Teacher wellbeing within the context of educational psychology casework for children and young people with SEND: an exploration of the experiences, perceptions and practices of educational psychologists

by Afia Akyeampong-Spencer

Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham for the degree of Doctor of Applied Educational Psychology

August 2021

Word count: 41,663 (excluding abstract, acknowledgements, references and appendices)

Table of Contents

List of tables

<u>**Chapter 2**</u>

List of figures

Abstract

Research (e.g. by Zafeiriou & Gulliford, 2020) indicates that teaching staff supporting children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) might present with issues related to their well-being within the context of educational psychology casework. The present study therefore uniquely explored the practices, perceptions and experiences of educational psychologists (EPs) in relation to teacher well-being (TWB) in the context of educational psychology casework for children and young people (CYP) with SEND. Semi-structured interviews were used with six EPs to explore their practices and experiences, drawing additionally on vignette methodology to explore their beliefs in this area.

Thematic analysis, used on interview data, suggests that EPs encounter TWB issues within casework across all areas of SEND, linking not only to the case demands, but to stressors within teachers' personal lives and within the profession. The data indicates that TWB needs can interrupt EPs' ability to problem-solve, impacting on their experience of the casework outcomes and trajectory.

The data also tentatively suggests that support for TWB might be a secondary outcome of educational psychology casework. Indeed, some EPs reflected their use of strategies to support both teachers' professional and affective well-being (as defined by van Horn et al., 2004) within casework. They also highlighted some constraints and professional duties which impede on their responses to TWB needs in casework, including those of service delivery and time. Helpfully, EPs reflected some of their responses which may enable TWB needs to be met within their casework involvement despite such constraints. Vignette methodology indicated considerable overlap between EPs' beliefs and their accounts of their own responses to TWB needs in casework.

The findings suggest that EPs should consider teachers' potential fragility within casework and consider using the casework context as a vehicle for TWB support to find a way forward for the CYP at the heart of this fundamental aspect of EPs' practice.

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend thanks to the following people:

To Dr Sarah Atkinson for her guidance throughout the process of conducting this research and throughout my course experience. I would also like to thank her for the reassurance and support that she has provided in the face of the hurdles presented whilst conducting a research study during a global pandemic.

To the participants of this study for their contributions and insight into the profession.

To the teachers who have inspired this work and to the children that they support.

To the tutor team at the University of Nottingham for their unwavering support throughout the doctorate.

To Cohort 13 who have been a constant source of support and smiles throughout this journey.

To my placement supervisor for always providing a listening ear, reassurance and guidance. Thank you for helping me to form my professional identity as a Trainee Educational Psychologist.

To my EPS colleagues for inspiring me and helping to guide my professional practice.

To my friends who have patiently cheered me on.

To my family and Marcus for standing by my side and supporting me in my journey onto the Doctorate and for being there for me throughout it.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Rationale and research context

According to Ofsted (2019), "teachers' occupational well-being is worryingly low," (p.16) and there is a large evidence base underpinning this assertion. Indeed, within their study, Ofsted (2019) found that 35% of teaching-staff reported low levels of wellbeing. Further, in a survey completed by over 7,000 teachers, NASUWT (2018) found that 84% of teachers reported that the occupation had adversely affected their wellbeing. NASUWT (2018) found that their sample of teachers reported having experienced a range of detrimental mental/physical consequences of their work, including: sleep loss, anxiety, reduced energy levels and changes to their overall mood. Worryingly, poor TWB is not a new phenomenon. In fact, almost 20 years ago, Gerda Hanko, an educational consultant, recognised the state and importance of aspects of TWB and asserted that teachers "experience not being valued, not receiving recognition, feel unsupported and thus do not 'feel safe to teach'." (Hanko, 2002, p.5).

It is thought that support for TWB would be an appropriate function of the educational psychologist's (EP's) role, to enable teachers to meet the needs of their pupils (Roffey, 2012). Indeed, the EP role is referred to frequently in the government research report into school and college staff wellbeing (Department for Education (DfE), 2019b).

As a Trainee EP, within my casework for CYP with SEND, I have encountered teachers who seem exhausted, stressed, entrenched in the presenting concerns surrounding the focus pupils and who generally seem to be presenting with concerns related to their own well-being. It is here that I feel my previous role as a Primary school teacher intersects with my current role, enabling me to stand in teachers' shoes to imagine how they might be feeling as a recipient of my support within the casework context.

My understanding and empathy for the state of well-being in the teaching profession fundamentally guides my role within all my work, including casework, as I acknowledge that the teachers who I encounter might be trying to 'pour from an empty cup', already depleted by the demands of the role.

There is a current dearth of research which investigates EPs' experiences in encountering TWB issues within casework, or the nature of their responses when these issues present. Similarly, there is a lack of research which has investigated EPs' beliefs regarding their role in facilitating TWB within casework or their perceptions of how these needs might shape the nature or trajectory of their casework involvement. This is concerning when one considers that staff will most likely present with difficult emotions within the context of the casework due to the impact that caring for the additional needs of young people might have on aspects of their own wellbeing as demonstrated by Birchall (2021), Brittle (2020), Blick (2019), Farouk (2012), Zafeiriou (2017) and Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020). It is also of concern since TWB is an integral component of a child's experience at school (Briner & Dewberry, 2007; Kidger et al., 2009; Roffey, 2012). Thus, in finding a way forward for the child, this evidence points to the importance of EPs considering TWB within the casework context.

The present study seeks to uniquely explore how, and to what extent, a sample of EPs experience issues related to TWB in the context of casework for CYP with SEND. Attention is also given to EPs' practice in relation to this, exploring how they respond when issues related to TWB are presented to them within casework. In addition, vignette methodology is used to explore participants' core assumptions and beliefs about the topic (Barter & Renold, 2000; Hughes, 1998).

1.2 Structure of thesis

Chapter 1 introduces the thesis, as the researcher provides both a personal and empirical rationale for the undertaking of the study.

Within Chapter 2, the researcher provides an analytic, narrative overview of the extant relevant literature. The researcher then provides a Systematic Literature Review which provides a narrower focus into reviewing the role of EPs in supporting TWB. The researcher then orients the reader to the unique contribution and purpose of the present study, derived directly from gaps identified in the reviewed literature.

Chapter 3 provides an overview of the epistemological and ontological decisions that drove the methodological choices for the current study. The researcher additionally

outlines their methodological choices, providing a justification for their use in addressing the proposed research questions. The researcher also provides an outline of the procedural information as well as a description of, and justification for, their data analysis method.

Chapter 4 provides an overview of thematic analysis findings to address each of the research questions. Themes and subthemes are presented alongside relevant data extracts chosen to illuminate each.

Chapter 5 presents a summary of the research findings in relation to the research questions. The researcher makes links between findings in the present study and findings and theoretical insights within the extant literature. Limitations and avenues for future research are also discussed as well as an exploration of the implications of the present study findings for the educational psychology profession.

Chapter 2: Literature review

2.1 Introduction and outline of the literature review

The following literature review begins with an exploration of definitions and models of wellbeing, before taking a closer examination of teaching-specific wellbeing models and definitions that have been provided within the extant literature. Thereafter, the researcher provides an overview of the implications and importance of TWB as demonstrated in research. Subsequently, the researcher provides the reader with a review of factors implicated in either positively or negatively influencing TWB, before eventually looking to examine the role of EPs generally, and more specifically, in relation to their facilitation of TWB.

2.2 Teacher well-being (TWB)

2.2.1 Definitions of well-being

Wellbeing is a notoriously difficult concept to describe, so much so, that the search for its single definition remains an ongoing process in the academic literature (DfE, 2019b; Dodge et al., 2012). In view of this complexity, within this section of the literature review, the author provides an outline of some of the models, definitions and conceptualisations of wellbeing that have been presented in the academic literature.

Researchers who embrace a hedonic approach to defining wellbeing would argue that it is a concept which is purely related to the existence of positive emotions (Ryan & Deci, 2001) over negative emotions (Dodge et al., 2012). For example, Bradburn (1969) as cited in Dodge et al., (2012) argues that optimal wellbeing is experienced when an individual's positive emotions outweigh their negative emotions. This approach to well-being is indeed supported by Birchall (2021) who found that over half the teachers in their study defined wellbeing as "a presence of positive emotions…and an absence of negative emotions" (p.150).

However, researchers aligned with a eudaimonic approach would argue that equating wellbeing purely with the presence of positive affect is inappropriate (Ryan & Deci, 2001), failing to give insight into what truly underpins the experience of wellbeing (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Ryff and Keyes (1995) argue that a more theoretical conceptualisation is necessary to provide insight into what encapsulates wellbeing, and they posit a multi-faceted wellbeing model which includes aspects of

psychological wellbeing, for example life purpose, autonomy and good relations with others.

From the alternative perspective of Self-determination theory, eudaimonic wellbeing is experienced when an individual fulfils fundamental requirements for competence, autonomy and relatedness (Ryan et al., 2008). Autonomy relates to a person's experience of their free choice over their own actions (Ryan et al., 2008). Competence encompasses a person's views of their own effectiveness whilst relatedness constitutes an individual's perceptions that they are liked and linked with others (Ryan et al., 2008). This model of wellbeing predicts that, where these psychological needs are not met, there will be negative implications for a person's wellbeing (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

However, Dodge et al., (2012) contend that many of the aforementioned conceptualisations remain flawed as they only offer descriptions of wellbeing as opposed to working definitions. Dodge et al., (2012) argue, instead, that wellbeing is better defined as a balance between an individual's personal tools and the difficulties they experience. Wellbeing is thus achieved when an individual has the resources required to tackle their presenting challenges; when the challenges outweigh a person's resources, their wellbeing is negatively impacted (Dodge et al., 2012).

2.2.2 Occupation specific definitions of TWB

Aelterman et al., (2007) have offered the following teacher specific well-being definition: "well-being expresses a positive emotional state, which is the result of harmony between the sum of specific environmental factors on the one hand, and the personal needs and expectations of teachers on the other hand" (p.286). This definition of TWB resonates with Dodge et al., (2012)'s notion of wellbeing as a counterbalanced state between difficulties encountered and the tools they have to tackle these (Lewis, 2017).

Alternatively, van Horn et al., (2004) utilised confirmatory factor analysis with a group of teachers and identified a five-factor model for teachers' occupational wellbeing. van Horn et al., (2004) identified that TWB was underpinned by affective (affect, emotional exhaustion, job satisfaction and commitment), social (depersonalisation and social relations), professional (aspiration, competence, self-

efficacy and autonomy), cognitive (cognitive functioning and the ability to focus on work) and psychosomatic wellbeing.

Having outlined various definitions of wellbeing generally and more specifically aligned with wellbeing in the teaching profession, it is clear to see why the DfE (2019b) state that, "it has not been possible to identify a clearly agreed, consistent definition of wellbeing as applied to the school and college workforce." (p.16). Consequently, the researcher has chosen to adopt a multidimensional perspective on well-being, focusing on the various aspects of well-being indicators that have been captured in the above literature throughout this study.

2.2.3 The implications and importance of TWB

The enhanced drive for focusing on well-being in schools began with a spotlight on primary and secondary pupils (Salter-Jones, 2012). This focus on mental health and well-being in schools is reflected within a recent government Green Paper (Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) & DfE, 2018). It proposes to support CYP's mental health in schools by funding the development of new Mental Health Support Teams, supporting schools to train a Designated Senior Lead for Mental health and by piloting a 4-week waiting list for CYP to access mental health services (DHSC & DfE, 2018).

In addition to this focus on student well-being, there is now a new emphasis on supporting TWB (Salter-Jones, 2012), with a recognition that "well-being in schools starts with staff: they are in the front line of this work" (Weare, 2015, p.6). Indeed, within the Green Paper, the DHSC and DfE (2018) acknowledge the role that TWB has to play in the context of the wider mental health in schools agenda. For instance, the Green Paper recommends that Designated Senior Mental Health Leads should also have a role in supporting staff well-being (DHSC & DfE, 2018). Additionally, in 2019, the Secretary of State announced the formation of a new advisory group to support the DfE in understanding school staff well-being (DfE, 2019b). Further, the government announced a recent £8 million investment into whole-school wellbeing (including teachers') to support the well-being needs that have arisen in schools following the Covid-19 pandemic (DfE, 2020). Further, The DfE (2021) have announced a new charter to be introduced in Autumn 2021 that schools can sign up to in evidence of their commitment to supporting staff well-being (DfE, 2021). Such is the focus on staff well-being in schools, that the Anna Freud National Centre for

Children and Families (AFNCCF, n.d.) advocate for the use of a tiered approach to offering well-being support for school staff, ranging from universal strategies embedded within the school culture to targeted and specialist support.

Despite this, there is evidence to suggest that TWB is still not being prioritised or openly acknowledged within individual school systems. For instance, Birchall (2021) and Sharrocks (2012; 2014) identified that teachers perceive a level of stigma attached with receiving well-being support. Additionally, NASUWT (2018) found that over 60% of their sample of teachers did not perceive that their school considered their wellbeing to be of importance. This is concerning when one considers the implications of TWB, which shall be addressed in the following section.

Firstly, poor TWB has potentially profound implications for the future of the teaching profession itself (Roffey, 2012). Indeed, when asked about their reasons for leaving the profession, teaching-staff in the Ofsted (2019) study largely cited issues related to their wellbeing, including high-workload and an insufficient work-life balance. Indeed, the retention of teachers has decreased annually since 2010 and the pupil to teacher ratio is expected to rise until 2025 (DfE, 2019a). Such crucial issues in relation to teacher attrition mean that consideration should undeniably be given to the protection of TWB in education settings (Roffey, 2012).

Importantly, there is also evidence to suggest that TWB fundamentally shapes pupils' school experiences and outcomes. Gerda Hanko, a psychodynamically informed educational consultant (Hanko, 2002) is an eminent figure whose work has contributed considerably to understanding the importance of TWB and its influence on pupils' emotions and behaviour. Using case-study evidence from a joint teacher problem-solving group, Hanko (2002) suggests that pupils' challenging behaviours and the difficult emotions underlying such behaviours often transfer onto teachers, evoking similar emotions in them (Hanko, 2002). Further, Hanko (2002) indicates that there is likely a reciprocal interaction between the emotions experienced by both teachers and pupils, stating that "the trained professional's response may be a major influence on whether the interaction becomes a virtuous or a vicious cycle." (p.4). These assertions made by Hanko (2002) imply that teachers' emotional well-being is affected by, and can influence, pupils' emotions and behaviour.

More recently, research from Kidger et al., (2009) further highlights that the wellbeing of teaching staff also has wider implications for pupil wellbeing. Kidger et al., (2009) identified that when teachers' emotional wellbeing is under threat, due to various stressors involved in the role, it prevents their perceived ability to support their pupils' emotional wellbeing. This once again highlights the role that staff well-being plays in pupils' experiences of school.

There is also evidence from Briner and Dewberry (2007) to suggest that TWB has implications for the CYP for whom they care. For example, Briner and Dewberry (2007) measured aspects of wellbeing in over 24,000 members of school staff in primary and secondary settings. Briner and Dewberry (2007) identified a positive association between TWB and pupil assessment results in both primary and secondary settings. It is vital to note that these relationships do not denote causality and that the direction of the relationship is also unknown, whereby pupils' achievement and academic attainment may also have an influence on TWB (Briner & Dewberry, 2007). Nevertheless, Briner and Dewberry (2007) concluded that the association between TWB and academic performance is likely a reciprocal one.

The research provided within this section demonstrates the far-reaching implications of poor TWB and provides an impetus for further research and investigation into this area; poor TWB has implications that extend beyond the teachers themselves (Roffey, 2012). The literature review now takes a point of departure to explore the factors that have been identified to influence TWB, since an understanding of these can help to gauge how TWB can be supported (Aelterman et al., 2007).

2.3 Issues that influence TWB
Aelterman et al., (2007) argue that the elements influencing TWB can be separated into three distinctive groupings: intraindividual factors, factors related to the teaching occupation itself and factors within society. Next, the author focuses on intraindividual issues that influence TWB. For each factor, the author outlines its defining features and constituent parts, before presenting research to support its role in influencing wellbeing and, where possible, TWB more specifically.

2.3.1 Intraindividual influences on TWB
2.3.1 (i) Self-efficacy
Self-efficacy beliefs refer to whether a person believes that they will be successful in enacting a behaviour required to achieve a specific goal (Bandura et al., 1977).

Teacher self-efficacy is defined more specifically by Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2010) as a teacher's conviction in their capacity to successfully coordinate and conduct activities that will achieve academic goals for their pupils.

According to Bandura et al. (1977), self-efficacy is supported by a person's previous accomplishments whereby their experience of previous success increases their predictions regarding their future success. Self-efficacy is also supported by their vicarious experiences, entailing an individual's observation of another person successfully navigating obstacles to enhance the belief that they themselves may also be able to do this (Bandura et al., 1977). Such vicarious experiences might be supported in a school through a teacher observing another's successful practice (Gibbs, 2007). Bandura et al. (1977) also purport that self-efficacy is supported by a person's emotional arousal and by aspects of verbal persuasion from others.

van Horn et al., (2004) argue that teacher self-efficacy is an integral component of professional wellbeing and there is a growing evidence base underpinning this. For example, in a comprehensive review of 40 years' worth of the teacher self-efficacy research, Zee and Koomen (2016) summarised that teachers higher in self-efficacy experienced less stress, emotional exhaustion and burnout, which is defined as great quantities of exhaustion, negative occupational attitudes and disengagement (Brittle, 2020; Demerouti et al., 2010). Zee and Koomen (2016) thereby concluded that teacher self-efficacy was strongly linked to several psychological factors underlying wellbeing.

2.3.1 (ii) Resilience

Teacher resilience has been described by Bobek (2002) as a person's capacity to acclimatise to a range of encounters and to increase their ability to cope with difficulties. According to Mguni et al. (2012), resilience is related to a person's wellbeing yet, unlike wellbeing, arguably develops in a cumulative fashion over a person's life and builds to support them during times of personal difficulty.

Within a review of qualitative research papers on teacher resilience, Greenfield (2015) provides a model which helps to decipher what constitutes and contributes to teacher resilience. Greenfield (2015) identified that teacher beliefs and perceptions of themselves are at the heart of their resilience for example, their self-efficacy

beliefs and their sense of purpose and hope. Greenfield (2015) argues that it is important to nurture such beliefs to nurture teacher resilience.

There is an accumulating body of evidence, such as that presented by Burić et al. (2019), which demonstrates that teacher resilience is indeed associated with their wellbeing. Indeed, Burić et al. (2019) studied the relationship between resilience and markers of TWB such as burnout, negative affect and psychopathological symptoms at two different time points. Their study identified that, where teachers presented with a higher degree of resilience, they experienced lower amounts of burnout, negative affect and psychopathological symptoms.

2.3.1 (iii) Autonomy

Autonomy features in various models of general wellbeing, for example those described by Ryff and Keyes (1995) and Ryan and Deci (2000;2001). Autonomy describes a person's ability to exercise choice over their behaviour (Ryan et al., 2008) and to maintain a sense of independence in adhering to their own beliefs (van Horn et al., 2004). From the perspective of the teaching profession, autonomy can be thought of as the ability to choose pedagogical approaches and techniques which resonate with the teacher's own viewpoints with regards to education (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014).

van Horn et al., (2004) argue that teacher autonomy is an integral component of their professional wellbeing and there is a growing evidence base underpinning this. For example, Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2014) found that teacher autonomy predicted aspects of their satisfaction with their work and emotional exhaustion, both of which are thought to underpin teacher's occupational wellbeing (van Horn, et al., 2004).

In summary, there are a wide range of intraindividual aspects which can be said to influence TWB (Aelterman et al., 2007). Within the next section, the author looks to examine the factors within the profession and the teaching workplace (Aelterman et al., 2007), that have been empirically demonstrated to either positively or negatively influence TWB.

2.3.2. Work factors related to TWB
2.3.2 (i) Workload

Workload in the teaching profession is in excess and appears to negatively influence TWB (Ofsted, 2019). Indeed, Ofsted (2019) identified that teachers are working an

average of 10.2 hours each day. Within the Ofsted (2019) study, marking was identified as one of the highest contributors to such excessive working hours, often completed outside of the hours within the school day.

The Ofsted (2019) study utilised regression analysis and found that such high levels of workload were predictors of wellbeing amongst staff in education settings. Van droogenbroeck et al. (2014) and Ofsted (2019) posit that teachers' workload increasingly consists of non-teaching related tasks such as record-keeping and basic administrative tasks. Indeed, Van droogenbroeck et al. (2014) argue that it is expected that the workload created by such tasks is negatively experienced by teachers since they are not perceived by teachers as central to supporting their pupils to learn and can often be experienced as a distraction to such direct pupil work.

2.3.2 (ii) Social support

Research highlights the importance of social relationships in the school environment as a supportive TWB factor. For instance, Paterson and Grantham (2016) conducted a focus group with five teachers in a primary school to gauge what contributed to their wellbeing. Paterson and Grantham (2016) identified, through thematic analysis, that relationships within school and communication alongside these relationships was one of the factors that contributed positively to TWB. However, one of the limitations of this study is that the participants may have been primed in their answers by the pre-measure used to assess their overall wellbeing in the initial study phase (Paterson & Grantham, 2016). Nevertheless, the findings support Paterson and Grantham (2016)'s claim that "Relational quality, and associated social capital, is a major factor in teachers' well-being and resilience." (p.97).

The mechanisms through which social support facilitates TWB was explained by Kinman et al. (2011) using the Cohen and Wills (1985) buffering hypothesis. According to Cohen and Wills (1985), social support may provide someone with resources for the challenges they face, thereby intervening at the point between a person's experience/apprehension of a stressful event and their subsequent reaction by diminishing a potential stress response. Alternatively, social support may come in at the point of a person experiencing stress and help to alleviate it to prevent it manifesting and worsening (Cohen & Wills, 1985).

2.3.2 (iii) Behaviour facilitation

Pupil behaviour has a profound impact on TWB (Ofsted, 2019). In the Ofsted (2019) study, challenging behaviour surfaced in the qualitative data as a factor that negatively influenced TWB alongside perceptions of discrepancies in school behaviour policy and insufficient support from senior leadership for facilitating challenging behaviour.

There is evidence from Farouk (2012) and Blick (2019) to suggest that pupil behaviour brings about some particularly challenging emotions for teachers, and this evidence will now be considered. First, Farouk (2012) identified, through interviews with primary school teachers, that they often encounter feelings of guilt when they have intervened to facilitate pupil behaviour, linked with a perception that they may have unintentionally caused emotional upset in their pupils. Blick (2019) also sought to investigate teachers' emotional experiences in relation to facilitating challenging behaviour using interviews with primary school teachers. Teaching-staff in the Blick (2019) study reported feelings of self-doubt in relation to the actions they take in the face of challenging behaviour amongst feelings of uncertainty and helplessness. These studies by Farouk (2012) and Blick (2019) triangulate evidence regarding the emotional experiences that seem to be involved with the facilitation of challenging behaviour for teachers. The presence of such negative affect within the professional context are arguably indicators of negative psychological wellbeing (Birchall, 2021; van Horn et al., 2004).

2.3.2 (iv) Supporting pupils with Special Educational needs and Disabilities (SEND)

It is thought that particular attention should be given to supporting the wellbeing of staff who work with children with a range of SEND (Brittle, 2020). According to the DfE (2015) "A child or young person has SEN if they have a learning difficulty or disability which calls for special educational provision to be made for him or her" (p.15). Areas of need included within SEND comprise of those in relation to Cognition & Learning, Communication & Interaction, Social, Emotional & Mental health and Physical/Sensory needs (DfE, 2015).

There is evidence to suggest that supporting the needs of pupils with SEND has an impact on TWB. For instance, Birchall (2021) found that teachers perceived that the

challenges of meeting the needs of CYP with SEND was an increasing pressure on their well-being. Further, Brittle (2020) identified that supporting the needs of pupils with SEND might impact teacher burnout, which has an established relationship with TWB (Milfont et al., 2008). Brittle (2020) used a survey method with 169 members of teaching staff supporting students with SEND in both mainstream and specialist schools (including teachers and support staff) to examine issues related to their burnout levels. Brittle (2020) identified that the teaching staff presented with levels of disengagement and exhaustion and concluded that the sample of staff in the study were experiencing burnout. Brittle (2020) acknowledged that their self-reported measures may not reflect a true picture of the levels of burnout experienced. Nevertheless, the findings are important as they indicate that teachers supporting pupils with SEND might require additional support for their well-being (Brittle, 2020).

Thus far, the author has oriented the reader towards intrapersonal and profession related factors that seem to both positively and negatively influence TWB levels (Aelterman et al., 2007). Within the next section of this literature review, the author seeks to present the role of EPs, who have an increasing role to play in promoting TWB (Rae et al., 2017).

2.4 The role of EPs

EPs have five fundamental aspects to their role: consultation, assessment, intervention, training and research, each of which is completed at the individual child/young person or organisational level (Scottish Executive Education Department, (SEED) 2002). They do so by applying psychological theory and research within each aspect of their role to ultimately, positively influence the lives of CYP (Fallon et al., 2010). Of course, the true client of educational psychology support varies, and it could also be argued to include school staff and the Local Authority, as well as individual CYP (Ashton & Roberts, 2006).

Casework has been argued to be the foundation of the educational psychology profession by Randall (2010), that is valued by schools, despite the desire of some practitioners within the profession to move away from this work (Boyle & Lauchlan, 2009). Casework is defined here as any involvement of an EP using consultation, assessment and intervention methods, which focus on the needs of individual CYP

following a request for educational psychology service support due to a school/family concern (Zafeiriou, 2017). Woolfson et al. (2003) present a problem-solving framework for EPs which actively seeks to identify how the presenting problems within casework can be understood in consideration of a range of interacting, ecological factors. Specifically, Woolfson et al. (2003) argue that any of the problems with which EPs are faced should be targeted and conceptualised not only at the pupil's level, but also at individuals around the child for example within their school, family and wider community.

Consultation, which reflects such an interactionist approach (Wagner, 2000), is becoming the main model of service delivery for many educational psychology services (Nolan & Moreland, 2014). This move towards consultation as a model of service delivery reflects a drive within the profession to move away from individual assessment and direct work with children and young people (Wagner, 2000). Rather, consultation looks to achieve change for individual CYP through collaborative problem-solving and exploration of presenting concerns around focus pupils with relevant adults (Wagner, 2000). Consultation is consequently considered by the author to be an important aspect of educational psychology casework.

2.4.1 The role of EPs in supporting TWB
Having outlined the role of the EP, and their role within casework more specifically, the researcher now takes a point of departure, orienting the reader towards the rationale for EPs providing support for TWB within their role. Indeed, Ravenette (1999) argues that teaching staff are the "bridge" (p.18) between EPs and pupils and that, "this is important since it establishes our role of providing a service both to teachers and to children" (p.18). It follows then that support for TWB would be an appropriate function of the EP role, to enable them to meet the needs of their pupils (Roffey, 2012). Indeed, within a position paper by Gibbs and Miller (2014), attention is drawn to the possible role of EPs in supporting aspects of TWB such as their self-efficacy and resilience. Further, the profession is referred to frequently in the government research report into school and college staff wellbeing (DfE, 2019b).

However, there is mixed evidence with regards to EPs' current role in supporting TWB. For instance, in a survey conducted by Birchall (2021), though 90% of EPs asked shared that they currently have a role in supporting TWB, only 34% of teachers perceived that there was such a role for EPs. Similarly, Andrews (2017)

identified that Special Educational Needs Coordinators (SENCos) did not perceive well-being support to be an integral component of the EP role, compartmentalising them within their traditional role as assessors of children's needs. It therefore seems that teachers' views of the EP's role in supporting their well-being seem more conflicting (Birchall, 2021).

2.4.2 The role of EPs supporting TWB within casework

There is a now growing body of evidence to suggest that EPs' support for TWB should not be implemented as an 'add on' service, but that it might, or should be, embedded within all aspects of their work, for example within consultations and casework for individual CYP (Birchall, 2021; Blick, 2019; Zafeiriou, 2017; Zafeiriou & Gulliford, 2020). For instance, Birchall (2021) found that a sample of EPs' work around TWB appears to be indirect and integrated into other aspects of their work, particularly in consultations and statutory work to support teachers to meet pupils' needs. Thus, as is the focus of the current study, there is a growing body of evidence to suggest that EPs have a role in meeting TWB needs within casework for CYP, the rationale for which is addressed below.

Firstly, within educational psychology casework, teachers often turn to the EP when they are feeling stuck and presenting with a high level of concern (Gibbs & Miller, 2014; Zafeiriou, 2017; Zafeiriou & Gulliford, 2020) and, with this, staff will most likely present with difficult emotions within the context of the casework due to the impact that caring for the additional needs of that young person might have on aspects of their own well-being as evidenced by Birchall (2021), Brittle (2020), Farouk (2012), Zafeiriou (2017) and Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020).

Further, it has been empirically identified that, unless staff well-being is adequately supported, their ability to appropriately support the needs of their pupils may be at risk (Briner & Dewberry, 2007; Kidger et al., 2009; Roffey, 2012). It is unsurprising then, that Sharrocks (2014) and Evans (2016) anecdotally report that an EP's ability to solve problems and meet the needs of individual CYP are compounded by aspects of staff well-being, which hinders their design and actualisation of strategies for the pupils. Thus, in finding a way forward for the child, it seems important that EPs consider TWB within the casework context.

There is now evidence accumulating to suggest that EPs do indeed respond to the emotional wellbeing needs of teachers as a secondary component of their casework involvement (Blick, 2019). Early evidence for this came from a study described by Miller (2003) in which 24 primary teachers, who had worked successfully with EPs to implement an intervention for pupil behaviour, were interviewed. Within these interviews, Miller (2003) argues that some of the key skills demonstrated by the EPs during consultation were their ability to encourage and to empathise with the difficult emotions the teachers were experiencing in relation to the pupils' challenging behaviour. More recently, Zafeiriou (2017) and Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020) theorised that, within casework for pupils with Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) needs, a sample of EPs in their study reduced feelings of threat and anxiety for teaching-staff and parents involved in casework, enabling them to participate in the problem-solving activities so central to the casework outcomes. These studies by Zafeiriou (2017), Zafeiriou & Gulliford (2020) and Miller (2003) identify a role for EPs supporting aspects of teachers' emotional well-being within casework for pupils with SEMH needs.

The literature presented in this section has given an initial insight into the role that EPs play in supporting TWB and the rationale for this. However, Rae et al. (2017) present this as an "underdeveloped role for EPs." (p.213). If this is to be an established role for the profession, the author argues that it is necessary to further explore the current practice and future possibilities for EPs in this area within a systematic literature review presented in the next section of this paper.

<center>**2.5 Systematic literature review (SLR)**</center>

2.5.1 Review introduction

SLRs aim to provide evidence-based information to answer a specific research question by identifying, synthesising and evaluating the available evidence in that specific area (Boland et al., 2017). SLRs differ from other literature reviews in that they aim to reduce bias by being transparent about the methods used to identify, evaluate and synthesise the evidence (Gough, 2007). The present SLR follows guidance from Gough (2007), the stages of which are outlined below:

1. Develop review question
2. Develop inclusion criteria
3. Complete search
4. Screen studies against inclusion criteria
5. Outline studies
6. Conduct study quality and relevance appraisal
7. Synthesize study outcomes

The synthesis stage was conducted by using a narrative synthesis to integrate both the findings of qualitative and quantitative research studies in parallel (Noyes & Lewin, 2011). The author primarily used words within this narrative synthesis with the ultimate goal of "telling a trustworthy story" of the included studies' findings (Popay et al., 2006, p.5). The author draws upon a framework provided by Popay et al. (2006) to conduct the narrative synthesis. The author now presents their SLR, the aim of which was to further investigate the EP role in supporting TWB.

In line with guidance from Cherry and Dickson (2017), an initial scoping hand search was carried out between 14th September and the 25th of September 2020. This was completed to provide an overview of the extant literature in this area and to guide the author's chosen questions and search terms. The researcher used Google Scholar, Educational Psychology in Practice and E-theses Online Service (Ethos) using the terms "educational psychology/ist" and "teacher wellbeing/well-being."

2.5.2 Review questions

Following this initial scoping search, the author outlined the following questions to be answered in this SLR:

1. What strategies do EPs use to support TWB? What is the impact of these strategies on TWB outcomes?

2. What are the implications of previous research for the future role of the EP in supporting TWB?

2.6 SLR search strategy

2.6.1 Search terms

Next, the researcher listed a series of key terms to use across three databases: British Education Index, Psychinfo & Web of Science. This search was carried out between the 30th September 2020-14th October 2020. These search terms and outcomes on each database are displayed in Table 2.1. There was no specified date range for the search. A further hand search was conducted in February 2021 of the Educational Psychology In Practice journal using the original scoping terms to identify if there were any additional papers to include. See Appendix A for a comprehensive overview of the search process.

Table 2.1

Search terms used in each database for the SLR and the resulting papers from each database

Search term	British Education index total papers identified	Psychinfo total papers identified	Web of Science total papers identified	Articles identified through handsearching
"educational psycholog*" AND teach* OR staff AND wellbeing OR well-being OR well being OR resilien* OR self-efficacy OR efficacy OR confiden* OR competen* OR autonom* OR burnout	54	249	262	1

2.6.2 Inclusion criteria

The researcher developed the following inclusion criteria to identify which of these papers would be included within the final review (Gough, 2007) (See Table 2.2).

Table 2.2

Inclusion and Exclusion criteria for papers in the SLR

Feature	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
Country	Research conducted in the UK.	Studies conducted outside of the UK
Participants	• Teachers/Trainee teachers in mainstream, specialist, primary and secondary settings ***and/or*** • EPs/Trainee Educational Psychologists (TEPs) Studies that included other members of staff (e.g. Teaching Assistants (TAs) alongside teachers were included due to the scarcity of studies that exclusively involved teachers.	Studies that do not involve either of this group of participants
Study focus	All studies which refer to the role of EPs/TEPs supporting TWB or a well-being related construct e.g. competence/self-efficacy.	Studies which do not refer to the role of EPs/TEPs in relation to TWB or a well-being related construct.
Reporting features	Empirical investigations published in peer reviewed journals	Books, conference presentations, review papers, book chapters, position papers and Grey literature.

2.6.3 Study screening

Next, the researcher screened the identified studies against the inclusion criteria (Gough, 2007). Details of all 565 identified studies were firstly extracted into an excel database and duplicates were removed. Abstracts and titles of the remaining 448 studies were subsequently screened against the inclusion criteria (Pilkington & Hounsome, 2017). See Figure 2.1 below for an outline of the screening process.

Figure 2.1

Prisma flow diagram (from Moher et al., 2009)

Identification

565 studies identified in initial database searches

Screening

Records after duplicates removed
(n = 448)

Abstracts and titles of records screened
(n = 448)

Records excluded (did not meet criteria)
(n =427)

Eligibility

Full-text articles assessed for eligibility
(n = 21)

Full-text articles excluded (Reasons for exclusion in Appendix B)

Included

Studies included in systematic review
(n =17)

Studies included from hand search
(n = 1)

2.7 Description of included studies

2.7.1 Data extraction

As per the next stage of Gough (2007)'s SLR guidance, the researcher now provides a data extraction table (Table 2.3) to describe the characteristics of the included studies.

Table 2.3

Data extraction table for included papers in the SLR

Authors and title	Data gathering techniques	Data analysis	Participants	Study aims	Key findings (most relevant to the review question)	Implications (relevant to the review questions)
Armstrong and Hallett (2012) *Private knowledge, public face: Conceptions of children with SEBD by teachers in the UK- a case study*	Analysis of 150 pieces of written coursework papers by teachers regarding their experiences and beliefs around supporting pupils with SEBD (Social, Emotional and Behavioural difficulties) .	Phenomenography	Qualified teachers in mainstream and specialist settings.	Explored teachers' experiences and perceptions of supporting CYP with SEBD.	**Phenomenography suggested the following categories of teachers' perceptions of their pupils with SEBD:** • Chronic predisposition to failure. • Unknown, and unpredictable, entities • Capable of renormalisation • Disabled by educational policy and practice	The authors conclude that many UK educators lack the understanding and emotional capacity to support children with SEBD. They argue that EPs are well positioned to support staff who might be feeling this way to build their understanding, to empower them and to offer supportive challenge.
Bond et al. (2017) *Professional learning among specialist staff in resourced mainstream schools for pupils with ASD and SLI*	• Pre and post training questionnaires • Semi-structured interviews	• Thematic analysis • Content analysis • T-tests • Mcnemera's test • Chi-square tests	47 TAs and qualified teachers in primary and secondary settings.	Investigated the effectiveness of EP-led ASD (Autism Spectrum Disorder) and SLI (Specific Language impairment) training to specialist staff and TAs in mainstream secondary schools	• A significant improvement in participants' confidence in having the skills to support pupils with ASD/SLI after training (p=0.002). • A significant increase in participants' self-efficacy following training p<0.001. A large effect size was found (Cohen's D=0.61) • The magnitude of effect size in self-efficacy improvements was larger for TAs than teachers.	The authors conclude that there is a need for EP delivered training around ASD to develop teaching-staff skills, knowledge and efficacy.

