Becoming an agent of change for school and student well-being

Sue Roffey

There is evidence to suggest that whole school approaches to student well-being enhance not only mental health and resilience but also promote prosocial behaviour, pupil engagement and academic learning. 'Positive education' is gaining traction in both the US and Australia, often with more privileged schools. Interventions are primarily based in positive psychology but also have elements of community psychology where they aim to give teachers and students an authentic voice. When schools focus on the well-being of the whole child, this not only benefits individuals, but the communities in which they participate. Educational psychologists are in a unique position, especially in state schools. They have opportunities for conversations on well-being at all levels, to support teachers and offer in-service training. There is also an ethical issue about whether the profession acts in a pro-active way to advocate for the needs of vulnerable young people at a systemic level or is primarily reactive to demands. This paper is based in research on school change and student well-being. It summarises what it is possible to influence and which practices and processes are effective. It takes an ecological and optimistic position on change that entails sowing seeds for growth, building a team and promoting good practice.
Keywords: Student well-being; educational psychologist; change agent; resilience; school culture.

DEFINITIONS of well-being are evolving with changing emphasis. The focus on subjective well-being where people feel good and function well grew out of a 'health and well-being' perspective. There has been some justifiable criticism of what has been labelled 'happyology' and the narrow focus on subjective well-being is slowly being replaced by a broader view that also encompasses issues of equality and the qualities of organisations and communities (Barnes & Roffey, 2014; Prilleltensky & Prilleltensky, 2006), and indeed whole societies (Burns, 2010; Wilkinson & Pickett, 2010). Positive psychologists now routinely discriminate between hedonistic well-being (briefly conceptualised as feeling good) and eudaimonic well-being (having virtue, doing good). There is recognition that well-being is the outcome of complex and interactive predispositions, experiences, processes and values. This is in constant ebb and flow in a nested ecological framework from the micro-level – what happens in the everyday – to the macro level – socio-political and cultural determinants (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

We are now much more aware of contributory factors and therefore more able to identify and implement practices and processes that foster both individual and community well-being.

Huppert and So (2011) carried out a major study in 23 European countries with 43,000 adults identifying the main elements of well-being. Their findings have influenced the theory presented in Seligman's (2011) book entitled *Flourish*. He no longer emphasises 'authentic happiness' but asserts that the core features of well-being are positive emotions, engagement, relationships, meaning and achievement. Within this he includes self-esteem, optimism, resilience, vitality and self-determination. The European country that best meets the criteria for flourishing is Denmark – a country where there is least difference between the haves and have-nots: 33 per cent of its citizens are doing well, compared with just 18 per cent in the UK and only six per cent in Russia. Since 1970 the UK's gross domestic product has almost doubled but life satisfaction has increased only marginally. Although poverty

and debt can significantly reduce well-being, having more material goods does not increase sustainable life satisfaction unless other things are in place.

Within positive psychology, a major contribution has been the increasing research evidence in neuroscience. Findings in gene research indicate that we all have genetic pre-dispositions but that it is our environment that determines how much these lead to 'gene expression' (for example, Lobo, 2008; van Dellen et al., 2000). Baron-Cohen in his book *Zero Degrees of Empathy* (2011) states that far more individuals have the genes for psychopathic behaviour than ever become psychopaths. The nature/nurture debate is now just about over: it is the interaction between the two that matters. This reinforces the critical importance of everyday experiences in the development of our young people. 'Each of us has a unique life narrative that leaves its mark on the brain, and it is this personalisation of the brain, driven by unique experiences, that we would regard as the human mind' (Greenfield, 2010).

Until the 1960s it was thought that the structure of the brain was formed in early childhood. From the research on brain plasticity (for example, Doidge, 2007) we now know that new neural pathways are constantly being formed in response to environmental stimuli. The environment therefore not only affects what happens for people in their lives, but it also causes actual changes in the structure of the brain. A process called synaptic pruning strengthens connections that are most frequently used while others are eliminated. This happens throughout life but especially at adolescence, beginning with the limbic system and finishing with the neo-cortex. This is one reason why young teenagers may be unskilled at thinking things through, may make decisions based on emotions and are often impulsive.

