

The definitive version of this article is published and available online as:
Hymer B, Michel D, Todd L, Dynamic Consultation: towards process and challenge 2002
Educational Psychology in Practice, Volume: 18, Number: 1, 47-62
<http://www.informaworld.com/openurl?genre=article&issn=0266-7363&volume=18&issue=1&spage=47>

Dynamic Consultation – Towards Process and Challenge

Barry Hymer, Deborah Michel and Liz Todd

This paper outlines the attempts of a group of educational psychologists to apply the theoretical principles underpinning dynamic assessment to the process of solution focused consultation with teachers at the school-based stages of the Special Educational Needs Code of Practice. Process questions based on dynamic assessment are used within a semi-structured consultative framework in order to challenge thinking, to explore meanings, to mediate learning and to plan interventions. It is suggested that the principles of dynamic assessment lend themselves well to the consultation process, providing a model for effective and reflective practice for educational psychologists and teachers, and non-intrusive intervention with pupils.

Introduction

The search for method becomes one of the most important problems of the entire enterprise of understanding the uniquely human forms of psychological activity. In this case, the method is simultaneously prerequisite and product, the tool and the result of the study.

Vygotsky, 1978, p65

In common with many educational psychology services, educational psychologists in Cumbria have been developing their 'method' (to take a term from Vygotsky's quotation above). They have been evolving their approaches to assessment, influenced by their own reflections on practice. Other influences include continuing professional development and complex local education authority demands such as statutory assessment. During the early 1990s Cumbria Education Service developed and implemented an extensive set of criteria for the allocation of statutory resources to children with a wide range of special educational needs (SEN). These criteria were developed with the intention of ensuring as far as possible a degree of consistency and transparency in resource-allocation across the county. With the publication of the Draft

Code of Practice for Children with SEN (DfE, 1993) and its successor (DfE, 1994), these criteria were expanded to include threshold criteria for the initiation of statutory assessment within the terms of the five-stage Code of Practice model (Cumbria County Council, 1997). For all the injection of Code of Practice process-driven requirements, the criteria for statutory resource allocations in Cumbria relied substantially on within-child factors. In many instances this would be expected to be illuminated through the use of standardised and norm-referenced assessment measures. Whatever individual intentions and sense of dissonance, direct casework with individual pupils within a referral system had in large part remained as our 'default setting'.

Unsurprisingly, given the model within which the Cumbria educational psychology service has operated (and to which we have contributed), Cumbrian educational psychologists have been required to call heavily upon psychometric tools when carrying out assessments at Stages 4 and 5 of the Code of Practice - but also (and often by extension) in many instances when intervening in schools at the pre-statutory stages. At the same time, we were exposed through continuing professional development (CPD) opportunities to a wide range of alternative assessment, therapeutic and intervention approaches - not all of which sit easily alongside those theories of development, teaching and learning which underpin the employment of norm-referenced assessment measures. A two day CPD training course in Dynamic Assessment delivered to Cumbria educational psychology service by one of the authors stimulated discussion about assessment and general issues of service delivery. However, it proved difficult to apply ideas from dynamic assessment systematically in individual assessment. In recent years, consultation approaches to service delivery had been explored and trialled by several members of the Service. From the various developments in the service, the two authors working in Cumbria began to look at the possibility of combining ideas from dynamic assessment with those from consultation. The idea of using dynamic assessment to shape questions within a consultation framework emerged. Subsequently, and with management support, this framework has been developed and operationalised by a group of EPs working in the south of the county, and trialled in the EPs' patch schools.

