**Appendix 13: Themes identified in semi-structured interviews: ThA Phase 3**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Themes |  | P7 | P6 | P5 | P4 | P3 | P2 | P1 |
| Valued by Head/SENCo | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| Flexibility in working arrangements | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Chosen to go on training by Head due to previous experience working with behavioural difficulties | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |
| Chosen to go on training by Head due to previous experience of working with children with a range of needs | 4 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| ELSA’s status, ie, versus classroom TA | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Awareness of children’s needs beyond the classroom | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Meeting with Head prior to submission of paperwork (and asked if would like to attend) | 7 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Head’s decision to go on course | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Impact of ELSA training on TA’s role | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| ELSA’s awareness of role prior to training - aware | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Pre-conceptions as readiness for course – no idea what to expect | 11 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 |
| Feeling at ease with course content | 12 |  |  | 2 | 2 | 1 |  | 2 |
| Equipped with skills to go on the course | 13 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |
| Lack of support from Head/SENCo | 14 |  | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Co-worker ELSA support - positive | 15 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 10 |
| Informal support from Head - positive | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Content with support offered from Head - informal | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Own ELSA’s personality as factor for role - Confident, patience, empathy, child trusts adult | 18 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Own ELSA’s good organisational skills for role | 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| ELSA awareness of when to seek support | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Teachers awareness of ELSAs – yes | 21 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 1 |
| Teachers informally speaking to ELSA Re: Concern | 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| TAs awareness of ELSAs - yes | 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| TAs seeking advice from ELSAs, ie, resources, ideas | 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| ELSA happy with degree role developing in school | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| ELSA happy with degree of support given during training by trainers | 26 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Interesting to hear about other ELSA’s experiences during clinical supervision | 27 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| ELSA clinical supervision useful for gathering information | 28 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| ELSA’s frustration with other schools not using their ELSA | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| Mutually sharing of frustration with ELSAs not being able to use their training | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Waste of training place when ELSA’s training not used | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| ELSA feeling uncomfortable in clinical supervision with schools not using their ELSA as limited as to what support those ELSAs can give in meetings | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Being an ELSA given confidence to take part in conversations | 33 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Importance of acting the role of ELSA as soon as possible before losing confidence | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Clinical supervision important in keeping awareness of ELSA training in school | 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| ELSA course good | 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Waste of time when ELSA’s training not used | 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Pleased with new opportunities training has provided – working outside of numeracy in 1:1, small groups | 38 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Pleased with new opportunities training has provided – working outside of numeracy as ‘consultant’ for Autism | 39 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Pleased with new opportunities training has provided | 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Positive impact with supporting TAs | 41 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Supportive Head/SENCo, eg, given time, budget, room, aP2ess to resources, approach SENCo for advice/help, noticeboards for displays | 42 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |
| Positive change in working relationship with teachers – seen as knowledgeable about children’s needs | 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| ELSA reaching children’s parents via teacher – positive impact | 44 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Greater interaction taking place between teacher and ELSA | 45 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| One teacher not utilizing ELSA | 46 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| ELSA established support service within school | 47 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Teachers positively embracing ELSAs | 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Changed working relationship with teachers | 49 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |
| Less of impact on working relationship with TAs | 50 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 1 |
| Own ELSAs flexibility in change of roles important | 51 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Training defined role of ELSA and usefulness | 52 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Positive working relationship with parents | 53 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 1 |
| No involvement with outside agencies (other than EP and AT) | 54 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| No impact on way work with AT since training | 55 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Negative response to Day 1 of training – too much info, too fast | 56 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Positive response from Day 2 + of training – practical, sharing of resources, real life scenarios, preferred less theory | 57 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 |
| Ideas from training still being used | 58 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Free resources being used from training | 59 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| At training would have been more beneficial working with someone from same school | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Learning about how schools operate | 61 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| More beneficial if two rather than person from school on same course (P1) | 62 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Benefits of two people attending | 63 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Need to be reminded of clinical supervision meetings and of focus | 64 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| ELSA having lack of resources to share at clinical supervision | 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Positive: ELSA – a new type of role in the school | 66 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Positive: ELSA – run with flexibility in school | 67 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Positive: ELSA – child focussed | 68 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Positive: ELSA – can be group focussed | 69 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Drawback: Head refusing teacher’s request for ELSA involvement despite ELSA considering they support the child | 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Drawback: Head prioritising cases in order ELSA disagrees with | 71 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Drawback: Unclear who has the power to decide which case ELSA picks up | 72 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Early stages of developing systems for which cases ELSA picks up | 73 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| ELSA has improved EL status amongst teachers – yes | 74 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 3 |