Knowledge about the constituent parts of the brain and how they interact has been helpful in understanding more about both emotional and cognitive behaviour. Goleman (1996) talks about 'emotional hijack' – the role of the amygdala in responding to threat. It would be helpful for all educators to know that when a student perceives threat (real or imagined, and often to their sense of self rather than physical danger) their amygdala goes rapidly into action. There is no point in reasoning with someone in a high emotional state – their neo-cortex will have temporarily been overwhelmed. Frederickson (2009) shows that negative emotions inhibit our cognitive function whereas the promotion of positive feelings such as feeling calm, heard and supported serve to increase creativity and problem-solving skills. This has major implications for promoting positive emotions within a learning environment.

Risk and resilience

Many pupils in our schools are struggling with how they feel about themselves, the world around them and the life they are living. For a significant proportion this is so serious it impacts on their ability to function and they have been diagnosed with a mental illness. It is estimated that about one in every 10 children aged 5 to 16 has a diagnosable mental health difficulty (Green et al., 2004). That is is about three students in every class, with issues including self-harm and depression. We also know that many young people who are anxious or miserable are not noticed. Unless their behaviour is challenging or their learning evidently impaired they may 'fly under the radar'. Keyes and Haidt (2003) refer to these individuals as 'languishing', and this applies not only to pupils but also to many of the adults who teach and care for them. Well-being is not, however, the opposite of being mentally ill, but rather the presence of multiple contributory factors – both personal and environmental that enable people to flourish.

In terms of resilience, the longitudinal study by Werner (2004) followed the progress of an entire birth cohort of nearly 700 babies born in 1955 on the Hawaian

island of Kauai into adverse circumstances until they were 40 years old. Whereas two thirds had the negative outcomes that might have been predicted, a third became caring, confident and competent adults. The factors that supported the resilience of this cohort can be divided into personal and environmental – although there is inevitably interaction between the two. The personal protective factors included the following: a positive attitude towards life – counting blessings rather than bemoaning one's fate, and being able to get things in perspective; a sense of humour – being light hearted and not taking oneself too seriously; a pro-social orientation – wanting to reach out and connect with other; persistence – not giving up the first time something does not go well; self-confidence and self-esteem; willingness and ability to talk about issues; androgyny – not being overly 'gender defined'; intelligence – but only if used pro-actively to problem-solve.

The environmental factors have resonance with those identified as critical for an effective environment for learning.

Someone who cares

The strongest factor in resilience is having someone in your life who thinks you are special and shows they care about you. As Bronfenbrenner (1990) put it: 'Every kid needs at least one adult who is crazy about him'. For most young people their families serve this critical function. When parents are not able to manage their own lives, however, they may not provide the care and support their children need. Sometimes an extended family member is the one person in a child's life who sees the best in them. It can be helpful for schools to discover who that person might be and perhaps engage with them for the benefit of the student. Grandparents, siblings, aunts and uncles can be highly significant in a child's life.

Biographies also often refer to teachers who fulfil this role. They have seen beyond challenging behaviour, poor attendance and difficulties with learning, and have enabled a young person to think and feel differently about themselves. They not only model a respectful relationship but also aim to seek strengths within the pupil. Teachers rarely get accolades for the critically important role of turning students lives around; they are much more likely to be credited for achieving good exam results. These are not the same thing. The American educational philosopher, Nel Noddings, summarises the ideal teacher-student relationship as where 'the best self of the educator seeks a caring relationship with the best self of the student' (1992). Barr (1996) goes even further: 'I knew that schools could make a difference, could transform the lives of children, could overcome the deficiencies of the home and the dysfunctions of the family…' (p.2)

High expectations

There is no doubt that many parents think their children are special and love them dearly. However, they do not always meet the second criterion for resiliency – high expectations. These are 'permissive' parents who do not establish clear boundaries for their child's behaviour, give into demands, do not encourage independence and provide answers rather than asking good questions. These children may not be allowed to feel bad about anything so any difficulty they get into is 'managed' by their parents with a focus on the child's rights rather than their responsibilities. These young people do not learn to be resilient, are often not well connected and are not resourceful in the face of challenges. They may crumble when faced with failure or other inevitable adversity in their lives.