The rationale for the shift in practice has its theoretical roots in social constructivist arguments around the nature of ability and 'potential' (cf Grigorenko and Kornilova,

1997), in longstanding and related concerns around the usefulness of psychometric tools in effecting positive changes in teaching and learning practices (cf Lidz, 1987; Wood, 1990), and in issues around client empowerment and human rights (cf Sewell, 1987; Burden, 1996; Maines, 1999). In essence the authors were keen to pursue a better integrated vision of assessment and intervention, looking for assessment which considered the “potential for change” (Daniels, 1992, p175). To this end we saw, in Vygotskian terms, merit in embracing a theory which understands human development as being simultaneously the *tool and result* of developmental activity - as opposed to the mechanical outworkings of something pre-existent (eg level of ability or maturity) - in a *tool for result* fashion. As practitioners, the theory *felt* right; we *knew* we had a body of knowledge and experience to draw on within our profession, and that we’d find support and inspiration specifically in the practices of consultation and DA. But being relatively new to these worlds and insecure in our knowledge base, we found comfort in Marx’s dictum: if you want to understand something, try to change it. Or perhaps (more timidly), integrate it.

The remaining sections of this article provide a description of how to *practise* ‘Dynamic Consultation’ within a *theoretical* framework. Both are necessary. As psychologists we need not be wary of theory. Indeed, together with an evaluation of effectiveness, psychological theory is crucial to give validity to our methods. First to theory – and next to a description of the approach before setting that, too, in a psychological context.

Consultation, Dynamic Assessment and Socrates

The ability to ask the kinds of questions that foster new understanding and the development of teaching is an essential part of teachers’ professional expertise.

Hart, 2000, p7

We transform through our activity the circumstances that determine us. What, how and how much a person can learn is not dependent on his or her developmental level (eg IQ, reading readiness, maturity) - for Vygotsky learning leads development. Holzman, 1995, p200

When the educational psychologist engages in a consultation with a teacher within the model there should be a meeting of equals (albeit with distinct but complementary skills) and elements which inhibit this perception need to be confronted. Wagner (2000) explores the need to question issues around power and control in a consultation, to include challenges to the language of consultation (eg *consultant/consultee*), and to develop “the expertise to be non-expert” (Draper, 1997). Teachers are seen as skilled professionals rather than tutees, and the process of dialogue must be reciprocal and enskilling, rather than unidirectional and deskilling. The solution or ‘truth’ still lies with the teacher.

The theoretical and practical foundations of consultation approaches within the disciplines of education and psychology are well described elsewhere (eg Conoley and Conoley, 1982; Wagner, 2000). There are many forms of consultation, with different psychological underpinnings, and time has seen a development through the different models. Consultation used by educational psychologists today can be argued to have roots in the mental health consultation of the 1960s as devised by Gerald Caplan (1970), based on psychodynamic ideas. UK consultation has also been influenced by behavioural consultation from the USA (Fuchs, Fuchs, Dulan, Roberts and Fernstrom, 1992). Consultation used by educational psychologists in the 1980s was strongly influenced by the systemic thinking of Milan family systemic therapy (Stringer, Stow, Hibbert, Powell, and Louw, 1992). Given such a background, it is not surprising to find a combination of theoretical roots including personal construct psychology, symbolic interactionism and social constructionism either implicit or explicit in current writing by educational psychologists about consultation (MacHardy, Carmichael and Proctor, 1996; Turner, Robbins and Doran, 1996, Wagner, 2001, and the articles on consultation in *Educational Psychology in Practice*, March 2000). However, the underlying theme of most such writing is that of a broadly social constructionist approach. The place of consultation within the family of social constructivism is also named by Watkins in his introduction to the articles on consultation contained in the March 2000 issue of *Educational Psychology in Practice*. He comments on their “underlying and often explicit psychological model: it may be described as a systemic, interactionist and constructionist psychology” (ibid. p5). The particular consultation approach adopted by the authors in Cumbria Educational Psychology Service also incorporated a solution focused framework, similar to that outlined by Wagner (2001).

It seems, therefore, that a number of different theories contribute to Wagner's (op cit) understanding of consultation as used by educational psychologists. We suggest that each theoretical approach has something to contribute, and that social constructivist dynamic assessment has something further to add. But first – what have the theories put forward by Wagner (op cit) contributed? A systemic, interactionist and constructionist consultation essentially means that problems are not assumed to be a characteristic of the child – they result in a complex manner from the interaction of a multitude of factors. A Vygotskian take on this affirms the use of dialogue to reach a higher understanding. A personal construct approach emphasises the importance of the perspectives of the consultee, often the teacher, on the 'problem'. Symbolic interactionism sees one's concept of self to be a reflection of the reflected perceptions of others – and consultation is a way of generating a dialogue to help the teacher come face to face with their reflected perceptions. Solution focused thinking (not, itself, a single theory, encompassing a number of theoretical approaches) has helped to provide questions to structure a consultation session. Such questions are consistent with a social constructionist approach, since their aim is to open up the complexity of the situation.