Authors and title	Data gathering techniques	Data analysis	Participants	Study aims	Key findings (most relevant to the review question)	Implications (relevant to the review questions)
Cane and Oland (2015) *Evaluating the outcomes and implementation of a TaMHS (Targeting Mental Health in Schools) project in four West Midlands (UK) schools using activity theory.*	Focus groups	Thematic analysis	20 staff members involved in focus groups which included SENCos, TAs, learning mentors, class teachers, and members of the Senior Leadership Team (SLT).	Investigated staff perceptions of the outcomes & implementation of a TaMHS project, led by two EPs.	**Outcomes for staff:** • Staff perceived improvements in their knowledge, skill and strategy implementation. • Staff perceived an improvement in their confidence in discussing mental health and offering mental health advice. • Participants at three out of four schools reported that TaMHS had a positive impact on staff well-being, due to an enhanced self-awareness or the translation of strategies in their own lives.	The authors conclude that EPs should support and promote staff wellbeing e.g. workload and stress management and more training to support staff's mental health awareness.
Cooper and Woods (2017) *Evaluating the use of a strengths-based development tool with head teachers*	• Post-intervention questionnaire (Likert scales) • Post-intervention semi-structured interviews	• Thematic analysis • Descriptive statistics	Five of the nine head teachers who received the Realise 2 Introductory profile assessment (Centre for Applied Positive Psychology, 2015, as cited in Cooper & Woods, 2017) and EP debrief.	Investigated outcomes of an EP's use of a strengths-based development resource with headteachers (Realise 2: Centre for Applied Positive Psychology 2015, as cited in Cooper & Woods, 2017.)	**Quantitative data:** • The rating scales indicate most impact upon headteachers' recognition and deployment of strengths upon their own well-being and performance. They perceived some, but less, impact on the well-being of other staff. **Qualitative themes:** • Value of psychologist debrief • Opportunity to reflect • Improved recognition of personal strengths and weaknesses. • Improved motivation, reflection and personal development. • Specific behaviour adaptations e.g. resilience. • An organisational focus on personal development e.g. an increased focus on organisational wellbeing.	The authors conclude that the findings promote EPs' use of intervention tools with professionals.

Authors and title	Data gathering techniques	Data analysis	Participants	Study aims	Key findings (most relevant to the review question)	Implications (relevant to the review questions)
Costelloe, et al. (2020) *Bereavement support provision in primary schools: an exploratory study*	Semi-structured interviews	Thematic analysis	16 primary school staff who had recent experience of supporting a bereaved child (Eight teachers, three ELSAs, two SENCOS, two assistant headteachers and one pastoral lead).	Investigated teacher views of bereavement support provision in primary schools.	**Themes:** • Understanding children's grief • Bereavement support provision • Factors influencing proximal successes in bereavement support provision • Emotional impact of bereavement support provision on school staff	The authors conclude that staff supporting bereaved children require support due to the impact of this work on their own emotional wellbeing. They conclude that EPs could offer the following for these staff: • Group supervision e.g. Work Discussion groups, Solution Circles and Circle of Adults (CoA) to contain, reflect and identify strategies. • Consultation to contain staff and help them support the child. • Raise awareness of the need for emotional support for school staff supporting bereaved children at a policy level.

Authors and title	Data gathering techniques	Data analysis	Participants	Study aims	Key findings (most relevant to the review question)	Implications (relevant to the review questions)

Davison and Duffy (2017) *A model for personal and professional support for nurture group staff: to what extent can group process consultation be used as a resource to meet the challenges of running a nurture group?*	• Pre and post questionnaires
	 • Focus groups
		• T-tests
		 • Thematic analysis
			11 teachers and 11 TAs.	Investigated EP facilitated group process consultation based on Farouk (2004) in supporting staff with pupil challenging behaviour in nurture groups.	**Quantitative data:**
					 • Staff showed a significantly reduced level of concern following each consultation in the first year.
					    o Cluster 1: p= 0.002 & a large effect size (6.19)
					    o Cluster 2: p= 0.002 & a large effect size (4.23)
					
					 • A significant decrease in participants' concern levels over the next two years of consultations were also significant (p <0.001) with a large effect size (2.94).
					 • An average increase in teacher self-confidence post intervention, but this was not significant (p= 0.060). However, the effect size was large (0.82).
					 • A statistically significant increase in teacher self-efficacy from pre-post intervention (p=0.023) with a large effect size (1.04).
					 Qualitative themes:
					 • Group support
					 • Relationship building
					 • Stress reduction
					 • Confidence building
					 • Problem solving
					 • United working
					 • Training
					 • The role of the EP (facilitating the process)
						The authors recommend that EPs have a role in training teachers in nurture groups. They also state that EPs should not only train in and establish consultation groups, but that they should also facilitate their delivery.

Authors and title	Data gathering techniques	Data analysis	Participants	Study aims	Key findings (most relevant to the review question)	Implications (relevant to the review questions)
Dobia et al. (2019) *Social and emotional learning: from individual skills to class cohesion.*	• Pre and post intervention surveys • Teacher Interviews • Pupil focus groups	• Thematic analysis • Factor analysis (on pupil data only) • Content analysis (on pupil data only)	Six experimental and three waitlist control primary schools.	Investigated the outcomes and implementation of Circle Solutions in primary schools on teachers and pupils. An EP gave continuous implementation support involving solution focused consultations with teachers.	Teachers seemed to feel more confident teaching social and emotional skills (insufficient participants for statistical analysis).	The authors conclude that EPs are well placed to support teachers with lesson planning and behaviour facilitation through consultation.
Edwards (2016) Looking after the teachers: exploring the emotional labour experienced by teachers of looked after children.	Semi-structured interviews.	Thematic analysis	14 KS2 teachers of Looked after children (LAC).	Explored teachers' experiences and perceptions of supporting LAC, through the lens of Emotional Labour theory.	Themes included: • Positive relational and aspirational role constructions • Time/workload pressure • Self-perceived role facilitators • Ambivalent feelings • Emotional labour • Facilitators of emotional response • Sources of support	The authors conclude that: • EPs should work at the systems level to support teachers' emotional understanding so that they can support LAC wellbeing. • EP consultation and training could support teachers' emotional control during pupil disclosures. • EP consultation could help teachers reflect on the emotional impact of work with LAC. • EPs could use group processes e.g. Solution Circles with teachers.

Authors and title	Data gathering techniques	Data analysis	Participants	Study aims	Key findings (most relevant to the review question)	Implications (relevant to the review questions)
Ellis (2012) *The impact on teachers of supporting children exposed to domestic abuse*	• Questionnaires • Semi-structured Interviews	• Thematic analysis • Descriptive statistics • Mann-Whitney U tests	Questionnaires were sent to 26 primary schools. Eight teachers from four schools participated in the interviews.	Investigated primary teachers' perceptions and experiences of supporting children exposed to domestic abuse (DA) and the outcomes of DA training on teachers.	**Themes included:** • Emotional factors of the teachers' role • Working within the school system • The relationship with the child and the family • Teachers' uncertainty about what they need to know (about the DA)	The author recommends the following for EP practice in relation to their DA training: o Allow staff to know that they are not isolated. o Acknowledge the anxiety that occurs when supporting LAC. o Teach staff about 'projection,' 'transference' 'countertransference' and supervision to help staff to understand emotions involved in this work. • The authors also recommend that EPs should: o Highlight the importance of teacher support at a policy making level. o Help teachers to process their feelings in consultation or supervision (group or individual) in the case of a disclosure.

Authors and title	Data gathering techniques	Data analysis	Participants	Study aims	Key findings (most relevant to the review question)	Implications (relevant to the review questions)
Gillard et al. (2021) *Acceptance & commitment therapy for school leaders' well-being: an initial feasibility study*	• Pre and post intervention questionnaires • Post intervention semi-structured interviews	• Effect sizes • Thematic analysis	Seven members of Senior Leadership e.g. Headteachers	Explored the impact of EP implemented Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT) on school leadership staff.	• Large reduction in participant burnout (d=1.70). • A moderate reduction in General Health Questionairre-12 scores (measure of psychological distress) (Goldberg & Williams, 1988). Themes: • Increased awareness (of well-being) • Building resilience • Safe and supportive group	The authors conclude that: • EPs can work at the senior leadership level to have an impact on well-being that filters down to other staff members. • ACT can be used to support well-being of SLT in schools. • EPs could train school staff in ACT to help them support their colleagues.
Lawrence and Cahill (2014) *The impact of dynamic assessment: An exploration of the views of children, parents and teachers.*	Semi-structured interviews & focus groups	Thematic analysis	Nine children aged 7-14 with SEND, seven primary and secondary teachers (of the pupil participants) and eight parents.	Explored pupil, teacher and parent views of an EP's use of dynamic assessment	Teachers' perceptions of the impact of dynamic assessment on them: • Inclusive teaching practice • Emotional response • Attitude and perspective • Skills and knowledge • Reflection Teachers also reflected that dynamic assessment affected their attitudes and supported a more optimistic view of the presenting problem.	Dynamic assessment is concluded by the authors to be an activity of value in educational psychology practice.

Authors and title	Data gathering techniques	Data analysis	Participants	Study aims	Key findings (most relevant to the review question)	Implications (relevant to the review questions)
Rae et al. (2017) *Supporting teachers' well-being in the context of schools for children with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties*	Semi-structured interviews	Content analysis	Eight teachers from two SEBD schools	Explored the perceptions of teachers in SEBD schools held about supervision and to explore the role of the EP in facilitating supervision.	**Themes:** - Stressful aspects of working in SEBD provision - Positive aspects of working in SEBD provision - Existing support provisions - Understanding of supervision as a process - Staff development of emotional literacy skills - The role of the EP in the supervision process i.e. teachers did not generally view that promoting their well-being through supervision was in the EP role.	The authors conclude that: - EPs need to encourage SEBD schools to use EPs to support well-being through supervision. - EPs can use mental health interventions for staff. - EPs should model emotional literacy in all their interactions with staff to promote wellbeing. - EPs should raise SLT awareness of the importance of TWB.

Authors and title	Data gathering techniques	Data analysis	Participants	Study aims	Key findings (most relevant to the review question)	Implications (relevant to the review questions)
Paterson and Grantham (2016) *How to make teachers happy: An exploration of teacher wellbeing in the primary school context*	• Well-being Questionnaire (Phase 1) • Focus groups (Phase 2)	• Thematic analysis • Descriptive statistics	34 primary teachers completed Phase 1 and five of these teachers from the school with the highest well-being scores from Phase 1 completed Phase 2.	Adopted a strengths-focused approach to investigate TWB.	**Key themes in relation to what TWB meant to staff:** • Affiliation • Agency • Autonomy • Healthy and safe **An exploration into what supports TWB:** • Relationships and positive communication • Collectivist culture • Work life balance • Media • Being trusted by society	The authors recommend from the findings that EPs should: • Promote TWB in order that they can support pupil well-being and academic attainment. • Not just focus on supporting children with additional needs but also the teachers. • Work at a policy level to ensure that TWB is prioritised. • Use their understanding of psychology and interventions to encourage and model emotional literacy in their relationships with schools.

Authors and title	Data gathering techniques	Data analysis	Participants	Study aims	Key findings (most relevant to the review question)	Implications (relevant to the review questions)
Salter-Jones (2012) *Promoting the emotional well-being of teaching staff in secondary schools*	• Focus groups • Interview	Grounded theory	Year 7 & 9 pupils, teaching staff, EPs and a Behaviour consultant	To explore the processes involved in supporting whole school well-being	Concluding Grounded theory highlighted the importance of both pupil and staff wellbeing, achieved on a whole-school level through: • Clear terminology • Developing a positive school environment • Additional whole-school behaviour programmes • Welfare and training to support staff wellbeing in order that they can support their pupils' wellbeing • Time/capacity for wellbeing interventions. • EP's role: ○ Joint agreement that the EP role should involve helping teaching staff to meet pupils' needs.	The author concludes that EPs should: • Offer consultation drop ins. • Be aware of teacher accountability and its consequences for their well-being, practice and their ability to holistically understand children's situations. • Encourage and initiate supervision. • Facilitate wellbeing interventions. • Upskill staff through training. • Develop wellbeing evaluation processes. • Promote Positive Psychology approaches. • Use solution-focused approaches e.g. Solution Circles. • Support whole-school systemic work e.g. training for wellbeing.

Authors and title	Data gathering techniques	Data analysis	Participants	Study aims	Key findings (most relevant to the review question)	Implications (relevant to the review questions)
Sharrocks (2014) *School staff perceptions of well-being and experience of an intervention to promote well-being*	• Post intervention questionnaires • Pre, during and post-intervention focus groups	Thematic analysis	Teaching staff, learning mentors, lunchtime supervisors, Community Development Centre staff, admin staff and student teachers (12-16 participants in each intervention session). Three focus groups with three teachers and one TA. Questionnaires had between 29-39% response rate from attendees. .	Investigated the outcomes of a staff well-being intervention co-facilitated by an EP called 'Chill and Chat' in a primary school. The study also sought teachers' views around their well-being.	**Staff's perceived impact of the intervention:** • Improved staff relationships • Made them feel appreciated • Gave them permission to take a break • Stigma around attendance • Temporary physical and emotional changes • Changes in actions • Wellbeing became an acceptable conversation topic • Concerns about workload of continuing the project • Staff felt better able to support pupils' emotions due to better focus on own wellbeing. • Staff more aware that they could help each-other.	The author concludes that EPs should: • Explain to SLT and Local Authority (LA) the importance of staff wellbeing. • Contribute to policy work e.g. creating resources in the LA to promote wellbeing and raising awareness for the importance of staff well-being. • Help SLT to prepare with their staff and explain what is expected of them.

Authors and title	Data gathering techniques	Data analysis	Participants	Study aims	Key findings (most relevant to the review question)	Implications (relevant to the review questions)
Turner and Gulliford (2020) *Examining the Circles of Adults process for Children Looked After: the role of self-efficacy and empathy in staff behaviour change.*	• Post-intervention focus groups • Post-intervention questionnaire measures (with a Treatment as Usual control group)	• Thematic analysis • ANOVA • Wilcoxon Signed rank	School staff in mainstream secondary schools supporting Children Looked after (e.g. SENCos and some teaching members of staff). Data was collected from 10 participants in experimental group and five in the control groups. Four focus groups were held with at least three experimental group participants in each.	Explored the impact of CoA intervention on staff attributions, self-efficacy and implementation of actions.	**Quantitative data:** • No statistically significant difference in teacher self-efficacy. **Themes identified:** • The process • Communication of information • Factors impacting upon the success • Change • Working in groups • Overall experience Staff perceived higher self-efficacy and success in executing actions.	The authors conclude that: • The study highlights the role of supervision in promoting self-efficacy. • The study emphasises the group supervision role of the CoA; acknowledging that the approach primarily supports staff well-being and confidence.

Authors and title	Data gathering techniques	Data analysis	Participants	Study aims	Key findings (most relevant to the review question)	Implications (relevant to the review questions)
Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020) *A grounded theory of educational psychologists' mental health casework in schools: connection, direction and reconstruction through consultation.*	Semi-structured interviews	Grounded theory	Five EPs	Explored the contribution of EPs in mental health casework.	Grounded theory presents the consultation skills that EPs use in the containment of adults' difficult emotions. Four categories were constructed: • Responding to the adults' difficult emotions • Joining theory with evidence • Sharing hypotheses and challenging perceptions • Planning	The authors summarise that EPs provide a secure base and containment for staff/adult emotions and support them to problem solve within SEMH casework. Implications are identified throughout the Grounded theory category analysis.

2.7.2 Quality appraisal

The author used Gough (2007)'s Weight of Evidence (WoE) tool to assess the quality of the included studies. It is important to recognize that there is a degree of subjectivity involved in the process of quality appraisal (Greenhalgh & Brown, 2017). Consequently, the researcher shall now clearly map out the quality appraisal approach used.

Weight of evidence A (WoE A) ratings provide a generic rating for the study quality (Gough, 2007). WoE A ratings for qualitative studies were calculated using the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme Checklist for qualitative research (CASP) (CASP, 2018).

WoE A ratings for mixed methods studies were calculated using both the CASP (2018) and a quantitative quality assessment tool from Woods et al. (2011) based on the American Psychological Association (2006). Like Woods et al. (2011), where there were differences in the qualitative and quantitative WoE A ratings for mixed methods studies, the higher rating was allocated. Percentages were calculated to ensure a fair rating process (Law, 2018). See Appendix C for a completed example of the CASP (2018). See Appendix D for a completed example of the quantitative quality assessment tool. For a summary of WoE A ratings for all papers see Appendix E.

Weight of Evidence B (WoE B) ratings were also calculated to assess the purposivity of the methods (Gough, 2007). Ratings were given to studies based on 1) a clear participant sample; 2) a clear study outcome; 3) involvement of teachers/EPs; 4) measurement of/exploration of teacher perceptions of well-being or a well-being construct following an intervention or strategy provided by an EP/TEP. Please note that criteria 1 & 2 were from Morris and Atkinson (2018) Studies were given a score of 1 for the presence of each of these criteria. See Appendix F for a summary of WoE B ratings for all papers.

Weight of Evidence C (WoE C) ratings were allocated based on studies' relevance for the present SLR's questions (Gough, 2007). Ratings were given to studies depending on whether they 1) involved an evaluation of a strategy/intervention carried out by an EP to support a TWB construct; 2) explored participants'

perceptions of EPs' role in supporting teacher well-being/well-being related construct; 3) referred to at least one of the core functions of the EP role like Morris and Atkinson (2018) and 4) discussed implications of their findings with reference to the potential role of EPs in supporting TWB. Studies were given a score of 1 for the presence of each of these. See Appendix G for WoE C ratings for all papers.

A combined WoE D rating was provided for studies based on their WoE A, B and C rating (Gough, 2007). See Table 2.4 for all WoE D ratings. Medium papers were included within the final SLR as they were felt to contain findings/implications which provided unique and salient insight into the role of EPs in supporting TWB that may benefit from further exploration and consideration.

Table 2.4

Summary of included SLR study WoE ratings (Gough, 2007)

Reference	WOE A	WOE B	WOE C	Overall WOE D
Armstrong and Hallett (2012)	High	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Bond et al. (2017)	High	High	High	**High**
Cane and Oland (2015)	High	High	High	**High**
Cooper and Woods (2017)	High	High	High	**High**
Costelloe et al. (2020)	High	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Davison and Duffy (2017)	High	High	High	**High**
Dobia et al. (2019)	Medium	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Edwards (2016)	High	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Ellis (2012)	Medium	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Gillard et al. (2021)	High	High	High	**High**
Lawrence and Cahill (2014)	High	Medium	High	**High**
Paterson and Grantham (2016)	High	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Rae et al. (2017)	High	Medium	High	**High**
Salter-Jones (2012)	High	Medium	High	**High**
Sharrocks (2014)	High	High	High	**High**
Turner and Gulliford (2020)	High	High	High	**High**
Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020)	High	Medium	High	**High**

2.8 Narrative synthesis

The author conducted a narrative synthesis to integrate both the qualitative and quantitative research studies in parallel (Noyes & Lewin, 2011).

2.8.1 Preliminary synthesis

The preliminary synthesis involved a tabulation of the study characteristics and findings to provide an initial description of studies and to develop an understanding of the key themes across the included studies (Popay et al., 2006). See Table 2.3 for a tabulation of key information extracted from studies, which are explored in further detail below.

In summary, methods used included interviews (Number of studies (n)=10), focus groups (n=eight), analysis of written papers (n=one) and questionnaire/survey data (n=seven). Methods of data analysis also varied, with thematic analysis being the most common across studies (n=12). Additional analysis tools involved phenomenography (n=one), content analysis (n=three), pre/post inferential statistics (n=four), Grounded theory (n=two) and factor analysis (n=one). All studies were awarded a WoE D score that was either medium quality (n=six) or high quality (n=10). As such, all studies were included in the final synthesis.

The next stage of the preliminary synthesis was to identify patterns across the studies to develop sub-groups amongst the included studies (Popay et al., 2006). This was necessary due to the wealth of studies identified with the adopted search strategy (Popay et al., 2006). The 17 studies included can be grouped into the following sub-categories as shown in Table 2.5.

Table 2.5

Summary of included SLR study categories

Category 1 *Studies which measured/explored teacher perceptions of well-being/a well-being related construct following an intervention or strategy implemented by an EP*	**Category 2** *Studies which captured EP/teacher views of the role of EPs in supporting teacher well-being/well-being related construct*	**Category 3** *Studies which captured teachers' views of the impact of their role on aspects of their well-being/a well-being related construct, with subsequent implications for the role of the EP in this area*
Bond et al. (2017)	Rae et al. (2017)	Armstrong and Hallett (2012)
Cane and Oland (2015)	Salter-Jones (2012)	Costelloe et al. (2020)
Cooper and Woods (2017)	Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020)	Edwards (2016)
Davison and Duffy (2017)		Ellis (2012)
Dobia et al. (2019)		Paterson and Grantham (2016)
Lawrence and Cahill (2014)		Rae et al. (2017)
Sharrocks (2014)		Salter-Jones (2012)
		Sharrocks (2014)
Turner and Gulliford (2020)		
Gillard et al. (2021)		

Research papers within Categories 1 & 2 are relevant for Review Question 1 and Categories 1, 2 & 3 are relevant in answering Review Question 2. In line with Popay et al. (2006), as a final part of this preliminary synthesis, the author now looks to identify key themes across the identified studied in relation to Review Questions 1& 2.

2.8.2 Review Question 1 synthesis
What strategies do EPs use to support teacher wellbeing? What is the impact of these strategies on teacher well-being outcomes?

Like Lewis (2017), this review has identified that EPs' role in supporting aspects of TWB is embedded across strategies that form their core role functions, and particularly within consultation, intervention, training and, to some extent, assessment (SEED, 2002). Each of these role functions shall now be discussed as a theme to answer Review Question 1.

Theme 1: Training

Three studies (Bond et al., 2017; Cane & Oland, 2015; Dobia et al., 2019) identified an impact of EP facilitated training on TWB constructs, the details of which are outlined in the following section.

Bond et al. (2017) investigated EP-led training for Specialist Teachers and TAs in mainstream primary and secondary schools who were developing to include an enhanced resource for pupils with ASD/SLI. The six-day training incorporated activities to enhance staff's understanding of pupils with ASD/SLI and to provide information about evidence-based interventions in this area.

Quantitative data from pre/post training questionnaires completed by staff identified that this enhanced training positively impacted aspects of TWB such as their confidence and self-efficacy (Bond et al., 2017). For example, staff in the study reported significantly higher levels of self-efficacy following training with a large effect size. Although this effect size was larger for TAs than teachers, this increase for teachers is of importance since teachers' self-efficacy beliefs are thought to be an aspect of their professional well-being as defined by van Horn et al., (2004).

Cane and Oland (2015) investigated, through focus groups, school staff's perceived impact of an EP lead TaMHS project. They focused particularly on training

delivered to staff including "Friends for Life" training (Barrett, 2004 as cited in Cane & Oland, 2015) and additional voluntary training in additional areas of mental health. The training audience was school staff, including SENCOs, learning mentors, TAs and class teachers.

Cane and Oland (2015) report that school staff perceived that the project positively influenced their own well-being due to the tools it gave them to translate into their own personal lives. Additionally, staff commented that the training supported their perceptions of their own competence and their confidence in supporting and discussing mental health. However, there is also evidence from the study to suggest some potential detrimental staff wellbeing consequences of the project. For example, the researchers report that some staff struggled to manage the project due to time constraints and workload.

Dobia et al., (2019) investigated the impact of EP facilitated training in Circle Solutions, a social and emotional learning program, on school staff and pupils. The EP's role was to provide the opportunity for staff and to offer teachers ongoing solution-focused consultation to support implementation.

Dobia et al., (2019) identified that this training seemed to positively influence teachers' confidence in supporting social and emotional learning in schools. The results of this study should be interpreted with caution since the quantitative data which indicated this increase in confidence did not receive enough participants to enable any statistical analysis. Nevertheless, the study tentatively indicates that this EP facilitated training impacted aspects of teacher's confidence in their own competence, which is an aspect of their professional well-being as defined by van Horn et al., (2004).

Theme 2: Consultation

A total of three studies (Davison & Duffy, 2017; Turner & Gulliford, 2020; Zafeiriou & Gulliford, 2020) investigated the role of educational psychology consultation on TWB constructs. For example, Davison and Duffy (2017) researched the impact of group process consultation on teachers and TAs working in nurture groups, designed to support their problem-solving for specific pupils referred to each group consultation. The group process used by them adhered to the guidance of

Farouk (2004). An EP chaired and facilitated the consultation sessions, which were delivered once a month over six months to two clusters of teachers and TAs.

The group consultation investigated by Davison and Duffy (2017) appeared to positively influence aspects of TWB. For example, qualitative analysis within the study suggests that the consultation groups had an influence on aspects of teachers' emotional well-being such as a perceived reduction in their levels of stress, with one teacher commenting that the group consultation process offered an opportunity to offload the emotional aspects of working in nurture groups.

Davison and Duffy (2017) also identified improvements in aspects of teachers' professional well-being as defined by van Horn et al., (2004). For example, statistical analysis revealed an average increase in teacher self-confidence following the consultation intervention. Though this increase in self-confidence was not statistically significant, Davison and Duffy (2017) identified a large effect size. They also identified a statistically significant increase in the average teacher self-efficacy scores from pre to post consultation. Teachers also discussed that the group consultation enhanced their confidence by enabling them to draw upon the experience of other group members and to seek support and assurance when they felt overwhelmed.

Turner and Gulliford (2020) investigated the impact of a CoA intervention on secondary school staff, who had an educational role (e.g. SENCos), and supported Children Looked After (CLA) who had been identified as being at risk of exclusion. The study utilized a pre-test post-test quasi-experimental design as well as a qualitative exploration to investigate participant views of the process further.

Turner and Gulliford (2020) identified that there was no statistically significant difference between the control group and experimental groups' self-efficacy levels at any time point. However, the researchers argued that qualitative data indicated a more positive change in staff's self-efficacy following the intervention. For example, one staff-member reported that the CoA led to them feeling "quite enthusiastic and…all sort of geared up to go." (Turner & Gulliford, 2020, p. 42).

Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020) utilized Grounded theory to investigate the nature of EPs' involvement in mental health casework; the data was gathered through semi-structured interviews with EPs. One of the categories identified in the Grounded

theory represented how, through consultation, EPs are "responding to adults' difficult emotions" (Zafeiriou & Gulliford, 2020, p.7). The researchers indicate that EPs use consultation and discussions within SEMH casework to fulfil the unmet emotional needs of adults supporting children through a series of processes such as offering containment. In doing so, Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020) suggest that consultation provides a vehicle through which EPs can support the emotional needs of staff who they purport often enter mental health casework feeling helpless and emotionally exhausted.

Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020) also described how their sample of EPs seem to support aspects of adults' self-efficacy within SEMH casework (through joint decision making and upskilling) and autonomy (through promoting collaboration), both of which are aspects of professional well-being as defined by van Horn et al., (2004).

Theme 3: Intervention

Four studies (Cooper & Woods, 2017; Gillard et al., 2021; Rae et al., 2017; Sharrocks, 2014) investigated the impact of an EP facilitated intervention on TWB. For example, Gillard et al. (2021) investigated the impact of an Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT) intervention on school leaders' well-being (e.g. Head Teachers). The intervention involved four weekly group ACT sessions lasting approximately two and a half hours each, provided by two EPs. The ACT aimed to support school leaders' well-being through enhancing their psychological flexibility to support them in being able to respond better to any uncomfortable thoughts or feelings (Gillard et al., 2021). Namely, it sought to provide them with six skills within the ACT Hexaflex such as acceptance (being open to the wide spectrum of human emotions and experiences) and defusion (being able to distance oneself from their thoughts) (Gillard et al., 2021).

Gillard et al., (2021) found that staff improved on outcomes related to psychological distress and burnout. Though the sample size was not sufficient for significance calculations, effect sizes demonstrated the efficacy of the intervention in these areas. Thematic analysis also indicated that the intervention was perceived to support participants' resilience and increased their awareness of their own and others' wellbeing. As well as this, school leaders perceived that the intervention provided

them with a safe and supportive group, thereby giving them a space and permission to reflect on issues related to their psychological well-being.

Sharrocks (2014) investigated the impact of an intervention on staff's well-being in a primary school, co-facilitated by an EP and two other members of school staff. The intervention, named "Chill & Chat" was delivered over an eight-week period through lunchbreaks to a range of members of staff, including teachers. Activities offered included relaxation hand massages, a socializing space, and an opportunity to have a respite area, away from work tasks.

Sharrocks (2014) found, through focus groups, that staff perceived that the intervention enabled them to discuss well-being more openly with one another. They additionally felt that the intervention not only communicated to them that they were valued within the school, but that it also gave them permission to actively take care of their well-being within the school environment. Further, staff commented that they noticed physical/affective changes in themselves (e.g. feeling more relaxed and aware of their well-being) amongst a commitment to changing their behaviors (e.g. taking breaks at work). However, staff also discussed some negative feelings about the intervention in relation to being viewed as someone who needed to attend the well-being intervention by individuals who had chosen not to participate; staff also expressed some worry about the impact of their attendance of the intervention on their workload.

Cooper and Woods (2017) investigated the impact of an EP's deployment of a strengths-focused intervention with headteachers. Specifically, headteachers completed the Realise 2 Introductory profile (Centre for Applied Positive Psychology, 2015, as cited in Cooper & Woods, 2017), which specifies 60 of an individual's strengths based on self-report questions. Within this study, an EP then conducted a debrief with headteachers to open a reflective discussion about their strengths profile in relation to their professional life.

Likert scale data in the Cooper and Woods (2017) study indicated that headteachers perceived that the intervention supported their well-being and a median rating of 4 was given by head teachers to this (where 5=high). Headteachers in the study also perceived that the intervention supported both physical and emotional aspects of their well-being, such as improving their state of calmness and developing their

resilience. Further, some headteachers also perceived that the intervention effects cascaded down to other members of staff, supporting an organizational shift to focus further on wider staff well-being.

Rae et al. (2017) explored the views of teachers working in schools for children with SEBD. One of the aims of this research was to explore, through semi-structured interviews, their views of the role of EPs in facilitating supervision as an intervention to promote TWB. The study identified that teachers did not perceive that EPs had a role in providing intervention for their well-being through supervision and felt that the role of EPs was constrained to working as assessors of pupils' needs.

Theme 4: Assessment

The study by Lawrence and Cahill (2014) tentatively indicates the role of EPs' assessment processes indirectly supporting constructs related to TWB. Though only one study identified this, it is discussed here since it provides a meaningful and salient perspective on the range of approaches that EPs have used which have had positive implications for TWB.

Lawrence and Cahill (2014) explored teachers', children's and parents' views following dynamic assessment provided by an EP through focus groups and interviews. After conducting dynamic assessment with pupils, the EP sent reports for children and discussed these consultatively with teachers and parents. Part of this study involved focus groups and semi-structured interviews with teachers.

Lawrence and Cahill (2014) found that dynamic assessment influenced teachers' perceived emotions and their perspective of the problem, as well as their perception of their own skills. This tentatively indicates that the EP's use of dynamic assessment influenced emotional aspects of TWB as well as teachers' perceptions of their own competence, which is another important aspect of their professional well-being as defined by van Horn et al., (2004). However, the study did not provide an examination of the exact impact on these outcomes, meaning that the strength of the evidence is questionable.

2.8.3. Review Question 2 synthesis
What are the implications of previous research for the future role of the EP in
supporting teacher well-being?

The second aim of this SLR was to disseminate implications that previous research studies have identified for the future role that EPs could have in supporting TWB based on their empirical findings. The author identified several themes within these implications which are presented in the following section:

Theme 1: A role for EPs in supporting teachers' unmet emotional well-being needs:

The emotional impact of teachers' work is empirically identified in several of the included studies (Armstrong & Hallett, 2012; Costelloe et al., 2020; Edwards, 2016; Ellis, 2012; Rae et al., 2017; Salter-Jones, 2012; Sharrocks, 2014; Zafeiriou & Gulliford, 2020). Specifically, some studies identified the emotional consequences for teaching-staff when they are involved in supporting particular groups of children e.g. those with Social Emotional and Mental health (SEMH) needs (Armstrong & Hallett, 2012; Rae et al., 2017; Zafeiriou & Gulliford, 2020). The emotional exhaustion and compassion fatigue involved when teaching-staff support children experiencing bereavement was also identified by Costelloe et al. (2020). Additionally, the emotional consequences for teachers when supporting children exposed to domestic abuse and the secondary trauma involved in this work is also identified by Ellis (2012). Edwards (2016) also identifies aspects of emotional labor involved for teachers supporting LAC (Looked After Children).

The authors of these studies draw on these findings to indicate that there is a role for EPs in supporting the unmet emotional well-being needs of teaching-staff that can arise due to the nature of their work. Some authors (Edwards, 2016; Ellis, 2012, Rae, et al., 2017; Paterson & Grantham, 2016) point towards EPs building up the emotional toolkit of teachers in a preventative fashion. For example, Ellis (2012) argues, from her findings, that EPs can train teachers who support children exposed to domestic abuse in concepts such as transference, projection and supervision techniques to preventatively provide them with tools to unpick the emotional needs that surface within their work. Similarly, Edwards (2016) identified that many teachers reported experiencing challenging emotions during disclosures made by

LAC. Edwards (2016) therefore calls for EPs to provide training/consultation for teachers who work with LAC pupils to support their understanding of their own emotions in the case of children's disclosures. Rae et al., (2017) & Paterson and Grantham (2016) argue, from their findings, that preventatively developing the emotional resources of teachers should be an ongoing aspect of EPs' work, where they continuously model aspects of emotional literacy in their interactions with teaching-staff.

Studies also conclude from their findings that EPs' support for teachers' emotional well-being needs might also need to be reactive and provided as an intervention as and when required (Costelloe et al., 2020; Edwards, 2016). For example, Costelloe et al. (2020) argue that the emotional consequences involved when teaching-staff support bereaved children warrants further provision of supervisory processes from EPs. Edwards (2016) also identifies that EP consultation should be provided for teachers to enable them the space to process the impact of pupils' needs on their own emotional responses and the need for EPs to harness teachers' peer support within this through the provision of group consultation processes.

Theme 2: Supporting aspects of teachers' professional well-being (as defined by van Horn et al., 2004).

Nine studies (Armstrong & Hallett, 2012; Bond et al., 2017; Davison & Duffy, 2017; Dobia et al., 2019; Ellis, 2012; Edwards, 2016; Salter-Jones, 2012; Turner & Gulliford, 2020; Zafeiriou & Gulliford, 2020) also focus on aspects of teachers' professional well-being within their implications for practice e.g. their competence, self-efficacy and autonomy. Studies purport that teachers require training to build their capacity for working with children presenting with challenging behavior in nurture groups (Davison & Duffy, 2017), to support the emotional needs of LAC (Edwards, 2016) to support pupils who have experienced domestic abuse (Ellis, 2012) and to support pupils with ASD (Bond et al., 2017). Alternatively, Turner and Gulliford (2020) suggest, based on their findings, that group supervision processes, such as that provided within the CoA approach can also be used as a method to build staff self-efficacy.

Theme 3: A role for EPs in acknowledging the impact of teacher well-being needs in their routine work in schools

Some studies indicate a role for EPs being consistently mindful of TWB when working with them within their routine work (Ellis, 2012; Salter-Jones, 2012; Zafeiriou & Gulliford, 2020). For example, after investigating the psychosocial processes underlying secondary school teacher's wellbeing, Salter-Jones (2012) argues that EPs should consistently hold in mind the impact of teachers' work on their well-being and the consequences that this might have on their practice and their ability to holistically conceptualize children's needs. Similarly, Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020) argue from the findings of their study that EPs' involvement in mental health casework largely involves them providing a caring role to staff supporting the child to enable the staff to engage in problem-solving around the particular piece of casework. Additionally, Ellis (2012) argues that EPs need to acknowledge the anxiety that might be present when teachers support children exposed to domestic abuse and openly acknowledge this in their routine domestic abuse training. These studies by Salter-Jones (2012), Ellis (2012) & Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020) highlight the importance of EPs being consistently mindful of the nature of teachers' well-being and explicitly displaying empathy for the pressures that teachers face within their routine work in schools.

Theme 4: Positioning involvement at the level of the organization

Several studies argue, based on their findings, that EPs are well positioned to be advocates for TWB at an organisational level (Costelloe et al., 2020, Edwards, 2016; Ellis, 2012; Gillard et al., 2021; Rae et al., 2017; Salter-Jones, 2012; Sharrocks, 2014). Some studies discuss the potential role for EPs in working with members of SLT in schools to support wider TWB (Gillard et al., 2021; Rae et al., 2017; Sharrocks, 2014). Indeed, Rae et al. (2017) identified that some teachers in their study felt under-supported by their SLT and subsequently argued that EPs' role here might be to raise SLTs' awareness of the importance of TWB for their professional practice. Similarly, Sharrocks (2014) identified in her study that school staff felt that the topic of well-being was felt to be a taboo and that the culture in school often prevented staff from taking measures to protect their well-being. As such, Sharrocks (2014) argues that there is a role for EPs in disseminating research to both SLTs in

schools and to Local Authorities in relation to the importance of staff well-being for pupils. Sharrocks (2014) also found that staff in her study experienced a fear of failing within their role. Sharrocks (2014) therefore argued that EPs should be advocates for teaching-staff's well-being by working with SLTs to work more collaboratively to clarify expectations of teachers' roles with them. Finally, Gillard et al. (2021) argue that it would be more efficient for EPs to position well-being interventions such as ACT at the level of SLT for the effects of this to filter down to other members of staff. This is because they identified that their participants perceived that they became more mindful of the well-being of their colleagues following the ACT intervention.

Further, some studies purport that EPs should have a role in advocating for the importance of TWB at a policy-making level (Costelloe et al., 2020; Ellis, 2012; Paterson & Grantham, 2016; Sharrocks, 2014). For example, Ellis (2012) identified some of the difficult negative emotions involved when teachers support children exposed to domestic abuse, and she argued that EPs should apply their research expertise and their understanding of psychology at a policy-making level to highlight the emotional support that teachers need.

