

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
PRINCIPAL EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGISTS

**PARENT AND CARER  
FEEDBACK ON THEIR  
EXPERIENCE OF EDUCATIONAL  
PSYCHOLOGISTS**

**APPENDICES**

2012

Hampshire's Educational Psychology's Research & Evaluation Unit conducted this research on behalf of NAPEP. The original data are available should anyone wish to check, question or challenge the information reported.

Roger Norgate  
Cara Osborne

September 2012

## CONTENT

APPENDIX A: Individual Service tables .....	4
Table 1: Distribution of data by EP Service and sex of child or young person who was the focus of the intervention .....	4
Table 2a: Distribution of data by EP Service and year group of the child or young person who was the focus of the intervention (part 1) .....	4
Table 2b: Distribution of data by EP Service and year group of the child or young person who was the focus of the intervention (part 2) .....	5
Table 3: Distribution of data by EP Service and type of contact involved ..	6
Table 4: Distribution of data by EP Service and type of need of the child or young person who was the focus of the intervention .....	6
Table 5: Responses to (Q1) I knew why the Educational Psychologist was going to be involved. ....	7
Table 6: Responses to (Q2) The Educational Psychologist seemed to value my views and take them into account. ....	8
Table 7: Responses to (Q3) I was able to share my views and any concerns. ....	9
Table 8: Responses to (Q4) I consider the Educational Psychologist provided independent advice. ....	10
Table 9: Responses to (Q5) I was fully involved in the discussion about my child's needs and what was going to happen to address them. ....	11
Table 10: Responses to (Q6) Sufficient time was provided during this contact to discuss my child's needs. ....	12
Table 11: Responses to (Q7) The Educational Psychologist seemed knowledgeable and assisted in finding ways to help. ....	13
Table 12: Responses to (Q8) All of my questions and concerns were addressed. ....	14
Table 13: Responses to (Q9) The involvement provided a better insight into the situation. ....	15
Table 14: Responses to (Q10) Actions agreed were relevant, useful and able to be done. ....	16
Table 15: Responses to (Q11) At the end of the Educational Psychologist's involvement it was made clear who would be doing what. ....	17
Table 16: Responses to (Q12) Things improved as a result of the Educational Psychologist's involvement. ....	18
Table 17: Responses to (Q13) The Educational Psychologist did everything they had agreed to do. ....	19
Table 18: Responses to (Q14) I would have liked the Educational Psychologist to have been involved sooner. ....	20
Table 19: Responses to (Q15) I am confident that my child's needs will be met more effectively as a result of this involvement. ....	21
Table 20: Responses to (Q16) How satisfied were you that the Educational Psychologist made a useful contribution? .....	22
APPENDIX B – ANOVA results .....	23

## APPENDIX A: Individual Service tables

**Table 1:** Distribution of data by EP Service and sex of child or young person who was the focus of the intervention

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Not stated</i>	<i>Total</i>
N	54	154	9	217
E	28	103	22	153
F	37	101	2	140
C	1	2	57	60
O	1	4	34	39
J	7	27	2	36
G	7	15		22
K	4	13	2	19
L			16	16
D	1	5	9	15
B	3	8	1	12
H	1	8	3	12
M	2	8	1	11
A	4	6		10
P		6		6
I			4	4
Q	1		2	3
<i>Total</i>	<i>151</i>	<i>460</i>	<i>164</i>	<i>775</i>

**Table 2a:** Distribution of data by EP Service and year group of the child or young person who was the focus of the intervention (part 1)

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>Pre-School</i>	<i>Reception</i>	<i>Year 1</i>	<i>Year 2</i>	<i>Year 3</i>	<i>Year 4</i>	<i>Year 5</i>	<i>Year 6</i>	<i>Year 7</i>
F	42	16	11	12	7	9	9	16	1
N	34	22	23	25	18	19	18	11	9
E	14	16	11	13	14	12	13	4	6
H	4				1				1
G	4	1	3	1	2	3	1	2	1
J	3	6	1	7	6	1	3	1	1
B									
I									
C									
L									
Q									
A									
O		3						1	1
K		3	3	2	1		4		
P									
M									
D									
<i>Total</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>20</i>

**Table 2b:** Distribution of data by EP Service and year group of the child or young person who was the focus of the intervention (part 2)

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>Year 8</i>	<i>Year 9</i>	<i>Year 10</i>	<i>Year 11</i>	<i>Post-16</i>	<i>Total</i>
F	4	6	3	1		140
N	12	9	5		1	217
E	1	6	3			153
H						12
G	1		1	1		22
J	1	1		3	1	36
B						12
I						4
C						60
L						16
Q						3
A						10
O		1				39
K	1	1				19
P						6
M						11
D						15
<i>Total</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>775</i>

**Table 3:** Distribution of data by EP Service and type of contact involved

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>Consultation Discussion</i>	<i>Non-Statutory</i>	<i>Statutory</i>	<i>Post-statutory</i>	<i>Total</i>
N	100	40	42	27	217
E	15	73	41	9	153
F	11	60	55	11	140
H	2	7			12
K	2		10	4	19
O	1	4			39
B					12
I					4
J		9	20	6	36
C					60
L					16
Q					3
A			2		10
G			22		22
P					6
M					11
D					15
<i>Total</i>	<i>131</i>	<i>193</i>	<i>192</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>775</i>

**Table 4:** Distribution of data by EP Service and type of need of the child or young person who was the focus of the intervention