Hattie's major meta-analysis of over 800 meta-analyses of effective education (2009) concluded that not only was the quality of the teacher-student relationship critical to outcomes but also the determination not to give up on students. In Australia the Aboriginal educator Dr Chris Sarra (2014), reflecting on his own negative experiences of schooling, has challenged the whole school community to have high expectations

of its indigenous students. Schools need to communicate high (but appropriate) expectations of what young people can achieve and also that they will help and support pupils in attaining their potential.

Connectedness

The third protective factor identified in the resilience research is the feeling that you belong, that you matter and that your contributions are valued. Being accepted within your social group is a basic psychological need. Baumeister and Leary (1995) argue that it is so vital to our survival that it counts as one of our basic human needs along with sustenance and shelter. There is, however, a significant difference between inclusive and exclusive belonging (Roffey, 2013). The first is open and welcoming of others and the second, although powerfully protective for those in the 'inner circle', can demonise others who are 'not like us'.

The Wingspread Declaration on School Connections (2004) recognises the importance of connectedness in the educational context. It was published in the hope of establishing and developing school environments in which all students, regardless of their academic capacity, are engaged and feel part of the educational endeavour. 'Students are more likely to succeed when they feel connected to school. School connection is the belief by students that adults in the school care about their learning as well as about them as individuals.'

Catalano and colleagues (2004) define school connectedness as two interrelated components. The first is affective, supportive relationships, and the second is commitment – where students perceive themselves as doing well and have an investment in being there. Schools need to provide a learning environment that is not only safe, caring and supportive, but also one where student strengths are identified so each individual sees themselves as progressing and achieving.

School and student well-being

There is evidence to suggest that whole school approaches to student well-being enhance not only mental health and resilience but also promote pro-social behaviour, pupil engagement and academic learning (Clift & Jensen, 2005; Noble et al., 2008; Roffey, 2011; Weare & Gray, 2003). A focus on well-being in schools is a different way of conceptualising and responding to pastoral care issues. Although it is recognised that some pupils will need something different or extra, a well-being focus is on universal and pro-active intervention to promote relationships and resilience. Instead of putting most resources into students who come to the attention of senior staff and specialists because of behaviour, emotional or learning difficulties, the mantra is that 'every teacher is a teacher for well-being' (Wyn et al., 2000). This is a 'catch-all' strategy that ensures that all pupils, including those whose needs are less evident, are in an environment that is supportive of their social and emotional development as well as their learning.

In their literature review on approaches to student well-being, Noble and colleagues (2008) found that when well-being is core school business, students of all levels are more likely to become more engaged with learning and academic outcomes improve; pro-social behaviour increases and there are better levels of mental health and resilience. According to the review there are seven pathways to well-being in school. These are physical and emotional safety, pro-social values, social and emotional learning, a supportive and caring school community, a strengths-based approach, a sense of meaning and purpose and a healthy life-style. Student well-being is a whole school/whole student approach which puts the learner at the heart of educational endeavours. It applies to leadership vision and management style, the level of social capital throughout the school, pedagogy, policy and practice. It is what people communicate and how they do it. It is how people feel as well as what they

do. It is pro-active and preventative. It means having high expectations for all.

