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This is an excellent study which investigates the views of Educational Psychologists (EPs) regarding the core and effective features of consultation. The research claims that the work can be used to help TEPs gain an understanding of what consultation is and how they can be effective practitioners by helping to elucidate the core features of consultation and what leads to change for CYP.

I have received 5 chapters; Chapter 1 sets the scene, Chapter 2 provides the theoretical background, Chapter 3 presents the methodology employed. Chapter 4 presents the results of the qualitative data followed by the quant analysis, and finally chapter 5 discusses the findings and draws conclusions with links to EP practice. Limitations are also clear. The writing could in places be tighter but overall this is easy to read.

Some comments to be discussed in viva:

* What is the preferred definition of consultation in this thesis?
* How does this definition follow a theoretical model that underpins the research?
* Who is at the center of the Bronfenbrenner model? How does the consultation model connect to it?
* Methodologically, what would the quantitative analysis bring to the board?
* TA and QCA are discussed – how are they compared
* I find the thematic map is really useful. What did you learn from it? How could you increase the validity here?
* What do we learn from Table 1?
* How would you use the themes to train TEPs?

I look forward to meeting Patrick at the viva voce and discussing some of the above points with him.

Some preliminary comments by chapter:

Chapter One: Introduction

This was a setting the scene chapter and it introduced some key literature regarding consultation. I would have expected more of a context setting regarding EP practice.

Chapter Two: Literature review

This review is fairly critical and the research questions clearly followed the literature. Which definition is followed and used as center of the research is still unclear.

I would expect this chapter to be framing and linking the theoretical models better.

Chapter Three: Methodology

Epistemology and research paradigm are fine. They explain the mixed methods approach followed well. Sampling is both convenience and snowballing to reach the aims of the research.

The qualitative analysis follows a classic thematic route but takes for granted the work. Event sampling used in observations is appropriate and frames the research questions. A very interesting discussion of TME as a tool follows and critical evaluation of the appropriateness and fit with the consultation framework. Reliability and validity are also discussed. It is interesting to read about the changes in design that were needed following the pandemic restrictions and reflecting on zoom interviews is really useful here.

Chapter Four: Findings

An interesting discussion of derived themes is included and the results of the observations follows in parallel.

There is a fair amount to discuss here and some of the issues are given above.

Chapter Five: Discussion

RQs are answered and the chapter flows quite nicely,

I was expecting a clearer direction given the in depth treatment of the data obtained.
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