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>ADHD</i>	<i>ASD</i>	<i>BESD</i>	<i>HI</i>	<i>MLD</i>	<i>MSI</i>	<i>SLCN</i>	<i>SLD</i>	<i>SpLD</i>	<i>OTH</i>	<i>PD</i>	<i>PMLD</i>	<i>VI</i>	<i>Total</i>
N	1	30	67	2	34	1	48	12	5	13	7	2	2	224
E	9	33	33		37		8		6	1	1			128
F	2	32	27	5	23		38	5	9		10	1	6	158
J		8	6	1	4		6	1	2		2			30
H			4		1		2							7
G		6	4		2			4						16
O	1		2											3
K		2	2		1		3		2		1			11
<i>Total</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>111</i>	<i>145</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>102</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>105</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>577</i>
<i>%</i>	<i>2.25</i>	<i>19.24</i>	<i>25.13</i>	<i>1.39</i>	<i>17.68</i>	<i>0.17</i>	<i>18.20</i>	<i>3.81</i>	<i>4.16</i>	<i>2.43</i>	<i>3.64</i>	<i>0.52</i>	<i>1.39</i>	<i>100.00</i>

**Table 5:** Responses to (Q1) I knew why the Educational Psychologist was going to be involved.

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Agree (%)</i>	<i>Strongly Agree (%)</i>	<i>Total (%)</i>		<i>Average Rating</i>
P	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00		5.00
M	0.00	0.00	0.00	18.18	81.82	100.00		4.82
B	0.00	0.00	8.33	8.33	83.33	100.00		4.75
L	0.00	0.00	6.25	25.00	68.75	100.00		4.63
K	0.00	0.00	0.00	36.84	63.16	100.00		4.63
F	0.72	2.16	2.16	25.90	69.06	100.00		4.60
C	1.67	1.67	1.67	30.00	65.00	100.00		4.55
E	3.31	1.32	2.65	23.84	68.87	100.00		4.54
D	0.00	0.00	0.00	46.67	53.33	100.00		4.53
N	1.39	1.85	2.78	31.48	62.50	100.00		4.52
G	0.00	0.00	4.55	40.91	54.55	100.00		4.50
J	0.00	0.00	2.78	44.44	52.78	100.00		4.50
A	0.00	0.00	0.00	60.00	40.00	100.00		4.40
O	0.00	0.00	5.41	51.35	43.24	100.00		4.38
H	16.67	0.00	0.00	8.33	75.00	100.00		4.25
I	25.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	50.00	100.00		3.75
<i>Total</i>	<i>1.70</i>	<i>1.31</i>	<i>2.61</i>	<i>30.16</i>	<i>64.23</i>	<i>100.00</i>		<i>4.54</i>

**Note:** The number of responses reported by each service ranged from 3 – 217. It needs to be borne in mind that where numbers are small there can be considerable volatility in the data (i.e. the views of one parent can sway the outcome by a large percentage).

**Table 6:** Responses to (Q2) The Educational Psychologist seemed to value my views and take them into account.

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Neither Agree or Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Agree (%)</i>	<i>Strongly Agree (%)</i>	<i>Total (%)</i>		<i>Average Rating</i>
P	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00		5.00
K	0.00	0.00	5.26	5.26	89.47	100.00		4.84
B	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	83.33	100.00		4.83
L	0.00	0.00	0.00	18.75	81.25	100.00		4.81
G	0.00	0.00	0.00	22.73	77.27	100.00		4.77
F	1.45	0.72	2.90	22.46	72.46	100.00		4.64
M	0.00	0.00	9.09	18.18	72.73	100.00		4.64
C	0.00	3.39	1.69	23.73	71.19	100.00		4.63
D	0.00	0.00	6.67	26.67	66.67	100.00		4.60
N	1.85	0.00	3.24	31.48	63.43	100.00		4.55
E	6.04	2.01	4.70	17.45	69.80	100.00		4.43
O	0.00	2.86	2.86	51.43	42.86	100.00		4.34
J	2.86	0.00	8.57	45.71	42.86	100.00		4.26
A	0.00	0.00	10.00	60.00	30.00	100.00		4.20
H	16.67	0.00	0.00	33.33	50.00	100.00		4.00
I	25.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	50.00	100.00		3.75
<i>Total</i>	<i>2.50</i>	<i>0.92</i>	<i>3.56</i>	<i>26.48</i>	<i>66.53</i>	<i>100.00</i>		<i>4.54</i>

**Note:** The number of responses reported by each service ranged from 3 – 217. It needs to be borne in mind that where numbers are small there can be considerable volatility in the data (i.e. the views of one parent can sway the outcome by a large percentage).



**Table 7:** Responses to (Q3) I was able to share my views and any concerns.

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Agree (%)</i>	<i>Strongly Agree (%)</i>	<i>Total (%)</i>		<i>Average Rating</i>
P	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00		5.00
M	0.00	0.00	0.00	18.18	81.82	100.00		4.82
L	0.00	0.00	0.00	18.75	81.25	100.00		4.81
B	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	75.00	100.00		4.75
K	0.00	5.26	0.00	10.53	84.21	100.00		4.74
G	0.00	0.00	0.00	27.27	72.73	100.00		4.73
F	1.45	0.72	1.45	20.29	76.09	100.00		4.69
C	0.00	3.33	0.00	26.67	70.00	100.00		4.63
N	0.93	1.85	1.39	31.02	64.81	100.00		4.57
D	0.00	0.00	6.67	33.33	60.00	100.00		4.53
E	4.03	0.67	6.04	18.12	71.14	100.00		4.52
A	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	100.00		4.50
O	0.00	0.00	8.33	33.33	58.33	100.00		4.50
J	2.86	0.00	0.00	42.86	54.29	100.00		4.46
I	25.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	50.00	100.00		3.75
H	16.67	25.00	0.00	16.67	41.67	100.00		3.42
<i>Total</i>	<i>1.96</i>	<i>1.57</i>	<i>2.49</i>	<i>25.39</i>	<i>68.59</i>	<i>100.00</i>		<i>4.57</i>

**Note:** The number of responses reported by each service ranged from 3 – 217. It needs to be borne in mind that where numbers are small there can be considerable volatility in the data (i.e. the views of one parent can sway the outcome by a large percentage).