There is now a significant number of studies confirming the validity of this approach and its impact on outcomes. (for example, Harris et al., 2013) 'We have focused on how building a student-centred school can make the difference for students who are most likely to face challenges in their education, including socio-economic disadvantage' (Harris et al., 2013, p.34). In 2004 the Scottish Government published *Being Well – Doing Well: A Framework for Health Promoting Schools* (Scottish Health Promoting Schools Unit, 2004). These are not just concerned with the physical well-being of students but with promoting a holistic approach to the education, health and care of Scotland's children and young people: 'Becoming a health promoting school provides a way for each school to listen to, and take account of the views of pupils, parents and staff. A positive, health promoting school ethos can influence health, attainment, achievements and expectations.' (p.ii)

The work of educational psychologists

The traditional work of educational psychologists is in the field of special educational needs, supporting schools, pupils and families where there are difficulties and children are vulnerable. There will always be a role that includes this. But there are also often untapped opportunities for school psychologists to be pro-active for well-being in their other legitimate functions – as advocate for the whole child and as a change agent in schools. These roles are not necessarily separate or additional but can be threaded through consultations, conversations and offers, maintaining awareness of school and student well-being and sowing seeds where possible. We cannot do much about the socio-political macro level of change, but there is much we can influence at other levels. As schools are ecologies what happens in one part of the system can have a ripple effect on others (Roffey, 2008).

Educational psychologists as pupil advocates

Eliciting and honouring student voice

Educational psychologists understand a good deal about both language development and positive communication practices. A child can express preferences and opinions on the world from an early age. Information on protective factors includes what helps them feel better when they are down; who is the person who sticks up for them the most (and how they do that); where do they most feel they belong and what do people do that helps. Which teachers recognise the pupil's strengths? Most psychologists would ensure that students are given an opportunity to have their say but this needs to be communicated to others as a right and a responsibility, and not as an extra.

Promoting the value of agency

Young people see their well-being as invested in being able to make decisions on issues that concern them (The Children's Society, 2013). This goes beyond eliciting pupil voice to ensuring that expressed views lead to shared decision-making. The other side of agency is responsibility. When decisions are imposed there is no ownership or commitment. For instance, when a school draws up a (usually behavioural) contract for a student it models respectful practice to ask the pupil what they want included. They are more likely to take responsibility for their part of an agreement when they have genuinely been involved in setting something up.

Strengths-based language

How we speak about something makes a difference to how that issue in constructed. How educators talk about students who are challenging determines both perceptions and responses. How adults talk to pupils influences their self-concept and how they see themselves. This is not bland praise but verbalising noticed actions and effort, however seemingly minor. Using the language of strengths gives young people

something to live up to. When a psychologist models this it influences the way others might communicate. It can also generalise to conversations with teachers and families. Young people are not the only ones to value someone noticing their strengths.

Another aspect of language highlighted by Dweck (2006) is the impact of praising effort rather than ability. It is the difference between saying, 'Well done, you are clearly very good at maths', and, 'Well done, you worked really hard to get that score'. The first promotes a fixed mind-set – you either have that ability or not. The second promotes a growth mind-set – it is possible to get better if you practise. It is not only what is said to an individual that counts but also what others overhear. If someone fails a test and has learnt a fixed mind-set because everyone else is praised for their ability, their view might be that they just do not have what it takes and not make the effort in future.

The opposite of strengths-based language is deficit labelling; even identifying children as being 'naughty' may have longer-term repercussions (MacLure et al., 2009). There has been increasing debate about the range of behaviours that are labelled as psychiatric disorders (Hill, 2013). As soon as this is done the problem is placed squarely within the child rather than as an outcome of interactive factors. This means that it is the child that has to change – often with the help of a drug regime. Medicating children, especially below the age of five has become an ethical issue and educational psychologists are encouraged to challenge this where appropriate, usually by contacting the prescribing medical practitioner and sharing their concern (Traxson, 2014).

Connectedness and participation
The young people educational psychologists work with are the most likely to be vulnerable, marginalised and excluded (Department for Education, 2011). This puts their well-being at even further risk. Being an advocate for the child means keeping a pupil connected to school for as long as possible

and encouraging flexibility within school systems to ensure this happens. The role of the educational psychologist might be to explore how and with whom a student feels they belong and where possible build on the positive and reduce factors that undermine this. For those returning after a period of absence for any reason, including fixed-term suspension, a planned returners programme may be useful. Relationships with staff, other students and parents are as relevant as the practical and organisational aspects of re-integration.