What can dynamic assessment contribute? Why add a further theory to an area which seems already cluttered by psychologies? Solution focused thinking has provided questions – but it can do this with little reference to any particular theoretical framework. Consultation, we suggest, should provide some kind of cognitive challenge to the teacher in order to develop his or her perceptions of a situation and deepen his or her understanding of possible solutions. Dynamic assessment recognised problems inherent in static assessment procedures:

Dynamic assessment (or mediated or assisted assessment as it is sometimes named) involves a dynamic interaction between tester and learner (testee) with a focus on the process rather than the product of learning.' Lunt, 1993, p155

Its use by educational psychologists (Stringer, Elliott and Laughlan, 1997; Educational and Child Psychology, Special Edition, Volume 15) and its theoretical rationale (Lidz, 1987; Daniels, 1992; Lunt, 1993; Elliott, Laughlan, and Stringer, 1996) are well documented. It can provide a way of thinking about how to facilitate challenge which is

missing from any other theoretical framework identified by previous writers. Its concept of mediation, the need for another person to scaffold the development in thinking of another, emphasises cognitive challenge as a purposeful and collaborative activity. Applying a dynamic assessment framework to consultation emphasises the process of learning rather than the product. The remaining paragraphs of this section refer to an antecedent of psychological theory – to Socrates no less - in order to further develop ideas about the way dynamic assessment both focuses on process and provides cognitive challenge.

Robert Fisher (1998), in exploring the legacy of Socrates to education, identifies a number of elements of Socratic teaching. These seem to resonate strongly when seen through the twin filters of consultation and dynamic assessment approaches. Specifically, and with key shared features italicised:

- by *listening and responding* to what others think, we learn what it is to *think for ourselves*;
- education is an *activity of mind*, not a curriculum to be delivered;
- *questions* are used as a way of approaching truth through the use of reason in a *shared enquiry*;
- the search for knowledge is a *co-operative enterprise* pursued through *dialogue*;
- *questioning* is the primary form of education, drawing out true knowledge from within, rather than imposing from outside;
- there is a *goal* towards which dialogue should be heading;
- because we don't know the truth, *we need to talk*;
- the teacher is seen as midwife - *helping us to give birth to our own ideas*;
- if we really and fully know which course of action is best, how can we fail to follow it?

(extracted from Fisher, 1998)

Fisher proceeds to contrast the Socratic method with that of Plato. It is also possible to attach (in parentheses) to the Plato-Socrates distinctions examples of the choices and tensions inherent in the traditional and emergent practices within our own profession. The Socratic examples demonstrate questions likely to challenge teachers' thinking about the process of a child's learning:

Platonic View

A fixed body of teachings
(the general nature of intelligence)

Deductive
(using large samples to contrast with an individual's performance)

Conceptual
(the child's thought is expressed through language)

Abstract truths
(ability)

For the few
(individual psychometric assessment; gifted pupils)

Written
(the value's in the report)

Socratic View

An active process of learning
(asking not 'How intelligent is this child?' but 'How is this child intelligent?')

Inductive
(the individual experience is unique and the starting-point for enquiry)

Linguistic
(the child's language *completes* her thought)

Practical truths
(performance)

Open to all
(consultation model; gifted teaching)

Dialogue
(the value's in the conversation)

These questions emphasise the process of human learning and in particular focus on its developmental rather than maturational or crystallised nature. Learning development is seen as that which happens to a person as he or she comes to know or 'construct' the world through dialogue and other forms of activity. In this valuing of activity, questioning, agency and process, and in the view of the essentially *collaborative* and *social* nature of learning, the connections between Socratic teachings, consultation and dynamic assessment approaches require few great conceptual leaps. These connections are seen to be manifest, for example, in the 'end-states' of variously a Socratic dialogue, a consultation, or a mediated activity: insights, knowledge and understanding will, under the right conditions, translate in turn into personal, 'owned' actions. In Socratic terms, if we really and truly know which course of action is best, how could we fail to follow it?

