Implementing a Whole-School Approach to Student Wellbeing: A Study Examining the Implementation Experiences of Bhutanese and Australian Teachers in Wellbeing Leadership Roles

Sangay Jamtsho

Submitted in total fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

April 2015

Melbourne Graduate School of Education,
The University of Melbourne

Abstract

Schools are ideal sites for the promotion of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that enhance personal as well as collective wellbeing. Schools engage in numerous programmes and activities for the wellbeing of students, including those that are identified as an integral aspect of learning in schools, and those which are seen as peripheral activities used to address distractions to the central aim of academic and intellectual development. This study explored the perceptions and experiences of key implementers in implementing a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion in secondary schools in Bhutan and Australia.

A whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion calls for student wellbeing promotion that is embedded in a school's policies, curriculum, structures, and practices, and as a shared responsibility of all stakeholders. Programmes that addressed the whole school have reported positive effects. However, implementation in schools has been reported to be very challenging as these programmes typically require fundamental changes in the ways in which schools operate and are organized. Very little research has been conducted investigating the experiences and the challenges that middle level leaders face at the school level when working towards a whole-school approach to wellbeing.

This study contributes to this gap in knowledge by drawing on the experiences of key implementers, whilst discussing their experiences in the context of research literature about student wellbeing and educational change. This study used a qualitative approach, conducting in-depth interviews to explore the experiences of people who were directly involved in implementation of student wellbeing programmes in schools. It involved participant groups from two very socio-economically and culturally different settings in Bhutan and Australia.

Findings suggest that key implementers in schools face numerous interconnected challenges in implementing a whole-school approach to student wellbeing. These challenges revolve around the three themes of meaning, culture, and time. The meaning ascribed to 'wellbeing' differed between the two settings with Bhutanese educators favouring an 'inside-out' understanding of wellbeing as developed through internal control, and the Australian educators favouring an 'outside-in' understanding of wellbeing as something fostered through the

relational environment. Key aspects of school organizational culture such as leadership, strategic and policy direction, organizational structure, and competing views and beliefs influenced the implementation of student wellbeing promotion. School cultures in relation to student wellbeing comprised of three themes of control, care, and wellbeing as integral to learning. Both parties favoured positioning wellbeing promotion as integral to education, however they identified that time constraints and lack of consensus about the importance of school-based efforts mean that schools defaulted to the use of reactive approaches. This was seen to be due in part to a lack of a shared valuing of wellbeing promotion as central to the school's business. Despite variations in the ways in which they manifest in the two school systems, the themes are found to be common across schools. While time constraint is expressed as a key concern, deeper analysis revealed more fundamental concerns relating to the issues of meaning and culture.

Literature on educational change identify the importance of a shared meaning or understanding to guide implementation of change (Fullan, 2009; Hargreaves, 2009); and define wellbeing or student wellbeing as all-encompassing of the various aspects of wellbeing (e.g., Evans & Prilleltensky, 2007; Awartani, Whitman, & Gordon, 2007). Findings from this study indicate that, in the case of student wellbeing promotion, finding a 'shared meaning' is very complex as student wellbeing is understood in a multitude of ways, often with seemingly dichotomous and conflicting views. Different definitions of wellbeing emphasize certain aspects and underplay others depending on contextual priorities, and individual as well as cultural dispositions.

Declaration

This is to certify that:

The Thesis comprises only my original work towards the Ph D.
Due acknowledgement has been made in the text to all other materials used.
The thesis is less than 100,000 words in length exclusive of tables, figures, bibliographies, and appendices.

Signed:

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I wish to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisors, Professor Johanna Wyn and Associate Professor Helen Cahill for their support and guidance throughout the process. I am truly thankful for their patience, wisdom, encouragement, and questions that allowed me to explore and exert myself.

I wish to thank Dr Ani Wierenga, and my Advisory Committee members, Associate Professor David Beckett and Dr Katie Wright for their support and guidance. My gratitude also goes to the two examiners for their thoughtful and helpful comments on the thesis.

I am indebted to the Melbourne Graduate School of Education, Melbourne University for granting me the scholarship without which doing this Ph. D. would have remained a dream. I am most grateful and feel deeply honoured for this wonderful opportunity to learn at a truly world-class educational institution. To all those at the Youth Research Centre, I thank you for all your kindness and support.

This study would not have been possible without the kindness of the participants who have given me their precious time despite their busy schedules. Your enthusiasm and candid sharing of experiences have truly inspired me to persevere, and helped me understand student wellbeing at a level much deeper than I could have imagined.

To my parents, who have endured difficult times to allow me to go to school, I am proud to report this milestone. I also wish to thank all my siblings, relatives, and friends for their support and good wishes.

To my dear wife Karma and son Khyenrab, thank you for being with me and enduring my shortcomings as a partner and parent the past several years. Finally, for Kezang, as the one who inspired me to pursue it and gave me a reason to persevere, this is for you.

Contents

CHAPTER 1. CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Wellbeing is a public concern. Governments across the globe are increasingly concerned about the wellbeing of its citizens and environment; and recognize the need to focus on national policies on promoting public wellbeing. Wellbeing is a private concern. We all seek a quality of life characterized by sound health, peace of mind, positive relationships, prosperity, and contentment. The desire for such a life is heightened by the fact that we live in increasingly consumerist societies that are fast-paced than ever before. Schools are recognized as ideal sites where enduring knowledge, skills, and attitudes that promote personal as well as collective wellbeing can be promoted. This study is about the promotion of student wellbeing along these lines; and in particular, an exploration of the challenges of implementing it in secondary schools.

This chapter sets out to do three things. First, it will briefly introduce the research project by outlining the rationale behind it and the purpose it seeks to serve. It also briefly introduces the key concepts and arguments that form the basis of the study. Next, it describes the two school systems in which this study was carried out, and the broader contextual settings within which they are embedded. Finally, a brief outline of the subsequent chapters that form the research report is provided.

The Research Project

This section defines the research problem and the purpose of this study. It includes a synopsis of the wellbeing and educational change implementation literature reviewed, identifying the key concepts in the existing literature that informed the study and its proposed contribution.

Statement of Problem

The promotion of student wellbeing covers a diverse range of programmes and activities that range from welfare services to life skills education; and from student management to student empowerment. Efforts to address wellbeing are sometimes recognized as an important and

integral aspect of school's responsibility. However, in other instances they are presumed to be peripheral activities, the chief function of which is to address distractions to the central aim of academic and intellectual development. A more recent development that holds promise is a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion. A whole-school approach calls for the inclusion of student wellbeing promotion in a school's policies, curriculum, structures, and practices; and making it a shared responsibility of all stakeholders.

In recent times, student wellbeing has been conceptualised as integral to education and as a form of learning in itself (for e.g., American School Counseling Association, 2005; de Jong & Kerr-Roubicek, 2007; Markham & Aveyard, 2003; Noddings, 2003; St. Leger, Young, Blanchard & Perry, 2010). There is a fast growing body of literature examining the promotion of student wellbeing in schools, but very little is written about the challenges of its implementation within schools, especially those using a whole-school approach.

There is now a growing body of research evidence pointing to the benefits of promoting student wellbeing, and outlining approaches that have been shown to be effective. For example, according to the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL, 2008), well-implemented programmes that emphasize acquisition of social and emotional competencies and supportive environments are found to decrease conduct problems, and emotional distress; while improving attitudes about self, others, and school, social and emotional skills, school and classroom behaviour, and academic achievement. Several reviews and research reports (e.g., Greenberg, Weissberg, Zins, Fredericks, & Elias, 2003; WHO, 2004a) provide evidence which suggests that programmes to promote student wellbeing are more likely to be effective when research evidence-based practices and a whole-school approach are being used. For instance, according to Greenberg, Domitrovich, and Bumbarger (2001), intervention programmes that focus on multiple domains (e.g., individual, school, and family) are effective in reducing psychological symptoms such as aggression, depression, and anxiety; and positively influence risk factors for child mental disorders. Universal prevention programmes that addressed the whole school showed positive effects on aggressive and disruptive behaviours in students (Wilson & Lipsey, 2007). System-wide change efforts that involved community, media, and family were found to have very positive impacts on student substance use (Tobler, Roona,

Ochshorn, Marshall, Streke, & Stackpole, 2000). Langford et al. (2014) in their systematic review of studies that used randomized control trials report positive effects of a whole-school approach in several areas of health. These findings are further elaborated in Chapter 3. Despite reports of their effectiveness, such programmes commonly involve fundamental changes to the ways in which schools operate and are organized (WHO, 1997), making them highly challenging to implement successfully.

Within the educational change literature, effective implementation or processes and practices at school level have been identified as a crucial factor for positive outcomes (for e.g., Fullan, 2005; Hopkins, 2001; McLaughlin, 2005). Gaining acceptance, development of capacity, and adequate support at the local level are identified as contributing to the effectiveness of implementation of educational change in general (Fullan, 2005). However, little has been written about the nature of the challenges that implementers face when acting at the school level. There are also very few studies that have used a qualitative approach to explore the experiences of people who are directly involved in implementation of student wellbeing programmes in schools. Even fewer have looked at participant groups across culturally different contextual settings. Indeed, one of the recommendations made by the Cochrane Review Report (Langford, et al., 2014), a systematic review of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing, is that there is a need for process evaluations that also collect rich contextual data to determine what works for whom, under what circumstances, and why. It is this gap in process knowledge that this study seeks to address by building on what is known from the research literature pertaining to student wellbeing and educational change; and drawing on the experiences of those who are directly involved in implementation.

Purpose and Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study is to gain a systematic and in-depth understanding of the challenges and opportunities that Student Wellbeing Leaders face in implementing a whole-school approach to student wellbeing. The Student Wellbeing Leaders, or key implementers referred to here are people in position of responsibility for student wellbeing in their schools. They primarily occupy middle-level leadership positions and directly deal with students as well as with school staff, parents, and community. The study uses a qualitative approach to facilitate

the understanding of the dynamics involved in the implementation processes. It is conducted in two socio-economically and culturally distinct settings to further facilitate an understanding of the extent to which there are similarities and differences in the experiences of implementation in different contexts.

This study explores the experiences and perspectives of Student Wellbeing Leaders as key implementers of student wellbeing programmes and activities in secondary schools within the Catholic Education system of Melbourne (CEOM) in Australia, and government secondary schools in Bhutan. It looks at their conceptions of student wellbeing, how they perceive their roles and responsibilities, and what they see as the key drivers, barriers, and facilitators of student wellbeing promotion. The main focus of this study is to investigate the challenges and opportunities of implementing a whole-school approach to student wellbeing programmes as experienced by key implementers. The two school systems are not only culturally and socio-economically distinct, but they also vary substantially in the duration of their exposure and experiences of implementing a whole-school approach. These two contexts provide an opportunity to study key variables of implementation under different contexts and conditions. The study draws on available research-based knowledge on wellbeing and educational change to explore the subject.

Findings from this study will enable schools and education policy-makers to understand the nuances involved in school-level implementation of student wellbeing promotion, most notably the challenges faced by key implementers in the practice of a whole-school approach. Whereas a whole-school approach to implementation holds great promise as it promotes a holistic and integrated approach to education that is most likely to be sustainable; and the literature on educational change implementation identify several factors that influence effective implementation; not enough is known of how intervention and contextual variables interact to create opportunities and challenges. This is particularly true of the implementation of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing.

In exploring the challenges that key implementers experience in the light of what is known in existing literature, this study also hopes to bridge knowledge gaps, where they exist,

between academic research and practitioner experiences. For instance, the whole-school approach literature outlines key areas of intervention, while educational change literature propose action theories for effective implementation. But the question remains: *How do key implementers perceive and experience these in their everyday practice?*

Key Concepts and Definition of Terms Used

This section defines some of the key terms and concepts used in the study. These are further elaborated in the subsequent chapters that review the literature.

Wellbeing: In this study wellbeing is conceptualized as consisting of multiple and inter-related dimensions operating at individual, relational, and collective levels. It is as much an individual as it is a societal aspiration, and hence education is a key mechanism through which wellbeing can be promoted in effective and sustainable ways. Schools, therefore, represent an important site for promoting wellbeing, whether it is to address their personal wellbeing or to prepare them as agents of societal change.

Student Wellbeing Promotion: Consistent with the view that wellbeing consists of the individual, relational, and collective dimensions, student wellbeing promotion refers to the practice of promoting these in schools through its policies, the ways in which they are organized, and teaching and learning of knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be well.

Whole-school approach: It is an approach to promotion of student wellbeing that involves all the members of the school community (students, staff, parents, and community); works across all the areas of school life (curriculum, culture, teaching practices, policies and procedures); engages all key learning areas and all year levels; and uses multiple (evidence-based) strategies that have a unifying purpose, and reflect a common set of values (CEOM, 2008). This approach sees wellbeing as an integral part of school's mission and recognizes its contribution to student achievement, and school's responsibility to facilitate the all-round development of children.

Student Wellbeing Leader: For the purpose of this study, 'Student Wellbeing Leaders' refer to those who are in charge of implementing wellbeing programmes and activities in schools. They are also referred to as 'key implementers' as is briefly described above. Their roles range from teaching and coordinating or leading, providing consultations, liaising with parents and community agencies, to providing mediation, guidance and counselling services. They go by various titles such as student wellbeing coordinator, deputy or assistant principal (student wellbeing), or year-level coordinator in the case of CEOM; and school guidance counsellor, teacher-counsellor, or school counsellor in Bhutan's case.

Context of the Study

The data for this study was collected from four public secondary schools in Bhutan and four secondary schools in the Archdiocese of Melbourne (CEOM) in 2010. The following section describes the context and provides relevant background information on the two school systems. It is important to understand the broader contexts within which the study is carried out as it is only through this that the perspectives and experiences of participants can be best understood and interpreted. The participants for this study represent two very geographically, socio-economically, and culturally distinct settings; and it is only through an understanding of the broader social contexts, and locating the problem that motivated the study within this context that the implementation of student wellbeing can be best understood and appreciated.

Education and Student Wellbeing in Bhutan

Bhutan is a landlocked kingdom in the Himalayas sandwiched between the two Asian giants of China and India with an area of 38,394 sq. km. It has a population of 708,265 of which 173,947 are school children (National Statistics Bureau, 2011). Bhutan's literacy rate stood at 59.5% in 2005 (Ministry of Education/ MoE, 2011).

Education in Bhutan

Formal education institutes in Bhutan can be traced back to 12th century in the form of Buddhist monastic education (Phuntsho, 2011). The Modern or Westernized secular system of

education in Bhutan began sometime in 1914-15 when the first King of Bhutan established a school (Tashi, 2012). As of 2011, there were 666 schools and institutes with 182,462 students (MoE, 2011). Education in public schools is fully state-funded; all policies, curricula and assessment are centrally regulated and administered by the MoE including appointments of principals and teachers.

Bhutan's Education system has not only seen rapid growth in numbers but also in quality. The first major reform in Bhutan's Education system was the introduction of the New Approach to Primary Education (NAPE) which began in 1986. The focus of this reform was on the introduction of an activity and inquiry-based approach to learning. It represented a shift from the traditional rote-learning to learning by doing and understanding; and most notably the inclusion of indigenous content in the social sciences moving away from the dependence on imported curricula and textbooks. Since the late 1990s, Bhutan's Education system focussed on promoting "wholesome education" to emphasize all-round development of school children (UNESCO, 2011). A recent initiative is the 'Education for GNH' (E4GNH), which attempts to align the Education system with the national development philosophy of Gross National Happiness (GNH), and has significant relevance to student wellbeing.

GNH as a development policy seeks to integrate sustainable and equitable economic development with environmental conservation, good governance, and preservation and promotion of the country's culture and traditions. The commitment to GNH is enshrined in the Constitution under Article 9, and it states that "The State shall strive to promote those conditions that will enable the pursuit of Gross National Happiness." The Planning Commission of Bhutan (1999) in its guiding document *Bhutan 2020: A vision for Peace, Prosperity, and Happiness* has articulated maximizing GNH as the unifying concept for development for Bhutan. The GNH index that comprise of nine domains and 33 indicators is used to measure changes in statistically robust ways for public action (Ura, Alkire & Zangmo, 2012).

Student Wellbeing in Bhutan
Since the late 1990s, as part of the promotion of "wholesome education", schools saw the introduction of programmes such as the comprehensive health programme, values education,

reproductive health and population education, career guidance and counselling (UNESCO, 2011). Prior to this, promotion of student wellbeing was mainly concerned with nutrition, physical fitness, sanitation, and spiritual wellbeing. School Feeding Programme supported by the World Food Programme to ensure adequate nutrition, periodic health check-ups, regular cleaning and gardening work by students, daily prayer periods are some examples that still continue. Extra-curricular activities involving performing arts, and games and sports are viewed as important for health and physical development as well as development of social skills. Many schools have also taken up social work and community service in recent years as part of extra-curricular and club activities.

The school guidance and counselling programme began in 1996 when the Youth Guidance and Counselling Division was first established within the Ministry of Education. Two of its main concerns were providing career guidance and counselling services in the face of rising youth employment and other youth issues such as substance abuse particularly in urban areas (Mittra & Kumar, 2004). Primary among its activities over the years was the training of in-service teachers as school counsellors who can teach the guidance and career education curriculum, and provide counselling services in schools.

In 2009, Bhutan launched the *Education for GNH* (E4GNH) initiative with a series of workshops involving experts, and education leaders and principals. In his Opening Address to the first "Workshop on Educating for GNH", then Prime Minister of Bhutan, Lyonpo Jigme Thinley said:

> To be honest, we spent some years shying away from the responsibility of presenting GNH in acceptable terms and translating it amply into practical action by simply taking refuge in the vision, concept, and the term itself. I now know that this option no longer exists. …And I am absolutely convinced that there is no more effective, comprehensive and far-reaching way to put GNH fully into practice and to realize our shared vision and goals – not in a frustratingly piecemeal way but so that our collective national consciousness naturally translates into enlightened action – than to infuse our education system fully and properly with the humane and ecological principles and values of Gross National Happiness (Royal Government of Bhutan, 2009, p.2).

This statement underscores the importance of transforming the Education system to embody and reflect the GNH values and principles, and the use of a holistic approach to ensure that GNH as a guiding development philosophy can flourish. GNH values and principles must be "rooted in their consciousness" if, as citizens and leaders of the future, in order for them to be able to act "wisely to balance economic development with environmental conservation, cultural dynamism, and good governance" (Hayward, Pannozzo & Colman, 2009, p.vi). Hence, the goal of a GNH-based education is to develop an educated populace with the wisdom to create and nurture a healthy and sustainable society. The following excerpt summarises the shape a GNH-based education will take:

> Bhutan's entire educational system will effectively cultivate GNH principles and values, including deep critical and creative thinking, ecological literacy, practice of the country's profound, ancient wisdom and culture, contemplative learning, a holistic understanding of the world, genuine care for nature and for others, competency to deal effectively with the modern world, preparation for right livelihood, and informed civic engagement (Ministry of Education, 2010, p.9).

A series of workshops involving educationists and experts from diverse disciplines, and teachers have been carried out to educate teachers and get schools to work towards this end. Some prominent activities that can be observed across schools as a result of this initiative are practice of mindfulness meditation, greening the school environment, care of the surrounding natural environment, community service, and efforts to integrate GNH values into academic subjects. In his opening address at a conference of principals and educationists, Prime Minister Jigme Thinley emphasized that "infusing GNH into the education system is not adding a new subject but enriching learning, and improving the *process* of education. It has to do with creating a context and an *approach* that infuses a GNH consciousness into everything that is learned" (Hayward & Colman, 2010, p.222). This statement underscores the importance of schools as settings where GNH is 'lived', and not just talked about. Education for GNH can, therefore, be viewed as a turning point in the approach to the promotion of student wellbeing in that it emphasize a holistic approach.