Relationships
It has been noted that Hattie's (2009) meta-analysis found that the most critical factor in effective education was the quality of the teacher-student relationship. Relationships matter more to children and young people than anything else. How teachers speak with, relate to and position students is a choice and not a given. There will be many educational psychologists who have spent time with pupils to help them cope in the classroom with negative staff. Although some pre-service courses now address these issues, teachers may not always know some of the strategies that help foster positive relationships. Educational psychologists have a valuable role in modelling, talking about and providing in-service learning for teachers on the value and skills of promoting quality relationships.

Educational psychologists as change agents
Educational psychologists may already influence more than they think at a systems level. This is not only about what they do, but how they do it. Even with limited resources, especially time, it is possible to enhance universal well-being.

Teacher well-being
There are multiple indications that teachers are overworked, undervalued and highly stressed (for example, Galton & McBeath, 2008). Not only does this impair their ability

to respond to the social and emotional needs of pupils but it also makes it hard to be an inspiring, motivated educator. Teacher well-being is critical to both student well-being and learning outcomes (Lovewell, 2012; Roffey, 2012). Educational psychologists have an important role in acknowledging, validating and supporting individual teachers, helping them value themselves and maintain a positive sense of self. It raises professional credibility when good practice to promote well-being is noticed and acknowledged. As well as this validation it is also possible to give teachers 'permission' to look after themselves and their own well-being. Because of unrelenting pressure in a school, teachers sometimes fall short of expectations and not only get blamed by others but also blame themselves. Educational psychologists can not only support teachers in personal conversations but encourage whole school practices that promote social capital. Teachers need leaders and colleagues who care about them as people as well as care about the pupils, and who are aware of the relevance of building healthy supportive relationships across the school (Roffey, 2007). Educational psychologists can also offer courses in mindfulness. The evidence for its effectiveness in stress reduction is growing (Grossman et al., 2004).

Getting universal well-being on the agenda

The most powerful change agent in a school is the head teacher, followed by the school leadership team. (Fullan, 2002; Roffey, 2007) Fostering a positive relationship with influential individuals is worth the effort. What is their vision for their school and what do they hope to achieve? Academic excellence, positive behaviour or ensuring that all pupils reach their potential are all congruent with having whole child/whole school well-being as core business. In sowing seeds for well-being, an educational psychologist might alert leadership to significant and relevant research, let them know about any good practice – or powerful stories – they come across and identify any relevant professional practice already taking place.

If leadership is unresponsive, identifying individual staff in the school who do care about these issues enables the psychologist to support their good practice, maintain their motivation and perhaps foster collaborative action. Holding regular meetings outside school with like-minded educators may also help to keep these issues on the agenda. Well-being Australia has state advisory groups who meet every couple of months to discuss practice and keep the well-being conversation alive.

Conversations

Educational psychologists are skilled listeners but are also able to reframe situations. Validating problematic feelings is an important part of the work but this can be combined with solution and strengths focused conversations – where are you heading, what has worked in the past, what resources do you have, what is the next step? This is a more optimistic framework for consultation and simply modelling this can make a difference. Conversations that include discussion of pro-active well-being strategies may also have traction over time. Bullying behaviours remain a cause for concern for many schools. Rather than looking at ways of eliminating bullying, a well-being focus is concerned with promoting respect, friendship and inclusion. This is best done within the wider framework of social and emotional learning where students themselves take responsibility for how everyone feels at school.

Social and emotional learning

Educational psychologists as a profession have been at the forefront of promoting social and emotional learning in schools and were involved in developing the SEAL (Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning) materials (Department for Education, 2005). Despite international research on the benefit of learning relationships (Brion-Meisels & Jones, 2012; Durlak et al., 2011), the two pillars of education on 'Learning to Be' and 'Learning to Live Together' (Delors,

1996) have been pushed aside with an overriding focus on a 'Learning to Know' and 'Learning to Do' curriculum. As it is a significant factor in well-being, the profession needs to continue to advocate for social and emotional learning. There has, however, been a justifiable criticism of implementation factors. Social and emotional learning needs to be a safe place for both teachers and students (Roffey & McCarthy, 2013) and also requires skilled facilitation by someone who thinks these issues matter.