Having explained *why* we need a further psychological framework in consultation and *what* in general terms dynamic assessment can contribute – we now outline the model used and explain this model in some detail with, once again, reference to psychological theory.

Outline of the Model

It is one thing to be told how an Instrumental Enrichment task can strengthen a cognitive deficiency and another to find the right questions and examples to guide children into carrying out the skill or operation on their own, or to bring them to the point of intellectual vigilance where they are highly receptive to acquiring a principle from a teacher. Sharron & Coulter, 1996, p195

Between the conception / And the creation ... / Falls the shadow

T.S. Eliot, The Hollow Men

Dynamic assessment contributes a number of questions to help the educational psychologist mediate the teacher's thinking as part of consultation and these are listed below. They have been further translated into a prompt-sheet to take to meetings and to use, if appropriate as a record of meetings (see appendix 1). The mediating questions for dynamic consultation are set in the context of their psychological roots, before discussing further questions that recognise the affective domain to include in dynamic consultation.

At the Input level - data gathering

- What do you mean by?
- Can you give me an example of this?
- Can you put that another way?
- When did that/does this happen? What exactly does this look like?
- Does it always look like this?

At the Elaborational level - factors affecting the efficient use of data

- Why do you think that ...?
- Where is the evidence for that?
- What are your reasons for ...?
- Could this be accounted for in any other way?
- What would happen if ...?
- What would you see if things were just a bit better?
- What must you do first, and how can you find out what to do next?
- If you were a fly on the wall, how would you describe what you saw?

At the Output level - factors leading to inefficient communication of solutions

- Could you tell me what you mean by ...?
- Is there anything you're thinking you need from me here?
- How are you going to find out what she thinks and feels about this
- How would he know that this is what you wanted from him?
- What would be the most effective way of checking this out?
- Why do you feel you couldn't do this?

The three headings for the sets of question above have been adapted from Feuerstein's Learning Potential Assessment Device (LPAD) (1979). Feuerstein's approach mediates development looking to pinpoint preferential interchanges and environmental conditions to facilitate change and conditions under which change can occur. It aims to identify barriers to change (termed, unhelpfully for us, 'deficient cognitive functions'). The LPAD examiner detects and assesses the amount, type and nature of intervention necessary to overcome or bypass any assessed difficulties. Data are collected at three phases: the input level, the elaboration level and the output level. In the teacher-educational psychologist interaction this might translate into questions about what are the barriers to learning and teaching which are contained in this situation (referral, problem, predicament), and what are the mechanisms or processes which could remove them? Feuerstein et al. (op cit), attribute the 'cognitive deficiencies' or barriers to an individual's learning to his or her lack or inadequacy of mediated learning experiences (i.e. reflecting motivational and attitudinal factors, and poor working habits rather than any organic or structural 'deficit'). They believe these barriers or 'deficiencies' to be reversible, and in their description of the LPAD they provide an inventory of cognitive functions that are undeveloped, under-developed, arrested or impaired. The functions are categorised into the input, elaborational and output levels (see Feuerstein, Rand and Rynders, 1988; Feuerstein and Feuerstein, 1991; also Elliott, Laughlan and Stringer, 1996, for a summary description of these levels). These categories can provide a helpful framework for structured process questions in the dynamic consultation model.

The agent of cognitive mediation in dynamic consultation is the process of reflective questioning. This happens by moving from an exploration of the 'data' around the issue or concern, to a consideration of the barriers to productive use of the available

information and resources, and to a consideration of the ways in which perceived solutions can better be communicated. We believe that process questions are powerful tools for understanding learning (which in turn leads development). They also help to bridge the gap that exists between the sense that teachers make of their classroom experiences and the meaning that we as educational psychologists struggle to construct around these accounts. This gap echoes that described by Donaldson (1978) - between the meanings created by children and the interpretations made by their teachers.

