



LJMU Research Online

Wood, P

Social and emotional learning schemes as tools of cultural imperialism: a manifestation of the national and international child well-being agenda?

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/8765/>

Article

Citation (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

Wood, P (2018) Social and emotional learning schemes as tools of cultural imperialism: a manifestation of the national and international child well-being agenda? Pastoral Care in Education. ISSN 0264-3944

LJMU has developed **LJMU Research Online** for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>

Social and emotional learning schemes as tools of cultural imperialism: A manifestation of the national and international child well-being agenda?

Dr Peter Wood

School of Education

Liverpool John Moores University

UK

4994 words

Corresponding author and address:

Dr. Peter Wood, Senior Lecturer

School of Education

Liverpool John Moores University, IM Marsh Campus, Barkhill Road, Liverpool, L17 6BD

UK

p.j.wood@ljmu.ac.uk

Social and emotional learning schemes as tools of cultural imperialism: A manifestation of the national and international child well-being agenda?

Abstract

The need for improved well-being of children in Britain has been highlighted in a raft of reports both nationally and internationally. In this paper, I aim to explore some of the practicalities experienced by schools who, in response, have implemented social and emotional learning (SEL) interventions as a means to improve child well-being. I make the case that the discourses of emotions inherent within such schemes and the various supranational publications, are susceptible to exploitation and manifestation. The study employed a mixed methodological approach, utilising a combination of quantitative and qualitative strategies with primary school staff members including head teachers, teachers, teaching assistants, welfare staff, other support staff, etc. Three phases of study - questionnaires, focus groups, and individual interviews - were administered as a means of creating an insight into the interpretation and use of SEL in these settings. The findings demonstrate a propensity for staff to conflate social and emotional aspects of self with more moralistic constructs of identity, revealing how SEL schemes have the potential to act as tools of cultural imperialism by marginalising and/or endorsing certain values, norms and behaviours. After maintaining that such realisations of these schemes may impede rather than improve the lived experiences of children, that are fundamental to their social and emotional well-being and mental health, I make the case for alternative approaches to SEL in schools.

Keywords: Social and emotional learning; well-being; mental health; development; primary school.

Introduction

This paper contributes to our understanding of the practicalities faced by schools and their staff when utilising social and emotional learning (SEL) as a vehicle to enhance children's social and emotional well-being needs. More specifically, it illustrates that through such educational activities, staff often conflate social and emotional aspects of self with more moralistic constructs of identity. Consequently, it aims to demonstrate how SEL has the potential to both celebrate and problematise social, emotional and behavioural skills common to specific groups of pupils in British schools, and that in some instances such schemes may operate as tools of cultural imperialism that can impede rather than improve the lived experiences of children, that are fundamental to their well-being. The main catalyst for the arguments presented here is empirical data derived from an 18-month long study that examined the views of a range of primary school staff members, who discussed their comprehension of SEL, and their role in its delivery, across four case studies. In order to contextualise this data, in the following section I provide a brief overview of literature and discourse that typifies the renewed emphasis, at both international and national level, that has recognised a failure, on the part of British schools, to meet children's social and emotional well-being needs. After outlining how SEL has been positioned as an intervention to improve these needs, and upon examining literature offered by its proponents and critics, I provide details of the empirical study, including: the methods of data collection employed; the staff members who formed the sample; and how the data gathered was analysed. Next, I present the research findings, in the form of qualitative data gleaned from group and individual interviews with staff, to illustrate how SEL has the capacity to endorse and marginalise norms, behaviours and experiences deemed important to some groups of children. After pondering on the legitimacy of a propensity for a monist operationalisation of SEL and a move towards character and values

education in policy, I propose an alternative vision of SEL that embraces a more pluralist approach to social, emotional and behavioural development in schools.