It is hard to have effective social and emotional learning programmes where the context does not demonstrate what pupils are learning (Roffey, 2010). Some workplaces are toxic: no-one feels good about being there. The opposite of a toxic environment is one with a high level of social capital. In the school context this is defined as respectful interactions that promote trust, authentic participation, reciprocity and collaboration to meet agreed goals. Educational psychologists can be powerful role models for emotionally literate practices and interactions. This includes how they run or participate in meetings, their awareness of inclusive practices and their ability to take account of contextual factors.

Research and intervention

There are opportunities for educational psychologists and those in training to carry out research in schools, including introducing and evaluating interventions. Doing this can change perceptions and practices. When the issue addressed is on an aspect of social and emotional well-being, resilience or positive education practices there is even more possibility to influence a change of culture. A single intervention may scale up across a school – for example, where a pedagogy for social and emotional learning for indigenous students was adopted across three high schools in a college (Dobia 2014) or a top-down approach such as the role of the educational psychology service in Glasgow's Nurturing Schools initiative (Glasgow City Council, undated).

Conclusion

Well-being is having greater traction in national policy and guidance with the UK Government now measuring indices of well-being on a regular basis (Office for National Statistics, 2014), going beyond Gross Domestic Product figures to 'measuring what matters'. This includes data on relationships, trust in government and personal life satisfaction. The New Economics Foundation (www.neweconomics.org) is an increasingly influential organisation. It describes itself as a 'leading think tank promoting economic, social and environmental justice'. Their first Happy Planet Index was released in 2006, downloaded and read in over 185 countries worldwide within two days of launch. This has data on 121 countries on three measures: ecological footprint, life expectancy and experienced well-being.

In 2006 Spratt and her colleagues wrote an article explicating the rationale for a focus on well-being in schools and claiming that we have a responsibility to ensure that the educational environment promotes good mental health:

> '…*the school environment too has the potential to either enhance or damage the mental well-being of both staff and pupils, and that school managers thus carry a significant responsibility to create an environment that promotes good mental health, acts to prevent development of problems in vulnerable groups and supports those experiencing difficulties.*' (p.15)

Educational psychologists know, possibly better than anyone, what facilitates optimal development, what is in children's best and longer-term interests, how they learn and the processes that enable them to learn well, what encourages their motivation and how to enhance their resilience. We need, both individually and as a profession, to be agents of change for well-being.

Address for correspondence
Associate Professor Sue Roffey
32 Ellington Road, Muswell Hill,
London N10 3DG.
Email: s.roffey@uws.edu.au *and*
sue@sueroffey.com

References

Barnes, J. & Roffey. S. (2014). Community change: The complex nature of interventions to promote positive connections.' In C. Cooper & F.A. Huppert (Eds), *Well-being: A complete reference guide, Volume VI: Interventions and policies to enhance well-being*. Chichester: Wiley.

Baron-Cohen, S. (2011). *Zero degrees of empathy*. London: The Penguin Group.

Barr, R.D. (1996). Who is this child? *Phi Delta Kappan, 77*(5), 382.

Baumeister, R.F. & Leary, M.R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 497–529.

Brion-Meisels, G. & Jones, S.M. (2012). Learning about relationships. In S. Roffey (Ed.), *Positive relationships: Evidence-based practice across the world*. London: Springer.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1990). Discovering what families do. In D. Blankenhorn, S. Bayme & J. Bethke Elshtain (Eds.), *Rebuilding the nest: A new commitment to the American family*. Milwaukee, WI: Family Service America.

Burns, G.W. (2010). Gross national happiness, a gift from Bhutan to the world. In R. Biewas-Diener (Ed.), *Positive psychology as social change*. London: Springer.