| ELSA has improved EL status amongst TAs – limited | 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| ELSA considering how to involve TAs, non-teaching staff | 76 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| Constraints on getting TA’s on board, eg, other pressures on TA’s time, ELSA role not seen as part of their role so don’t need to know | 77 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| ELSA has improved EL status amongst lunchtime staff - limited | 78 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| ELSA has improved EL status amongst admin staff – limited | 79 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Use of EL proforma | 80 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Impact of training when working with children as an ELSA – improving their communication, organizational and friendship skills, confidence building, self-esteem, anger management, reduce worrying, solution focussed work | 81 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| Impact of ELSA on school - positive | 82 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |
| Attending ELSA training – progression of current role | 83 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| ELSA had worked with social skills group prior to training | 84 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| SENCo informed ELSA of course | 85 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| SENCo queried whether course suitable as already doing the role | 86 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| ELSA persuading SENCo if could go on course | 87 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| Only member of staff available to attend course | 88 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Lack of support from school initially but improved (by positive results seen) | 89 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Supported by staff – yes | 90 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| Frustration with lack of staff awareness about ELSA | 91 |  |  |  | 1 | 3 | 2 |  |
| Good communication between ELSA and teacher | 92 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Good to be appreciated by teachers | 93 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| ELSA’s ways of raising awareness of their role | 94 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3 |  |
| Lack of staff awareness | 95 |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |
| More TAs know about ELSA role than teachers | 96 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| SENCos knowledge of children very important | 97 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| No managerial supervision apparent | 165 |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Managerial support – SENCo - frustrations | 98 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Feel supported by supervision meetings, want more of it | 99 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |
| Communication between ELSA and trainers good during training | 100 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| ELSA role meaning working with more members of SMT | 101 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| ELSA course/supervision given ELSA more confidence, raised profile in school, organised, knowledgeable, increased awareness | 102 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 1 | 4 |  |
| ELSA training cause of strain with TAs | 103 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| ELSA unsure of how much responsibility should take on | 104 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Parents aware informally child with ELSA – child or Head says | 105 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| Parents seeking ELSA support for their child | 106 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| ELSA has developed skills for meeting with parents | 107 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |
| ELSA aware of signposting to others, eg, parent to PSA | 108 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Limited engagement with outside agencies | 109 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Improve training: more time on each session, bereavement, anger management | 110 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |
| Drawback: Taken away from ELSA session (with children in tow) | 111 |  | 5 |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| Pupils relationship with ELSA – reliance, availability | 112 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |
| Frustration: Parents not working in same way as ELSA | 113 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |
| Ways of working more effectively with parents | 114 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Frustration: Peers winding up vulnerable children | 115 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| ELSA has improved EL status amongst teaching staff – improving | 116 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |
| ELSA has improved EL status amongst lunchtime staff – limited | 117 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Additional forms used other than EL proforma, eg, B/G STEEM, self-image evalu | 118 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Ideas to improve ELSA support, eg, online forum, | 119 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| Awareness of course – letter given | 120 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Useful aspects of training course –revisiting, eg, speaking/listening | 121 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Useful aspects of training course – new knowledge, eg, puppets | 122 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| No flexibility in teaching timetable | 123 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 3 |  |  |
| As ELSA no involvement with parents | 124 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| Training had no impact on working with outside agencies | 125 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| ELSA’s frustration at not being an ELSA and impacting not being able to gain more out of clinical supervision | 126 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Strengths of ELSA: good listener, empathy, general awareness of situations, using own initiative, relevant feedback to children, time for children, working directly with child, tolerant, patient, increased understanding reasons behind behaviour, more compassionate | 127 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Frustration in trying to find ways of raising staff awareness of ELSA | 128 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| ELSA has improved EL status in school – no (already good) | 129 |  |  |  | 3 | 1 |  |  |
| Impact of training when working with children but not as an ELSA – improving communication, organizational and friendship skills, confidence building, eg, more realistic expectations, view from different perspective, greater understanding of behaviour – refers to ELSA’s skills | 130 |  |  |  | 3 | 1 |  |  |