Policy framework and structure

There is no clear strategic framework document for student wellbeing promotion. However, there are some guidelines issued by the Ministry of Education such as the *Curriculum Framework for School Guidance and Career Education*, and *Educating for Gross National Happiness: Refining Our School Practices* (Department of Curriculum & Research, 2010). Following spates of growing concerns over disciplinary issues in schools, *Guidelines for School Discipline Policy*, was introduced in 2012 (Ministry of Education, 2012). The Education Monitoring and Support Division (EMSD, 2010) has come up with a school self-assessment guide *Towards Educating for GNH – A Guide to School Self-Assessment Tool and School Improvement Plan* that can be used for school improvement planning. It identifies six key operational areas of (a) Leadership and management practice; (b) Green school (school physical and psycho-social environment); (c) Curriculum (teaching and classroom management practices); (d) Continuous and holistic student assessment; (e) Co-curricular activities for wholesome development; and (f) School-community relationship that can be assessed to determine a school's progress.

The Department of Youth and Sports (DYS) is primarily responsible for promotion of student wellbeing related programmes and activities such as school guidance and counselling including career education, comprehensive school health, life skills education, scouts programme, and games and sports activities. However, the recent Educating for GNH initiative is coordinated by the Education Monitoring and Support Division within the Department of School Education.

Secondary schools typically have committees for academics and student services, usually headed by vice-principals. Student wellbeing related programmes and activities fall within the realm of student services. Most schools have a school guidance counsellor who is also a teacher. Teachers also take on other wellbeing related responsibilities such as being the school health in-charge, or the coordinator for club activities that promote student activities in their interest areas including community social work. Each school has an E4GNH focal person who is trained to take the lead role in promoting E4GNH in his or her school.

Programmes and strategies

Current student wellbeing related practices include school health education programmes addressing sanitation, reproductive health, and sexually-transmitted diseases (STD); school feeding and agriculture programme, school guidance and counselling including career education; life-skills education; values education; mindful meditation, religious discourses and daily prayers; and physical education mainly addressed through school games and sports activities. Many of these constitute extra-curricular activities, and quite often are restricted to a smaller group than the whole school. For example, only students with problems may avail counselling services, and as sports tend to be competitive, only those who are good at it may avail the opportunities especially where schools are large. Values education, career guidance and life skills education are mandated but often considered optional in practice dictated by the challenges of an already crowded curriculum and shortage of appropriately trained personnel to teach them.

The introduction of E4GNH has given some impetus to the recognition of the importance to spiritual, environmental, social, and emotional wellbeing as integral to learning. The daily practice of mindful meditation and use of circle time, and greening the school environment has been made part of school activities and are practised almost on a daily basis.
Teachers are encouraged to integrate and infuse GNH values into academic subjects, and this is facilitated through workshops at various levels. Several programmes such as values education, health education, physical education, life skills education, and guidance and career education have been introduced into schools, but these tend to be subject to school's preferences and availability of resources including personnel, and not a standard practice across the board. The school guidance and counselling including career education form one of the main wellbeing programmes in secondary schools. Despite the numerous student wellbeing-related programmes, there is no comprehensive overarching policy framework that links the goals and objectives to related programmes and services.

Whereas the Ministry of Education through its divisions such as the Education Monitoring and Support Division and the Policy and Planning Division collect data that are both quantitative and qualitative in nature, there are no published sources that report the measurement of the effectiveness of student wellbeing programmes and services. Such evidence or data

through programme and service evaluations will be important to drive a planned and systematic programme of continuous improvement.

The DYS has over the years provided several short training programmes and workshops for teachers in various areas of wellbeing such as career guidance and counselling, health education, life skills development, parent education, and religious discourses and meditation. Teachers are also being sponsored to take accredited programmes at diploma level in school guidance and counselling. These trained teachers are expected to take on the roles of school counsellors. However, deployment and implementation has been problematic as they are also usually required to teach at least one academic subject.

Schools seek community participation in student wellbeing through Parent Teacher Meetings that take place every semester or annually, and through a parenting education programme that many schools have, supported by the DYS. Many secondary schools have community service and social work oriented clubs some of which are associated with non-profit civil society organizations. Schools also carry out awareness raising programmes, cleaning campaigns, and social work in the community.

Student wellbeing issues and challenges

Beyond the sound aspirations aligned with the national goal of GNH, the main challenge is in translating the aspirations into actions at the school level. Establishing an education system that is consistent with the GNH will require much more than explicitly stated and documented GNH ideas. It will need to address the basic structures, policies, curricula, teaching-learning methods, and the learning environment amongst other things. For instance, with the aim of implementing E4GNH system-wide, the Ministry of Education set itself the ambitious goal of having all the teachers trained in providing "GNH-inspired Education" in three years' time, and all school principals in one year's time (MoE, 2010). While the target of providing training to all may be met, the extent to which the ideas are assimilated, and thereby successfully implemented across the system is debatable. As critical as teachers are in bringing about this change, without similarly concerted efforts at changing other important elements such the policies, structures,

curriculum, and support systems including parents and the community, achieving a truly GNH-inspired education will be incomplete.

There are numerous student wellbeing-related challenges that will need to be addressed starting with the basic needs of safe drinking water and nutrition (Pelden, 2011; Tshering, 2012). According to the Ministry of Education's annual report for 2011, nearly 40% of the schools reported that they did not have sufficient water supply (MoE, 2011). Nutritional neuropathy related death and sickness has been reported in some schools (Pelden, 2012).

The grade repetition and dropout rates have consistently peaked in classes IV and VII over the years indicating transition issues as most schools terminate at grade III and grade VI, thus requiring many children to travel longer distances the following year to their new schools or live away from home for the first time in their lives. Simultaneously, they also experience the added stress of being introduced to additional subjects to learn (MoE, 2011), and very likely a change in school culture. Dorji, Dema, and Penjore (2005) based on their interviews with young people across the country, report that broken families, financial hardships, substance abuse, teenage pregnancy, punitive discipline both at home and school, and lack of interest in school work were among the common reasons cited for dropping out of school. Media reports suggest a rise in suicide rates among students and young people (Pelden, 2010). Students constituted 13.1% of psychiatric patients at Thimphu referral hospital diagnosed as suffering from mental and behavioural disorders due to psychoactive substance use, mainly alcohol use, of which most of them fell in the age bracket of 10-19 years old (Pelzang, 2012).

The recent onslaught of social media pose massive challenges to student wellbeing, particularly in the absence of any preparations such as through media literacy in schools. Internet and Television came to Bhutan only at the turn of the century. While it comes with the boon of knowledge, information, and exposure to the outside world in ample supply, it also comes with underlying beliefs, assumptions, and value systems that may not be consistent with the local culture and GNH values. This is likely to raise a host of hitherto little known wellbeing issues such as those related to body image, dietary habits, and cyber-bullying. The influence of mass media currently dominated by foreign content on culture, for instance, may be far stronger than

what schools can offer and are able to deal with at this point. Wierenga and Stokes (2006) in their Report commissioned by the Ministry of Education and Youth Development Fund (Bhutan) point out that there is a clear need to counter the negative influence of mass media and materialism, while exploring ways of nurturing and sustaining their sense of culture, spirituality, and national identity.

These indicate huge responsibilities and challenges for schools to be able to live up to E4GNH ideals, and suggests that more needs to be done in the area of student wellbeing. It is also apparent that interventions in school alone may not be sufficient to address these. It calls for a more holistic approach that is proactive and involvement of all stakeholders.

Education and Student Wellbeing: Catholic Education in Melbourne

The state of Victoria is located in the south-eastern part of Australia with an area of 237,629 sq. km, and about six times bigger than Bhutan. Melbourne is the capital and the largest city; and it is about six times more populated than Bhutan with a population close to four and half million.

Education in Victoria

Victoria has three school systems: Government, Catholic, and Independent schools. All schools receive public funding, and are required to comply with government-set curriculum standards. Victoria's school education system is made up of 2,239 schools: 1538 government schools; 486 catholic schools; and 215 independent schools (Department of Education and Early Childhood Development/ DEECD, 2011a). Catholic schools account for 21% of secondary students in all of Australian schools (Australian Bureau of Statistics/ ABS, 2012). Catholic Education in Victoria has been in existence for nearly one and half century (Sheehan, 2004).

The Catholic Education in Victoria is governed by the Catholic Education Commission of Victoria (CECV). Catholic schools are established under the authority of the Bishop of their diocese. The Catholic Education Office of Melbourne is one of the four dioceses in Victoria. The Catholic Education receives Commonwealth and State Government grants, and schools are

bound by the Acts and regulations of both Commonwealth and Victorian Parliaments, the authority of the Victorian Minister for Education and bodies such as the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority (VCAA) which regulates the Victorian Certificate of Education (VCE) and the Victorian Essential Learning Standards (VELS). However, schools have considerable autonomy in developing appropriate curriculum and structures that best suit their community and circumstances. School principals are appointed by a group of parish priests (called canonical administrators), or the religious order that owns the school. Most parishes have an Education or School Board that advises on the school's operation.

Catholic education is the Catholic Church's commitment to schooling which integrates religious and general education. The Catholic schools' purpose is "to meet the educational and spiritual needs of individual students, to develop in them the Christian identity of which Christ is the foundation" (CECV, 2005, p.2). It states that the values taught and practiced by Christ such as love, justice, freedom, compassion, hope and forgiveness should inform and enrich every aspect of school life. Schools aim to actively and systematically promote faith development of students in their day-to-day activities, and through provision of religious education programmes.

Student Wellbeing in Melbourne Catholic Schools

Catholic education has a long tradition of pastoral care that began with faith-based moral welfare but has now come to encompass all aspects of student wellbeing (Hearn, Campbell-Pope, House, & Cross, 2006). Wellbeing in Catholic schools in Melbourne "incorporates all aspects of school community life from students' physical, intellectual, moral, social, emotional and spiritual wellbeing and development to the safe and supportive environment in which they learn" (CEOM, 2009a).

The CEOM approach to student wellbeing has been largely shaped by a number of studies and National as well as State Government policy frameworks in addition to the Christian values. Promotion of student wellbeing as it is practiced in CEOM schools today is a result of a series of efforts that followed the Victorian Government Suicide Prevention Taskforce Report (1997). This Report made a series of recommendations on the identification of risk factors, strategies for prevention, early intervention, intervention, and post-vention. It identified a

number of social factors (e.g. social adaptability, family and peer relationships, child abuse, and unemployment) and six protective factors that are important to be addressed. The six protective factors included minimising family stress, strengthening family relationships, ensuring a relationship with at least one competent caring adult, promoting a sense of belonging at school, positive social and problem solving skills, and fostering a sense of spiritual and communal belonging. The Report highlighted the important role of schools and the inextricable link between educational attainment and the welfare of students. The Task Force advocated a holistic approach to young people's needs and a well-defined school welfare strategy which provided positive learning outcomes, enhanced social and emotional health of students, and better links with other professionals and support services, while pointing out how ill-prepared and under-resourced schools were for this task. This was corroborated by the Youth Homelessness Report (Chamberlain & Mackenzie, 1998) that audited the provision of student welfare in Victorian Catholic and Government schools. This report highlighted the lack of confidence and competence in schools to address student welfare needs, and the urgent need for professional development of teachers who can address the needs. Soon after this, *The Welfare Needs of Victorian Catholic Schools,* a study commission by CECV in 2003 investigated the nature, range and impact of the welfare issues in Catholic schools. This study reported that schools are required to respond to a very broad range of welfare problems, and identified five 'priority' issues that needed to be addressed: learning problems, mental health, family problems, social health, and staff wellbeing (Cahill, Wyn & Smith, 2004).

Policy frameworks and structure

CEOM student wellbeing is driven by a set of policy frameworks with resource support from both federal and state levels. Its commitment to student wellbeing is manifest in the identification of student wellbeing as one of the five key spheres for learning in their *School Improvement Framework* (CEOM, 2006b); and more recently as a priority area in its *Learning Centred Schools, a Sacred Landscape: Learning and Teaching Framework and Strategy 2009-2013* (CEOM, 2009a). Both the documents highlight the importance of student wellbeing promotion as an integral aspect of school learning. The *Pastoral Care of Students in Catholic Schools* as a policy document outlines the key principles, procedures, and guidelines for student wellbeing. Other examples of policies related to student wellbeing include the *Drug Issues in*

Catholic Schools policy, and the *Mandatory Reporting of Child Physical and Sexual Abuse* policy. The *CEOM Student Wellbeing Strategy 2011–2015*, launched in 2010, supports the development of a strong culture of wellbeing to promote learning; and identifies three key areas as central to aligning student wellbeing, and teaching and learning at the school level:

(a) Leading wellbeing to enhance learning, acknowledging the critical role of school leaders in developing a wellbeing culture;

(b) Creating safe and supportive learning environments, focusing on a wide range of school structures, processes and procedures; and

(c) Promoting school community partnerships, acknowledging the role of school in reaching out to broader community to build diverse and inclusive partnerships for learning (CEOM, 2010).

Several national policy frameworks exist to guide the CEOM approach to student wellbeing. The *National Health Promoting Schools Framework* (CDFHS & AHPSA, 1997) is a framework to guide interaction between various sectors and levels, both government and non-government, to guide policy, planning, infrastructure development, programmes, and initiatives to promote the health of children and young Australians. Drawing on this framework, CEOM advocates a whole-school approach that addresses the three key components of school life: (a) Curriculum, teaching, and learning; (b) School organization, ethos, and environment; and (c) Partnerships and services. Another important framework that addresses aspects of student wellbeing is the *National Safe Schools Framework* (MCTEEYA, 2003), initiated by the Commonwealth Government to ensure that all Australian schools are safe and supportive environments. It addresses the issues associated with bullying, harassment, violence, child abuse, and neglect. Other national initiatives such as the *National Framework for Values Education*, and the *National School Drug Education Strategy* also provide guidelines as well as resource support to schools.

All Catholic schools are expected to develop their own "Pastoral care and related policies and procedures in areas such as special needs provision, student behaviour code, student behaviour management, safe school environment (anti-bullying), and critical incident management"; that are consistent with the principles expressed in the CEOM policy statement,

and compliant with other relevant legal requirements (CEOM, 2009a). The guiding principles for behaviour management in Catholic schools also recommend a whole-school approach with a focus on personal resilience, student connectedness and engagement, and use of restorative practices.

The CEOM Student Wellbeing Unit (SWU) which reports to the Assistant Director, Religious Education and Pastoral Care is the body responsible for supporting and empowering school communities in the area of student wellbeing. Its central aim is "to strategically build capacity and confidence in teachers and school leaders to implement whole-school approaches to student wellbeing with a focus on school improvement and enhanced learning outcomes" (CEOM, 2009b). The SWU provides support, information, and guidance to members of school communities in a wide range of areas including school attendance, anti-bullying, behaviour management, conflict management, family-school collaboration, student health, safety, resilience, suspension, expulsion, negotiated transfer, mandatory reporting, child protection and grief and loss (CEOM, 2009b).

Secondary schools are typically structured with two broad divisions of curriculum and instruction, and student wellbeing each headed by a deputy principal. They are supported by student wellbeing coordinators, school counsellors, school nurses, year-level coordinators, and the home-room teachers. All schools have a School Wellbeing Core Team, and about 80% of the Student Wellbeing Leaders have been appointed to school leadership teams (CEOM, 2011). Student wellbeing clusters, consisting of a group of schools support each other through the provision of ongoing professional learning and strategic planning and implementation at the local level. Each cluster has a Cluster Convenor who liaises with the CEOM Facilitators to progress the work of the cluster. Clusters require schools to work together to help build new relationships and networks of support including strengthened connections with the community, and facilitate sharing of good practices as well as resources.

Programmes and strategies

CEOM has adopted a whole-school approach that emphasize professional development; linking wellbeing to curriculum, teaching, and learning; proactive programmes; and partnerships and collaborations as the key aspects of their wellbeing strategy.

One of the key features of the CEOM approach is the investment in professional development of its teachers and school leaders. In response to the Suicide Prevention Task Force Report (1997) which pointed out how ill-prepared schools were to meet student wellbeing needs, the *Youth Services Strategy* (YSS) was designed to enhance teacher confidence and competence in providing preventative and early intervention strategies to enhance student wellbeing. This was done by investing in professional development of its teachers and school leaders in partnership with the University of Melbourne to train teachers and school leaders through a programme aimed at promoting a preventative, whole-school approach to take on proactive leadership roles, and engage in reflective practice (Freeman & Strong, 2004). The CECV-University of Melbourne partnership funded by the Victorian Government began in 1999 with a two-year Postgraduate Diploma in Educational Studies (Student Welfare) with the objective of maximizing the capacities of those sponsored to contribute to long-term and sustainable change in the Catholic education (Cahill, Wyn & Shaw, 2004). By 2005, more than 55% of Victorian Catholic schools (over 80% of secondary and approximately 50% of primary schools) had engaged a teacher in this programme, and 70% of the enrolled teachers held a leadership position related to student wellbeing in their schools (CEOM, 2006a). The course was upgraded to a Master of Education (Student Wellbeing) in 2006.

Each year, CEOM also provides two days of central Professional Learning for Student Wellbeing Leaders to enable them to network, share good practices, and develop skills and understandings relevant to their work.

One of the three strands or areas of learning in the Victorian Essential Learning Standards (VELS) is the Physical, Personal and Social Learning in which students learn about themselves and their place in society; how to stay healthy and active; develop social relationship-building and team-work skills; take responsibility for their learning; and learn about their rights and

responsibilities as global citizens (Victorian Curriculum & Assessment Authority, 2007). Schools also have access to Federal Government funded programmes such as the *MindMatters*. MindMatters is a mental health and wellbeing promotion initiative for secondary schools that uses a whole-school approach. It comes with a curriculum resource kit, and professional development support for teachers.

CEOM initiated *Social Emotional Learning* (SEL) in 2006 recognizing the strong links between social and emotional skills and student learning outcomes. SEL is defined as the "process for integrating thinking, feeling and behaviour to achieve important social/life tasks, meet personal and social needs and develop the skills necessary to become a productive, contributing member of society" (CEOM, 2009a). A core component of the SEL strategy is to ensure that the interpersonal development and personal learning domains of the VELS is promoted and taught both explicitly and implicitly across all levels of schooling (CEOM, 2006a). Schools are supported in this by the SWU through facilitation of professional learning sessions and resources.

CEOM supports schools to adopt *Restorative Practice* which is "an approach to promoting resilience, and aims to contribute to the building of positive relationships in school communities. It is focused on helping young people become aware of the impact of their behaviour on others through personal accountability and learning from a conflict situation. An important component of restorative practices is the focus on restoring relationships after harm has been done" (CEOM, 2007c, p.2). Schools have been supported to implement restorative practices since 2002 through professional learning opportunities. Schools are also supported with trained personnel to provide counselling and psychological services both within the school as well as through referrals to external agencies. Schools also have protocols or procedures for management of critical incidents; and policies specifying duty of care.

Partnerships and collaboration is another important feature of CEOM student wellbeing programme. CEOM (2009a) states that, "Fostering community development and partnerships is integral to an effective wellbeing strategy. Partnerships engender support for the development and wellbeing of young people and their families and serve to maximise student engagement and

achievement." One initiative along this line is the *Schools as Core Social Centres* (SACSC) project established in 2002 funded by the Victorian Health Promotion Foundation (VicHealth) to develop a strategic approach to school improvement with emphasis on wellbeing and school-community partnerships. The SACSC initiative has the five key outcome areas of (a) impact on learning outcomes; (b) attitudes to school, including student management; (c) parent connectedness; (d) social emotional learning; and (e) community partnerships. Data collected in relation to each of the areas showed improvements in all the five key areas (CEOM, 2007b). Yet another example is the Student Wellbeing Action Partnership (SWAP), a partnership project between the CEOM and the Education faculty at the University of Melbourne. It presents teachers, school leaders and the wider education community with articles, resources, multimedia content and research about student wellbeing in Victorian schools.

