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What is This?
The significance of the interculturally competent school psychologist for achieving equitable education outcomes for migrant students

Andrea Lanfranchi
University of Applied Sciences of Special Needs Education, Zürich, Switzerland

Abstract
This article examines procedures and processes that result in the over-referral of migrant students to separate special education programmes and, as a consequence, their exclusion from general education. The particular focus is on the role of the school psychologist in this process. The empirical study is a comparison of Swiss teachers’ and school psychologists’ responses to the paper case of a boy with behavioural and learning difficulties whose name and ethnicity was varied so that one version identified him as from an ethnically mainstream, Swiss German background and the other as a migrant and foreign first language speaker. The results show that, compared with teachers, school psychologists’ assessments and choice of interventions demonstrated less cultural bias and higher levels of intercultural competence. These findings support the call that school psychologists have a vital role to play in the reduction of discrimination against migrant students and in the implementation of a more inclusive and equitable education system.
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Internationally, students with a history of migration are over-referred for placement in separate special education programmes (SEPs), despite international agreements to reduce discrimination and exclusion in education, beginning with the 1960 UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education and through to the 2012 UNESCO Guide to Addressing Exclusion in Education. The latter calls on governments to give highest priority to inclusion and equal opportunities in education (UNESCO, 2012). Classroom teachers contribute to these discriminatory placement practices through biased assessment procedures (Hanna & Linden, 2012; Riley & Underleider, 2012). This article is based on an empirical study of teachers’ and school psychologists’ decision making involved in a referral process and investigates whether school psychologists (SPs) are similarly biased in their assessments. Therefore, this article investigates the potential of the SPs’ role as a way to achieve inclusion in education.

School psychologists and teachers working in schools in Switzerland were tested using the practice testing method (Arrijn, Feld, & Nayer, 1999). Both groups were presented with one of two versions of a constructed paper-case which describes a male student with learning and behavioural difficulties. A questionnaire asked participants to select from a range of assessment and intervention options. Two versions of the case were distributed; in one the boy’s name indicated an ethnically mainstream Swiss German background, in the other an ethnically ‘other’ migrant background. The results show that compared with teachers SPs demonstrated a more culturally neutral attitude and that their chosen interventions were less exclusionary and more in-school based. Consequently, SPs’ involvement in the assessment and referral process of students with special educational needs may be a means to reduce discrimination and increase equal access to general education.

**Discrimination through assessment and referral**

This article examines the procedures involved in the assessment and placement of immigrant/migrant students (MSs) in separate special education programs. The critical question is whether discrimination on the basis of ethnic and social status occurs in the assessment process that results in a referral. The wider context for this process are the kinds of procedures schools have for dealing with student diversity, primarily to addresses two issues: the special educational needs (SEN) of students with learning, developmental, or achievement difficulties, and the needs of students from socially disadvantaged families, often also with a background of migration. Recent studies of the role of school psychology identified the same diversity issues as central (Bartolo, Borg, Cefai, & Martinelli, 2010).

The ever increasing rates of change in contemporary societies also have an impact on schools and lead to increasing demands on teachers (Beck, 1992; OECD, 2009). Demands to adopt best practice models, self-audit, and achieve excellence result in higher pressures on teachers' time, and as a consequence, also bring about mechanisms for excluding those students who do not fit easily into the educational system. Studies from all over the world show that students
from socially disadvantaged and migrant families are predominantly affected. Research on the over-representation of children from cultural and linguistic minorities in special education programs over two decades in the USA identified that out of all students, a disproportionate number of African-American students were referred for special education placement (Blanchett, 2006; Fryer & Levitt, 2006). Similarly, in a controlled study of several variables Oswald, Coutinho, Best, & Sing (1999) showed that African-American children were 2.4 times more likely to be assessed as mildly mentally retarded, and 1.5 times more likely as seriously emotionally disturbed, than non-African-American children. A recent risk index identified that in cases of specific achievement deficits the use of SEN interventions is for African-American students 1.9 times higher than for Whites, and in cases of behaviour problems, 1.4 times higher (US Department of Education, 2011).

