Viva notes

More details about what consultation is

Bring in Bronfenbrenner in the conclusion

Erikkson (2018): why people are using the old Bronfenbrenner model?

Be more clear that the child is not in the consultation

Chapter 2:

Be clearer on what the difference between just a meeting and a therapeutic meeting

What are the consequences of the lack of theoretical adherence?

What are the theoretical underpinnings of the consultation models (in chapter 2) – more detail about PAF and SFBT. Allows comparison with what happened in the consultations to the theories.

Discuss more about role of the EP in the consultation.

Make it clearer the difference between expertise, experience, being the expert. What do I mean by “being the expert”, explain in detail?

Chapter 3:

More methodological literature to substantiate claims (sampling, interviews)

~~Didn’t explore ethical considerations, more detail about how long I’d store data, get informed consent~~

Chapter 5:

Talk about how much/whether frameworks appear in the results and whether I think there should be more/less.

~~Where the targets good? Be more critical that maybe change wasn’t observed because of the goals.~~

Additional findings: parent didn’t know the goal meant. Explore.

Publish in an article for teachers (teacher journal). National Parents Council for parents.

Have a checklist of things that could be included for consultations

~~Give definition at end of thesis~~ + more details about what the effective features are

Impact for teachers and parents (talk about)

1. Lit review: have more of a discussion about the models, take one or two and bring them throughout the
2. Child voice (paragraph, use updated Bronfenbrenner model)
3. Give definitions (consultation,
4. ~~Practical answers after answering the research questions, what should EPs do?~~

Put pages numbers by the checklist of where it was changed + use different colour – do it in the R script and then change the colour afterwards when knitted to Word.