Theme 5: The application of psychological paradigms to support TWB

Several studies indicate, based on their empirical findings, that EPs should use particular psychological paradigms to support aspects of TWB. For example, Salter-Jones (2012) recommends that EPs offer approaches grounded in Positive Psychology as well as solution-focused approaches such as Solution Circles (see Brown & Henderson, 2012) to move staff away from negative patterns of thinking and to develop their resilience. Similarly, Costelloe et al. (2020) and Edwards (2016) advocate for EPs' use of Solution Circles with staff to harness peer support.

Several studies also indicate their support for EPs' use of psychodynamic theories to support aspects of TWB on the basis of their findings (Ellis, 2012; Costelloe et al., 2020; Zafeiriou & Gulliford, 2020). The notion of teaching-staff containment (Bion, 1970, as cited in Billington, 2006) is recommended by Costelloe et al. (2020) in the form of EP facilitated group supervision and consultation. Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020) also argue from their findings that EPs' role in mental health casework involves them providing a secure base and containment for the difficult emotions

that adults bring to their involvement. Interestingly, Ellis (2012) argues that EPs should support teachers' emotional needs by teaching them about psychodynamic concepts such as projection and transference.

Gillard et al., (2021) indicate from their findings that EPs should draw upon aspects of Cognitive behavioural psychology, using ACT to train school-based mental health leaders in order that they can support their colleagues with their psychological well-being.

2.8.4 Discussion of narrative synthesis
The authour used SLR methodology with a narrative synthesis to 1)identify strategies used by EPs to support TWB and to investigate the impact of these strategies; 2) to disseminate the reccomendations that empirical investigations make for the future role of EPs in supporting TWB on the basis of their findings.

Review Question 1: What strategies do EPs use to support TWB? What is the impact of these strategies on TWB outcomes?

The findings of this review suggest that EPs are well positioned to apply their knowledge of psychological theory to embed TWB support within all aspects of their role.

Included studies suggest that EP facilitated training seems to have a particular influence on what van Horn et al., (2004) would refer to as teachers' professional well-being, such as their feelings of self-efficacy and competence (Bond et al., 2017; Cane & Oland, 2015; Dobia et al., 2019).

Included studies also indicate that EPs' use of consultation methods such as CoA (Turner & Gulliford, 2020) and group process consultation (Davison & Duffy, 2017) also support aspects of teachers' professional well-being as well as aspects of their emotional well-being (Davison & Duffy, 2017; Zafeiriou & Gulliford, 2020).

There is also some evidence that specific well-being interventions might be able to support aspects of teachers' emotional well-being (Cooper & Woods, 2017; Gillard et al., 2021; Sharrocks, 2014).

Lawrence and Cahill (2014)'s study also suggests EPs' use of dynamic assessment might also have a positive impact on aspects of both teachers' perceived professional

and emotional well-being, despite the intended recipient of the assessment being the pupil.

Review Question 2: What are the implications of previous research for the future role of the EP in supporting TWB?

A prominent theme in the studies is their recommendations for EPs to have a core role in supporting the unmet emotional well-being needs that might surface due to the nature of teachers' work in a preventative manner (Edwards, 2016; Ellis, 2012; Paterson & Grantham, 2016; Rae et al., 2017) and through responsive interventions such as supervision (Costelloe et al., 2020).

Several studies also indicate that EPs should support aspects of teachers' professional well-being through training (Bond et al., 2017; Davison & Duffy, 2017; Edwards, 2016; Ellis, 2012) and through supervision (Turner & Gulliford, 2020).

Many studies advocate for the role of psychological paradigms within EPs' support for aspects of TWB such as Cognitive behavioral approaches (Gillard et al., 2021), Solution-focused/Positive Psychology approaches (Costelloe et al., 2020; Edwards, 2016; Salter-Jones, 2012) and psychodynamic approaches (Ellis, 2012; Costelloe, et al., 2020; Zafeiriou & Gulliford, 2020).

Some studies also indicate that EPs have a role in advocating for TWB at an organizational level through working with members of school SLTs (Gillard et al., 2021; Rae et al., 2017; Sharrocks, 2014) and through applying their expertise in this area to the development of education policy (Costelloe et al., 2020; Ellis, 2012; Paterson & Grantham, 2016; Sharrocks, 2014).

What is more, studies indicate that EPs' role in supporting TWB should be woven throughout their routine practice, acknowledging the possible nature of TWB and supporting where necessary within routine training (Ellis, 2012) and casework (Zafeiriou & Gulliford, 2020).

2.8.5 Limitations of the narrative synthesis
The findings of this SLR must be considered in light of some of the methodological limitations which shall be addressed in this section.

First, many of the studies used to answer Review Question 1 assessed the perceived impact of EP strategies using qualitative methods, which may reduce generalizability

of the findings to other settings (Cohen et al., 2018). Additionally, the lack of randomization in allocation to participant groups in all mixed methods investigations (Bond et al., 2017; Cooper & Woods, 2017; Davison & Duffy, 2017; Dobia et al., 2019; Ellis, 2012; Turner & Gulliford, 2020) precludes any interpretations of causality between the strategies implemented by the EP and the study outcome (Cohen et al., 2018).

Further, though this review focused on aspects of TWB, there is a dearth of evidence which focuses exclusively on the role of the EP in supporting TWB. Consequently, some of the findings of this study may be conflated at times with the role that the EP has in supporting the well-being of other members of staff who were included in studies such as TAs, particularly when a clear distinction was not made between findings for different members of staff within the included studies (e.g. Cane & Oland, 2015; Sharrocks, 2014; Turner & Gulliford, 2020; Zafeiriou & Gulliford, 2020).

2.9 The current study
2.9.1 The rationale for the current study
The initial narrative literature review suggests that teaching-staff working with children with SEND can often experience issues in relation to their wellbeing (Birchall, 2021; Brittle, 2020). Research indicates that these staff might present with such wellbeing needs within the context of educational psychology casework when the children they support are raised for educational psychology support (e.g. Evans, 2016; Sharrocks, 2014; Zafeiriou, 2017; Zafeiriou & Gulliford, 2020).

The SLR also demonstrated that EPs seem to embed TWB support within all aspects of their role and it uncovered a diverse range of current practice and potential avenues for development within this area across their five core role functions outlined by SEED (2002). What is more, the SLR uncovered that there is a potential role for EPs in explicitly acknowledging and empathising with the state of a teacher's well-being in all aspects of their routine work, such as casework as indicated by Salter-Jones (2012) and Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020).

However, there is a dearth of research which investigates the experiences of EPs in encountering TWB issues within casework, or the nature of their responses when these issues present. Similarly, there is a lack of research which has investigated

EPs' beliefs regarding their role in facilitating TWB needs that may arise within casework. This is concerning when one considers, firstly, that staff will most likely present with difficult emotions within the context of the casework due to the impact that caring for the additional needs of young people might have on aspects of their wellbeing as demonstrated by Birchall (2021), Brittle (2020), Farouk (2012), Zafeiriou (2017) and Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020). It is also of concern since TWB is an integral component of a child's school experience as indicated by Hanko (2002), Briner and Dewberry (2007), Kidger et al., (2009) and Roffey (2012). Thus, in finding a way forward for the child as part of their involvement in casework, it seems important that EPs consider TWB as a vehicle for change for the pupils at the heart of their involvement.

As discussed in the narrative review, Birchall (2021) did find that some EPs offered indirect TWB support within consultations and statutory work. However, this study did not explore how EPs experience TWB needs within casework and did not provide an in-depth exploration into their specific responses or beliefs in this area. Though Zafeiriou (2017) and Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020) captured aspects of this from the perspective of SEMH casework, the nature of the EPs' experiences, practices and perceptions in relation to supporting TWB within casework for children with SEND warrants further exploration more broadly. Additionally, studies by Birchall (2021), Zafeiriou (2017) Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020) should be interpreted with caution since the use of interview methods may bring up discrepancies between what the EPs in their studies say they do, what they do and what their general beliefs in the area are (Robson & McCartan, 2016).

2.9.2 The unique contribution of the present study

The present study seeks to uniquely explore how a sample of EPs experience issues related to TWB in the context of casework for CYP with SEND. Attention is given to the practices of EPs in relation to this, exploring specifically how, and the extent to which, these EPs respond when issues related to TWB are presented to them within the casework. Vignette methodology is also used here to explore participants' core assumptions and beliefs about the topic and as a way of exploring beyond their accounts of their own practice (Barter & Renold, 2000; Hughes, 1998).

This research seeks to extend the findings of Zafeiriou (2017) and Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020). It differs in that it seeks to explore the experiences, practices and

responses in relation to supporting TWB within casework for children with a wider range of SEND in addition to SEMH needs. Additionally, vignettes are uniquely used in this study to tap into participants' beliefs about the topic (Barter & Renold, 2000; Hughes, 1998), extending beyond their accounts of their previous casework examples as was the case in studies by Zafeiriou (2017) and Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020).

2.9.3 Research questions

To meet the aims outlined above, the author looks to address the following three research questions.

> **RQ1)** What are the experiences of educational psychologists in encountering teacher well-being needs during individual casework for CYP with SEND?
>
> **RQ2)** How do educational psychologists respond to teacher well-being needs that present in relation to individual casework for CYP with SEND?
>
> **RQ3)** What are the beliefs and attitudes of educational psychologists in relation to responding to teacher well-being needs that present during casework for CYP with SEND as represented in vignettes?

Chapter 3: Methodology and procedure

Within this chapter, the researcher firstly discusses issues related to epistemology and ontology, before outlining the impact of such decisions on the present research. Next, the researcher presents the methodological choices of the present study, addressing the rationale for and the nature of their use of vignettes & semi-structured interviews. Since the research was designed and conducted during the Covid-19 pandemic, the author subsequently discusses the methodological implications of this. Thereafter, the researcher addresses ethical considerations that were accounted for in the research, as well as issues related to the trustworthiness of the methods used.

3.1 Methodology

3.1.1 Epistemology and ontology

First, it is necessary to outline the epistemological and ontological assumptions that have driven the author's chosen methods, as advised by Guba and Lincoln (1994). Discussions of ontology relate to an individual's beliefs about the inherent features of reality (Guba & Lincoln, 1994), whilst epistemology refers to beliefs about the nature of what can be known about that reality and how it can be discovered (Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Tikly, 2015). A researcher's epistemological and ontological beliefs underpin the paradigms that they adopt within their research (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). These paradigms are summarised below in Table 3.1, using information from Braun and Clarke (2013), Guba and Lincoln (1994) & McEvoy and Richards (2006).

Table 3.1

An outline of the ontological and epistemological assumptions of positivism, post positivism and constructivism

Paradigm	Ontological assumption	Epistemological assumption	Associated methodology
Positivism	Realism or naïve realism: there is a single, truthful reality (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).	This single reality can be determined through research, and research findings will be a true reflection of reality (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).	Experimental method, often using quantitative measures (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).
Post positivism	Critical realism: there is a single, truthful reality but it can only partially be known (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).	Knowledge is influenced by humans and social interaction (Braun & Clarke, 2013) which partially reflects the 'truth' (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).	Qualitative e.g. thematic analysis and Grounded theory (Braun & Clarke, 2013), mixed methods (McEvoy & Richards, 2006) or adapted experimental methods (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).
Constructivism	Relativism: there are various constructed versions of reality (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).	Knowledge is socially constructed (McEvoy & Richards, 2006). Findings are created through interaction between researchers and participants (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).	Research involves dialogic interaction between the researcher and the participant to develop a shared construction (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

3.1.1 (i) Epistemological and ontological assumptions of the present study

This research is underpinned by critical realism, which hails from the original work of Roy Bhaskar (Archer et al., 1998) and whose ontological assumptions provide an intersection between realist and relativist beliefs (Tikly, 2015). Specifically, with regards to its ontological and epistemological position, critical realism assumes that there is one reality but that it can only ever incompletely be known (Braun & Clarke, 2013).

In his original formulation, Bhaskar argued that critical realism is based on the notion that reality can be divided into three domains: the empirical, the actual and the real (Bhaskar & Lawson, 1998). The empirical domain relates to aspects of the world that are perceived and experienced (McEvoy & Richards, 2006; Tikly, 2015). The actual domain encapsulates true reality which may exist outside of individual experience (McEvoy & Richards, 2006; Tikly, 2015). Finally, the real domain relates to the causal structures and mechanisms, not always directly experienced, that elicit the former two ontological domains (McEvoy & Richards, 2006; Tikly, 2015). As such, critical realism differs from an empiricist approach in that it aims to understand underlying mechanisms which, though not always directly observable, are still considered to exist and give way to behaviour (Tikly, 2015; Willig, 2013). Within critical realist research, qualitative data is helpful since it can help to shed light on these processes that cannot be captured by pre-determined quantitative measures (McEvoy & Richards, 2006). Additionally, critical realists assume that research findings are not a replica of reality, unlike those who take a naïve realist approach (Willig, 2013). As such, the goal of a critical realist researcher is to gain the experiences and views of participants as accurately as possible, whilst working as a "detective who uses his or her skills, knowledge and experience in order to uncover what is really going on." (Willig, 2013, p.15).

A critical realist perspective was felt to be appropriate in this research. Unlike interpretivist and positivist approaches, the critical realist stance adopted by the researcher allowed for the exploration of deeper, underlying structures and mechanisms which may promote or restrict participants' behaviour (McEvoy & Richards, 2006). Indeed, as Law (2018) argues, this is important when one considers the range of mechanisms that influence educational psychology practice such as

wider organisational structures and policies as well as individual psychological mechanisms. It is accepted that the findings and views within the interviews would not be directly linked to reality as is the case within critical realist research (Willig, 2013). Yet the researcher aimed to draw upon their understanding, experience as a qualified teacher and TEP and use this as a lens through which to unpick the deeper, underlying mechanisms that give rise to participants' views and experiences in relation to the research questions (McEvoy & Richards, 2006; Willig, 2013).

3.2 Methodological choices

This research study is exploratory, and it looked to discover the experiences, perceptions and practices of a sample of EPs in relation to TWB in the context of educational psychology casework for CYP with SEND. Semi-structured interviews were used alongside vignettes with six EPs. Vignettes were created during initial focus groups with trainee/qualified EPs.

In the following section, the researcher firstly outlines their use and development of the vignettes used within semi-structured interviews as well as the development of the semi structured interviews themselves. Methodological choices in relation to the Covid-19 pandemic are also addressed, followed by a summary of ethical considerations and an evaluation of the trustworthiness of the study. Finally, the researcher provides a summary of the procedure and an overview of their choice for data analysis.

3.2.1. Vignette methodology

Vignettes are hypothetical narratives about situations which can be used in research to elicit participants' views, beliefs and attitudes (Braun & Clarke, 2013; Hughes, 1998). They often provide a "snapshot of a given situation" (Hughes, 1998, p. 383), to which participants are asked to comment or respond (Barter & Renold, 2000; Hughes, 1998). For example, some vignette studies ask participants to comment on how they would respond/how they feel the character in the vignette should respond given the scenario presented (Braun & Clarke, 2013b). Often 'should' questions can tap into an individual's moral stance on the situation presented whilst 'would' questions allow researchers to elicit participants' pragmatic beliefs in relation to the vignette (Braun & Clarke, 2013b).

Vignettes have traditionally been used in quantitative research studies, requiring participants to respond to their content with predetermined responses (Barter &

Renold, 2000). However, they are increasingly being used in qualitative research studies to tap into the processes and mechanisms underlying participants' responses to the vignettes (Barter & Renold, 2000). Vignettes have been used in various studies in the field of educational psychology to study how school staff view the link between challenging behaviour and language development (Ramsay et al., 2018), to study teacher and pupil views of home-school interventions (Miller & Black, 2001) and to study the attitudes of key stakeholders in relation to the placement of CYP in alternative provisions (Brown, 2018).

One of the benefits of vignettes is that they can be used alongside other data collection approaches (Barter & Renold, 2000). For example, vignettes can be used prior to participant interviews to orient participants to their own experiences in relation to the subject matter (Barter & Renold, 2000; Hughes, 1998) or to help them consider aspects of the vignette content in relation to their own experiences (Hughes, 1998).

Critics of vignette methodologies commonly argue that there is a stark disparity between their content and real-life situations (Hughes, 1998), such that a participant's espoused actions and beliefs may not mirror their responses in reality (Barter & Renold, 2000). However, Hughes (1998) argues that vignettes do not intend to truly reflect reality; they simply aim to aid in its interpretation. Similarly, when utilised within qualitative research, the researcher is less interested in how the participants would respond and more interested in the processes and arguments they use to reach these conclusions, their attitudes and their views, which vignette methodology allows one to tap into (Braun & Clarke, 2013b; Hughes, 1998). Equally, though there are concerns regarding the disparity between vignettes and reality (Barter & Renold, 2000; Hughes, 1998), the researcher felt that this caveat was acceptable when used as part of the present critical realism informed research study. Indeed, critical realism assumes that research findings cannot ever wholly correspond to true reality (Willig, 2013), and looks to understand the processes (e.g. belief systems) which drive responses and behaviour (McEvoy & Richards, 2006), which vignette methodology is able to elicit (Barter & Renold, 2000; Hughes, 1998). Another methodological limitation of vignette methodology centres around their susceptibility to capturing socially desirable responses from participants (Barter & Renold, 2000). Barter and Renold (2000) argue that this can be counteracted through

asking participants not only how they feel the character in the vignette 'should respond' but also by asking them how they, themselves 'would respond' in reality.

3.2.1 (i) The use of vignettes within the current research study

The researcher sought to produce two vignettes describing fictional scenarios in which a teacher presents an issue to an EP related to their own wellbeing within a piece of educational psychology casework for a child with SEND; the TWB need was intended to be linked to the piece of casework the fictional EPs in the vignettes were carrying out. These vignettes would then be used in later semi-structured interviews with other EPs to elicit their views on how they believe the fictional EPs should respond and to explore how the participating EPs would respond in such a scenario. These questions were chosen to elicit both the pragmatic and moralistic beliefs and perceptions (Braun & Clarke, 2013b) of EPs to answer Research Question 3. The author also felt that the vignettes would prime a subsequent discussion, within the semi-structured interview, centred around participating EPs' own experiences of and responses to TWB within casework to address Research Questions 1 and 2 (Hughes, 1998).

Braun and Clarke (2013b) argue that authenticity is of central importance in the creation of vignettes. Consequently, like Brown (2018), the researcher used focus groups with EPs/TEPs to produce two written vignettes that were as reflective as possible of the experiences of EPs in responding to and encountering TWB needs within their individual casework. This was thought to be suitable as Hughes (1998) argues that vignettes can be developed through discussions with other professionals. Krueger and Casey (2001) also argue that focus groups provide a platform to develop research stimuli such as case studies. Since the researcher sought to create vignettes, it was deemed that focus groups would therefore be a suitable data collection technique.

Convenience sampling (Braun & Clarke, 2013) was used to identify six EPs/TEPs from a single Local Authority willing to participate in focus groups to develop vignettes. The researcher recruited by sending emails to their host Educational Psychology Service along with information sheets (See Appendix H for information sheet and Appendix I for consent forms). The researcher then emailed out the

consent forms with a further copy of the information sheet to individuals who expressed an interest in participating.

The researcher held two focus groups with three participants in each group as recommended for small scale research by Braun and Clarke (2013). Braun and Clarke (2013) argue that three participants in a single focus group enables a rich discussion to develop in a way that is easily facilitated. One of the groups consisted of three EPs and the other consisted of two EPs and one TEP. Due to social distancing measures in place, these focus groups both took place over Microsoft Teams. Individuals participating in focus groups were not included in the later semi-structured interviews like Brown (2018).

The researcher aimed to create vignettes that contained the following pieces of information:

1. The purpose of the EP's role in the hypothetical casework
2. The EP's role within the hypothetical casework
3. The needs of the hypothetical child/young person
4. The hypothetical well-being need of the teacher
5. The hypothetical link between the casework and the TWB need
6. A summary of how the EP came to feel that the teacher was presenting with the well-being need.

To create these vignettes, the researcher devised a focus group guide based on guidance from Braun and Clarke (2013) and a guide used by Brown (2018). See Appendix J for a focus group guide. In summary, the focus groups used the following structure:

Following introductions and establishing ground rules, the researcher began a discussion with participants about their experiences of TWB needs within educational psychology casework for pupils with SEND to prime them to produce the vignette (See Appendix J for questions asked and Appendix K for an excerpt of the researcher's summary of these discussions).

Following this, the researcher asked participants a range of questions to elicit the key points required within the vignette outlined in the previous section. These ideas were

scribed by the researcher using a mind-mapping process (See Appendix L for mind-maps). Next, the researcher translated ideas from the vignette into a written narrative form with the participants during the final stage of the focus groups. The final vignettes are presented in Appendix M.

It was hoped that the vignettes would represent casework involving different aspects of SEND in line with the Code of Practice i.e. Cognition & learning, Communication & Interaction, Social, Emotional & Mental Health and Physical/sensory needs (DfE, 2015). However, as demonstrated, both vignettes depict casework involving two KS1 boys presenting with SEMH needs. The vignettes also only described pupils presenting with externalising behaviours, not representing the full range of SEMH needs such as anxiety, depression and self-harm as outlined in the SEND code of practice (DfE, 2015). These vignettes therefore only represent a restricted range of SEND. It is important to acknowledge that other aspects of SEND were discussed in the initial focus group priming discussions within the vignettes e.g. pupils with speech, language and communication needs (see Appendix K). However, during the final co-construction of the vignettes, it was decided that they would describe pupils presenting with externalising behaviours. The author recognises that the co-construction of the vignettes may have been affected by issues relating to group dynamics within the focus groups, such as the presence of more hesitant contributors (Braun & Clarke, 2013; Krueger & Casey, 2001). Yet the researcher made the decision not to influence the final construction of vignettes to ensure that they felt plausible and authentic for participants (Barter & Renold, 2000).

Following each focus group, the researcher shared a copy of the debrief sheet (See Appendix N) with participants and offered a space for reflection and questions on the process.

These vignettes were later piloted within the semi-structured interview with a qualified EP and adaptations were made where required following this pilot. See Appendix P for an excerpt of reflections made following the pilot interview.

3.2.2 Semi-structured interviews
Semi-structured interviews were felt to be the most appropriate tool within this study since they are particularly relevant for research that aims to address questions related

to practice and experience (Braun & Clarke, 2013), as is the goal of Research Questions 1 and 2 in this study.

Semi-structured interviews allowed the researcher to develop a pre-determined set of questions whilst remaining flexible as to the order and presentation of these questions (Braun & Clarke, 2013). Additional prompts are used to orient interviewees towards a discussion of topics that researchers hope to cover in the interview (Robson & McCartan, 2016).

Whilst the advantages of semi-structured interviews for this study have been addressed, they are not without methodological limitations (Robson & McCartan, 2016). For instance, it is "neither possible nor desirable to attempt to minimise the interviewer's role" (Braun & Clarke, 2013, p.79) within a semi-structured interview. It is for this reason that the researcher has outlined the research and theories that have had a role in guiding this research in their literature review and has also outlined their previous experience as a qualified teacher and as a current TEP to acknowledge the influence that this may have had on interview data (Braun & Clarke, 2013). Additionally, it is important to recognise the introduction of demand characteristics (Orne, 1962) within interviews when asking participants about their own experiences and responses to TWB in casework. However, as well as asking participants about their own experiences, it is hoped that the vignettes will enable the researcher to tap into their beliefs and attitudes in relation to responding to TWB within casework. This is because vignettes provide the distance that participants require to discuss their beliefs and attitudes towards potentially sensitive areas of practice since they depersonalise the area being explored, providing a non-threatening context to explore this area of their practice (Hughes, 1998).

3.2.3 The methodological implications of the Covid-19 pandemic

The current Covid-19 pandemic has introduced various challenges for qualitative researchers due to social distancing measures in place (Santana et al., 2021). Indeed, the researcher initially questioned the extent to which qualitative research methods, so dependent on relationships, proximity and connection, could be completed in the face of such physical barriers to human interaction (Santana et al., 2021). In the present study, the researcher felt that video conferencing via Microsoft Teams would

provide a suitable alternative to in person interviews and focus groups, and there is an abundance of evidence to support this decision.

Indeed, Moises (2020) argues that such video conferencing methods are suitable alternatives for face-to-face interviews and focus groups during this time, allowing data to be collected in a "real-time, live, and face-to-face yet remote" manner (Moises, 2020, p.83). There are multiple reasons why these video conferencing methods are deemed as suitable options for qualitative researchers during this time. For example, Dodds and Hess (2020) identified, through thematic analysis, that young people participating in virtual interviews found them to be comfortable, non-invasive, accessible and engaging. There were few perceived limitations of these online interviews (Dodds & Hess, 2020). Dodds and Hess (2020) also found that many of their participants were used to using such video-conferencing tools due to their increased exposure to them during the Covid-19 pandemic, thereby alleviating some of the perceived limitations of these more distal communication approaches.

There is also support for the use of online focus groups in the academic literature. For example, Underhill and Olmsted (2003) found that there were no significant differences between the number of ideas generated in online focus groups and in person focus groups, nor any significant difference in participants' satisfaction with the focus group process. Overall, Dodds and Hess (2020) argue that the Covid-19 pandemic has fundamentally changed how people view such online communication tools, meaning that such tools will possibly become a part of normative practice.

In summary, though the Covid-19 pandemic presented some methodological dilemmas initially, the researcher felt that their use of video-conferencing software within focus groups and semi-structured interviews was empirically supported by research presented within this section.

3.2.4 Ethical considerations

The researcher gained ethical approval from the University of Nottingham (See Appendix O for ethical approval letter). The researcher drew on the Code of Human Research ethics (British Psychological Society, (BPS) 2014) to mitigate against potential ethical risks within the study. The steps taken are shown in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2

Examples of steps taken in the present study to address ethical principles in the BPS (2014) Code of Human Research ethics

Principle	Example of steps taken to address
Risk	• Participants were provided with a debrief sheet at the end of focus groups and interviews with an opportunity to ask questions. • Participants were told that they could withdraw from the research without consequence and that their data could be destroyed (within three weeks of data collection). • Participants were provided with contact details of the researcher and their university tutor should they have wished to discuss anything following the interview. • Ground rules were created at the start of the focus group process to mitigate against the risk of inter-group conflict.
Valid consent	• Participants were provided with an information sheet detailing information about the study prior to giving their consent to participate. • Participants were provided with the information sheet again at the start of interviews and focus groups to check that they were still happy to participate. • Participants were told that they could withdraw from the study at any time without consequence (data to be withdrawn within three weeks of the data collection point).

Principle	Example of steps taken to address
Confidentiality	• All transcriptions and data were presented anonymously in the thesis. Participants within focus groups and interviews were assigned with codes that could not be traced back to them. • All audio-recordings were stored in a secure manner (password protected device) and will be deleted when no longer required for research purposes. • Due to the duty to protect individuals from harm, participants were informed that confidentiality may be overridden (BPS, 2014).
Debriefing	• Participants were provided with a debrief sheet at the end of interviews and focus groups and given an opportunity to ask questions.

3.2.5 Trustworthiness of the research study

Guba (1981) presents four dimensions upon which the trustworthiness of qualitative research can be assessed. These dimensions, and the steps taken to address them in the present study are presented below in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3

Trustworthiness dimensions in qualitative research and steps taken in the present study to address them

Trustworthiness dimension	Definition	Steps taken to address in the present study
Credibility (Guba, 1981)	The extent to which the researcher has accurately depicted reality (Guba, 1981; Shenton, 2004)	• Encouraging honesty during interviews i.e. informing participants that 'there is no right answer' (Shenton, 2004). • Peer debriefing and scrutiny with supervisor and peers during thematic analysis (Shenton, 2004). • Refining the themes in the case of contrary evidence in data (Shenton, 2004). • Providing biographical information about the researcher in this paper (Shenton, 2004).
Transferability (Guba, 1981)	The extent to which the findings can be applied in other contexts (Guba, 1981; Shenton, 2004)	• Providing information about the context to allow the reader to consider the research transferability (Braun & Clarke, 2013).
Dependability (Guba, (1981)	The extent to which the study can be repeated (Guba, 1981; Shenton, 2004)	• Providing a thick description of the research study and data analysis processes (Shenton, 2004).
Confirmability (Guba, 1981)	The extent to which the findings are grounded in the data (Guba, 1981; Shenton, 2004)	• Providing a reflective commentary during the data analysis and an in-depth description of methodology (Shenton, 2004). See Appendix P for an excerpt of a reflective commentary from the research diary.

3.3 Procedure

3.3.1 Stakeholders in the present study
The stakeholders for this researcher were:

- The researcher
- The University of Nottingham
- The host Local Authority Educational Psychology Service
- The participating EPs/TEPs

The research was developed in discussion with the researcher's university tutor, their placement supervisor, and Principal Educational Psychologist from the host Educational Psychology Service. The study is of professional relevance to the researcher's host Educational Psychology Service, and so the researcher will take steps to feedback a summary of the research with the service within a team meeting or at another suitable timepoint. The researcher is in discussion about this with their placement supervisor.

3.3.2 Convenience sampling

The researcher used convenience sampling (Braun & Clarke, 2013) to identify six EPs to participate in the semi-structured interviews. Braun and Clarke (2013) argue that six participants is sufficient for a small-scale project utilising thematic analysis. The researcher recruited by sending out emails to their host Educational Psychology Service with an information sheet about the semi-structured interviews (See Appendix Q for semi-structured interview information sheets). For those who expressed an interest in participating, the researcher sent a consent form along with an additional copy of the information sheet. The researcher was able to recruit five EPs and gained consent to include data from the pilot interview to take the number of participants up to six. Data from the pilot interview was included as very few changes were made to the interview schedule following this and no changes were made to vignettes.

Participating EPs needed to meet the following inclusion criteria:

- Must be qualified EPs at the time of the research taking place
- Must regularly complete casework for CYP with SEND

- Must work with teachers during this casework through consultation or any other means.

3.3.3 Participants

The researcher recruited six EPs to participate in the semi-structured interviews. To protect the identities of participants, limited information is presented regarding demographics. All participants were fully qualified EPs and the number of years as qualified EPs in practice ranged from four to 25 years. Participants worked for a service with the following service delivery model:

- Part Local Authority commissioned (including statutory duties such as statutory assessments)
- Traded service delivery to schools and the Virtual School (offering a range of work including training for staff and individual casework for CYP).

Individual casework in the service involves a variety of tools including consultation with adults, observations and direct assessment work with CYP.

3.3.4 Semi-structured interviews

Semi-structured interviews were used to answer Research questions (RQs) 1, 2 and 3. Vignettes were used at the start of the semi-structured interviews to specifically address RQ3. Questions were also included in the semi-structured interviews to explore EPs' experiences of encountering TWB in casework (RQ1) and to explore their responses to TWB needs in casework (RQ2). See Appendix R for semi-structured interview schedule.

Due to social distancing measures in place, the researcher used semi-structured interviews conducted virtually over Microsoft Teams. Interviews lasted approximately one hour each.

The researcher presented the vignettes first by sharing their screen with participants and asking them to read through the scenarios. Next, the researcher asked EPs what well-being needs they felt the teachers in the vignettes might have been presenting with based on the information presented to them within the scenarios. This was felt to be important due to the subjective nature of the term 'well-being' (DfE, 2019b).

Thereafter, participants were asked how they felt the EP in the scenario 'should' respond to the scenarios before asking them how they 'would' respond. Following these vignette-based questions, EPs were asked about their own experiences of encountering TWB needs within casework, as well as the responses they had taken upon encountering TWB needs within casework to address RQs 1 and 2. Interviews were audio recorded on a password protected device with consent from the participants. These audio files were later transcribed verbatim by the researcher for later analysis.

Following the interviews, the researcher shared a copy of the debrief sheet with participants. See Appendix S for debrief sheet.

3.3.5 Thematic Analysis

The researcher chose to analyse their data using Reflexive Thematic Analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Braun & Clarke, 2020). Thematic analysis looks to capture and present recurring patterns (themes) across an entire data set (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Braun & Clarke, 2020).

Thematic analysis was chosen for the present research study as it is suited for investigating areas related to participants' practices, experiences and perceptions (Braun & Clarke, n.d.). Additionally, the researcher deemed it suitable since, unlike other methods such as Grounded theory and Interpretive Phenomenological analysis, it is not bound to any epistemological or ontological framework (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Grounded theory was disregarded as an analysis tool since Glaser and Holton (2004) underline the criticality of the researcher not bringing in their own preconceptions into the data analysis and collection for this analysis method. Due to their experience as a TEP and as a qualified teacher, the researcher felt that it would be difficult to remove their worldview and experience from the research process.

Thematic analysis was suited to the critical realist framework of the current research study (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Braun & Clarke, 2020). It enabled the researcher to identify and capture the experiences and beliefs of participants, whilst also acknowledging the role of society, individual belief systems and psychological differences on these phenomena (Braun & Clarke, 2006), as is the goal within critical realist research (Willig, 2013).

According to Braun and Clarke (2020), Reflexive Thematic Analysis follows the procedure provided by Braun and Clarke (2006). It is reflexive in that it acknowledges the influence of the researcher's role and subjectivity in the data analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2020).

In line with the critical realist approach to data analysis, the researcher intended to use inductive thematic analysis, which attempts to identify themes in a way which is driven by the data rather than prior theoretical frameworks and research (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Braun & Clarke, n.d.). However, the researcher acknowledges that "TA (Thematic Analysis) can never be conducted in a theoretical vacuum" (Braun & Clarke, 2020, p. 10). Consequently, the researcher recognises that it is almost impossible to conduct a purely inductive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2013).

Within the next section, the author shall outline the process they took to complete thematic analysis of the semi-structured interview data, as guided by Braun and Clarke (2006).

Thematic analysis stage 1: familiarisation with the data

All interviews were transcribed verbatim guided by a notation framework from Braun and Clarke (2013) which they adapted from Jefferson (2004). See Appendix T for an example transcript.

Next, the researcher familiarised themselves with the data to immerse themselves in the content of each interview and to gain some initial insight into patterns and meanings across the data set (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This involved listening to each audio file twice alongside repeated readings of each transcript. The researcher made notes in their research journal during this process. Comments in the research journal involved salient points of interest in each data set (Braun & Clarke, 2013). Next, the researcher extracted all transcripts into individual transcript tables with four columns (data section, data, comment and code) (See Appendix U). Here, the author began to make comments on initial ideas for codes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). At this point, the researcher systematically worked through each of the interviews and commented on any extracts that were potentially relevant for addressing any of the research questions (Braun & Clarke, 2013). The researcher gave full attention to each individual item of data in the interviews during this immersion process.

Thematic analysis Stage 2. producing initial codes

Initial codes were developed to label features of relevance to the research questions (Braun & Clarke, 2013) and applied to the transcript tables, working systematically through transcripts and comments applied in Stage 1. Codes were given a label with numbers and a letter which corresponded to each research question. Codes corresponding to RQ1 were assigned with an E label (e.g. E1, E2 etc). Codes corresponding to RQ2 were given an R label (e.g. R1, R2 etc). Codes corresponding to RQ3 were given A and B labels, where A was given to responses to Vignette 1 and B was given to responses to Vignette 2. By giving each code a label corresponding to their respective relevant research question, thematic analysis could be completed separately for each research question like Sharrocks (2012) and responses between the different vignettes could be compared if necessary.

A coding manual was developed at this stage. This involved the code, the code label as well as a reference to any section of each participant interview that contained each code (See Appendix V).

Thematic analysis Stage 3: identifying themes

After this coding process, the researcher moved to the stage of identifying themes in the data to identify salient and meaningful patters across the data set in relation to the research questions (Braun & Clarke, 2013). This was completed separately for codes in each category to carry out thematic analysis separately for each question like Sharrocks (2012). In searching for themes, the researcher sought to identify commonalities across codes (Braun & Clarke, 2013). The researcher wrote all codes onto individual post it notes and began to group those with commonalities into theme piles (Braun & Clarke, 2006) (See Appendix W for evidence of this stage). Codes that did not appear to apply to a group at this stage were placed in a miscellaneous group (Braun & Clarke, 2013).

At this point, the researcher began to identify some candidate themes. Plastic wallets were used to group post-it note codes into themes and names were written on these plastic wallets to develop some initial ideas for theme names. This stage also involved grouping individual codes in each theme into subthemes where it was deemed to support coherence amongst diversity within themes (Braun & Clarke, 2013). During this stage, the author cross referenced raw data extracts to ensure that the allocated candidate theme names were appropriate.

Thematic analysis Phase 4 & 5: reviewing, naming and defining themes

With a set of candidate themes and subthemes, the researcher could begin to review them. This involved a process of reviewing data extracts within each theme to ensure that they faithfully captured the dataset (Braun & Clarke, 2013). The researcher also highlighted extracts from the raw data that were particularly pertinent and illustrative for each theme for later use. The second phase of theme reviewing was to return to the data set to ensure that the themes were representative of the whole data set and to code data within themes that were missed in the initial coding process (Braun & Clarke, 2013). During this stage, the author also gave themes and subthemes descriptions to aid the process of reviewing (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

The author made the decision not to undertake member checking on the final data analysis. Member checking is a method used by qualitative researchers to explore the extent to which participants feel that the final analysis reflects what they intended to communicate within interviews (Willig, 2013). On reflection, the author identified that member checking was not appropriate within a critical realist framework (Willig, 2013). This is because critical realist researchers aim to use their analysis tools to identify underlying structures and mechanisms that the participants themselves may not be aware of (Willig, 2013). However, the author did seek supervision from their university tutor to review the themes and used peer supervision groups consisting of other TEPs to discuss data analysis methods and to review findings. This helped the author to review theme names, to gain an additional perspective on the data and to identify any areas within the analysis that would benefit from further clarification or description.