**Table 8:** Responses to (Q4) I consider the Educational Psychologist provided independent advice.

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Neither Agree or Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Agree (%)</i>	<i>Strongly Agree (%)</i>	<i>Total (%)</i>		<i>Average Rating</i>
P	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00		5.00
B	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	75.00	100.00		4.75
M	0.00	0.00	0.00	27.27	72.73	100.00		4.73
L	0.00	0.00	12.50	12.50	75.00	100.00		4.63
F	0.72	0.72	2.88	31.65	64.03	100.00		4.58
G	0.00	0.00	9.09	31.82	59.09	100.00		4.50
C	1.67	1.67	1.67	40.00	55.00	100.00		4.45
E	2.65	1.32	8.61	25.83	61.59	100.00		4.42
K	0.00	5.26	5.26	31.58	57.89	100.00		4.42
D	0.00	0.00	6.67	46.67	46.67	100.00		4.40
N	2.33	0.93	4.19	41.40	51.16	100.00		4.38
O	0.00	2.86	8.57	40.00	48.57	100.00		4.34
H	16.67	0.00	0.00	8.33	75.00	100.00		4.25
J	2.86	8.57	2.86	51.43	34.29	100.00		4.06
A	0.00	10.00	20.00	60.00	10.00	100.00		3.70
I	25.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	50.00	100.00		3.50
<i>Total</i>	<i>2.09</i>	<i>1.57</i>	<i>5.24</i>	<i>34.42</i>	<i>56.68</i>	<i>100.00</i>		<i>4.42</i>

**Note:** The number of responses reported by each service ranged from 3 – 217. It needs to be borne in mind that where numbers are small there can be considerable volatility in the data (i.e. the views of one parent can sway the outcome by a large percentage).

**Table 9:** Responses to (Q5) I was fully involved in the discussion about my child’s needs and what was going to happen to address them.

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Neither Agree or Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Agree (%)</i>	<i>Strongly Agree (%)</i>	<i>Total (%)</i>		<i>Average Rating</i>
B	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.33	91.67	100.00		4.92
P	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	83.33	100.00		4.83
M	0.00	0.00	0.00	18.18	81.82	100.00		4.82
L	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	75.00	100.00		4.75
K	0.00	5.26	0.00	26.32	68.42	100.00		4.58
F	2.21	0.74	3.68	25.74	67.65	100.00		4.56
C	0.00	3.45	3.45	32.76	60.34	100.00		4.50
G	0.00	4.55	9.09	27.27	59.09	100.00		4.41
N	1.40	5.61	2.34	32.71	57.94	100.00		4.40
E	5.30	2.65	10.60	19.21	62.25	100.00		4.30
J	2.86	5.71	0.00	51.43	40.00	100.00		4.20
D	6.67	0.00	6.67	40.00	46.67	100.00		4.20
O	0.00	8.11	16.22	24.32	51.35	100.00		4.19
A	0.00	0.00	0.00	90.00	10.00	100.00		4.10
H	18.18	0.00	27.27	18.18	36.36	100.00		3.55
I	25.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	50.00	100.00		3.50
<i>Total</i>	<i>2.63</i>	<i>3.42</i>	<i>5.53</i>	<i>28.42</i>	<i>60.00</i>	<i>100.00</i>		<i>4.40</i>

**Note:** The number of responses reported by each service ranged from 3 – 217. It needs to be borne in mind that where numbers are small there can be considerable volatility in the data (i.e. the views of one parent can sway the outcome by a large percentage).

**Table 10:** Responses to (Q6) Sufficient time was provided during this contact to discuss my child’s needs.

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Neither Agree or Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Agree (%)</i>	<i>Strongly Agree (%)</i>	<i>Total (%)</i>		<i>Average Rating</i>
P	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00		5.00
L	0.00	0.00	6.25	12.50	81.25	100.00		4.75
M	0.00	0.00	0.00	27.27	72.73	100.00		4.73
B	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	66.67	100.00		4.67
K	0.00	5.26	0.00	26.32	68.42	100.00		4.58
C	0.00	6.67	3.33	36.67	53.33	100.00		4.37
F	2.86	6.43	2.14	28.57	60.00	100.00		4.36
G	0.00	0.00	9.09	45.45	45.45	100.00		4.36
O	0.00	5.56	2.78	44.44	47.22	100.00		4.33
D	6.67	0.00	0.00	40.00	53.33	100.00		4.33
N	1.87	4.67	4.67	39.25	49.53	100.00		4.30
E	3.33	8.00	9.33	18.67	60.67	100.00		4.25
J	2.94	0.00	8.82	55.88	32.35	100.00		4.15
A	0.00	0.00	20.00	60.00	20.00	100.00		4.00
I	25.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	50.00	100.00		3.50
H	45.45	0.00	0.00	18.18	36.36	100.00		3.00
<i>Total</i>	<i>2.76</i>	<i>5.00</i>	<i>5.13</i>	<i>32.50</i>	<i>54.61</i>	<i>100.00</i>		<i>4.31</i>

**Note:** The number of responses reported by each service ranged from 3 – 217. It needs to be borne in mind that where numbers are small there can be considerable volatility in the data (i.e. the views of one parent can sway the outcome by a large percentage).