The affective dimension in assessment and intervention is acknowledged and affirmed both in consultation and DA approaches. Mediation through the medium of process questions can be seen to build bridges both between concepts (cognitive mediation) and between people. It is in the affective domain that questioning within a dynamic consultation framework comes closest to a guided discovery and client-centred model. This corresponds more closely to Vygotsky's metacognitive mediation as outlined by Karpov & Haywood (1998) and implicitly recognises the role of inner-speech, especially when challenging faulty thinking. Questions and reflective statements which attempt to tap into and to "scaffold" (Wood, Bruner and Ross, 1976) learning development within the affective domain could include (from an infinite menu of possibilities):

- How does this behaviour make you feel? (Anxiety)
- You're uncertain this could work? (Anxiety)
- This might look odd to your colleagues? (Anxiety/Fear of failure)
- You feel this strategy carries a risk? (Fear of failure)
- I guess this would be difficult to carry out alone ... (Access to assistance)
- You wouldn't like to be left to get on with this alone ... (Access to assistance)
- You feel quite/less confident about that? (Self-confidence/uncertainty)
- Would it be difficult to cope with that in the short term? (Frustration tolerance)
- You feel this improvement has nothing to do with you? (Attributions/Locus of control)
- Is it difficult to take the credit for this? (Attributions/Locus of control)
- You *really* want this to work, don't you? (Motivation)
- I can see this is really important to you. (Motivation)

It goes without saying that if these questions are to be effective they will need to be integrated into the process of the dynamic consultation, rather than mechanically

interjected at set intervals. Finding an appropriate and non-intrusive moment for such questions will relate more to the interpersonal and counselling skills of the educational psychologist than to the dictates of a dynamic consultation script, but it is the principle of non-neglect of the affective dimension which is crucial.

Alongside the centrality in dynamic consultation of mediation in the cognitive and affective domains through process questions, is the notion that in mediating the cognitive and affective experiences and learning of the teacher, we are also seeking to model a way of mediating the social, emotional and cognitive learning of the child or group of children with whom the teacher will engage. The process by which this transfer could take place may correspond to the activities through which (it is suggested within the constructivist paradigm) self-regulation in children is developed. As this is described by Karpov & Haywood (1998, p28):

- someone regulates the child's behaviour through the use of external speech;
- the child regulates someone else's behaviour by external speech and regulates his own behaviour by use of egocentric speech;
- the child regulates his own behaviour by inner speech.

Through a parallel process, what is possible within the educational psychologist-teacher dyad is possible also within the teacher-pupil dyad. Just as the educational psychologist would seek in dynamic consultation to tap into the teacher's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) - those psychological functions which are in the process of development "... and which are likely to be overlooked if the focus is exclusively on the unassisted [child's] performance" (Zozulin, 1990, p170), so might the teacher do likewise in the classroom. The nature of the tasks, concepts and skills are likely to be very different, but the processes of mediation should be similar, tapping into the child's ZPD. As described by Rogoff (1990) in her description of the general features of effective collaboration, a central feature is the extent to which teachers provide a bridge between a child's existing knowledge and the demands of the new task. Alone, the child may not appreciate the relations between the task demands and his or her existing relevant knowledge and skills. Together, anything is possible.

Conclusions and Implications

The conclusion is the place where you got tired of thinking

(Attributed to Arthur Bloc)

Thinking inductively is inborn and lawful. This is revolutionary work, because schools have decided to teach in a lawless fashion, subverting inborn capacity

Taba (to a group sitting on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, 1966)

In South Cumbria, in starting to move towards dynamic consultation as the primary tool for an initial consultation with teachers, we are aware that we are still only at the beginning of a process of change in our professional thinking and practice which began decades back (Gillham, 1978). Specific to our current needs, we have been curious to establish whether, at the practical level, the forms of mediation which are based around the processes of interpersonal communication could beneficially be wedded to the more directive processes of cognitive mediation. The move to Dynamic Consultation has led to significant changes in our working practice. We now use a dynamic consultation as our initial response to a referral at Stage 3 of the Code or Practice. We no longer routinely take out our BAS-II or WISC-III; instead we reach for our 'consultation folder' and our dynamic consultation script. Each visit does not lead to a lengthy report with a list of recommendations for the teacher to choose from when writing an Individual Education Plan (IEP). Instead we leave either a short record of our meeting or a jointly negotiated IEP.