Children's mental health and well-being in Britain: A national and international concern

Children's mental health has been the focus of much debate and discussion in Britain recently, with demands for improvement in this area gathering momentum since the turn of the millennium, when the WHO (1999) called for schools to create an environment where social and emotional development should be prioritised so that well-being can be enhanced. The need for improved social and emotional well-being of children in Britain was further highlighted in a report commissioned by UNICEF (2007) where comparatively, across OECD countries, British children were the least satisfied with life, disliked school most and had the lowest levels of emotional health. One aspect of the UNICEF (2007) report identified specific weaknesses relating to the education system, where Britain fell into the bottom six countries with regards to how children rated their enjoyment of school life and their judgments of satisfaction with the education they received. Although improvements have been reported (see Palmer, 2006; Alexander and Hargreaves, 2007), concerns regarding the unhappiness and emotional ill-health of children in Britain persist, (see Layard and Dunn, 2009; UNICEF, 2013)

With doubts still firmly cast over the quality of schooling as a means to improve pupils' social and emotional well-being needs (see Pope, Rees, Main and Bradshaw, 2015) and with a recognition that Britain 'is not doing well on children's mental health' (Warin, 2017, p. 188), there have been international demands for greater state intervention in education, with the OECD (2009, p 163) calling for 'Governments (to) continuously experiment with policies and programmes for

children.....to enhance well-being'. Such supranational pleas have been echoed in political rhetoric nationally, with previous Prime Minister, David Cameron, identifying improvements in mental health and the social and emotional well-being of citizens in Britain as a 'priority of government'. His view that 'happiness' should be the new gross domestic product, and that 'government has the power to improve well-being' (Cameron, 2010), was re-emphasised in January 2017, by current Prime Minister, Theresa May, who called for:

'The power of government as a force for good to transform the way we deal with mental health problems right across society...at every stage of a person's life: not only in our hospitals, but in our classrooms, at work and in our communities...This starts with ensuring that children and young people get the help and support they need and deserve'

This well-being agenda, as it has become known, is now deemed a 'serious business of government' that is about 'improving society's sense of well-being' (May, 2017). Acting on the international concerns voiced in the many publications introduced above, and on the renewed emphasis at national level to facilitate mental health issues across society, subsequent British governments have made use of various education-based schemes as vehicles to target the social and emotional well-being needs of its children. Such strategies include, but are not limited to, the 'Healthy Schools' programme, designed to promote a whole school/whole child approach to emotional health, a renewal in the practice of 'Nurture groups' that invest in the importance of attachment and on-going relationships (Warin, 2017), and the 'Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning' (SEAL) initiative, 'designed to support schools in promoting the well-being and learning of children and young people' (Banerjee, 2010, p. 8).

In this paper I focus on just one of these strategies by exploring some of the practicalities experienced by schools when implementing SEL schemes that focus on child social and emotional well-being. I make the case that the ‘discourses of emotions’ (Burman, 2009), inherent within the various supranational publications on well-being and in the national calls to improve mental health through schooling, are susceptible to exploitation by policy makers and practitioners alike. Whilst an aim of the international comparisons of child well-being, outlined above, is to illustrate how ‘performance in protecting children compares with the record of other nations at a similar level of development’ (UNICEF, 2013, p. 4), through the examination of the data captured, I make the case that instead of facilitating social and emotional development, SEL may be being used to problematise norms and behaviours fundamental to children’s positive mental health and well-being.

Overview of the research study

SEL as a research focus Whilst SEL schemes internationally have been given an array of labels such as *Social responsibility* in Canada, *Life Skills* in Israel, *Kids Matter* in Australia and *Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning* (SEAL) in Britain, all, at some level, aim to improve children’s personal relationships, capacity to understand their own emotions, and awareness of appropriate response to the emotions of others (Weare, 2007). Indeed, at their core is a commitment to cater for children’s well-being needs through the development of their social, emotional and behavioural skills (Kroeger, Schultz and Newsom 2007). Across the globe, the potential benefits of these schemes have been identified, with claims of improvements in children’s anger management strategies, social skills, and emotional control (see Gadre, 2004) enhanced social and emotional well-being (Hallam 2009) and academic attainment (Banerjee, 2010). That said, there

has been research that doubt the legitimacy of such opinion (see Humphrey, Kalambouka, Bolton, Lendrum, Wigelsworth, Lennie and Farrell, 2008), whilst others offer more fervent opposition, due to claims that SEL is well positioned to coerce children into experiencing specific constructions of social and emotional well-being, (Ecclestone and Hayes, 2009).