**Table 11:** Responses to (Q7) The Educational Psychologist seemed knowledgeable and assisted in finding ways to help.

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Neither Agree or Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Agree (%)</i>	<i>Strongly Agree (%)</i>	<i>Total (%)</i>		<i>Average rating</i>
P	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00		5.00
L	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	75.00	100.00		4.75
M	0.00	0.00	0.00	27.27	72.73	100.00		4.73
K	0.00	0.00	5.26	21.05	73.68	100.00		4.68
B	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	66.67	100.00		4.67
D	0.00	6.67	6.67	20.00	66.67	100.00		4.47
F	2.16	2.16	6.47	26.62	62.59	100.00		4.45
C	1.69	0.00	10.17	30.51	57.63	100.00		4.42
G	0.00	0.00	4.55	50.00	45.45	100.00		4.41
E	3.95	4.61	5.92	23.68	61.84	100.00		4.35
N	1.85	1.85	6.94	38.89	50.46	100.00		4.34
O	0.00	5.56	5.56	38.89	50.00	100.00		4.33
J	0.00	0.00	14.29	45.71	40.00	100.00		4.26
H	18.18	0.00	0.00	18.18	63.64	100.00		4.09
A	0.00	11.11	11.11	55.56	22.22	100.00		3.89
I	25.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	50.00	100.00		3.50
<i>Total</i>	<i>2.23</i>	<i>2.36</i>	<i>6.69</i>	<i>31.63</i>	<i>57.09</i>	<i>100.00</i>		<i>4.39</i>

**Note:** The number of responses reported by each service ranged from 3 – 217. It needs to be borne in mind that where numbers are small there can be considerable volatility in the data (i.e. the views of one parent can sway the outcome by a large percentage).

**Table 12:** Responses to (Q8) All of my questions and concerns were addressed.

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>Strongly disagree (%)</i>	<i>Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Neither Agree or Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Agree (%)</i>	<i>Strongly Agree (%)</i>	<i>Total (%)</i>		<i>Average rating</i>
P	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00		5.00
L	0.00	0.00	6.25	31.25	62.50	100.00		4.56
M	0.00	0.00	18.18	9.09	72.73	100.00		4.55
B	0.00	0.00	8.33	33.33	58.33	100.00		4.50
K	0.00	5.26	5.26	26.32	63.16	100.00		4.47
F	2.21	2.94	8.09	30.88	55.88	100.00		4.35
G	0.00	4.55	9.09	36.36	50.00	100.00		4.32
C	1.69	5.08	10.17	32.20	50.85	100.00		4.25
E	4.64	4.64	8.61	26.49	55.63	100.00		4.24
D	0.00	6.67	13.33	33.33	46.67	100.00		4.20
N	1.85	4.63	10.65	38.43	44.44	100.00		4.19
J	5.71	0.00	8.57	45.71	40.00	100.00		4.14
O	0.00	8.57	11.43	42.86	37.14	100.00		4.09
A	0.00	11.11	22.22	55.56	11.11	100.00		3.67
H	18.18	0.00	27.27	18.18	36.36	100.00		3.55
I	25.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	50.00	100.00		3.50
Q	33.33	0.00	33.33	0.00	33.33	100.00		3.00
<i>Total</i>	<i>2.76</i>	<i>4.08</i>	<i>10.00</i>	<i>32.89</i>	<i>50.26</i>	<i>100.00</i>		<i>4.24</i>

**Note:** The number of responses reported by each service ranged from 3 – 217. It needs to be borne in mind that where numbers are small there can be considerable volatility in the data (i.e. the views of one parent can sway the outcome by a large percentage).

**Table 13:** Responses to (Q9) The involvement provided a better insight into the situation.

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Neither Agree or Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Agree (%)</i>	<i>Strongly Agree (%)</i>	<i>Total (%)</i>		<i>Average rating</i>
P	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	83.33	100.00		4.83
B	0.00	0.00	8.33	25.00	66.67	100.00		4.58
M	0.00	0.00	9.09	27.27	63.64	100.00		4.55
L	0.00	0.00	12.50	25.00	62.50	100.00		4.50
K	0.00	0.00	5.56	38.89	55.56	100.00		4.50
D	0.00	0.00	13.33	33.33	53.33	100.00		4.40
F	0.73	0.73	13.14	35.04	50.36	100.00		4.34
G	0.00	0.00	13.64	45.45	40.91	100.00		4.27
E	4.00	3.33	10.00	30.00	52.67	100.00		4.24
N	1.86	3.72	11.63	38.60	44.19	100.00		4.20
C	0.00	5.17	15.52	34.48	44.83	100.00		4.19
O	0.00	5.56	19.44	38.89	36.11	100.00		4.06
J	0.00	11.43	11.43	48.57	28.57	100.00		3.94
H	16.67	0.00	8.33	33.33	41.67	100.00		3.83
A	10.00	0.00	10.00	70.00	10.00	100.00		3.70
I	25.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	50.00	100.00		3.50
Q	33.33	0.00	33.33	33.33	0.00	100.00		2.67
<i>Total</i>	<i>2.12</i>	<i>3.04</i>	<i>11.64</i>	<i>35.98</i>	<i>47.22</i>	<i>100.00</i>		<i>4.23</i>

**Note:** The number of responses reported by each service ranged from 3 – 217. It needs to be borne in mind that where numbers are small there can be considerable volatility in the data (i.e. the views of one parent can sway the outcome by a large percentage).

**Table 14:** Responses to (Q10) Actions agreed were relevant, useful and able to be done.

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Neither Agree or Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Agree (%)</i>	<i>Strongly Agree (%)</i>	<i>Total (%)</i>		<i>Average rating</i>
P	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	83.33	100.00		4.83
B	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	66.67	100.00		4.67
L	0.00	0.00	0.00	43.75	56.25	100.00		4.56
M	0.00	0.00	9.09	36.36	54.55	100.00		4.45
K	0.00	0.00	5.56	44.44	50.00	100.00		4.44
F	1.50	0.75	6.77	37.59	53.38	100.00		4.41
C	1.72	1.72	15.52	37.93	43.10	100.00		4.19
E	3.97	3.97	12.58	29.14	50.33	100.00		4.18
O	0.00	8.33	8.33	44.44	38.89	100.00		4.14
G	0.00	0.00	25.00	40.00	35.00	100.00		4.10
N	2.40	2.88	11.06	51.92	31.73	100.00		4.08
D	0.00	13.33	13.33	26.67	46.67	100.00		4.07
J	0.00	11.76	11.76	52.94	23.53	100.00		3.88
H	16.67	0.00	25.00	25.00	33.33	100.00		3.58
I	25.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	50.00	100.00		3.50
A	0.00	20.00	20.00	50.00	10.00	100.00		3.50
Q	33.33	0.00	33.33	33.33	0.00	100.00		2.67
<i>Total</i>	<i>2.42</i>	<i>3.36</i>	<i>10.63</i>	<i>40.78</i>	<i>42.80</i>	<i>100.00</i>		<i>4.18</i>

**Note:** The number of responses reported by each service ranged from 3 – 217. It needs to be borne in mind that where numbers are small there can be considerable volatility in the data (i.e. the views of one parent can sway the outcome by a large percentage).