Studies by the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) present data based on comparisons of national educational systems; the UNICEF sponsored Innocenti Research Centre survey on educational disadvantage in wealthy nations and their reports on nations where migrant students are successfully integrated into mainstream education are particularly relevant (OECD, 2006; UNICEF, 2002). These reports show conclusively that the educational systems of many highly developed nations are not able to provide the children of their immigrant populations with the same basic and equitable education as the general population, and therefore are not able to fully integrate them into society. Because of increased migration across national borders, European countries need to develop measures to reduce and prevent social and educational discrimination, and improve the integration of immigrant youth (Trentin, Monaci, De Lumè, & Zanon, 2006; Vedder & van Geel, 2011).

Socioeconomic factors play an important role in determining risk factors for migrant children. Poverty and lack of institutional support impact on students’ development, capacity to learn, and their behaviour in schools. However, the question is whether these factors alone explain migrant students’ underachievement and their over-representation in special education programs. A recent critique of a 2002 United Kingdom Report on poverty and minority students in SEPs argues that a poverty analysis obscures the critical role of school culture and organization. It points in particular to a school’s capacity to address diverse needs in a culturally heterogeneous student population with the aim to integrate migrant students rather than segregate them as an at risk group with academic and behavioural deficits (O’Connor & Fernandez, 2006). Similarly, the authors of a US study on inequity in educational opportunity for minority students and students with English language learner status conclude that segregation contributes to inequity (de Valenzuela, Copeland, Huaqing Qi, & Park, 2006). Based on Hosp & Reschly’s (2003) meta-analysis they highlight three reasons for inequities as a result of placement in special education programs: a) the potentially stigmatizing effect of being identified with a disability; b) restricted access to general education resources; and c) lack of evidence about the effectiveness of special education placements for migrant students.
Inequity of educational opportunities in Switzerland

In Switzerland educational opportunities are also not distributed equitably across students from diverse social and ethnic backgrounds (Moser & Lanfranchi, 2008; Robson, 2005, pp. 81, 118). Although there is some development towards a greater integration of students with learning and behavioural difficulties into general school education, Switzerland tops the list of comparable countries with 5.4% of students enrolled in special education programs (Germany 4.8%, France 3.1%, Austria 1.4%, Sweden 0.05%, Italy 0.01%) (European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education, 2011). According to the PISA study, in Switzerland and Germany differences in students’ achievement due to diversity of family origin are the least successfully addressed and equalized (Coradi Vellacott & Wolter, 2004). In Switzerland the problem of migrant students over-representation in special education and of poor intergenerational transmission of educational attainment remains unresolved (Bauer & Riphahn, 2004). In the school year 2010–2011 23.7% of students in general education classes (‘normal curriculum classes’) were non-citizens, but in ‘special curriculum classes’ there were 41.2% (Federal Statistical Office, 2013).

The usual criteria for the placement of students in special education include assessments of deficits in reading, writing and arithmetic, or of behavioural problems. However, such placements are not necessarily correlated with poor cognitive or learning ability or performance. A sample survey revealed that one-quarter of those migrant students placed in special education placements achieved at a higher level in German than 50% of those migrant students in general education classes (Kronig, 2003). In the same sample about one-fifth of those migrant students in special education have an IQ higher than 50% of all other students in general education classes.

Ethnic discrimination

When teachers and institutions fail to recognize migrant students’ abilities and educational potential, or when they target lower achievement levels than is cognitively indicated and refer migrant students for special education placement, the result is a self-fulfilling prophecy (Jussim & Harber, 2005). Two empirical studies in the US indicate that teachers’ and employers’ expectations of students’ potential can be influenced by a student’s name and its association with a particular ethnicity or social status. Bertrand & Mullainathan (2004) show that people with ‘White’ sounding names such as Emily Walsh and Greg Baker are 50% more likely to be invited for a job interview than those with African-American sounding names such as Lakisha Washington and Jamal Jones. Moreover, such discrimination is as prevalent in public organizations, which are accountable to anti-discriminatory affirmative action laws, as it is in private industry. Figlio (2003) examined whether teachers treated students differently because of assumptions they made about parents’ lack of educational ability based solely on a student’s first name. His findings
show that teachers expect those students whose first names are associated with lower socioeconomic or disadvantaged ethnic backgrounds to perform at significantly lower levels than their peers in reading and arithmetic. Teachers’ lower expectations also resulted in students’ reduced cognitive achievement. By comparing sibling pairs he ascertained that teachers treated students differently on account of their first names alone since a sibling with a mainstream first name did not prompt the same lower teacher expectations.