The aims of the main study Drawing on Goleman's (1995) theory of emotional intelligence, Hargreaves' (1995) typology of school culture, notions of a 'whole-school approach' (Weare, 2007; Banerjee, 2010), and concepts within the interpretive paradigm, the main study aimed to determine how staff members working in the primary sector in Britain understood and made use of SEL in their schools. As a means of achieving this aim the issues captured in the following research questions were addressed:

1. What are the main motivations for using SEL in primary schools?
2. How is SEL being interpreted in primary schools?
3. What are the influences behind these interpretations?

Methodology A mixed-methods empirical study, employing three separate methodological approaches, utilising a combination of quantitative and qualitative strategies, was developed to explore the research questions outlined above. The three phase study was carried out in primary schools in a town in Northern England. Data was gathered from a range of staff members, including head teachers, assistant head teachers, senior management staff, teachers, teaching assistants, welfare staff, other support staff, administration staff and maintenance staff.

In phase one, a 29-item questionnaire was employed to access the views of a broad range of staff members, in relation to their interpretation and use of SEL, across the primary schools in the town. In total, 402 staff members in 38 schools took part in this phase of the empirical study. By outlining this phase of the study here, I don't intend to imply a positivist approach to the research questions but include such information due to its role in initiating the research process, and as a tool that provided a broad, extensive survey of how schools and their staff members interpret and use SEL. Results from the quantitative phase also provided a means of triangulating the findings made during the qualitative phases two and three (Arksey and Knight, 1999). Additionally, phase one was also a valuable resource in identifying the four case study schools and was utilised extensively in the sampling strategy for phases two and three.

Phases two and three, which focused on staff members' perceptions of SEL, their beliefs in relation to the motivations for its use, its function in school in general, their own use of the scheme, and its impact, were carried out in case study primary schools sampled to achieve maximum variation. Consequently, four schools that varied with regards to culture, social class (categorised by pupil eligibility for free school meals), size, number of pupils on roll, ethnicity, religious character, and duration of SEL use, were selected as cases. Phase two involved semi-structured focus group interviews with groups of management/teaching staff, non-teaching staff and, in two cases, a range of staff selected from the 'whole school'. These samples were selected from 'naturally occurring groups', which are advocated widely in the literature (Macnaghten and Myers 2004). There were ten focus group interviews comprising of a total of 44 staff members across the four case study schools. Phase three was composed of 24 semi-structured interviews (six staff members in each case study school). Employing a stratified purposeful sampling scheme (see Onwuegbuzie and

Collins 2007), I divided the various groups of staff within each school into six distinct groups: management, inclusion co-ordinator, teacher, teaching assistant, pastoral staff and welfare staff, and sampled an individual from each group for interview.

Data analysis To help organise the qualitative data, all interviews during phases two and three were recorded and transcribed, and Atlas.ti software was utilised as a tool of analysis. Using a mixture of ‘top-down deductive and bottom-up inductive processes’ (Teddlie and Tashakkori, 2010, p. 17), the iterative approach adopted during the research allowed the data analysis process to be both exploratory and confirmatory. The findings and inferences reported here have all been subjected to a rigorous form of content analysis (Creswell, 2005), where data collected from all phases of the research was utilised to illustrate the phenomena being reported. To achieve a certain degree of ‘descriptive validity’ (Maxwell, 1992), and to make my interpretations of the participants’ views as ‘valid’ as possible, confirmation of these interpretations were sought at all phases. With methodological and data triangulation achieved, the findings reported in this paper have been cross checked and validated with evidence from each phase of the research. As is to be expected, the larger research project produced numerous themes which have been reported elsewhere (see XXXX), meaning in this article I focus on just one thematic finding, reported next, by making use of the qualitative data outlined above to illuminate this. In keeping with the ethical procedures outlined by the British Educational Research Association (2011), all of which were adhered to throughout the study, the names used in the remainder of the paper are pseudonyms.

Findings: Staff members' interpretations of SEL

The analysis of data uncovered consistencies in the way staff members across schools interpreted and utilised SEL in their daily practice, particularly in terms of perceived motivations for its use and how it was operationalised, in response. Consequently, I will now elaborate on these findings by relating more specifically to the paper's focus, to illustrate how SEL became a vehicle that targeted the behaviours and experiences deemed of value to specific groups of children.