**Table 15:** Responses to (Q11) At the end of the Educational Psychologist's involvement it was made clear who would be doing what.

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>Strongly disagree (%)</i>	<i>Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Neither Agree or Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Agree (%)</i>	<i>Strongly Agree (%)</i>	<i>Total (%)</i>		<i>Average rating</i>
B	0.00	0.00	9.09	27.27	63.64	100.00		4.55
L	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	100.00		4.50
P	0.00	0.00	16.67	16.67	66.67	100.00		4.50
K	0.00	0.00	0.00	56.25	43.75	100.00		4.44
I	0.00	0.00	33.33	0.00	66.67	100.00		4.33
M	0.00	0.00	18.18	36.36	45.45	100.00		4.27
G	0.00	4.55	4.55	54.55	36.36	100.00		4.23
F	1.54	3.85	14.62	34.62	45.38	100.00		4.18
D	0.00	15.38	0.00	38.46	46.15	100.00		4.15
E	3.52	5.63	12.68	31.69	46.48	100.00		4.12
N	2.39	4.78	11.96	50.72	30.14	100.00		4.01
C	1.79	3.57	26.79	35.71	32.14	100.00		3.93
O	2.70	8.11	13.51	48.65	27.03	100.00		3.89
A	10.00	0.00	0.00	80.00	10.00	100.00		3.80
J	3.23	19.35	19.35	41.94	16.13	100.00		3.48
H	8.33	33.33	0.00	50.00	8.33	100.00		3.17
Q	33.33	0.00	33.33	0.00	33.33	100.00		3.00
<i>Total</i>	<i>2.47</i>	<i>5.63</i>	<i>13.05</i>	<i>41.62</i>	<i>37.23</i>	<i>100.00</i>		<i>4.05</i>

**Note:** The number of responses reported by each service ranged from 3 – 217. It needs to be borne in mind that where numbers are small there can be considerable volatility in the data (i.e. the views of one parent can sway the outcome by a large percentage).

**Table 16:** Responses to (Q12) Things improved as a result of the Educational Psychologist's involvement.

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Neither Agree or Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Agree (%)</i>	<i>Strongly agree (%)</i>	<i>Total (%)</i>		<i>Average rating</i>
P	0.00	0.00	20.00	20.00	60.00	100.00		4.40
M	0.00	0.00	9.09	45.45	45.45	100.00		4.36
L	0.00	0.00	21.43	28.57	50.00	100.00		4.29
I	0.00	33.33	0.00	0.00	66.67	100.00		4.00
K	0.00	7.14	28.57	21.43	42.86	100.00		4.00
D	0.00	20.00	6.67	33.33	40.00	100.00		3.93
B	0.00	9.09	27.27	36.36	27.27	100.00		3.82
E	4.58	7.63	26.72	23.66	37.40	100.00		3.82
F	1.02	5.10	37.76	24.49	31.63	100.00		3.81
J	2.94	8.82	23.53	38.24	26.47	100.00		3.76
G	0.00	6.25	37.50	37.50	18.75	100.00		3.69
O	9.38	12.50	12.50	40.63	25.00	100.00		3.59
N	3.59	5.99	40.72	28.74	20.96	100.00		3.57
C	3.70	3.70	46.30	24.07	22.22	100.00		3.57
A	20.00	0.00	20.00	50.00	10.00	100.00		3.30
H	9.09	0.00	45.45	45.45	0.00	100.00		3.27
Q	33.33	0.00	33.33	33.33	0.00	100.00		2.67
<i>Total</i>	<i>3.66</i>	<i>6.52</i>	<i>32.43</i>	<i>28.78</i>	<i>28.62</i>	<i>100.00</i>		<i>3.72</i>

**Note:** The number of responses reported by each service ranged from 3 – 217. It needs to be borne in mind that where numbers are small there can be considerable volatility in the data (i.e. the views of one parent can sway the outcome by a large percentage).

**Table 17:** Responses to (Q13) The Educational Psychologist did everything they had agreed to do.

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Neither Agree or Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Agree (%)</i>	<i>Strongly Agree (%)</i>	<i>Total (%)</i>		<i>Average rating</i>
P	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	83.33	100.00		4.83
B	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	75.00	100.00		4.75
L	0.00	0.00	6.25	18.75	75.00	100.00		4.69
M	0.00	0.00	9.09	27.27	63.64	100.00		4.55
K	0.00	0.00	6.67	46.67	46.67	100.00		4.40
I	0.00	0.00	33.33	0.00	66.67	100.00		4.33
G	0.00	0.00	13.64	40.91	45.45	100.00		4.32
F	1.64	1.64	10.66	37.70	48.36	100.00		4.30
E	2.84	4.96	9.93	26.24	56.03	100.00		4.28
J	0.00	0.00	11.76	52.94	35.29	100.00		4.24
N	1.56	1.04	16.15	44.27	36.98	100.00		4.14
D	0.00	13.33	13.33	20.00	53.33	100.00		4.13
C	3.57	1.79	19.64	33.93	41.07	100.00		4.07
O	0.00	5.71	14.29	48.57	31.43	100.00		4.06
H	10.00	0.00	30.00	30.00	30.00	100.00		3.70
A	0.00	20.00	0.00	70.00	10.00	100.00		3.70
Q	33.33	0.00	33.33	0.00	33.33	100.00		3.00
<i>Total</i>	<i>1.85</i>	<i>2.56</i>	<i>12.94</i>	<i>37.13</i>	<i>45.52</i>	<i>100.00</i>		<i>4.22</i>

**Note:** The number of responses reported by each service ranged from 3 – 217. It needs to be borne in mind that where numbers are small there can be considerable volatility in the data (i.e. the views of one parent can sway the outcome by a large percentage).