The *School Focused Youth Service* (SFYS) programme is aimed at strengthening partnerships between communities and schools to improve links between health and welfare services so that all children and young people are supported to have every opportunity to succeed. The DEECD funds local government, community health, and youth service organisations to manage the programme, which support children and young people who are vulnerable and at risk of disengagement from school. Through yet another project called *Celebrating Inclusion within Catholic School Communities,* CEOM addresses the needs of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CALD) students; and seeks to improve transition and engagement practices for all students; and build positive partnerships with parents and community agencies.

Student wellbeing issues and challenges

Cahill, Wyn, and Smith (2004) identified five key wellbeing issues that were "high on frequency and impact and low on adequacy of resourcing" in Victorian Catholic schools:

a) Learning problems, particularly those related to literacy and numeracy, and the lack of alternatives for troubled and less academically-inclined students in secondary schools;

b) Mental health problems especially affective disorders (e.g. depression, anxiety) and conduct-related disorders (e.g., ADHD, Autism, conduct disorders, etc);

c) Family problems such as family break up, mental illness, suicide, gambling, violence, and drug and alcohol problems;

d) Social health, particularly the prevalence of bullying, negative or defiant classroom behaviours; and

e) Staff wellbeing related to staff mental health and burnout due to overwork, and poor class management and relationship skills in relation to their potential impact on students.

They report concerns regarding resourcing issues both in terms of expertise and time to address more challenging mental health issues (e.g. Asperger's syndrome, Autism, ADHD, etc.); family problems (e.g. family breakdown, substance abuse, domestic violence, etc.); and time constraints teachers faced to focus on curriculum and teaching having to deal with student welfare problems, and the subsequent impact of fatigue and burnout.

Similarly, the *State of Victoria's Children 2010/ SOVC* (DEECD, 2011b) identifies a number of wellbeing issues such as school connectedness, bullying, access to mental health services, and substance use among young people in Victoria. More than a quarter of Victorian young people reported enjoying school only sometimes (28.9%); and 14% reported as rarely if ever enjoying school. Bullying appears to be a major wellbeing issue. Nearly half (49.2%) of Victorian young people aged 12-14 years, and 39.7% of 15-17 years old experienced bullying; and 15.2% of all 12-17 year olds reported having been bullied or harassed at school on most days. With the new media technology becoming a part of everyday life, cyber-bullying is believed to be on the rise. About 14.2% of young people aged 12-17 years have used or believe they have a need of mental health professionals, but a quarter of these young people feel that they cannot access mental health services if needed due to perceived barriers such as cost, confidentiality and accessibility.

Substance abuse represent a serious threat to student wellbeing in Victoria. According to the *SOVC* 2010, alcohol consumption appears to be a more common threat to student wellbeing than other substances. About three in five (59.8%) report to have consumed alcohol at least once, and 37.7% had consumed alcohol over the past month. One in four young people aged 12–17 years report having smoked tobacco at least once. Of the 11.5 per cent of Victorian young people who smoked over the last year, about a third (29.9%) smoked regularly, and more than half of

these regular smokers smoked on a daily basis, although the proportion of young people who are regular smokers had decreased over the past decade. They also report use of illegal drugs but to a much lesser extent. These include use of cannabis or marijuana (9.6 %), glue sniffing (7.5%), and other illicit drugs (2.8%) at least once.

The CEOM schools also collect useful data on student wellbeing concerns as part of the School Improvement Framework, to inform their programmes and activities. These are, however, not publicly available.

Similarities and Differences in the Two Contexts

The two school systems come from very distinct contexts - socio-economically, culturally, and geographically. According to the UN Human Development Index (United Nations Development Programme, 2011) which is a comparative measure of life expectancy, literacy, education, standards of living, and quality of life for countries worldwide; Australia is ranked number two (very high category) compared to Bhutan which is 141 (medium category) out of 187 countries ranked in 2011. The GDP per capita for Bhutan in 2011 was USD 6,112; whereas it was AUD 54,774 for Victoria. Bhutan is predominantly a Buddhist country located in the Himalayas. It is landlocked and has a very rugged terrain. Melbourne is culturally diverse with nearly 42% of its population born overseas, and speaking over 100 different languages (City of Melbourne, 2012). Melbourne has a flat terrain, and is located around Port Phillip Bay. The two school systems are similar in size, except for the lower teacher student ratio in CEOM schools (see Table 1.1 below). Both the systems integrate religious education with general education. CEOM schools emphasize Catholic ethos whereas Bhutan schools emphasize Buddhist values. In both instances, they are noticeably manifest in their curricula and practices of rituals as well as use of symbols.

In terms of student wellbeing promotion, there is a common trend towards a whole-school approach to student wellbeing. This is yet to be fully translated into practice in Bhutan's case, while CEOM is at a more advanced stage having set on this path over a decade ago. For example, policies and programmes are better integrated and more strategic in approach; and organizational structures more focussed. In Bhutan's case on the other hand, there is a lack of

strategic framework with cohesive approach allowing policies, structures, and programmes to be loose and fragmented. A framework that integrates all student wellbeing programs and services with rest of the school programmes and activities, and shows how they align to a central mission will be important for consolidating efforts and investment of resources. Nevertheless, the recent introduction of the E4GNH in principle advocates a whole-school approach that not only sharpens the focus of Bhutan's education system to fit the national ideals, but also spell a central role to student wellbeing promotion as integral to learning.

Table 1.1: *Schools, Enrolment, and Teachers*

	CEOM				BHUTAN (Public schools only)			
STUDENTS								
School type	Schools	Male	Female	Total	Schools	Male	Female	Total
Primary	256	37,334	36,896	74,230	437	51236	51264	102500
Secondary	67	32,909	35,133	68,042	87	30173	30518	60691
Total	323	70,243	72,029	142,272		81409	81782	163191
Special Schools	07	67	30	97	8	180	111	291
All Schools	330	70,310	72,059	142,369	532	81,589	81,893	163,482
TEACHERS (Full-time equivalent)								
Primary		693.8	3778.2	4472.0		2,638	1,695	4,333
Secondary		2170.8	3255.5	5426.3		1,623	1,070	2,693
Total Regular		2864.6	7033.7	9898.3		4,261	2,765	7,026
Special Schools		10.4	24.5	34.9		77	76	153
All Schools		2875.0	7058.2	9933.2		4,338	2,841	7,179

Note: Table based on CEOM (2011) for CEOM, and MoE (2012) for Bhutan.

One of the key differences is in the approach to setting up the policies and programmes. The CEOM's approach draws on a systematic study of issues and concerns of wellbeing to design a strategy to suit these needs; whereas Bhutan used a top-down approach based on perceived needs felt by policy makers based on national policies rather than a systematic study or involvement of all stakeholders.

A notable feature of the CEOM approach to student wellbeing is the implementation support that schools receive. Participation in or implementation of National Frameworks are typically supported with funding and other necessary support such as provision of professional development, implementation guidelines, audit tools, support networks, technical support, and online resources designed to help implement, assess, and improve. On the other hand, these are relatively weaker in Bhutan's case, a likely reason being inadequate funding and resource constraints.

When it comes to student wellbeing issues and concerns there are differences as well as overlaps. Many Bhutan schools struggle with basic concerns such as safe drinking water and nutrition; grade repetition and drop-out due to primary to secondary school transition issues, financial hardships, and punitive discipline. Common wellbeing concerns include substance abuse, mental health problems, and social issues such as broken families. Bullying, a major concern in Victoria has not been reported for Bhutan. This is most likely because there is no data that is being collected, or reported. Reports such as the SOVC can serve as useful sources of information related to student wellbeing, but Bhutan does not have such a source.

The CEOM strategy to student wellbeing in general is characterized by policy frameworks matched by professional development of teachers, required resources such as funding, implementation guidelines, audit tools; and collaboration and partnerships with communities and other agencies. It brings together some of the most promising strategies in a holistic manner. CEOM schools have systematically promoted a whole-school approach for nearly over a decade. It will be interesting to learn about its implementation in practice, particularly in terms of lessons learned by key implementers in using such an approach to address student wellbeing. In contrast, E4GNH has just begun in Bhutan with the promise of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion. This presents the opportunity of studying the implementation of student wellbeing promotion in different stages of development in socio-culturally distinct contexts.

Brief Overview of Subsequent Chapters

In the following section, a brief outline of how the thesis is organized into different chapters that follow is provided. This report consists of nine chapters.

Chapter 2 is a review of literature on how wellbeing is conceptualized or understood across various disciplines. It identifies the various dimensions of the concept of wellbeing, and explores factors that influence our wellbeing. This chapter sketches the broader field of wellbeing as a foundation to understanding the meaning and relevance of student wellbeing in schools.

Chapter 3 looks at the literature on student wellbeing with a focus on a whole-school approach. In the first part, it discusses the definition of student wellbeing, and the different approaches to student wellbeing promotion. The second half of the chapter examines the Health Promoting School model of whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion, reviewing its effectiveness and challenges of implementation.

Chapter 4 reviews the literature on implementation of school reform in relation to a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion. It begins with a discussion of the process of change, and action theories for educational change to identify key aspects of change that need to be addressed for reforms to be effective and sustainable. The later part of the chapter discusses the implementation of change in schools and the host of factors that influence implementation. Finally, it summarizes the review of literature to establish its links to the design of the study.

Chapter 5 outlines the research methodology chosen for this study. This chapter presents the theoretical perspective, research design, data collection and analysis procedures, strategies for ensuring trustworthiness, ethical issues, the role of researcher, and limitations of the study.

Chapter 6 reports on the meanings of student wellbeing as perceived by the participants of the study. It explores their diverse views on student wellbeing promotion in relation to its implementation. It examines the links between prevalent views on student wellbeing, and the possible beliefs and assumptions underlying these views. The analysis draws on a robust

literature on the meaning of wellbeing, to highlight the ways in which Student Wellbeing Leaders view it. It also discusses the meanings and views participants believe to be held by others in their schools, and the challenges these pose to the implementation of student wellbeing promotion. It draws out some key themes that can be used to understand student wellbeing promotion; and the related challenges of implementing student wellbeing programmes.

Chapter 7 reports on the challenges of implementing student wellbeing programmes pertaining to the organizational culture and structure of schools. This chapter looks at how the ways in which schools are organized as well as the prevalent norms, beliefs, and values affect the practice of student wellbeing promotion, and the challenges they pose for its effective implementation. More specifically, it looks at the organizational structure, leadership and strategic direction, beliefs about student wellbeing and approaches to student wellbeing promotion across schools in the two systems; and summarize the salient aspects observed to propose a simple way of conceptualizing or understanding school organization and culture for student wellbeing programme implementation.

Chapter 8 looks at the challenges of time as expressed by student wellbeing leaders in secondary schools. It discusses time allocation for student wellbeing promotion in the two school systems vis-à-vis participants' views on time requirements for effective implementation of student wellbeing programmes, and the challenges they experience in bridging the gaps or mismatches between the two. Based on this discussion, a simple framework for conceptualizing time for student wellbeing promotion is presented. This Chapter also discusses how the deeper and broader challenges of meaning and culture discussed in the two preceding chapters are manifest as time constraints.

Finally, the Conclusion chapter provides a summary of the research project. It summarizes the main findings, and discusses how they are inter-related. It also identifies some areas for further research, and discusses the significance of the findings.

CHAPTER 2. DEFINING WELLBEING

Introduction

In order for student wellbeing to be fully appreciated as an important aspect of education, it is important to understand what 'wellbeing' means; and clarify how it relates to students, school, and learning. Wellbeing in the literature tends to be defined along disciplinary lines, often in ways that foreground certain aspects of it to the exclusion of others. Similarly, different disciplines exert varying influence on how wellbeing is understood and the implementation of its promotion in schools. This chapter looks at conceptions of wellbeing across disciplines to gain a broader perspective of wellbeing, and its determinants. The objective of the chapter is to arrive at a more holistic conception of wellbeing that brings together all its constituent parts so that it can be most effectively promoted in education in general, and schools in particular to achieve individual as well as collective wellbeing. This can be used as a basis on which the implementation of student wellbeing promotion in schools can be assessed and understood.

This chapter begins by identifying a range of perspectives on how wellbeing is presented in different disciplines such as psychology, sociology, economics, and public policy. It identifies the various factors at individual, relational, and broader contextual levels that determine wellbeing. The main point of this is to illustrate that wellbeing is a multi-dimensional concept that operates at multiple levels, and is systemic in nature. Such exploration and analysis of wellbeing is fundamental to this study because it is about how the implementation of student wellbeing in schools reflect or align with the larger goal of wellbeing in life. Underlying this is the belief that schools should be preparation for life, of which wellbeing is a primary concern. This chapter, therefore, explores the broader meaning of wellbeing as understood across disciplines. Wellbeing literature more specific to education and schools is reviewed in the next chapter.

What is Wellbeing?

Wellbeing is a term that is widely used in public as well as academic discourses, and perceived and defined in a variety of ways. As a social construct, its meaning is subject to shifts across time and space. Ereaut and Whiting (2008), in their analysis of the use of term 'wellbeing'

in public discourse point out that "What it means at any one time depends on the weight given at that time to different philosophical traditions, world views and systems of knowledge" (p.7). Nevertheless, with the need to make it measurable to be scientific as well as facilitate implementation and assessment of policies in public affairs, it is also viewed as a measurable and achievable state, albeit with several dimensions. This is evident in the growing number of wellbeing measures and indicators that define it as consisting of several inter-related dimensions. For instance, the UNICEF (2007) Child Wellbeing Index consists of material wellbeing, health and safety, educational wellbeing, family and peer relationships, behaviour and risks, and subjective wellbeing. Other commonly used dimensions of wellbeing include physical wellbeing, psychological wellbeing, emotional wellbeing, social wellbeing, material wellbeing, and spiritual wellbeing (Awartani, Whitman & Gordon, 2007; Pollard & Lee, 2003).

Wellbeing is also used synonymously with several other terms such as 'quality of life,' 'health', 'happiness', 'standard of living', and 'welfare'. However, the term 'wellbeing' tends to be used most commonly and currently, especially in the social sciences. According to Diener, Lucas, Schimmack, and Helliwell (2009), wellbeing is an increasingly preferred term as it provides for a broader construct than the others, and captures them all.

The following section discusses some of the prevailing constructs and concepts on wellbeing to explore the complex and multi-dimensional nature of wellbeing. Wellbeing can be conceptualized as consisting of three inter-related layers of personal, relational, and collective needs and aspirations (Evans & Prilleltensky, 2007). The following discussion of concepts and constructs is loosely organized along these three dimensions of personal (e.g., subjective wellbeing), relational (e.g. social capital), and collective (e.g. social justice) wellbeing.

Subjective, Psychological, and Social Wellbeing

In psychology, with the emergence of positive psychology and its focus on human strengths as opposed to Psychology's traditional emphases on disabilities, wellbeing has gained prominence as a subject of interest. Some of the key concepts are subjective wellbeing, psychological wellbeing, and social wellbeing. More recently, Seligman (2011) has also proposed a theory of wellbeing.

According to Kesebir and Diener (2008), *subjective wellbeing* refers to presence of positive affectivity, low levels of negative affectivity, a global assessment of one's life satisfaction, and satisfaction with important life domains such as marriage or work satisfaction. Subjective Wellbeing emphasizes the importance of the individual's subjective assessment of feelings and life satisfaction as opposed to being measured against some objective criteria. Drawing on the work of Aristotle, psychologists (e.g., Gallagher, Lopez & Preacher, 2009; Huppert & Baylis, 2004; Ryff & Singer, 2008) distinguish between hedonic wellbeing or a life of pleasure; and eudaimonic wellbeing or a meaningful and virtuous life. Subjective Wellbeing, with its focus on positive emotions and absence of negative emotions emphasize the hedonic while clearly wellbeing is much more than living a life of pleasure.

Eudaimonic wellbeing refers to enduring positive states brought about by the pursuit of virtuous goals in the service of something larger than the self, and that which brings out the best in self. The concept of *psychological wellbeing* proposed by Ryff and Singer (2008) underscore the idea of eudaimonic happiness. Psychological wellbeing consists of six key dimensions that are strongly rooted in the ideas of positive human functioning from philosophy and psychology. The dimensions include self-acceptance, positive relations with others, personal growth, purpose in life, environmental mastery, and autonomy. Within this definition, 'wellbeing' is not just about feeling happy and satisfied, but also about leading a virtuous and meaningful life. Ryan and Deci (2001), based on evidence available in literature, conclude that wellbeing is best conceived as a multidimensional phenomenon that includes both the hedonic and the eudaimonic. However, both subjective and psychological wellbeing underplay the social dimension of wellbeing.

Keyes (1998) notes that despite the fact that life constitutes both private and public sides, each making their own demands and producing their own consequences, conceptions of wellbeing tend to be primarily portrayed as a private phenomenon. Hence, Keyes (1998) introduces '*social wellbeing*', defined as "the appraisal of one's circumstances and functioning in society" (p.122) that consists of five key social challenges or dimensions of social wellness: social acceptance, social integration, social actualization, social contribution, and social coherence. Social wellbeing

highlights the importance of how one relates to society, and goes beyond wellbeing as merely an individual sense of fulfilment. It acknowledges the role of social environment in one's wellbeing. Nonetheless, it is important to note that within this definition, the emphasis is on the subjective appraisal of the 'social' rather than the social as a key determinant. Wellbeing is primarily viewed as a subjective experience while understating any influence of the objective social conditions.

Gallagher, Lopez, and Preacher (2009) studied the latent structure of wellbeing, and report empirical support for all three types of wellbeing (i.e. subjective wellbeing, psychological wellbeing, and social wellbeing) as independent from one another. Hence, wellbeing appears to be a function of positive affect, life satisfaction, characteristics such as social and emotional competence, autonomy, and a sense of meaning and purpose. Seligman (2011) has captured these in his definition of wellbeing as consisting of five contributing elements of positive emotion, engagement, relationships, meaning and purpose, and accomplishment (PERMA).

One of the key features of these conceptions of wellbeing is putting the individual subjective perspectives at the centre. Implicit within these definitions is the individual self as the primary agent of wellbeing, and therefore, also responsible for one's own wellbeing. Wellbeing becomes something that individuals can learn and achieve through development of skills and activities they choose to engage in; and it is achieved through not only addressing weaknesses and deficits, but also propagation of personal strengths and virtues.

The treatment of wellbeing as mainly concerned with individual perspectives of how well they feel about their lives and the environment they live in has been criticised by some for being narrow and limited. Ecclestone and Hayes (2008) have criticised it for bringing about a therapeutic culture that shifts the focus to an "education of self" focused on emotions, at the expense of the intellectual; in effect promoting a vulnerable and diminishing sense of self and preventing the realization of human potential. Wyn (2009) has also argued that an individualized view of wellbeing provide individuals a sense of autonomy and freedom of choice, when in fact their choices are shaped by a consumerist culture that define wellbeing as a commodity or states of being and performance to be desired. She observes a shift in conceptions of wellbeing as an individual responsibility almost to the point of a moral obligation, often accompanied by guilt. In

a similar vein, Sointu (2005) raises concerns about wellbeing becoming something sought after by individuals through a variety of practices that are consumerist in nature; increasingly becoming a commercialized commodity that can be brought - through wellbeing therapies, wellbeing food and merchandise, reality talk shows, and self-help books and audio-visual materials.

There is little doubt that the experience of wellbeing at an individual level is important and therefore, should form a part of one's education. Yet, wellbeing at a personal level is to a great extent, dependent on the social and environmental factors that are beyond individual control. This implies a need to go beyond the focus on individual behaviour and subjective experiences to be able to promote enduring wellbeing.

