Editorial for 23(4) Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties

Welcome to Issue 23(4) of the journal. The first two papers in this issue are concerned with assessment. In the first paper Christina Cipriano, Tia Navalene Barnes, Michelle C. Bertoli, and Susan E. Rivers discuss the application of the Classroom Assessment Scoring System in Classrooms Serving Students with Emotional and Behavioural Disorders. They used mixed-methods to examine the psychometric properties of the widely used Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS). Their results suggest limitations in the applicability of the CLASS for self-contained classrooms. In the second paper Matt Allwood, Kate Allen, Anna Price, Rachel Hayes, Vanessa Edwards, Susan Ball, Obioha C. Okoumunne, and Tamsin Ford consider the reliability and validity of the Pupil Behaviour Questionnaire (PBQ). They compare it with the already extensively validated teacher-completed Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ). Their participants included 2074 primary school children participating in a universal school-based trial and 41 vulnerable children who were taking part in a study exploring the impact of exclusion from school. This study suggests that the PBQ is a reliable measure, and provides some evidence of validity. Further work is needed to test the PBQ in an older, more diverse populations and to measure sensitivity to change.

In paper three, Dorota Martin and Cathy Atkinson report the outcomes of a systematic review of the literature on the narratives that young people use to communicate depression. They note that for many young people, the impact of depression has wide ranging social and economic implications; and argue that it is important to enable early identification and intervention. Their suggestion is that understanding self-report processes may be one way of enabling this. They identified eight studies which they assessed using qualitative and quantitative frameworks. Readers are presented with a range of useful information about issues, methods and processes in communicating depression as well as perceptions about effective support.

In the next paper Johan Malmqvist asks whether the schooling of ADHD students has reached a crossroads in Sweden. His study set out to examine and describe educational leaders' mindset types related to schooling of students with ADHD in five municipalities with ADHD special education classes and in five pair-matched municipalities without such classes. The perceived neuropsychiatric influence on ADHD students' schooling seemed to affect educational leaders' decision making, leading to different approaches to schooling for ADHD students in different municipalities. The implications of such local variation are discussed in terms of pathways to inclusion or exclusion.

In paper five Liv Duesund and Magnar Oedegaard report the findings of a study of students' perception of reactions towards disruptive behaviour in Norwegian and American schools. In both countries, reactions from students indicated a tendency to escalate disruptive behaviour, while the reactions from teachers mostly decreased disruptive behaviour.

Susan Salisbury turns her attention to attachment enhancing activities. She reports on the effects of an intervention based on the principles of Theraplay® to improve adult-child relationships and reduce a child's 'Overall Stress' as measured by the Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ). She argues that positive outcomes may be observed from 10 minutes of attachment enhancing play delivered daily over 2 weeks. She claims that there was a real change in each of the adult/child

relationships after the intervention. The evaluation of ‘short burst’ interventions presents significant challenges to the design of studies. This exploratory study invites further consideration of impact.

In paper seven Kimberly Maich, Monique Somma, and Randy Hill examine the Programs, Policies, and Practice for Students with Emotional/Behavioural Disorders that have been implemented in Canada over the last decade. They replicated a survey undertaken ten years ago which intended to examine similarities and differences in Canada’s provinces and territories, as well as exploring overall changes to policy and process. They report on continued movement away from diagnosis, identification, and categorization is evident although there appeared to be little consistency across the country. This paper provides a further spur to researchers to develop a more nuanced understanding of local implementation of policy.

The issue concludes with a very helpful book review by Joan Pritchard