Studies in Germany and Switzerland reveal similar patterns of institutional discrimination and lower achievement expectations associated with ethnicity or risk factors (Fibbi, Bülent, & Piguet, 2003). What has so far not been investigated is whether SPs reproduce such mechanisms of discrimination. Before presenting the empirical study on which this article is based, some context for the ways in which schooling difficulties are addressed in Switzerland is outlined.

**Dealing with difficult cases**

Switzerland is geographically in Central Europe. In 2012 it had a population of around 8 million, of which 23% do not have Swiss nationality. There are four national languages (Swiss German, French, Italian, and Romansh) and four linguistic regions. The largest is the Swiss German region with 63% of the population (French 20%, Italian 6.5%, Romansh 0.5%). The country is a Federate State with a Federal Government and is subdivided into 26 cantons that vary in size and have a high degree of governmental autonomy. The Swiss constitution delegates the authority for the education system to cantons where education directors administer their own education systems and coordinate them across cantons.

This research was carried out in the Swiss German region where school psychological services are well established and organized. The availability of services is lower in rural areas and varies between 1000 to 6000 students per SP position. The SP’s work load is approximately 40% assessment, 30% consultation, 20% administration and special projects, 10% professional development (Scherer, Bösch, & Zeberli, 2007).

Although SPs are constrained to act within the organizational and regulatory framework of the educational system, as professionals they have relative autonomy in determining the procedures and methods they apply (Fagan, 2002; Gutkin, 2009). They can decide to follow the linear model of referral—assessment—intervention, which often results in separating the student by placement in special education placement, or they follow a circular model which leads to integrative interventions such as consultations and meetings with teachers and parents (Käser, 1993).

This analysis focused on school psychologists’ dispositions involved in making assessments and referrals against this institutional and professional background. It was crucial to find out how they proceed in a specific case and whether their procedures and decision making processes differ from those of teachers. The findings presented here are based on the published study Growth of Special Education...
Services (Wachstum des sonderpädagogischen Angebots, WASA) which focused on referral practices and placement mechanisms for special education placement (Lanfranchi & Jenny, 2005).

**Method**

For the WASA study I sampled 201 primary schools in six Swiss German cantons and examined the conditions and criteria by which students with learning deficits were either referred for placement in special educational placement or for school-based measures and in-class support, such as teaching support or remedial teaching (Lanfranchi, 2007). I designed a paper case of a boy presenting with typical problems whose name and ethnic family origin were systematically varied. The paper case was distributed as a questionnaire to a sample of primary school teachers (N = 1916), which were selected to achieve an even distribution of classes with different percentages of students with a foreign first language (FFL): low (<10%), medium (11% to 30%), and high (>30%). Additionally, the paper case was sent to 395 school psychologists in the same region. The response rates were 34.2% for teachers (N = 655) and 52.4% (N = 207) for school psychologists.

**Research design**

This study is an additional analysis that differentiates teachers’ and school psychologists’ decision making processes in a hypothetical paper case. The question is whether the two groups approach specific cases of students with learning and behavioural difficulties differently. School psychologists and teachers have different roles in the education system, their training differs, and the psychologists have higher levels of professionalization, which all suggest the potential for a difference in approach.

After determining locally available special education services, the questionnaire suggested a variety of procedures and interventions in relation to the paper case. Respondents were asked to choose among no more than three options and to rank them in order of importance (high, middle, or low priority). The analysis identified these choices by simple chosen/not chosen values. For example, school psychologists chose among procedure options such as ‘I will contact the teacher to obtain additional information’ or ‘I will invite the student for a psychological assessment’, and interventions options such as ‘referral for placement in a special class’ or ‘initiate in-class support and remedial teaching’ targeting specific deficits.

A core element of the research design was the systematic variation of the paper case. This was based on the ‘practice testing’ method developed for the study of discrimination by the International Labour Organisation (Arrijn, Feld, & Nayer, 1999). Half of both samples of teachers and school psychologists received one of two questionnaire versions in which the name of the boy in the case description differed: One version (A) referred to a boy called Lukas who was ‘from a Swiss German family’; in the other version (B) the boy’s first name was Bekir who was
‘from a Kosovo-Albanian family’. I chose this ethnicity because Kosovo Albanians are the most recent group of immigrants to Switzerland after a large number of Albanians from the former Yugoslavia fled the wars in Kosovo and Macedonia in the 1990s to join relatives in Switzerland. As the most recent arrivals they are to some extent stigmatized. Of the 1.8 million foreigners living in Switzerland (22.6 % of the total population) 150,000 are from Kosovo and Macedonia and make up the fourth largest group of immigrants (8%), after Italian (290,000, 16.2%), German (280,000, 15.2%), and Portuguese (230,000, 12.8%) labour migrants (Federal Migration Office of Switzerland, 2013).