Wellbeing as Relationships and Social Capital

Social relationships and the extent to which we feel included and connected play important roles in promoting our wellbeing. Prilleltensky (2005) highlight that wellbeing is highly dependent on positive relationships as much as personal attributes and the attributes of the community in which one resides. Social psychologists Baumeister and Leary (1995) in their seminal paper postulated that humans are fundamentally motivated by a need to belong and form enduring interpersonal attachments because many of the strong emotions that we experience are linked to belongingness. Being accepted, included, or welcomed leads to a variety of positive emotions such as happiness and contentment; whereas being rejected, excluded, or ignored leads to potent negative feelings such as anxiety, grief, and loneliness.

Social relationships influence wellbeing in many ways. Cohen (2004) provides empirical evidence that social relationship variables such as social support, social integration, and negative interactions influence health and wellbeing. For example, social relationships buffer stress, and promote positive psychological states. Relationships not only provide us with the intrinsic values of affiliation and identity, but they have an instrumental value. Camfield, Choudhury and Devine (2008) in their study of Bangladeshi peasants point out that good relationships lead to material benefits such as better prices and purchase advice; which in turn can be used to strengthen their relationship by fulfilling their needs. They assert that "relationships determine individuals'

values, choices, actions, and indeed the construction of self", and therefore influence the way people understand and experience wellbeing.

'Social capital' highlights the important role of social relationships and context. Putnam, Leonardi, and Nanetti (1993) define social capital as "the features of social organization, such as trust, norms, and networks that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions" (p.167). Well-functioning communities provide members with benefits such as a sense of belonging and inclusion (referred to as bonding capital); and enable individuals to make connections beyond their usual social boundaries (called bridging capital). Manderson (2005) points out that such 'network-mediated benefits' include associational involvement (e.g. belonging to clubs), participatory behaviour such as voting, and reading newspapers, and expression of confidence in extra-familial processes and institutions ("trust"). According to her, the physical, cultural, social, and economic environments in which people live have strong influences on people's experiences of wellbeing. Social capital underlies the belief that individual wellbeing is very much associated with community inclusion, the strength of collective identity, the extent of mutual support, and everyday social interaction. From this perspective, schools can potentially enhance the wellbeing of those within schools as well as the community through partnerships with the community and external agencies, as opposed to often operating as self-contained and protected entities shielded from the wider community.

On the other hand, Portes (1998) points out that social capital can also lead to exclusion of outsiders and restraining individual freedom. According to Ferragina (2010), groups can use it to enforce norms and individuals can use it to achieve private objectives. While it is likely to facilitate cooperation and mutually supportive relations in communities to prevent or fight many of the social disorders such as crime; it can be used by individuals to further personal gains that may be contrary to the good of society. Group interests can also come in the way of fulfilment of private objectives. These do pose challenges to concerns of equity, and need to be given due consideration in promoting social capital to promote wellbeing.

Relationships and social networks based on trust play important roles in promoting wellbeing. Beyond the teaching of social and interpersonal skills, networking with the

community and other external agencies can have mutual benefits for both the school and community in promoting wellbeing.

Wellbeing and Social Justice

In addition to the personal dispositions and social relationships, broad structural factors impinge on our collective wellbeing. For example, oppressive conditions such as poverty, unemployment, homelessness, discrimination, and violence can put significant strains on the capacity of many individuals, families, and communities to effectively cope with life's daily demands.

The concept of social justice underlies the importance of a just and equitable society for our collective wellbeing. Social justice is based on the ideals of human rights, equal opportunities, and the respect for the dignity of human being (Ratts, DeKruyf, & Chen-Hayes, 2007). Ho (2011) identifies three different approaches to social justice:

(a) Social justice as a joint responsibility, focuses on fair redistribution of resources to close the gaps between rich and poor, equal access to opportunities and exercise rights, fair system of law and due process, and protection of vulnerable and disadvantaged groups. This approach emphasizes the responsibility of system or state to address systemic/ structural poverty, inequality and unfairness.

(b) Social justice as individual responsibility, in which justice is primarily viewed as "getting what you deserve" depending on one's status or social position, personal characteristics or capability, behaviour, and workforce participation as determinants of the share of resources an individual deserves.

(c) Social justice as recognition of human value and wellbeing emphasizes human value beyond status and economic productivity. It is the recognition of fundamental human rights and the dignity of all humans as important aspect of what is just.

Hence, what is considered fair and just can be viewed along the three principles of treating people according to their needs, treating them according to merit, and treating everyone equally (Smith, 2012). It is important to understand these distinctions in order to understand the practice

of social justice in schools, and its influence on student wellbeing and the overall purpose of education.

Calls for social justice and equity have come to be a prominent aspect of the pursuit of wellbeing in today's political and economic scenario where the gaps between the rich and poor, both within and across nations, continue to widen and the planet's natural resources continue to dwindle due to over-exploitation. Recent social movements such as "Get Up!" and "Occupy" are some examples of this. In schools, however, disparities can be more subtle and often in taken for granted forms that perpetuate norms around socioeconomic status, patriarchy, racism, cultural differences, and disabilities.

According to McInerney (2004), social justice refers to a diverse range of views around equality, fairness and human rights. They spring from concerns over different forms of injustice and oppression such as those arising from the class, gender, race, and disability. From a student wellbeing point of view, it highlights the need to address issues of culture and structures both within and outside school to ensure the wellbeing of all students. Schools not only have the important longer-term goal and responsibility of shaping an inclusive, fair and just society; but also the immediate role of creating schools into institutions reflective of these ideals.

The Economics of Happiness

National wellbeing has been traditionally viewed in economic terms with more accumulation of material wealth and consumption as indicators of better wellbeing. However, growing reports of a declining sense of wellbeing and social networks, and rising social ills such as crime rates and mental health issues despite high per capita income, has led to the questioning of prevalent conceptions of economic progress as wellbeing. Contemporary economists and public policy experts (e.g., Bruno, Comim, & Pugno, 2008; Helliwell, Layard & Sachs, 2012; Layard, 2005; Sen, 2008) have questioned current approaches to understanding and assessing wellbeing and human development as an inadequate and imperfect indicator of wellbeing. Gross Domestic Product (GDP) that measures economic or material accumulation and consumption is currently the standard measure used for national wellbeing. According Sen (2008), resources are imperfect indicators of wellbeing as the ability to convert resources into states of being are

mediated by personal and social circumstances. GDP measures market activity (production and consumption) in monetary terms without differentiating desirable and undesirable economic activities. Crime and calamities are counted as contributors while anything that does not have a monetary tag such as voluntary work and leisure time with family does not count. Nussbaum (2005) points out that by using a single figure to represent how well a nation is doing, it not only conceals the numerous aspects of wellbeing such as healthcare, education, and political liberty amongst others, but also has the problem of distribution, and it can give very high marks to those with huge inequalities.

The UN Human Development Index (HDI), a yardstick of wellbeing that uses a composite index aggregating health, education, and living standards, is an effort to shift the attention away from an overly economic growth centric approach to development. However, HDI does not capture other dimensions of human wellbeing such as equity, political freedom, human rights, and sustainability (Klugman, Rodriguez & Choi, 2011). The efforts and initiatives of numerous governments and international organizations to develop broader and more comprehensive measures of human development and wellbeing underscores the importance of a broader understanding of wellbeing and its structural determinants. Some examples include the Better Life Index (OECD, 2012); Gross National Happiness Index (Ura, Alkire & Zangmo, 2012), Genuine Progress Index (GPI) of Nova Scotia (Pannozzo & Colman, 2009), and Australian Unity Wellbeing Index (Cummins, Eckersley, Pallant, Van Vugt, & Msagon, 2003).

These highlight the need for a development paradigm that takes into account a holistic and enduring human wellbeing, not just based on economic progress and levels of consumption. Such a shift in thinking and approach to development has to be necessarily linked to education and schools. Assuming that schools are organized environments where the foundations for shaping the future are laid, it is through its curricula and the ways in which they are organized that such an approach to holistic and enduring human wellbeing can be best propagated.

Wellbeing as Sustainable Development

Sustainable development is an effort to cope with global challenges such as the impacts of climate change and unsustainable depletion of natural resources in the name of economic

progress. It is most commonly defined as "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987, p.43). It emphasizes the need to balance the three interdependent areas of economic development, environmental protection, and social equity to sustain human wellbeing.

One of the consequences of a relentless capitalist pursuit of material wellbeing is the excessive pressure put on our planet's finite resources. Environmental conditions are without doubt central to our wellbeing. Without clean water, clean air, and healthy natural surroundings wellbeing is impossible. Concerns over climate change such as changes in the carbon and the water cycles, loss of biodiversity, and natural disasters have put environmental conditions at the centre of concerns about the sustainability of our ecosystem. Sachs (2012) point out that the current economic trajectory characterized by technological prowess and consumerist lifestyle if unrestrained could risk undermining the life support system of the planet. Science historian, Naomi Oreskes (2004) in her review of literature report scientific consensus on global warming and climate change induced by human activities as posing a grave threat to human wellbeing. Our wellbeing is inextricably linked to climate changes due to increases in greenhouse gas emissions as a result of human industrial activity. We are dependent on the natural environment for our basic needs such as food, water, air quality, amongst other things; and this is threatened by climate change. Hence, the stability, productivity, and resilience of the natural environment is indispensable for our wellbeing.

Sustainable development is inextricably linked with education, and has been identified as the key to achieving sustainability (Mckeown, 2002). From this perspective, schools become important sites for developing the essential knowledge, skills, and values to participate in a just, equitable, and sustainable world; not just through traditional dissemination of knowledge and skills, but also by organizing themselves to operate along the principles of sustainable development.

Wellbeing: A Multi-dimensional and Multi-layered Concept

From the preceding discussion, we can say that wellbeing is a multi-dimensional concept.

The study of its dimensions such as psychological, social, health, economic, and political straddle across different disciplines with varying degrees of emphasis. Not only this, wellbeing is also a multi-layered concept. At one level, the concept addresses individual perspectives of how well they feel about their lives and the environment they live in. At another level, social relationships form a crucial component of our wellbeing. The immediate physical and natural environments around us play equally important roles to influence our wellbeing. At a broader level, factors such as public policies and structures, and national economy are inextricably linked to the wellbeing we experience. Evans and Prilleltensky (2007) aptly conceptualize wellbeing as falling into three interdependent layers of personal, relational and collective; and define wellbeing as "a positive state of affairs in which the personal, relational, and collective needs and aspirations of individuals and communities are fulfilled" (p.681).

Table 2.1 below provides a summary of wellbeing along the three different levels or dimensions based on distinctions made by Evans and Prileltensky (2009). Wellbeing in the

Table 2.1: *Dimensions of Wellbeing*

Scope	Focus	Assumptions	Key concepts	Disciplines
Individual	Development of skills for individual achievement	Wellbeing can be brought about through skills development	subjective wellbeing, psychological wellbeing, social wellbeing	Psychology, Health sciences
Relational	Development of relationships and social networks	Trust, relationships and networks are crucial for wellbeing	social capital; social support; inclusion	Sociology, social psychology
Collective	Development of conducive environmental/ contextual structures	Environment (including laws, policies, culture) within which one is embedded determines one's wellbeing	Inclusion, social justice, social responsibility, sustainable development	Economics, public policy, Public health

current literature accentuate three inter-related levels of individual wellbeing focussed on personal characteristics and dispositions that determine wellbeing; relational wellbeing emphasizing social relationships as a determinant of wellbeing; and collective wellbeing that refers to the social-contextual and structural determinants of wellbeing. Quite often, the specialized focus along disciplinary lines serve to fragment discussions of wellbeing, hence making it more disjointed than holistic in approach. For instance, psychological approaches to wellbeing tend to focus on the individual and the subjective meaning and sense of self. While this may serve well to boost one's self esteem, positive affectivity, sense of autonomy, and the like; but with its emphasis on an individual behavioural change, it also encourages individuals to increasingly assume personal responsibility of their wellbeing, which in fact is to a large extent, determined by forces beyond their control. For instance, Ereaut and Whiting (2008) point out that constructs such as 'lifestyle choice', and 'self-help' are part of wellbeing discourse; and wellbeing is a commercialized commodity with 'wellbeing consultants' to help people in their wellbeing identities through a 'project of self'. Similarly, Sointu (2005) argues that wellbeing has increasingly become consumerist in nature over the years with the focus shifting to making it a private responsibility from being a primarily public concern.

On the social and relational front, social psychologists such as Baumeister and Leary (1995), and Cohen (2004) highlight the human need to belong and the importance of social support or network resources for wellbeing. Likewise, sociologists such as Putnam (1995) illustrate the importance of social capital for wellbeing in the face of declining traditional family and community bonds due to a fast urbanizing consumerist culture.

In the realm of public health and policy, economics, and sociology, wellbeing discourses centre around system-wide structural interventions. Wellbeing of individuals and communities are seen as depending on multiple factors that require system-wide structural interventions. Conditions such as access to health care and quality education, good governance, clean environment, justice and equity all impact wellbeing. Structural provisions through the promotion of social justice, human rights and sustainable development practices play important roles in determining our wellbeing. Eckersley (2004), for example, calls for a paradigm shift from the view that equates progress and wellbeing with economic growth. He argues that current constructs promote a consumerist culture which contributes to declining social cohesion,

increasing social fragmentation and tension, and inequitable distribution; and unsustainable depletion of natural resources. The good news is that many national governments and international organizations are calling for social and economic policies that enhance societal wellbeing and sustainability beyond economic growth and consumption in the face of looming environmental crisis and climate change (Helliwell, Layard & Sachs, 2013; Stiglitz, Sen & Fittousi, 2009).

Despite the mainly fragmented focus on wellbeing along disciplinary lines, there is growing recognition that addressing wellbeing is essentially about recognizing the need to look at individual, social, and structural determinants of wellbeing. For instance, Wyn (2009) points out that as much as wellbeing is something that individuals choose, manage, and experience, it is also a reflection of the quality of relationships and social processes they are embedded in. According to sociologist Veenhoven (2000), a happy life is one that has value and meaning for oneself as well as the environment in which one lives, and this depends on one's living conditions as well as the personal capacities to exploit them or cope with problems of life. Similarly, economists Gough, McGregor and Camfield (2007) point out that wellbeing entails both objective circumstances and subjective perceptions that are continually produced in interplays within social, political, economic and cultural processes of human social being making it a relational and a dynamic concept. These highlight the importance of both personal dispositions and choices, as well as the creation of sound environments as key to wellbeing.

In summary, wellbeing is a broad and complex concept involving interplay of several dimensions. As much as it is a subjective, personal experience, it is also dependent on environmental conditions, and the relationships in which one is embedded, making it a private responsibility as well as a public concern. Education systems and schools have an important role and social responsibility in addressing wellbeing at all levels.

Determinants of Wellbeing

This section expands on the three levels of personal, relational, and collective wellbeing. It looks at some of the variables that influence and the ways in which they determine our

wellbeing as reported in research literature. A closer look at the various factors that determine our wellbeing can facilitate the exploration of ways of promoting wellbeing at different levels and their interrelationships.

Personal or Individual Characteristics

Both inherent personal characteristics such as age, gender, and traits; as well as acquired characteristics such as educational attainment, and health behaviour and skills influence our wellbeing.

Age

Subjective wellbeing in found to increase with age (Yang, 2008), especially between the ages of 40 and 75 years (Horley & Lavery, 1995); while negative affect is found to decline with aging (Charles, Reynolds & Gatz, 2001; Erskine, Kvavilashvili, Conway & Myers, 2007; Teachman, 2006). Erskine, et al. (2007) contend that this is because older people are more likely to avoid negative stimuli and emotions in their interactions. Another explanation according to Carstensen's (1995) socio-emotional selectivity theory is that older people perceive time as being limited and running out, and therefore, are more selective in the choice of social partners and interactions to maximize emotional benefits and avoid potentially negative events. Several studies (e.g., Charles, Reynolds & Gatz, 2001; Cheng, 2004; Erskine et al., 2007; Mrozcek & Kolar, 1998; Teachman, 2006) have found evidence to support this. Even though age is a factor that cannot be changed, these findings suggest that subjective wellbeing may be a function of learning and experience.

Gender

Findings on gender differences in wellbeing are mixed, but where they exist, it appears to be influenced mainly through socialization. Yang's (2008) analysis of data from the US General Social Survey from 1972-2004 with a yearly sample of 1500-3000 conclude that everything else being equal, women are happier than men throughout the life course. Nolen-Hoeksema and Rusting (1999) attribute such differences to a combination of biological (hormones and genetic factors), personality, and social contexts (e.g., abuse, balance of power relationships, gender

roles, stereotypes). In a similar vein, Tesch-Romer, Motel-Klingebiel and Tomasik (2008) contend that gender differences in wellbeing are influenced by gender inequality in access to resources and opportunities, and cultural norms regarding gender inequality that put women at a disadvantage. In their study, Graham and Chattopadhyay (2011) found that in countries where gender rights are more equal, women are relatively happier. These findings suggest that while some differences may be biological, socialization also play a role; and this is where schools could play an important role.

Personality traits

Research evidence suggests that personality traits can influence one's wellbeing. Abbot, Croudace, Ploubidis, Kuh, Richards and Huppert (2008) report stable and enduring associations between personality and wellbeing. Weiss, Bates & Luciano (2008) in their study of twins reported similar relationships. Some studies suggest that traits account for as much as 50% of the variance in wellbeing (Diener, 1996; Lyubomirsky, Sheldon, & Schkade, 2005).

According to McCrae and Costa (1991), traits can predispose people to engage in certain behaviours which in turn influence wellbeing. For instance, the correlation between extraversion and neuroticism, and subjective wellbeing was replicated in cross-cultural studies by Francis, Brown, Lester and Philipchalk (1998), and Furnham and Cheng (1997). DeNeve and Cooper (1998) also found associations between positive affect and agreeableness, conscientiousness and life satisfaction. Nevertheless, Diener (1996) points out that it is important to understand that traits are predispositions and it is their interplay with contextual factors that determine the outcome. Diener and Lucas (1999) explain that the degrees to which people experience wellbeing will depend on the extent of fit between their personalities and the environment.

Educational attainment

Educational attainment contributes to wellbeing in direct as well as indirect ways. Ryff and Singer (2008) report positive correlations between education and psychological wellbeing, most notably with personal growth and purpose in life; and Gerdtham and Johanesson (2001) found a positive relationship between life satisfaction and education. According to Cummins (2000), longer education can strengthen internal resources such as self-esteem, control, and

43

optimism that serve as protective factors. Similarly, Helliwell and Putnam (2007) maintain that rising levels of education are likely to be accompanied by higher levels of political and social engagement; and have strong positive effects on social trust.

Educational attainment contributes to wellbeing in indirect ways by affecting occupation, and therefore income. For example, Oreopoulos and Salvanes (2011) report that raising the compulsory minimum school leaving age is likely to raise average happiness levels mainly through its effect on income. Blanchflower and Oswald (2004) also report that factors such as increased employability, job security, and promotion are associated with longer years of education.

Health behaviour and skills

Health behaviour and skills influence wellbeing. Lubyomirsky, Sheldon and Schkade (2005) argue that behavioural activities, such as exercising regularly or trying to be kind to others; cognitive activities, such as reframing situations in a more positive light or counting one's blessings; and volitional activities, such as striving for important personal goals or devoting effort to meaningful causes to be effective ways of achieving wellbeing. Seligman, Steen, Park, and Peterson (2005) in their randomized controlled trial studies on the use of character strength building exercises report increased happiness levels maintained at six month follow-up study. They report interventions such as writing about three good things that happened each day and why they happened; getting subjects to use their signature strengths of character in new ways; and making gratitude visits made people happier and less depressed.

In summary, even though inherent personal characteristics such as age, gender, and traits have an influence on wellbeing, the studies reported suggest that effects are largely dependent on socialization. Factors such as educational attainment and health behaviour and skills can be used to nurture or regulate predispositions to promote wellbeing. This understanding that our wellbeing is in our hands to shape rather than just heritable, highlights the role of education in promoting wellbeing. However, the extent to which education and schools play a role in promoting wellbeing is most likely to be dependent on how well it is understood, planned, and implemented in schools.