Chapter 4: Results

This chapter outlines findings from the thematic analysis conducted on data transcribed from the semi-structured interviews. Themes addressing each research question are presented separately and the themes and related subthemes are presented for each question in succession. The researcher shall describe each theme and subtheme in turn, presenting data from each transcript that was thought to best illustrate each of them. To aid the interpretation of the data, the reader has omitted participants' word repetition in places.

4.1 RQ1

 What are the experiences of educational psychologists in encountering teacher well-being needs during individual casework for CYP with SEND?

Five themes were identified when analysing data in relation to this research question. These themes and their related subthemes are presented below in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1

Themes and subthemes for RQ1

Theme	Subtheme
Theme 1. How the well-being need came to the EP's attention	1.1 Teacher openly communicated issues around their well-being to the EP
	1.2 Inferring teacher well-being needs in the absence of explicit communication.
	1.3 Other staff reported the well-being need
Theme 2. How the well-being need was linked to the casework	2.1 Issues related to affective well-being
	2.2 Issues around competence and self-efficacy
	2.4 Case as a precipitating factor
Theme 3. Factors outside the casework	3.1 Personal life stressors
	3.2 School system
Theme 4. Impact of the well-being need on the casework outcomes	
Theme 5. The nature of the presenting concerns in the casework	

4.1.1. Theme 1: How the well-being need came to the EP's attention

This theme captures EPs' experiences in relation to how they came to feel or perceive that a teacher was presenting with a well-being need within a piece of casework. Within this theme there are four subthemes which are outlined below.

4.1.1 (i) Teacher openly communicated issues around their well-being to the EP

Some EPs indicated that teachers openly conveyed to them indicators of poor well-being akin to low levels of overall resilience and a general sense of low mood in the casework context. For example, P3 describes a teacher's seemingly emotive communication of their state of well-being during a feedback meeting for a piece of casework for a pupil with SEMH needs. P3 describes how the teacher, *"...just burst into tears and just said 'I'm not I can't cope any more' it was really just a very emotive situation and I found it quite stressful myself."* P6 also described how a teacher would frequently indicate issues related to their well-being with them within a piece of ongoing casework, stating that, *"Yeah she'd be in tears as I was talking to her... Yeah really upset really upset you know 'I can't cope with this I can't cope with this' erm and it was just hard to know really what to do (.) to help..."*

4.1.1 (ii) Inferring teacher well-being needs in the absence of explicit communication

Alternatively, some EPs shared that teachers are not always so open about the state of their well-being within casework. Some EPs felt that this might be a result of the stigma associated with well-being needs in the profession:

> *"...you know there's that professional façade that teachers want... to er put in place you know and mask their own difficulties because they think there'll be stigma or they'll be told off... Or I'll think less of them and that they should be able to cope." (P1)*

EPs reflected how, in the absence of a teachers' admission of the state of their well-being, they use additional cues to infer a well-being need. For instance, P2 stated, *"...I think sometimes you can recognise that there's a wellbeing need in staff... but if*

they're not (.) ready to kind of open up and talk about that that can be quite tricky to
suggest almost…"

EPs gave examples of the cues they use to deduce TWB needs in the absence of this being directly communicated to them in casework. For example, P1 indicated that they use behaviour as a lens to a teacher's emotional well-being in casework, for example:

> *"… it's never a bold 'I need help I'm stressed out of my head' I've never had that 'I'm at the point of breakdown' So we just get you just get we just get to see the tip of the ice-berg you know little throw away comments from the teachers (.) you know the shrug of the shoulders you know the self-deprecating jokes but really you know there's something deeper going on below the surface and that these people are really unhappy."(P1)*

EPs also indicated that their understanding of the school system and culture have led them to infer issues related to a teachers' well-being in casework, for example:

> *"…because I know the school and I know (.) as I say the dynamics with the Head and with the SENCo and learning mentor I think I can also understand why she [the teacher] would be feeling that way." (P2)*

4.1.1 (iii) Other staff reported the well-being need

Some EPs described how a teacher's well-being need was described to them by other members of staff in the casework context. For example, P2 stated, *"Erm I think initially it was the SENCo and the learning mentor that spoke to me about it… and being concerned about that teacher's wellbeing." (P2).* This indicates that other school staff perceive that communicating a teacher's state of well-being to the EP might be important in guiding the EP's approach to the work.

4.1.2. Theme 2: How the well-being need was linked to the casework

Some EPs described how they felt the TWB need was linked to the demands of the casework or to the demands of meeting the needs of the focus pupil. Within this theme there are four subthemes which are described below.

4.1.2 (i) Issues related to affective well-being

EPs spoke of their experiences in encountering teachers whose affective well-being (i.e. emotional exhaustion, satisfaction with their job and commitment (van Horn et al., 2004), as well as the overall balance of their positive and negative emotions

appeared to be influenced by the demands of the case. For example, P2 described how catering for the needs of a young person with SEMH evoked an abundance of negative emotions such as fear, guilt, stress and anxiety in a teacher stating,

> *"I think she [the teacher] was feeling like the way ((pause)) the way she was feeling was wrong (.) and that if other people were in that situation they wouldn't be feeling as stressed or anxious you know she would say things like "I just feel like I'm walking on eggshells around him all the time" "I feel like I'm just letting him get his own way all the time cos I'm scared that he's gonna suddenly flip out erm and I won't know what to do."*

Further, some EPs described encountering teachers for whom, striving to meet the needs of the CYP at the heart of the casework, seemed to be resulting in issues indicative of a depletion in their overall emotional resources. For instance, P3 described a piece of casework for a pupil with SEMH stating that the case, "…*had a high level of social care involvement erm and it was burning everybody out."* P5 also described their experience in meeting a teacher who was *"emotionally exhausted"* in the casework context.

4.1.2 (ii) Issues around competence and self-efficacy

Some EPs indicated how the focus pupils' needs may have presented as a professional threat to teachers' perceived levels of competence within casework. For example, P2 described working with a teacher who was, *"...just feeling very deskilled erm she'd had this young person last year (.) and I think things had been fairly ok ((pause)) then they've seen this massive change in his behaviour over (.) lockdown over the summer.*" P4 also indicated how the needs of a young person questioned a more experienced teacher's view of their own competence stating, *'Erm and again they'd got that very experienced teacher 'well I've never had a child like this.'*

Some participants described teachers whose self-efficacy appeared to be threatened by the needs of a pupil within casework. For instance, P2 stated, *"I think predominantly in terms of supporting that young person the teacher thought that they were failing that young person because the level of differentiation that they were needing to do was just vast…"*

Such threats to overall self-efficacy and competence indicates that the demands of meeting these pupils' needs presented as a threat to teachers' overall professional well-being as defined by van Horn et al (2004).

4.1.2 (iii) Case as a precipitating factor

This subtheme captures EPs' experiences of encountering teachers for whom the case demands seemed to be a precipitating factor in their overall well-being amongst a backdrop of more distal, perpetuating and predisposing factors that were external to the case.

For example, P5 described how, within a piece of casework for a pupil with SEMH needs, a teacher presented as emotionally exhausted. However, they explained that they felt the case, *"felt like…the straw that broke the camel's back…I think it's a challenging job anyway."* The EP presents a description of a teacher for whom the behaviour of the pupil, in the absence of other extraneous demands might not have impacted the teacher's well-being.

4.1.3 Theme 3: Factors outside the casework

Linking onto the previous subtheme, EPs also shared their experiences of teachers bringing well-being issues to the casework process that were situated outside of the demands of the case and the young person's needs. There are two subthemes within this theme which are described below.

4.1.3. (i) Personal life stressors

EPs described their experiences of working with teachers during casework who presented with well-being needs that might be related to tensions within their own personal lives. For instance, P5 gave an example of a teacher within a piece of casework for a young person with SEMH needs who "…*did kind of touch on a personal situation"* with them during consultation.

EPs recognised that they may not always be aware of these personal life stressors or know what struggles the teacher is carrying whilst simultaneously trying to meet the young person's needs:

> *"... It might just be because they've had a particularly bad evening the evening before and their partner had said something nasty or their kids hadn't slept so you know there's always a lot of questions for us that go unanswered."* (P1)

Yet, where personal matters were conveyed to P5, there was a recognition that this may have been the key factor impacting on their well-being and overall emotional capacity within casework for a pupil with SEMH needs:

> "…It kind of came up in the example I gave where the teacher she had things going on in her personal life but I think sometimes it might not be about the job it might not be feeling the key issue I suppose might not be around competency or being confident it might be more I suppose if someone's just kind of just feeling at capacity in terms of processing their emotions about challenging situations." (P5)

4.1.3 (ii) School system

EPs had also worked with teachers in casework who brought well-being needs to them associated with pressures within the school system more broadly, such as conflicting demands and workload.

For example, P3 reflected further on some of the specific additional workload pressures which seemed to influence the well-being of a headteacher within a piece of casework for a pupil with SEMH needs:

> "there were lots of themes that emerged around her being the matriarch of the school… Feeling like she had to cater to all of the staff's needs all of the children's needs and lots of issues around boundary setting and her asserting herself…"

EPs also reflected their experiences of meeting teachers in casework whose well-being seemed to be influenced by rigid and high expectations for them to be performing at their best and in the way prescribed to them at a higher organisational level:

> "…she (the teacher) didn't agree with a punitive reward sanction system that the others were wanting to implement, and she told me this she just felt and she just didn't break down but she just felt really (.) deflated I suppose." (P3)

> "You know in one of those vignettes it was saying that the teacher was feeling judged by other members of staff I (.) I don't know this because she never actually openly said this but I could imagine that there would be pressure from the head teacher to be managing that situation [the case]…" (P2)

4.1.4. Theme 4: Impact of the well-being need on the casework outcomes

EPs often reflected their experiences of feeling that issues related to TWB needs influenced the development of the casework, particularly in relation to the EPs' ability to problem-solve around CYP and to support positive change:

> *"... I just felt like they weren't in a place to be able to even think it felt like they couldn't even well particularly the teacher couldn't even problem solve to think about the young person because she was just absolutely exhausted." (P5)*

P3 seemed to reflect that a teacher's emotional state can pose as an ongoing barrier and source of frustration for them in casework, *"And I think that is erm a very frustrating situation to come across as an EP where you (.) have tried to empathise but you're not really getting anywhere erm so I suppose that can be a barrier..."*

It seems that TWB needs can often take over aspects of the EPs' problem-solving role in casework, as demonstrated by P5 in their discussion around their consultation experience within casework stating, *"...I think sometimes it's more just an offload and people come and say a lot of stuff and then like 'ok so I need to go now.'"*

4.1.5. Theme 5: The nature of the presenting concerns in the casework

EPs described the presenting concerns around the needs of the CYP in the cases where they felt they had encountered issues linked to TWB. Five EPs described encountering TWB within casework for pupils with SEMH, for instance:

> *"...So he has got a diagnosis erm ((pause)) but yeah mainly around his behaviour and his sort of ability to cope with demands in the classroom and erm emotional regulation." (P2)*
>
> *"...A lot of aggression aggressive behaviours…" (P3)*
>
> *"...Erm yeah particularly call-lots and lots of calling out and lots and lots of me first and lots and lots of attention seeking behaviour." (P4)*

Two EPs described casework involving CYP with Communication and Interaction needs. For example, P2 shared, *"...I mean I'd say his primary area of need was I think he'd got ASD (.) I think his primary area of need was he'd got communication and interaction."*

P2 also shared that within the same piece of casework, the pupil presented with some Cognition and Learning needs, *"...it was a little boy who was who had got very significant learning needs…"*

Two EPs also described cases involving CYP with sensory needs, for example P3 shared, *"...Erm I suppose more recently in one of my schools a teacher in consultation so it was a child who had lots of sensory needs…"*

SEMH casework was the most cited example of casework in which EPs felt they had encountered TWB needs. This suggests that EPs feel that these cases may evoke more well-being needs in teachers than other areas of SEND. Indeed, when asked which areas of need they felt EPs encountered the most TWB needs, P4 stated, *"Erm I think it comes up more under the SEMH."* P4 also shared, *"I don't tend to see so much stress about the kid not learning something."*

4.2. RQ2

How do educational psychologists respond to teacher well-being needs that present in relation to individual casework for CYP with SEND?

10 themes were found when analysing data in relation to this research question. The themes and their related subthemes are presented below in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2

Themes and subthemes for RQ2

Theme	Subtheme
Theme 6. The impact of TWB on the EP's problem-solving approach	6.1 Acknowledging the need to support teachers within the casework
	6.2 Teacher well-being needs as data
Theme 7. Providing a space where well-being needs can be expressed	7.1 Providing a safe space for offloading
	7.2 Conveying curiosity about the teacher's emotional needs
Theme 8. Emotionally supportive interactive responses	8.1 Accepting and acknowledging emotions and difficulties.
	8.2 Reframing and restructuring the teacher's perspective
Theme 9. Sensitivity	9.1 Taking guidance from the teacher's needs and responses
	9.2 Avoiding exacerbating pressures on the teacher's well-being
Theme 10. Enhancing the teacher's professional well-being	10.1 Supporting confidence/self-efficacy
	10.2 Developing competence
	10.3 Respect for and development of autonomy
Theme 11. EPs' personal emotional responses	
Theme 12. Professional boundaries and duties	12.1 Ensuring positive outcomes for the client (pupil)
	12.2 Objectivity and triangulation
Theme 13. Constraints	13.1 Service delivery
	13.2 Time

Theme	Subtheme
Theme 14. Ensuring teacher well-being needs are met once the EP has ended their involvement	14.1 Helping the teacher to implement boundaries
	14.2 Providing teachers with emotional coping tools
	14.3 Mobilising in-school support
Theme 15. The use of distinctive features within the EP toolkit	15.1 Paradigms
	15.2 Named psychological process vs informal support

4.2.1. Theme 6: The impact of TWB on the EP's problem-solving approach

This theme relates to participants' views of the consequences of TWB needs in casework on their overall problem-solving strategy i.e. the purpose of their involvement and their formulation of the presenting problem. This theme is separated into two subthemes as outlined below.

4.2.1 (i) Acknowledging the need to support teachers within the casework

This subtheme captures how some EPs reframe the overall purpose of their involvement in casework where TWB needs surface. For instance, some EPs expressed that they alter the focus within such casework, taking on a dual role for both the child and supporting TWB:

"I think it I suppose it would be about what's happening for that child but I suppose it might become clear that supporting a particular member of staff in terms of their well-being is an important part I think…" (P5)

"So I guess that's where I where I focused (.) the consultation wasn't so much on the young person it's more about yeah their wellbeing." (P5).

EPs also gave specific examples of incidents where they have sought permission from the school to shift their focus towards supporting a teacher within the casework in which a TWB need has surfaced. For example, P3 describes how they offered ongoing support after a Headteacher broke down to them during a feedback meeting for a piece of casework for a pupil with SEMH needs reporting,

"…so after spending quite a long time meeting with them [the Headteacher] we agreed to do some supervision sessions with myself and the Head around some of the issues she brought up around the fact that she thought there were no boundaries

between (.) the children coming into her office the staff coming in whenever they wanted to ask the Head questions ..."

P2 also described how they tried to persuade a school to allow them to make teacher support work integral to their casework as opposed to assessment of a pupil's needs in response to encountering a TWB need stating, *"...And I said well actually I think it's gonna be much more effective if I work with that teacher than trying to do any kind of I'm not sure what I would be assessing..."*

These data extracts indicate that these EPs responded to TWB needs presenting within casework by positioning their involvement, not only towards assessment and support for a child's needs, but also as a source of support for the teacher within casework.

4.2.1 (ii) Teacher well-being needs as data

Participants indicated how they use presenting TWB needs within casework as data to inform their formulation of the presenting concerns, for example:

> *"And I tend to look at the environment most of the time so I think the teachers' wellbeing is just paramount within that formulation" (P3)*

> *"But then we then look at the kids and look at their behaviour and gauge how stressful it must be and how challenging it must be for that teacher to have that pupil behaving in that way and then we think well- and an alternative hypothesis is well- the teacher just hasn't got enough support (.)" (P1)*

4.2.2 Theme 7: Providing a space where well-being needs can be expressed

Where a TWB need was perceived by EPs within casework, some described how they responded by ensuring that they held space for teachers to openly express these within the casework context. This theme is separated into two subthemes as outlined below:

4.2.2 (i) Providing a safe space for offloading

Some EPs indicated that, upon encountering TWB needs in casework, they felt that, as P4 states *"...there was a there was a need [for the teacher] to offload."*

EPs described the steps they take to ensure that teachers feel safe to offload with them. For instance, P3 stated how they provide teachers with permission to offload to them in casework, communicating to them that, *"You can talk to me about things that you feel about the situation... because I don't think they [teachers] always know."*

When reflecting on their response in a piece of casework where a teacher presented with a well-being need, for P4, it seemed that this sense of safety was also facilitated by adopting a non-judgemental approach when hearing teachers offload as they stated, *"...cos we're not on*

the school staff cos we're not judging ((laughs)) cos we're not I think there's a load of really important things we bring to that set of ears."

Some EPs also discussed the importance of confidentiality in providing a safe space for teachers to offload about issues related to their well-being in the casework context. For example, P3 described how they state to teachers, *"You can talk to me about things that you feel about the situation this is a confidential space…" (P3)*

4.2.2 (ii) Conveying curiosity about the teacher's emotional needs

Some EPs spoke about how they openly expressed curiosity about the teachers' emotional needs upon encountering TWB needs within casework. Again, this seemed to be an action taken to provide the preconditions for teachers to feel able to express their well-being needs to them within the casework context. For instance, P3 openly sought to label and name a teacher's feelings with curiosity in a piece of casework upon encountering a TWB need:

"… I said 'does that make you feel that you need to control everything?' and she [the teacher] said yes and I said well 'how does that make you feel quite dysregulated yourself?' and she said, 'Yes because I'm always panicking about senior leaders walking in and it's really loud…'" (P3)

For P2, this curiosity was also expressed by simply asking a teacher how they were feeling after being told by other members of staff that the teacher might need support with their well-being before starting the casework:

"I kind of asked you know I asked her how she [the teacher] was feeling about the situation and she very quickly sort of opened up that she was feeling ((pause)) like she didn't know what to do and she (.) she was feeling erm ((pause)) so yeah I guess that she couldn't (.) you know couldn't manage that she didn't feel like she was effectively managing that situation [the case]."

4.2.3. Theme 8: Emotionally supportive interactive responses

In the previous section, the researcher highlighted how EPs seem to respond preventatively to set the preconditions to enable teachers to feel able to express their well-being needs in the casework context. Next, the researcher details some of the emotionally supportive interactive tools and responses used by EPs to respond to teachers' difficult thoughts and feelings upon experiencing TWB needs within casework. This theme is separated into two subthemes as outlined below.

4.2.3 (i). Accepting and acknowledging emotions and difficulties.

EPs commonly spoke about the need to demonstrate an acceptance and acknowledgement of teachers' emotional state and difficulties when they have presented with issues related to their well-being within casework.

For example, P2 spoke of how they respond to teachers' negative emotions in casework through a process of normalising, "…*I think saying you know it is a normal response to often a really tricky situation [the case] that they may never encounter again."* P4 also shared how they normalised a teacher's difficulty in feeling out of control with regards to a pupil's behaviour upon encountering issues linked to their well-being in the casework stating, *"And there's assumptions about what ought to be going on in that situation and I think part of the normalising is well actually when you think about it and kind of talking through you know there's some of it in fact a lot of it isn't in your control." (P4).*

EPs also spoke of how they convey empathy for teachers' emotions and difficulties when they present with issues related to their well-being within casework. For example, P6 spoke about conveying their empathy for the challenges presented to the teacher by the needs of the focus child within casework stating, *"...and again it was a matter of recognising that she had got an exceptional challenge in dealing with this particular child."*

4.2.3 (ii) Reframing and restructuring the teacher's perspective

EPs also discussed using reframing and restructuring techniques as an emotional support response upon encountering teachers presenting with issues related to their well-being within casework. Such techniques involved EPs aiming to alter some of the possibly distorted perceptions that the teachers may have developed of the casework, for example:

> *"...In terms of (.) trying to get things into balance again? Trying to its almost like trying to their [the teacher's] thinking had become skewed and kind of twisted...So I think part of the questioning and the talking was about trying to edge some of that back in in a way." (P4)*

> *"I think sometimes in those situations where you've got a member of staff that is quite entrenched in a situation and is feeling really really "I'm*

overwhelmed" actually kind of looking at d'you know what-what is working well?" (P2).

4.2.4. Theme 9: Sensitivity

This theme relates to actions taken by EPs which demonstrates their sensitivity towards discussing difficult information and potentially emotive subjects with teachers upon encountering TWB needs within casework.

4.2.4 (i) Taking guidance from the teacher's needs and responses

Some EPs described how they try to be sensitive in their discussion of well-being with teachers within casework, taking guidance from teachers' needs before opening such a potentially emotive discussion. For instance, P2 explained, *"...if they're not (.) ready to kind of open up and talk about that [their well-being] that can be quite tricky to suggest almost…"* Similarly, P3 discussed their sensitivity in discussions of teachers' emotional state in casework recognising this as a *"bold"* topic,

> *"...sometimes it can catch teachers off guard so I do feel sometimes I've had to tone that down a bit and sometimes really (.)...it's quite a bold question to ask but I think it has to be asked when you've established that trust in in in a with a teacher."*

4.2.4 (ii) Avoiding exacerbating pressures on teachers' well-being

This subtheme captures the responses taken by EPs to mitigate adding further pressure to a teacher's well-being because of their involvement with a case, demonstrating sensitivity towards the teachers' potential fragility and bearing this in mind in discussion of recommendations for practice within casework:

> *"But there's only so much you can donate when people are stressed because really we want them to gradually change and evolve and recognise that they need to change their practice…" (P1)*

> *"Yeah and I guess I suppose it was a tricky one because if someone's feeling overwhelmed that's just gonna make them feel worse giving them more things to do and it feels like I suppose sometimes not very respectful…"(P5)*

Further, P4 also shared how they felt they needed to refrain from being critical of a teacher's practice in the face of their presenting well-being needs within a piece of

casework stating, *"So I had to fight the instinct not to be critical"* and then shared, *"I think my instinct was to er ((pause)) to kind of dismiss her level of agitation almost to counter to almost to defend the child."*

4.2.5. Theme 10: Enhancing teachers' professional well-being

This theme captures actions taken by EPs to enhance aspects of teachers' professional well-being (as defined by van Horn et al., 2004) in the face of their presenting well-being needs namely, their self-efficacy, competence and autonomy. This theme is separated into three subthemes as outlined below:

4.2.5 (i) Supporting confidence/self-efficacy

Some EPs indicated that they respond to TWB needs in casework by aiming to provide them with reassurance, encouragement and through feeding back proof of their competence, to build the teachers' beliefs in their own ability and understanding of the case:

> *"...actually through our sort of discussions and erm (.) she [the teacher] does know where to go with it [the case] she has got the skills erm it's just I think giving her that confidence…" (P2)*

> *"... I think it's a lot about giving reassurance and yeah I guess yeah highlighting good practice and I think sometimes people can want to check things out with me and'll say 'what do you think about this?' 'I'm doing this d'you think this is working?' and so I guess its yeah perhaps the tone is trying to be encouraging and supportive and to help them to feel more confident." (P5)*

4.2.5 (ii) Developing competence

This subtheme captures responses taken by EPs to increase teachers' actual ability to successfully meet the children's needs by way of providing professional development opportunities within the casework in the face of TWB needs, for example:

> *"Yeah ah yeah but also and also there is that strategy where we try to upskill teachers you know to give them some technical advice about behaviour management…" (P1)*

"...I think that was more I think my work there ended up being more around talking about strategies and how you could differentiate…" (P2)

4.2.5 (iii) Respect for and development of autonomy

When teachers have presented with well-being needs in casework, some EPs indicated how they aimed to respect and support them to make some independent choices and decisions within the casework:

"I guess what I was doing was trying to problem solve with the staff I guess to try and empower them to think what they would do…" (P5)

"...and I like to make a pragmatic action plan and if I feel that it's got to be co-constructed (.) that's going to help support teachers' wellbeing" (P3).

4.2.6. Theme 11: EPs' personal emotional responses

A sample of EPs described some of the emotional responses that they themselves have felt during casework in which teachers have presented with well-being needs. Some EPs expressed that they had felt uncertain as to how to support the teachers who had presented with issues related to their well-being within casework:

"… I don't know I suppose it is a thing when someone shares something you feel you carry something of that burden then and it's like oh what do I do with this? Because I feel like this situation's not okay, but I wasn't really sure what I could do about it." (P5)

EPs also expressed a level of concern and anger at the teachers' situation in relation to pressures on their well-being, for example:

"D'you know I really really erm ((pause)) felt for her [the teacher] in terms of ((pause)) she's clearly a teacher who that wanted- wants to do the very very best for this young person… (.) and (.) it was (.) it was difficult to see that actually ((pause)) her the way she was feeling about herself in terms of managing that situation was having such an impact on erm ((pause)) her own views of her own kind of ability."

"Erm I think I was a bit angry that the school had put her in that situation…I thought it wasn't right that that was happening" (P5)

4.2.7. Theme 12: Professional boundaries and duties

This theme captures EPs' discussion of professional boundaries and duties that seem to influence their response to TWB needs within casework. This theme is separated into three subthemes as outlined below:

4.2.7 (i) Ensuring positive outcomes for the client (pupil)

EPs reflected the actions they take to ensure that they facilitate change for the pupil upon encountering issues related to TWB in casework. Indeed, some EPs reflected that they still challenge the teachers' practice where necessary, ensuring that the pupils' needs are being met, for example:

> "Because we're there as an advocate for the kids so we want to make sure that kid is receiving a good diet of education and that their needs are being met and if the teacher isn't doing that, I'd also walk down the corridor and tell the SENCo and headteacher." (P1)

P4 also described how they felt it was necessary to challenge a teacher's behaviour management strategies with a focus pupil, despite the teachers' presenting well-being needs:

> "...So if you like the I'm in two parts now-part is with the teacher... talking about her world and working with that-the other part is also feeling like you know er I'm gonna have to defend this kid about this [the teacher's practice]."

4.2.7 (ii) Objectivity and triangulation

EPs discussed how they took actions to remain objective and gain a credible and trustworthy perspective on the case in the face of a TWB need. Part of this involved the EPs collecting data to gain a holistic understanding of the situation. For instance, P6 described, *"also erm doing work with the child...Seeing how they're operating"* within a piece of casework in which a teacher presented with a well-being need.

The need to remain objective and triangulate data sources also meant that P4 did not change their practice in the face of a TWB need as they stated, *"Er did it change my practice? No not in that still went back to the data let's get the data let's get the data in and have a conversation from there."*

4.2.8. Theme 13: Constraints

EPs described the barriers impeding on their ability to respond to TWB within casework. This theme is separated into two subthemes as outlined below.

4.2.8 (i) Service delivery

Some EPs described that their responses to TWB in casework were constrained by their models of service delivery.

P2 spoke of how their ability to offer support for teachers is often constrained by the school's choice for the EP's time within a traded model of service delivery, stating,

> *"And I think sometimes when I've made suggestions about something you know might use a bit more time or it might be using time differently obviously that then has to kind of go through the SENCo or someone..." (P2)*

For P1 and P2, the recent lockdowns due to the Covid-19 pandemic have provided an opportunity to shift this model of service delivery somewhat. In fact, P2 discussed how the move to remote technology had offered them an opportunity to provide more ongoing work for a teacher who presented with a well-being need in casework, for example:

> *"And actually in a way it's worked (.) lockdown's worked quite well in terms of like the way we work because it's a school…. that is very like set on assigning a session per child and they want me to come in and do a visit and erm (.) I think had we been working in a typical way I'd've gone in and seen this young person, done an observation, done some work with that young person realised that actually this class teacher is really really struggling and not necessarily have had that opportunity to work with that class teacher."*

4.2.8 (ii) Time

EPs also discussed that time obstructs their ability to respond to TWB needs in casework. For instance, P1 shared that time limitations mean that EPs are unable to reliably interpret whether a teacher in distress is truly struggling with their well-being or whether this may be a one-off incident, for example:

> *"So (.) a one-off meeting with a teacher where they express how stressed they are and how they wanna quit and they might even cry that's still a one-off event and that's the downside of our work often but we just we just do a sequence of one-off events you know is that reliable about of how that teacher is feeling for the rest of the day or the rest of the week?"*

P5 also shared that time can be a limiting factor in their ability to initiate discussions about TWB needs within casework consultations stating, *"I think sometimes consultations with staff can feel quite rushed and they've got to go and do something else sometimes it doesn't necessarily feel like a very safe space to start to open up things…"*

4.2.9. Theme 14: Ensuring TWB needs are met once the EP has ended their involvement

EPs reflected the steps they have taken to ensure that TWB needs can be met once they have finished their involvement in casework, which seems important given the constraints outlined above. This theme is separated into three subthemes, outlined below:

4.2.9 (i) Helping the teacher to implement boundaries

EPs spoke of how they have responded to TWB needs in casework by helping them implement protective boundaries around their role to re-address their work life balance. This included helping teachers to 'say no' to additional work-pressures and supporting them to develop their own self-advocacy skills to communicate their boundaries:

> *"…We put a bit of an action plan together to help put some boundaries in with staff… Even just simple things like putting a sign on her door saying 'I'm not available between these hours' erm and just lots of little strategies like that."* (P3)

> *"I guess I tried to help her [the teacher] to think about what she might be able to do I guess to try and advocate for herself that she needed to have a break…"* (P5)

4.2.9 (ii) Providing teachers with emotional coping tools

EPs discussed how they respond to TWB needs by providing them with coping tools to manage their feelings in response to the casework demands. For example, P3 spoke about the importance of supporting staff's emotional regulation strategies in response to TWB within casework, stating *"…I suppose I'm always thinking about regulation (.) are the staff regulated? Are they able to regulate themselves within these quite stressful situations….? And if they can't how could we help them do that?(P3)"*

4.2.9 (iii). Mobilising in-school support

EPs indicated how they respond to TWB needs in casework by mobilising in-school support for the teacher. For example, P1 described how they, *"told the head teacher that it wasn't working for that class teacher and she needed more resources."* P3 similarly described how they reported a teacher's need to Senior Leadership stating that the teacher, *"Expressed that she just didn't really know what to do erm so I agreed with her that I would speak to Senior Leadership…"*

4.2.10: Theme 15: The use of distinctive features within the EP toolkit

EPs discussed their application of distinctive features to the EP role in response to TWB needs within casework (i.e. psychological paradigms and processes referred to by Farrell et al. (2006).

4.2.10 (i) Paradigms

Three EPs explicitly referred to the application of psychological paradigms in their response to TWB needs in casework. Psychodynamic principles such as containment were referenced by both P2 and P3. For example, P3 stated,

> *"You know implicitly through my questioning erm I also am quite psychodynamic I do like to use and draw on principles around containment erm and safety for both the children and the teachers and how safe they feel erm to try things in the classroom to take risks."*

Solution focused principles were also indicated by P2:

> *"I think sometimes in those situations where you've got a member of staff that is quite entrenched in a situation and is feeling really really "I'm overwhelmed" actually kind of looking at d'you know what what is working well? how can we move this situation forward? How would we know if there's been a been a difference?*

P3 also mentioned their use of Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems theory as a response to TWB needs in casework stating,

> *"…erm good old Bronfenbrenner always I do practise in that way I do for me for me personally as a Psychologist I'm quite visual (.) In my head I do have that framework imprinted behind my eyelids I think."*

Personal Construct Psychology was also referred to by P3, who stated,

> "… I think one of the things I always love to use is Tom Ravenette's personal constructs for teachers erm there's he did some research about different feelings that different children can evoke in teachers."

It is interesting that only three participants explicitly referenced their use of paradigms in response to TWB needs in casework and it is possible that their use of paradigms is not always wholly conscious. This is evidenced by P2 who, when asked about their use of paradigms in these scenarios, stated, *"Erm (.) do you know I always find these questions difficult because I think that you do but you're just not always kind of conscious that you are doing."*

4.2.10 (ii) Named psychological process vs informal support

EPs spoke of their use of, or recommendation for, psychological processes in their response to TWB needs within casework.

For example, P5 explained that they used consultation to discuss TWB within a piece of casework for a pupil stating, *"So I guess that's where I focused (.) the consultation wasn't so much on the young person it's more about yeah their [staff's] wellbeing."*

P3 also discussed how they offered supervision as an ongoing support opportunity to a headteacher who presented with a well-being need within a piece of casework explaining, *"…so after spending quite a long-time meeting with them we agreed to do some supervision sessions with myself and the Head around some of the issues she brought up."*

It is important to note that some EPs discussed how some of their responses to TWB needs were not so much specific psychological processes but took a less structured and informal approach. For example, P4 shared how they used a, *"low level conversation"* to support reframing a teachers' perspective on a piece of casework upon encountering an issue related to their well-being.

4.3 RQ3

What are the beliefs and attitudes of educational psychologists in relation to responding to teacher well-being needs that present during casework for CYP with SEND as represented in vignettes?

Eight themes were identified in relation to this research question. These themes and their related subthemes are presented below in Table 4.3. Where participants were discussing their beliefs around Vignette 1 (Teacher 1) and Vignette 2 (Teacher 2), this is clarified.

Table 4.3

Themes and subthemes for RQ3

Theme	Subtheme
Theme 16. Views on the importance of, and rationale for, supporting the teachers' well-being in the casework	16.1 A dual role in supporting the child and the teacher
	16.2 Working together with the common goal of achieving positive outcomes for the child
	16.3 Human nature
Theme 17. The role of the EP within the system	17.1 Positioning involvement at a systems level
	17.2 The EP as the external, objective agent
Theme 18. Enhancing the teachers' professional well-being	18.1 Development of and respect for autonomy
	18.2 Supporting confidence/self-efficacy
	18.3 Developing competence
Theme 19. Emotionally supportive interactive responses	19.1 Accepting, hearing and supporting the teacher's emotional experience
	19.2 Reframing and restructuring the teachers' perspective
Theme 20. Sensitivity	20.1 Managing expectations

Theme	Subtheme
	20.2 Caution around challenging
Theme 21. Barriers to, and precautions around, supporting the teachers' well-being	21.1 School culture
	21.2 Take guidance from the teacher's needs and responses
	21.3 Triangulating and testing the teachers' construction of the case
	21.4 Service delivery
	21.5 Time constraints
Theme 22. Keeping the child at the heart of the casework	22.1 Understanding the child
	22.3 Challenge the teacher
Theme 23. Distinctive features within the EP toolkit	23.1 Paradigms
	23.2 Psychological processes

4.3.1. Theme 16: Views on the importance of, and rationale for, supporting the teachers' well-being in the casework

EPs expressed various beliefs about reasons for supporting the teachers' well-being within the vignettes. These beliefs are captured within three subthemes outlined below.

4.3.1 (i) A dual role in supporting the child and the teacher

Some EPs perceived that the fictional EPs had a dual role in supporting the teacher and child simultaneously within the casework, indicating that support for TWB was a part of this dual role, for example:

> *"You know not just the pupil but I'm an advocate for the teacher and er if it looks like they're doing you know a reasonable job and trying their hardest but there are no resources (.) additional resources then the teacher deserves support (P1 in response to Teacher 1)"*

> *"But you know why not use this as a situation where we could do both…? Try and support the youngster and think of ways we can support the teacher with this youngster." (P4 in response to Teacher 2).*

4.3.1 (ii) Working together with the common goal of achieving positive outcomes for the child

Some EPs felt that supporting the teachers' well-being in the casework was akin to supporting a colleague in need. For example, P1 believed that it was in the EP's role to support both teachers' well-being stating, "*Oh yeah yeah well these are fellow professionals aren't they you know they're just like us you know they're part of our family aren't they?... And you know and er we've gotta look after them.*"

Similarly, participants indicated that supporting the teachers' well-being was an important part of working with a team member towards achieving a common goal: positive outcomes for CYP. For example, when asked about whether they felt supporting Teacher 1's well-being was part of the EP role, P3 said, *"…I do because I think ultimately if we want to support the child, we have to support the adults…"*

P2 also felt that it was in the role to support Teacher 2's well-being for similar reasons:

"Yeah definitely erm…I think it's a big part of meeting that young person's needs is that the staff working with that young person particularly the teacher (.) is feeling empowered and that they've got the skills to do that because (.) if they're feeling really disheartened by the whole situation they're probably not gonna be at their best to (.) to support him."

4.3.1 (iii). Human nature

Some EPs also shared that they felt as though supporting Teacher 1's well-being was not necessarily within the EP role, but that it was simply a personal responsibility in response to another human in need of support. When asked about their views of supporting Teacher 1's well-being, P4 initially stated, *"…I think I'd be thinking that actually (.) psychologist aside (.) this is another human being… And they're not having a good time of things…And you know it's not a duty…."*

4.3.2 Theme 17. The role of the EP within the system

This theme captures EPs' beliefs about their role in supporting the teachers' well-being in relation to their position within the wider school system. It is separated into two subthemes as outlined below:

4.3.2 (i) Positioning involvement at a systems level

Some EPs reflected a belief about the need to look to the wider school system for support for the teachers' wellbeing. For instance, P2 indicated that they felt as though a suitable response to Teacher 1's well-being would be through acting as advocates for them within the school system and by mobilising in-house support:

"… And I think almost advocate a little bit for the teacher erm that actually they need they need a little bit more support erm because I think I think for any teacher trying to manage that challenging behaviour if they're feeling like they're doing that on their own… That's really tricky erm and I think as the EP you can almost be that extra person and almost be another voice for them…"
(P2 in response to Teacher 1).