Perceived motivations for SEL in schools

The findings indicate that holistic notions of children's social and emotional development were viewed as a main function of SEL, with staff members pointing to the facilitation of '*social abilities,....motivation, relationships, managing feelings....(and) self-awareness.*' (Bethany – Assistant head) - skills traditionally associated with emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1995) - being emphasised. That said, there was a distinct tendency for staff to prioritise two specific aspects of emotional intelligence: emotional control and social skills, as central tenets of SEL. In doing so, there was a further propensity to attribute issues with these aspects to certain groups of school children, with staff members such as Samantha, a teaching assistant, believing SEL to be specifically for '*the poorer children of a lower class (and those) of the Asian community*'. As such, SEL became reified as a tool to tackle the issues '*presented by Asian children*' (Lucy – Teaching assistant) and '*the many deprived kids*' (Shirley – Welfare assistant). When asked why SEL was introduced in schools, Leroy, a Key stage two teacher maintained:

Leroy (Teacher): *I think it's possibly because of the kids we get in our schools, schools situated in council estates or in Asian communities. I think there are a lot*

of issues with social skills and behaviours at home in those places, which are then brought into school, not only by the children but by the parents as well.

As alluded to by Leroy, staff members across schools, in keeping with previous findings (see Broomhead, 2013), often attributed blame to parents for children's perceived lack of social, emotional and behavioural skills. By consistently highlighting presumed negative aspects of their nature, and in the act of labelling them *'drug abusers, alcohol abusers and prostitutes'* (Abigail – Head teacher), *'neglectful'* (Lilian – TA; Edith – Welfare assistant), *'aggressive and violent'* (Stanley – Head teacher), parents living in socio-economic hardship were often 'othered' (Paechter, 1998). Furthermore, there was a belief that *'social and emotional education is not important to the Asian community'* (Carol – HLTA) due, in part, to the attribution of *'ignorance of families... from an Asian background....who aren't willing to change,'* (Lucy - TA)

Subsequently, some staff alluded to school as a *'battle ground of social and cultural integration'* (John - Assistant head) whilst others, such as Head teacher, Stanley, maintained there was a *'real need to fire fight'* the social, emotional and behavioural norms believed to being promoted within communities. The use of such metaphors illustrate how some school staff members perceive the role of schooling and the purpose of SEL within that, offering support to existing views that position *'schools and the curricula.....(as) prime areas of attack'* (Apple, 2006, p.17) in cultural maintenance. When discussing their use of SEL, the trend to target the groups identified continued, as is shown next.

The utilisation of SEL

The view that SEL was most appropriate for specific groups of children was further reified in its practice. Across the cases, head teachers echoed the sentiments discussed above, by positioning SEL as a tool to target behaviours deemed a product of the '*children's hectic lives*' (Hannah – Head teacher) and their '*socially and emotionally illiterate home environments*' (Stanley – Head teacher). Such usages were emphasised again, by Alice:

Alice (Head teacher): *Due to where they live, our kids get together in their little gangs and they make up their own social rules, but SEL counteracts all of that in a positive way, and that's why and how we use it.*

The schools operationalised SEL via classroom based lessons, using the SEAL resources (see DfES, 2005), and also in small group work and one to one intervention with individual children, led by Behaviour Support Workers and Learning Mentors. In accordance with the SEAL materials (see DfES 2005), and across schools, peaceful conflict resolution was endorsed as a means of promoting positive emotional control, whilst assertiveness was prioritised as an 'appropriate' social skill. Such uses of the scheme were recognised as combatants for behaviours deemed common in areas of deprivation, where it was felt children are expected to "*act tough*" (Charlotte – TA), "*be aggressive*" (Amber – Welfare) and "*hit back, if hit by others*" (Fred – Teacher), as well as in Asian communities where some children "*aren't encouraged to be independent or forthcoming with their ideas*" (Jane – Teacher). Such uses of SEL to problematise behaviours endorsed in low socio-economic and Asian communities have been reported elsewhere (see

XXXX), but a further finding related to how staff often conflated social and emotional aspects of self with more moralistic constructions of identity.