**Table 18:** Responses to (Q14) I would have liked the Educational Psychologist to have been involved sooner.

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Neither Agree or Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Agree (%)</i>	<i>Strongly Agree (%)</i>	<i>Total (%)</i>		<i>Average rating</i>
G	0.00	0.00	15.79	36.84	47.37	100.00		4.32
K	0.00	6.25	18.75	12.50	62.50	100.00		4.31
A	0.00	10.00	20.00	20.00	50.00	100.00		4.10
J	3.03	3.03	24.24	21.21	48.48	100.00		4.09
N	2.55	7.65	19.39	22.45	47.96	100.00		4.06
E	5.76	5.76	18.71	17.99	51.80	100.00		4.04
D	0.00	13.33	6.67	46.67	33.33	100.00		4.00
L	0.00	7.14	28.57	28.57	35.71	100.00		3.93
O	0.00	11.76	23.53	32.35	32.35	100.00		3.85
C	3.70	7.41	27.78	27.78	33.33	100.00		3.80
F	3.10	10.85	25.58	31.01	29.46	100.00		3.73
I	0.00	33.33	0.00	33.33	33.33	100.00		3.67
P	0.00	16.67	33.33	16.67	33.33	100.00		3.67
M	0.00	10.00	50.00	20.00	20.00	100.00		3.50
B	0.00	28.57	28.57	14.29	28.57	100.00		3.43
H	10.00	20.00	10.00	50.00	10.00	100.00		3.30
Q	33.33	33.33	33.33	0.00	0.00	100.00		2.00
<i>Total</i>	<i>3.15</i>	<i>8.45</i>	<i>21.78</i>	<i>24.93</i>	<i>41.69</i>	<i>100.00</i>		<i>3.94</i>

**Note:** The number of responses reported by each service ranged from 3 – 217. It needs to be borne in mind that where numbers are small there can be considerable volatility in the data (i.e. the views of one parent can sway the outcome by a large percentage).

**Table 19:** Responses to (Q15) I am confident that my child's needs will be met more effectively as a result of this involvement.

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Neither Agree or Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Agree (%)</i>	<i>Strongly Agree (%)</i>	<i>Total (%)</i>		<i>Average rating</i>
P	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	66.67	100.00		4.67
K	0.00	0.00	11.11	22.22	66.67	100.00		4.56
M	0.00	0.00	0.00	45.45	54.55	100.00		4.55
B	0.00	8.33	0.00	25.00	66.67	100.00		4.50
L	0.00	6.25	6.25	31.25	56.25	100.00		4.38
I	0.00	0.00	33.33	0.00	66.67	100.00		4.33
F	0.00	2.90	15.22	31.16	50.72	100.00		4.30
G	0.00	0.00	18.18	36.36	45.45	100.00		4.27
H	8.33	0.00	0.00	41.67	50.00	100.00		4.25
D	0.00	7.14	7.14	57.14	28.57	100.00		4.07
E	6.00	5.33	13.33	27.33	48.00	100.00		4.06
O	2.86	5.71	17.14	37.14	37.14	100.00		4.00
C	1.72	1.72	31.03	27.59	37.93	100.00		3.98
N	2.38	4.29	18.57	42.38	32.38	100.00		3.98
J	6.06	3.03	15.15	39.39	36.36	100.00		3.97
A	10.00	0.00	20.00	60.00	10.00	100.00		3.60
Q	33.33	0.00	66.67	0.00	0.00	100.00		2.33
<i>Total</i>	<i>2.80</i>	<i>3.73</i>	<i>16.25</i>	<i>34.75</i>	<i>42.48</i>	<i>100.00</i>		<i>4.10</i>

**Note:** The number of responses reported by each service ranged from 3 – 217. It needs to be borne in mind that where numbers are small there can be considerable volatility in the data (i.e. the views of one parent can sway the outcome by a large percentage).

**Table 20:** Responses to (Q16) How satisfied were you that the Educational Psychologist made a useful contribution?

<i>EP Service</i>	<i>Dissatisfied (%)</i>	<i>Not very satisfied (%)</i>	<i>Satisfied (%)</i>	<i>Very satisfied (%)</i>	<i>Total (%)</i>	<i>Average rating</i>
O	2.56	10.26	48.72	38.46	100.00	3.83
A	0.00	10.00	60.00	30.00	100.00	3.82
P	0.00	0.00	16.67	83.33	100.00	3.75
E	1.31	3.27	32.68	62.75	100.00	3.69
L	0.00	0.00	31.25	68.75	100.00	3.60
Q	0.00	33.33	66.67	0.00	100.00	3.60
K	0.00	5.26	36.84	57.89	100.00	3.58
M	0.00	0.00	18.18	81.82	100.00	3.57
C	1.67	5.00	45.00	48.33	100.00	3.53
B	0.00	0.00	25.00	75.00	100.00	3.50
N	1.38	4.15	44.24	50.23	100.00	3.50
I	0.00	25.00	0.00	75.00	100.00	3.47
D	0.00	6.67	26.67	66.67	100.00	3.43
F	0.00	2.86	34.29	62.86	100.00	3.40
G	0.00	4.55	40.91	54.55	100.00	3.23
J	0.00	8.82	35.29	55.88	100.00	3.20
H	0.00	0.00	41.67	58.33	100.00	2.67
<i>Total</i>	<i>0.90</i>	<i>4.39</i>	<i>38.24</i>	<i>56.33</i>	<i>99.87</i>	<i>3.50</i>

**Note:** The number of responses reported by each service ranged from 3 – 217. It needs to be borne in mind that where numbers are small there can be considerable volatility in the data (i.e. the views of one parent can sway the outcome by a large percentage).