P3 also indicated a view around the need for the EP to investigate how the school system itself might be contributing to Teacher 2's presenting well-being needs, and felt that it might be important to intervene at a systems level in response to this, for example:

"...I'm wondering about the school culture as well (.)...Is it a supportive school culture? This is one thing yeah but are there other examples of it happening?... And is does there need to be a little bit more training around some of these more complex cases?..."

4.3.2 (ii) The EP as the external, objective agent

EPs also expressed their views about their role as external and objective professionals outside of the school system and the role that this plays in their ability to support the teachers within the casework scenarios, for example:

"I guess sometimes if you go in as an outside professional erm and talk to the senior team they perhaps sometimes think ooh actually someone else is saying that there is a difficulty here maybe we do need to kind of have a look at this a bit more." (P2 in response to Teacher 1).

P6 also felt that being external to the school system itself almost enabled the EP to provide a new and refreshing perspective on Teacher 2's situation, facilitating them to have influence on their well-being stating,

"We've got a job to do to support the teacher and I think we have actually got a unique job and it's a very privileged job and I think it's a very exciting job that we can actually come in come in and in the space of a minute or two or five minutes or 10 minutes we can really change the perspectives of people who are involved there."

4.3.3. Theme 18: Enhancing the teachers' professional well-being

Though EPs discussed the need to position their involvement at a systems level, they also expressed that they felt there was some direct work that could be done with staff to support their professional wellbeing (defined by van Horn et al., 2004): their autonomy, competence and self-efficacy.

4.3.3 (i) Development of and respect for autonomy

Some EPs conveyed a perception that the teachers' independence and freedom should be promoted and safeguarded throughout the casework. For example, P4 suggested that a suitable response to Teacher 1 could be for the EP to encourage them to collect their own data as part of the information gathering process, stating,

"It might be better if they collect some data themselves and then we sit down together to talk about the data we've got… I guess what I'm thinking is er (.)

you get she's already disempowered you don't want this to be a one-sided exposé ((laughs))."

Some EPs also felt that teachers should exercise their own choice regarding the construction of recommendations and strategies within the casework scenarios. For instance, P1 felt that it was important for the EP to avoid dictating strategies to Teacher 1 stating, *"…you know it's too simple with behaviour management you know for us to dictate you know you don't wanna do it like that you wanna do it like this."*

4.3.3 (ii). Supporting confidence/self-efficacy

Some EPs expressed a perception around the importance of promoting the teachers' confidence in their own ability in their role within the casework context. There were several views expressed about processes that might support the teachers' views of their own ability such as providing encouragement, providing reassurance and helping the teacher to experience success:

> *"And to make sure they're fully prepared and there's no failure I'll make sure they send me a lesson plan before I go in …cos we know that it's success that I want and I want to make sure that they're confident so I can't afford any failure in any of the sessions I observe they must be working at their best." (P1 in response to Teacher 1)*

> *"Erm so that I guess giving her some encouragement that she you know that she is doing even though there might be areas for development I'm sure there are things that she is doing well." (P5 in response to Teacher 2)*

4.3.3 (iii) Developing competence

EPs expressed beliefs around the need to increase the teachers' actual ability to effectively support the pupil. For instance, P4 stated of Teacher 2 that, *"you could do that through casework support so you could almost use the case as a learning case for the teacher… You know more about helping to skill up the teacher."* In a similar way, in response to Teacher 1, P2 shared,

> *"Erm you know they said that they've tried everything which (.) I know we often hear ((laughs)) erm (.) and I think yeah I think erm (.) a big part of supporting this young person effectively sounds like it's going to be by supporting the teacher*

to feel more empowered and (.) equipped to deal with the behaviour and
obviously on a day to day basis it sounds like."

This notion of upskilling and equipping was also explored by other EPs, who made suggestions for how they could do so through providing teachers with feedback on their practice following EP observations:

"So I suppose yeah I'd be doing lots of observations I'd be looking at different settings around the school I'd be looking at the pupil's interactions with adults I'd be reflecting that back to the teacher." (P3 in response to Teacher 2).

EPs also discussed how they could provide the teachers with some pedagogical strategies. For instance, P3 stated (in response to Teacher 2):

"But this is a child who is very complex and is struggling and maybe through the process of hypothesising what's going on for the child we can come to some more bespoke and more meaningful strategies."

4.3.4. Theme 19: Emotionally supportive interactive responses
EPs also described the direct support they could provide to the teachers, through their interactions with them, within the casework scenarios to support their presenting difficult emotions. This theme is separated into two subthemes as outlined below:

4.3.4 (i). Accepting, hearing and supporting the teacher's emotional experience
Some EPs felt that their response to the teachers in the scenarios should be to provide a space to acknowledge and provide an acceptance of their emotions. For example, EPs expressed a belief that it was important to convey an understanding and empathy for the teachers' situations, for example:

"...And talking to them about how hard it must be for the teacher and really hearing the teacher's concerns erm about the feelings that this child evokes for them and I would I'd yeah that's the first thing I would do I'd be validating and hearing the teacher's concerns." (P3 in response to Teacher 1)

Another aspect of this was EPs' beliefs about the need to convey acceptance of the teachers' feelings by way of normalising their emotional experience. For instance,

P4 also explained how they could help to normalise some of the feelings the child may be evoking in Teacher 1 stating,

> *"And er I mean maybe I mean again you'd want to feel things were pretty safe I think before having that conversation but I there is some normalising I think you could do (.) she might feel really guilty about that [her feelings towards the child]."*

4.3.4. (ii) Reframing and restructuring the teachers' perspective

EPs indicated that a suitable response to the vignettes might be to adapt the way teachers were conceptualising the casework challenges to support their emotions. For instance, P5 felt that it was important to investigate *"… unpicking some of those thoughts that lead into those [Teacher 1's] feelings…but I guess seeing if there's any erm work that could be done to begin to start to shift some of those thoughts."*

EPs also discussed the need to reframe the teachers' perceptions that the challenges within their case are their sole responsibility, for example:

> *"And she needs to have a boundary drawn which is kind of a safety thing which says ok I can do these things in the class…But I can't deal with that and… My hope would be that that could to some extent protect her and enable her to develop some strategies around that problem which is exceptional that she can label out there 'it's not me'"* (P6 in response to Teacher 2).

In this way, EPs describe the importance of offering emotional support to the teachers by reframing their, arguably distorted, perceptions of the case. This seems to involve aiming to reframe teachers' perceptions of personal responsibility to alleviate some of the guilt and shame the teachers may feel around the possibility of the casework reflecting their own personal failures.

4.3.5. Theme 20: Sensitivity

This theme related to EPs' beliefs about the need to demonstrates their sensitivity towards discussing difficult information and potentially emotive subjects with the teachers, bearing in mind their potential fragility in the casework. This theme is separated into two subthemes as outlined below:

4.3.5 (i) Managing expectations

Some EPs expressed a belief around the need to bear in mind the teachers' capacity through reducing their expectations of them within the casework. For example, P6

discussed how they felt it was important to prioritise areas for feedback with Teacher 1 stating that, *"...it has to be the right bit the right bit pick the right bit where you think there's going to be the most change" (P6 in response to Teacher 1).*

P1 also felt that it would be important to offer Teacher 2 a simple action plan for their behaviour management strategies, for example:

> *"I mean the plans are simple (.) sometimes we just need one when we are struggling so that plan would just be around- to start with would be just the classroom behaviour management to start with-would be a simple classroom discipline plan trying to get the rules rewards consequences straightened out and communicated well to the class and to this kid."*

4.3.5 (ii) Caution around challenging

Some EPs indicated a belief that the EP ought to exercise caution in their challenging of Teacher 1's practice or views in the face of their presenting well-being needs, for example:

> *"...I'd see my role as very much working to shift the attitude and the view of the teacher but I think (.) bearing in mind the teacher's potential fragility and feelings of stress in the moment." (P3)*

> *"So just providing the member of staff with some erm some feedback... It has to be gently put." (P6)*

Here the EPs seem to discuss the need to provide challenge and feedback in a gentle manner, potentially demonstrating a belief that being directly critical of teachers' practice is likely to serve as an additional stressor to the teachers' well-being.

4.3.6. Theme 21: Barriers to and precautions around supporting the teachers' well-being

EPs expressed some factors that they felt might present as a barrier towards them supporting the teachers' well-being within the casework. Additionally, they indicated some of the precautions that EPs should consider around their responses to the teachers' well-being.

4.3.6 (i) School culture

EPs expressed concern around the barriers that the school culture might pose in their ability to support Teacher 1's well-being. In particular, EPs carefully weighed up the consequences of seeking help for the teacher within the school system, for example:

> *"… I mean we don't want to go to the senior leadership team and kind of almost make out that this teacher isn't coping in that situation…" (P2).*

> *"Erm I mean if I knew I had their [SLT's] trust… Felt like I could share some of this information with them… Errm (.) I probably would… But if it was-I felt like I didn't and I wasn't sure what they'd do with it… I'd probably at this point keep a lid on it just to errrm get a bit more clearer idea of what's going on first and then act on it I think."* (P4)

4.3.6 (ii) Take guidance from the teacher's needs and responses

EPs also perceived that precautions would need to be taken to ensure that the support for the teachers' well-being was tailored towards their needs and wishes and was also proportionate to the state of the teachers' well-being in that moment.

For example, P5 felt that it would be important, before having a discussion around Teacher 1's well-being, to identify their willingness to do so, stating,

> *"Cos I guess in some sometimes a teacher might be quite open to talking about their own practice and I guess about their own emotions… About how the young person is behaving and how they're-and those sorts of things and I guess sometimes more broadly it might be about the way they respond to emotions generally and why that might be I guess how deep they want to go."*

P3 also indicated that it would feel important to gain consent from Teacher 2 to seek support from senior leadership for their well-being as they said, *"I think I would personally be going to speak to the Leadership team about but (.) going very carefully and with the teacher's consent."*

P4 also indicated that, for Teacher 2, there might be stages of intervention that the EP might need to consider. They felt that it was important to gain a sense of the nature of the teacher's well-being needs before offering individualised well-being support, stating,

"I think I don't think I'd necessarily go off onto a purely er ((pause)) what's the word let's look at ways to boost build your resilience ((laughs)) … But that could be an avenue to go down later."

These EPs indicated that they believe that caution needs to be exercised before taking steps to support the teachers' well-being. The data extracts highlight that EPs feel that they need to support the teachers' well-being with their consent and in consideration of a graduated response.

4.3.6 (iii) Triangulating and testing the teachers' construction of the case

EPs spoke of how a response to the teachers' well-being needs might be for the EP to take a cautious view of teachers' interpretations of the casework.

Some EPs did indeed question the staff's constructions of the casework. For instance, P2 felt that by speaking to different staff members, *"You kind of get two different perceptions of situations but I guess what you've got to remember is that Senior leadership aren't dealing with that every single day in the classroom…"*

In considering their response to Teacher 2, P4 also questioned their construction stating, *"You'd want to know whether this is a justified kind of I think you'd still wanna-what's the word triangulate your information… Ok cos it could be someone that is just in the wrong job..."*

4.3.6 (iv) Service delivery

EPs indicated concerns over their models of service delivery presenting as a constraint in their response to the teachers in the scenario. In particular, EPs expressed concerns about the extent to which they would be able to offer any ongoing support to the teacher due to their typical model of casework delivery:

"… because of time allocation my experience of working…has been a model of (.) assess the child send a report out… Erm which I think is fine for some pieces of work but … a case like this is not a quick fix and I think this teacher needs an external objective level of support in a supervisory way…" (P3 in response to Teacher 2).

4.3.6 (v) Time constraints

EPs also indicated that time might also present as a barrier to their response to the teachers in the vignettes:

"Er the difficulty is how much time has the school paid for?... And the more time they pay for the more I can progress and support the teacher" (P1 in response to Teacher 1).

"...I'd typically be thinking (.) they may well draw some non-allocated EP time out of the EP" (P4 in response to Teacher 2).

4.3.7. Theme 22: Keeping the child at the heart of the casework
Some EPs indicated that, despite the teachers' presenting well-being needs, the EP should keep the child's needs at the heart of the work. Indeed, when asked if they thought it was in the EP role to support Teacher 1's well-being, P4 stated, *"No no I think the first duty's the child."* This theme is separated into two subthemes as outlined below.

4.3.7 (i) Understanding the child
In considering their response to the vignettes, participants indicated that they felt the EP would need to continue in providing a formulation of the child's needs and bringing the child's voice into the work:

"So I think I'd maybe want to build the teacher's awareness of the child's behaviour and be asking you know functional behaviour sorts of questions around what are the child's underlying needs?...bringing the child's voice in a little bit" (P3 in response to Teacher 1).

This indicates that EPs felt that understanding the problem from the child's perspective and understanding the child's world view was of importance, regardless of the teachers' presenting well-being needs.

4.3.7 (ii) Challenge the teacher
Some participants' expressed beliefs around the need to challenge the teachers' views and practice where necessary:

"...I would probably start reflecting back some of the language that the teacher is using so (.) choosing and I'd just be gently challenging those assumptions that the child is choosing to behave that way" (P3 in response to Teacher 1).

"...the EP should help the teacher to see that the negative interactions… That she is reflecting back on the child are contributing to the problem" (P6 in response to Teacher 1).

Once again, this indicates that the EPs feel that they should keep the children's needs at the heart of the casework, irrespective of the teachers' presenting well-being needs.

4.3.8. Theme 23. Distinctive features within the EP toolkit

Participants discussed the possibility of the EP applying features that are distinctive to the EP role in responding to the vignettes such as paradigms and psychological processes. This theme is separated into two subthemes outlined below.

4.3.8 (i) Paradigms

Solution focused work was discussed in response to Teacher 1 by P1, who said, "*Yeah it's it's solution focused as well you know where they donate you know what they want to improve.*"

Cognitive behavioural approaches were also discussed by P4 and P5. For example P4 felt that the collection of observational data would be helpful in supporting this approach stating, *"We have that thing of er you know the difference between what you feel like is happening and what is really happening … So that that again (.) it's a bit like a diary so for CBT isn't it?"*

Psychodynamic principles of containment were also alluded to by P3, who felt that Teacher 2, *"is at a point where…she really does need support to be able to reflect and to be able to feel someone is (.) holding kind of holding those feelings with her alongside her…which I think is a great use of EP time."*

4.3.8 (ii) Psychological processes

EPs also discussed specific psychological processes that could be used to support the teachers in the vignettes. For example, P3 felt that supervision would be a helpful response to Teacher 2, commenting that,

"...So I'd almost want to give some supervision to the teacher over time (.) I'd be I think that would be a good use of time because I don't-I mean I prefer to work this way-I think this probably reflects as well in an ideal world…I'd want to extend this piece of casework over a longer period of time."

Consultation was felt to be a helpful psychological process by many of the EPs in response to the presenting needs of the teacher, for example:

"I mean they need to be they need to be freed up so that we can have a 60-minute consultation." (P1 in response to Teacher 2).

"So I think obviously well what I would do is I would meet obviously have an initial consultation with the teacher erm and spend some time listening to the teacher's feelings…" (P3 Teacher 1).

Chapter 5: Discussion

The present study sought to uniquely explore EPs' experiences of encountering issues related to TWB in the context of casework for CYP with SEND. Attention was additionally given to the practice of EPs in relation to this, exploring specifically how, and the extent to which, EPs respond when TWB needs are presented to them within the casework. Vignette methodology was also used to explore participants' core assumptions and beliefs about the topic and as a way of exploring beyond their retrospective accounts of their experience and practice (Barter & Renold, 2000; Hughes, 1998).

This chapter firstly aims to address the three research questions outlined in Chapter 2, drawing directly on the key findings presented in Chapter 4 and the themes outlined in Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3. In doing so, the findings shall be discussed through a comparison and contrast to the extant literature that was presented in Chapter 2 and to new literature where necessary. The researcher shall then provide an evaluation of the methods used alongside recommendations for future research. Findings are then discussed with reference to their implications for educational psychology practice.

5.1 RQ1

What are the experiences of educational psychologists in encountering teacher well-being needs during individual casework for CYP with SEND?

This research study has offered novel insight into how a sample of EPs come to encounter and experience TWB needs within casework for CYP with SEND. One of the key findings here is that teachers' expressions of issues related to their well-being within the casework context varied across EPs' accounts, and such variation was presented within ***Theme 1 ('How the well-being need came to the EP's attention').*** Indeed, EPs explained that their experiences ranged from feeling that teachers were open with them about their well-being ***(subtheme 1.1),*** to them deducing a well-being need in the absence of such a direct admission ***(subtheme 1.2).*** EPs also described how TWB needs were communicated to them by other members of staff in establishing their role and purpose in the casework ***(subtheme 1.3).***

It is interesting that EPs reflected their experiences of teachers being so open with them about issues related to their well-being within casework. This finding seems to stand in contrast to research from Andrews (2017) and Birchall (2021) who found that teachers do not seem to view EPs as professionals to turn to for issues related to their emotional well-being, viewing them more as professionals who worked with children within an assessment capacity. Rather, the finding of the present study seems to corroborate the argument put forward by Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020) who state that adults enter SEMH casework as "careseekers," (p.10) seeking support from the EP, who they frame as the "professional caregiver" (Zafeiriou & Gulliford, 2020, p.10). This present study therefore corroborates this phenomenon, extending such a finding in casework for pupils with SEND more broadly. It also indicates that these teachers viewed their EPs as sources of social support, cushioning their experience of the stressors involved in meeting the focus pupils' needs in a manner congruent with Cohen and Wills (1985) buffering hypothesis. It is, however, important to note that the contrast in study findings may stem from the fact that the Andrews (2017) and Birchall (2021) studies sought the views of school staff, in comparison to the present study and that conducted by Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020) which sought the views of EPs in relation to their role.

Nevertheless, EPs did indicate their experiences of deducing a TWB need in the absence of direct communication, using behavioural cues as well as their knowledge of the pressures within the system within their interpretation. Indeed, one EP felt that teachers held up a "professional façade" with them in the casework context. This perceived reluctance could therefore be attributed to the stigma attached to the experience of poor well-being within the teaching profession as identified by Birchall (2021) and Sharrocks (2012; 2014).

This research study has provided novel insight into the mechanisms through which aspects of the case itself might influence aspects of TWB within the casework context *(Theme 2: How the well-being need was linked to the casework).* Indeed, where EPs reported experiencing a TWB need within casework, they seemed to perceive that these needs may have stemmed from the demands of the casework/the demands of meeting the needs of the focus pupil. As demonstrated by *subtheme 2.1,* EPs indicated that the case demands may have instigated issues related to teachers' affective well-being such as emotional exhaustion as well as, what seemed like, the

presence of a culmination of negative emotions such as fear, anxiety and guilt, all of which are potentially indicators of low affective well-being (Birchall, 2021; van Horn et al., 2004). EPs' reports of the negative emotions and the apparent emotional exhaustion that seemed to be evoked by the demands of meeting the needs of focus pupils with SEND are commensurate with research by Blick (2019), Brittle (2020) and Farouk (2012).

Additionally, as demonstrated by *subtheme 2.2,* some EPs described their experiences of working in cases where they perceived that the focus pupils' needs had almost presented as a threat to the teachers' perceptions of their own competence and self-efficacy, which are important aspects of their professional well-being as defined by van Horn et al., (2004). Indeed, Ravenette (1999) argues that, within educational psychology casework, "a request for help comes because of the failure of the teachers to make any marked difference to the child's behaviour…." (p.105). That EPs report that casework demands present as a threat to the teachers' views of their own competence and self-efficacy, as indicated by Ravenette (1999) is therefore unsurprising.

One of the original findings of this study is that EPs also reflected their experiences of working with teachers who brought additional pressures to their well-being, seemingly unrelated to the focus pupil, into the casework context *(Theme 3: 'factors outside the casework'),* so much so that some participants deemed that the demands of the case may have been a precipitating factor amongst a series of other external stressors *(subtheme 2.4).* For instance, EPs discussed their experiences of working with teachers in casework who may have been experiencing some difficulties attributable to the stressors of their role or within their personal lives, whilst simultaneously aiming to meet the focus pupils' needs *(subtheme 3.1).* This finding is commensurate with the study by Birchall (2021) who identified that teachers referenced issues within their personal lives as having a negative impact on their well-being. Yet, in the Birchall (2021) study, only one EP versus 19 teachers addressed the influence of such personal life matters on TWB. That EPs in this study discussed the perceived influence of these external pressures on teachers' well-being in the casework context sits in contrast of the finding from Birchall (2021).

It is interesting that, where a TWB need was perceived by an EP within casework, they often indicated that it impacted on their experience of the casework trajectory, having implications for their ability to move the situation forward *(Theme 4: Impact of the well-being need on the casework outcomes).* It might be that the process of problem-solving within casework is too psychologically challenging for teachers presenting with already difficult emotions (Zafeiriou, 2017; Zafeiriou & Gulliford, 2020). It is also important to recognise that, if teachers' perceptions of their self-efficacy have been impacted by the demands of the case as indicated by *subtheme 2.2,* their perceptions of their own ability to successfully implement any strategies or facilitate change may be limited (Bandura et al., 1977), which may result in their inability to engage in discussion around this with the EP.

This study also presented insight into the nature of the presenting concerns within cases that EPs feel they most commonly experience TWB needs *(Theme 5: The nature of the presenting concerns in the casework).* Though EPs gave examples of casework involving pupils with a range of SEND, when asked about an example of casework in which they felt they had encountered a TWB need, most EPs described casework involving pupils with SEMH needs. This is unsurprising considering the emotional nature of supporting pupil behaviour and the impact it has on TWB as documented in studies by Hanko (2002), Blick (2019), Farouk (2012) and Ofsted (2019).

5.2 RQ2

How do educational psychologists respond to teacher well-being needs that present in relation to individual casework for CYP with SEND?

This study has uniquely identified that, in cases where EPs perceived a TWB need, some reported that it seems to fundamentally change their overall problem-solving approach as reflected in *Theme 6.* The second perceived impact of TWB on the problem-solving approach was EPs' reported use of TWB needs as data to help them to develop a formulation of the presenting problem within the casework *(subtheme*

6.2). This formulation process within educational psychology casework is reflected in the latter stages of the problem analysis framework in which EPs develop hypotheses concerning the presenting problems in casework (Woolfson et al., 2003). EPs' use of TWB needs in this way reflects their broad aim to develop hypotheses at various ecological tiers as would be advocated for in the Woolfson et al., (2003) model. It also reflects that EPs feel that TWB is a fundamental aspect of pupils' experiences at school as indicated by Hanko (2002), Briner and Dewberry (2007), Kidger et al., (2009) and Roffey (2012) and that it is therefore a fundamental component of their problem-solving approach.

Secondly, upon encountering a TWB need, some EPs described how it provided them with an impetus to additionally target their support within the casework towards the teachers' well-being *(subtheme 6.1).* One of the reasons given for this was that EPs felt that it would be a more effective problem-solving approach to support the teachers' well-being to meet the children's needs successfully. It demonstrates that these EPs respond to TWB within casework, viewing teachers as the "bridge" (Ravenette, 1999, p.18) to positive outcomes for the focus pupils. That EPs also report making TWB the focus of their involvement within casework, also negates the assertion that TWB support is an "underdeveloped role for EPs" (Rae et al., 2017, p.213). Having identified that TWB appears to impact participants' overall approach to their casework, the discussion shall now narrow its focus to consider EPs' descriptions of their specific responses to TWB in casework in further detail.

Importantly, some of the EPs indicated having responded to TWB needs preventatively, through providing the preconditions required to enable teachers to offload their distress in the casework context *(Theme 7: Providing a space where well-being needs can be expressed).* For instance, EPs described how they conveyed a direct sense of curiosity about the teachers' emotional states, explicitly asking them how they were feeling during casework interactions and seemingly seeking to proactively unpick TWB needs *(subtheme 7.2).* Additionally, EPs indicated the importance of providing a sense of safety for teachers to feel able to offload their well-being concerns within casework. This involved a commitment to aspects such as confidentiality, non-judgemental responses and giving explicit permission for teachers to use the casework as an opportunity to offload. This communication of such clear boundaries around the relationship within the EP-teacher dyad in the

casework context is akin to a therapist's provision of a reliable holding environment within a psychodynamic therapeutic context (Howard, 2018).

In addition to these proactive responses some EPs indicated responding reactively to TWB needs in casework through utilising emotionally supportive interactive responses, as indicated in *Theme 8.* Specifically, they reported how they have explicitly conveyed acceptance and acknowledgement for teachers' emotions within the casework context (e.g. through normalising and empathising with their emotions). They also reflected how they have sought to reframe teachers' perspectives when they have presented with increasingly negative perceptions and feelings around the casework (e.g. by helping them to consider what is working well).

Psychodynamic principles of containment (Bion, 1970, as cited in Billington, 2006) could be used to interpret *Themes 7 and 8* together, in which EPs seem to, "establish the secure and containing space where distress experienced by the consultee…is met by an empathetically attuned consultant who acknowledges and helps process such experience." (Kennedy & Lee, 2021, p.148). Several studies within the SLR also indicate the importance of EPs' use of psychodynamic theories within their TWB role (e.g. Ellis, 2012; Costelloe et al., 2020).

Linked to this, a sample of EPs discussed some of their own personal emotional responses in casework in which they have perceived a TWB need. Feelings of uncertainty, frustration and anger were expressed by EPs here, as reflected in *Theme 11.* The uncertainty seemed to reflect EPs' perceptions that they did not feel they ultimately had power over some of the issues impacting on TWB. The fact that EPs held difficult emotions here is unsurprising when considered within a psychodynamic lens. Indeed, Ellis (2021) argues that EPs' daily work involves them supporting individuals who are overwhelmed and who will therefore, through a process of projection, expel some of their feelings onto the EP who may then, through a process of projective identification, begin to identify with some of these feelings as their own.

As well as responding to teachers' emotional well-being, EPs described the steps they have taken to respond to TWB needs within casework by supporting professional aspects of their well-being such as self-efficacy, competence and

autonomy as defined by van Horn et al. (2004). This is important given that this study identified that difficult cases may present as a threat to teachers' self-efficacy and confidence *(subtheme 2.2.)* In the present study, it seemed that some EPs supported teacher self-efficacy *(subtheme 10.1)* by providing them with reassurance and encouragement, supporting them to feel that they do indeed have the skills and experience required to handle the demands of the case. This finding reflects Gibbs and Miller (2014)'s argument that EPs can support teacher self-efficacy through various approaches, including engaging in discussion with teachers about their previous successful experiences, as was the case in some of the EPs' responses in the present study.

It is also of interest that EPs reflected the steps they take to demonstrate respect and support for teachers' autonomy *(subtheme 10.3)* upon encountering an issue related to TWB within casework. Specifically, EPs gave examples of how they utilise collaborative problem-solving approaches with teachers and how they additionally aim to co-construct action plans with them within casework. This apparent respect for teachers' autonomy is in line with the literature that presents the view of the EP as a collaborative consultant within casework (e.g. Nolan & Moreland, 2014). This collaborative model is guided by the premise that both the EP and the client own expertise which can contribute differentially to the problem-solving and decision-making processes around a young person's needs (Gutkin, 1999). This study echoed and extended the finding of Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020) and Zafeiriou (2017) that EPs support aspects of adults' efficacy and autonomy within SEMH casework through providing a space for collaboration.

This study also offers unique insight into the responses that EPs report having taken to respond to TWB within casework that reflect their use of distinctive tools within the EP toolkit i.e. their use of "psychological methods, concepts, models, theories or knowledge" (Farrell et al., 2006, p.30). The present study found that some EPs described a preference for their use of psychological paradigms in this area, though there was no clear consensus and various paradigms were referred to *(subtheme 15.1)*. For example, solution focused principles were referred to, as suggested by Salter-Jones (2012) and Costelloe et al. (2020) in the arena of TWB. Psychodynamic principles of containment were also described by some EPs in this study. The use of psychodynamic principles in support of teachers' emotional needs is advocated for

by Ellis (2012) Costelloe et al. (2020), Zafeiriou (2017) and Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020).

In addition, EPs discussed that they had responded to TWB needs by providing them with psychologically informed processes such as supervision and consultation *(subtheme 15.2).* For example, one EP suggested that they had focused a consultation within a piece of casework on staff well-being needs, whilst another EP had offered ongoing supervision to a headteacher following a piece of casework in which they expressed a well-being need. EPs' use of supervision, to enable staff to reflect on the emotional encounters of their practice, is advocated for by Rae et al. (2017). That EPs were able to articulate their use of such distinctive psychological tools, suggests that they are conscious of utilising their distinctive skillsets and knowledge to respond to TWB within the casework context.

However, it is noteworthy that only three EPs referred to the use of specific psychological perspectives when describing their responses to TWB in casework. In fact, one EP felt that their use of psychological perspectives was difficult to describe since it did not always feel wholly conscious. Additionally, not all participants referred to such named psychological processes, and one EP reflected that their support for a teacher's well-being in casework took on the form of a, "low level conversation." This level of informality mirrors the assertion that the EP role in supporting well-being is, "not necessarily separate or additional but can be threaded through consultations, conversations and offers, maintaining awareness of school and student well-being and sowing seeds where possible." (Roffey, 2015, p.25).

Though EPs report having supported TWB within casework as has been discussed, they also demonstrated an awareness of their own potential influence on TWB within pieces of casework. Indeed, they described the steps they have taken to respond to TWB well-being needs in casework by embedding principles of sensitivity during potentially difficult conversations *(Theme 9)*. For instance, some EPs described taking steps to convey sensitivity by avoiding dictating strategies or being openly critical of teachers' practice. This is similar to a finding from Birchall (2021) in which EPs expressed an awareness of their ability to contribute to poor TWB by adding an abundance of recommendations in reports and psychological advices. This sensitivity, particularly around challenging practice, is important when one considers

that, "the naming and shaming of 'poor' performing teachers has created a sensitised culture, which, not surprisingly has become wary and defensive." (Finney, 2006, p. 26).

Though EPs did discuss the steps they have taken to respond to TWB, they also reflected on the professional boundaries and duties of their role that have influenced their responses in casework where they have encountered a TWB need *(Theme 12: Professional boundaries and duties).* One of the professional duties indicated by EPs was their apparent perception that, regardless of the teachers' well-being, they should aim to ensure that positive outcomes are achieved for the young person *(subtheme 12.1).* It is also reflective of a finding of Zafeiriou (2017), Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020) and Nolan and Moreland (2014) who identified that EPs kept the child and their best interests at the core of their work. Indeed, within their definition of the EP role, Fallon et al. (2010) argue that the EP's role is fundamentally to utilise psychology to support CYP. That EPs feel that their duty to fulfil this role, irrespective of a teachers' well-being, is in accordance with the professional boundaries implied by such a definition.

Linked to this, EPs also discussed some of the barriers that they perceived to constrain their ability to respond to TWB within casework *(Theme 13).* The barriers discussed here were linked to time constraints and to the EPs' service delivery models. For example, EPs indicated that offering ongoing support for TWB within casework had previously been difficult due to schools' expectations of time allocation within casework and by them being positioned as assessors of children's needs within this. The finding that schools may be unwilling to commission EPs to provide ongoing support for TWB within a piece of ongoing casework may also be reflective of the tensions of working within a traded model of service delivery; schools may want more tangible and efficient outcomes because of buying in time from the Educational Psychology Service (Lee & Woods, 2017). Of interest, is that some EPs discussed that the recent lockdown period had provided them with an opportunity to position themselves away from this pure assessment role within casework, enabling them to provide more support for teachers due to the new avenues and opportunities for casework approaches that remote work had required them to explore.

In view of these constraints, EPs reflected some of their responses which indicated their commitment to ensuring that TWB needs could be met once their involvement in the casework had ended as reflected in *Theme 14.* For example, EPs discussed some practical boundaries that they had supported teachers to implement upon them presenting with a well-being need within the casework context *(subtheme 14.1).* This included helping teachers to 'say no' to additional work-pressures and supporting them to develop their own self-advocacy skills to communicate their boundaries to other staff. Given the documented impact of workload on TWB (Ofsted, 2019; Van droogenbroeck et al., 2014), it seems important that EPs are offering this support within the casework context.

EPs also indicated that they had previously taken their concerns regarding a teachers' well-being within casework to members of Senior Leadership, thereby mobilising in-school support for that teacher *(subtheme 14.3).* This finding suggests that EPs feel that their temporary involvement might limit the extent to which they can truly support and respond to TWB within casework in the absence of wider school support. Several studies presented in the SLR also indicate, based on their findings, that EPs are well positioned to be advocates for TWB at an organisational level (e.g. Ellis, 2012; Gillard et al., 2021; Rae et al., 2017; Salter-Jones, 2012; Sharrocks, 2014).

5.3 RQ3
What are the beliefs and attitudes of educational psychologists in relation to responding to teacher well-being needs that present during casework for CYP with SEND as represented in vignettes?

Here, the researcher focuses on themes presented in Table 4.3, since these were the themes that were identified from participants' responses to the vignettes. The researcher shall draw links to the extant literature and shall also compare themes within Table 4.3 to those presented in Table 4.2 and discussed in section 5.2, which illustrate the responses that EPs report having made in their own practice when encountering TWB needs in casework.

Participants expressed supportive beliefs about the importance of, and rationale for, the EP supporting the teachers' well-being in the vignettes. For instance, some EPs felt that the EP had a dual role in supporting the teacher and child simultaneously

within the fictional casework *(subtheme 16.1).* This view around the duality of the EP's client is illustrative of the ambiguous nature of the identity of the client within educational psychology work (Ashton & Roberts, 2006)*.* Participants also shared a view that supporting the teachers' well-being in the casework was akin to supporting a colleague or a team-member in need. For some EPs, this notion extended to a belief that supporting the teachers' well-being was a part of them working with the teacher towards a common goal in meeting the child's needs *(subtheme 16.2).* Yet, it is also interesting that a belief was also expressed within the study around support for Teacher 1's wellbeing being, not a duty, but a basic human instinct to support a person in need *(subtheme 16.3).* That EPs believed that there was a role for the EP in supporting the wellbeing of the teachers in the vignettes is reflective of how EPs report acknowledging the need to support TWB within their accounts of their own casework practice depicted in *subtheme 6.1,* suggesting congruence between EPs' beliefs and their practice.

Despite this, some EPs felt that the EP in the vignettes should keep the children's needs at the heart of the casework *(Theme 22).* For instance, some EPs perceived that it would be important to challenge teachers' views and practice where necessary to ensure the pupils' needs were met. This belief echoes findings of Zafeiriou (2017), Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020) and Nolan and Moreland (2014) who identified that EPs kept the child and their best interests at the heart of their work. The view captured by *Theme 22* is reflective of responses EPs reported having taken in the face of TWB in their own casework practice whereby they have sought to ensure positive outcomes for pupils regardless of TWB as captured in *subtheme 12.1.*

Though EPs discussed the need to challenge teachers and to keep the children's interests at the heart of the casework, some expressed a belief around the need to be sensitive in their approach with the teachers, cautiously challenging Teacher 1's practice *(subtheme 20.2)* and being flexible with regards to their expectations of both teachers' practice *(subtheme 20.1).* This belief around the need to respond to teachers with sensitivity maps onto the reports of EPs' responses within their own practice demonstrated in *Theme 9.*

EPs discussed their beliefs around distinctive psychological tools that EPs might uniquely be able to offer in response to the TWB needs in the vignettes *(Theme 23).*

Like their responses in their own casework examples depicted in *Theme 15,* EPs referred to the use of solution focused and psychodynamic principles as well as psychological processes such as supervision and consultation. However, in contrast to these patterns of responses in their own casework practice, EPs also explicitly named Cognitive behavioural approaches in their response to the teachers' well-being needs. This finding is reflective of Gillard et al., (2021)'s use of ACT with school staff. That EPs discussed these distinctive psychological tools, suggests that they might be uniquely positioned to respond to TWB needs within casework.

Participants also felt that it would be important for the EP to support aspects of teachers' self-efficacy (by providing reassurance, helping them to prepare for EP observations and by providing evidence of their success), autonomy (by asking them to self-monitor practice and through co-constructing action plans) and competence within the casework scenarios, namely their professional well-being as defined by van Horn et al., (2004*) (Theme 18).* Indeed, several studies reviewed within the SLR (e.g. Armstrong & Hallett, 2012; Bond et al., 2017; Davison & Duffy, 2017) also focused on the role of the EP in developing aspects of teachers' professional well-being. Interestingly, this belief maps onto EPs' reports of how they have responded to teacher well-being needs within their own casework practice by enhancing aspects teachers' professional well-being *(Theme 10).*

As well as supporting teachers' professional well-being, participants indicated beliefs about the need for the EP to respond to the teachers' emotional well-being needs. For instance, they discussed interaction skills that could be utilised by the EP ranging from them accepting, hearing and supporting the teachers' emotional experience *(subtheme 19.1),* to reframing and restructuring the teachers' perspective *(subtheme 19.2).* This theme, which represents the beliefs of some of the EPs in the sample, mirrors *Theme 8,* which captured the emotionally supportive interactive skills that EPs report having used in their casework practice to respond to TWB needs. EPs' beliefs about the specific responses they could take to respond to teachers' emotional well-being needs in the vignettes are outlined in greater detail below.

Some participants felt that the EPs' responses should involve providing a space to acknowledge and to convey acceptance of the difficult emotions the teachers were

presenting with within the casework scenarios through processes such as empathising with and normalising their emotional experiences. Again, this notion links back to the psychodynamic principle of containment (Bion, 1970, as cited in Billington, 2006). Specifically, the EPs felt that it is within the EPs' role to engage with the complex and uncomfortable emotions that the cases seem to have evoked in the teachers in a manner congruent with that described by Kennedy and Lee (2021). This echoes research by Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020) and Zafeiriou (2017) which identified that the EP's role in mental health casework involves them providing a secure base and containment for the difficult emotions that adults bring to the casework.