Social Relationships and Wellbeing

Positive relationships are fundamental to wellbeing because besides fulfilling our inherent need to belong, they contribute to our wellbeing in numerous ways. Ashgrove and Caroe (2007) draw attention to a range of beneficial outcomes for wellbeing that we accrue from positive relationships such as practical support, self-development, physical health, access to opportunity, and social development. Positive relationships provide emotional, material, or informational support in times of need. We come to better understand who we are in the context of relationships with others. Positive relationships are linked to improved immune responses, buffering of stress, and faster recovery from illness. We gain access to information and resources through our network of relationships; and social skills and appropriate behaviour are also best learned in the context of relationships with others.

Our fundamental need to belong (Baumeister & Leary, 1995) suggests that social relationships are important to our sense of wellbeing. Studies provide support for this link between social relationships and wellbeing. Diener and Seligman (2002), in their study of very happy people found excellent social relationships to be characteristic of happy people. In their study of relationship between character strengths and life satisfaction, Park, Peterson, and Seligman (2004) report character strengths that are interpersonal in nature such as love and gratitude as predictors of life satisfaction. Helliwell and Putnam (2004) in their study of the link between social capital and subjective wellbeing, report that marriage and family, ties to friends and neighbours, workplace ties, civic engagement (both individually and collectively), trust-worthiness and trust, all appear independently and robustly related to happiness and life satisfaction, both directly and through their impact on health. Similarly, Layard (2005) identified family relationships, financial situation, work, community and friends, health, personal freedom and values as the seven most important factors that affect wellbeing; pointing out that except for health and income, they are all concerned with the quality of relationships.

Relationships within families and friendships are among the most likely to have a strong influence on our wellbeing. For example, Easthope and White (2006) in their interviews with

young people found that their social relationships, particularly with friends and family are central to their feelings of wellbeing and influence their health behaviour.

Family relationships

Positive family relationships represent a sound support system and a strong protective factor. Conversely, single parenting and divorced parents have detrimental effects on wellbeing of children as well as parents themselves. Furstenberg and Kiernan (2001) report that parental separation can make their children twice as vulnerable to depression in adulthood as compared to those whose parents stayed together. According to Layard (2005), single parent families do poorly as a support system because it means a drop in income by a half or more; and lesser parental input and supervision. They are also more likely to move which often results in disruption of friendships.

Many studies report marriage to be a strong correlate of wellbeing (Argyle, 1999; Blanchflower & Oswald, 2004; Kim & McKenry, 2002). Married people living together on average are happier and more satisfied with life than those who are widowed, divorced, or single (Kim & McKenry, 2002; Myers, 2000; Yang, 2008). Argyle (1999) and Myers (2000) believe that, this is because marriage provides enduring intimacy, commitment, companionship, and support. However, it is the quality of relationship that may be more important as Myers (2000) point out that, in fact, those in not-very-happy or conflict-ridden marriages are likely to be less happy than those who are unmarried or divorced.

According to Myers (1999, 2000), marriage offers people new roles such as parent or spouse, and serves as a source of identity and self-esteem. This may be a reason why marriage is found to have a greater influence on wellbeing than co-habiting. Kim and McKenry (2002) in their study of relationship between marriage and psychological wellbeing using panel data found that cohabiting did not have the same beneficial effects as marriage for psychological wellbeing, suggesting that the protective effects of marriage are greater than those of cohabiting relationships.

Friendship

Friendships provide several benefits that influence our wellbeing. Hintikka, Koskela, Kontula, Koskela, and Viinamaeki (2000) report that people with more friends have lower levels of mental distress than those with fewer friends. In another study by Antonucci, Lansford, and Akiyama (2001), women with a confidant were found less likely to be depressed, and are more satisfied with their lives than women who lack a confidant.

Just like for marriage, Demir and Weitekamp (2007) report that it is the quality of friendship that contribute to happiness. Their study of relationship between friendship and subjective wellbeing in college students found that friendship quality contributed to happiness above and beyond the influence of personality. They point out that companionship and self-validation, defined as perception of others as helpful in maintaining one's self-image as a competent and worthwhile person (Mendelson & Aboud, 1999), as the two key features of friendship that contributed to wellbeing. Not only does companionship predict more positive outcomes, but lack of it predicted diverse problems.

Social networks

Putnam (2001) reported that people prosper in societies where people trust one another and are mutually helpful. He found that communities with high rates of volunteer activity, club membership, church membership, and social entertaining all had higher wellbeing than communities that were low in these characteristics. Helliwell's (2003) findings lend support for this, and report that where trust in others is high, wellbeing is high and suicide rates are low. He also reported high wellbeing where memberships in organizations outside of work are at high levels. Likewise, Helliwell and Wang (2010) found that those who feel themselves to be living in trustworthy environments report high levels of subjective wellbeing.

Social networks and communities can serve as protective factors for health and wellbeing. According to Lin (1999), people who are embedded in communities high on support, trust, information, and norms are likely to have resources that support healthy living. According to Bolin, Lindgren, Lindstrom, and Nystedt (2003), social trust and membership discourage individuals from engaging in risky health behaviours such as smoking and binge drinking. On

the other hand, a study of adolescents in Sweden by Aslund, Starrin and Nilsson (2010) report that those with low social capital and low social trust have significantly higher odds of being depressed, and having higher rates of psychosomatic symptoms, and musculoskeletal pain. Providing help and support may have positive effects on wellbeing as much as receiving it. Thoits and Hewitt (2001) found that people high in life satisfaction and happiness were more likely than others to be community volunteers. Similarly, Brown, Nesse, Vinokur, and Smith (2003) found that giving social support is more important to longevity than receiving social support. Woolcock (2001) succinctly summarize the review of research evidence on social capital and wellbeing. He points out that "the well-connected are more likely to be hired, housed, healthy and happy" (p.12).

The preceding studies suggest that social relationships and networking are key to wellbeing, but do not say enough about how they may be promoted. Without doubt, schools can be ideal sites for building their relationship-building and networking skills. However, schools have distinct organizational cultures, and engage in a variety of programmes and activities that may promote or inhibit the development of students' social skills, and social capital.

Collective and Contextual Determinants

The broader contextual settings within which we are embedded influence our wellbeing in numerous ways. For instance, the provision of public health care, education, transport services, and clean air and surroundings all have a bearing on our wellbeing. Factors such as the quality of governance, economy, culture, and natural environment influence our wellbeing but are beyond any individual's control.

Governance

Democratic and stable governance is positively correlated with wellbeing. Inglehart and Klingemann (2000) report strong associations between the extent of democracy in nations and their levels of wellbeing. Dorn, Fischer, Kirchgassner and Sousa-Poza (2007) analysed the relationship between democracy and perceived subjective wellbeing in 28 countries using data from the International Social Survey Programme. They observed a significant positive

relationship between democracy and wellbeing even when controlling for income, and culture as measured by language and religion respectively. They also found the effect of democracy on life satisfaction to be stronger in countries with an established democratic tradition as compared to transitioning countries. Some studies indicate that having a stable government is important for wellbeing more than a democratic form of governance per se. Studies involving breakaway countries immediately after the disintegration of the Soviet Union provide some support for this. Both Helliwell (2003), and Inglehart and Klingemann (2000) reported substantial drops in wellbeing in former Soviet bloc nations that have become unstable democracies following their breakaway from stable dictatorship. Veenhoven (2002) also report that in the 1990s, nations such as Russia, Georgia, Armenia, Ukraine, and Moldavia had the lowest enjoyment of life, out of 68 countries studied. Additionally, Helliwell (2003) found that effective and trustworthy governance characterized by low corruption and effective rule of the law correlates with wellbeing even when controlled for the effects of democracy. Thus, it appears that while democracy has a positive relationship with perceptions of wellbeing, a stable, effective, and trustworthy government is more likely to have a stronger and positive influence on wellbeing.

Governments influence wellbeing through its policies on resource and opportunity distribution. The extent to which resources and opportunities are distributed in a society have a bearing on its wellbeing. Wilkinson and Pickett (2009), for instance, provide evidence of the negative effects of income inequality and the positive effects of greater societal income equality. Using sources such as the United Nations, the World Bank, the World Health Organisation and the US Census data, they measured inequality of income in countries and compared it with levels of health and social problems. They measured the differences in income between the wealthiest and poorest in different countries, and looked at indicators such as physical health, education, housing, imprisonment, mental health, drug abuse, obesity, social mobility, trust and violence. They found that more unequal countries were worse on all the indicators. Countries that have the smallest gap between rich and poor incomes do much better on all the social factors, and also had various government policies for more than decades to ensure more equality. They point out that inequality erodes trust, increases anxiety and illness, and encourages excessive consumption.

If democratic and stable governments that are equitable provide the best chances of a society characterized by wellbeing, it can be argued that education is fundamental in promoting these. For example, Kaufman, Kraay, and Mastruzzi (2003), using data from the Worldwide Governance Indicators, demonstrated that countries with higher gross enrolment rate of secondary education has higher levels of political stability and lower levels of corruption. Well-functioning democratic institutions require educated citizens that play active roles in civic life and public decision-making. This will take more than the inclusion of civics in the curricula, and will likely depend on the extent to which classroom climates and school culture are participatory and democratic in nature. Yet, there is very little evidence-based information on how this link can be made to guide practice.

Culture

While wellbeing is desired universally, the ways in which it is conceptualized differ across cultures. Evidence available in the literature mainly point to differences between the Eastern and Western cultures, more specifically that of Americans and Asians. Uchida, Norasakkunkit, and Kitayama (2004) in their review of empirical literature, conclude that there are substantial cross-cultural variations in how wellbeing is viewed. They point out that overall, in European-American cultures happiness tends to be defined and experienced as personal achievement; whereas in East Asian cultures, it tends to be defined and experienced as a realization of social harmony. Lu and Gilmour (2004) studied cultural beliefs and conception of happiness by American undergraduate students following up on a similar study by Lu (2001) involving Chinese students. They conclude that Asians tend to be socially oriented and emphasizes role obligations and dialectical balance (which sees happiness and unhappiness as ever-present as background for each other), while Euro-Americans are likely to be individual oriented and emphasize personal accountability and explicit pursuit. This is consistent with Kitayama, Mesquita, and Karasawa's (2006) findings that positive emotions that are engaging and reflect interdependence (e.g., social harmony, duty to groups) among Japanese; and positive disengaging emotions that privilege independence (e.g., free choice, personal achievement and rights) among Americans best predicted wellbeing. These suggest that for the Japanese, being embedded in close, relatively harmonious relations that offer experiences of friendly feelings, and respect are likely to perceive better wellbeing; whereas for the Americans, social

interdependence may not be as important for wellbeing as standing on one's own feet, striving for personal achievement, and maintaining high self-esteem. Similarly, Diener and Biswas-Diener (2008) also report that Asians are more likely to seek calm, harmony-producing activities, while Westerners are more likely to look for exciting and pleasure arousing experiences for happiness. In a study carried out by Ingersoll-Dayton, Saengtienchai, Kespichayawattana, and Aungsuroch (2001) to examine the subjective meaning of psychological wellbeing of Thai elders, they identified five dimensions of wellbeing: harmony, interdependence, acceptance, respect and enjoyment. These dimensions are predominantly 'other focused' rather than 'self-focused', and hence lend further support for the findings on Asian views on wellbeing as interdependence-focused.

Therefore, wellbeing despite being a universal quest is also significantly grounded in socio-cultural modes of being a person and interacting with others (Uchida, Norasakkunkit, & Kitayama, 2004). It cannot be completely understood without taking into account culture-dependent ways in which it is realized and shaped.

Economy and national income

Many studies report positive relationships between wellbeing and affluence (e.g., Blanchflower & Oswald, 2004; Diener, Diener & Diener, 1995; Headey, Muffels & Wooden, 2008). Stevenson and Wolfers (2008) in their study using multiple data sets spanning several decades across nations, report that there is a positive link between subjective wellbeing and GDP; and that life satisfaction levels rise with economic growth. Likewise, Diener and Biswas-Diener (2002) reported substantial correlations between per capita income and wellbeing across nations, noting that wealthy nations are happier than less wealthy nations. However, they also noted that increase in wealth had a stronger effect on wellbeing for poorer nations. Similarly, Hagerty and Veenhoven (2003) examined correlations between changes in income and wellbeing in 21 nations over time. They found that even though wellbeing in nations tend to rise over time, the effects of income on wellbeing are larger in poorer nations than in richer ones.

Economists, Frey and Stutzer (2002) estimate a figure of USD 10,000 per capita income as the threshold level beyond which increasing wealth has diminishing returns for wellbeing.

This is supported by Diener and Seligman's (2004) computation of associations between GDP per capita income and average life satisfaction based on the World Value Survey data which also showed that beyond a moderate level of income, any increases in life satisfaction is only very small. When the analysis was restricted to countries with per capita income above USD 10,000, the correlation was only .08 suggesting very little effect on wellbeing. Hence, it appears that increasing national wealth does not necessarily translate to rise in wellbeing beyond a certain point, and increasing wealth appears to have diminishing returns for wellbeing.

GDP or national income per capita, as a traditional measure of wellbeing is now widely criticised. For example, Stiglitz, Sen and Fitoussi (2008) point out that it takes into account only monetary exchanges and market activities, without paying enough attention to income distribution within society amongst other things. Sen (1985) has argued that it only captures a dimension of 'well-having', since income is only important insofar as it enables people to transform their resources into wellbeing. Similarly, Cummins (2000) points out that the influence of money on happiness will largely depend on the extent to which it converts into appropriate resources. Helliwell (2003) found that when variables such as quality of government, health, and human rights were factored in, the relationship between wealth and wellbeing dropped substantially. He concludes that "Those who have the highest levels of subjective wellbeing are not those who live in the richest countries, but those who live where social and political institutions are effective, where mutual trust is high, and corruption is low"(p.355).

Besides affording improved standards of living, economic growth is also likely to contribute towards factors that may have a negative impact on wellbeing. Easterlin and Angelescu (2007), based on a cross-sectional and time series analysis of the relation between wellbeing and economic growth, noted that with economic growth comes increases in food, clothing, and shelter per capita, and therefore, qualitative changes in the standard of living; but it is also generally accompanied by an increase in ills such as pollution, urban concentration, rising consumption, and carbon emission. They conclude that as a result of economic growth, we may have more goods in greater varieties, but whether this translates to satisfying lives is questionable. Van de kerk and Manuel (2012), in their analyses of Sustainable Society Index data

for 151 countries supports this as they report that income (GDP per capita) correlates positively with human wellbeing, but negatively with environmental wellbeing.

Whereas wealth does contribute to wellbeing, its contribution to increased wellbeing is dependent on how it is used, and the relationship it has with social indicators such as health, education, governance, and human rights. In fact, increases in economic growth can bring about increases in ills such as pollution and excessive consumption that can adversely impact wellbeing. Measures of economic progress such as GDP also do not take into account the important wellbeing concerns of equity and sustainability.

Natural environment

Our natural environment provides us with provisioning services such as food, water, timber, fiber, and genetic resources; regulating services such as the regulation of climate, floods, disease, and water quality as well as waste treatment; cultural services such as recreation, aesthetic enjoyment, and spiritual fulfilment; and supporting services such as soil formation, pollination, and nutrient cycling; all of which are essential for our livelihood and wellbeing (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment/ MEA, 2005).

Depletion and degradation of these directly impact our health and wellbeing. According to the MEA (2005) Report, human activities have caused substantial and irreversible loss to diversity in life on earth in the last 50 years more than in any comparable period in human history. Ecosystem services such as fresh water, capture fisheries, air and water purification, and the regulation of regional and local climate, natural hazards, and pests are being degraded or used unsustainably. These have been a consequence of increasing other services such as food. The report points out that while these have contributed to substantial net gains in human wellbeing and economic progress, they have been at a growing costs in the form of the degradation of many ecosystem services, increased risks of nonlinear changes, and the exacerbation of poverty for some groups of people. Unsustainable production and consumption practices have not only lead to depletion and degradation of our natural resources but also increase in the risks of climate change, infectious diseases, and loss of biodiversity.

According to a report by Stiglitz, Sen, and Fittoussi (2009), it is estimated that since the mid-1980s our ecological footprint has surpassed the Earth's biocapacity, and by 2003, it exceeded by approximately 25%. Ecological footprint is a measure of the extent to which the regenerative capacity of the biosphere is used up by human activities or consumption, and biocapacity is the productive capacity of the biosphere and its ability to provide resources and services useful to humankind. The World Health Organization (2008) estimates the global burden of disease due to environmental factors to be at 24% of the total burden of disease. This means that our wellbeing is tied to the ways in which we use or abuse the natural environment. Our current model of development that promote unrestrained consumption and exploitation of natural resources pose a serious threat to our wellbeing.

In summary, it can be said that nations high in wellbeing are likely to be democracies with effective and stable governments and strong economies. High economic growth, however, may come at the cost of depletion and degradation of our natural resources that sustain our livelihood. Our conceptions of wellbeing as economic growth have implications for both our natural and social environments, and raise issues of social justice and sustainability. Our wellbeing is not only dependent on sound national policies, but also on sound global governance and collaboration.

Even though schools are less likely to be able to exert a direct influence on the broader contextual determinants of wellbeing, they can still teach and integrate democratic principles, cultural values, and care for the natural environment into ways in which schools are organized. In addition to exploring the extent to which schools recognize and incorporate collective and contextual determinants of wellbeing, it will be equally useful to understand how broader contextual factors influence the implementation of student wellbeing promotion.

A Systems View of Wellbeing

Wellbeing, as described earlier in the chapter, consists of personal, relational, and collective dimensions that are determined by a range of factors at various levels. Bronfenbrenner's (2005) Bioecological Systems theory provides a useful framework to understand the interdependence of the various determinants of wellbeing. This theory views the

individual as being embedded in layers of nested environments, and its development shaped through progressive reciprocal interplay between one's active and growing biological dispositions and the changing environmental forces, both immediate and remote. It views development as a function of reciprocal interplay between individuals as active and evolving bio-psychological organisms, and continually evolving layers of environment. In this sense, wellbeing is a product of interactions or relationships between the unique individual characteristics and the environmental factors that consists of one's immediate surroundings as well as more distal settings of the broader social context and culture over time. Hence, from a systems perspective, it becomes important that the promotion of wellbeing in schools address the various determinants of wellbeing at individual, relational, and collective levels; after all schools are expected to prepare students for life beyond school, including becoming change agents that shape the future.

Conclusion

Conceptualizations of wellbeing vary across disciplines. They tend to emphasize certain aspects of wellbeing while underplaying other aspects. A variety of labels such as subjective wellbeing, social capital, and sustainable development to cite a few examples, represent aspects of wellbeing through different disciplinary lenses. Wellbeing is thus a complex concept that requires the understanding of a diversity of perspectives to be fully understood.

Our wellbeing is determined by a wide range of factors including individual, social, cultural, economic and environmental (Commission of Social Determinants of Health, 2008). Individual characteristics and choices shape health and wellbeing, but these personal factors are themselves subject to our social, cultural and environmental contexts. Broader contextual factors such as governance, culture, economy, and ecology influence our wellbeing in numerous ways beyond individual control. These contextual factors, in turn are inextricably linked to our actions and choices as individuals as well as groups. Thus, an individual's wellbeing is but a consequence of a complex web of inter-relationships or interactions between individual, social and environmental influences.

In this chapter, we have seen that wellbeing is a complex concept with multiple dimensions determined by multiple and inter-related factors operating at individual, relational, and collective levels. It is as much an individual as it is a societal aspiration. Education is a key mechanism through which wellbeing can be promoted in effective and sustainable ways. Insofar as education is a preparation for life, schools have the responsibility to promote wellbeing. Schools represent an important site for promoting wellbeing, whether it is to address the personal wellbeing of students, or to prepare them as agents of societal change. The following chapter looks at wellbeing in the context of education. More specifically, it reviews literature on the approaches to promotion of student wellbeing in schools.