Catalano, R.F., Haggerty, K.P., Oesterle, S., Fleming, C.B. & Hawkins, J.D. (2004). The importance of bonding to school for healthy development: Findings from the social development research group. *Journal of School Health, 74*(7), 252–261.

Clift, S. & Jensen, B.B. (2005). *The health promoting school: Advances in theory, evaluation and practice*. Copenhagen: Danish University of Education Press.

Delors, J. (1996). *Learning: The treasure within*. Paris: International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century, UNESCO.

Department for Education (2005). *Social and emotional aspects of learning: Improving behaviour, improving learning*. Accessed 25 November 2014, from: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ 20110809101133/nsonline.org.uk/node/87009.

Department for Education (2011). *Permanent and fixed period exclusions from schools and exclusion appeals in England, 2011/12*. Accessed 25 July 2014, from: https://www.gov.uk/government/ uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/ 224893/SFR29–2013.pdf

Dobia, B., Bodkin-Andrews, G., Parada, R., O'Rourke, V., Gilbert, S., Daley, A. & Roffey, S. (2013). *Aboriginal girls circle: Enhancing connectedness and promoting resilience for Aboriginal girls*. Accessed 24 September 2014, from: www.napcan.org.au/wordpress/wp.../08/ AGC-Evaluation_Final-Report.pdf

Doidge, N. (2007). *The brain that changes itself: Stories of personal triumph from the frontiers of brain science*. New York: Viking.

Durlak, J.A., Weissberg, R.P., Dymnicki, A.B., Taylor, R.D. & Schellinger, K.B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development, 82*(1), 405–432.

Dweck, C.S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. New York: Random House.

Scottish Health Promoting Schools Unit (2004). *Being well – doing well: A framework for health promoting schools in Scotland*. Accessed 25 July 2014, from: http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/images/ Beingwelldoingwell_tcm4-121991.pdf

Fredrickson, B. (2009). *Positivity*. New York: Crown Publishers.

Galton, M. & McBeath, J. (2008). *Teachers under pressure*. London: Sage.

Glasgow City Council. (undated). *How nurturing is our school? A self-evaluation tool based on nurturing principles*. Glasgow: Author.

Goleman. D. (1996). *Emotional intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Fullan, M, (2002). Beyond instructional leadership. *Educational Leadership, 59*(8), 16–21.

Green, H., McGinnity, A., Meltzer, H., Ford, T. & Goodman, R. (2004). *Mental health of children and young people in Great Britain. Office for National Statistics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Greenfield, S. (2010). *The future of the brain, the brain of the future: Summary*. Athens Dialogues. Science and Ethics. Period One. Accessed 8 July 2014, from: http://athensdialogues.chs.harvard.edu/ cgi-bin/WebObjects/athensdialogues.woa/ wa/dist?dis=13

Grossman, P., Neimann, L., Schmidt, S. & Walach, H. (2004.) Mindfulness-based stress reduction and health benefits: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 57*(1), 35–43.

Harris, J., Spina, N., Ehrich, L.C. & Smeed, J. (2013). *Literature review: Student-centred schools make the difference*. Melbourne: Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership.

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. London: Routledge.

Hill, V. (2013). *The medicalisation of childhood behaviours: The need for a paradigm shift.* Accessed 25 July 2014, from: https://www.bps.org.uk/.../conference_introduction_-_vivian_hill.pptx.

Huppert, F.A. & So, T.T.C (2011). Flourishing across Europe: application of a new conceptual framework for defining well-being. *Social Indices Research.* Accessed 7 July 2014, from: http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs11205-011-9966-7#page-1

Keyes, C. & Haidt, J. (Eds.) (2003). *Flourishing: Positive psychology and the life well-lived.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Lobo, I. (2008). Environmental influences on gene expression. *Nature Education, 1*(1), 39.

Lovewell, K. (2012). *Every teacher matters.* St Albans, Herts: Ecademy Press.