The paper case described Lukas/Bekir with behavioural difficulties and causing in-class disturbance that are consistent with the ICD-10 category Behavioural and emotional disorders with onset usually occurring in childhood and adolescence (F90–F98), subcategory F90.1 Hyperkinetic conduct disorder (World Health Organization WHO, 2011).

Version A: Lukas (Version B: Bekir) attends grade three of primary school. Two years ago his Swiss German family (Version B: his Kosovo-Albanian family) moved into the area from Canton Luzern. For some time the boy has come to his teacher’s attention because of his impulsive behaviour, poor concentration, and marked restlessness. Over the last six months his behavioural problems and aggression have worsened and become intolerable. His parents report that already in first grade their son was a very active boy who could not focus on anything for more than about a minute and was often involved in quarrels. Currently his academic performance is average, but in his written work he makes many careless mistakes. He often does not follow rules, is unpopular with other children and mostly excluded from play and team tasks because of his incessant talking and restlessness. The teacher is at her wit’s end and exhausted. Something needs to happen soon; in six months the student is due to go on to grade four.

I applied nominal scales to the dichotomous variables (procedure and intervention choices) and conducted chi-square tests for all analyses (Johnson & Wichern, 2008).

Results

Only results relevant to differences between teacher and SP respondents and their decisions to refer the case for placement in a special educational placement are presented here (for more detailed figures, tables, and statistical indices, see Supplemental Materials). The SP sample (N = 207) comprised an even distribution of men and women, but on average men’s job experience was longer. About one-quarter of all SPs (counted as equivalent per full time position, EFP) provided services for fewer than 1500 students and about one-third for more than 2500 students. Thirty-one percent of all SPs worked in areas with more than 30% of foreign first language (FFL) students, while 10% of SPs worked in areas with less than 10% FFL students.
Referral differences between the two ethnic versions

The hypothesis was that migrant students and FFL students are more likely to be referred for placement in separate special-education placements than their peers with comparable learning and behavioural problems. This was confirmed by the teacher respondents but not by the SP respondents. The teachers’ chosen interventions varied depending on the ethnic variable of the paper case. For Bekir, of supposed Kosovo-Albanian origin, teachers chose a referral for placement in a special educational class (smaller class) or to a separate special education school for behavioural disorders significantly more often ($\chi^2 = 6.23, \text{ df} = 1, \ p < 0.05$, or $\chi^2 = 4.20, \text{ df} = 1, \ p < 0.05$). For Lukas, of supposed Swiss German origin, teachers chose more often a consultation with a child psychiatrist or psychomotor function therapy ($\chi^2 = 5.47, \text{ df} = 1, \ p < 0.05$, or $\chi^2 = 5.08, \text{ df} = 1, \ p < 0.05$). Among SPs, however, there was no significant difference between the two case versions. SPs chose similar procedures and interventions for Lukas and Bekir.

Comparison of referral procedures for extreme subgroups

Milic’s (2007) study suggests the following differences among SPs’ decision making processes:

a. The more job experience an SP has the more likely s/he chooses assessment procedures involving consultations with the student, parents and teachers rather than diagnostic tests;

b. The higher the number of students for which the school psychologist is responsible the smaller the time available to allocate to consultations; therefore the SP is more likely to choose SE interventions.

c. larger SPs’ organizations offer more professional processes and procedures; they have the capacity to provide a systems approach oriented toward problem-solving, resulting in more consultations with all stakeholders involved with the student’s education.