## APPENDIX B – ANOVA results

As discussed in the text, to investigate how the rating of statements related to other factors a 3-way ANOVA was conducted on each of the statements with sex, school year and type of contact (consultation/discussion, non-statutory, statutory and post-statutory) being between-subject variables. Type of need was not included as a variable as there were doubts about the validity of these data. There was considerable variation in the results which have consequently been discussed in relation to each statement. To be included here the significance needed to be  $p < 0.05$ .

NOTE: Where year was found to be significant it needs to be acknowledged that the data sets start to become very small.

Question 1: *I knew why the Educational Psychologist was going to be involved.* The analysis indicated a main effect of year [ $F(13, 437) = 1.86, p < 0.05$ ] and an interaction between year and type [ $F(34, 437) = 1.66, p < 0.01$ ]. Inspection of the means indicated a fairly systematic decline in parental ratings with the age of the child. By way of illustration the mean rating across Key Stage 1 was 4.58, for Key Stage 2 was 4.56, for Key Stage 3 was 4.48 and for Key Stage 4 was 4.48. The interaction related primarily to consultation and non-statutory work. The mean ratings for parents whose contact had been consultation dropped in years 5 & 6 to 3.75 whilst that for the whole of the consultation condition was 4.40. Similarly for non-statutory contacts the mean was 4.48 but dropped to 3.00 in year 8 and a very low 2.50 in year 10. The overall implication is that less attention may have been directed to clarifying the reason for involvement to parents of older children.

Question 2: *The Educational Psychologist seemed to value my views and take them into account.* The analysis indicated a main effect of type [ $F(3, 434) = 7.03, p < 0.001$ ], year [ $F(13, 434) = 3.25, p < 0.001$ ] and an interaction between year and type [ $F(34, 434) = 1.61, p < 0.05$ ]. Inspection of the means indicated that whilst the overall average for this statement was 4.54, that for cases in which the contact related to consultation was relatively low at 4.17 and that for non-statutory work was even lower at only 4.08. As above when considering year there was a fairly systematic decline in parental ratings of this statement with the age of the child. Adopting a similar approach to that above, the mean rating across Key Stage 1 was 4.59, across Key Stage 2 was 4.50, across Key Stage 3 was 4.27 and across Key Stage 4 was 3.50. Again the interaction related exclusively to consultation and non-statutory work. Whilst the averages for all years and types generally exceeded 4.00 the mean ratings for parents whose contact had been consultation was 3.83, 3.67 and 2.75 respectively for years 10, 5 and 6. Similarly for non-statutory contacts the only mean ratings to fall below 4.00 was in years 7, 8 and 10, which were 3.79, 3.00 and 2.50 respectively. The overall implication is that generally parents perceived their views to have been valued and taken into account. However, the ratings in respect to consultations and non-statutory were relatively poor and there was a general deterioration in ratings in respect to secondary aged children.

Question 3: *I was able to share my views and any concerns.* The analysis indicated a main effect of type [ $F(3, 434) = 6.84, p < 0.001$ ], year [ $F(13, 434) = 2.15, p = 0.01$ ] and an interaction between year and type [ $F(34, 434) = 1.87, p < 0.01$ ]. Inspection of the means indicated that whilst the overall average for this statement was 4.57, that for cases in which the contact related to consultation was relatively low at 4.11 and was the only mean (for type) below 4.48. It seems difficult to explain why the ratings for consultations had the lowest mean when listening to the views and concerns of the parent or carer would seem to be fundamental to the process. Yet again when looking at the means for year there was a systematic decline in parental ratings of this statement with the age of the child. The three lowest means related to year 7, 10 and 11 and were 4.19, 3.81 and 3.63 respectively. Again the interaction related to consultation and non-statutory work. Whilst the averages for all years and types generally exceeded 4.00 the mean ratings for parents whose contact had been consultation was 3.67 and 3.50 for years 5 and 7 respectively. Similarly for non-statutory contacts the only mean ratings to fall below 4.00 were in years 8 and 10, which were 3.00 and 2.50 respectively. The overall implication is that generally parents perceived that they were able to share their views and concerns when engaged with EPs. However, the ratings in respect to consultations were relatively poor and there was a general deterioration in ratings in respect to secondary aged children.

Question 4: *I consider the Educational Psychologist provided independent advice.* The analysis indicated a main effect of year [ $F(13, 436) = 2.55, p < 0.01$ ], of type [ $F(3, 436) = 4.34, p < 0.01$ ] and an interaction between year and type [ $F(34, 436) = 1.51, p < 0.05$ ]. In respect to type, the average for this statement was 4.42 and most types of intervention were consistent at this level, with the exception of non-statutory contact which registered at 3.99. Hence parents would seem to be less positive about the impartiality of EP advice in this type of contact. Inspection of the means indicated that the only ratings to fall below an average of 4.00 related to young people of secondary age or those who were Post-16. The averages for year 7, 10 and 11 were 3.92, 3.64 and 3.63 respectively. The average for the Post-16 group was lowest at 3.00 but this was still at the midpoint for the scale as a whole. Adopting an average rating of 3.50 as a cut off, the interaction related only to non-statutory and statutory work. This would seem to hold some face validity. In respect to statutory work Post-16 contacts achieved an average rating of 2.00 and an average of 1.00 for year 11 and 2.50 for year 10 non-statutory work. This implies that there may have been friction about Post-16 placements at these points. The only other low scores were in respect to non-statutory work during the first two years at secondary school (years 7 and 8) which had mean ratings of 3.43 and 3.00 respectively. One hypothesis here is that the contact may have failed to lead to a Statement which parents may have been hoping for.