MacLure, M., Jones, L., Holmes, R. & MacRae, C. (2009). *Becoming a problem: How and why children acquire a reputation as 'naughty' in the earliest years at school.* Accessed 25 November 2014, from: http://www.esri.mmu.ac.uk/resprojects/reports/becomingaproblem.pdf

New Economics Foundation (2006). *Happy planet index.* Accessed 18 July 2014, from: http://www.happyplanetindex.org/data/

Noble, T., McGrath, H., Roffey, S. & Rowling, L. (2008). *Scoping study on approaches to student well-being.* Canberra: Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, Australia.

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education.* Advances in Contemporary Educational Thought series, Vol. 8. New York: Teachers College Press.

Office for National Statistics (2014). *Measuring national well-being: Life in the UK, 2014.* Accessed 25 July 2014, from: http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/well-being/measuring-national-well-being/life-in-the-uk-2014/index.html.

Prilleltensky, I. & Prilleltensky, O. (2006). *Promoting well-being: Linking personal, organisational and community change.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Roffey, S. & McCarthy, F. (2013). Circle solutions: A philosophy and pedagogy for learning positive relationships. What promotes and inhibits sustainable outcomes? *International Journal of Emotional Education, 5*(1), 36–55.

Roffey, S. (2007). Transformation and emotional literacy: The role of school leaders in developing a caring community. *Leading and Managing, 13*(1), 16–30.

Roffey, S. (2008). Emotional literacy and the ecology of school well-being. *Educational & Child Psychology, 25*(2), 29–39.

Roffey, S. (2010). Content and context for learning relationships: A cohesive framework for individual and whole school development. *Educational & Child Psychology, 27*(1), 156–167.

Roffey, S. (2011). *Changing behaviour in schools: Promoting positive relationships and well-being.* London: Sage.

Roffey, S. (2013). Inclusive and exclusive belonging: the impact on individual and community well-being. *Educational & Child Psychology, 30*(1), 38–49.

Roffey. S. (2012). Teacher well-being, pupil well-being: Two sides of the same coin. *Educational & Child Psychology, 29*(4), 8–17.

Sarra, C. (2014). *Which is more important for our kids – making them stronger or smarter?* Accessed 26 July 2014, from: http://chrissarra.wordpress.com/

Seligman, M.E.P. (20011). *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being.* Sydney: Random House.

Spratt, J., Shucksmith, J., Philip, K. & Watson, C. (2006). Part of who we are as a school should include responsibility for well-being: Links between the school environment, mental health and behaviour. *Pastoral Care*, September, 14–21.

The Children's Society (2013). *The good childhood report.* Accessed 25 July 2013, from: http://www.childrenssociety.org.uk/what-we-do/research/well-being/good-childhood-report-2013

Traxson, D. (2014). *Using ethical guidelines to effectively challenge over-prescribing psychotropics for children.* Accessed 24 September 2014, from: http://dxsummit.org/archives/2242

van Dellen, A., Blakemore, C., Deacon, R., York, D. & Hannan, A.J. (2000). Delaying the onset of Huntingdon's in mice. *Nature, 404*, 721–722.

Weare, K. & Gray, G. (2003). *What works in developing children's emotional and social well-being?* Research Report RR456. London: Department for Education and Skills.

Werner, E.E. (2004). What can we learn about resilience from large-scale longitudinal studies? In *Handbook of resilience in children.* New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

Wilkinson, R. & Pickett, K. (2010). *The spirit level: Why equality is better for everyone.* London: Penguin Books.

Wingspread Declaration on School Connections (2004). *Journal of School Health, 74*(7). Accessed 5 September 2014, from: http://www.umass.edu/schoolcounseling/NLC/page3/page20/assets/Wingspread%20Declaration%20on%20School%20Connections.pdf

Wyn, J., Cahill, H., Holdsworth, R., Rowling, L. & Carson, S. (2000). Mindmatters. A whole school approach promoting mental health and well-being. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 34*, 594–601.