For this study the returned questionnaires were coded for different control variables to prepare the data for a comparative analysis of extreme subgroups which were differentiated by relative work experience (<5 years/>20 years), service coverage (<1500 students per EFP/>2500 students per EFP), and size of the SPS (<3 EFP/ >6 EFP). The results are:

a. Job experience: SPs with less than five years work experience invite the student for a diagnostic assessment as a first intervention significantly more often than their veteran colleagues (>20 years) ($\chi^2 = 0.68, \text{ df} = 1, \ p < 0.05$). More experienced SPs prefer to consult with parents and teachers ($\chi^2 = 5.10, \text{ df} = 1, \ p < 0.05$). As expected, relatively inexperienced SPs tend to give priority to
diagnostic testing procedures whereas more experienced SPs give priority to diagnostic consultation procedures.

b. Service coverage: SPs employed in services with lower student/EFP ratios chose more often to invite the parents and the student for a first interview than colleagues with higher student/EFP ratios. They also give higher priority to school visits, including in-class student observations. Although these results are not be statistically significant on the 0.01 or 0.05 level ($\chi^2 = 3.20$, df = 1, $p = 0.074$ or $\chi^2 = 3.58$, df = 1, $p = 0.058$), they indicate a trend. When SPs provide services for fewer children they have a greater capacity to assess the student’s situation in a systemic problem solving approach through consultations and school visits before deciding on special education interventions.

c. Size of school psychological services: In schools covered by smaller services (<3 EFP), a student with educational difficulties is more likely to be invited for psycho-diagnostic test assessment than in schools covered by larger services (6 or more EFP) ($\chi^2 = 5.52$, df = 1, $p < 0.05$). SPs in larger services also tend to obtain additional information from teachers by telephone before psychodiagnostic assessment ($\chi^2 = 7.82$, df = 1, $p < 0.01$). SPs in smaller services give significantly higher priority to consultations with parents and student ($\chi^2 = 6.80$, df = 1, $p < 0.01$), while SPs in larger services refer parents and student more often for consultation with a child psychiatrist ($\chi^2 = 3.87$, df = 1, $p < 0.05$). These results differ in terms of assessment or intervention: SPs in smaller services, like less experienced SPs, give priority to assessment by individual testing, while SPs in larger services give priority to assessment through systemic information gathering and teacher consultation. SPs in smaller services retain case management whereas SPs in larger services tend to access other expert services.

Discussion

School psychological services in Switzerland are undergoing a challenging transition which is similar to other countries with comparable services (Forlin, 2010). They previously provided services in an education system with a relatively homogenous student population, in which students with norm deviating difficulties were excluded from general education and placed in separate education facilities. Now they need to provide services in an education system with heterogeneous student populations and more integrative forms of schooling. Given that in Switzerland migrant students are disproportionately represented in separate special education classes, I hypothesized that processes of ethnic discrimination may play a part in the assessment and referral procedures and processes.

This study of SPs in selected Swiss German cantons analysed their role in assessment and referral processes which may result in inclusive or exclusive educational interventions. The focus of this additional analysis is on questions about SPs’ levels of professionalism in how they carry out assessments and would proceed in relation to a specific, realistically designed case example. Crucially, this case of a student
with learning and behavioural difficulties in the attention-deficit hyperactivity spectrum was varied in terms of the student’s first name and family origin—in one version he was Lukas from a Swiss German family and in the other he was Bekir from a Kosovo-Albanian family. Compared to the practice test applied to teachers, SPs demonstrated a less prejudiced attitude in their choices of assessment procedures and interventions. Especially regarding such far-reaching interventions as referral for placement in a special educational placement, SPs were less influenced by common ethno-cultural stereotypes evoked by the student’s first name and ethnicity than their teacher counterparts.

One may contend that SPs are more experienced than teachers in choosing among itemized formulations of procedures and interventions for the questionnaire. Perhaps SPs were also more astute at anticipating the implicit research intent, particularly those SPs dealing with the ethnically ‘other’ case? However, the comparison of extreme subgroups clearly indicates that this is not the case. More than teachers, SPs based their assessments on solid criteria which reflected the specifics of the case as well as their professional status (work experience and the organizational contexts in which they practice). SPs appeared to be less influenced by circumstances than their teacher counterparts and suggested case appropriate interventions using available resources rather than interventions based on assumptions about the student’s origin. This speaks of a more professional approach to assessment, case management, and interventions.

**Intercultural competence**

SPs’ less prejudiced approach to the paper case and their close attention to the specific case description indicate that they act with cultural awareness, sensitivity, and competence. A comparative analysis of teachers’ responses to the questionnaire (Lanfranchi, 2007, p. 138) confirms that SPs demonstrate high intercultural competence. These are meaningful findings, but they need to be interpreted in context. First, teacher respondents are on the whole satisfied with their SPSs. Teachers access them with high priority for case management, support, referrals, and to consult with SPs to discuss and reflect on their assessment and referral procedures. By contrast, teacher respondents to the Bekir version gave lower priority to accessing child and adolescent psychiatric services (CAPS) for a consultation (see Lanfranchi & Jenny, 2005, p. 274). This finding indicates that teachers attribute higher levels of intercultural competence to their SPSs than to their CAPS in dealing with students and especially with parents who are culturally ‘other’.