Evidence of ‘othering practices’ (Griffith-Williams and Korn, 2016) were voiced by staff who identified SEL as a vehicle to teach children, from deprived and Asian communities, skills such as *‘being polite, showing respect, being helpful’* (Erica – TA), *‘social etiquette, how to dress properly, how to eat properly, how to speak to people properly’* (Abigail – Head teacher) and *‘our manners and social skills’* (Samantha - TA). Here, Samantha’s use of *‘our’* reveals an ‘us and them’ dichotomy (Brewer and Gardner 1996), hinted at throughout the qualitative phases and exemplified in the quotes shared in this paper. This was strengthened by a belief that schools, not home, deliver the *‘right way’* (Charlotte – TA) and the *‘right behaviours’* (Samantha – TA) in guiding children on what is the *‘right thing to do’* (Lilian – TA) in difficult situations. Emphasising this point further, Barbara, a Key stage two teacher stated:

Barbara (Teacher): *I think a lot of our children see inappropriate ways to react to things when they’re out of school. So the idea of SEL being in school is to teach them the right way to behave.*

Consequently, in its conflation of social and emotional behaviours with moralistic aspects of character, SEL became a framework that operationalised as means to inform pupils of the *‘right’* behaviours to display, with teachers such as Fred believing *‘that, through SEL, we as a school...have the right to show children...the way; we are trying to make them good citizens.’* Whilst work to develop children’s behavioural skills are often incorporated within other discrete

aspects of the curriculum, such as PSHE and Citizenship (Weare, 2000), the data explored in this section reveals a propensity for schools and staff to operationalise SEL as a tool to not only target social and emotional experiences, but to also fuse expectations relating to these aspects of self with those of being a *'good citizen'*. The potential consequences of this conflation are discussed next.

Discussion

'Assimilation practices' (Back, Keith, Khan, Shukra and Solomos 2002), which place emphasis on students 'to mix...to blend in and to stop being different' (Crozier and Davies, 2009, p. 299), were apparent in the operationalisation of SEL across the schools in this study, demonstrating its embodiment as a tool of cultural imperialism. In their use of SEL to target children from deprived and Asian areas, negative connotations of specific behavioural norms were manufactured by staff that 'othered' common practices within these communities. Furthermore, as the space of school and practice of SEL were seen to target these groups, aspects of structural and cultural violence (Galtung, 1969; 1990) were present. Curriculum, both formal and hidden, has long been viewed a vehicle of social and cultural reproduction (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990) that transmits 'appropriate' forms of cultural capital (Apple, 2004), privileges middle class values (Gewirtz, 2001) and normalises whiteness (Crozier and Davies, 2008), and in uncovering a propensity for a monist approach to SEL, the findings of this study provide further support for these views. Such expectations of acculturation in schools often have negative consequences for children's identity formation (Wright 2013), social and emotional development, and well-being (Broomhead, 2014), signalling a need for an alternative approach to SEL, one that embraces difference and pluralism.

I call on educational establishments to recognise the multitude of values and behaviours that children experience and, as such, feel schools and staff may benefit from exposure to the notion of ‘spheres of influence’ and ‘family values’ (Epstein, 2001), that assume an exchange of interests and knowledge between teachers and parents, that is based on common goals and mutual respect for the benefit of children’s learning and development. Similarly, in developing an ability to interpret, understand and accept the specific social and cultural practices of individuals, Earley and Mosakowski’s (2004) concept of ‘cultural intelligence’ may provide a useful framework to establish more pluralist realisations of SEL. Although many teachers fear the consequences of discussing contentious issues in the classroom (Keddie, 2014) and often feel under-prepared to engage critically with difference (Bhopal and Rhamie, 2014), by adopting a more agonistic (Mouffe, 2005) approach to teaching – one that utilises conflict and disagreement as a stimulus for learning - schools and staff may be better positioned to operationalise SEL as a means to develop *all* children’s social and emotional skills.

Under recent Conservative governments, support for the use of SEL in school has dwindled. Instead, there is now an explicit emphasis on educating values, epitomised in expectations for schools to promote ‘fundamental British values’ (DfE 2014). As such, the advocacy of ‘democracy’, the ‘rule of law’, ‘individual liberty’ and ‘mutual respect and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs’ now forms part of all pupils’ schooling in Britain. With SEL schemes such as SEAL now languishing in government archives, and with a demand that British values are promoted in a ‘muscular way’ (Cameron, 2014), schools and their practitioners should be aware of the criticisms levied at this current approach to children’s spiritual, moral, social and cultural development, that label it assimilationist (Keddie, 2014), anti-Muslim (Lander, 2016) and an

exercise to reinforce white privilege (Elton-Chalcraft, Lander, Revel, Warner and Whitworth, 2017). Bearing in mind the utilisation of SEL in schools reported in this article, it wouldn't be too fanciful to anticipate similar manifestations in the promotion of fundamental British values.

