give us fluent language in the home language?” ~ EP 1

The findings from the thematic analysis also extracted language and cultural implications sub-themes. EPs reported that they can experience technical restrictions due to differences in conceptual representation of certain words (Ameel et al., 2005; Athanasopoulos, 2016) and connotation across different languages.

“I think I struggle with the medical diagnosis terms like ADHD, Autism, another big one is attachment difficulties. [...] it can very much come across as like [...] I’m blaming you as a parent ‘you gave them the early life experiences’." ~ EP 1

“I was trying to explain the word ‘learning difficulties’ - ‘moderate learning difficulties’ and there isn't really...I mean there is a word and it is called "Sada" but it basically has a connotation I guess from the olden days like ‘handicapped’, ‘mentally handicapped’ or ‘retard’. [...] I really struggled to think ‘how am I going to say he has got like learning difficulties?’ [...] I said he was kind of ‘slow’ and the word I translated was that he was kind of slow with doing things compared to his peers.” ~ EP 1

“I don’t know the technical words, I would have to look up ‘statutory assessment’ and it is all specialist placements, all that technical ‘special needs’. I could do it in a very simple way, it sounds very pathetic, you know 'we will have a meeting’ and ‘we will have to do the paperwork, the documents, so that he can go to special school’" ~ EP 2
Limited correspondence between systems and/or professional roles can also make it difficult to effectively relay information to the families.

“the school systems are very different in [country]. So here we have loads of schools for children with additional needs and also they would go into a mainstream school. It is not the same in [country] or where these families are coming from.” ~ EP 6

“They are coming from different culture and a different way of thinking and living. It is all very new and they wouldn't have access to so many different professionals.” ~ EP 6

Yet, the mismatch between cultural norms and expected outcomes can sometimes translate to resistance to change.

“Sometimes the community needs may not always meet the Educational Psychology needs. So the goals are not the same because our goals are very much politically-led, the community needs may be very different/ There is discrepancy there in that respect.” ~ EP 5

“sometimes these parents, due to cultural norms, they are very 'within child' [...] I remember seeing a young girl who was hearing voices or something and they ascribed it to, you know, spiritual demons and saying there is nothing you can do about it and nothing the school can do. [...] At first, they were really resistant” ~ EP 1

5.2.5 Community

Themes identified within the ‘community’ node are presented in Figure 5.11.

The findings from the thematic analysis illustrate plurilingual EPs’ recognition of a collective responsibility when working with and/or supporting the work with EMCs using language other than English. The main themes relate to the wider
establishments, whereas corresponding sub-themes illustrate specific examples of services and/or practitioners who operate and/or work within these establishments.

EPs’ ability to distinguish the role of other stakeholders demonstrates their understanding of the structures and systems of a wide range of settings in which education, health and/or care services are delivered to EMCs (HCPC, 2015).

Nevertheless, they acknowledged that even though there is some diversity within these services, it is not entirely representative of the ethnic minority and/or plurilingual population.
"You have a whole range of people [...], you will get people who reflect the community that they are serving." ~ EP 2

"We have got 50% of the population of Birmingham being EAL or from another culture, so the [number of] professionals representing it is very small." ~ EP 5

Some practitioners may also be apprehensive to use language/s other than English in their practice.

"...sometimes professional people feel like they have got to use English to show they can speak English and you almost have to say to them 'what about, you know, would she understand better in Panjabi?' You almost have to encourage them." ~ EP 2

Interestingly, EPs focused primarily on service delivery to EMCs, as they did not recognise CYP and/or families as part of the community who participate, contribute and/or belong to the activity.

5.2.6 Division of labour

Themes identified within the ‘division of labour’ node are presented in Figure 5.12.

Research question: What do plurilingual EPs recognise is their unique contribution within their professional role in relation to working with ethnic minority groups using language other than English?

The findings from the thematic analysis demonstrate plurilingual EPs’ perceptions of how their activity (work with EMCs using language other than English) is divided. Participants explained that their work is distributed through the work allocation system, which does not necessarily differentiate ‘standard’ EP work from plurilingual
### Figure 5.12: Overview of the themes for the ‘division of labour’ node.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work allocation</th>
<th>Self-perceived role / responsibility</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Multi-agency context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EP service</strong></td>
<td><strong>Schools</strong></td>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quality assurance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School allocation</td>
<td>Individual case allocation</td>
<td>Occasional informal involvement</td>
<td>Information sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical area-based allocation</td>
<td>Skill- and/or demographic-based allocation</td>
<td>Some cases flagged by school EPs</td>
<td>Promoting informed decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools</strong></td>
<td><strong>EP service</strong></td>
<td><strong>Schools</strong></td>
<td><strong>EP service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover for an interpreter</td>
<td>Shared responsibility</td>
<td>Request for joint working in a dual role</td>
<td>Joint working Advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-agency context</strong></td>
<td><strong>Expectations</strong></td>
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EP work. Although participants offered that school allocation tends to be determined by geographical area (e.g. working with school clusters), it can also be informed by the practitioner's skill set and/or demographics of certain schools, known to and understood by others (e.g. management team). Thus EPs suggested that there is a level of flexibility to negotiate EP service delivery directly with schools (Leadbetter, 2000), further reinforcing the notion that EP practice is indeed centred on the presenting need (DfCSF, 2007).

“When I went into the school and I met with the Head Teacher and she described the needs, the cultural needs as well as the language needs [...] It just seemed to make complete sense for me to be the EP for that school.” ~ EP 3

Individual case allocation (e.g. statutory work) on the other hand may involve greater consideration of plurilingual EPs’ additional competencies, suggesting that their professional development opportunities could be reduced within that context (Desforges, Goodwin and Kerr, 1985).

“It does make a difference when we allocate, certainly the newly arrived children. [...] if there are any preschool cases we would try and make sure that we allocate to somebody with home language if we possibly can. So it is done much more on an individual child level.” ~ EP 4

Self-perceived role/responsibility and others’ expectations can also have an impact on plurilingual EP work distribution and/or its execution. Although most definitions do not specifically address EPs’ professional role in relation to working with EMCs using language other than English (see chapter 2, section 2.2), participants identified education and quality assurance as their key responsibilities. For example, they highlighted the importance of information sharing with other professionals, echoing the HCPC’s (2016) requirement to “work
in partnership with colleagues, sharing skills, knowledge and experience where appropriate, for the benefit of service users and carers” (p. 6), which could in turn increase capacity within the wider workforce (Farrell et al., 2006).

“It is the cultural component of educating other professionals about cultural practices which is seen as a norm for [EMCs].” ~ EP 5

Correspondingly, by acknowledging their role in EMCs’ education through information sharing (e.g. by offering reassurance about professional roles and/or systems), EPs demonstrated their understanding of, and further reinforced, the HCPC’s (2015) requirement to “provide service users or people acting on their behalf with the information necessary to enable them to make informed decisions” (p. 10), which could subsequently help to reduce power imbalance (Chaudhury, 1988; Reed, 1999).

“it is just then about how to provide that information in a different way so as I say […] make sure that families are accessing and are aware of their rights and they are aware of what is available and they’re understanding the systems.” ~ EP 4

“if I am having to speak in a different language there is perhaps a vulnerability about those people in terms of their access to information, particularly often it is statutory processes […] They are harder processes to understand for them so I try and communicate as well as I can with that side of things.” ~ EP 6

EPs also recognised “the need to monitor and evaluate the quality of practice” (HCPC, 2015; p. 13) in relation to:

a) ensuring respectful and/or accurate representation of the family’s views and/or personal data, demonstrating their commitment to “listen[ing] to service users and carers and tak[ing] account of their needs and wishes” (HCPC, 2016; p. 6);
“I said I want to see [the private psychologist’s] report […] she had gotten the names spelt wrong, all sorts of inaccuracies.” ~ EP 2

“I will use an interpreter and say ‘can you ask this question and that question?’ and they will return back and I know exactly what they were asked. I will say ‘well you didn't really say this’…”~ EP 5

b) **access to the correct and/or accurate information** provided by other practitioners.

“I guess with that role comes a level of responsibility then that, you know, you need to make sure [professionals] give the right information to [EMCs] and so forth” ~ EP 1

In terms of the **expectations**, plurilingual EPs indicated that there is an emphasis on **shared responsibility** across EPSs, suggesting that the needs of the clients and the needs of professionals may be balanced, as plurilingual EPs’ practice does not seem to be purposefully limited to working with EMCS from culturally and/or linguistically compatible background (Desforges, Goodwin and Kerr, 1985; Reed, 1999).