Professional school psychological organizations internationally promote intercultural competence. They require that SPs apply non-discriminatory assessment procedures, culturally neutral or fair diagnostic methods, and avoid assumptions that lead to mistaken formulations but aim for culturally responsive, unprejudiced and reliable assessments (Paez, 2004; Sullivan & A’Vant, 2009). Such intercultural competence makes higher demands on SPs’ time—time for gathering systemic information on family background, school and social environment, for
direct observations of learning processes instead of diagnostic tests, and to consider language development and competence in multilingual students (Klingner et al., 2005).

A system of experts

This study shows that school psychology services is a system of experts which applies fair and culturally competent assessment procedures. SPs are therefore well positioned to stem migrant students’ over-representation in segregated educational settings and their unjust exclusion from general education. But educational opportunities for children from socioeconomically disadvantaged families remain unequally distributed, and structural pressures to segregate remain. It is a fair assumption that experienced SPs who work in large, well-resourced school psychology services with access to extended professional networks that provide services for a manageable number of schools make fullest use of the possibilities for professional and fair assessments and referrals. This is much less achievable in smaller organizations with a relatively high turnover of junior school psychologists who follow a more linear rather than a circular systemic approach (Gutkin, 2009).

Internationally the transition from a segregated to an inclusive system of schooling has an enormous influence on the SP’s role and scope of action (Farrell, 2010). This is captured in the shorthand ‘from a psychologist of students to a psychologist of schools’ (Käser, 1993). While school psychology services traditionally had a legitimizing function—they supported teachers with assessment and selection of specific students for in-class SE programmes or referral to separate SEP—the current situation affords SPs a much wider and varied set of tasks. The role of the SP is no longer focused only on individual diagnostic procedures such as intelligence testing and individually targeted interventions, but on remedial diagnostic methods, consultation, problem-solving which takes account of the family network and school environment, and conflict mediation (Farrell, 2010).

The professional conceptualization of the school psychologists’ scope of activities in the current interplay of segregation and inclusion is ongoing. Generally, SPs are still reluctant to face the challenge of this transition and have so far failed to position themselves in current debates about equity in educational opportunity and achievement (Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000). Nevertheless, school psychology services have expanded and increased their service quality which includes higher professionalization of SPs (Jimerson, Oakland, & Farrell, 2007). In many schools SPs are the most important office for expert guidance, case management, planning of interventions, and applications for referral. It is important that SPs retain this expert function, otherwise the risk to students to be discriminated against because of their ethnicity would be even higher (Bartolo et al., 2010). This is the quintessential conclusion of this study comparing teachers and SPs relative cultural neutrality.
Limitations and outlook

What are the international implications of this study? The results of the country reports published in Jimerson et al. (2007) suggest that these findings from Swiss-German speaking Switzerland are transferable not only to other Swiss regions and other European countries but worldwide, at least to those countries with comparable established school psychology services. Although test results and standardized observations were not correlated with assessment and procedures, and the analysis is limited to an intended rather than actual course of action, the study results are valid in so far as they compare two different groups of professional respondents—teachers and SPs. The results show that, in comparison with teachers, SPs’ attitudes are largely unbiased. SPs envisaged a course of action that is interculturally competent. Therefore, intercultural competencies need to be further developed in school psychology. The aims formulated by the US National Education Association for professional training and development to achieve a change of habitus for a multicultural society reflect this call (National Education Association of the United States, 2007).

Note

The empirical part of this work was carried out in collaboration with the Schweizer Zentrum für Heil- und Sonderpädagogik (SZH) [Swiss Centre for Special Needs Education] for which I am grateful, especially to its Director, Dr Beatrice Kronenberg. I also thank Dr Greg Jenny, Research Fellow, University of Zürich, for his technical support with data collection and data analysis, and Dr Claudia Gross, University of Auckland, New Zealand, who prepared the English version of this article.

The empirical investigation of this work was carried out on behalf of and funded by the Cantons Aargau, Appenzell Ausserhoden, Basel-Stadt, Nidwalden, Schaffhausen, Thurgau.
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