Question 5: *I was fully involved in the discussion about my child's needs and what was going to happen to address them.* The analysis in respect to this statement indicated a main effect only of year [ $F(13, 431) = 2.25, p < 0.01$ ] and of type [ $F(3, 431) = 3.43, p < 0.05$ ]. Adopting the approach above, in



respect to type the total average for this statement was 4.40 and most types of intervention were consistent at this level, with the exception of non-statutory contact which registered at 4.00. Hence parent or carers would seem to be marginally less positive about being involved in discussion about their child's needs and how they were to be addressed than in other types of contact. Again, however, 4.00 signifies that they were in overall agreement with the statement, it is just that parents and carers were even more positive in respect to other types of contact. In respect to year the only ratings to fall below 4.00 related to the oldest age groups; year 10, 11 and Post-16 (3.61, 3.63 and 3.00 respectively).

Question 6: *Sufficient time was provided during this contact to discuss my child's needs.* The analysis in respect to this statement indicated a main effect only of year [ $F(13, 433) = 2.09, p < 0.01$ ] and of type [ $F(3, 431) = 6.47, p < 0.001$ ]. Inspection of the means in respect to type indicated that non-statutory contact received the lowest rating, at 3.79. As has been a fairly familiar pattern, the ratings for secondary aged pupils were generally lower and especially those for years 7, 10 and 11 (mean ratings being 3.66, 3.58 and 3.13 respectively). This is against an overall rating of 4.31 for this statement.

Question 7: *The Educational Psychologist seemed knowledgeable and assisted in finding ways to help.* The overall average for this item was 4.39 and no main effects for type, gender or year were found nor was there any significant interaction between these variables

Question 8. *All of my questions and concerns were addressed.* The analysis indicated a main effect only of year [ $F(13, 433) = 2.54, p < 0.01$ ]. As noted earlier when considering year there was a fairly systematic decline in parental ratings of this statement with the age of the child. By way of illustration the mean rating across Key Stage 1 was 4.30, across Key Stage 2 was 4.27, across Key Stage 3 was 3.87 and across Key Stage 4 was 3.55. Again there are reservations about the decreasing amount of data relating to the older age groups that need to be acknowledged. The net implication is that the parents of younger children felt that their questions and concerns were better addressed.

Question 9: *The involvement provided a better insight into the situation.* The analysis on this statement indicated a main effect of year [ $F(13, 431) = 1.86, p < 0.05$ ] and of type [ $F(3, 431) = 2.17, p < 0.05$ ]. Inspection of the means in respect to type indicated that non-statutory contact received the lowest rating, at 3.89. As has been a fairly familiar pattern, only the ratings for secondary aged pupils fell below 4.00, with the exception of year 9 which was at 4.22. The implication here is that the parents or carers of younger children felt they had been given a better insight into the nature of the difficulties being experienced.

Question 10: *Actions agreed were relevant, useful and able to be done.* The analysis on this statement indicated only a main effect of year [ $F(13, 420) = 2.07, p < 0.05$ ]. Inspection of the means in respect to year indicated that whilst the overall average was 4.18 only the ratings for secondary aged pupils fell

below 4.00, with the exception of year 9 which was at 4.32. The implication here is that the parents or carers of younger children felt they had been given interventions which tended to be more viable and practical.

Question 11: *At the end of the Educational Psychologist's involvement it was made clear who would be doing what.* The analysis indicated no significant main effect of sex, type or year. The implication being that there was no marked difference in parent/carer ratings of this statement.

Question 12: *Things improved as a result of the Educational Psychologist's involvement.* The analysis of this statement indicated only a main effect of type [ $F(3, 331) = 3.64, p < 0.01$ ]. Whilst the overall rating of this statement was 3.72, that for statutory contact was 4.00 and other forms of contact were lower but at a similar level to each other. One possible hypothesis is that parents or carers equated results as being linked to the statutory processes which provide some apparent certainty to the outcomes of the contact, however this is speculative.

Question 13: *The Educational Psychologist did everything they had agreed to do.* The ANOVA on this statement indicated only a main effect of type [ $F(3, 386) = 3.64, p < 0.01$ ]. Whilst the overall rating of this statement was 4.22, the means for consultation and non-statutory contact were below 4.00 (3.96 and 3.97 respectively). It is difficult to make sense of this, although statutory and post-statutory contacts may have more actions arising which are required to be met because of the statutory context.

Question 14: *I would have liked the Educational Psychologist to have been involved sooner.* The analysis of responses to this statement indicated no significant main effect of sex, type or year. The implication being that there was no marked difference in parent or carer ratings of this statement, the overall mean receiving one of the lowest ratings at 3.94

Question 15: *I am confident that my child's needs will be met more effectively as a result of this involvement.* The ANOVA on this statement indicated a main effect of year [ $F(13, 427) = 2.32, p < 0.01$ ] and of type [ $F(3, 427) = 3.70, p < 0.01$ ]. Inspection of the means in respect to type indicated that non-statutory contact received the lowest rating, at 3.75, and consultation the second lowest at 3.89. All of the other means exceeded 4.00 and the overall mean was 4.10. As has been a fairly familiar pattern in this set of analyses, only the ratings for secondary aged pupils fell below 3.80, with the exception of year 9 which was at 4.30. The implication here is that the parents of younger children felt more confident that the needs of their children would be met more effectively as the result of EP involvement. To explore this decline in ratings with the age of the child or young person we explored the relationship between rating and year group of the child. Spearman's Rho was - 0.18 which was significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). This supports the observation that ratings generally decline with the age of the child who is the subject of the contact.