“I think it is very much you know if you have that particular patch of schools then you cover [that area]. The other Psychologists may not speak the community languages but they still cover those schools.”~ EP 5

“now what I tend to find more so is people will come to me and ask me questions rather than ask me to take on the work which I quite like”~ EP 3

Thus there is no formal recognition of plurilingual EPs’ additional skills and/or competencies within the West Midlands EPSs.

“There is nobody for example who has got a remit of […] key EP for bilingualism.” ~ EP 4

“I think it is just accepted as a help rather than…It helps get the work done and I don't know whether the value is understood.” ~ EP 6
Likewise, there are no professional guidelines and/or policies that would inform, safeguard and/or regulate plurilingual EPs practice using language other than English.

“I don’t get any recognition really, like formal recognition that I speak a different language. So there is nothing that tells me what my role is or there is nothing that makes me use it.”
~ EP 6

However, despite there being no formal expectation of plurilingual EPs to use their additional skills and/or competencies, participants recognised that there is an expectation to make a contribution to the service (echoing the EPs’ responsibility to contribute to the wider society; BPS, 2009).

“I suppose the expectation would be if a newly arrived family is referred to our team and they have [language], the expectation is that I would pick them up. It does make sense and we share them out so that is absolutely fine. I guess if somebody received any information and it was written in [language] and then they would know that I would be able to help with that.”
~ EP 4

Nevertheless, most EPs shared that they are expected to work as EPs over interpreters within the EPS and multi-agency working, with a sporadic exception within the school context. This finding corresponds with Boyle and Lauchlan (2009), who offered that the EP role may sometimes be at odds with what schools expect it to be.

“I think the expectation is to work as a Psychologist first and foremost, the additional benefits of using language it is value added.” ~ EP 5

“There have been some cases where the professionals are already involved and really they feel that another Ed Psych talking to [EMCs] would be more beneficial than an interpreter.”
~ EP 1
For example, plurilingual EPs recognised that sometimes they may be asked to **cover for an interpreter** at **schools**, which can make them feel uncomfortable and/or taken advantage of.

“they have said ‘well the interpreter is not here, do you mind being the interpreter because we are in a multi-agency meeting?’, so I tend to be the psychologist and the interpreter. Which is something I don't particularly like because I feel…you can murky the waters as such. I would rather have an interpreter there and ask the questions and if I need to I may ask a question myself directly but because then I almost feel the school are basically taking advantage of cutting cost and using me in dual roles really.” ~ EP 5

In particular, EPs reported that certain **schools** do not always go through the ‘proper’ channels (e.g. follow the referral procedure) and can make **informal requests for incidental involvement**.

“some [schools] have referred informally to me saying ‘this girl is having a struggle, can you make some suggestions or can you have a chat?’ And I have said, ‘there is an issue because you need parental permission’ and they said ‘well’ because I was a member of the team and I was coming in and out of schools in different roles […] it was more of a community role, I think. So they said ‘Well we will call you a friend of the school so can you talk to this girl’.” ~ EP 2

This could trigger a range of ethical dilemmas, as EPs are obligated to obtain informed consent from service users (or those acting on their behalf) prior to their involvement (BPS, 2009 and 2015; HCPC 2015 and 2016). Yet, the **stakeholders’ expectations** can be difficult to manage due to the importance of relationship building (Farrell et al., 2006), especially during the era of traded services (Islam, 2013). Again, it appears that in the absence of formal guidelines to regulate plurilingual EPs’ role and/or remit, plurilingual EPs’ professional identity may be compromised.
5.2.7 Tools and Artefacts

Themes identified within the ‘tools and artefacts’ node are presented in Figure 5.1. They represent plurilingual EPs’ perceptions regarding the mediating tools and/or artefacts that they use in their practice with EMC using language other than English.

Research question: What are the socio-cultural factors that mediate the plurilingual EPs’ approaches and/or unique contributions to working with ethnic minority groups using language other than English?

The findings from the thematic analysis suggest that plurilingual EPs tend to adopt an eclectic approach to their activity. Although it tends to be informed by the presenting need (discussed under the ‘outcome’ node in section 5.2.3)...

“I don’t mind assisting say sometimes if [meetings] are in school but as a service then you are setting a precedence. So I was employed as a Psychologist not as a translator or as an interpreter.” ~ EP 5

“I’m not a token [...] for being an advocate for speaking the language, translating or anything like that” ~ EP 1

“I have had to do a lot of work with schools and within the service of trying to make people view me as a Psychologist who has an additional language which I can use as a resource but not see me as an interpreter.” ~ EP 3

“on the whole my approach has become a lot more eclectic, I think, because of the kind of group I work with.” ~ EP 4

“I think the tools that I use vary and it depends on the family and it depends on the presenting needs of the child.” ~ EP 3
Figure 5.13: Overview of the themes for the ‘tools and artefacts’ node.
...it is also holistic (taking into account multiple perspectives) and inclusive.

“through interviewing the parents, through interviewing the child, I was able to get almost a good picture of how this child was at home. But I also observed this child in the classroom context, I observed him in structured work, I observed him in play time, so that what parents told me, what he told me, and what school told me gave me what I would say a much richer picture of this child’s functioning.” ~ EP 5

“The dad actually spoke very good [language], so I spoke to him and did all the assessment through the dad […] There was the cultural issue for mum. […] clearly she saw that as dad’s role and I don’t think she spoke so much [language], but I did keep, obviously asking you know ‘what does your wife think?’ Just trying to draw her in to the conversation […] and make sure that she was aware of what was happening.” ~ EP4

Participants reported that they use a wide range of abstract tools in their work with EMCs when they share language other than English, as compared to their use of concrete tools (limited to relevant assessment instruments and/or translating support).

Although the results show that plurilingual EPs use various assessment tools and/or methods, it could be questioned whether their occasional use of standardised cognitive assessment instruments with EMCs who are not proficient in English is in line with best practice guidelines. However, O’Bryon and Rogers (2010) found that BSPs may feel more confident to use a wide range of tools when they share language with EMCs, as they can contextualise and subsequently interpret the information in a culturally and/or linguistically sensitive way. Nevertheless, it is possible that a lack of formal training and/or guidelines could have a negative impact on practitioners’ confidence levels and/or quality of this type of assessment. These hypotheses are, however, beyond the focus of the current research.
Cameron (2006) asserted that applied psychologists are required to use psychology in order to “provide an integrated and coherent perspective of complex environments (e.g. school, homes, children’s homes, etc), the complex problems and situations which occur in such environments (e.g. critical incidents, parental uncertainty, teacher stress, children’s learning and behaviour difficulties, etc.) and the complex needs of people which results from such problems (e.g. reassurance, insight, skill deficits, challenges to current belief systems, etc.)” (p. 292). Thus, EPs’ emphasis on their use of psychology within the abstract tools overarching theme, demonstrates their distinctive contribution within that context.

**Theory:**

“I often go back to, when I am communicating more formally with the schools, to like EAL type of stuff the Cummins, the BICS and the CALP” ~ EP 6

“I think just conversation, cultural identity, cultural psychology kind of aspects, understanding I think of how communities work” ~ EP 6

**Frameworks:**

“sometimes using solution focused techniques can be really helpful with these parents [...] the techniques and concepts from narrative therapy can be really helpful” ~ EP 1

“we started to do some cognitive behavioural therapy” ~ EP 3

Whilst discussing their use of psychological **theory** and/or **frameworks**, another theme emerged in relation to EPs’ **differentiation skills**, which further reinforces the notion that EPs use psychology in a creative and innovative way (Cameron, 2006).

“I use, you know Fredrickson’s portfolio with the different booklets. Yeah I use that and I use that in home language. [...] I translate it, but I let them you know write it and I will just translate it.” ~ EP 1
“we started to do some cognitive behavioural therapy, used some strategies from there and what we did with that was before we did that with the daughter, we talked to mum about it and that was quite a challenge for me as well talking about thoughts, feelings and behaviour but very much, using quite a visual, so I used pictures and spoke around it in the home language which really helped mum to understand the avenue that we were going to take in order to support the daughter.” ~ EP 3

In addition, EPs recognised the importance of their interpersonal skills and engaging in reflective practice, further reinforcing these tools/artefacts as key features of their practice (Gersch, 2004).