In responding to the teachers' emotional well-being needs, EPs also spoke of the strategies they believed could be used to adapt both teachers' possibly distorted perceptions of the presenting cases to support them to feel better about the situations. One such example of this was participants' discussion around the need for the EP to reframe the teachers' perceptions that the presenting concerns were entirely their fault. In doing so, EPs seem to be describing a belief around the importance of Weiner (2000)'s theory around causal attributions. Namely, it seems that they feel it is important to respond to the teachers' well-being needs by helping them to reframe the locus of the cause of the problem externally rather than internally (Weiner, 2000).

Although EPs expressed beliefs about how the EPs could respond to the teachers' well-being in the vignettes, they also considered the EPs' role as a supplementary one in supporting the teachers within the wider school organisation *(Theme 17: the role of the EP within the system).* Some EPs felt that it would be important for EPs in both vignettes to position their involvement at a systems level *(subtheme 17.1),* looking to the wider school system for support for the teachers' well-being and advocating for in-house support. This belief reflects the findings from the SLR in Chapter 2 that EPs are well positioned to be advocates for TWB at an organisational level (e.g. Ellis, 2012; Gillard et al., 2021; Rae et al., 2017; Salter-Jones, 2012; Sharrocks, 2014). It also mirrors the findings in the empirical literature about the importance of social support within the school environment for teachers' well-being (Paterson & Grantham, 2016). The belief that surfaced here in relation to the EPs' responses to the teachers' well-being needs also mirrors EPs' discussion of their

responses to TWB within their own casework examples as depicted in *subtheme 14.3,* in which they report having mobilised in-house support for TWB during casework.

Though EPs did reflect beliefs about the need to respond to TWB needs in this way, they also perceived some barriers and precautions around responding to the teachers' well-being needs within the vignettes *(Theme 21).* It is noteworthy that EPs indicated a belief around the school culture being a possible barrier to them seeking support for Teacher 1's well-being from Senior Leadership due to the possible negative consequences of alerting them to the teachers' needs *(subtheme 21.1).* EPs' concerns here are reflective of the stigma that seems to be associated with seeking help for well-being within the teaching profession (Birchall, 2021; Sharrocks, 2012; Sharrocks, 2014).

EPs also perceived that it would be important for them to be cautious around taking steps to support both teachers' well-being, doing so with their consent whilst also considering the extent of the teachers' need for support *(subtheme 21.2).* This notion of providing support tailored towards teacher's needs resonates with the model from the Anna Freud National Centre for Children and Families (n,d), which advocates for a tiered approach to supporting staff well-being. It seems important then, that EPs not only consider a teacher's readiness to engage in a discussion about their well-being in the casework context, but that they also exercise caution in gauging whereabouts a teacher is on this scale prior to offering support. Again, there is overlap here between EPs' beliefs and their responses within their own casework captured within *subtheme 9.1.*

EPs also conveyed beliefs around the need to respond to TWB needs in both scenarios by taking a cautious view of teachers' interpretations of the casework. Within this, EPs discussed the importance of triangulating various data sources in the face of the presenting teachers' well-being needs. Indeed, it seems important to consider this due to Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020)'s and Zafeiriou (2017)'s finding that staff's emotional state can alter their understanding of the presenting problem. Indeed, this subtheme is reflective of *subtheme 12.2* which demonstrates EPs' responses to TWB needs within their own casework practice.

EPs also seemed to perceive that service delivery and time constraints might restrict their ability to respond fully to both teachers' well-being needs in the vignettes or to offer them any ongoing support *(subtheme 21.4 and 21.5).* This reflects a finding from the Andrews (2017) and Birchall (2021) studies with regards to the barriers to EPs implementing TWB support within their role, and it reflects the tensions of operating within a traded model of service delivery (Lee & Woods, 2017). This echoes EPs' reporting of their responses in their own casework practice as portrayed in subthemes *13.1 and 13.2.*

5.4 Methodological evaluation and areas for future research

The author recognises some of the limitations that this study has with regards to its credibility, transferability, and confirmability (Guba, 1981; Shenton, 2004). Firstly, the credibility of the study findings may be threatened due to demand characteristics effects within the interviews, with the possibility of participants responding to questions around their own casework practice in a manner they felt was aligned with the wishes and aims of the researcher (Orne, 1962). Whilst this is possible, it is hoped that the additional use of vignettes enabled the researcher to tap into their beliefs and attitudes in relation to responding to TWB within casework (Barter & Renold, 2000; Hughes, 1998). This is because vignettes provide the distance that participants require to discuss their beliefs and attitudes towards potentially sensitive areas of practice since they depersonalise the area being explored, providing a non-threatening context to explore this area of their practice (Hughes, 1998). It is also possible that EPs may have provided socially desirable responses within their vignette responses; it is hoped that this was mitigated by not only asking EPs how they felt the fictional EP should respond, but also asking how they would respond if it were their own case (Barter & Renold, 2000).

Another limitation of the study is that the vignettes were presented at the start of semi-structured interviews, meaning that their content may have influenced EPs' responses in relation to their own personal practice. Yet, this decision was made to orient the participants towards the research focus and to the topic of TWB within educational psychology casework before a discussion of their own experience (Barter & Renold, 2000; Hughes, 1998). Additionally, little information was provided regarding EPs' responses within the vignettes and so the researcher does not consider there to be a large risk of influence here.

Another limitation of the vignette methodology is that both vignettes depicted pupils in similar age categories, both of whom presented with SEMH needs. The vignettes also only described pupils presenting with externalising behaviours, not representing the full range of SEMH needs such as anxiety, depression and self-harm as outlined in the SEND code of practice (DfE, 2015). These vignettes therefore only represent a restricted range of SEND. The aim of this paper was to identify the practices, experiences and beliefs of EPs in responding to TWB needs within casework for pupils with SEND more broadly. Since the vignettes only captured a narrow range of SEND, it is important to note that findings in relation to RQ3 may not capture EPs' beliefs in responding to TWB needs across a wider range of SEND. However, findings from RQ1 and RQ2 do capture the experiences and responses of EPs in encountering TWB needs across a wider range of SEND casework from examples of their own practice.

Future studies may benefit from creating vignettes that capture a broader range of SEND casework using the academic literature (Braun & Clarke, 2013b) and by drawing upon what is currently known about TWB needs in relation to supporting pupils with SEND. Perhaps focus groups could be used at a later stage when reviewing the content of the vignettes to ensure that participants feel that their content is authentic.

The credibility of the study is also limited by the lack of triangulation completed in this study (Shenton, 2004). The teacher voice is amiss in this research study, and it might be helpful for future research studies to explore this further. This is important when one considers the disparity between teacher and EP views on the EP role in supporting TWB e.g. Andrews (2017) and Birchall (2021). Future research might seek to identify teachers who feel they have experienced a well-being need during a piece of educational psychology casework, gaining both the perceptions of the teacher and the EP to compare and contrast these different viewpoints. Alternatively, a case study approach could be taken in which observations of EPs' practice is conducted in cases where they feel a teacher is presenting with a well-being need.

It is also important to recognise that this is a qualitative research study and that, "the results of a qualitative study must be understood within the context of the particular characteristics of the organisation, or organisations and, perhaps, geographical area

in which the field work was carried out." (Shenton, 2004, p.70). For instance, the findings of the study may not readily transfer to all services, particularly where the models of service delivery might differ from that described within the participants section of this paper. It might be that services that draw primarily on consultation as a model of service delivery may not experience the same service delivery and time constraints in relation to supporting TWB in casework that were presented in this paper. The researcher recognises that the transferability of the study findings may be limited due to their inability to report in-depth features of the participants for ethical reasons. This may prevent other researchers from feeling able to compare the findings of this study to their own settings (Shenton, 2004).

Similar to the Ofsted (2019) study, a possible criticism of this research is that the findings are based on eliciting EPs' subjective understanding and conceptualisations of the term 'well-being'. One of the potential implications of this is that, although an EP may perceive a teacher was presenting with a well-being need in a discussion of their own experiences and responses within casework, this may not have been experienced by the teacher as a well-being need as such. However, it felt important not to offer a definition of well-being in recognition of its subjective nature (DfE, 2019b) and through capturing such subjectivity, the researcher was able to elicit a rich and broad understanding into EPs' individual experiences in this field, which have been captured in RQ1. Further, from the perspective of critical realism, the EPs' perceptions of TWB are of importance since they reflect the empirical domain of reality, relating to aspects of the world that are perceived and experienced (McEvoy & Richards, 2006; Tikly, 2015) as well as the reality which may exist outside of individual experience (McEvoy & Richards, 2006; Tikly, 2015).

Additionally, it is possible that not all EPs felt that the teachers in the vignettes were presenting with well-being needs due to the subjective nature of this term (DfE, 2019b). However, it is hoped that by co-constructing the vignettes with EPs in focus groups, the researcher was able to capture an authentic and representative depiction of how EPs may experience TWB needs within their routine casework.

It is true that the term well-being is broad and somewhat lacking in precision (Weare & Gray, 2003). However, it is a widely accepted, ecological term that is of currency across academic literature and within the educational sphere (Weare & Gray, 2003).

Within this research, embracing the multidimensional and broad nature of the term well-being has actually enabled the researcher to gain rich insight into how EPs experience TWB and what they feel is important in responding to it within the casework context. Nevertheless, future research might benefit from focusing on aspects of the findings here in relation to more specific TWB indicators e.g. the role of the EP in supporting self-efficacy/autonomy within casework.

5.5 Implications for educational psychology practice

The findings of this study have far-reaching implications for the practice of EPs, the experiences of teachers they meet within casework and the outcomes for pupils at the heart of the casework.

Firstly, the findings suggest that teachers present issues related to both their professional and affective well-being as defined by van Horn et al., (2004) within the casework context, linking to the demands of the case, their personal lives and to the general demands of the teaching role. Consequently, it seems important that EPs embrace their role as, "professional caregivers" (Zafeiriou & Gulliford, 2020, p.10) within the casework context. In doing so, they should actively seek to demonstrate their awareness of the potential fragility of teachers in the casework context, working sensitively so as not to further perpetuate the situation or to further imbalance teachers' state of well-being. In conveying such sensitivity, EPs should be mindful of how they challenge teachers' views and practice within the casework context whilst also avoiding adding extensive pressures to teacher workload as a consequence of their involvement.

The findings also suggest that support for TWB is a secondary outcome, and thereby an essential element, of educational psychology casework for CYP with SEND. Indeed, some participants in this study indicated that it is an integral focus for their involvement within casework, so much so, that some EPs report having specifically targeted their involvement towards this. Consequently, it seems important that some EPs consider reframing the term 'casework' when contracting such work with schools, making it clear that their involvement may involve, not only assessment of a child's needs, but that it may also involve them supporting aspects of teachers' well-being to support them in meeting CYP's needs. Nevertheless, the study also

highlights the importance of EPs supporting TWB with teachers' consent and guided by their willingness to do so.

The findings also indicate that EPs and service managers need to consider providing continuous access to professional development opportunities for EPs to understand how they can support TWB generally and within their routine casework. This is important since support for TWB may not necessarily be an add on aspect of the role but something that EPs need to consider within their routine casework. To this end, services should ensure that EPs feel confident in drawing upon their skills in solution-focused and psychodynamic approaches within their conversations and consultations with teachers during their routine casework, as described by EPs within the present study. It might also be helpful for some EPs to develop their skills and confidence in offering specific well-being interventions such as ACT (see Gillard et al., 2021), staff supervision or staff consultation groups (e.g. Davison & Duffy, 2017). Such interventions could be offered to schools in which EPs feel that teachers require further well-being support following a piece of casework.

EPs expressed that TWB needs can also impact on their experience of casework outcomes, often acting as a barrier to their ability to engage in problem-solving or move situations forward. This highlights the importance of EPs taking steps to support aspects of teachers' affective and professional well-being, as defined by van Horn et al., (2004), drawing on the supportive processes that have been outlined in this study, in the casework context. Some EPs in this study reflected a belief that their duty within casework is to keep the child's needs at the centre, regardless of the teachers' presenting well-being needs. Yet, the findings of this study suggest that, in the absence of such support for TWB, the EP's ability to problem solve and support the child will be greatly hindered. It will therefore be important for EPs to consider that support for TWB and support for the child are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

It is important to note that some EPs also felt that teachers often convey reluctance to discuss issues related to their own well-being with them in the casework context. EPs should therefore provide specific permission to teachers to discuss issues related to their own well-being within the casework context, providing the boundaries of a

holding environment as outlined by Howard (2018) for teachers to offload as part of their role in the casework.

The findings indicate that EPs perceive time and their model of service delivery to be barriers to them supporting TWB within routine casework. It therefore seems important that service managers provide EPs with more flexibility as to how they negotiate the use of their time with schools to afford them more scope to engage with issues related to TWB within casework. It might be that including measures related to TWB within casework evaluation processes might enable both schools and service managers to move towards this approach. It is interesting that some participants felt that the transition towards remote services due to the Covid-19 pandemic has afforded them more opportunity to work with teachers around particular cases and it would be helpful for services to unpick this further and to consider how this might be translated into future practice.

EPs also reflected the steps they had taken to ensure that the TWB needs could be met once their involvement had ended. This seems important given their discussion of time and service delivery constraints. As a part of the casework then, EPs could support teachers to develop some emotional coping strategies to support them in their work with the focus CYP or help them implement boundaries to protect themselves against the additional workload pressures within their role. Additionally, as discussed by EPs in this study, it would be sensible for them to act as advocates, with the teacher's permission, seeking support for their well-being in the wider school system.

Indeed, the findings suggest that EPs' routine casework in schools might provide insight into schools who require a more systemic intervention in relation to their approach to supporting TWB. For instance, some EPs felt that issues within the school culture impacted upon the well-being of teachers they meet within casework. Others felt that issues within the school culture impacted on their ability to seek help for TWB at a higher organisational level. It will be important for EP services to develop a tiered approach to supporting TWB, in line with that recommended by Anna Freud National Centre for Children and Families (n,d), so that they can intervene with issues related to TWB at an organisational level as appropriate. For instance, EPs could design and deliver TWB training packages to schools as a

universal approach to raise awareness for the importance of TWB as recommended by Salter-Jones (2012). Such training could be offered as a package where EPs feel that they are encountering TWB needs within casework on a recurring basis within particular schools. Alternatively, upon encountering TWB needs within casework, EPs could look to actively promote and facilitate staff supervision groups as a targeted approach to help teachers to process the emotional nature of their work (Rae et al. 2017). It is likely that the support of SLTs in schools will be required to embed these more systemic approaches. Consequently, it will be vital for EPs to consider how they can engage members of SLT in schools and to share with them the rationale for focusing on TWB as suggested by researchers such as Rae et al., (2017). As discussed by EPs in this study, one such way of achieving this could be for EPs give explicit consideration for how TWB needs can be included within their formulation of presenting problems within their casework as appropriate. If this were to constitute part of their formulation, it might be easier for an EP to recommend that the school implement their own support systems for staff well-being to support them in meeting pupils' needs.

A unique finding of this study is that EPs discussed some of their own personal emotional responses upon experiencing a TWB issues within casework. The researcher argues that it will be important for EPs to be provided with appropriate supervision, in which they are encouraged to reflect on processes such as projection and projective identification, which they are likely to experience frequently within their work (Ellis, 2021).

5.6 Conclusion

Following an in-depth exploration of the literature, the researcher deemed that there is a current dearth of research which investigates the experiences of EPs in encountering TWB issues within casework, or the nature of their responses when these issues present within casework. Similarly, there is a lack of research which has specifically investigated EPs' views/beliefs regarding their role in responding to TWB within casework. This is concerning when one considers that staff will most likely present with difficult emotions within the context of the casework due to the impact that caring for the additional needs of young people might have on their own well-being as indicated by Blick (2019), Brittle (2020), Farouk (2012), Zafeiriou

(2017) and Zafeiriou and Gulliford (2020). Further, ultimately, if casework is argued to be the essential ingredient of educational psychology practice (Randall, 2010), and if EPs cite examples of how they indirectly support TWB through this (e.g. Birchall, 2021), further in-depth exploration into the EP role in offering such indirect well-being support within casework is required.

The present study sought to uniquely explore how, and to what extent, a sample of EPs experience issues related to TWB in the context of casework for CYP with SEND. Attention was additionally given to the practices of EPs in relation to this, exploring specifically how, and the extent to which, these EPs respond when issues related to TWB are presented to them within the casework. Vignette methodology was also used to explore participants' core assumptions and beliefs about the topic (Barter & Renold, 2000; Hughes, 1998).

5.6.1 RQ1
Findings from RQ1 give novel insight into how the EPs within the sample experience TWB within casework for pupils with SEND. Participants indicated how such well-being needs come to their attention within the casework context. This ranged from their experience of teachers being seemingly transparent with them about their well-being needs, to EPs using additional cues in the absence of such an explicit admission to infer a well-being need. Some EPs indicated that such well-being needs can interrupt their experience of the casework trajectory, having a negative influence on casework outcomes and their ability to problem-solve and move the situation forward.

EPs additionally described their experiences of encountering TWB needs within casework by reflecting their perceptions of the influencing factors on the teachers' state of well-being. For example, EPs indicated that the demands of the casework itself or the demands of meeting the needs of the focus pupil may have impacted on aspects of teachers' affective and professional well-being (as defined by van Horn et al., 2004). EPs indicated that they most commonly encounter such TWB needs within casework involving pupils with SEMH needs. That notwithstanding, EPs gave examples of cases in which TWB needs had presented across the spectrum of areas of need.

Additionally, though EPs perceived that aspects of the cases themselves influenced TWB, they also described the perceived contribution of teachers' extraneous personal life stressors and factors attributed to the demands of the teachers' role more generally.

5.6.2 RQ2

Findings from RQ2 provide insight into the responses that EPs take or have taken in the face of TWB needs within educational psychology casework. It is noteworthy that some EPs indicated that TWB needs in casework have a fundamental impact on their problem-solving approach. For instance, EPs cited examples of how they not only make TWB needs their focus within casework, but that the presence of TWB needs additionally impacts on their overall formulation of the presenting concerns around CYP.

Some EPs provided insight into how they respond to TWB needs in casework preventatively by providing, what could be viewed as, a safe holding environment as outlined by Howard (2018), to enable TWB needs to be expressed. In reacting to TWB needs, EPs also spoke of how they respond in an emotionally attuned manner to the teachers' needs, convey sensitivity during difficult conversations and by additionally providing support for aspects of their professional well-being as defined by van Horn et al. (2004).

The data also suggests that some of the EPs offer a distinctive contribution in their responses to TWB within casework, through the provision and application of psychological processes and paradigms described previously in this chapter. Nevertheless, it is also important to recognise some EPs' admissions that such support also takes on a more informal approach using "low level conversations" to respond to TWB needs in casework.

Though these responses to TWB needs were discussed, some EPs also referenced barriers to their ability to support TWB within casework, citing service delivery and time constraints as examples. Helpfully, EPs referenced responses taken that might enable TWB needs to be met in their absence: mobilising in school support, helping teachers to implement boundaries and providing emotional coping tools to the teacher in the casework context.

Similarly, EPs also discussed the importance of their professional boundaries and duties and how this influences their responses to TWB needs within casework. Some EPs indicated that their core professional duty within the casework remains with children, regardless of the teacher's well-being. Others described their duty to respond objectively, gaining a credible view of the situation in the face of the teacher's presenting well-being needs.

5.6.3 RQ3

Interestingly, there was considerable overlap between EPs' discussions of their own responses (RQ2) and their beliefs (RQ3), and this is described in depth in section 5.3.

EPs shared their perceptions around the rationale for supporting the teachers' well-being in the vignettes. Some EPs felt that support for the teachers' well-being was not a professional duty, but a human instinct. For others, supporting the teachers' well-being was akin to supporting a team-mate in need to work towards a common goal of achieving positive outcomes for the child.

That notwithstanding, some EPs reflected the importance of keeping the children's needs at the heart of the casework, regardless of the teachers' presenting well-being needs. For instance, participants perceived that it would be important for the EP to challenge the teacher's practice where necessary. Nevertheless, some EPs perceived that it would be important demonstrate sensitivity when challenging the teachers' practice or when making suggestions for next steps, bearing in mind their potential fragility in the casework context.

EPs also offered insight into some of the specific responses they believed might be helpful in the face of the teachers' presenting well-being needs in the vignettes. EPs reflected that an appropriate response would be to enhance aspects of teachers' professional well-being as defined by van Horn et al., (2004). They also described how it would be important for the EP to attend to the difficult and often, uncomfortable emotional experiences of the teachers, through processes of conveying empathy, acceptance, validation and through seeking to reframe teachers' perspectives on the cases. Participants also explicitly referred to a range of paradigms and psychological processes that could be deployed in the EPs' responses to the teachers' well-being needs.

Some EPs also expressed beliefs about the barriers towards supporting TWB needs in the casework scenarios. The barriers included EPs concerns about the stigma attached to the provision of well-being support in the school culture, the need to take guidance from the teacher in relation to their wishes and needs, service delivery, time constraints and the need to triangulate and test the teachers' constructions of the case.

In conclusion, the researcher has offered novel insight into understanding the experiences, practices, and perceptions of EPs in relation to TWB in the context of their routine casework. The findings of the study must be considered in view of the limitations discussed. Yet, ultimately, the research has offered an understanding, not only into the mechanisms through which EPs might experience and support TWB, but has also indicated how this role might be embedded within this core aspect of educational psychology practice. The research tentatively indicates that teachers do present with issues related to their well-being within educational psychology casework. This is important as it means that EPs should bear in mind the potential fragility of teachers in the casework context and consider using the casework context as a vehicle for TWB support. TWB is an integral part of a child's experience as indicated by Hanko (2002), Briner and Dewberry (2007), Kidger et al., (2009) and Roffey (2012) and therefore, in finding a way forward for the child, it is vital for EPs to consider TWB within their routine casework.

References

All references in appendices are provided in the present section

Aelterman, A., Engels, N., Van Petegem, K., & Verhaeghe, J. P. (2007). The wellbeing of teachers in Flanders: The importance of a supportive school culture. *Educational Studies*, *33*(3), 285–297. https://doi.org/10.1080/03055690701423085

American Psychological Association (APA). (2006). Evidence-Based Practice in Psychology. *American Psychologist, 61*(4) 271-285. DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.61.4.271

Andrews, R. (2017). *Reaching for a shared understanding: Exploring the views of Educational Psychologists (EPs) and Special Educational Needs Coordinators (SENCos) about the role of the EP in supporting mental health and psychological wellbeing in schools.* (Doctoral thesis, University of East London) Retrieved from https://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?uin=uk.bl.ethos.725825

Anna Freud National Centre for Children and Families. (n.d.). *Supporting Staff wellbeing in Schools.* Retrieved from *https://www.annafreud.org/schools-and-colleges/resources/supporting-staff-wellbeing-in-schools/*

Archer, M., Bhaskar, R., Collier, A., Lawson, T., & Norrie, A. (1998). General Introduction. In M, Archer., R, Bhaskar., A, Collier, A., T, Lawson., & A, Norrie (Ed.). *Critical Realism: Essential Reading*s (pp ix-1). Retrieved from https://www.google.co.uk/books/edition/Critical_Realism/lrK5m8NThWYC?hl=en&gbpv=1&printsec=frontcover

Armstrong, D., & Hallett, F. (2012). Private Knowledge, public face: Conceptions of children with SEBD by teachers in the UK- a case study. *Educational & Child Psychology 29*(4), 77-87. Retrieved from https://shop.bps.org.uk/educational-child-psychology-vol-29-no-4-december-2012-teachers-well-being

Ashton, R., & Roberts, E. (2006). What is valuable and unique about the Educational Psychologist? *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *22*(2), 111–123. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667360600668204

Atkinson, C., Thomas, G., Goodhall, N., Barker, L., Healey, W.L., & Ogunmyiwa, J. (2019). Developing a student-led school mental health strategy. *Pastoral Care in Education*, *37*(1), 3-25. https://doi.org/10.1080/02643944.2019.1570545

Bandura, A., Adams, N. E., & Beyer, J. (1977). Cognitive processes mediating behavioral change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. *35*(3, 125-139. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.35.3.125

Barter, C., & Renold, E. (2000). 'I wanna tell you a story': Exploring the application of vignettes in qualitative research with children and young people. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *3*(4), 307–323. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645570050178594

Bhaskar, R., & Lawson, T. (1998). Introduction: Basic texts and developments. In M, Archer., R, Bhaskar., A, Collier, A., T, Lawson., & A, Norrie (Ed.). *Critical Realism: Essential Reading*s (pp 3-16). Retrieved from https://www.google.co.uk/books/edition/Critical_Realism/lrK5m8NThWYC?hl=en&gbpv=1&printsec=frontcover

Billington, T. (2006). Psychodynamic theories and the 'science of relationships' (Bion): A rich resource for professional practice in children's services. *Educational & Child Psychology, 23*(4) 72-91. Retrieved from https://shop.bps.org.uk/educational-child-psychology-vol-23-no-4-2006-psychological-perspectives-in-multi-agency-working.

Birchall, A. (2021). *Working on Wellbeing: An exploration of the factors that support teacher wellbeing, and the potential role for Educational Psychologists.* (Doctoral thesis, University College London) Retrieved from: https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10122171/

Blick, O. (2019). "*It would be easier if I didn't care as much, but if I didn't care I wouldn't be able to do it…" Enabling teachers to manage the personal and*

professional tensions when supporting pupils with challenging behaviour. (Doctoral thesis, University of Sheffield) Retrieved from http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/24682/

Bobek, B. L. (2002). Teacher Resiliency: A Key to Career Longevity. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, *75*(4), 202–205. https://doi.org/10.1080/00098650209604932

Boland, A., Cherry, M.G., & Dickson, R. (2017*). Doing A Systematic Review: A student's guide.* (2nd ed). London: Sage.

Bond, C., Hebron, J., & Oldfield, J. (2017). Professional learning among specialist staff in resourced mainstream schools for pupils with ASD and SLI. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *33*(4), 341–355. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2017.1324406

Boyle, C., & Lauchlan, F. (2009). Applied psychology and the case for individual casework: Some reflections on the role of the educational psychologist. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *25*(1), 71–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667360802697639

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1191/1478088706QP063OA

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful Qualitative Research: A practical guide for beginners.* London: Sage

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013b). A*n introduction to the Vignette method.* Retrieved from https://studysites.sagepub.com/braunandclarke/study/additional.htm

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2020). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *17*(4), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (n,,d.). *Thematic Analysis: a reflexive approach*. Retrieved from https://www.psych.auckland.ac.nz/en/about/thematic-analysis.html#bfa0bedc83228bf4cabc945e04addce

Briner, R., & Dewberry, C. (2007). *Staff wellbeing is key to school success: A research study into the links between staff wellbeing and school performance.* Retrieved from http://www.teachertoolkit.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/5902birkbeckwbperfsummaryfinal.pdf

The British Psychological Society. (2014). *Code of Human Research Ethics.* Leicester: The British Psychological Society.

Brittle, B. (2020). Coping strategies and burnout in staff working with students with special educational needs and disabilities. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *87*, 1-8 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102937

Brown, E., & Henderson, L. (2012). Promoting staff support in schools: Solution Circles. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *28*(2), 177–186. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2012.665358

Brown, L.Z. (2018). *"One of ours"- an exploration of inclusion and the use of alternative provision.* (Doctoral Thesis: University of Nottingham) Retrieved from *http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/55530/*

Burić, I., Slišković, A., & Penezić, Z. (2019). Understanding teacher wellbeing: a cross-lagged analysis of burnout, negative student-related emotions, psychopathological symptoms, and resilience. *Educational Psychology*, *39*(9), 1136–1155. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2019.1577952

Cherry, M.G., & Dickson, R. (2017). Defining My Review Question and Identifying Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria. In A. Boland., G.M Cherry., & R. Dickson (eds*.). Doing a Systematic Review: A student's guide* (2nd ed., pp 43-61). London: Sage.

Cohen, S., & Wills, T.A (1985). Stress, Social Support and the Buffering Hypothesis. *Psychological bulletin, 98*(2) 310-357.

Cohen, J. (1992). Quantitative methods in psychology: a power primer in psychology, *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(1), 155-159.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research Methods in Education.* Retrieved from: https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/nottingham/reader.action?docID=5103697

Costelloe, A., Mintz, J., & Lee, F. (2020). Bereavement support provision in primary schools: an exploratory study. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *36*(3), 281–296. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2020.1767040

Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (2018). *CASP Qualitative Studies Checklist.* Retrieved from: https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/

Davison, P., & Duffy, J. (2017). A model for personal and professional support for nurture group staff: to what extent can group process consultation be used as a resource to meet the challenges of running a nurture group? *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *33*(4), 387–405. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2017.1336704

Demerouti, E., Mostert, K., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Burnout and work engagement: a thorough investigation of the independency of both constructs. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, *15*(3), 209-222. DOI: 10.1037/a0019408

Department for Education. (2015). *Special Educational needs and disability code of practice: 0 to 25 years.* Retrieved from *https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/398815/SEND_Code_of_Practice_January_2015.pdf*

Department for Education. (2019a). *School Workforce in England: November 2018.* Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/811622/SWFC_MainText.pdf

Department for Education. (2019b). *School and College staff wellbeing: evidence from England, the UK and comparable sectors: Research Report.* Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/937601/Wellbeing-literature-review_final18052020_ap.pdf

Department for Education. (2020, August 25*). £8m programme to boost pupil and teacher wellbeing* [press release]. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/news/8m-programme-to-boost-pupil-and-teacher-wellbeing

Department for Education. (2021). *Education staff wellbeing charter: An explanation of the education staff wellbeing charter and the benefits of using it.* Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/guidance/education-staff-wellbeing-charter

Department of Health & Social Care and Department for Education (2018). *Government response to the consultation on Transforming Children and Young people's Mental Health Provision: a Green Paper and Next steps.* Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/728892/government-response-to-consultation-on-transforming-children-and-young-peoples-mental-health.pdf

Dodds, S., & Hess, A. C. (2020). Adapting research methodology during COVID-19: lessons for transformative service research. *Journal of Service Management*, *32*(2), 203–217. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-05-2020-0153

Dodge, R., Daly, A.P., Huyton, J., & Sanders, L. D. (2012). The challenge of defining wellbeing. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, *2*(3), 222–235. https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v2i3.4

Durksen, L.T., & Klassen, M.R. (2012). Pre-service teachers' weekly commitment and engagement during a final training placement: A longitudinal mixed methods study. *Educational & Child Psychology 29(*4). Retrieved from

https://shop.bps.org.uk/educational-child-psychology-vol-29-no-4-december-2012-teachers-well-being

Ellis, G. (2012). The impact on teachers of supporting children exposed to domestic abuse. *Educational & Child Psychology 29*(4) 109-120. Retrieved from https://shop.bps.org.uk/educational-child-psychology-vol-29-no-4-december-2012-teachers-well-being

Ellis, G (2021). What's yours and what's theirs? Understanding projection, transference and countertransference in educational psychology practice. In C, Arnold., D, Bartle., & X, Eloquin (Eds.), *Learning from the Unconscious: Psychoanalytic approaches in Educational Psychology.* (pp. 62-77) London: Karnac.

Evans, K. (2016). *Primary School Teachers' experiences of well-being. How can wellbeing be supported by schools and Educational Psychologists?* (Doctoral thesis, University of Birmingham) Retrieved from https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/7087/2/Evans16Ap.Ed.andChildPsyD_Vol_1.pdf

Fallon, K., Woods, K., & Rooney, S. (2010). A discussion of the developing role of educational psychologists within Children's Services. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *26*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667360903522744.

Farrell, P., Woods, K., & Lewis, S., Rooney, S., Squires, G., & O'Connor, M. (2006). *A Review of the Functions and Contribution of Educational Psychologists in England and Wales in light of "Every Child Matters:Change for Children."* London: DfES.

Farouk, S. (2004). Group work in schools: A process consultation approach. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 20* (3), 207-220. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0266736042000251790

Farouk, S. (2012). What can the self-conscious emotion of guilt tell us about primary school teachers' moral purpose and the relationships they have with their

pupils?. *Teachers and teaching*, *18*(4), 491-507. DOI: 10.1080/13540602.2012.696049

Finney, D. (2006). Stretching the boundaries: Schools as therapeutic agents in mental health. Is it a realistic proposition? *Pastoral Care in Education*, *24*(3), 22–27. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0122.2006.00375.x

Gibbs, S. (2007). Teachers' perceptions of efficacy: Beliefs that may support inclusion or segregation. *Educational and Child Psychology*, *24*(3), 47–53. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Simon_Gibbs/publication/292588052_Teachers'_perceptions_of_efficacy_Beliefs_that_may_support_inclusion_or_segregation/links/582ede3b08ae138f1c031598/Teachers-perceptions-of-efficacy-Beliefs-that-may-support-inclusion-or-segregation.pdf

Gibbs, S., & Miller, A. (2014). Teachers' resilience and well-being: A role for educational psychology. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *20*(5), 609–621. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2013.844408

Gillard, D., Wright, D., McNally, A., Flaxman, P. E., McIntosh, R., & Honey, K. (2021). Acceptance & commitment therapy for school leaders' well-being: an initial feasibility study. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *37*(1), 34–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2020.1855120

Glaser, B.G., & Holton, J. (2004). Remodeling Grounded Theory. *Forum: Qualitative Market, Media and Opinion Research* ,*5*(2). Retrieved from https://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/607

Gough, D. (2007). Weight of evidence: A framework for the appraisal of the quality and relevance of evidence. *Research Papers in Education*, *22*(2), 213–228. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671520701296189

Greenfield, B. (2015). How can teacher resilience be protected and promoted? *Educational & Child Psychology, 32*(4) 52-68. Retrieved from https://shop.bps.org.uk/educational-child-psychology-vol-32-no-4-december-2015-practising-psychology-in-challenging-times

Greenhalgh, J., & Brown, T. (2017). Quality Assessment: Where do I begin? In A. Boland., G.M Cherry., & R. Dickson (eds*.). Doing a Systematic Review: A student's guide* (2nd ed., pp 107-131). London: Sage.

Guba, E.G. (1981). Criteria for Assessing the Trustworthiness of Naturalistic Inquiries. *Educational Communication and Technology, 29* (2) 75-91. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF02766777

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K, Denzin & Y. S, Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gutkin, B.T. (1999). Collaborative versus directive/prescriptive/expert school-based consultation: Reviewing and Resolving a False Dichotomy. *Journal Of School Psychology, 37*(2) 161-190. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022440599000035

Hanko, G. (2002). Making psychodynamic insights accessible to teachers as an integral part of their professional task: the potential of collaborative consultation approaches in school-based professional development. *Psychodynamic Practice*, *8*(3), 375–389. https://doi.org/10.1080/1353333021000018980

Hosford, S., & O'Sullivan, S. (2016). A climate for self-efficacy: the relationship between school climate and teacher efficacy for inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *20* (6), 604-621. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2015.1102339

Howard, S. (2018). *Psychodynamic Counselling in a nutshell* (3rd ed). London: Sage.

Hughes, R. (1998). Considering the vignette technique and its application to a study of drug injecting and HIV risk and safer behaviour. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, *20*(3), 381–400. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.00107

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G.H, Lerner (Ed.). *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp.13-

31). Retrieved from

https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=Cae1CqfKig8C&oi=fnd&pg=
PA13&dq=jefferson+glossary+of+transcript+symbols&ots=1YJf7i0y4c&sig=d
9GsJj7JLwA-Gkyl-
TiY95F2Utk#v=onepage&q=jefferson%20glossary%20of%20transcript%20sy
mbols&f=false

Kennedy, E.K., & Lee,V. (2021). A distinctive helping relationship: historical and
contemporary perspectives on psychodynamic thinking in consultation. In C,
Arnold., D, Bartle., & X, Eloquin (Eds.). *Learning from the Unconscious:
Psychoanalytic approaches in Educational Psychology (pp. 135-157).* London:
Karnac.

Kidger, J., Gunnell, D., Biddle, L., Campbell, R., & Donovan, J. (2009). Part and
parcel of teaching? Secondary school staff's views on supporting student
emotional health and wellbeing. *British Educational Research Journal*, *36*(6),
1-17 https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920903249308

Kinman, G., Wray, S., & Strange, C. (2011). Emotional labour, burnout and job
satisfaction in UK teachers: The role of workplace social support. *Educational
Psychology*, *31*(7), 843–856. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2011.608650

Krueger, A.R., & Casey, A.M. (2001). Designing and Conducting Focus Group
Interviews. *Social Development Papers 36,* 4-24. Retrieved from
https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.607.4701&rep=rep1
&type=pdf#page=10

Law, C.E. (2018). *An exploration of Educational Psychologists' (EP) practices for
behaviour concerns.* (Doctoral Thesis, University of Manchester) Retrieved
from
https://www.escholar.manchester.ac.uk/api/datastream?publicationPid=uk-ac-
man-scw:315420&datastreamId=FULL-TEXT.PDF

Lee, K., & Woods, K. (2017). Exploration of the developing role of the educational
psychologist within the context of "traded" psychological services, *Educational

Psychology in Practice, *33(3),* 111–125.
https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2016.1258545

Leung, C., Leung, J., Leung, S., & Karnilowicz,W. (2019). Effectiveness of the
Whole Inclusive School Empowerment (WISE) project in supporting preschool
children with diverse learning needs. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*,
92, 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2019.103433

Lewis, T, F. (2017). *Special Educational Need Coordinator (SENCO) wellbeing: a*
mixed methods exploration of workplace demands and effective coping actions
(Doctoral Thesis, University of Birmingham). Retrieved from
http://etheses.bham.ac.uk/7781/

McEvoy, P., & Richards, D. (2006). A critical realist rationale for using a
combination of quantitative and qualitative methods. *Journal of Research in*
Nursing, *11*(1), 66–78. https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987106060192

Mguni, N., Bacon, N., & Brown, J. F. (2012). The wellbeing and resilience paradox.
London: The Young Foundation.