Although very early and informal feedback from schools has been positive, much work remains to be done around implementation, monitoring and review. We will need to be receptive to the feedback received over time, and to find ways of having this feedback reflected in our evolving practice. Also central to the development of the model will be the extent to which it can be integrated into national initiatives and ways of working. Consultation is referred to both directly and indirectly in two recent documents, the Draft Code of Practice on the Identification and Assessment of Special Educational Needs (DfEE, 2000a) and the Report of the Working Group into the Current Role, Good Practice and Future Directions of Educational Psychology Services in England (DfEE, 2000b). Indirect references include the Working Group Report's emphasis on the drive to earlier intervention with children, which is mirrored in the Revised Code of Practice. The Working Group document refers in Section 3.1 to core functions with individual

children, and notes that educational psychologists can be expected to carry out either a direct assessment '*or indirect assessment through interviews and consultation*' (p8). Section 3.3, which relates to work with schools and early years providers, even uses social constructivist language (italicised):

Educational psychologists will provide teachers, SEN co-ordinators, and early years providers with professional advice and support either at an individual level, group or whole school level. At an individual level this might be *through offering one-to-one advice and coaching or through acting as a critical friend by helping individuals to reflect on their own practice and the effectiveness of intervention strategies ...* (p10)

There are still many questions unanswered, both practical and theoretical. These include: how do we organise a school-visiting diary in a way that emphasises collaborative review rather than 'test-and-place'? How do we mediate the learning of those teachers described by Meadows (1998, p21) as "unwilling conscripts, whose despair or lack of enthusiasm or disaffection makes them resist normal types of support"? And how do we reconcile the emphases in the recent DfEE documents on direct work with parents with a model in which educational psychologist-parent meetings do not routinely take place at an initial consultation? How does this sit with notions that children should be included in decision-making (Hobbs, Taylor and Todd (2000)? The latter two questions raise related issues: where dynamic consultation is used as the primary tool for an initial consultation, the model makes certain assumptions around problem ownership. Where a *school* raises an issue for consultation, it is assumed that the *school* will retain primary responsibility for addressing the issue. This is likely in most instances to involve close *home-school* (as opposed to home-educational psychologist) liaison. Where parents raise an issue with an educational psychologist, however, there is of course no reason why dynamic consultation couldn't be used directly in this interaction.

It should also be conceded that in moving from the concrete task-based dimension (dynamic assessment with children) to the more abstract reflective dimension (dynamic consultation with teachers) we have sometimes taken liberties with the strict meanings of the LPAD cognitive functions as defined by Feuerstein et al (1979). However, the terms dynamic assessment and consultation do not in themselves denote one particular and freestanding technique (Watkins, 2000; Bransford, 1987). Certainly we have no intention of casting implicit *judgement* on teachers' skills through the use of apparently pejorative

language (*impaired, egocentric, narrowness of mental field, etc.*) - language which reflects its time and purpose. Indeed we have difficulties with such explicit notions of deficit. The value for us of the LPAD classification is in the taxonomical framework it provides - offering a way of structuring a dynamic consultation with a teacher so that there can be simultaneously a logical progression and 'flow' to the consultation and a careful (albeit often implicit) consideration of the possible cognitive factors involved. It could be argued that our model continues to assume implicit notions of deficit, and this is an area for further development to remove such notions. Indeed we would look to a model of ways of working with teachers that removed any assumptions of deficit in either themselves or the child or family.

Feuerstein's LPAD (Feuerstein, Rand, and Hoffman, 1979; Feuerstein, Rand, and Rynders, 1988; and Feuerstein and Feuerstein, 1991) assumes that mediated learning which involves the use of his framework leads to some kind of structural cognitive change. At least one major theoretical question occurs from our application of dynamic assessment ideas to consultation: what is the nature of any cognitive challenge or change that is actually happening for teachers – and the educational psychologists using this? Some evaluation of this would seem to be useful.

We have made a start to integrate the dynamic consultation framework with compatible and more familiar therapeutic techniques and strategies within the social constructivist tradition - such as those developed in solution-focused brief therapy and narrative therapy practices and also in personal construct psychology. This has shown the possibilities which can result from what is at present only a broad theoretical and facilitative framework but one, which we believe, holds promise both for teachers and for educational psychologists. Further integration needs to be done. For teachers, the dynamic consultation model is likely to be consistent with the convergence of research evidence in support of formative over summative assessment - which is well marshalled by Black & Wiliam in their seminal paper, *Inside the black box* (1998). For educational psychologists, we have the opportunity to develop a model which might "help us to understand, discuss and intervene appropriately in the complex social process of learning" (Daniels, 1992, p183). This should be accompanied by a cautionary caveat too - that we have an equivalent responsibility to develop our skills in active listening and dynamic questioning to a level which affirms the role of teachers as good learners

(rather than knowers) in creating environments in which learning leads development. And this responsibility can expose quite cruelly our own vulnerabilities and insecurities, as we self-consciously shed the baggage of professional mystique and expertise with big black boxes. We may not quite be *disarming* ourselves in Cumbria (at least for the time being we will still need to use our test materials at Stages 4 of the Code of Practice), but for the purposes of an initial intervention at least, we are proposing to put our black boxes *beyond immediate use*. We sometimes feel we're walking naked into the consulting chambers, but if that involves helping teachers to leave more warmly dressed, so be it.

References

- Black, P. & William, D. (1998). *Inside the black box: raising standards through classroom assessment*. London: King's College School of Education
- Bransford, J.D., Delclos, V.R., Vye, N.J., Burns, M.S. & Hasselbring, T.S. (1987). State of the art and future directions. In Lidz, C.S. (ed.), *Dynamic Assessment - an interactional approach to evaluating learning potential*. New York: Guilford
- Burden, R. (1996). Meaningful questions or meaningful answers: worthwhile assessment in a changing world. In Engelbrecht, P., Kriegler, S.M & Booysen, M.I. (eds.), *Perspectives on Learning Difficulties: International Concerns and South African Realities*. Pretoria: van Schaik
- Caplan, G. (1970) *The Theory and Practice of Mental Health Consultation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Conoley, J.C. & Conoley, C.W. (1982). *School Consultation: A Guide to Practice and Training*. New York: Pergamon
- Cumbria County Council (1997). *Special Educational Needs Handbook*. Carlisle: Cumbria Education Service
- Daniels, H. (1992). Dynamic Assessment. Pitfalls and Prospects. In: Cline, T. (Ed) *The Assessment of Special Educational Needs: International Perspectives*. London, Routledge.
- Department for Education (1993). *Draft Code of Practice on the Identification and Assessment of Special Educational Needs*. London: HMSO
- Department for Education (1994). *Code of Practice on the Identification and Assessment of Special Educational Needs*. London: HMSO

Department for Education & Employment (2000a). *Revised SEN Code of Practice*. London: HMSO

Department for Education & Employment (2000b). *Educational Psychology Services (England): Current Role, Good Practice and Future Directions - Report of the Working Group*. London: HMSO

Donaldson, M. (1978). *Children's Minds*. London: Fontana

Draper, R. (1997). *Workshop*. London: Institute for Family Therapy

Elliott, J, Lauchlan, F. & Stringer, P. (1996). Dynamic Assessment and its potential for educational psychologists, part 1: theory and practice. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 12(3), 152-160

Feuerstein, R. and Feuerstein, S. (1991) Mediated Learning Experience: A Theoretical Review. In Feuerstein, R., Klein, P. S. and Tannenbaum, A. J. (Eds) *Mediated Learning Experiences (MLE) Theoretical, Psychosocial and Learning Implications*. Freund: London.