“I suppose the first thing I would be doing is trying to make them feel at ease as possible. So being friendly just all those sort of soft skills just making them hopefully feel comfortable. Letting know what I am there for, I am there to try and support the child or to try and reduce some of the anxiety” ~ EP 4

“It is very much about that relationship and I think interpersonal skills and the critical reflection I think is so important as well coming back and thinking what could I have done differently” ~ EP 3

5.2.8 Contradictions

A final aspect that contributes to the dynamic nature of the current activity system relates to contradictions and/or tensions (Daniels, 2004a), which create disturbance and/or instability within the system (Engeström, 2000). Thus the analysis of the activity system is indeed directed towards these contradictions, as they are the driving force of change and/or development (Engeström, 1999a; 2001). Engeström (1987) offered that there are two types of contradictions. Whilst primary contradictions include tensions within a single node of the Activity Theory, secondary contradictions include tensions between two different nodes.
The location of contradictions within the activity system under investigation was determined post-data analysis through manual cross-referencing of themes within and between individual AT nodes. There are some notable patterns and a few contradictions particularly relevant to the research aims and questions, some of which have already emerged in section 5.2, especially under the ‘rules’ node discussion (section 5.2.4). The key contradictions are presented in Tables 5.1 and 5.2.

Research questions:

- What are the socio-cultural factors that mediate the plurilingual EPs’ approaches and/or unique contributions to working with ethnic minority groups using language other than English?

- What new ways of working do plurilingual EPs propose may further enhance EP practice and services offered to ethnic minority groups?

The vast majority of contradictions emerged within the ‘rules’ node and/or between the ‘rules’ and ‘division of labour’ nodes. This inclination suggests that the rules governing the plurilingual EPs’ professional practice with EMC using language other than English (see section 5.2.4), as well as certain aspects of how this type of work is distributed (see section 5.2.6), are the most significant areas of tension which require careful consideration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contradiction</th>
<th>Text extract</th>
<th>Superordinate theme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4 Rules Local / Community level | **1. Supportive - Schools - Diversity** vs. **Constraining - Schools - Limited cultural understanding** | “There is a level of expertise in the schools now [...] their experience has gained as it is not a new thing so much anymore to have children come in from different countries quite suddenly.” ~ EP 6  
 vs.  
 “schools don’t always understand. [...] People don’t understand where they are coming from” ~ EP 6 | Recognition of individual differences |
|                           | **2. Supportive - Local community - Power dynamics** vs. **Constraining - Local community - Power imbalance** | “I think these parents [...] value power and they see professionals as experts. So as soon as you say you are an Educational Psychologist they want to listen.” ~ EP 1  
 vs.  
 “I think sometimes a professional can automatically seem like an expert [and] it can instil a level of fear or worry that they don’t know anything about their child.” ~ EP 1 | Power dynamics |
|                           | **3. Supportive - EP service - Information sharing** vs. **Constraining - EP service - Limited knowledge of other EPs’ specialisms/interests/additional skills** | “the service understood what my skills were and it is much more beneficial for me to be the EP [for that school] do some more systemic work” ~ EP 3 / “I guess if somebody received any information and it was written in [language] and then they would know that I would be able to help with that.” ~ EP 4  
 vs.  
 “I mean I didn’t really recognise that my colleague was using her other language as much and even lots of EPs that might use like an Asian type of language.” ~ EP 6 / “I don’t know for example who might have an interest in another team.” ~ EP 4 | Information sharing |
|                           | **4. Supportive - Local Authority - Multi-agency working** vs. **Constraining - EP service - The nature of the EP role – Autonomy** | “if [a home visit] has been with another professional it seems to be that parents recognise that there is a professional role here and we need to stick with it” ~ EP 3  
 vs.  
 “When I have gone on my own, I could quite easily be there for a couple of hours, getting very side tracked.” ~ EP 3 | Role boundaries (autonomy) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>National and/or cultural level</th>
<th>Individual vs. Local / Community level</th>
<th>Individual vs. National and/or cultural level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Supportive - Context - National Agenda vs. Constraining - Context - Current political climate</td>
<td>“there is a great emphasis on you know Muslim youngsters being radicalised and how professionals can support that” ~ EP 3 vs. “there is this whole atmosphere of I think less support, it almost seems like ‘oh, we don’t want them’. Half the population doesn’t feel that but the half does” ~ EP 2</td>
<td>National agenda and its execution&lt;sup&gt;67&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Supportive – Practitioner positionality – Sharing knowledge / expertise vs. Constraining - EP service – Resources – Limited workforce diversity</td>
<td>“I will help people who will come and ask me about a cultural and a religious questions or about language and that is absolutely fine” ~ EP 3 vs. “early on as people became aware in the service that I could speak these languages there was an influx of ‘could you help me with this case?’ and ‘could you help me with this case?’ and ‘could you interpret here?’ […] I could have quite easily have been taken up with being just a glorified interpreter really.” ~ EP 3</td>
<td>Information sharing Role sharing (responsibilities vs. expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Constraining – Dual role - Blurred role boundaries vs. Supportive - EP service – Service delivery - Traded delivery sets boundaries</td>
<td>“there are very few schools, they all know I am [nationality] because of my name and some have referred informally to me” ~ EP 2 vs. “the teachers or the specialist coordinators saying ‘well, can you go and have a talk to that girl and do that assessment for that [nationality] girl and now thinking ‘that is an hour’ you know” ~ EP 2</td>
<td>Role boundaries (responsibilities vs. expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Supportive – Skills and competencies – Additional language competency vs. Constraining – Context – Language implications</td>
<td>“having those core [Language and cultural] skills and competencies. I am able to use them” ~ EP 5 vs. “I feel like I am out of my comfort zone when it comes to any kind of hypothesis that suggests I need to talk about a type of you know…if I’m pursuing a line of or if I am agreeing or thinking there is suspected Autism […] because those terms don’t exist in the home language” ~ EP 1</td>
<td>Recognition of individual differences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>67</sup> Please note that although the ‘national agenda and its execution’ superordinate theme is beyond the scope of this research, it was purposefully included in the above overview of the key primary contradictions, as EPs are sometimes in position of advising professional and/or government-based working groups concerned with organisation and planning of policy (Boyle, MacKay and Lachlan, 2008).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Rules Local / Community level vs. Individual</th>
<th>Supportive - EP service - The nature of the EP role – Autonomy vs. Constraining – Dual role - Blurred role boundaries</th>
<th>“if I have done an assessment of a child and I want to get the views of the parent then I won't use an interpreter. I would want that rapport between me and the parents to find out exactly what is happening” ~ EP 5 vs. “you almost are viewed by some parents as a family friend or a relative [...] I have had to say I am not an aunty; I am a professional” ~ EP 3</th>
<th>Role boundaries (autonomy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Division of labour</td>
<td>Expectations - EP service - Shared responsibility vs. Expectations - EP service - Contribution</td>
<td>“at a service level the people come in with different expertise [...] so just because I am bilingual or multilingual or whatever [...] there isn't an expectation from the service to always think that I am the expert.” ~ EP 5 vs. “I suppose the expectation would be if a newly arrived family is referred to our team and they have [language] then I would, the expectation is that I would pick them up.” ~ EP 4</td>
<td>Recognition of individual differences Role boundaries (responsibilities vs. expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations - EP service - Contribution vs. Expectations - EP service - Shared responsibility</td>
<td>“where possible I think the Seniors in our team really value having me there to be able to say 'oh can you pick up this case?' because they know that would be tricky for anyone else to pick up” ~ EP 1 vs. “I mean I don't get any recognition really, like formal recognition that I speak a different language.” ~ EP 6</td>
<td>Information sharing Role boundaries (responsibilities vs. expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations – Schools – Cover for an interpreter vs. Expectations – EP service – Shared responsibility – EP over an interpreter</td>
<td>“they have said 'well the interpreter is not here, do you mind being the interpreter because we are in a multi-agency meeting?' [...] I almost feel the school are basically taking advantage of cutting cost and using me in dual roles really.” ~ EP 5 vs. “I wouldn't go just to be a translator for a Physio or something like that because obviously that is not my role” ~ EP 6</td>
<td>Role boundaries (responsibilities vs. expectations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2: Key secondary contradictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contradiction</th>
<th>Text extract(s)</th>
<th>Superordinate theme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Rules Local / Community level vs. 6 Division of labour</td>
<td><strong>Supportive - Local community - Power dynamics</strong> vs. <strong>Self-perceived role / responsibility – Education – Information sharing – Promoting informed decision making</strong></td>
<td>&quot;sometimes with ethnic minorities who have limited English skills I think sometimes professionals can make decisions for them&quot; ~ EP 1 vs. &quot;I guess with that role comes a level of responsibility then that, you know, you need to make sure [professionals] give the right information to them and so forth.&quot; ~ EP 1</td>
<td>Power dynamics vs. Role boundaries (responsibilities vs. expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Supportive - EP service - Service delivery - Occasional skill and/or demographic-based school allocation</strong> vs. <strong>Expectations – EP service - Shared responsibility</strong></td>
<td>&quot;I am placed in a culturally diverse [area] and I feel I am able to bring in that cultural experience into the meetings I have with the parents and it is more effective use [of my skills] I think.&quot; ~ EP 5 vs. &quot;there is not a particular sort of, in my team, they don’t say ‘because you are a Panjabi speaker you get a Panjabi case’, there is a whole mixture” ~ EP 2</td>
<td>Information sharing vs. Role boundaries (responsibilities vs. expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>Supportive - EP service - Service delivery - Traded delivery sets boundaries</strong> vs. <strong>Expectations – Schools – Cover for an interpreter</strong></td>
<td>&quot;the teachers or the specialist coordinators saying ‘well, can you go and have a talk to that girl and do that assessment for that [nationality] girl’ and now thinking ‘that is an hour’ you know” ~ EP 2 vs. &quot;they have said ‘well the interpreter is not here, do you mind being the interpreter because we are in a multi-agency meeting?’” ~ EP 5</td>
<td>Role boundaries (responsibilities vs. expectations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The key contradictions within the current activity system (plurilingual EPs’ practice with EMCs using language other than English) highlight potential issues in relation to the following superordinate themes:

a) Role boundaries;
b) Information sharing;
c) Recognition of individual differences;
d) Power dynamics; and
e) National agenda and its execution.

Engeström (2001) advised that the benefit of highlighting tensions within the activity system is that they can be acted upon and/or inform the change in the future. Thus further discussion of these contradictions and their implications for EP practice and/or future research is offered in chapter 6, under section 6.3.

5.3 Chapter summary

This chapter presented the study results and discussion of the most pertinent findings in relation to the research questions (chapter 4, section 4.1.2). The results were presented in line with the Activity Theory framework, supported by verbatim quotes from semi-structured interviews. They were also discussed with reference to the literature considered in chapters 1-4, as well as some new literature introduced post-data analysis in order to help to contextualise all relevant findings.

The next chapter will provide a summary of the current research. It will then discuss implications for EP practice and future research.
Chapter 6: Conclusions with Implications for Practice and Future Research

6.1 Introduction
This chapter provides a comprehensive summary of the key conclusions. It then discusses implications for EP practice and offers suggestions for future research.

6.2 Conclusions
In light of rapidly increasing and ever changing diversity within an international arena, one could argue that exploring multilingual capacities and/or integrating linguistically and culturally diverse perspectives ought to be an integral part of today’s social science research (e.g. Aalberse et al., 2011; Athanasopoulos, 2016; Johnson et al., 2012). However, the review of the literature suggests that it may not yet be the case.

Some argue that despite the increasing number of people whose ‘main’ or ‘first language at home’ is other than English (Demie, 2013; Liu and Evans, 2016), migrant populations are not ‘received’ and/or spread evenly across the country (ONS, 2017a). Thus various regions, LAs and/or individual services are likely to have different experiences and/or perceptions of migration and its related cost and/or benefit (e.g. ‘burden’ to the public services or a gain to the local areas). Consequently, research studies that explore multilingual capacities and/or culturally and linguistically diverse perspectives could be perceived as more or less relevant. In particular, some argue that the future of languages other than English in predominantly English-speaking countries is uncertain due to a possible decline in
native/home language proficiency in plurilingual speakers who have resided in a foreign country for a long period of time (Liu and Evans, 2016; Schmid, 2011).

Although it is not yet known what impact Britain’s upcoming departure from the EU in March 2019 will have on its cultural and/or linguistic diversity, the current trends (discussed in chapter 1, section 1.5) strongly suggest that the changing demographics of schools may continue to place an increased demand on practitioners to not only work with clients from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds who are not proficient in English, but also to know how to best educate and intervene with them (DfE, 2017a; Newell et al., 2010).

Thus the current study aimed to explore the views of plurilingual EPs who have used language/s other than English in their professional practice across the West Midlands region, in order to:

- gain familiarity with the professional practice of plurilingual EPs (‘activity’), including the socio-cultural factors that mediate this type of work;
- acquire insight into how plurilingual EPs construct their unique contribution within the profession;
- increase the knowledge base about the benefits and constraints of EP practice using language/s other than English; and
- indicate areas for professional and/or organisational development.

Overall, the findings are largely consistent with the existing literature which suggests that through adding not only their professional skills as EPs, but also their personal skills from their own experiences (e.g. cultural and linguistic awareness), plurilingual
EPs may indeed have an invaluable insight into cultural and/or linguistic knowledge and skills utilised when working with EMCs, which could in turn help to inform future practice (M’gadzah, Saraon and Shah, 1999). For example, interaction between practitioners with varying levels and/or types of experience has been found to develop individual as well as distributed knowledge (Lave and Wenger, 1991). Thus workforce diversity is essential for teams that wish to avoid the negative outcomes associated with the ‘expert’ model. As plurilingual practitioners possess multilingual capacities and offer culturally diverse perspectives, they may contribute both explicit and tacit knowledge of the ethnic minority communities (albeit limited to that gained through their individual experiences) within the EP workforce. This could in turn help to review and/or improve established practices to the EMCs’ and/or EPSs’ advantage (e.g. building culturally responsive capacity within the EP workforce) (Annan et al., 2008).

Additionally, plurilingual EPs’ ethnicity, nationality, migrant status (briefly discussed in chapter 1, under section 1.4.1), as well as their language proficiency and the context of English language acquisition (briefly discussed in chapter 1, under section 1.4.2) could impact their understanding of EMCs’ individual circumstances and subsequently increase their empathy towards EMCs, including those with whom they do not share a language.

However, even though workforce diversity has been found to decrease the high cost of professional interpretation driven by “the need for confidentiality and accuracy” (Poppleton et al., 2013; p. 35), it is debatable whether it would indeed be cost-effective and ethically sound (e.g. due to EPs being bound by a wide range of
professional codes of ethics, conduct and/or practice) to even occasionally supplement interpreters with highly skilled, and therefore much more expensive, EPs. In particular, professional practice guidelines are clear in that EPs should work within the limits of their knowledge and skills and scope of practice (HCPC, 2016), and additional cultural and/or linguistic competencies of plurilingual EPs have not yet been formally recognised in the UK as part of the EPs’ skill set and/or toolkit to further develop for the benefit of the service users.

Furthermore, “the practice of Educational Psychology is taking place in a complex, challenging and ever-changing context where professional confidence is difficult to maintain and where it is easy for EP practitioners to lose sight of the beliefs, hopes and aspirations with which they entered the profession” (Cameron, 2006; p. 289-290). Indeed, the results of the current study illustrate that the delivery of EP services using language/s other than English is multi-layered, demanding and, at times, can pose a threat to the EPs’ professional identity. For example, in the absence of formal training (Newell et al., 2010; Sotelo-Dynega and Dixon, 2014) and/or guidelines specific to delivering EP services using language/s other than English (O’Bryon and Rogers, 2010), there is a lot of ambiguity regarding the boundaries, especially in relation to the expectations of and plurilingual EPs’ responsibilities.

Despite being self-professed plurilingual practitioners and/or regardless of the stakeholders’ expectations, plurilingual EPs appear to have a strong awareness of the standards and ethics of professional conduct (e.g. BPS, 2009 and 2015; HCPC, 2015 and 2016), further reinforcing their view of themselves as Psychologists over
interpreters. In other words, although the delivery of EP services using language/s other than English is not solely determined by professional guidelines and/or boundaries, plurilingual EPs try to work within the limits of their knowledge and skills by practising in the areas they have appropriate knowledge, skills and/or experience (HCPC, 2016). Also, EPs’ acknowledgement of a wide range of limitations to the methods used and/or of their additional skills, suggests that they are highly self-aware and transparent not only about their professional (BPS, 2009), but also about their personal (e.g. cultural and/or linguistic) competencies. Correspondingly, this study highlighted that a lot of decisions in relation to the suitability and/or scope of plurilingual EP practice may need to be made on a case-by-case basis in order to secure the best outcomes for EMCs and to protect the plurilingual EPs’ professional identity.

To sum up, the findings of the current study suggest that the West Midlands-based EPSs may not have yet taken advantage of the opportunities that the workforce diversity offers (e.g. sharing knowledge). Also, despite recognising numerous supportive factors and benefits of using language/s other than English in professional practice, a wide range of constraints can make it difficult to further develop plurilingual EP practice, especially due to other and/or competing priorities, limited workforce diversity, as well as demands on plurilingual EPs’ time and capacity (NCTL and NHS HEE, 2016).

6.3 Implications for professional practice

As there are many potential barriers in addition to language for EPs when working with all families (e.g. class, race, gender, level of education, perception of and/or
response to disability / mental health to name a few), it is difficult to draw out specific recommendations to guide EPs in their work with EMCs on current state of knowledge. Further research is required in order to help to determine more specific recommendations, as outlined under section 6.8.

Nevertheless, a few key implications for practice have been collated from general data analysis (chapter 5, sections 5.2.1-5.2.7), tensions identified within the activity system in relation to current practice (chapter 5, section 5.2.8), as well as EPs’ predictions and/or hopes in relation to their future practice (chapter 5, Figure 5.3).

| Suggestion 1: Determining demographics of the EP profession |
| Contradiction(s): Information sharing |
| Recognition of individual differences |

Based on the findings, it appears that the pool of plurilingual EPs practising in the West Midlands is likely to be highly diverse (chapter 5, section 5.2.1). Thus a clear picture of the current demographics within the EP profession in England would be an essential foundation for developing the future of Educational Psychology, including its plurilingual strand (in line with Oakland and Cunningham, 1992). This could be executed through revising the existing data collection systems (Proctor et al., 2014), especially those employed by professional governing bodies, which account for all (e.g. HCPC) or large numbers of practising EPs (e.g. BPS and/or AEP).

Although access to information about EPs’ nationality, ethnicity, and additional cultural and linguistic competencies (e.g. religious beliefs and/or languages spoken fluently) would allow for a needs analysis and/or potential execution of the subsequent suggestions offered below, consideration should be given as to whether
disclosure of such personal and/or sensitive information (governed by the Data Protection Act 1998) should be voluntary. In particular, in the absence of formal training and/or professional guidance in relation to using language/s other than English as part of EP practice, EPs may feel apprehensive to disclose some of their additional skills and/or competencies due to a fear of additional demands being placed upon them, especially in context of a nationally recognised shortage of EPs (NCTL and NHS HEE, 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion 2: Defining a plurilingual EP role and its remit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contradiction(s):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As public services are increasingly accountable for their work, it is important for stakeholders to be well-informed about what services they can access (Ashton and Roberts, 2006; MacKay, 2002). Nevertheless, in the absence of formal training and/or professional guidelines specific to the provision of EP services using language other than English, it is not clear whether currently self-professed plurilingual EPs should be using their additional cultural and/or linguistic competencies within their professional practice and/or how (O’Bryon and Rogers, 2010). Yet, the current study proves that it is not unusual for EP services in England to be delivered in language/s other than English.

Thus it would be helpful to formally recognise and endorse the special role plurilingual EPs can offer in promoting cultural transfer (Reed, 1999). This could be executed by defining and/or clarifying their role and its remit in the light of the strengths and constraints of the additional cultural and/or linguistic competencies
highlighted in this study. For example, it could be developed into a specialism, which would subsequently help to ensure that psychological research, theory and practice in relation to working with EMCs are considered and/or incorporated into local (and possibly even national) agendas, for the benefit of service users (Cameron, 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion 3:</th>
<th>Safeguarding role boundaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contradiction(s):</td>
<td>Role boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition of individual differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National agenda and its execution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the findings of the current research suggest that plurilingual EPs are mostly willing to share their knowledge and expertise with others (in line with professional standards set out by HCPC and BPS highlighted in chapter 2, Table 2.1), they also emphasise that there is a danger of placing too much expectation and/or demand on them due to a presumption that they hold expertise in a particular culture, language and/or religion on a sole basis of their ethnic origin or possession of additional cultural and/or linguistic skills (M’gadzah, Saraon and Shah, 1999). Yet, Ortiz (2008) asserted that “even when the [cultural and linguistic] competency requirement is met, the potential for bias is not fully diminished because there are no established procedures or guidelines to guide the [assessment] process in a fair and equitable manner“ (p. 668).

Therefore, it would be helpful to safeguard plurilingual EPs’ dual role boundaries and their professional identity at an individual, service and/or national level. For example, EPs already identified that certain legislation (chapter 5, section 1.2.4.3.1, Figure 5.10), as well as a traded model of service delivery (chapter 5, section 1.2.4.2.1, Figure 5.9a) can be helpful in reinforcing professional standards and/or ethics of
conduct, especially when negotiating their work with schools. Thus developing professional guidelines specific to delivering EP services using language/s other than English might be the next step in order to consider how to best utilise, yet safeguard dual role boundaries at different levels, especially in the current context of a national shortage of EPs (NCTL and NHS HEE, 2016) and traded service delivery (Islam, 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion 4:</th>
<th>Establishing forums and/or peer support groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contradiction(s):</td>
<td>Role boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition of individual differences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the results suggest that the variation in the extent to which plurilingual EPs use their additional cultural and/or linguistic competencies when providing EP services to EMCs ranges from minute over time, to 3-4 cases per term (see section 5.2.1), it is likely to be determined by the demographics of the local communities and/or the prevalence of specific needs across different ethnic minority populations that meet the criteria for EP involvement (chapter 2, section 2.2).

Thus addressing cultural and linguistic matters in EP practice could ensure that it is more balanced (Desforges, Goodwin and Kerr, 1985; Reed, 1999). For example, Burkard et al. (2006) found that supervisors who are willing to discuss cultural matters are likely to have positive effects on their supervisees in helping them to develop the skills needed to facilitate positive outcomes for service users. Although limited workforce diversity may pose a barrier to identifying plurilingual supervisors, establishing forums and/or peer support groups would enable more experienced EPs to share their expertise with less experienced EPs (e.g. through peer supervision).
This could in turn contribute to culturally responsive capacity building within the EP workforce (Farrell et al., 2006; Reed, 1999), especially as plurilingual speakers are multi-competent thinkers with a unique mental representation of the world (Athanasopoulos, 2006 and 2011; Cook, 2002; Cook and Bassetti, 2011; Cook et al., 2006; Grosjean, 1998; Jarvis, 2011; Levinson, 1996; Lucy, 1992; Pavlenko, 2011; Roberson et al., 2000; Whorf, 1956).

It is important to note that the wide range of reported languages used within the profession provides additional opportunities for sharing knowledge and resources not only locally or nationally, but also internationally (in line with Jimerson et al., 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion 5:</th>
<th>Developing formal CPD opportunities relevant to delivering EP services using language other than English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Contradiction(s): | Role boundaries  
Information sharing  
Recognition of individual differences  
National agenda and its execution |

At present, it appears that plurilingual EPs practising in the West Midlands are likely to be self-professed, simply because they can communicate in language/s other than English (in line with Sotelo-Dynega and Dixon, 2014). Nevertheless, Cummins (1987) argued that the extent to which plurilingual speakers can effectively transfer their thoughts between different languages is determined by the level of proficiency in all languages. Therefore, a high level of variation in self-reported and/or self-assessed cultural and linguistic competency (chapter 5, section 5.2.1, Figure 5.5), especially in the absence of formal training, might suggest varied (and therefore limited and/or inconsistent) competency in the provision of psychological services using language/s other than English. Yet, the American Educational Research
Association, American Psychological Association and National Council on Measurement in Education (1999) suggest that professionally trained BSPs are uniquely equipped to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse CYP.

Indeed, the next step for EPs could be to replicate Sotelo-Dynega’s (2015) study in order to investigate current training practices in relation to working with EMCs across all universities\(^6\) in England which offer post-graduate training programmes in Educational Psychology. A subsequent needs analysis could help to establish the criteria required in the training and/or CPD of plurilingual practitioners in England to further develop their range of skills (Desforges, Goodwin and Kerr, 1985; Reed, 1999).

Once EPs gain more insight into and develop their own formal and/or informal CPD opportunities specific to using language other than English in their practice, there may be opportunities for training of other practitioners (e.g. school-based interpreters) to increase their cultural awareness and to ensure a more effective use of resources for the benefit of service users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion 6:</th>
<th>Extending EP practice with EMCs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contradiction(s):</td>
<td>Power dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National agenda and its execution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) University of Birmingham, Bristol University, University of East London, Institute of Education, Exeter University, University of Manchester, Newcastle University, University of Nottingham, University of Sheffield, University of Southampton, Tavistock & Portman NHS Foundation Trust, University College London, University of East Anglia*

*Beginning with the 2018 intake the University of East Anglia (UEA) will be offering a training programme for the first time*
Boyle and Lauchlan (2009) suggested that EPs should be advancing psychological knowledge in as many areas as possible by tailoring their services for the type of school and/or community they cater for. Thus longer-term, EPs could explore the suitability and/or feasibility of further extending their practice with EMCs using language other than English through strengthening professional links with local communities (e.g. religious services and/or charities identified by the participants in the current study).

This could be accomplished through combining EP skills with cultural and linguistic awareness when working together to address the needs, issues, resources, and/or experiences of culturally and/or linguistically diverse CYP and their families (M’gadzah, Saraon and Shah, 1999), by actively engaging and validating their voices within the social justice framework (Williams, Weerasinghe and Hobbs, 2015).

It is important to note that although the implications for practice derived from the current study are interesting and could help to further develop the delivery of EP services to EMCs at a local level, the results also suggest that greater and/or competing priorities driven by the overarching government agenda could significantly hinder this advancement, especially in context of the upcoming departure of Britain from the EU.

### 6.4 Research Methodology and Design Limitations

#### 6.4.1 Activity Theory

The use of Activity Theory as an overarching data collection framework, enabled the gathering of rich qualitative data, whilst accounting for an array of complex socio-
cultural factors associated with plurilingual EP practice using language/s other than English. Nevertheless, even though one of its strengths is consideration of historicity (Daniels, 2001a), it was beyond the scope of this study to compare and/or discuss the data in relation to the past influences and/or anticipated future practice. Thus an understanding of how the current activity system might have been shaped and/or come to be over time is implicit, as this research focused primarily on the present activity.

Also, despite the current study aiming to tackle the issues of subjectivity (Engeström and Sannino, 2010) through learning about the collective ‘activity’ of plurilingual EP practice, it could be argued that the framework might have dismissed the role of the individual within the system (Leadbetter, 2008). Yet, the data gathered under the ‘subject’ node (chapter 5; section 5.2.1) suggest discrepancies between participants’ self-reported cultural and/or linguistic competencies, as well as their experiences of working with EMCs using language other than English.

In addition, although AT purports that identification of tensions within the system creates opportunities for planning and/or facilitating change, its focus on local systems (Avis, 2007; Peim, 2009) has hindered the possibility to accommodate the wider, macro-social perspectives (Martin and Peim, 2009). Indeed, the results of the current study suggest that not all issues (e.g. contradictions at a national and/or cultural level) can be fully resolved by (or within) the activity system at a local level. Consequently, AT has failed to address power relationships and/or social antagonisms that derive from these macro-social contexts (Avis, 2009; Daniels, 2004b).
6.4.2 Ontology and Epistemology

The epistemological positioning of this research poses a limitation to the current study, as knowledge gained through data analysis is viewed as ‘provisional’. In other words, it is accepted that it may be “superseded if other information or insights come to light” (Thomas, 2013; p. 123), especially due to various stakeholders constructing a different reality (Guba and Lincoln, 1989), as informed by their individual social paths (Coste, Moore and Zarate, 2009).

6.4.3 Exploratory study design

Although the exploratory study design was fit for purpose due to “little or no scientific knowledge” (Stebbins, 2001; p. 6) about a phenomenon in question, the lack of literature specific to the professional practice of plurilingual EPs in England and/or within the broader context of the UK, required this research to be positioned within the context of an extremely limited (yet highly relevant) number of US-based studies. Thus the relatedness of the literature to the current research findings was likely to be limited and any comparisons and/or references had to be made with caution, as the EP profession is “somewhat diverse and differs between countries, within countries, within services, and lastly at the level of individual EPs” (Boyle and Lauchlan, 2009; p. 71).

In addition, although a high level of flexibility provided an opportunity to gain knowledge and understanding of the unfamiliar phenomenon (Bryman, 2012; Stebbins, 2001) of plurilingual EPs’ practice using language/s other than English, the
current study resulted in more questions and/or priorities for further investigation (Check and Schutt, 2012).

6.4.4 Sampling

As there is no formal register where the UK-based EPs can disclose their ethnicity, nationality and/or additional language skills, it was impossible to contextualise plurilingual EP practice within the regional and/or the national context. Participant recruitment was therefore dependent on self-identification and voluntary participation governed by ethical guidelines (chapter 4, section 4.5.1; Appendix D) and voluntary informed consent (Appendix H).

Due to a limited number of people who have expertise in the researched area (confirmed through the initial participant scoping), purposive sampling employed in this study was reliant on my judgement of what would be deemed a ‘representative’ sample. Thus this research was inclusive of all participants who self-identified as ‘plurilingual EPs who have used language/s other than English in their professional practice with EMCs’. It was deemed that any further exclusion criteria would impact the overall sample size.

Nevertheless, participant homogeneity was limited to their plurilingualism and the use of language/s other than English in their professional practice with EMCs. Participants were not a homogeneous group in any other sense (e.g. their ethnicity, language acquisition and/or experience of acculturation). This is important to note, as the experiences of practitioners born and raised in England/UK might be very
different to the experiences of practitioners who have immigrated to England/UK at some point in their lives.

Likewise, Robson (2011) pointed out that characteristics and/or views of those who offer their participation in research may differ from those who do not. As participants were asked to self-assess their level of language and/or cultural competency, it is possible that some practitioners did not come forward on a basis of their self-appraisal. The language and/or cultural competency criteria were vaguely defined as follows:

“a ‘functional’ level of language and/or cultural competency which enables them to ‘reasonably’ understand and communicate information via language other than English in their work with ethnic minority clients.”

(Appendix E: Recruitment advertisement)

Although it was beyond the scope of this research to formally assess and/or compare language proficiency of the participants who have collectively reported to be fluent and/or competent in nine different languages, a standardised tool would have offered more consistency and/or reliability. However, it would have been highly time consuming and it would require a lot of additional resources (e.g. due to linguistic distance between different languages discussed by Chiswick and Miller, 2005).

Finally, although this study aimed to explore plurilingual EP practice form the unique perspective of plurilingual EPs themselves, the absence of alternative perspectives (e.g. child’s voice) could also be considered a limitation of this research.
6.4.5 Thematic analysis

It could be argued that the deductive stage of the data analysis (driven by the AT framework) might have decreased the depth and complexity of data (Braun and Clarke, 2006; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011). However, it was counterbalanced by eliciting the themes strongly linked to the raw data (Patton, 1990) at an initial inductive stage of data analysis, in an attempt to maintain a rich description of the information related to each AT node (Braun and Clarke, 2006).

It could be argued that my judgement was another limitation when identifying the themes, as they were determined primarily by their relevance to the research questions (Braun and Clarke, 2006), as opposed to quantifiable measures (e.g. repetition).

6.4.6 Reliability and validity

The concept of reliability as “an ability to measure consistently” (Black and Champion, 1976; p. 232) is incompatible with the social constructionist epistemology (chapter 4; section 4.3.1) employed in the current study. Accordingly, as participants’ constructs of their practice using language/s other than English are individual, they may be impossible to replicate.

Similarly, although subjectivity and/or my positionality (chapter 1, section 1.3; chapter 4, section 4.3) was an integral part of the research (Robson, 2011), the trustworthiness (equivalence of validity in qualitative research, as conceptualised by...
Winter, 2000) of the current findings may have been limited due to the following factors:

- sharing some personal characteristics with those of the research participants;
- not sharing culture, history and/or traditions with those of the research participants (Kramsch, 2003); and
- holding personal constructs in relation to the research area.

In particular, my ability to witness all relevant aspects of the phenomenon under investigation (McCall and Simmons, 1969) might have been compromised due to conducting interviews employing an open-ended design without the use of and/or consultation with a co-researcher and/or research assistant (Stebbins, 2001).

Additionally, this study sought to represent the phenomenon under investigation fairly and fully (Winter, 2000) rather than to claim the external generalisability of its findings. Although the West Midlands region was considered an area where plurilingualism is likely to be well-established and/or code switching between languages is common (Costa et al., 2009), the answers hinted at by a small sample of participants (discussed under in chapter 4, section 4.5.3, as well as section 6.4.4) may not necessarily be representative of the larger population (Babbie, 2007).

### 6.5 Other limitations

#### 6.5.1 Study advertisement

Reliance on the study advertisement being distributed by Principal EPs and/or secretaries might have been an additional practical limitation to the recruitment of a larger and/or more homogeneous sample. For example, during the initial participant
scoping phase, some Principal EPs replied to me directly sharing their knowledge and/or understanding of their team’s demographics. Whilst it is possible that Principal EPs confirmed that data with their team members, it is unknown whether all Principal EPs forwarded my email to their staff to allow them to self-identify as possessing the required characteristics. As this study did not determine plurilingualism by EPs’ ethnicity, it is possible that some Principal EPs might not have been fully aware of the range of additional cultural and/or linguistic competencies within their team. This might have subsequently decreased the number of EPs volunteering to take part in this study.

Additionally, one Principal EP forwarded the email to all staff adding a caveat in relation to staff’s workload, which could have limited the number of responses and/or interest received, as some EPs might have decided against their participation due to competing work-related pressures.

6.5.2 Terminology

Definitions of cultural competency, language competency (or proficiency) and/or ethnic minority used in this study were purposefully vague to allow participants to share their individual constructs. However, it became apparent that the concept of ethnic minority can be relative, dependent on whose needs EPs cater for and/or within which geographical area. Similarly, although ‘generic’ work with EMCs was differentiated from ‘specific’ (using language other than English) post-pilot interview, the area is so broad that participants tended to get confused and the distinction had to be reinforced. Nevertheless, the semi-structured nature of the interview schedule
allowed for these nuances to be mediated and/or accounted for as and when required to ensure that all participants had the same understanding of these terms.

6.6 Suggestions for improvement

As informed by the above limitations, the following improvements could be made to the current study design and/or its implementation:

- The use of multiple channels of communication to advertise the study in order to increase participant recruitment (e.g. a forum, such as EPNET);
- Further clarification of the key terminology used in the study;
- Employing a co-researcher and/or a research assistant to counter-balance my subjectivity; and/or
- Clarifying the accuracy of interpretations through the post-study interview with research participants to generate new insights and/or hypotheses (Bartholomew, Henderson and Marcia, 2000).

Should the scope of the current study increase and/or additional resources become available, the following improvements and/or changes could also be made:

- Ensuring a greater level of sample homogeneity through employing a more in-depth case study or ethnographic study design;
- Employing a standardised screening tool for cultural competency;
- Employing a screening tool to determine participants' language proficiency;
- Incorporation of alternative perspectives (e.g. those of stakeholders); and
- Expanding the scope of this research to other regions or a national level.

Please note that this would be much more realistic in a case study or an ethnographic study design, where sample sizes tend to be very small.
In addition, Bartholomew, Henderson and Marcia (2000) argued that piloting often ceases due to limited time and/or resources. Nevertheless, where possible, it should include the minimum of a two-phase approach to refine the interview and interviewer's skills, as well as to test the interview schedule and the coding system.

6.7 Original contribution to social science

Cameron (2006) captured the essence of the applied psychology and its contribution to knowledge as follows:

“applied psychology can help people to understand themselves and others, enable them to maximise developmental opportunities and encourage them to recognise/celebrate diversity among people. Psychology is concerned with understanding how individuals and groups learn and develop and how this informs the development of society [...] Part of the power of psychology stems from the fact that it draws upon a research and theoretical knowledge base which seeks to understand the complexity of human experience and eschews simple answers to complex questions.” (p. 301).

Accordingly, the views gathered in this study appear to support the notion that learning takes place through lived experiences in different languages, and within different social networks (Robertson, Drury and Cable, 2014).

The current research offers the first in-depth conceptualisation of plurilingual EP practice using language/s other than English in the UK. Thus it fulfils the aim and
objective of social science exploration, as the findings advance the understanding of the professional practice of plurilingual EPs in England when working with EMCs using language other than English. They also offer a sound foundation for subsequent research (Babbie, 2007; Stebbins, 2001). In particular, I hope that the themes and/or contradictions highlighted in the current study will help to inform and to further develop the Educational Psychology profession in its endeavours to improve the outcomes for EMCs.

6.8 Suggestions for future research

In order to further investigate the area of EP practice using language/s other than English, future research could build on the existing study by addressing the following:

- The views and/or experiences of plurilingual EPs from the same or similar cultural and/or linguistic background (e.g. using the case study approach);
- The views and/or experiences of immigrant plurilingual EPs, as compared to those of plurilingual EPs born and raised in the UK;
- The perspectives of plurilingual practitioners who acquired English as their additional language, as compared to those of plurilingual EPs who acquired language other than English as their additional language;
- Monolingual EPs’ views on their practice with EMCs when they do not share language;
- Community perceptions of working with plurilingual practitioners and/or accessing services using language other than English, including the views of CYP, parents, as well as other practitioners involved in the activity (e.g. as identified under the ‘community’ node in chapter 5, section 5.2.5);
• The relationships and competing objects of activity between different systems impacting on the plurilingual EP practice using language other than English, employing the third generation AT (Engeström, 1999b); and

• The development of new practices and establishing a mutually agreed and/or shared model of working through a collaborative approach to learning, employing the Developmental Work Research (DWR) (Engeström, 1999b; 2005).
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Appendices

Appendix A: HCPC’s response to a request for a breakdown by nationality of registered Educational Psychologists under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (Ref. FR05310)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Afghanistan</th>
<th>Argentina</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>Brazil</th>
<th>Bulgaria</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Cyprus</th>
<th>Czech Republic</th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CO ED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CO FO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CO ED OC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CO FO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CO FO OC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CO HE SP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CO SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL ED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CO ED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CO FO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CO FO HE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CO HE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CO PO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL ED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL ED FO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL ED FO OC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL ED HE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL HE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL ED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL ED FO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL ED FO OC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL ED HE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL HE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL ED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL ED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL ED FO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL ED FO OC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL ED HE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL HE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL ED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL ED FO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL ED FO OC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL ED HE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL HE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data as at 20 September 2017

Modality codes:
- CL = Clinical psychologist; CO = Counselling psychologist; OC = Occupational psychologist; ED = Educational psychologist; HE = Health psychologist; FO = Forensic psychologist; SF = Sport psychologist.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Lithuania</th>
<th>Luxembourg</th>
<th>Macao</th>
<th>Malaysia</th>
<th>Malta</th>
<th>Mauritius</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
<th>Nigeria</th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD ED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD ED FO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD ED OC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD FO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD FO HE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD FO OC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD HE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD SP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL ED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL ED FO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL ED HE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL ED SP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL HE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL HE SP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL HE SP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Romania</th>
<th>South Arabia</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>Singapore</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>St Helena</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>Switzerland</th>
<th>Tristan and Tobago</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD ED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD ED FO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD ED OC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD FO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD FO HE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD FO OC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD HE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD SP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL ED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL ED FO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL ED HE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL ED SP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL HE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL HE SP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
<th>United States of America</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Uruguay</th>
<th>Venezuela</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>5.063</td>
<td>50.370</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD ED</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD ED FO</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD ED OC</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD FO</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD FO HE</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD FO OC</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD HE</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL CD SP</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL ED</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL ED FO</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL ED HE</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL ED SP</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL HE</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL HE SP</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.165</td>
<td>71.088</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Initial participant scoping email (November-December 2015)
**Appendix C: Research Panel PowerPoint Presentation (March 2016)**
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**VOLUME 1**
**PROPOSED RESEARCH STUDY**

The work of plurilingual Educational Psychologists and how culture influences practice with ethnic minority population:

A socio-cultural activity theory analysis using of plurilingual Educational Psychologists' views with implications for improved practice, in light of catering for the needs of increasingly more diverse society.

**BY**

KASIA KRAUSE

**Slide 2**

**Broad purposes of the research**

- To gain familiarity with a phenomenon
- To acquire insight into plurilingual EPs' practice
- To explore plurilingual EPs' practice
  - Strengths
  - Constraints
- To further improve the EP practice
- To add to the UK and international research

**Rationale**

**Personal**
- Ongoing interest in strengths and constraints of bilingual practice, as identified and/or perceived by practitioners.

**Professional**
- Interest in anti-oppressive practice.
- Strive to promoting and/or ensuring access to equal opportunities.

**Psychological**
- Experience through practice (e.g. working with ethnic minority clients; work allocation on a basis of ethnicity).

**Political**
- Ongoing research in the field of Bilingualism and Language Diversity.
- Ongoing interest in strengths and constraints of bilingual and/or multicultural practice.

**Research**
- Call for additional research in the field of Bilingualism and Language Diversity.
Previous research

UK - based
- M’gadzah et al. (1999)
  - Black & Asian EP consultants
  - Bridging the divide between the LEA & community
  - Evaluation of an intervention
    - Training / presentations
  - Brief reflection in the summary
    - strengths vs. constraints of bilingual practice
- Robertson et al. (2014)
  - Ethnographic study
    - A bilingual TAs in Early Years settings
    - Daily practice
  - Utilising ‘funds of knowledge’
    - Tensions
    - Equality of opportunity vs. institutional practice
    - Equality of opportunity vs. wider policy
  - Reflections
    - Bilingual & bicultural experiences
    - Impact of own life histories on practice & interactions

International arena
- USA
  - Bilingual educators
  - Bilingual school psychologists
  - Mental health professionals
- Europe
  - Norway
    - Bilingual teachers

Focus on:
- The nature of bilingualism – advantages vs. disadvantages
- Assessment (e.g. language proficiency)
- Experiences of CYP / parents / carers / teachers
- Providing bilingual education / services to bilingual CYP
- Credentials & training of bilingual practitioners
- Status of bilingual practitioners vs. native speakers

Proposed research questions
1. What do plurilingual EPs recognise is their unique contribution within their professional role to working with ethnic minority groups?
2. What do plurilingual EPs perceive supports or constrains their practice when providing services to ethnic minority population?