Conclusion

The research reported in this article indicates a tendency for primary school staff members to target social and emotional behaviours valued by specific groups of children. Furthermore, by conflating these experiences with constructs of character governed by morals, SEL operationalised as an assimilationist tool in its promotion of behaviours and values deemed central to positive citizenship. Furthermore, the research revealed a degree of reticence towards pluralist models of social and emotional development which served to 'other' children from deprived and minority ethnic communities. In prioritising this monist stance, and in utilising SEL as a form of acculturation, there may, as has been reported within the literature, be negative ramifications for children's social and emotional well-being and mental health. Consequently, it is recommended that instead of pursuing universality, school staff should recognise and celebrate the differences amongst the many pupils they teach, and make use of their variety of experiences as a means to facilitate all children's social and emotional skills.

References

- Alexander, R., and Hargreaves, L. (2007). *Community soundings: First report of the Cambridge University Primary Review Group*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge.
- Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology and the curriculum (3rd Ed)*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Apple, M. W. (2006) *Educating the 'right' way: Markets, standards, God and inequality (2nd Ed)*.

London: Routledge.

Arksey, A., and Knight, P. (1999). *Interviewing for social scientists*. London: Sage.

Back, L., Keith, M., Khan, A., Shukra, K., and Solomos, J. (2002). New Labour's white heart: Politics, multiculturalism and the return of assimilation. *The Political Quarterly*, 73 (4), pp. 445-454.

Banerjee, R. (2010) *Social and emotional aspects of learning in schools: Contributions to improving attainment, behaviour, and attendance. A report on data from the National Strategies Tracker School Project*. Sussex: University of Sussex.

Bhopal, K., and Rhamie, J. (2014) Initial teacher training: Understanding 'race', diversity and inclusion. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 17 (3), pp. 304-325

Blair, A. (2007) Britain's children are the unhappiest in the world. *The Times*, 14th February.

Brewer, M. B., and Gardner, W. (1996). Who is this 'we'? Levels of collective identity and self-representation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, pp. 83-93.

Broomhead K. (2013) 'Going the extra mile': Educational practitioners compensating for perceived inadequacies in the parenting of children with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties (BESD) *Pastoral Care in Education*, 31, pp. 309-320

Broomhead K. (2014) 'A clash of two worlds': Disjuncture between the norms and values held by educational practitioners and parents of children with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties *British Journal of Special Education*, 41, pp. 136-150

Burman, E. (2009) Beyond 'emotional literacy' in feminist and educational research. *British Educational Research Journal*, 35 (1), pp. 137-155.

Cameron, D. (2010). *PM Speech on Wellbeing*.

Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-speech-on-wellbeing> (Accessed March 2017)

Cameron, D. (2014). *British values: article by David Cameron*.

Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/british-values-article-by-david-cameron> (Accessed March 2017)

Cresswell, J. W. (2005) *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. NJ: Pearson Education.

Crozier, G., and Davies, J. (2007). Hard to reach parents or hard to reach schools? *British Journal of Educational Research*, 33 (3), pp. 295–313.

Crozier, G., and Davies, J. (2008). ‘The trouble is they don’t mix’: Self-segregation or enforced exclusion? *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 11 (3), pp. 285–301.

Department for Education (2014) *Promoting fundamental British values as part of SMSC in schools*. Available online at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/promoting-fundamental-british-values-through-smsc> (accessed 25 March 2017).

Department for Education and Skills. (2005). *Excellence and enjoyment: Social and emotional aspects of learning: Good to be me!* London: HMSO.

Earley, P. C., and Mosakowski, E. (2004). Cultural intelligence. *Harvard Business Review*, 82, pp. 139-146.

Ecclestone, K., and Hayes, D. (2009) Changing the subject: The educational implications of developing emotional well-being. *Oxford Review of Education*, 35 (3), pp. 371-389.

Elton-Chalcraft, S., Lander, V., Revel, L., Warner, D., and Whitworth, L. (2017) To promote, or not to promote fundamental British values? Teachers’ standards, diversity and teacher education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 43 (1), pp. 29-48.

Epstein, J. (2001) *School, family and community partnerships: preparing educators and improving schools*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press

Gadre, S. (2004). Effect of school climate on social intelligence. *IFE Psychologia*, 12 (1), pp. 103-111.

Galtung, J. (1969) Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6 (3), pp. 167-191

Galtung, J. (1990) Cultural violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, 27(3), pp. 291–305.

Gewirtz, S. (2001). Cloning the Blairs: New Labour's programme for the re-socialisation of working class parents. *Journal of Education Policy*, 16 (4), pp. 365-378.

Goleman, D. (1995) *Emotional intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury.

Griffith-Williams, J., and Korn, J. (2016) Othering and Fear: Cultural Values and Hiro's Race in Thomas & Friends' Hero of the Rails. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 41(1) pp. 22–41

Hallam, S. (2009). An evaluation of the Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) programme: Promoting positive behaviour, effective learning and well-being in primary school children. *Oxford Review of Education*, 35 (3), pp. 313-330.

Hargreaves, D. H. (1995) School culture, school effectiveness and school improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 6 (1), pp. 23-46.

Humphrey, N., Kalambouka, A., Bolton, J., Lendrum, A., Wigelsworth, M., Lennie, C., and Farrell, P. (2008). *Primary social and emotional aspects of learning (SEAL): Evaluation of small group work*. Nottingham: DfES Publications.

Keddie, A. (2014) The politics of Britishness: Multiculturalism, schooling and social cohesion. *British Educational Research Journal*, 40 (3), pp. 539-554.

Kroeger, K. A., Schultz, J.R., and Newsom, C. (2007). A comparison of two group-delivered social skills programs for young children with autism. *Journal of Autism & Developmental Disorders*, 37 (5), pp. 808-817.

Lander, V. (2016) Introduction to fundamental British values. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 42(3), 274-279.

Layard, R., and Dunn, J. (2009) *A good childhood: Searching for values in a competitive age*. London: Penguin.

Macnaghten, P., and Myers, G. (2004). Focus groups. In G. Gobo, J. Gubrium, C. Seale and D. Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice*. London: Sage.

Maxwell, J. A. (1992) Understanding and validity in qualitative research. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62 (3), pp. 279-300.

May, T. (2017) *Prime Minister unveils plans to transform mental health support*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/prime-minister-unveils-plans-to-transform-mental-health-support> (Accessed March 2017)

Mouffe, C. (2005) *On the political*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

OECD (2009) *Doing Better for Children*. Paris: OECD.

Onwuegbuzie, A.J., and Collins, K.M.T. (2007). A typology of mixed methods sampling designs in social science research. *The Qualitative Report*, 12 (2), pp. 281-316.

Paechter, C. F. (1998). *Educating the other: Gender, power and schooling*. London: Falmer.

Palmer, S. (2006) *Toxic childhood*. London: Orion.

Pope, L., Rees, G., Main, G., and Bradshaw, J. (2015) *The Good childhood Report 2015*. New York: The Children's Society and New York University.

Teddlie, C., and Tashakkori, A. (2010) *SAGE handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioural research (2nd Ed)*. London: Sage.

UNICEF (2007) *Report Card 7. An overview of child well-being in rich countries: A comprehensive assessment of the lives and well-being of children and adolescents in the economically advanced nations*. Florence: Innocenti Research Centre

UNICEF (2013) *Report Card 11. Child well-being in rich countries: A comparative overview*. Florence: Innocenti Research Centre

Warin, J. (2017) Creating a whole school ethos of care. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 22 (3), pp. 188-199.

Weare, K. (2000). Promoting mental, emotional and social health: A whole-school approach. London: Routledge.

Weare, K. (2007) Delivering 'Every Child Matters': The central role of social and emotional learning in schools. *Education 3-13*, 35 (3), pp. 239-248.

World Health Organisation (WHO) (1999) *Creating an Environment for Emotional and Social Well-Being: An Important Responsibility of a Health-Promoting and Child-Friendly School*. Atlanta: Division of Adolescent and School Health.

Wright, C. (2015) Othering difference: Framing identities and representation in black children's schooling in the British context. *Irish Educational Studies*, 29(3), pp.305-320