Feuerstein, R., Rand, J. & Hoffman, M. (1979). *The Dynamic Assessment of Retarded Performers: The Learning Potential Assessment Device*. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Feuerstein, R., Rand, Y. and Rynders, J. E. (1988) The Learning Potential Assessment Device (Chapter 11). *Don't Accept me as I am: Helping retarded people to excel*. Plenum Press: New York.

Fisher, R. (1998). *Teaching Thinking - Philosophical Enquiry in the Classroom*. London: Cassell

Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L., Dulan, J., Roberts, H. and Fernstrom, P. (1992) Where is the research on consultation effectiveness? *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 3, 2, 151-174.

- Gillham, B. (ed.) (1978). *Reconstructing Educational Psychology*. London: Croom Helm
- Grigorenko, E.L. & Kornilova, T.V. (1997). The resolution of the nature-nurture controversy by Russian psychology: culturally biased or culturally specific? In Sternberg, R.J. & Grigorenko, E.L. (eds.), *Intelligence, Heredity and Environment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Hart, S. (2000). *Thinking Through Teaching*. London: David Fulton
- Hobbs, C., Taylor, J., & Todd, L. (2000) Consulting with children and young people. Enabling educational psychologists to work collaboratively with children and young people. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 14, 4. (DEC)
- Holzman, L. (1995). Creating developmental learning environments: a Vygotskian practice. *School Psychology International*, 16(2), 199-212
- Karpov, Y.V. & Haywood, H.C. (1998). Two ways to elaborate Vygotsky's concept of mediation. *American Psychologist*, 53(1), 27-36
- Lidz, C.S. (1987). Historical perspectives. In Lidz, C.S. (ed.), *Dynamic Assessment - an interactional approach to evaluating learning potential*. New York: Guilford
- Lunt, I. (1993) The practice of assessment. In: Daniels, H. (Ed) *Charting the Agenda. Educational Activity After Vygotsky*. Routledge, London.
- MacHardy, L., Carmichael, H. and Proctor, J. (1996) *School Consultation: It don't mean a thing if it ain't got that swing. An Evaluative Study of a Consultation Model of Service Delivery*. Aberdeen City Council Psychological Service.
- Maines, B. (1999). *Re: Assessment/Ghettoes/Future etc.* EPNET Mailbase posting, 31 January 1999
- Meadows, S. (1998). "I have a dream ...". *Educational and Child Psychology*, 15(2), 21

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in Thinking: Cognitive Development in Social Context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Sewell, T.E. (1987). Dynamic Assessment as a non-discriminatory procedure. In Lidz, C.S. (ed.), *Dynamic Assessment - an interactional approach to evaluating learning potential*. New York: Guilford

Sharron, H. & Coulter, M. (1996). *Changing Children's Minds - Feuerstein's Revolution in the Teaching of Intelligence*. Birmingham: Imaginative Minds

Stringer, P.H., Stow, L., Hibbert, K., Powell, J. and Louw, E. (1992) Establishing Staff Consultation Groups in Schools. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 8,2, 87-96

Stringer, P., Elliott, J & Lauchlan, F. (1997). Dynamic Assessment and its potential for educational psychologists, part 2: the zone of next development? *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 12(4), 234-239

Turner, S., Robbins, H. & Doran, C. (1996). Developing a model of consultancy practice. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 12(2), 86-93

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Cambridge MA.: Harvard University Press

Wagner, P. (2000). Consultation: developing a comprehensive approach to service delivery. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 16(1), 9-18

Wagner, P. (2001) Consultation: A Solution-Focused Approach. *Solutions in Schools*. Creative Applications of Solution Focused Brief Thinking with Young People and Adults. Brief Therapy Press.

Watkins, C. (2000). Introduction to the articles on consultation. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 16(1), 5-8

Wood, R. (1990). The agenda for educational measurement. In Horton, T. (ed.), *Assessment Debates*. London: Hodder & Stoughton

Wood, D., Bruner, J.S. & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem-solving. *Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry*, 17, 89-100

Zozulin, A. (1990). *Vygotsky's Psychology*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf

WORDS: 6007 (including references)