Milfont, T. L., Denny, S., Ameratunga, S., Robinson, E., & Merry, S. (2008).
Burnout and wellbeing: Testing the Copenhagen burnout inventory in New
Zealand teachers. *Social Indicators Research*, *89*(1), 169–177.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-007-9229-9

Miller, A., & Black, L. (2001). Does Support for Home-School Behaviour Plans
Exist Within Teacher and Pupil Cultures? *Educational Psychology in Practice*,
17(3), 245-261. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667360120072765

Miller, A. (2003). *Teachers, Parents and Classroom Behaviour: A Psychosocial*
Approach. Retrieved from
https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/nottingham/reader.action?docID=292133
#

Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., & Altman, D. G. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLOS medicine*, *6*(7) https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.b2535

Moises Jr, T. C. (2020). Online data collection as adaptation in conducting quantitative and qualitative research during the COVID-19 pandemic. *European Journal of Education Studies*, *7*(11) 78-87. http://dx.doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v7i11.3336

Morris, R., & Atkinson, C. (2018). The role of educational psychologists in supporting post-16 transition: findings from the literature. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 34*(2), 131-149, https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2017.1411788.

NASUWT. (2018). *The Big Question: Teachers' Mental Health and Wellbeing 2018.* Retrieved from: https://www.nasuwt.org.uk/uploads/assets/uploaded/a884ec81-ce33-42f6-ab0411b407b540b2.pdf

Nolan, A., & Moreland, N. (2014). The process of psychological consultation. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *30*(1), 63-77. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2013.873019

Noyes, J. & Lewin, S. (2011). Supplemental Guidance on Selecting a Method of Qualitative Evidence Synthesis, and Integrating Qualitative Evidence within Cochrane Intervention Reviews. In Noyes J, Booth A, Hannes K, Harden A, Harris J, Lewin S, Lockwood (Eds.). *Supplementary Guidance for Inclusion of Qualitative Research in Cochrane Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Version 1*(1-22). Retrieved from *https://methods.cochrane.org/sites/methods.cochrane.org.qi/files/public/uploads/Data%20synthesis%20supplemental%20guidance_2010%2012%2023B.doc*

Ofsted. (2019). *Teacher wellbeing at work in schools and further education providers*. Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/936253/Teacher_well-being_report_110719F.pdf

Orne, M. T. (1962). On the social psychology of the psychological experiment: With particular reference to demand characteristics and their implications. *American psychologist, 17*(11), 776.

Partridge, K. (2012). Exploring pastoral staff's experiences of their own emotional well-being in a secondary school. *Educational & Child Psychology,* 29 (4), 121-132. Retrieved from https://shop.bps.org.uk/educational-child-psychology-vol-29-no-4-december-2012-teachers-well-being

Paterson, A., & Grantham, R. (2016). How to make teachers happy: An exploration of teacher wellbeing in the primary school context. *Educational & Child Psychology*, *33*(2), 90-104. Retrieved from https://shop.bps.org.uk/educational-child-psychology-vol-33-no-2-june-2016-neuroscience-and-educational-psychology

Pilkington, G., & Hounsome, J. (2017). Planning and Managing My Review. In A. Boland., G.M Cherry., & R. Dickson (eds*.). Doing a Systematic Review: A student's guide* (2nd ed., pp 21-43). London: Sage.

Popay, J., Roberts, H., Sowden, A., Petticrew, M., Arai, L., Rodgers, M., Britten, N., Roen, K., & Duffy, S. (2006). *Guidance on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews. A product from the ESRC methods programme.* Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mark_Rodgers4/publication/233866356_Guidance_on_the_conduct_of_narrative_synthesis_in_systematic_reviews_A_product_from_the_ESRC_Methods_Programme/links/02e7e5231e8f3a6183000000/Guidance-on-the-conduct-of-narrative-synthesis-in-systematic-reviews-A-product-from-the-ESRC-Methods-Programme.pdf

Rae, T., Cowell, N., & Field, L. (2017). Supporting teachers' wellbeing in the context of schools for children with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, *22*(3), 200–218. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632752.2017.1331969

Ramsay, J., Cowell, N., & Gersch, I. (2018). How school staff understand the relationship between problem behaviours and language difficulties. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *34*(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2017.1367647

Randall, L. (2010). Secure attachment in the future: The role of educational psychology in making it happen. *Educational & Child Psychology 27*(3), 87-99. Retrieved from https://shop.bps.org.uk/educational-child-psychology-vol-27-no-3-september-2010-attachment

Ravenette, T. (1999). *Personal Construct Theory in Educational Psychology: A practitioner's view.* London: Whurr publishers.

Robson, C., & McCartan, K. (2016). *Real World Research*. (4th ed). West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Roffey, S. (2012). Pupil wellbeing -Teacher wellbeing: Two sides of the same coin? *Educational and Child Psychology*, *29*(4), 8–17. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285631404_Pupil_wellbeing_-Teacher_wellbeing_Two_sides_of_the_same_coin

Roffey, S. (2015). Becoming an agent of change for school and student well-being. *Educational & Child Psychology, 32*(1). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320854162_Becoming_an_agent_of_change_for_school_and_student_well-being

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and wellbeing. *American psychologist*, *55*(1), 68-78. Retrieved from https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/SDT/documents/2000_RyanDeci_SDT.pdf

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On Happiness and Human Potentials: A Review of Research on Hedonic and Eudaimonic Wellbeing. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*(1)*,* 141-166. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/12181660_On_Happiness_and_Huma

n_Potentials_A_Review_of_Research_on_Hedonic_and_Eudaimonic_Well-Being

Ryan, R. M., Huta, V., & Deci, E. L. (2008). Living well: A self-determination theory perspective on eudaimonia. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *9*(1), 139–170. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-006-9023-4

Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The Structure of Psychological Wellbeing Revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*(4), 719–727. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.4.719

Salter-Jones, E. (2012). Promoting the emotional well-being of teaching staff in secondary schools. *Educational & Child Psychology*, *29*(4) 18-32. Retrieved from https://shop.bps.org.uk/educational-child-psychology-vol-29-no-4-december-2012-teachers-well-being

Santana, F. N., Hammond Wagner, C., Berlin Rubin, N., Bloomfield, L. S. P., Bower, E. R., Fischer, S. L., Santos, B.S., Smith, G.E., Muraida, C.T., & Wong-Parodi, G. (2021). A path forward for qualitative research on sustainability in the COVID-19 pandemic. *Sustainability Science, 16,* 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-020-00894-8

Scottish Executive Education Department (SEED). (2002). *Review of Provision of Educational Psychology Services in Scotland.* Edinburgh: SEED

Sharrocks, L. (2012). *School Staff Perceptions of Well –Being and Experience of an Intervention to Promote Mental Well-Being* (Doctoral Thesis, University of Manchester). Retrieved from https://www.research.manchester.ac.uk/portal/en/theses/school-staff-perceptions-of-wellbeing-and-experience-of-an-intervention-to-promote-mental-wellbeing(1d196198-4ded-4aaf-b082-b3568777a294).html

Sharrocks, L. (2014). School staff perceptions of wellbeing and experience of an intervention to promote wellbeing. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *30*(1), 19–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2013.868787

Shenton, A.K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information, 22 (2)* 63-75. Retrieved from https://content.iospress.com/articles/education-for-information/efi00778

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of relations. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*(4), 1059–1069. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.11.001

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2014). Teacher self-efficacy and perceived autonomy: Relations with teacher engagement, job satisfaction, and emotional exhaustion. *Psychological Reports: Employment Psychology & Marketing*, *114*(1), 68–77. https://doi.org/10.2466/14.02.PR0.114k14w0

Tikly, L. (2015). What works, for whom, and in what circumstances? Towards a critical realist understanding of learning in international and comparative education. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *40*, 237–249. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2014.11.008

Underhill, C., & Olmsted, M. G. (2003). An Experimental Comparison of Computer-Mediated and Face-to-Face Focus Groups. *Social Science Computer Review*, *21*(4), 506–512. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439303256541

Van Droogenbroeck, F., Spruyt, B., & Vanroelen, C. (2014). Burnout among senior teachers: Investigating the role of workload and interpersonal relationships at work. *Teaching and Teacher Education. 43,* 99-109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.07.005

van Horn, J. E., Taris, T. W., Schaufeli, W. B., & Schreurs, P. J. G. (2004). The structure of occupational wellbeing: A study among Dutch teachers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *77*(3), 365–375. https://doi.org/10.1348/0963179041752718

Wagner, P. (2000). Consultation: Developing a comprehensive approach to service delivery. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *16*(1), 9–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/026673600115229

Weare,K., & Gray, G. (2003). What works in Developing Children's Emotional and Social Competence and Wellbeing? *Nottingham: DfES*

Weare, K. (2015). What works in promoting social and emotional well-being and responding to mental health problems in schools? *London: National Children's Bureau.*

Willig, C. (2013). *Introducing qualitative research in Psychology.* Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/nottingham/reader.action?docID=1220260&query=willig+2013+qualitative+

Weiner, B. (2000). Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Theories of Motivation from an Attributional Perspective. *Educational Psychology Review*, *12*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009017532121

Woods, K., Bond, C., Humphrey, N., Symes, W., & Green, L. (2011). *Systematic review of Solution Focused Brief Therapy (SFBT) with children and families.* Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/184113/DFE-RR179.pdf

Woolfson, L., Whaling, R., Stewart, A., & Monsen, J. (2003). An integrated framework to guide educational psychologist practice. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *19*(4), 283–304. https://doi.org/10.1080/0266736032000138535

Zafeiriou, M.E. (2017). *A grounded theory study of educational psychologists' mental health casework in schools* (Doctoral thesis, University of Nottingham). Retrieved from http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/45423/1/Maria%20Evrydiki%20Zafeiriou%20Thesis%20Final %20pdf.pdf

Zafeiriou, M. E., & Gulliford, A. (2020). A grounded theory of educational psychologists' mental health casework in schools: connection, direction and

reconstruction through consultation. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *36*(4), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2020.1818553

Zee, M., & Koomen, H. M. Y. (2016). Teacher Self-Efficacy and Its Effects on Classroom Processes, Student Academic Adjustment, and Teacher Well-being: A Synthesis of 40 Years of Research. *Review of Educational Research*, *86*(4) 1-35 https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626801

Studies included in the Systematic Literature Review

Armstrong, D., & Hallett, F. (2012). Private Knowledge, public face: Conceptions of children with SEBD by teachers in the UK- a case study. *Educational & Child Psychology 29*(4), 77-87. Retrieved from https://shop.bps.org.uk/educational-child-psychology-vol-29-no-4-december-2012-teachers-well-being

Bond, C., Hebron, J., & Oldfield, J. (2017). Professional learning among specialist staff in resourced mainstream schools for pupils with ASD and SLI. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *33*(4), 341–355. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2017.1324406

Cane, F. E., & Oland, L. (2015). Evaluating the outcomes and implementation of a TaMHS (Targeting Mental Health in Schools) project in four West Midlands (UK) schools using activity theory. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *31*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2014.975784

Cooper, L., & Woods, K. (2017). Evaluating the use of a strengths-based development tool with head teachers. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *33*(1), 31–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2016.1220924

Costelloe, A., Mintz, J., & Lee, F. (2020). Bereavement support provision in primary schools: an exploratory study. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *36*(3), 281–296. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2020.1767040

Davison, P., & Duffy, J. (2017). A model for personal and professional support for nurture group staff: to what extent can group process consultation be used as a resource to meet the challenges of running a nurture group? *Educational*

Psychology in Practice, *33*(4), 387–405.
https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2017.1336704

Dobia, B., Parada, R.H., Roffey, S., & Smith, M. (2019). Social and emotional
learning: from individual skills to class cohesion. *Educational & Child
Psychology*, *36*(2) 78-91. Retrieved from: https://shop.bps.org.uk/educational-
child-psychology-vol-36-no-2-june-2019-school-belonging

Edwards, L. N. (2016). Looking after the teachers: exploring the emotional labour
experienced by teachers of looked after children. *Educational Psychology in
Practice*, *32*(1), 54–72. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2015.1112256

Ellis, G. (2012). The impact of teachers of supporting children exposed to domestic
abuse. *Educational & Child Psychology 29*(4), 109-120. Retrieved from
https://shop.bps.org.uk/educational-child-psychology-vol-29-no-4-december-
2012-teachers-well-being

Gillard, D., Wright, D., McNally, A., Flaxman, P. E., McIntosh, R., & Honey, K.
(2021). Acceptance & commitment therapy for school leaders' well-being: an
initial feasibility study. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *37*(1), 34–51.
https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2020.1855120

Lawrence, N., & Cahill, S. (2014). The impact of dynamic assessment: An
exploration of the views of children, parents and teachers. *British Journal of
Special Education*, *41*(2), 191–211. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8578.12060

Paterson, A., & Grantham, R. (2016). How to make teachers happy: An exploration
of teacher wellbeing in the primary school context. *Educational & Child
Psychology, 33(2),* 90-105. Retrieved from https://shop.bps.org.uk/educational-
child-psychology-vol-33-no-2-june-2016-neuroscience-and-educational-
psychology.html?platform=hootsuite

Rae, T., Cowell, N., & Field, L. (2017). Supporting teachers' well-being in the
context of schools for children with social, emotional and behavioural
difficulties. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, *22*(3), 200–218.
https://doi.org/10.1080/13632752.2017.1331969

Salter-Jones, E. (2012). Promoting the emotional well-being of teaching staff in
secondary schools. *Educational & Child Psychology 29*(4) 18-32. Retrieved
from https://shop.bps.org.uk/educational-child-psychology-vol-29-no-4-
december-2012-teachers-well-being

Sharrocks, L. (2014). School staff perceptions of well-being and experience of an
intervention to promote well-being. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 30*(1),
19-36. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2013.868787

Turner, J., & Gulliford, A. (2020). Examining the Circles of Adults process for
Children Looked After: the role of self-efficacy and empathy in staff behaviour
change. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *36*(1), 3.
https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2019.1667752

Zafeiriou, M. E., & Gulliford, A. (2020). A grounded theory of educational
psychologists' mental health casework in schools: connection, direction and
reconstruction through consultation. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *36*(4),
1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2020.1818553

Secondary References

Barrett, P. M. (2004). FRIENDS for Life! For children: Participant workbook and
leader's manual. Cited in Cane, F. E., & Oland, L. (2015).

Bradburn, N. (1969) The structure of psychological wellbeing. Cited in Dodge, R.,
Daly, A., Huyton, J., & Sanders, L. (2012).

Bion, W.R. (1970). Attention and interpretation. Cited in Billington, T. (2006).

Centre for Applied Positive Psychology (CAPP). (2015.) Realise 2 Technical
Manuel Version 1.4. Cited in Cooper, L., & Woods, K. (2017).

Goldberg, D., & Williams, P. (1988). A user's guide to the general health
questionnaire. Cited in Gillard, D., Wright, D., McNally, A., Flaxman, P. E.,
McIntosh, R., & Honey, K. (2021).

Appendix A: Full details of the Systematic Search Strategy

(All final searches are highlighted in yellow)

British Education Index

Date	**30/09/2020**
Data base	British Education Index
Search terms	**"educational psycholog*" AND (teach* OR staff) AND (wellbeing OR well-being OR well being OR resilience OR emotion* OR self-efficacy OR confidence OR competence OR autonom* OR stress OR coping OR burnout)**
Limits	All fields
Results	**600**
Action taken	**Limited to abstract**

Date	**30/09/2020**
Data base	British Education Index
Search terms	AB "educational psycholog*" AND AB (teach* OR staff) AND AB (wellbeing OR well-being OR well being OR resilience OR emotion* OR self-efficacy OR confidence OR competence OR autonom* OR stress OR coping OR burnout)
Limits	Abstract only
Results	**67**
Actions	removed emotion*, stress and coping

Date	**30/09/2020**
Data base	British Education Index
Search terms	AB "educational psycholog*" AND AB (teach* OR staff) AND AB (wellbeing OR well-being OR well being OR resilience OR self-efficacy OR confidence OR competence OR autonom* OR burnout)
Limits	Abstract only
Results	**48**
Actions	Search terms refined and asterixis added to resilience, confidence and competence

Date	**02/10/2020**
Database	**British Education index**
Search terms	AB "educational psycholog*" AND AB (teach* OR staff) AND AB (wellbeing OR well-being OR well being OR resilien* OR self-efficacy OR efficacy OR confiden* OR competen* OR autonom* OR burnout)
Limits	Abstract
Results	54
Actions	This is my final British Education Index search.

Psych info (Ovid)

Date	30/09/2020
Database	Psychinfo (Ovid)
Search terms	("educational psycholog*" and (teach* or staff) and (wellbeing or well-being or well being or resilience or emotion* or self-efficacy or confidence or competence or autonom* or stress or coping or burnout)).af.
Limits	All fields
Results	77082
Actions	Refined search terms to exclude the term emotion*

Date	30/09/2020
Database	Psychinfo (Ovid)
Search terms	"educational psycholog*" and (teach* or staff) and (wellbeing or well-being or well being or resilience or self-efficacy or confidence or competence or autonom* or stress or coping or burnout)).af.
Limits	All fields
Results	65013
Actions	Limited to abstract only and refined search terms to re-include emotion*

Date	30/09/2020
Database	Psychinfo (Ovid)
Search terms	("educational psycholog*" and (teach* or staff) and (wellbeing or well-being or well being or resilience or emotion* or self-efficacy or confidence or competence or autonom* or stress or coping or burnout)).ab.
Limits	Abstract only
Results	373
Actions	Remove emotion*, stress and coping from search terms

Date	30/09/2020
Database	Psychinfo (Ovid)
Search terms	("educational psycholog*" and (teach* or staff) and (wellbeing or well-being or well being or resilience or self-efficacy or confidence or competence or autonom* or burnout)).ab.
Limits	Abstract only
Results	186

Actions	Included * in some of the search terms e.g. confidence, competence and resilience.

Web of Science

Date	**30/09/2020**
Database	Web Of Science
Search terms	("educational psycholog*") *AND* **TOPIC:** (teach* OR staff) *AND* **TOPIC:** (wellbeing OR well-being OR well being OR resilience OR emotion* OR self-efficacy OR confidence OR competence OR autonom* OR stress OR coping OR burnout)
Limits	Topic
Results	**281**
Actions	Removed emotion*, stress and coping from search terms. Also decided to put an asterix on competence, resilience and confidence to ensure I was getting all words with the appropriate root.

Date	**30/09/2020**
Data base	Web Of Science
Search terms	**TOPIC:** ("educational psycholog*") *AND* **TOPIC:** (teach* OR staff) *AND* **TOPIC:** (wellbeing OR well-being OR well being OR resilience OR self-efficacy OR confidence OR competence OR autonom* OR burnout)
Limits	Topic
Results	**209**
Actions	**Adapted search terms to include competen*, resilien* and confiden***

Date	**02/10/2020**
Data base	Web Of Science
Search terms	**TOPIC:** ("educational psycholog*") *AND* **TOPIC:** (teach* OR staff) *AND* **TOPIC:** (wellbeing OR well-being OR well being OR resilien* OR self-efficacy OR efficacy OR confiden* OR competen* OR autonom* OR burnout)
Limits	Topic
Results	261
Actions	**This is my final Web of Science search.**

Date	**09/10/2020**
Data base	Web Of Science
Search terms	**TOPIC:** ("educational psycholog*") *AND* **TOPIC:** (teach* OR staff) *AND* **TOPIC:** (wellbeing OR well-being OR well being OR resilien* OR self-efficacy OR efficacy OR confiden* OR competen* OR autonom* OR burnout)
Limits	Topic
Results	262- one more study has been added which I feel is relevant to my work (Zafeiriou & Gulliford, 2020).
Actions	**This is my final Web of Science search.**

Appendix B: Reasons for studies being excluded from the SLR during screening of full texts

Table B1

Codes allocated for the primary reasons for study exclusions

Primary reason for study exclusion	Allocated code
Study was conducted outside of the United Kingdom	1
Study did not involve participants who are teachers in mainstream, primary and secondary settings or Educational Psychologists/Trainee Educational Psychologists.	2
Study did not refer to the role of Educational Psychologists in relation to teacher wellbeing or a well-being related construct	3
Study was not an empirical investigation/in a peer reviewed journal.	4

Table B2

Exclusion codes applied to the excluded studies

Study title	Authhour	Year of Publication	Exclusion code
Developing a student-led school mental health strategy	Atkinson et al.	2019	3
Pre-service teachers' weekly commitment and engagement during a final training placement: A longitudinal mixed methods study	Durksen and Klassen	2012	1
A climate for self-efficacy: the relationship between school climate and teacher efficacy for inclusion	Hosford and O'Sullivan	2016	1
Effectiveness of the Whole Inclusive School Empowerment (WISE) project in supporting preschool children with diverse learning needs	Leung et al.	2019	1
Exploring pastoral staff's experiences of their own emotional well-being in a secondary school.	Partridge	2012	2

Appendix C: An example of a completed CASP checklist (CASP, 2018) used to assess quality of qualitative studies

CASP
Critical Appraisal
Skills Programme

Paper for appraisal and reference: Bond, Hebron & Oldfield (2017)

Section A: Are the results valid?

1. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?

Yes ✔
Can't Tell
No

HINT: Consider
• what was the goal of the research
• why it was thought important
• its relevance

Comments: Clearly addresses the research aims. Literature presented highlights the relevance of the study.

2. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?

Yes ✔
Can't Tell
No

HINT: Consider
• If the research seeks to interpret or illuminate the actions and/or subjective experiences of research participants
• Is qualitative research the right methodology for addressing the research goal

Comments: The qualitative aspect of this study is appropriate to explore the experiences of the staff.

Is it worth continuing?

3. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?

Yes ✔
Can't Tell
No

HINT: Consider
• if the researcher has justified the research design (e.g. have they discussed how they decided which method to use)

Comments: Explains their use of questionairres and interviews clearly.

4. Was the recruitment
strategy appropriate to
the aims of the
research?

Yes	✔
Can't Tell	
No	

HINT: Consider
- If the researcher has explained how the participants were selected
- If they explained why the participants they selected were the most appropriate to provide access to the type of knowledge sought by the study
- If there are any discussions around recruitment (e.g. why some people chose not to take part)

Comments: Clear reason as to why these schools were chosen and also provided insight into who completed the research as opposed to who did not.

5. Was the data collected in
a way that addressed the
research issue?

Yes	✔
Can't Tell	
No	

HINT: Consider
- If the setting for the data collection was justified
- If it is clear how data were collected (e.g. focus group, semi-structured interview etc.)
- If the researcher has justified the methods chosen
- If the researcher has made the methods explicit (e.g. for interview method, is there an indication of how interviews are conducted, or did they use a topic guide)
- If methods were modified during the study. If so, has the researcher explained how and why
- If the form of data is clear (e.g. tape recordings, video material, notes etc.)
- If the researcher has discussed saturation of data

Comments: Clear discussion of data collection. Also discussion around basing the training around the pp's needs.

178

6. Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered?

Yes ✔
Can't Tell
No

HINT: Consider
- If the researcher critically examined their own role, potential bias and influence during (a) formulation of the research questions (b) data collection, including sample recruitment and choice of location
- How the researcher responded to events during the study and whether they considered the implications of any changes in the research design

Comments: Yes- discussion around the researcher's use of a bespoke tool to gather data and the limitations around this discussed.

Section B: What are the results?

7. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?

Yes ✔
Can't Tell
No

HINT: Consider
- If there are sufficient details of how the research was explained to participants for the reader to assess whether ethical standards were maintained
- If the researcher has discussed issues raised by the study (e.g. issues around informed consent or confidentiality or how they have handled the effects of the study on the participants during and after the study)
- If approval has been sought from the ethics committee

Comments: Approval has been sought which implies that ethical considerations have been taken fully into consideration.

8. Was the data analysis
sufficiently rigorous?

Yes [ ]
Can't Tell [✔]
No [ ]

HINT: Consider
- If there is an in-depth description of the analysis process
- If thematic analysis is used. If so, is it clear how the categories/themes were derived from the data
- Whether the researcher explains how the data presented were selected from the original sample to demonstrate the analysis process
- If sufficient data are presented to support the findings
- To what extent contradictory data are taken into account
- Whether the researcher critically examined their own role, potential bias and influence during analysis and selection of data for presentation

Comments: Qual data does highlight that there was some contrary findings in relation to perceived effectiveness of training. Lack of data to show the evidence e.g. in perceptions of effectiveness no data is presented. The description of thematic analysis is also limited it simply states that it was done on Nvivo but no exploration as to codes and themes etc.

9. Is there a clear statement
of findings?

Yes [✔]
Can't Tell [ ]
No [ ]

HINT: Consider whether
- If the findings are explicit
- If there is adequate discussion of the evidence both for and against the researcher's arguments
- If the researcher has discussed the credibility of their findings (e.g. triangulation, respondent validation, more than one analyst)
- If the findings are discussed in relation to the original research question

Comments: Thematic map is provided and a summary of the data. Contrary data not discussed as a limitation/summary point.

5

180

CASP
Critical Appraisal
Skills Programme

Section C: Will the results help locally?

10. How valuable is the research?

HINT: Consider
- If the researcher discusses the contribution the study makes to existing knowledge or understanding (e.g. do they consider the findings in relation to current practice or policy, or relevant research-based literature
- If they identify new areas where research is necessary
- If the researchers have discussed whether or how the findings can be transferred to other populations or considered other ways the research may be used

Comments:

Appendix D: An example of a completed quantitative tool quality assessment criteria

Quality assessment tool taken from Woods et al., (2011) based on the American Psychological Association (2006)

Author: Cooper and Woods (2017)

Title: Evaluating the use of a strengths-based development tool with head teachers

Criteria from Woods et al. (2011)	Score	Comment
Use of a randomised group design	1 **0**	Single group post-test design.
Emphasis on a specific, well-defined disorder/problem	**1** 0	Clear outcome for the use of the Realise 2 debrief i.e. the outcome ratings for headteachers.
Comparison with treatment-as-usual placebo, or less favourably, standard control	1 **0**	No comparisons made.
Use of manuals/ protocols/ training procedures	**1** 0	The EP was a trained Realise 2 practitioner and the Realise 2 tool is also an established tool- see paper for details of reliability and validity.
Fidelity checks/intervention supervision	1 **0**	Not discussed.
Sample big enough to identify effect (from Cohen, 1992)	1 **0**	No effect sizes calculated.
Use of outcome measure(s) with demonstrable reliability and validity **(2 point weighting for more than one measure).**	2 1 **0**	Unclear as to whether these measures have reliability/validity.
Total	2	

Additional comments: the authors prioritise qualitative evidence

Appendix E: Summary of WoE A ratings for all qualitative papers

Table E1

Summary of WoEA ratings for all 17 papers using the CASP tool (CASP, 2018)

Criteria (taken from CASP, 2018)	Armstrong & Hallett (2012)	Costelloe et al. (2020)	Edwards (2016)	Cane & Oland (2015)	Rae et al. (2017)	Sharrocks (2014)	Lawrence & Cahill (2014)	Salter-Jones (2012)	Zafeiriou & Gulliford (2020)	Bond, et al. (2017)	Cooper & Woods (2017)	Davison & Duffy (2017)	Dobia et al. (2019)	Ellis (2012)	Gillard et al., (2021)	Turner & Gulliford (2020)	Paterson & Grantham (2016)
Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research e.g. relevance and goal?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Is a qualitative method	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Criteria (taken from CASP, 2018)	Armstrong & Hallett (2012)	Costelloe et al. (2020)	Edwards (2016)	Cane & Oland (2015)	Rae et al. (2017)	Sharrocks (2014)	Lawrence & Cahill (2014)	Salter-Jones (2012)	Zafeiriou & Gulliford (2020)	Bond, et al. (2017)	Cooper & Woods (2017)	Davison & Duffy (2017)	Dobia et al. (2019)	Ellis (2012)	Gillard et al., (2021)	Turner & Gulliford (2020)	Paterson & Grantham (2016)
ology appropriate?																	
Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the study?	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
Was the data collected in a	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1

184

Criteria (taken from CASP, 2018)	Armstrong & Hallett (2012)	Costelloe et al. (2020)	Edwards (2016)	Cane & Oland (2015)	Rae et al. (2017)	Sharrocks (2014)	Lawrence & Cahill (2014)	Salter-Jones (2012)	Zafeiriou & Gulliford (2020)	Bond, et al. (2017)	Cooper & Woods (2017)	Davison & Duffy (2017)	Dobia et al. (2019)	Ellis (2012)	Gillard et al., (2021)	Turner & Gulliford (2020)	Paterson & Grantham (2016)
way that addressed the research issue?																	
Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered?	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0
Have ethical issues been taken into consideration	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0

Criteria (taken from CASP, 2018)	Armstrong & Hallett (2012)	Costelloe et al. (2020)	Edwards (2016)	Cane & Oland (2015)	Rae et al. (2017)	Sharrocks (2014)	Lawrence & Cahill (2014)	Salter-Jones (2012)	Zafeiriou & Gulliford (2020)	Bond, et al. (2017)	Cooper & Woods (2017)	Davison & Duffy (2017)	Dobia et al. (2019)	Ellis (2012)	Gillard et al., (2021)	Turner & Gulliford (2020)	Paterson & Grantham (2016)
Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0
Is there a clear statement of findings?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
Will the results help locally?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Score (out of 10)	8	8	9	10	10	9	8	8	9	9	10	8	6	6	10	9	7
Percentage	80	80	90	100	100	90	80	80	90	90	100	80	60	60	100	90	70
Rating for WoE A (qualitative	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	MEDIUM	MEDIUM	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH

Criteria (taken from CASP, 2018)	Armstrong & Hallett (2012)	Costelloe et al. (2020)	Edwards (2016)	Cane & Oland (2015)	Rae et al. (2017)	Sharrocks (2014)	Lawrence & Cahill (2014)	Salter-Jones (2012)	Zafeiriou & Gulliford (2020)	Bond, et al. (2017)	Cooper & Woods (2017)	Davison & Duffy (2017)	Dobia et al. (2019)	Ellis (2012)	Gillard et al., (2021)	Turner & Gulliford (2020)	Paterson & Grantham (2016)
assessment)																	

0-33 %= low

34-66% = medium

67-100% = high

Table E2

Summary of quantitative quality assessment WoE A ratings used for Mixed Methods studies using criteria presented by Woods et al. (2011) based on the APA (2006)

Criteria (from by Woods et al. (2011) based on the APA (2006)	Bond et al., (2017)	Davison & Duffy (2017)	Cooper & Woods (2017)	Dobia, et al. (2019)	Ellis (2012)	Gillard et al., (2021)	Turner & Gulliford (2020)
Use of a randomised group design	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Focus on a specific, well-defined disorder or problem	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Comparison with treatment as usual placebo, or less preferably, standard control	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
Use of manuals/protocols/training procedures	1	1	1	1	0	1	1
Fidelity checks/intervention supervision	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
Sample large enough to detect effect (from Cohen, 1992)	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
Use of outcome measure(s) that have demonstrable reliability and validity (2 point weighting for more than one measure used)	1	1	0	1	0	2	0
Score (out of 8)	4	5	2	5	3	5	4
Percentage	50	62.5	25	62.5	37.5	62.5	50
Rating for WoE (quantitative)	MEDIUM	MEDIUM	LOW	MEDIUM	MEDIUM	MEDIUM	MEDIUM

Low= 0-33%   High= 67-100% Medium= 34-66%

Appendix F: Summary of WoE B ratings for all papers

Table F1

WoE B ratings for all papers

	Armstrong & Hallett (2012)	Costello, et al. (2020)	Edwards (2016)	Cane & Oland (2015)	Rae et al. (2017)	Sharrocks (2014)	Lawrence & Cahill (2014)	Salter-Jones (2012)	Zafeiriou & Gulliford (2020)	Bond et al. (2017)	Cooper & Woods (2017)	Davison & Duffy (2017)	Dobia et al. (2019)	Ellis (2012)	Gillard et al., (2021)	Turner & Gulliford (2020)	Paterson & Grantham (2016)
Clear participant sample (Morris & Atkinson, 2018)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
Clear study outcome (Morris & Atkinson, 2018)	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
Study involved teachers/Educational Psychologists	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Study measured/explored teacher perceptions of a well-being construct following an intervention/strategy provided by an Educational Psychologist	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0
Total Score	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	2	3	4	4	4	2	3	4	4	3
Weight of Evidence B score	Medium	Medium	Medium	High	Medium	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	High	High	High	Medium	Medium	High	High	Medium

1= low

2-3= medium

4= high

Appendix G: Summary of WoE C ratings for all papers

Table G1

Summary of WoE C ratings for all papers

	Armstrong & Hallett (2012)	Costello, et al. (2020)	Edwards (2016)	Cane & Oland (2015)	Rae, et al., (2017)	Sharrocks (2014)	Lawrence & Cahill (2014)	Salter-Jones (2012)	Zafeiriou & Gulliford (2020)	Bond et al. (2017)	Cooper & Woods (2017)	Davison & Duffy (2017)	Dobia et al. (2019)	Ellis (2012)	Gillard et al., (2021)	Turner & Gulliford (2020)	Paterson & Grantham (2016)
Study involved an evaluation of a strategy/intervention carried out by an EP which supported a teacher well-being/ well-being construct	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0
Study explored participant perceptions of the role of EPs in supporting teacher well-being	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Study made reference to at least one of the core functions of EP practice (from Morris & Atkinson, 2018)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Implications from findings for the role of the EP in supporting teacher well-being/well-being related construct are discussed	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
Score	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2
WOE C overall rating	Medium	Medium	Medium	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	Medium	Medium	High	High	Medium

1= low 2= medium 3-4= high

Appendix H: Focus group information sheet

School of Psychology
Information Sheet

The University of **Nottingham**

UNITED KINGDOM · CHINA · MALAYSIA

Title of Project Teacher wellbeing within the context of Educational Psychology casework for children and young people with SEND: an exploration of the experiences, perceptions and practices of Educational Psychologists.

Insert Ethics Approval Number or Taught Project Archive Number: S1275

Researchers: Afia Akyeampong-Spencer (Trainee Educational Psychologist) [email:

lpxaa6@nottingham.ac.uk]

Supervisors: Dr Sarah Atkinson [email: lpasa3@exmail.nottingham.ac.uk]

You are being invited to participate in a research study that will be written up for the researcher's Thesis for the Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology at the University of Nottingham.

This research study is looking into the practices, experiences and perceptions of Educational Psychologists in encountering and responding to the wellbeing needs of teachers that are linked to, and present during, individual casework for children and young people with special educational needs (SEND).

Before you decide if you wish to take part, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully before you decide whether you wish to participate. If you require any additional information, please do not hesitate to ask.

If you participate, you will be asked to attend one of two focus groups with other participating Educational Psychologists (EPs). Each focus group will involve myself as the researcher and 3 Educational Psychologists. In the focus group, I will ask you some questions, drawing upon your own experiences as an EP, to support the group in collaboratively creating a vignette (a fictional story) describing a fictional situation in which a teacher presents an issue to an EP related to their own wellbeing within a piece of Educational Psychology casework for a child with SEND; the teacher's wellbeing need will be linked to the piece of casework the EP is carrying out.

Educational psychologists should only take part in the study if they:
- regularly complete casework for Children and Young people with SEND
- work with teachers during this casework through consultation or any other means.

This vignette will then be used in later semi-structured interviews with other Educational Psychologists to elicit their views on how they believe the fictional EP should respond and to explore how the participating EP would respond in such a scenario. The vignettes and discussions from the focus group will be presented within the Doctoral thesis.

If you consent to participating in the focus group, you will not be able to participate in the semi-structured interview phase of the study.

The whole focus group procedure will last between 1.5-2 hours. Due to social distancing measures in place, the researcher intends to do these focus groups online using Microsoft Teams and will scribe the group's ideas and the vignettes using the whiteboard function in Microsoft Teams.

Participation in this study is totally voluntary and you are under no obligation to take part. You are free to withdraw at any point before or during the study without consequence. If you choose to withdraw during the study the vignette and data collated during this focus group will not be used or presented in the study and will be destroyed. Data can be destroyed at your request within 3 weeks of the focus group taking place.

The data scribed by the researcher during the focus groups and the subsequent vignettes will be presented and recorded in the thesis without identifiers. It will be stored securely on a password protected device and destroyed when it is no longer required for the research.

It is important that participants in the study keep information discussed confidential. If you are drawing on previous experiences of casework during these focus groups, please do not use identifiers in this discussion.

However, due to the duty to protect individuals from harm, confidentiality may be overridden (BPS, 2014). For example, if any information is disclosed which is thought to place a child at significant risk of harm, appropriate safeguarding procedures will be followed.

As an online participant in this research, we are obliged to make you aware that there is always a potential risk of intrusion by outside agents, for example through hacking, and therefore the possibility of being identified.

 If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to ask now. We can also be contacted after your participation at the above addresses. If you are interested in participating in these focus groups, please contact the researcher on the contact details listed above and you will be sent a consent form via email.

I intend to run the focus groups in two time slots listed below:

XX: 2:00-3:30
XX: 2:00-3:30
If you choose to participate in this study, you will be invited to sign up to one of these time slots.