Sub-questions:
- What are the socio-cultural factors (e.g. tools/artifacts) that mediate the plurilingual EPs approaches and/or unique contributions to working with ethnic minority groups?
- What new ways of working do plurilingual EPs propose may further enhance EP practice and services offered to ethnic minority groups?

Proposed methodology & methods

Paradigm
- Ontology
  - Interpretivism
- Epistemology
  - Constructivism
    - Social constructionism

Analysis
- Qualitative
  - Activity Theory framework (Engeström, 1987)
  - Thematic Analysis (Braun and Clarke 2006)
2nd generation Activity Theory model (Engestrom, 1987)

Conceptual Framework

2nd generation Activity Theory model (Engestrom, 1987)

Thematic Analysis

(Braun and Clarke, 2006)

Proposed methodology & methods

- Exploratory research
  - purposeful sample
  - new topic / issue
  - little knowledge available
  - flexibility

- Semi-structured interviews

Design frame

Methods

Ethics

- Access to information
  - Recruitment advertisement
  - Information sheet

- Consent form
  - Right to withdraw
  - Audio-recordings
    - Confidentiality
    - Data storage
Expected impact

- Local and national consideration
  - catering for the needs of ethnic minority clients
- Sharing knowledge and expertise
  - ‘Pedagogical resource’ / ‘Funds of knowledge’
  - EP profession &/or across other contexts
- Utilising assets within the EP profession
  - empowerment of professionals
  - informing practice (e.g. training)
- Sign-posting for additional research

Proposed time scale

- April 2016: Ethics Form submission
- May-July 2016: Data collection
- August 2016: Data transcription
- August – December 2016: Data analysis
- January – June 2017: Write up

Strengths & Limitations

**Strengths**
- In-depth understanding
- Discovery
  - Perceptions
  - Interpretations
- Feasibility

**Limitations**
- Generalisation
- Subjectivity
- Replicability
- Demands
  - Time
  - Effort
Appendix D: University Of Birmingham Application for Ethical Review (AER) (8th April 2016)

Please note that only relevant extracts have been included below. A full copy can be made available upon request.
Appendix E: Recruitment advertisement

70 Please note that for the purpose of this study, plurilingualism is referred to as “the possession of skills in more than one linguistic code”, which enables the speaker to “switch from one language to another according to the situation” (p. 19), in line with the description proposed by the Council of Europe (for details see Coste, Moore and Zarate, 2009).
Appendix F: Participant information sheet

Please note that for the purpose of this study, plurilingualism is referred to as “the possession of skills in more than one linguistic code”, which enables the speaker to “switch from one language to another according to the situation” (p. 19), in line with the description proposed by the Council of Europe (for details see Coste, Moore and Zarate, 2009).
Appendix G: Pre-interview email sent to each participant (22nd June – 27th July 2016)
Appendix H: Consent form
Appendix I: Semi-structured Interview Schedule (revised on 30.06.16)

1. Subject – Who?

   Personal characteristics

   Ethnicity
   - How long have you lived in England for? (since birth vs. immigrated)
   If applicable – Where did you live before and for how long?
   - How would you describe your ethnicity / ethnic background?

   Language(s)
   - Which language would you identify as your first language?
   - What other languages do you speak fluently or at a ‘functional’ level (meaning that you are able to communicate information and understand the information when it is communicated to you verbally or in writing)?

   Relevant ethnic minority community/-ies
   - Which ethnic minority groups / communities are you able to communicate with using language other than English?
   - Based on your experience, how would you describe key characteristics of this/these community/-ies?
     o Needs (e.g. provision of services)
     o Community cohesion
     o Perception of authority figures
     o Level of familiarity with professionals

   Cultural competency
   - How would you describe your cultural and/or religious competency in relation to this/these ethnic minority community/-ies (i.e. awareness, understanding & ability to relate to them)?
   OR How competent do you feel regarding your understanding of the culture and/or religion of this/these community/-ies?
   - How did you acquire your cultural and/or religious competency in relation to this/these community/-ies? (e.g. being raised in ... family, friends, travelling, living in a different country, media, professional practice, previous work experience etc.)

   Professional characteristics

   Professional role / background
   - What is your professional role?
   - Do you have a specialism within your professional role? If so, what is it?
   - When did you qualify as an Educational Psychologist?
   - What qualifications and/or training do you have?
   - What was your role before becoming an Educational Psychologist?
   - What do you perceive is your professional role and/or responsibility in relation to working with ethnic minority groups using language other than English?
Historicity
- Has your role changed over time, as compared to your practice in the past? (e.g. when you qualified as an EP or started working as an EP)
- Do you foresee any changes in the future?

Context specific background
- How often (on average) do you work with ethnic minority service users? OR Approximately how many cases do you work with termly / annually?
- How often (on average) do you work with ethnic minority service users where you are required to use language other than English? OR How often are you assigned a case that requires you to use language other than English?

Self-reported (context specific) professional competency
- How skilled and/or qualified do you feel to cater for the needs of ethnic minority groups in language other than English?
- Have you had any professional development opportunities relevant to working with ethnic minority groups? If so, could you elaborate on that experience?
- Have you had any professional development opportunities relevant to working with ethnic minority groups using language other than English?
- Have you ever assisted other professionals working with ethnic minority clients in a way that required you to use language other than English?
  o If so, which professionals?
  o What is your task / role / responsibility within that context? (e.g. EP vs. interpreter)

2. Object – What?

General context

Experience
- What type of experience do you have of working with ethnic minority groups where you used language other than English? e.g. with respect to the five core functions of EP practice (Farrell et al., 2006)

Specific context
- Could you describe a specific example of a successful piece of work or an activity undertaken with a client from ethnic minority group where you used language other than English?
  e.g.
  o How did you become involved? (e.g. referral source)
  o Why did you become involved? (e.g. identified need)
  o What were you working on? (focus) OR What was the aim of this work?
  o Who established the main focus of your involvement?

Historicity
- Has the focus of your work with ethnic minority clients, using language other than English, changed over time?
- Do you forecast the focus of this particular work changing in the future? If so, could you elaborate on that?
3. Outcomes

General context
- Have you noticed any similarities and/or patterns regarding the outcomes of your involvement with ethnic minority clients?

Specific context
With regards to the specific piece of work that you have just described, could you please elaborate on the following:
- What were you working towards? OR What did you hope to achieve?
- What did you achieve? OR What were the outcomes of your involvement? OR What was the impact? How do you know? (e.g. Did you measure it? If so, how?)

Historicity
- Have these outcomes changed compared to your practice in the past? If so, how?
- Do you foresee different outcomes being prioritised in the future? If so, could you elaborate on that?

4. Rules
- What facilitates and/or supports your work with ethnic minority clients using language other than English?
  o Individual level
  o Local / Community level (e.g. service / local community)
  o National level (e.g. government / policy)
  o Cultural level
- What constrains and/or restricts your work with ethnic minority clients using language other than English?
  o Individual level
  o Local / Community level (e.g. service / local community)
  o National level (e.g. government / policy)
  o Cultural level
- Are there any other factors that influence what you do?

Historicity
- Have any of these factors changed over time? If so, how?
- Do you anticipate different factors having an impact on your work with ethnic minority groups using language other than English in the future?

5. Community

General context
- Who else works with and/or supports the work with ethnic minority groups in your region (or Local Authority)? (e.g. professionals / services)
- What is their role and how they relate to you on a professional level?
Specific context
- Is there anyone else OR any other service that works with or supports the work with ethnic minority clients using language other than English?
- What is their role and how they relate to you on a professional level?

Historicity
- Have you worked with any of these or any other professionals / services in the past?
- Who do you foresee working with in the future?

6. Division of Labour
- How are the roles and/or responsibilities in relation to working with ethnic minority clients shared amongst the Local Authority and your team?
- What does each of you try to do?
- Are there any expectations of you in context of this particular type of work? If so, what do you think they are?

Historicity
- How has this (division of work / responsibilities / expectations) come about?
- Has there been any change / shift of responsibilities over time?
- Do you think the roles are likely to change in the future? If so, how?
  e.g. Are others likely to have different expectations of your role in the future?

7. Tools or Artefacts
- What ‘tools’ do you use in your work with ethnic minority clients using language other than English?
  o Skills (e.g. translating, interpreting translated documents)
  o Tools / resources / materials
  o Techniques
  o Strategies
  o Approaches
  o Psychological theory / frameworks
- How do you use it / them?
- Why do you use it / them?
- What do you hope to achieve by using it / them?
- How had you come to use it / them in this way?

Historicity
- How had you come to use it / them over time?
- What do you think might be useful for the future? (e.g. assessments in child’s first language)
Appendix J: Example coded transcript