| No more external support needed over and above clinical supervision (know can contact EP if needed more support) | 131 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| No idea why chosen by Head to go on training course | 132 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| No apparent awareness by Head what ELSA was about prior to course | 133 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Preparedness for training course – limited | 134 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| ELSAs frustration at not being an ELSA/being used more as an ELSA/becoming de-skilled | 135 |  | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Obstacles delaying working with a child, eg, in-school bureaucracy, illness, start of new class | 136 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| ELSA work going well with child – ELSA’s perspective | 137 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| ELSA considered supported by teacher of child (but no awareness by rest of staff) | 138 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| While on training course supported by trainers – yes | 139 | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Pleased with support from EP at clinical supervision | 140 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |
| ELSA training impact on working with SMT - none | 141 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Improve training: Less theory as already known, could read in advance, on self-esteem, friendships | 141 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| Apart from those given at training no other proformas used | 142 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| ELSA training had limited impact working with a child | 143 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| ELSA expressed interest to go on course – recognised by SENCo | 144 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Informed of Day 1 by colleague who dropped out instead of info from SENCo | 145 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Teachers beginning to appreciate ELSA role | 146 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Training course: Mutual support from others, gaining knowledge | 147 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Teachers more supportive than TAs | 148 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| ELSA pleased with being able to gain what needed through increased confidence | 149 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| More confident with speaking with outside agencies, eg, SALT | 150 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Improve clinical supervision: Being able to speak more specifically about cases – 1:1, revisit bereavement and anger management, down to individual to say what want, visit other settings to see ELSA-type work | 151 | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| ELSA aware of needing to improve own communication – acquire email address | 152 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Drawback: Limited progress made at end of bank of sessions | 153 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Lack of time for planning [13 children seen over 1 ½ days incl planning!]/need to develop time management skills | 154 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| System for referring children | 155 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| ELSA decides referrals and prioritises | 156 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| My opinion: ELSA undermining own ability | 157 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| As ELSA valued by staff, given TA opportunity to attend training to develop skills | 158 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| ELSA asked if would like to attend training | 159 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| After reading information wanted to attend training | 160 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not prepared for training content from previous knowledge but looked forward to challenge | 161 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Training course content overwhelming initially | 162 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Training put pressure on time [off from school] | 163 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supported by most staff | 164 |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Children expecting to work with ELSA but ELSA can’t be there | 166 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sessions during children’s lesson funtimes but don’t mind (infant) | 167 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Skills ELSA’s developed, eg, understanding child’s behaviour, identifying behaviours not noticed before and confident to share with outside agency | 168 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELSA happy with training | 169 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Schools need to be made aware prior to training commitment involved | 170 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Staff became aware of ELSA when she spoke to them individually | 171 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chosen to go on course as had an interest in children’s EL, matched personal spec criteria, ie, outgoing, bubbly, good listener | 172 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELSA read through training details before making decision | 173 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Readiness for training: Prior life experience, limited knowledge, willingness to learn, attended bereavement counselling | 174 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Managerial supervision: ad hoc | 175 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All TAs supportive; majority of teachers supportive | 176 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Positive: Able to contribute more, consider higher status than a TA | 177 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Positive: Mutual support between ELSA and staff – team building | 178 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improve training: fewer powerpoints, more practical, too much information | 179 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ok with being only ELSA in school – small school so know all children | 180 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frustration: Trying to find ways of supporting the child but seeks advice | 181 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Most staff taken EL on board | 182 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Limited time for planning | 183 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meeting between SENCo, teacher and ELSA to decide whether ELSA should pick up | 184 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supported by teachers | 185 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Considering revamping EL referral form | 186 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Were you consulted about the course before embarking on it? | 1 |  |
|  | 2 | P3, P4 |
|  | 2-3 | P5 |
|  | 3 | P7 |
|  | 3-4 | P1 |
|  | 4 | P2, P6 |
|  | 5 |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Did you feel prepared for the training, eg, in terms of life experiences, own level of education, prior knowledge? | 1 | P1 |
|  | 2 | P4, P6 |
|  | 2-3 | P7 |
|  | 3 | P3, P5 |
|  | 4 | P2 |
|  | 5 |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Do you consider you feel supported since embarking on becoming an ELSA by   1. School management, including managerial supervision | 1 | P3 |
|  | 2 | P1, P4, P6 |
|  | 3 |  |
|  | 4 | P2, P5 (was 2 at start), P7 |
|  | 5 |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Do you consider you feel supported since embarking on becoming an ELSA by  b. Colleagues | 0 | P3 |
|  | 1 | P5 (for TAs) |
|  | 2 | P4 |
|  | 3 |  |
|  | 4 | P1, P2, P5 (for teachers), P6 (unsupportive teacher as ‘2’), P7 |
|  | 5 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Do you consider you feel supported since embarking on becoming an ELSA by  c.Trainers | 1 |  | | |
|  | 2 |  | | |
|  | 3 |  | | |
|  | 4 | P1, P3, P5 | | |
|  | 5 | P2, P4, P6, P7 | | |
| Do you consider you feel supported since embarking on becoming an ELSA by  d. ELSA EP, including clinical supervision | | | 1 |  |
|  | | | 2 |  |
|  | | | 3 | P1, P3 |
|  | | | 4 | P5 |
|  | | | 5 | P2, P4, P6, P7 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rate the emotional literacy ethos in your school prior to the ELSA training | 1 | P1, P3 |
|  | 2 | P2. P5, P6 |
|  | 3 | P7 |
|  | 4 | P4 |
|  | 5 |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rate the emotional literacy ethos in your school since the ELSA training | 1 | P3 |
|  | 2 |  |
|  | 3 | P1, P5, P6 |
|  | 4 | P2, P4, P7 |
|  | 5 |  |