If you have any complaints about the study, please contact:
Stephen Jackson (Chair of Ethics Committee)
stephen.jackson@nottingham.ac.uk

Appendix I: Participant consent form

School of Psychology Consent Form	The University of Nottingham UNITED KINGDOM · CHINA · MALAYSIA

Insert Ethics Approval Number or Taught Project Archive Number: S1275

Researchers: Afia Akyeampong-Spencer (Trainee Educational Psychologist) [email:

lpxaa6@nottingham.ac.uk]

Supervisors: Dr Sarah Atkinson [email: [lpasa3@exmail.nottingham.ac.uk]

The participant should answer these questions independently:

- Have you read and understood the Information Sheet?   YES/NO

- Have you had the opportunity to ask questions about the study?   YES/NO

- Have all your questions been answered satisfactorily (if applicable)? YES/NO

- Do you understand that you are free to withdraw from the study?   YES/NO
  (at any time and without giving a reason)

- I give permission for my data from this study to be shared with other
  researchers provided that my anonymity is completely protected.   YES/NO

- Do you agree to take part in the study?
  YES/NO

 "This study has been explained to me to my satisfaction, and I agree to take part. I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time."

Signature of the Participant: Date:

Name (in block capitals)

I have explained the study to the above participant and he/she has agreed to take part.

Signature of researcher: Date:

Appendix J: Focus group guide

(based on a guide from Braun and Clarke (2013) & Brown, (2018)

Introduction:

My name is Afia Akyeampong-Spencer and I am a Trainee Educational Psychologist at the University of Nottingham. For my thesis I am researching the practices, experiences and perceptions of Educational psychologists (EPs) in encountering and responding to the wellbeing needs of teachers that are linked to, and present during, individual casework for children and young people with special educational needs.

Our task during this focus group is to develop a vignette (fictional passage) describing a situation in which, within a fictional piece of casework, a teacher will make an EP aware of an issue pertaining to their own wellbeing needs in relation to the casework; this wellbeing need will be linked to the piece of casework the EP is carrying out. I will ask you a range of questions to develop this vignette and then we will co-construct this vignette together. This task should take between 1.5 to 2 hours.

These vignettes will then be used in my semi-structured interviews in a later phase of this study with qualified Educational Psychologists to elicit their views on how they believe the EP should respond/how they would respond within a semi-structured interview.

Your contribution to these vignettes is important as I want to draw upon your experiences to create vignettes that are as realistic to the EP experience as possible. You may wish to draw upon your own experiences in practice and this will be a helpful contribution to the discussion. Also try to think more broadly about a range of different experiences and try not to focus on one specific incident within our discussion. If you are drawing on previous experiences of casework, please do not use identifiers in this discussion.

You are free to withdraw from this focus group at any time. If you choose to withdraw your data from the study, the vignettes and all other data produced within this focus group will not be used within the semi-structured interviews or in the thesis and all data from this focus group will be destroyed. Your data can be destroyed within 3 weeks of the focus groups taking place. There are no right or wrong answers here and I am interested in drawing on your views and experiences.

I am going to scribe our ideas on the Whiteboard function using Microsoft Teams. The data scribed by the researcher during the focus groups and the subsequent vignettes will be presented and recorded in the thesis without identifiers. It will be

stored securely on a password protected device and destroyed when it is no longer required for the research.

1. Start by asking people to introduce themselves
2. Establish some ground rules with the group (confidentiality, timings, no right/wrong answers/try not to talk over one another/give each-other room to speak, not using identifiers when speaking)
3. Explain that I, as the moderator, may need to intervene in the discussion if the ground rules are not adhered to.

Starting questions:

Question 1. When completing casework, for CYP with SEND, without naming names, what issues present to you that you feel are about the teacher's wellbeing in relation to the piece of casework?

Question 2. Think back to a time where you feel that one of these issues has surfaced during casework for a child/young person with SEND. Can you tell me about how the teacher communicated their need to you/What made you feel they were experiencing this need?

Question 3. Without naming names, can you tell me a bit about the casework and your involvement in it?

Question 4. Without naming names, can you tell me about how this particular wellbeing need was linked to the case?

Question 5. Without naming names, can you tell me when you feel that this need surfaced? (at what point in your casework?)

Question 6. Can you tell me about how you feel this influenced the casework?

<u>Mind map:</u>

We are now going to try and write a vignette (fictional scenario) using some of the ideas that you have individually fed back to the group. This vignette will describe a situation in which, within a fictional piece of casework for a pupil with SEND, a teacher will make the EP aware of an issue pertaining to their own wellbeing needs in relation to the casework; this wellbeing need will be linked to the piece of casework the EP is carrying out.

7. What was the purpose of the casework?
8. What was the EP's role within this piece of casework?
9. What were the needs of the child/young person?
10. What stage of the casework was the EP at when they became aware that the teacher was presenting with a wellbeing need in relation to the case?
11. What is the wellbeing need raised by the teacher in relation to the casework?
12. How is it linked to the casework?
13. How does it influence the casework?

14. How does the teacher communicate this to the EP?
15. Is there anything else you feel I should add into this vignette?

I am now going to use the information you have given me in this mindmap and translate this with you into a vignette which is realistic to the experiences of an Educational Psychologist. I need to pull out a mix of information from the information in these vignettes and draw upon all your contributions to ensure that it is representative of all your views and not identifiable.

1. How should we start the vignette?
2. What should we write next?
3. What should go in next? (etc)
4. Do you feel that we have captured all of your ideas here or is there anything you would like to adapt?

Finally- thank participants for their time and give out the participant debrief sheet.

Appendix K: Excerpt from the researcher's summary of initial discussions in a focus group

Codes for participants

1= participant 1

2= participant 2

3= participant 3

Questions asked in the focus groups:

Question 1. When completing casework, for CYP with SEND, without naming names, what issues present to you that you feel are about the teacher's wellbeing in relation to the piece of casework?

Question 2. Think back to a time where you feel that one of these issues has surfaced during casework for a child/young person with SEND. Can you tell me about how the teacher communicated their need to you/What made you feel they were experiencing this need?

Question 3. Without naming names, can you tell me a bit about the casework and your involvement in it?

Question 4. Without naming names, can you tell me about how this particular wellbeing need was linked to the case?

Question 5. Without naming names, can you tell me when you feel that this need surfaced? (at what point in your casework?)

Question 6. Can you tell me about how you feel this influenced the casework?

Question 1- summary of responses

1- stress related to the casework. If they feel ill equipped to attend to the casework or if they are feeling unsupported. If they have other things going on in their lives which mean that their emotional capacity to attend to things above and beyond is really difficult.

Ill equipped- the experience, skills, resources and support elsewhere in the school.

2. Even if we aren't told about the particular concerns the adult might have it might be the EP's observation of the situation. SLT not having an awareness of the difficulty or prioritising the need.

3. Information will often be presented through other people- e.g. the senco/another member of staff might report this that is working closely to the child. Possibly reports that the member of staff is out of their depth.

Question 2- summary of responses

2. On a very obvious level- members of staff being in tears about their perceived inability to cope with a situation. Less obvious- staff questioning whether or not they are doing things right/are they supporting their child well- casework. In some cases this is casework but sometimes this can be more of an organisational concern- these discussions can often be unplanned during informal chats about work completed. These incidental conversations are more difficult now working virtually.

3. A sense of helplessness through the dialogue or the narrative you are having with them a lot of self-doubt ' I don't know what to do' not necessarily saying their wellbeing is poor and struggling.

1. The way the EP feels following a meeting with a member of staff will tell them a lot about their wellbeing- anger, rigidity, feeling stuck. If EP leaves the situation feeling deprofessionalised, stuck and deskilled this might be an indicator of transference. This has occurred following a piece of casework and in some organisations.

Question 3- summary of responses

1. A case with a member of staff not skilled or experienced working with challenging behaviour. She was questioning a lot- was she failing the child? Very tearful and shaky. EP had regular supervision with her- unpicked what this was triggering for the member of staff- discussions of unmet needs as a child. Attachment focused conversations with the adult- working with keyworkers. Lead to a discussion about the staff's past experiences what this was triggering and why that might be particularly challenging.

Question 4- summary of responses

3. Challenging behaviour- learning mentor the individual with wellbeing needs. The feeling of doing the case in isolation- always falling on her to deal with any issue related to the case. Being physically hit/worn down by the child. It all felt on her.

2. Feeling like they are the only person who is supporting. A child with SLCN difficulties- challenging behaviour and trying to unpick why- child in FS1. His way of communicating was to scream. The TA is the adult who is asked to support the send in the classroom. Feelings of letting the child down- supporting the ta to approach slt and other members of staff to support. Giving the member of staff hope that it will get better.

Question 5- summary of responses

1. The wellbeing needs are usually apparent right at the beginning- but the unpicking can sometimes take longer. Pretty much impossible for stuck situations to not evoke certain emotions. Kids are referred to us where people might be feeling overwhelmed and this will usually have some sort of emotional impact.

Question 6- summary of responses

2. Sometimes changes the plan later on- transference and thinking about how you felt being in a setting- reflecting on the feeling and based on the reflection
3. Feedback meeting- when the learning mentor's emotional needs arose the focus of the consultation changed- went from feeding back the findings to doing something more practical. Did a hierarchy of support instead- exploring things in more depth.

Appendix L: Mind maps produced in focus groups 1 and 2 to produce the vignettes (based on starting discussions)

Figure L1

Mind map for focus group 1:

What was the EP's role in this piece of casework?

-   Assessing strengths and needs and identifying strategies to facilitate change

What was the purpose of this casework?

-   Following more instructions
-   Reduction in the behaviour/increase in socially acceptable behaviour
-   For staff to increase their understanding of the child's needs

What is the wellbeing need raised by the teacher in relation to the casework

-   Need for reassurance 'am I doing the right thing?'
-   They are being lashed out- physical wellbeing having an emotional impact
-   The need for support in different ways- feeling like they need slt on their side- needing to have training, needing time to reflect on what is happening from an external professional.

How is this communicated?

-   The teacher presenting as quite defensive in consultation
-   When asking what works they might say nothing works they've tried everything and its impossible. Any comments that place the problem on the child ' he does it on purpose, manipulative' teaching x amount of years and never had this experience.
-   Commenting on a lack of support from SLT and not having enough time. Not enough people to help 'got 28 other children in the class.' Not enough money to get resources.
-   The EP has observed and the teacher is quite 'snappy' with children and has said to the EP that they have lots of other things going on in their lives.

What were the needs of the child?

-   Challenging behaviour: refusing to follow instructions, lashing out, kicking, punching and biting
-   Behaviour described as unpredictable
-   No obvious triggers 0-100.

Vignette

What stage of casework was the EP at?

-   During the information gathering stage quite early on.

Figure L2

Mind map for focus group 2

What was the EP's role in this piece of casework?

School want support for the child to stay in the classroom so that he can make progress. School want strategies.

What was the purpose of this casework?

A step taken by school as child might be at risk of exclusion.

What is the wellbeing need raised by the teacher in relation to the casework?

New qualified teacher

How is it linked to the casework?

- Teacher feels they have a lack of experience, skills and feeling ineffective in supporting the pupil.
- Feeling as though they are being judged by other members of staff in the classroom

How does it influence the casework?

How does the teacher communicate this to the EP?

- Through consultation and observation of the teacher
- The EP is asking questions and acknowledges the challenge of the class and asks the teacher how they are finding the year- the teacher said they are finding it really difficult because of the level of need.
- As the ep continues to ask questions and show empathy , the teacher looks as though they are on the verge of tears.

What were the needs of the child?

Y3 boy

Struggling to stay in the classroom

Not focusing on work- resistant to instructions

Working just below age related expectations

Home life- big family- school feel parents struggle to put boundaries in place.

Strained relationship between home and school.

Diagnosis of ADHD

Vignette

What stage of casework was the EP at?

At the start of the casework- during information gathering in the consultation with teacher.

Appendix M: Vignettes

(pseudonyms created with participants' consent)

Focus group 1 vignette (Teacher 1)

Corey is 8 years old and has been referred by his school for Educational Psychology service (EPS) support. School have reported concerns with challenging behaviour, for example:

- refusing to follow instructions, lashing out, kicking, punching and biting
- His behaviour is described as unpredictable
- School report no obvious triggers for the behaviour and feel that it can escalate from 0-100 very quickly.

School requested the Educational Psychologist's (EP's) involvement to assess Corey's strengths and needs and to identify strategies to facilitate change. The purpose of EP involvement was to support school to increase their understanding of Corey's needs, to support Corey to follow instructions and to reduce incidents of challenging behaviour. Parental consent for involvement was obtained for the EPS support.

During consultation with Corey's class teacher, the class teacher frequently asked the EP if they are doing the right thing to support Corey. They talked about how challenging the behaviour was e.g. being lashed out at and how upset this was making them. They told the EP that they feel as though the child chooses to behave in this way. They said they had been teaching for a long time and had never experienced such behaviour challenges. The teacher felt that they did not have enough support from the Senior Leadership Team and felt that they were not doing anything or did not have the money for additional resources. The class teacher reflected that they felt that nothing was working and told the EP that they had tried everything. The teacher explained that they had a lot of other children to support and a number of other things to do. The teacher is concerned that there are also a lot of complaints from other parents in the class.

The EP observed Corey working in the classroom and identified that there were twice as many negative interactions between the teacher and Corey than positive interactions and that the teacher spent a significant amount of time responding to Corey.

Focus group 2 vignette (Teacher 2)

Dominic is a Year 3 boy who has just moved to the Junior School from the Infant school next door. He has been referred for Educational Psychology Service support and school report the following needs:

- Struggling to stay in the classroom
- Not focusing on work- resistant to instructions
- Working just below age related expectations
- Diagnosis of ADHD
- He is at risk of exclusion

Consent was gained for Educational Psychology Service support and school have asked for strategies that will help Dominic to stay in the classroom so that he can make progress.

The Educational Psychologist (EP) goes into the school to observe Dominic in the classroom and to meet with the class teacher to gather initial information. During consultation, the teacher (who is a Newly Qualified Teacher) reported to the EP that they feel like they have a lack of experience and skills and that they feel ineffective in supporting Dominic. They also report that they feel as though they are being judged by other members of staff in the classroom as his behaviours are escalating and not improving. The EP asked the teacher questions and acknowledged how challenging the needs of children in the class are and asked the teacher how they are finding the year. The teacher said that they are finding it really difficult because of the level of Dominic's need and because strategies aren't working. The teacher states that she doesn't know what else to try. As the EP continued to gather information about the situation and showed empathy, the teacher looked as though they were on the verge of tears.

Appendix N: Focus group debrief sheet

EXPERIMENTAL DEBRIEFING INFORMATION
School of Psychology
University of Nottingham

Name of Experimenter:	Email of Experimenter
Afia Akyeampong-Spencer	lpxaa6@nottingham.ac.uk
Name of Supervisor:	Email of Supervisor:
Dr Sarah Atkinson	*lpasa3@exmail.nottingham.ac.uk*

Title of Experiment:
Teacher wellbeing within the context of Educational Psychology casework for children and young people with SEND: an exploration of the experiences, perceptions and practices of Educational Psychologists.

Thankyou for taking part in my focus groups today. Below you will find debrief information regarding the research study.

Background
Within Educational psychology casework, teachers often turn to the EP when they are feeling stuck and presenting with a high level of concern (Gibbs & Miller, 2014; Zafeirou, 2017) and, with this, staff will more than likely present with difficult emotions within the context of the casework due to the impact that caring for the additional needs of that young person might have on their own emotional wellbeing (Brittle, 2020; Zafeirou, 2017). For example, Sharrocks (2014) anecdotally reports that teachers often present with tiredness and low mood within Educational Psychology casework and argues that this affects their ability to implement strategies.

This study looks to explore, through semi-structured interviews, the practices, experiences and perceptions of Educational psychologists in encountering and responding to the wellbeing needs of teachers that are linked to, and present during, individual casework for children and young people with special educational needs.

Design and Dependent Measures:
This is an exploratory study with 3 phases. In the initial focus group phase, two groups of qualified Educational Psychologists have been given the task of creating a vignette describing a fictional situation in which a teacher presented an issue to an EP related to their own wellbeing within a piece of Educational Psychology casework for a child with SEND; the teacher's wellbeing need will be linked to the piece of casework the EP is carrying out.
These vignettes will then be piloted with Educational Psychologists within a semi-structured interview during phase 2, refined and used within phase 3 semi-

structured interviews with a different group of Educational psychologists to explore how they felt the fictional EP should react and how the participating EP might react in this situation. These fictional scenarios will help the researcher to understand the EP's beliefs/attitudes regarding responding to the wellbeing needs of teachers that present during casework. Individuals participating in focus groups will not be permitted to participate in semi-structured interviews.

Additional questions will be asked in the semi-structured interview to gain insight into the EPs' experiences of encountering and responding to such teacher wellbeing needs within individual casework for children and young people. Questions will also be asked to understand the extent to which EPs feel that teacher wellbeing needs might influence a piece of casework influence their casework for children and young people with SEND.

Intended Analysis:

- Discussions from the focus group will lead to the production of 2 vignettes (fictional scenarios) for use in semi-structured interviews.
- The semi-structured interviews will be recorded and transcribed. The researcher will use thematic analysis to identify patterns of views across the data regarding the research questions (Braun & Clarke, 2013).

Useful Reading:

Blick, O. (2019) *"It would be easier if I didn't care as much, but if I didn't care I wouldn't be able to do it…" Enabling teachers to manage the personal and professional tensions when supporting pupils with challenging behaviour.* [Doctoral thesis, University of Sheffield] Retrieved from: http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/24682/

Brittle, B. (2020). Coping strategies and burnout in staff working with students with special educational needs and disabilities. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *87*, 102937. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102937

Gibbs, S., & Miller, A. (2014). Teachers resilience and well-being: A role for educational psychology. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *20*(5), 609–621. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2013.844408

Sharrocks, L. (2014). School staff perceptions of well-being and experience of an intervention to promote well-being. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *30*(1), 19–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2013.868787

Zafeirou, M.E. (2017). *A grounded theory study of educational psychologists' mental health casework in schools* [Doctoral thesis, University of Nottingham]. Retrieved from: http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/45423/1/Maria%20Evrydiki%20Zafeiriou%20Thesis%20Final %20pdf.pdf

If you have any further questions or concerns about the research you have participated in today please do not hesitate ask me now or to contact either myself or my supervisor using the contact details listed at the top of this sheet.

Appendix O: Ethical approval letter

The University of Nottingham

UNITED KINGDOM · CHINA · MALAYSIA

School of Psychology

The University of Nottingham
University Park
Nottingham
NG7 2RD

T: +44 (0)115 8467403 or (0)115 9514344

SJ/tp

Ref: S1275

Tuesday 4th August 2020

Dear Afia Akyeampong-Spencer and Sarah Atkinson,

Ethics Committee Review

Thank you for submitting an account of your proposed research **'Teacher wellbeing within the context of Educational Psychology casework1 for children and young people with SEND2: an exploration of the experiences, perceptions and practices of Educational Psychologists.'**

That proposal has now been reviewed by the Ethics Committee and I am pleased to tell you that your submission has met with the committee's approval.

Final responsibility for ethical conduct of your research rests with you or your supervisor. The Codes of Practice setting out these responsibilities have been published by the British Psychological Society and the University Research Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns whatever during the conduct of your research then you should consult those Codes of Practice. The Committee should be informed immediately should any participant complaints or adverse events arise during the study.

Independently of the Ethics Committee procedures, supervisors also have responsibilities for the risk assessment of projects as detailed in the safety pages of the University web site. Ethics Committee approval does not alter, replace, or remove those responsibilities, nor does it certify that they have been met.

Yours sincerely

Professor Stephen Jackson
Chair, Ethics Committee

Appendix P: Excerpt from research diary

20th November 2020: reflections on pilot interview

- The vignette approach really felt helpful in orienting the participant to the purpose of my research and in initiating some of their views regarding the need for EPs to support teacher wellbeing within casework. It was interesting that the EP felt that the second vignette was more desperate due to the status of the teacher (NQT) and then discussed issues of teacher retention, bringing the wider political context into our discussion of the vignettes.

- I wonder if having two semh cases might constrain the data in any way since the ep could only think of semh cases that might invoke well-being needs in the teacher. However, this might just be further triangulation of the fact that these cases do potentially stir up some difficult emotions for teachers, over and above other SEND.

- I wonder if I need to ask more clarification questions or allow for more silence within the interview since it was finished quite quickly.

- An interesting reflection on the end that sometimes these wellbeing signs are often only a 'snapshot' of what might be occurring in the teacher's life and the need to ensure that we are not becoming over-involved in something that might not necessarily be an ongoing need for that teacher.

- The participant did not feel that any changes need to be made in my research and felt that it was a really interesting and good piece of work.

Appendix Q: Semi-structured interview information sheet

<table>
<tr><td>School of Psychology

Information Sheet</td><td>The University of Nottingham
UNITED KINGDOM · CHINA · MALAYSIA</td></tr>
</table>

Title of Project Teacher wellbeing within the context of Educational Psychology casework for children and young people with SEND: an exploration of the experiences, perceptions and practices of Educational Psychologists.

Insert Ethics Approval Number or Taught Project Archive Number: s1275
Researchers: Afia Akyeampong-Spencer (Trainee Educational Psychologist) [email: lpxaa6@nottingham.ac.uk]
Supervisors: Dr Sarah Atkinson [email: [lpasa3@exmail.nottingham.ac.uk]

You are being invited to participate in a research study that will be written up for the researcher's Thesis for the Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology at the University of Nottingham. This research is looking into the practices, experiences and perceptions of Educational Psychologists in encountering and responding to the wellbeing needs of teachers that are linked to, and present during, individual casework for children and young people with SEND.

Before you decide if you wish to take part, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully.

If you participate, you will be asked to answer a range of questions on your experiences of responding to teacher wellbeing needs that may have presented during casework for children and young people with SEND where this particular wellbeing need is linked to the casework that you have conducted. There will also be two short vignettes (fictional scenarios) to respond to in which a teacher

presents a wellbeing need to the EP that is linked to the piece of casework that the EP is carrying out. These scenarios were devised by EPs within previous focus groups. The interview will be audio-recorded and transcribed by the researcher.

Educational psychologists should only take part in the study if they:
- regularly complete casework for Children and Young people with SEND
- work with teachers during this casework through consultation or any other means.

Data will be audio-recorded, transcribed and presented in the thesis in an anonymised way and will not have any identifiers. All data will be used for research purposes only. Data will be stored in a secure fashion on a password protected device and deleted when it is no longer required for research purposes. When talking about your own experience in casework, please do not use identifiers in these interviews.

Due to the duty to protect individuals from harm, confidentiality may be overridden (BPS, 2014). For example, if any information is disclosed which is thought to place a child at significant risk of harm, appropriate safeguarding procedures will be followed.

The whole procedure will last approximately 1 hour. Due to social distancing measures in place currently, it will take place via Microsoft Teams at a time that is convenient for you.

Participation in this study is totally voluntary and you are under no obligation to take part. You are free to withdraw at any point before or during the study and your data can be destroyed at your request within three weeks of the interview date. All data collected will be transcribed and presented without identifiers, stored securely on a password protected device and deleted when no longer required for research purposes.

As an online participant in this research, we are obliged to make you aware that

there is always a potential risk of intrusion by outside agents, for example through hacking, and therefore the possibility of being identified.

 If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to ask now. We can also be contacted after your participation at the above address.

If you have any complaints about the study, please contact:
Stephen Jackson (Chair of Ethics Committee)
stephen.jackson@nottingham.ac.uk

Appendix R: Semi-structured interview schedule

My name is Afia Akyeampong-Spencer and I am a Trainee Educational Psychologist at the University of Nottingham. For my thesis I am researching the practices, experiences and perceptions of Educational psychologists in encountering and responding to the wellbeing needs of teachers that are linked to, and present during, individual casework for children and young people with SEND. Our first task today is to look at two vignettes which describe scenarios whereby a teacher has presented an issue related to their own wellbeing that is linked to the casework conducted by an Educational psychologist. These have been created during two focus groups with qualified and Trainee Educational Psychologists. We will read through these two short scenarios together and I will ask you a series of questions about them.

Following this, I will ask you a series of questions to try and understand your experiences, practices and perceptions in this area further.

You are free to withdraw from this study at any time during this interview and your data can be destroyed within three weeks after this interview has taken place on your request. I am going to record our discussion so that I can transcribe what we have discussed for my later analysis. All data will be stored anonymously without any personal identifiers.

Can I check that I am okay to include information about gender and years of experience in my discussion of participant demographics?

There are no right or wrong answers here and I am interested in your views.

Am I okay to begin recording?

Here are two vignettes describing a scenario whereby a teacher has presented to the EP, a wellbeing need that is linked to the casework the EP is carrying out. Please can you read them carefully as they will guide the first part of this interview. You do not need to memorise the information- you can refer to the vignettes throughout our discussion. If you are drawing on previous experience, do not use identifiers in this discussion.

Beliefs/ perceptions about responding to the wellbeing needs of teachers in the context of Educational Psychology casework

Present the vignettes individually and ask the following:

- What wellbeing needs do you think the teacher is presenting with during this casework?
- What do you think the Educational psychologist in this scenario should do?
- What would you, as a qualified EP, do in this situation?

After presenting each vignette and asking the above questions, ask the following:

- Do you feel that it is within the Educational Psychologist's role to support the wellbeing of this teacher within this piece of casework?
- Do you feel that it is within your role to support wellbeing needs that present in relation to casework for individual children/young people with SEND?

Experiences in encountering wellbeing needs of teaching staff that are presented in relation to casework:

- **Without naming names, could you tell me about a time during an individual piece of casework for a pupil with SEND where you feel that a teacher has presented with a wellbeing need to you in relation to this piece of casework?**
  - *Prompt: What was your involvement/purpose within this casework?*
  - *Prompt: What were the particular needs of the child within this casework?*
  - *Prompt: At which stage in your casework did this need present?*
  - *Prompt: How did the teacher communicate this need to you? What told you that the teacher might be feeling this way?*
  - *Prompt: How was this wellbeing need linked to the piece of casework you were carrying out?*
  - *Prompt: Did you have any particular thoughts/feelings in response to this?*

Experiences in responding to the wellbeing needs of staff that are presented in relation to casework:

- **Without naming names, can you tell me about a time during individual casework for a pupil with SEND where you have responded to a wellbeing need that a teacher presented to you in relation to this piece of casework?**
  - *Prompt: What was your involvement/purpose within this casework?*
  - *Prompt: What were the particular needs of the child within this casework?*
  - *Prompt- At what stage of the casework did this occur?*
  - *Prompt- How was this linked to the piece of casework?*
  - *Prompt- Did you apply any particular psychological paradigms in response to the teacher's wellbeing need?*
  - *Prompt- did you use any particular interactional skills in response to the teacher's wellbeing need?*

<u>Perceptions of the influence of these wellbeing needs on the casework:</u>

- **When a teacher presents with an issue related to their wellbeing related to the casework, do you feel that this influenced the nature of your involvement in any way?**
  - *Prompt: The purpose of your involvement?*
  - *Prompt: Your hypotheses/formulations?*
  - *Prompt: Your problem-solving process?*
  - *Prompt: The outcome of the casework for the CYP?*
  - *Prompt: Your recommendations/interventions?*

  Closing questions:

  - If the pp has only discussed SEMH ask- are there any other needs that sometimes present that can lead to the EP's role in this way?
  - Is there anything else that you would like to add?

Appendix S: Semi-structured interview debrief sheet

EXPERIMENTAL DEBRIEFING INFORMATION
School of Psychology
University of Nottingham

Name of Experimenter: Afia Akyeampong-Spencer	**Email of Experimenter** lpxaa6@nottingham.ac.uk
Name of Supervisor: *Dr Sarah Atkinson*	**Email of Supervisor:** *lpasa3@exmail.nottingham.ac.uk*

Title of Experiment:
Teacher wellbeing within the context of Educational Psychology casework for children and young people with SEND: an exploration of the experiences, perceptions and practices of Educational Psychologists.

Thankyou for participating in the semi-structured interviews today. Further debrief information about the research is provided below.

Background

Within Educational psychology casework, teachers often turn to the EP when they are feeling stuck and presenting with a high level of concern (Gibbs & Miller, 2014; Zafeirou, 2017) and, with this, staff will more than likely present with difficult emotions within the context of the casework due to the impact that caring for the additional needs of that young person might have on their own emotional wellbeing (Brittle, 2020; Zafeirou, 2017). For example, Sharrocks (2014) anecdotally reports that teachers often present with tiredness and low mood within Educational Psychology casework and argues that this affects their ability to implement strategies.

This study looks to explore, through semi-structured interviews, the practices, experiences and perceptions of Educational psychologists in encountering and responding to the wellbeing needs of teachers that are linked to, and present during, individual casework for children and young people with special educational needs.

Design and Dependent Measures:
This is an exploratory study with 3 phases. In the initial focus group phase, two groups of Educational Psychologists were given the task of creating a vignette describing a fictional situation in which a teacher presented an issue to an EP related to their own wellbeing within a piece of Educational Psychology casework for a child with SEND; the teacher's wellbeing need will be linked to the piece of casework the EP is carrying out.

These vignettes were piloted with an Educational Psychologist within a semi-structured interview during phase 2, refined and are now being used within phase 3 semi-structured interviews with a different group of Educational psychologists to explore how they feel the fictional EP should react and how the participating EP might react in this situation. These fictional scenarios helped the researcher to understand the EP's beliefs/attitudes regarding responding to the wellbeing needs of teachers that present during casework. Individuals participating in focus groups were not permitted to participate in semi-structured interviews.

Additional questions were asked in the semi-structured interview to gain insight into the EPs' experiences of encountering and responding to such teacher wellbeing needs within individual casework for children and young people. Questions were also asked to understand the extent to which EPs feel that teacher wellbeing needs might influence a piece of casework influence their casework for children and young people with SEND.

Intended Analysis:
- Discussions from the focus group lead to the production of 2 vignettes (fictional scenarios) for use in semi-structured interviews.
- The semi-structured interviews will be recorded and transcribed. The researcher will use thematic analysis to identify patterns of views across the data regarding the research questions (Braun & Clarke, 2013).

Useful Reading:

Blick, O. (2019) *"It would be easier if I didn't care as much, but if I didn't care I wouldn't be able to do it…" Enabling teachers to manage the personal and professional tensions when supporting pupils with challenging behaviour.* [Doctoral thesis, University of Sheffield] Retrieved from: http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/24682/

Brittle, B. (2020). Coping strategies and burnout in staff working with students with special educational needs and disabilities. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *87*, 102937. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102937

Gibbs, S., & Miller, A. (2014). Teachers resilience and well-being: A role for educational psychology. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *20*(5), 609–621. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2013.844408

Sharrocks, L. (2014). School staff perceptions of well-being and experience of an intervention to promote well-being. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *30*(1), 19–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2013.868787

Zafeirou, M.E. (2017). *A grounded theory study of educational psychologists' mental health casework in schools* [Doctoral thesis, University of Nottingham]. Retrieved from:

http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/45423/1/Maria%20Evrydiki%20Zafeiriou%20Thesis%20Final %20pdf.pdf

If you have any further questions or concerns about the research you have participated in today please do not hesitate to ask me now or to contact either myself or my supervisor using the contact details listed at the top of this sheet.

Appendix T: Transcript excerpt

Extract from the interview with P2:

Interviewer: Yeah (.) ok (.) thankyou X erm and then again do you feel that it is within the EP's role to support the well-being of this teacher within this casework?

Interviewee: Yeah definitely erm (.) I think similar to- similar to the last one I think it's a big part of meeting that young person's needs is that the staff working with that young person particularly the teacher (.) is feeling empowered and that they've got the skills to do that because (.) if they're feeling really disheartened by the whole situation they're probably not gonna be at their best to (.) to support him

Interviewer: Mmm

Interviewee: And (.) I think kids kids pick up on adults' emotions

Interviewer: Mmm

Interviewee: And erm you know if this teacher is feeling is if they're feeling that they're ineffective that young person's probably picking up on that (.)

Interviewer: Mmm

Interviewee: So yeah I would say definitely

Interviewer: mmm yeah thankyou X (.) so that was it for the vignettes um so now we are just kind of moving onto erm your (.) experiences erm in this area so I'm just gonna stop sharing my screen (.) okay so erm without naming names could you tell me about a time during a piece of casework for a pupil with SEND where you feel that a teacher has presented with a well-being need to you in relation to the casework?

Interviewee: Erm yeah I've got one yeah recently actually currently at the minute

Interviewer: Ah okay

Interviewee: And actually in a way it's worked (.) lockdown's worked quite well in terms of like the way we work because it's a school- as I mentioned when I was talking about that vignette it's one of my schools that is very like set on assigning a session per child and they want me to come in and do a visit and erm (.) I think had we been working in a typical way I'd've gone in and seen this young person, done an observation done some work with that young person realised that actually this class teacher is really really struggling and not necessarily have had that opportunity to work with that class teacher

Interviewer: mmmm yeah

Interviewee: But because of the situation I've been doing a weekly (.) weekly sessions with that class teacher erm (.) so similar to the vignettes I think she's just feeling very very deskilled erm she'd had this young person last year (.) and I think things had been fairly ok ((pause)) then they've seen this massive change in his behaviour over (.) lockdown over the summer

Interviewer: OK

Interviewee: And she said he's come back and he's like a completely different child

Interviewer: Right

Interviewee: So I think she's trying to manage (.) kind of adjusting to that (.) that that he's so different and almost can't let go of the fact that he used to be fine

Interviewer: ((in overlap)) Mmm

Interviewee: Erm and I think again she's fairly you know recently qualified I don't think has come across a young person presenting with such challenging behaviours before (.) erm and I think actually she has been well supported by the school but it's felt like through the work I've been doing with her a lot of it has kind of been containment

Interviewer: ((In overlap)) mmmm

Interviewee: And (.) validating how she's feeling and reinforcing that actually ((pause)) she's doing a really good job and she absolutely is trying everything and she's got loads of great ideas erm of what she can try it's just (.) I think she's needed somebody to say ((pause)) that's great ((laughs))

Interviewer: Yeah

Interviewee: You know have a go see if it works sort of thing whereas I think she was a bit (.) I think she was feeling at a point like the teachers in the vignettes were (.) they didn't know what else to kind of do now they didn't know what the next step was and actually through our sort of discussions and erm (.) she does know where to go with it she has got the skills erm it's just I think giving her that confidence and (.) yeah validating those feelings

Appendix U: Transcript with initial comments and codes

Section	Data	Comment	Code	Code label
45B	Interviewer: Yeah (.) ok (.) thankyou X erm and then again do you feel that it is within the EP's role to support the well-being of this teacher within this casework?			
46A	Yeah definitely erm (.) I think similar to- similar to the last one I think it's a big part of meeting that young person's needs is that the staff working with that young person particularly the teacher (.) is feeling empowered and that they've got the skills to do that because (.) if they're feeling really disheartened by the whole situation they're probably not gonna be at their best to (.) to support him	• EP needs to support teacher 2 well-being to support young person • EP needs to empower teacher 2 to support young person • EP needs to upskill teacher 2 to support young person • If teacher 2 is feeling disheartened they will not be able to support child	EP responsibility/role to support well-being EP supporting TWB will support child EP to upskill	B13 B26 B18
46B	Interviewer: Mmm			
47A	Interviewee: And (.) I think kids kids pick up on adults' emotions	• Children pick up on teachers' emotions so it is important for EPs to support Teacher 2	TWB impact on pupil	B27
47B	Interviewer: Mmm			
48A	Interviewee: And erm you know if this teacher is	• Children pick up teachers' emotions so it is	TWB impact on pupil	B27

Section	Data	Comment	Code	Code label
	feeling is if they're feeling that they're ineffective that young person's probably picking up on that (.)	important for teachers to support Teacher 2		
48B	Interviewer: Mmm			
49A	Interviewee: So yeah I would say definitely			
49B	Interviewer: mmm yeah thankyou X (.) so that was it for the vignettes um so now we are just kind of moving onto erm your (.) experiences erm in this area so I'm just gonna stop sharing my screen (.) okay so erm without naming names could you tell me about a time during a piece of casework for a pupil with SEND where you feel that a teacher has presented with a well-being need to you in relation to the casework?			
50A	Interviewee: Erm yeah I've got one yeah recently actually currently at the minute			
50B	Interviewer: Ah okay			
51A	Interviewee: And actually in a way it's worked (.) lockdown's worked quite well in terms of like the way we work because it's a	• EP experience: remote work as an opportunity for EP working in new ways with teachers in casework	Remote work as teacher support opportunity for EP Ongoing support not viewed as	R97 R104

Section	Data	Comment	Code	Code label
	school- as I mentioned when I was talking about that vignette its one of my schools that is very like set on assigning a session per child and they want me to come in and do a visit and erm (.) I think had we been working in a typical way I'd've gone in and seen this young person, done an observation done some work with that young person realised that actually this class teacher is really really struggling and not necessarily have had that opportunity to work with that class teacher	• EP experience: teachers with rigid views of what constitutes casework • EP experience: schools want EP to focus on the child in casework • EP experience: remote work as an opportunity to move away from old casework model to support teacher more extensively	typical in casework School focus on pupil in casework	 E56

Appendix V: Coding manual excerpt

Code label	Code description	Theme	Subtheme	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6
E2	teachers mask difficulties to EP	How the well-being need came to the EP's attention	Inferring teacher well-being needs in the absence of explicit communication	27B, 28B, 77B, 79B, 78B, 120A	83A, 84A			151b, 152b,162b	
E4	Lack of in school well-being support	Factors outside of the casework impacting on teacher well-being	School system	72B, 73B, 99B	35A, 36A				
E5	Interpreting teacher behaviours as TWB indicator	How the well-being need came to the EP's attention	Inferring teacher well-being needs in the absence of explicit communication	76B	70A, 83A		176b	116a	

Appendix W: Thematic analysis evidence

Multiple codes organised into candidate themes are shown in the pictures below: