Editorial

The provision of mental health services for children and young people exacts a heavy economic burden, particularly as the identification of mental health difficulties among children and young people has been increasing in recent years. Social and emotional education is increasingly being considered as a potentially sound financial investment that may actually lead to considerable savings in the currently spiralling economic costs. In addition to direct costs incurred through mental health budgets, there are additional economic, social and emotional costs, such as unemployment and homelessness benefits, substance abuse rehabilitation, probation services for delinquency and criminality, and suicide of people in the prime of their lives. This issue is addressed in the first paper in this edition by Klapp and colleagues (Sweden) who present a benefit-cost analysis of social and emotional education in school. They carry out a benefit-cost analysis of a longitudinal social and emotional learning intervention in Sweden, comparing intervention costs against treatment impact on self-reported drug use. The results show that students in the social and emotional education group reported decreased use of drugs over the five year long intervention, the value of which clearly outweighs the intervention costs.

In the second paper, Pittard and colleagues (USA) examined the relationship between school teachers’ behaviour and depressive symptoms in college students in the USA. They found that negative and socio-emotional teaching behaviours were positively associated with depressive symptoms amongst students, while instructional and organizational teaching behaviours were negatively associated with depressive symptoms. Both organizational and negative teaching behaviour interacted significantly with inferential style. The authors suggest that the promotion of instructional and organizational teaching behaviour, as well as the reduction of negative teaching behaviours in school, may be useful strategies to reduce depressive symptoms amongst students.

In another paper on teachers in the USA, Binfet and Passmore (USA) examined school teachers’ perceptions of kindness at school. Findings indicate that teachers define and enact kindness in comparable ways and that most believed they had a strong to moderate influence on shaping students’ kindness. Moreno and colleagues (USA) are the authors of the fourth paper which investigates the practice of functional
behavioural assessment (FBA) (mandated in special education twenty years ago) amongst educators from Midwestern USA. Survey results suggest that while educators were strongly assured on the FBA’s form and implementation, they expressed reservations about the influence of culture on behaviour. The findings reveal a disconnection between cultural awareness and culturally attuned FBA practices.

Love and intimate relationships amongst persons with intellectual disability have received relatively scant attention in the literature. The fifth paper by Mattila and colleagues (Finland) present an interesting study on the experience of falling in love amongst Finnish young adults with intellectual disability. The participants were familiar with and able to describe falling in love concretely, describing it as a positive experience. Love was seen as an important part of wellbeing. The authors make various suggestions on how to support persons with intellectual disability in the various phases of falling and being in love, in a way that enhances their cognitive love skills and self-determination.

In the sixth paper in this edition, Reeves & Le Mare (Canada) examine the beliefs and experiences of primary school teachers on relational pedagogy as a way of supporting students’ positive social, emotional, and academic growth. Qualitative findings reveal that the teachers’ understandings of the aims of education reflected a more relational perspective at the end of the study.

The penultimate paper in this edition is a theoretical discussion from Downes (Ireland), providing an original reconceptualization of the phenomenon of resilience from a cross cultural, spatial, systems perspective. The author proposes a specific model of dynamic spatial systems of relation to underpin agency and phenomenology in resilience, building on a reinterpretation of Lévi-Strauss’ cross-cultural observations of contrasts between concentric and diametric spatial systems. This framework of spatial-relational agency shifts the focus from bouncing back into shape, towards transition points in space, moving from diametric spaces of splitting to concentric spatial relations of assumed connection across different system levels.

The final paper is a short research report by Beer and colleagues (UK). It discusses cyberbullying levels of impact in special schools on the basis of a case study on bystander intervention and subsequent cyberbullying victimisation within a special educational needs context.

We are also pleased to announce two forthcoming special editions, one on facilitating diversity in education (November 2017) and the other on the use of technology in the promotion of mental health and wellbeing in children and young people (April 2018).
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