CHAPTER 3. WELLBEING IN SCHOOLS

Introduction

The preceding chapter delved into wellbeing as an important life aspiration, and unpacked some of its key components. It identified education as a key mechanism to promote wellbeing, and schools as ideal sites for this to happen. This chapter narrows down the focus on schools, and provides a review of literature on the promotion of student wellbeing. It begins with a discussion of the rationale for promoting student wellbeing, and attempts to define student wellbeing. This is followed by a brief discussion of the various approaches to the practice of student wellbeing promotion, leading up to the more recent inclination towards a whole-school approach, and a discussion of the opportunities and challenges associated with it. The purpose of this chapter is to identify key concepts around the topic of wellbeing in schools; outline what research literature tells us about the practice of student wellbeing promotion; identify the challenges associated with its implementation; and identify any gaps in knowledge that may need to be addressed through further research. These provide a framework within which student wellbeing promotion in the participants' schools will be analysed and interpreted.

Why Promote Student Wellbeing?

A good education, Nell Noddings (2003) asserts, should contribute to both personal and collective happiness. This makes the promotion of wellbeing an important aim of education. Whereas it is well-recognized that the role of schools is to prepare young people for life, this aim can be obscured by too much focus on academic achievement and tests. For instance, despite the responsibility to promote wellbeing, school structures and cultures often create stress with intense pressures to perform. Similarly, as Wyn (2007) points out, national education policies with their focus on economic development marginalize the social development goals of education.

Schools represent organized environments with responsibilities to help children and young people learn the knowledge, skills, and values they need to lead healthy, happy and productive lives. It is a place where they spend most of their time in the formative years making

it an appropriate time and place for learning health promoting knowledge, skills, and values (Best, 2007). It is also a setting where interventions can be most efficiently and economically delivered. Langford, et al. (2014) point out that given the inextricable link between health and education, investment on health in schools during "the formative years can prevent suffering, reduce inequity, create healthy and productive adults, and deliver social and economic dividends to the nation" (p.34). According to the World Health Organization (WHO, 1997), schools through their culture, management, curricula, teaching, learning and assessment methods can have profound effects on student wellbeing. However, schools can be effective as health promoting environments only to the extent that they are healthy organizations.

Concerns such as rising cost of health, rapid disintegration of social fabric, and depletion of natural resources necessitate preventive and sustainable interventions to address wellbeing. The rising costs and burden associated with children and young people's health have become a serious source of public concern. For example, the WHO (2003) estimated the aggregate cost of mental disorders to be between 2.5 to 4.0% of global GNP. This does not include costs that are not easily assessed, such as those associated with mental health problems not amounting to disorders, and their related impaired social functioning. One fifth of young people under the age of 18 suffer from developmental, emotional or behavioural problems, and one in eight has a mental disorder (WHO, 2004b). At the same time, there is a growing evidence-base of school-based preventive mental health interventions that have proved to be both efficacious and cost-effective (Catalano, Berglund, Ryan, Lonczak, & Hawkins, 2002; Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011; Greenberg, Domitrovich, & Bumbarger, 2001; Seligman, Ernst, Gillham, Reivich & Linkins 2009). They provide evidence of benefits not just for preventing and improving behavioural, social, and emotional problems, but also for improving academic or educational achievement (CASEL, 2008; Durlak, 1997). St Leger, Young, Blanchard and Perry (2010) point out that education and health are inextricably linked as healthy young people are more likely to learn more effectively. Through health promotion, schools can meet their targets in educational attainment as well as social aims by helping their students to feel connected, and turning schools into settings that practice and model effective health promotion.

Schools are also increasingly seen as ideal sites to sow the seeds of social justice and equity, and organize young people to engage in social and civic responsibilities in their communities (St Leger, Young, Blanchard & Perry, 2010). Growing issues of social fragmentation and environmental degradation, for instance, are major issues of wellbeing for present as well as the future. These necessitate the preparation of the younger generation to face these challenges and restore societal wellbeing in more sustainable ways; making schools ideal sites for intervention. More importantly, education should be about preparing students to be able to shape change in the desirable direction (Sterling, 2001). Hence, the promotion of student wellbeing in schools is not only a means of enhancing academic achievement or reducing the burden and costs of ill-health, but more importantly enabling students to lead a fulfilling and flourishing life. Being well is a way of life that can be learned in schools.

Defining Student Wellbeing

This section looks at some current definitions of student wellbeing in literature, including how it is perceived by students or young people themselves. This is important to understand because the ways in which student wellbeing is defined or perceived is likely to influence or set the boundaries for its promotion.

Student wellbeing is a fairly recent appellation, and is often used synonymously with its precursors such as student welfare, student support, or pastoral care. Fraillon (2004) defines student wellbeing as "*the degree to which student is functioning effectively in the school community*" (p.23), and further elaborates it as consisting of an intrapersonal dimension that entail an "internalized sense of self", and an interpersonal dimension which is an "appraisal of their social circumstances". Similarly, synthesizing definitions of wellbeing and student wellbeing in the extant literature, Noble, McGrath, Wyatt, Carbines and Robb (2008), define student wellbeing as "a sustainable state of positive mood and attitude, resilience, and satisfaction with self, relationships and experiences at school" (p.21). The underpinning assumption of the definition is that student wellbeing is an outcome indicated by "the degree to which a student demonstrates *effective academic, and social and emotional functioning and appropriate behaviour at school*" (p.22). Both these definitions emphasize effective functioning,

or wellbeing as demonstrated through academic achievement and appropriate social and emotional behaviour. They capture the personal and relational aspects of wellbeing discussed in the earlier chapter, but are silent on the collective aspect of wellbeing.

Others have defined child wellbeing in general rather than student wellbeing, often specifying various dimensions of wellbeing. According to Awartani, Whitman, and Gordon (2007), it is *"the realization of one's physical, emotional, social, mental and spiritual potential"* (p.1). UNICEF (2007) defines child wellbeing as consisting of material wellbeing, health and safety, education, peer and family relationships, behaviours and risks, and young people's own sense of subjective wellbeing. Pollard and Lee (2003), based on a review of the literature on child wellbeing, define it as consisting of several domains - physical, economic, psychological, cognitive, and social wellbeing. These definitions highlight the multi-dimensional nature of wellbeing, and go beyond the individual, subjective dimensions. Thus, expert definitions tend to focus on wellbeing as an idealized outcome or state to be achieved, consisting of various dimensions. There is a stronger emphasis on the individual aspect of wellbeing than on the relational and collective aspects of wellbeing.

The emphasis on the individual and subjective perspectives can obscure the role of the environment, and the dynamic interplay of various factors that contribute to wellbeing. For instance, Wyn (2009) points out that it is the changing social conditions such as fragmentation of social relations, and increased pressures created by individualization of responsibility for negotiating life that underlie threats to young people's health and wellbeing. Ecclestone and Hayes (2008) have also argued that social and emotional education, with their therapeutic assumptions engender an unhealthy preoccupation with the self, leading to increased emotional vulnerability; and compromise the development of knowledge, reason, and independence.

Children's own views of what wellbeing means to them is not well-addressed in the research literature, but some studies have reported on it. Children and young people's conceptions of wellbeing appear to be no less profound. Fattore, Mason, and Watson (2007) interviewed young people and identified three fundamental themes in their views of wellbeing. They are (1) having 'agency' or the power to take independent action, leading to some control

and capacity to act independently in everyday life; (2) a sense of 'security' to be able to engage fully with life and do the things that one needs to do; and (3) having a 'positive sense of self', or feeling good about who you are as well as what you do, and being recognised as such by those around you. Similarly, in a survey of young people 14-16 years of age in England, Layard and Dunn (2009) found that the three overarching themes on what they saw as a good childhood were the quality of relationship with others, safety, and freedom. Bourke and Geldens (2007) also report that relationships are central to young people's definition of wellbeing, while youth workers were more likely to emphasise the importance of structural factors. Put together, wellbeing as understood by young people entails having a sense of safety and security, good relationships, and autonomy.

Whilst there is a good degree of convergence in the ways in which student wellbeing is defined by experts and young people themselves, there appear to be some differences that may have implications for practice. Although programmes to promote student wellbeing are more likely to be based on expert views, it appears that young people's views can enrich and render them more relevant to their needs. For instance, if a sense of agency is an important element of their wellbeing, student wellbeing programmes may do well to actively involve young people in shaping programmes or interventions aimed at enhancing their wellbeing.

Despite the current definitions or conceptions of student wellbeing, the meaning and practice of the promotion of student wellbeing has evolved over the years. Various approaches used over the years provide some sense of how the concept of student wellbeing and its promotion may have evolved, as well as how it can be best shaped. The next section outlines some prominent approaches to student wellbeing promotion.

In recognizing wellbeing in general as individual, relational, and contextual, the practice of student wellbeing promotion should ideally consist of addressing wellbeing in schools as both process and outcome. As a process, school culture, environment, and relationships should reflect this; and as outcome, students should be educated in the knowledge, skills and attitudes that will enable them to be well and contribute to the wellbeing of community and society at large.

Approaches to Student Wellbeing Promotion

Programmes to promote student wellbeing in schools are known by a variety of names such as school health, pastoral care, school counselling, student welfare, and student support. Different assumptions and practices underlie the use of these terms. The approaches used by schools to address student wellbeing range from 'add-on' peripheral interventions to comprehensive school-wide or whole-school approaches. This section outlines some approaches to student wellbeing promotion in schools and their underpinnings. It is, however, not intended to be a comprehensive list. For example, it does not cover approaches related to physical health and education, a distinct and well-established area, even though it should be integral to any holistic approach to student wellbeing promotion.

Pastoral Care Approach to Wellbeing

Pastoral care in schools has its roots in Christian moral philosophy which emphasized the provision of moral welfare, guidance, and ethical self-development in schools and is believed to have originated from England (Hearn, et al., 2006). It is, therefore, prevalent in Education systems with the influences from the British Empire (e.g. Australia, Hong Kong). Calvert (2009) traces the shifts in priorities that pastoral care practices has taken over the past 50 years in Britain. He points out that the earlier concerns of control through hierarchical disciplinary systems have been replaced by concerns of meeting children's individual and then collective needs. These responsive approaches gradually gave way to the more proactive approaches that attempted to anticipate the issues that young people are likely to face. A developmental approach with a growing recognition of the need for a pastoral curriculum followed this, but was, however, eroded by a prescriptive, overloaded National Curriculum and later government priorities to raise the bar and close the gap of educational achievement. Then came the Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL), "a comprehensive, whole-school approach to promoting the social and emotional skills that underpin effective learning, positive behaviour, regular attendance, staff effectiveness and the emotional health and wellbeing of all who learn and work in schools" (DCSF, 2007, p.4) to form a part of UK school curricula. This is reflective of trends in other countries as well. Best (2007) argues that pastoral care should be an integral part of curriculum and teaching practices, and that students should be construed as 'whole persons' that are not

segmented for instruction, care and discipline. He describes pastoral care as consisting of five pastoral tasks of (a) reactive pastoral casework, (b) proactive, preventive pastoral care, (c) developmental pastoral curricula, (d) the promotion and maintenance of an orderly and supportive environment, and (e) the management and administration of pastoral care. In the Australian context today, there is a call for a pastoral care system that is more proactive and developmental in approach to make it more holistic. According to deJong and Kerr-Roubicek (2007):

> Pastoral care is an integrated approach to implementing an ethos of care within a school. Its ultimate goal is to build the capacity of the school community so that it can support each student to grow and develop and to engage with meaningful and successful learning. Pastoral care is integral to the curriculum and organisational life of the school that affects school culture, relationships within the school, the health and wellbeing of students and staff and the learning of students (p.5).

They go on to point out that even though pastoral care in schools may have traditionally been about controlling, helping, advice giving, and moral guidance offered to students separate from and complementary to academic learning; but today, a 'whole-school approach' that supports a holistic development and addresses personal, social, and academic needs of all students in an integrated fashion has become more accepted.

School Guidance and Counselling

School guidance and counselling has its origins in vocational guidance that began at the turn of 20th century, followed by a focus on personal counselling as a result of the mental health movement of the 1930s (Gysbers, 2000). However, Gysbers and Henderson (2006) note that today, with the introduction of comprehensive school guidance and counselling model, a complete shift has taken place in the roles that school counsellors play. For example, the American School Counselling Association (ASCA) model advocates a whole-school approach that is comprehensive in scope, preventative in design, developmental in nature, and an integral part of the total educational programme for student success (ASCA, 2005). It consists of a guidance curriculum component with structured developmental lessons designed to assist students in achieving the competencies, presented systematically through classroom and group

activities; individual planning or ongoing activities designed to assist individual students in establishing personal goals and developing future plans; and responsive services for students requiring counseling, consultation, referral, peer mediation or information. This model emphasizes strong collaboration with other stakeholders, and reaching out to every student to meet their needs in the three domains of academic development, career development, and personal/social development. Despite the psychotherapeutic connotations traditionally attached to counselling, school counselling has a strong educative component that is aimed at prevention and skill development. In some countries such as Hong Kong (Lam & Hui, 2010), such an approach is also referred to as a "whole-school approach" to school guidance and counseling.

Studies report positive effects of a comprehensive school counselling programmes on overall student development, including academic, career, and emotional development, as well as school climate (Fitch & Marshall, 2004; Sink & Stroh, 2003). Positive changes have been reported for student academic performance (Brigman & Campbell, 2003; Lapan, Gysbers & Kayson, 2007; Sink, 2005), as well as school attendance, classroom behaviour, and self-esteem (Whiston, 2007) as a result of implementing comprehensive school guidance and counselling programmes.

Rights-based Approach to Student Wellbeing

As the world strives for ideals such as democracy, justice, and equity, concerns of human rights have gained prominence in wellbeing, health and education discourse. The Convention of the Rights of the Child (UN General Assembly, 1989) and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UN General Assembly, 1948) provide the foundations for a rights-based approach to wellbeing and education. The Child Rights Convention emphasizes the wellbeing of children as key to realizing their rights, as well as the obligations and responsibilities of all concerned (i.e., children, parents, institutions, governments). It highlights children's participation and the right to expression of views on matters affecting them. At the heart of the initiatives such as the Child-Friendly School, Inclusive Education, and Health Promoting School by global agencies such as UNICEF, UNESCO, and WHO are promotion of children's fundamental rights to quality education and wellbeing.

According to UNICEF (2006), Child-Friendly Schools aspire to promote a healthy, safe and protective environment for children's wellbeing, and promote quality teaching and learning processes through provision of school-based policies and practices that are gender sensitive, in partnership with families and communities. It embraces a philosophy that fosters equality, respect for human rights and participation of all children. In a similar vein, UNESCO (2004) define Inclusive Education as "the inclusion and teaching of ALL children in formal or non-formal learning environments without regard to gender, physical, intellectual, social, emotional, linguistic, cultural, religious, or other characteristics" (p.10). It emphasizes the creation of 'inclusive learning-friendly environments' by addressing not only the classroom and school environment, but also through policies, curriculum, and active involvement of parents and communities.

Education for Sustainable Development

Underlying the move for sustainable development is the over-exploitation of natural resources to satisfy excessive consumption combined with inequitable distribution of wealth, and consequently environmental degradation and the threat of climate change which pose grave threats to human wellbeing. According to Jackson (2007), schools and education have a central role in addressing this. The United Nations General Assembly declared the period between 2005 and 2014 as the United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (UNDESD) with the vision of "a world where everyone has the opportunity to benefit from education and learn the values, behaviour and lifestyles required for a sustainable future and for positive societal transformation" (UNESCO, 2006). Education for Sustainable Development was launched to encourage changes in behaviour that allow for a more sustainable and just society for all. Hence, education for sustainability is not only about transforming existing unhealthy lifestyles and environments through learning and education, but also about addressing the existing patterns of injustice and inequality (Davis & Cooke, 2007).

According to Sterling (2001), education for sustainability is about transforming the way schools educate children. Changes in education tend to be more about adapting policies to the demands of a globalized economy, and helping people adapt to change rather than developing their capacities to shape change. The problem with this is that it seeks to improve effectiveness

without disturbing the basic organizational or instructional milieu of education; and does not prepare young people to develop the ability to shape their world. Hence, sustainable schools, Henderson and Tilbury (2004) point out, are focal points where children, adults and the community interact and learn together, shifting the focus beyond 'what to teach students' and 'how they are behaving'. In their review of sustainable school programmes using a whole-school approach, they report that programs have been effective in reducing ecological footprint of schools. Schools engaged in reducing resource consumption through recycling initiatives; and improving environmental efficiency through energy saving. However, they observed that despite being recognised by the literature and programme documentation as important, socio-cultural dimensions of education for sustainability such as consumerism, globalisation, respect for diversity, promotion of indigenous knowledge and intercultural understanding, peace and equity, did not appear as prominent components in the programmes.

Mental Health Prevention and Promotion

The literature on mental health is by far the most pervasive in student wellbeing promotion. The prevention and promotion of mental health forms a major portion of evidence-based knowledge base on student wellbeing promotion. Edwards (2003) defines mental health as the ability to develop psychologically, socially, emotionally, intellectually and spiritually. It is the ability to,

> initiate, develop and sustain mutually satisfying relationships, use and enjoy solitude, become aware of others and empathise with them, play and learn, develop a sense of right and wrong and to face and resolve problems and setbacks satisfactorily and learn from them (p.v).

Mental health approaches to wellbeing fall into two categories in their focus: promoting wellbeing and preventing ill-being. According to Blank et al. (2009), interventions to promote pro-social behaviours and skills emphasize positive behaviour change, conflict resolution, social competency, resilience, peer support, and coping with change; while those that focus on prevention address problem behaviours such as bullying, violence, aggression, victimisation, and delinquency. One emphasizes building assets and strengths associated with resilience, and view targeting risk factors as focussing on deficits; while the other emphasizes building individual

strengths often ignoring social and environmental risk factors. More recently, however, both prevention science and positive youth development approaches have converged on similar recommendations characterised by a focus on 'whole youth' rather than single problem focus, through interventions that address social and environmental factors and the developmental tasks confronted by young people (Catalano et al., 2002). Drawing on evidence from research literature, Catalano et al. (2002) argue that programmes should focus on both reduction of problem behaviours and risks, and promotion of positive influences or strengthening assets and protective factors. Based on a review of mental health promotion policies internationally, Patterson (2009) points out that current approaches to mental health promotion takes a holistic view that acknowledges the multiple influences at the individual, social, and structural levels; and the need for a multifaceted approach to policy and service delivery encompassing a variety of sectors that influence mental health. In this approach attention to mental health encompasses facets of life such as the quality of housing, relationships within and beyond the home, meaningful employment, and connectedness to community and culture, amongst many others.

Prevention science approach to wellbeing

Prevention science emphasizes research-evidence based understanding of the origins of emotional and behavioural problems, identification of risk and preventive factors related to these, and systematic intervention development targeting these factors, their implementation, and evaluation (Stormont, Reinke & Herman, 2010). Protective factors promote adaptation (Guerra & Bradshaw, 2008; Hawkins, Catalano, Kosterman, Abbot, & Hill, 1999); and profoundly impact young people's wellbeing despite their being exposed to several risk factors. Risk and protective factors operate at individual, social, and structural levels (Barry & Jenkins, 2007). At an individual level, examples of risk factors include low self-esteem, low self-efficacy, poor coping skills, and disabilities. Protective factors may include a positive sense of self, good coping skills, social skills, and good health. Socially, risk factors may include abuse and violence, loss and separation, peer rejection, and social isolation; on the other hand, supportive and caring family, supportive social relationships, sense of social belonging, and community participation can serve as protective factors. At a structural level, neighbourhood violence and crime, poverty, unemployment, homelessness, school failure, discrimination, and lack of support services are examples of risk factors; whereas safe and secure environment, economic security,

employment, positive educational experiences, and access to support services can serve as protective factors. Thus, focussing on building individual strengths; as well as family, school, and community as the three primary social systems form crucial aspects to be addressed (Howard, Dryden & Johnson, 1999).

A well-recognized approach to prevention is one that considers the full spectrum of interventions that are needed to address all levels of risk in a population. Mrazek and Haggerty (1994) identify three distinct levels of preventive intervention based on the degree of risk. *Universal* interventions target an entire population irrespective of risk status. They are proactive with minimal risk of stigmatizing participants, facilitating ready acceptance and adoption. *Selected* interventions target those who are at significantly higher risk than the general population, usually based on biological or social risk factors. *Indicated* preventive interventions target individuals who are identified as showing early symptoms of mental disorders but who do not yet meet diagnostic criteria. O'Connell, Boat, and Warner (2009) note that school-based programmes based on this approach are comprehensive in nature and address the needs of all students.

Reviews suggest positive impacts of interventions at all the three levels of prevention. In a meta-analysis of 177 universal mental health promotion interventions for children and adolescents in the USA, Durlak and Wells (1997) found that a majority of these achieved positive effects with average effect sizes ranging from 0.24 to 0.93. A similar meta-analysis of indicated preventive intervention programmes for children and adolescents by Durlak and Wells (1998) found that programmes that seek to identify early signs of maladjustment and intervene before full-blown disorders develop resulted in significant reductions in problems as well as increases in competencies. Guo, Scott and Bowker (2003), in their review of suicide prevention strategies, found that selective intervention programmes targeting those at risk led to reductions in risk factors such as depression, a sense of hopelessness, growing anxiety, anger and self-reported stress. In addition, the programmes led to an increase in protective factors such as better personal control, higher reported levels of self-esteem, improvements in problem-solving skills, and social support. However, none of the programmes reviewed were able to record a reduction in actual suicides or suicide attempts. Review of studies by Sutton et al. (2005) also concluded

that there is not enough evidence to identify any school-based intervention that is demonstrably effective in reducing suicide amongst young people.

Positive youth development

Positive development views young people in holistic ways as individuals with problems as well as strengths, rather than merely focussing on prevention of problems and casting them as deficient. According to Durlak et al. (2002), positive youth development programmes generally seek to achieve one or more of the following objectives: promoting bonding; social, emotional, cognitive, behavioural, and moral competence; fostering resilience; self-determination; spirituality; self-efficacy; clear and positive identity; belief in the future; pro-social norms (or healthy standards for behaviour); and provide recognition for positive behaviour and opportunities for pro-social involvement.

An example of positive youth development programme is Social and Emotional Learning (SEL). According to the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL, 2003a), SEL builds children's skills to recognize and manage their emotions, appreciate the perspectives of others, establish positive goals, make responsible decisions, and handle interpersonal situations effectively, through developmentally and culturally appropriate classroom instruction and application of learning to everyday situations. SEL programmes aim to foster development of five interrelated sets of competencies: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making. According to CASEL (2003a), it is best accomplished through classroom instruction; student engagement in positive activities in and out of the classroom; and broad student, parent, and community involvement in program planning, implementation, and evaluation.

Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, and Schellinger (2011) in their meta-analysis of school-wide programmes to promote SEL, found that SEL programmes yielded significant positive effects on targeted social and emotional competencies and attitudes about self, others, and school. They also enhanced students' behavioural adjustment in the form of increased pro-social behaviours and reduced conduct and internalizing problems, and improved academic performance on achievement tests and grades. Where studies collected follow-up information,

effects remained statistically significant at least six months after the intervention; and where data was available, they report that SEL interventions led to a gain of 11-percentile in academic performance. They also found that classroom teachers and other school staff effectively conducted SEL programmes, which suggests that SEL interventions can be incorporated into routine educational practices without requiring outside personnel for their effective delivery. SEL programmes were found effective for all school levels (elementary to high school) irrespective of whether they are located in urban, suburban, or rural areas.

In an earlier review of positive youth development interventions, Durlak et al. (2007) reported positive youth behaviour outcomes and prevention of youth problem behaviours. Positive changes in youth behaviour such as interpersonal skills, quality of peer and adult relationships, self-control, problem-solving, cognitive competencies, self-efficacy, commitment to schooling, and academic achievement in 19 programmes; and 24 effective programmes showed significant improvements in problem behaviours such as drug and alcohol use, smoking, misbehaviour, violence, truancy, and high risk sexual behaviour.

Programmes to promote student wellbeing exist in schools in diverse forms and with different names. They range from those that grew out of religious, human rights, sustainable development, and mental health underpinnings. Despite the differences in orientation and focus, they have all come to recognize the importance of a more holistic approach that addresses different aspects of school life. This trend towards a holistic approach to student health and wellbeing is most explicitly captured by the Health Promoting Schools (HPS) model. The HPS model is also often used synonymously with a whole-school approach. The following section is a discussion of this approach and the opportunities and challenges related to its implementation.

Schools adopt a certain approach or combination of approaches to promote student wellbeing; either in conscious and explicit ways or implicitly and without being fully aware. Hence, identifying these approaches used can help better understand the implementation of student wellbeing promotion in schools.

Health Promoting Schools and the Whole-School Approach

The WHO (2014) defines a health promoting school as "one that constantly strengthens its capacity as a healthy setting for living, learning and working." Such schools foster health and learning by engaging all stakeholders in their efforts to create healthy environments; develop healthy policies and practices; provide health education to develop knowledge, skills, and attitudes; reorient health services and resources towards health promotion; and strengthen community participation to make it a shared responsibility. These represent the five key areas of action in health promotion identified by the Ottawa Charter for Health Promotion (1986). According to the WHO Expert Committee on Comprehensive Health Education and Promotion (1997), it is an essential means to achieve the twin goals of "Health for All", and "Education for All" by integrating school health environment, school health education, and school health services; areas of school health that tend to be dealt in fragmentation. Elaborating on this, St Leger, Young, Blanchard, and Perry (2010) define health promotion in schools as activities "undertaken to improve and/or protect the health of everyone in the school community" (p.3) that consists of the following six essential components:

1) *School policies* that are clearly defined in documents or in accepted practices that promote health and wellbeing (e.g., policies that enable healthy food practices, and policies which discourage bullying).

2) *Physical environment* such as the design and location of buildings, grounds and equipment in and around the school; provision of natural light and adequate shade; spaces for physical activity; and facilities for learning and healthy eating.

3) *Social environment* such as the quality of relationships among and between staff and students; relationships with parents and the wider community; and connections among and between all the key stakeholders in a school community.

4) *Health skills and action competencies,* or the formal and informal curriculum and associated activities that will enable students to gain age-related knowledge, skills and experiences, or competencies to improve the health and wellbeing of themselves and others in their community; and enhance their learning outcomes.

5) *Community links* or the connections between school and families, community, and other stakeholders to engage them in appropriate consultation, participation, and support.

6) *Health services* that are local and regional school-based or school-linked for health care and promotion of students including those with special needs (St Leger et al., 2010).

The six components outlined above fall into three key interrelated components or domains of a whole-school approach:

(i) formal curriculum to teach the essential knowledge and skills for making enlightened choices affecting their wellbeing;

(ii) the school ethos, organization, and environment, which refers to the quality of the physical and social environment, policies, and services; and

(iii) school-community partnerships for consultation, participation, and support (see for e.g., Deschesnes, Martin & Hill, 2003; Ostroff, O'Toole & Kropf, 2007; Weare, 2000).

A useful contribution to the Health Promoting School model is a theory proposed by Markham and Aveyard (2003), particularly because it brings together existing theories and outlines their practical application to school settings. It draws on Nussbaum's (1990) ethical-political theory of human functioning, and Bernstein's (1975) theory of cultural transmission to outline a practical approach to student wellbeing. According to this theory, good human functioning, or wellbeing is dependent on the realization of two fundamental capacities of practical reasoning, and affiliation with others; and these should be the primary focus of health promoting schools. This theory recognizes the idea that academic learning and wellbeing are integral parts of human functioning, and therefore, need to go hand-in-hand. According to Markham and Aveyard (2003), these functions can be achieved in schools by encouraging greater student involvement in pedagogic practices as well as decision-making processes; and increasing partnership and collaboration with parents and community.

The HPS model is often referred to as a "whole-school approach" due to its holistic approach that addresses all aspects of school and community that affect student health and wellbeing. This represents a social response in contrast to the more individual-focussed response such as the positive youth development discussed earlier. A whole-school approach means ensuring that students learn appropriate knowledge, skills, and attitudes through the formal curriculum and classroom practices supported by sound policies, guidelines and practices. It

involves all the members of the school community (students, staff, parents, and other community members), and works across all areas of school life, including community involvement. Consistent with the ecological-systems perspective (Bronfenbrenner, 2005), and wellbeing being personal, relational, and collective in nature (Evans & Prilleltensky, 2007), discussed in Chapter 2, it views school as a part of the wider community; and wellbeing as a function of interactions between various levels of the system, and thereby making its promotion a shared responsibility. According to Weare and Markham (2005), the strength and efficacy of a whole-school approach lies in its holistic approach that emphasize consistency in policies and practices, and wellbeing promotion as a shared responsibility of all.

Understanding Approaches to Student Wellbeing: Models of Health Promotion

Health promotion literature talks about three distinct models - bio-medical, social, and ecological. These models provide a useful backdrop to understand and place discourses around student wellbeing and its promotion within a theoretical as well as a historical perspective.

The biomedical model of health is based on provable facts, derived from rigorous procedures; and presumes that our state of health is a biological fact (Taylor & Hawley, 2010). According to Gutkin (2012), by attributing health and educational difficulties to internal states of disease and pathology, the bio-medical model has inadvertently influenced the creation of a service delivery system that focuses on individual pathology and remediation reliant on treatments of limited efficacy and expert knowledge. He points out that these have undermined the role of systemic intervention for general populations through prevention and early intervention, the role of environment, and other stakeholders. This model ignores the role of environment in shaping health, and primarily sees health as an individual responsibility. Hence, health promotion deriving from this model focuses on interventions in response to problems; and addressing risk behaviours and healthy lifestyles, emphasizing health education for shaping knowledge, attitudes and skills.

The social model of health, on the other hand, emphasizes the broader determinants of health by addressing it mainly through inter-sectoral collaborations to reduce social inequities, enable access to health care, and empower individuals and communities. Taylor and Hawley

(2010) argue that the health or ill-health we experience relates to the way society is organized. Our health and wellbeing has a historical, cultural and social context that can undermine our rational choices as autonomous individuals. A range of factors such as social and physical environment, health care services, poverty, employment, and education impact our health and wellbeing. Hence, state intervention through social policies is critical to promote wellbeing.

It is, however, important to recognize that the two models described above are in reality more of a matter of emphasis rather than existing in their pure forms. They are used here mainly to highlight the key dimensions and reflect a historical progression and preferences towards a more holistic view and approach that recognize inter-relationships over the years.

The ecological model of health acknowledges the reciprocal relationship between health-related behaviours and the environment, and views individuals as embedded in nested layers of sub-systems. It emphasizes the relationships and inter-dependencies between these sub-systems; and relies on a comprehensive, multi-faceted, and shared framework for change at individual and environmental levels. This model is based on the recognition that we grow up in a social ecology, a nested arrangement of family, school, neighbourhood, and community contexts (Earls & Carlson, 2001). Bronfenbrenner (1979, 2005) conceptualized the individual as embedded in layers of interlocking environmental systems ranging from the proximal family and community to broader systems of law, culture and socio-historical contexts. According to this view, human health and behaviour is a result of complex interactions between individual attributes and the characteristics of various levels of environmental systems.

Approaches to the promotion of student wellbeing can be located within these models of health promotion. Much like the earlier discussion on the focus of certain dimensions of wellbeing being accorded primacy along disciplinary lines, both bio-medical and social models emphasize certain aspects of health and wellbeing, while underplaying others. The ecological model, on the other hand, is consistent with the view of wellbeing as a holistic concept encompassing the personal, relational, and collective components as inter-connected. The individual, relational, and collective dimensions represent the 'what', whereas the models represent the 'how' of wellbeing promotion that are inter-connected.

Other ways in which people have tried to make sense of approaches to student wellbeing promotion are by looking at the models of wellbeing services delivery, and the focus or objects of interventions used. In other words, descriptions of approaches to student wellbeing promotion either focus on the form or the content. Spratt, Shucksmith, Philip, and Watson (2006) delineate the forms that wellbeing promotion take; while Stokols (1996) points out how wellbeing promotion approaches differ in ways they give priority to the content of programmes.

Models of service delivery

Spratt et al. (2006) identify three ways in which schools address mental health and wellbeing, while also noting that they are not always clear-cut distinctions. The "export" model removes students with difficulties from the school by making referrals. This often ends up with a large number of referrals but little work on improving the school environment to be inclusive. The "import" model introduces other types of workers such as counsellors and psychologists to the school to take responsibility for mental health. This puts students at the centre of service delivery, but in practice, they tend to be not so well integrated in the school (Tett, Munn, Kay, Martin, Martin & Ranson, 2001), and are often plagued by misunderstanding and professional mistrust (McCulloch, Tett & Crowther, 2004). They tend to be seen as specialists 'mending' or 'fixing' children who do not fit with the expectations of the school; when schools would be served best if they are viewed as a source of advice, consultation and professional development, rather than simply as trouble-shooters and problem fixers (Spratt et al., 2006). Finally, there is the "ownership" model which takes steps to address mental health as a whole school issue. In this proactive approach, schools put student wellbeing at the very heart of their value systems, take ownership of wellbeing of the school population, and works in partnership with other agencies. According to Spratt et al. (2006), unless schools address pupils' experience of the whole school environment, there is little hope that the targeted endeavours of specialists will have much impact.

Focus/ objects of intervention

Wellbeing issues in schools involve complex interactions between a multiplicity of individual or contextual factors. Stokols (1996) identify three distinct, yet complementary,

perspectives on health promotion of behavioural change, environmental enhancement, and social ecological improvement. Behavioural change or lifestyle modification view individual health behaviour as the key determinant of wellbeing. Hence, the focus of behavioural change focused programmes focus on modifying health-related attitudes, beliefs, and behaviour requiring voluntary and sustained effort by those targeted. Programmes focussed on environmental enhancement and restructuring view the quality of physical and social environments as key determinants of health. In this, health promotion interventions entail the improvement of environmental hygiene, safety, and strengthening social supports for health. Social ecological approach, on the other hand, sees the degree of fit between people's biological, behavioural, and socio-cultural needs and the environmental resources available to them as determining health and wellbeing. The focus in this orientation is to integrate behavioural and environmentally based health promotion strategies both at individual, organizational, and community levels.

The 'ownership model' and the social ecological perspective described above are consistent with a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion, and provides the rationalization for a whole-school approach. In summary, approaches to student wellbeing promotion should recognize the inter-relationships, and address both behavioural and environmental changes to be effective. Addressing wellbeing should be integral to what schools do, in partnership with other stakeholders, and not just few people's or an expert's responsibility.

Effectiveness of Whole-School Approach

Several systematic reviews report research evidence in support of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion. St Leger et al. (2010) based on their review of research literature on health promotion assert that school programmes that are integrated, holistic and strategic are more likely to produce better health and education outcomes than those which are mainly information-based and implemented only in the classroom. This confirms an earlier review of research literature on health promoting schools and health promotion in schools by Lister-Sharp, Chapman, Stewart-Brown, and Sowden (1999), which described HPS as a promising and multifaceted approach likely to be most effective given its focus on a combination of curriculum, ethos and environment, and family and community partnerships. Studies they reviewed show that the approach was successful in improving health behaviour such as dietary

76

intake and fitness; as well as aspects of mental and social wellbeing such as self-esteem and bullying, even though results were not consistent across all studies. Lee, Cheng, Fung and St Leger (2006) report that students in schools accredited as HPS schools enjoy better health status and academic standards, a lower prevalence of emotional problems, fewer episodes of unacceptable social behaviours, improved eating habits, and increased satisfaction with life compared to those that were not accredited as HPS schools. Wells, Barlow, and Stewart-Brown (2003), in their review of interventions using a universal approach to mental health promotion report evidence of effectiveness for programmes that adopted a whole-school approach, especially if they are implemented continuously for more than a year. Further support comes from a synthesis of reviews by Stewart-Brown (2006) which determined that school-based programmes designed to promote mental health are particularly effective if developed and implemented using the HPS approach. A more recent review of the HPS framework in improving wellbeing and academic achievement by Langford et al. (2014) using meta-analysis of randomized control trials report evidence of improvement in some areas of health such as physical activity and fitness, tobacco use, and being bullied; but not in others such as alcohol and drug use, violence, and mental health. However, the authors admit that there were only a small number of studies in the areas where no evidence of effectiveness could be found. Similarly, there were only two studies that reported academic-related outcomes, and only a few that reported on other school-related outcomes, making it impossible to draw any conclusions.

One example of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion is the *MindMatters* mental health programme initiated by the Commonwealth Government of Australia. A number of studies have reported on its implementation and effectiveness. They include a pilot study of the programme across Australia (Wyn, Cahill, Holdsworth, Rowling & Carson, 2000); evaluations of professional development programme and school-level implementation (Hazell, 2005), implementation of mental health curriculum resources (Askell-Williams, Lawson, Murray-Harvey & Slee, 2005), and partnership programme (Khan, Bedford, & Williams, 2011); a national survey of wellbeing policies and practices (Ainley, Withers, Underwood & Frigo, 2006); and an evaluation of the programme. These reports highlight both opportunities and challenges in implementing a whole-school approach to student wellbeing. Both Wyn et al. (2000) and Hazell (2005) report that the schools find the comprehensive

framework provided by MindMatters helpful to envision and facilitate the promotion of student wellbeing and school change process in holistic and strategic ways. Based on data from 15 schools, Hazell (2005) report a number of key outcomes associated with the implementation of MindMatters in these schools. They observed that there was a decrease in bullying behaviours and an increase in the policies that support bullying victims and management of offenders, improved help-seeking behaviour, an increase in knowledge, awareness, skills and attitudes towards mental health problems among both teachers and students, improvements in attendance and student behaviour, increased job satisfaction among staff arising from more positive relationships with other staff and with students, strengthened school ethos, a shared understanding of wellbeing, and a common language to talk about wellbeing. These findings were not completely consistent across the schools but were reported by most schools in varying degrees.

Two other notable examples of projects that used HPS approach, which indicate positive outcomes are the Aban Aya Project (Flay, Graumlich, Segawa, Burns & Holliday, 2004) and the Gatehouse Project (Patton, et al., 2006). The Aban Aya youth project aimed to reduce substance misuse, poor sexual health, violence, and truancy among high school students in Chicago by enhancing students' sense of belonging and social support. Interventions involved setting up a taskforce of staff, students, parents, and local residents to examine and amend school policies and ethos; partnering with community organisations; training teachers to develop more interactive and culturally appropriate teaching methods; and teaching students social skills. Flay, Graumlich, Segawa, Burns and Holliday (2004) report substantial reductions in substance abuse among boys in the intervention schools compared with those in the control group, in addition to significant benefits regarding condom use, frequency of sex, violence, and truancy. Similar benefits were not reported among girls.

The Gatehouse project included initiating a school-wide group to review policies about inclusion and health behaviour and implement changes. It also included surveys of the health and sense of inclusion among students, the deployment of a health expert to act as "critical friend" in encouraging schools to make appropriate changes, and training of teachers on interactive teaching and better classroom management. A cluster randomised trial in 26 Australian schools

which involved surveying students at the beginning of year 8 (age 13-14) and the end of year 10 (age 15-16) found that students were less likely to report a range of risky health behaviours such as regular smoking, drinking and marijuana use in the intervention schools than in control schools (Bond et al., 2004; Patton et al., 2006).

These project reports suggest the benefits of targeting system-wide changes with multiple interventions in the areas of teaching-learning, ethos and environment, and collaboration with parents and communities.

Hence, overall, a whole-school approach has been reported to result in positive outcomes. However, there are also some concerns and caveats highlighted regarding its outcomes and effectiveness. These include the lack of or limited information on interventions involving school environment and partnerships, drawing links between interventions and outcomes due to its complexity, and lack of detailed information on implementation or process evaluation. Deschesnes, Martin and Hill (2003) point out that evaluation results for interventions using a whole-school approach are still too few in number, and inconclusive when it comes to operationalization of its dimensions of school environment and school-community partnerships. Langford et al. (2014) also reported engagement with families and communities to be the least reported of the three HPS areas, and even within this, studies attempted to involve families rather than community. An earlier study of HPS by Mitchell, Palmer, and Davies (2000) also report increased knowledge and awareness but not much change in policy and practices. They evaluated that implementation of HPS in 22 schools and compared it with 19 control schools after implementation for two school terms. While they observed significantly higher awareness in intervention schools post-intervention, they found very few significant changes to health-related policy and practice in the intervention schools.

Implementing a whole-school approach can be complex, requiring the involvement of a multitude of strategies, sites, and stakeholders, and making direct attribution of outcomes to interventions may not be as clear-cut. Mukoma and Flisher (2004) in their evaluation of HPS interventions in schools found that while the interventions have some influence on various domains of health, it was not possible to draw any conclusions of their efficacy due to the use of

different methodologies, most of which did not allow direct attribution of outcomes to interventions. In addition, there appears to be a lack of information on the implementation process to determine why and how interventions worked or did not work. For instance, Blank et al. (2009) point out that, often school-based interventions lacked detailed information on what the interventions involved beyond their length and number of sessions, suggesting a lack of process evaluations or measurement of intervention fidelity. There is a need for qualitative contextual data that can help understand what works, for whom, how, why, and in what circumstances. On the other hand, implementation in the real world almost always require adaptations to suit the local context as opposed to maintaining fidelity which assumes that one size will fit all (Botvin, Griffin & Nichols, 2006).

Langford et al. (2014) point out that one of the main reasons for not being able to determine the impact of the HPS approach on a number health as well as academic and school-related outcomes, is due to a paucity of data. Hence, more research is required to determine the effectiveness of the HPS approach. Most studies also focussed only on one or two outcomes. For example, 34 of the 67 studies evaluated by Langford et al. (2014) were either on physical activity, nutrition, or both, compared to only seven that looked at multiple risk behaviours. Studies are also predominantly carried out in developed Western countries with very few, if at all, in low-income countries, and in more than one country.

Challenges of Whole-School Approach Implementation

Several studies report a number of challenges and barriers to the implementation of a whole-school approach. Some of the prominent ones include achieving the commitment and active participation of all stakeholders, allocation of time and resources, finding space in a crowded curriculum, conflicting attitude of teachers, and the lack of knowledge and training to implement.

Wyn et al. (2000) point out that implementing a whole-school approach is extremely challenging because it requires going beyond delivering classroom programmes to addressing school ethos and environment, policy and practices, and developing or extending partnerships with parents, community groups or health agencies all of which involved additional time, energy

and resources. This appears to be a consistent observation made by most studies reporting on a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion. Studies of implementation of a whole-school approach in similar programmes such as Education for Sustainable Development (ESD), and school guidance and counseling concur on what teachers and other school staff see as challenges. Hargreaves (2009) in their review of whole-school approach to ESD programmes report that time and resource constraints are identified by teachers and school administrators as common barriers to ESD implementation. They observe that a whole-school approach is viewed by many as simply impractical given existing constraints on teachers' time within already overcrowded curricula. Furthermore, such programmes tend to be conceptualized as an 'add-on' rather than a holistic change involving integration. Lam and Hui (2010) reporting on the implementation of a whole-school approach to school guidance and counseling in Hong Kong, report that teachers were mainly concerned over the lack of time and skills to assist students. Similarly, Orpinas et al. (2000) based on their experience of implementing a comprehensive approach to violence prevention in schools, point out that it is difficult to implement a whole-school approach as it requires time and strong commitment by teachers, administrators and staff to achieve. In schools, implementing new initiatives such as this often means competing for staff time with other parallel programmes (Hazell, 2005). Time is not only required for implementing the programme but also to plan, organize and coordinate amongst the various stakeholders involved from both inside and outside the school (Khan, Bedford & Williams, 2011). In the evaluation reports on implementing MindMatters programme, one of the challenges was finding space in curriculum to include the MindMatters modules; which often meant that it was likely to be relegated to pastoral care classes of one or two lessons per year (Askell-Williams et al., 2005; Ainley et al., 2006).

Teacher attitudes towards student wellbeing promotion, and their knowledge and skills on the subject are reported as areas of concern for effective implementation. Ainley et al. (2006) report that conflicting attitudes of teaching staff posed significant barrier in promoting student mental health and wellbeing through the MindMatters programme. Not everyone believed student wellbeing to be important, or part of a teacher's role. Where school staff acknowledged its importance, lack of appropriate knowledge and training to implement was raised as a concern (Khan, Bedford & Williams, 2011). However, where training was provided, it was not always

possible for staff to attend due to other priorities, unsuitable timing, and sometimes due to limited budget. In some cases, teachers felt that too much was expected of schools and teachers with limited resources (Orpinas et al., 2000; Wyn et al., 2000).

Time and resource constraints in schools appear to be further complicated by gaps in inter-disciplinary collaborations and integration within schools despite claiming to use a whole-school approach. Davis and Cooke (2007) point out that it is the case with HPS and Sustainable Schools programmes in Australia. Both reform movements seek to provide ways of operationalizing transformative educational processes; aim to build resilience and optimism, use action-oriented teaching and learning approaches, and have a focus on the future. Despite the commonality, there is virtually no conversation between their proponents and advocates. Schools may, therefore, have several whole-school programmes added on without reconfiguring them for collaboration and integration, making the curriculum more crowded than may be necessary.

A whole-school approach to promotion of student wellbeing is one in which student wellbeing is an integral component of school's curriculum, culture, structure, relationships, and services. It is one in which wellbeing is a shared responsibility of all stakeholders, and sees wellbeing as a function of interaction between individual and environmental factors. Despite the promise of effective and sustainable outcomes as a result of its holistic approach, its implementation can be challenging as it entails readjustments and restructuring of existing and time-honoured arrangements in schools. Challenges reported include issues of finding time, changing attitudes, lack of resources, required knowledge and skills, and collaboration and integration.

Conclusion

Student wellbeing promotion has gained some attention in recent times, mainly in response to social changes that impact on young people's as well as societal wellbeing. Student wellbeing promotion has thus far been viewed as peripheral to what schools do, and has mostly been practised as 'add-on' activities, and in fragmented ways. This is evident from a variety of labels and approaches with different underpinnings that have been in use. More recently, there is

a growing recognition for the need to be more holistic in approach. This means making student wellbeing promotion integral to what schools do, and making it a shared responsibility of all stakeholders.

Research literature suggests that a whole-school approach to be effective in promoting student wellbeing despite also being challenging to implement. This is mainly because a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion, entails interventions in multiple domains, involving all stakeholders including parents and community agencies. It requires the infusion of wellbeing across all spheres of school life ranging from its policies, curriculum, structures, practices, to relationships and external networks.

Despite the recognition of the promise that a whole-school approach holds for student wellbeing promotion, it entails transformational changes in the ways in which schools typically operate. Due to the complexities involved in implementing a whole-school approach, studies report several challenges in its implementation. This is mainly believed to be the case because implementing a whole-school approach often requires a fundamental shift in the way schools think about student wellbeing as well as the ways in which they are organized. However, there exists a gap in qualitative information on the nature of challenges that implementers experience to understand the challenges of implementing a whole-school approach to student wellbeing. This study aims to contribute towards filling this gap.

The biggest challenge for a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion lies in its implementation, as it appears to be the case with most educational reform. Chapter four draws on educational change literature, particularly on the implementation of change, to analyse the implementation of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion.

CHAPTER 4. THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SCHOOL CHANGE AND STUDENT WELLBEING

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I have argued that implementing a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion is likely to require a fundamental shift from the ways in which schools traditionally operate and are organized. This is because a whole-school approach views the promotion of student wellbeing as an integral aspect of learning in schools, unlike the traditional view of it as incidental or peripheral 'add-on' to the main goal of academic development. Any attempt to understand how the promotion of student wellbeing can be made an integral part of schooling warrants an understanding of educational change and school improvement processes. Consequently this chapter examines literature on the implementation of educational change and its application in the context of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion.

Despite the persuasive evidence in support of a whole-school approach and the potential of a system-wide positive change, several studies have reported challenges and barriers, particularly with regard to implementation. Yet, research evidence suggests that effective implementation has arguably the most powerful impact on outcomes. For example, Durlak and Dupre (2008) in their extensive review of research involving over 500 studies conclude that effective implementation is associated with better outcomes. This is consistent with Wilson, Lipsey and Derzon (2003), and Wilson and Lipsey's (2007) findings that it is the quality of the implementation that determined how effective interventions were for school-based intervention programmes on aggressive and disruptive behaviour. In the light of these reports, both on challenges of student wellbeing promotion as well as on the critical role of implementation in ensuring programme efficacy, understanding implementation becomes crucial for understanding student wellbeing promotion. This chapter looks at implementation as a key element in the change process that is a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion.

The implementation of student wellbeing promotion, particularly using a whole-school approach, necessitate departures from ways in which schools are used to thinking about student

wellbeing as well as the ways in which they are organized and structured. The first part of the chapter draws on literature on school change process and action theories of educational change, and relates these to the implementation of student wellbeing promotion. The second half focuses on factors that influence implementation of change in schools with reference to the promotion of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing.

The Change Process

The study of change is a vast field in its own right with concerns across disciplines that range from personal change management to leading and managing organizational and social change. The objective here is to draw on insights from this field to understand the implementation of wellbeing programmes in schools. This section discusses the three phases in a change process, the dynamics involved in the phases, and their relevance to the promotion of student wellbeing as change.

Lewin's (1947, 1997) work on social change was among the first to provide a framework for understanding change as a process. It views social change as a process consisting of three key stages of 'unfreezing', 'movement', and 'freezing'. The first step toward change is 'unfreezing' or developing awareness of the need to change, and creating motivation for becoming different. According to his 'force-field analysis theory', there are forces that promote the change goal (driving forces), and those opposing it (restraining forces). For the change process to begin, driving forces must be relatively stronger than the restraining forces, and a certain degree of tension must be created. Once openness or 'unfreezing' has been achieved, the next step is 'movement' or actions that move the system to a new level or changed state. Restraining forces can continue to make movement very difficult in the form of resistance or protection of status quo. 'Freezing', also referred to as 'refreezing' involves actions or processes that support the change and lead to resilience against resistant forces. It is important to point out here that, perhaps due to the choice of labels such as 'freezing' that create an imagery contradictory to change, Lewin's model has often been misread and criticised as being too mechanistic, viewing change as linear, stable and predictable (Burnes, 2004). Lewin actually assert that social settings are in a state of constant change; and describe change as a complex and iterative learning

process, fluid and unpredictable by nature. By 'freezing', he referred to preventing individuals and groups from regressing to their old behaviours rather than being frozen in a certain state.

Marcus (2000) has aptly reframed Lewin's three-stage change process as an outcome of a series of conflict resolution activities that involves three critical psychological components of motivation, resistance, and commitment. This perspective of change process shifts the focus on understanding the dynamics involved in change process. The stages of change process are briefly discussed below.

Motivation and Unfreezing

In order to be open to change, those involved must see a need for change. Marsh (2000) points out that this motivation for change can be either felt or created through dissatisfaction or concern with the way things are. People must be sufficiently dissatisfied with the current state of affairs as well as challenged and supported to face the realities they have chosen to avoid without blaming and shaming. It is only natural for people to cling to the old tried and tested ways, and be afraid to try new ones, especially when the changes involved are large and complex, the time-frame short, and the tolerance for error is low. According to Evans (1996), "In such a context, it becomes easy to rationalize the value of the tried and true and the impossibility of the new. Unfreezing is a matter of lessening one kind of anxiety, the fear of trying, but first of mobilizing another kind of anxiety, the fear of *not* trying" (p.56).

Marcus (2000) highlights two important aspects of "unfreezing" and getting people motivated to change: (a) getting feedback to the system by identifying salient discrepancies between current and desired state from those who are both inside and outside of the system; and (b) creating networks for social support and access to resources needed to manage or tolerate the ambiguity created. This recognizes that unfreezing is not just one step at the start but pervades through the entire change process; and that a support system will be critical in sustaining motivation.

Marsh (2000) suggests a consideration of the likely rewards and costs for key players. He points out that while extra labour-intensive activities, threat to established procedures, having to

work closely with others may all be perceived as 'punishment'; and opportunities to engage in more stimulating teaching, show results such as meaningful student work, increased resources or incentives can be powerful rewards. Additionally, demystifying fears that are often unfounded and perceived, and highlighting potential rewards through dialogues can be helpful.

Resistance and Movement

Resistance is a naturally emerging part of change process. Evans (1996) points out that change upsets existing power arrangements often creating winners and losers; brings added responsibilities to some and benefits some more than others, in addition to the tension created by rising demands in the face of diminishing resources. Stamping out resistance may lead to success but can also overlook potentially constructive role it plays. Two good reasons why resistors need to be respected, according to Fullan (2001) are: (a) they sometimes have ideas we might have missed, and (b) things may seem like working but it could just be superficial compliance. Diversity of views may yield deeper and richer understanding whereas consensus despite being pleasant could mean superficial agreement. Hence, it may even be useful to deliberately build in differences rather than going only for like-minded innovators.

Marcus (2000) advises that the goal should be to manage resistance productively, and not prevent them from emerging. For instance, breaking down conflicts into manageable pieces and working on them can lead to constructive resolution and enhance confidence. On the other hand, if change is overwhelming, tension levels can become difficult to manage. Thus, keeping some parts of the system stable can reduce the stress level and foster constructive resolution. Further, giving a chance to mourn the loss that change may involve can also serve to weaken resistance. However, it is important to revisit the assumptions about the past to be able to move forward. Abundant availability of resources (time, money, people) may help weaken resistance but it can also undermine change.

Resistance is likely to be stronger when the need for change is not well understood. Non-involvement of those who are affected in the planning, and those with strong interests in maintaining the status quo are two strong motives for resistance (Marcus, 2000). According to Fullan (1999), differences may be better incorporated early in the process of change when there

is chance to address problems than to avoid conflict and face it later when it may be unresolvable.

The promotion of student wellbeing, as described in the previous chapter, is very likely to encounter challenges of motivation and resistance as it will entail disruptions to status quo and new ways of doing things. These may entail a redistribution of limited resources and additional responsibilities that are not always welcome in the absence of immediate and tangible benefits. As a relatively new area, in-depth explorations of the experiences of implementers to understand how these play out in schools remain more or less uncharted.

Gaining Commitment

Commitment is an important element for change to be sustainable. However, commitment requires patience and participation. Active and meaningful participation leads to commitment (Marcus, 2000). For this to happen, it is very important to involve and engage those who will be affected by the proposed change at every stage of the change process. People do not wish to change because they do not see it as meaningful, and change involves a loss in giving up long established ways of doing things (Evans, 1996). People need time and support to process this loss and fashion their own meaning of change (Evans, 1996, Marcus, 2000). This is important if change is to be transformational in that it not only affects change in behaviour but also changes the way people think or their underlying beliefs. Marcus (2000) warns that in hierarchical systems, it is often very difficult to tell compliance from commitment.

In the case of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion, gaining commitment from all stakeholders will be critical given that it is based on the premise that promoting student wellbeing is a shared responsibility. Yet the involvement of multiple stakeholders including those from outside the school such as parents and community agencies can make it complex and daunting. Since it also entails a fundamental shift in doing things as well as the underlying beliefs, change is likely to be slow and demanding in many ways.

In summary, contrary to the misleading imagery of change as stable and static generated by the use of terms such as freezing and unfreezing, Lewin's (1997) idea of change as a three-

stage iterative process provides a simple framework to understand the complex process of change. His 'force-field analysis' is a useful tool that can used to understand the dynamics of forces that help or hinder change, and how they may be negotiated to achieve desired outcomes.

Implementing change successfully entails creating dissatisfaction with the way things are, making those involved understand the benefits of change beyond the costs, and mobilizing sustained commitment. It is important to view change as a "process" involving the dialectical stages of unfreezing or building motivation, movement or implementation of change, and refreezing or stabilizing reform. Fullan (2001) has used the terms initiation, implementation, and institutionalization to refer to similar iterative phases in change process. While these provide a useful tool for visualizing the change process, the bottom-line is that, it is a complex process that is by nature fluid, non-linear and context specific. It cannot be dictated or managed in a rigid step-by-step process and involves uncertainty. It is a process of collaborative 'meaning-making' (Fullan, 2001), a learning journey full of problems that are potentially friends, and requires leadership, resource support and a systematic approach (Fullan, 2011).

Therefore, implementing change effectively involves both structure and open-endedness. This could be more so in the case of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion owing to its potential complexity. It will require enough structure to maintain its focus, and flexibility to adapt to the demands of context. Action theories in the field of educational change address these needs for structure and open-endedness. The following section is a discussion of two action theories that identify key components of educational change process.

Theories of Action for Educational Change

A theory of action, according to Fullan (2009) is "a way of understanding the world that identifies insights and ideas for effectively improving it" (p.209). In this section, two such theories by Fullan (2009) and Hargreaves (2009) are briefly discussed to identify key components of system change in education. These two not only have parallel ideas but also effectively complement each other to provide a whole system approach to educational change.

Theory of Action for System Change

Fullan's (2009) *Theory of Action for System Change* (TASC) consists of six interrelated components:

1) *Direction from the top and sector engagement*: This includes establishing an inspirational overall vision, a small number of publicly stated critical goals, a guiding coalition or team that ensures clarity and consistency of the components of change, investment of resources, and partnerships with the field to establish engagement with schools and districts. The underlying thinking is that system change requires a blend of top-down direction and investment with bottom-up capacity building; and system leaders that direct but do not try to micro-manage change.

2) *Capacity-building with a focus on results*: Strategies and actions that mobilize capacity are critical. Capacity refers to new knowledge, skills, and competencies; additional resources such as time, ideas, money, and expertise; and motivation on the part of all to put in the effort to get results. Capacity building for results involves the practice of assessment for learning as well as assessment of learning. Capacity-building can be done directly (e.g., providing training, and curriculum resources), and indirectly through use of deliberate strategies designed to help peers learn from each other, within schools, across schools or districts. The underlying thinking is that capacities cause results, and capacity enhancement is motivational as well as empowering.

3) *Supportive infrastructure and leadership*: This entails capacity development at different levels (viz., government, district, and school) to bring about cultural as well as structural arrangements. This will involve reconfiguring and adding to existing resources, and developing leaders who can focus on details and look at the bigger picture simultaneously. The underlying thinking is that without refocussing and refurbishing the infrastructure, things will continue the way it always used to.

4) *Managing the distractors*: In complex political systems, distractors such as collective bargaining, paper work, finance, building issues, safety, and personnel are ubiquitous and

inevitable. Focussing on capacity-building can minimize it, and being aware of them allows us to deal with some efficiently. Distractors should be analysed and acted upon to make them less time and energy consuming.

5) *Continuous evaluation and inquiry*: Theories can never be assumed to be valid once and for all, and it must be always subject to assessment in relation to current and future realities. Leaders of reform at all levels should constantly ask about the effectiveness of the strategies used and what is being learned from their experiences. External evaluators must be employed to provide critical feedback; findings disseminated to a broader audience for external scrutiny and critique; and efforts benchmarked against other established assessments or standards. Modelling ongoing inquiry is a powerful way of practicing what you preach, and help gain strategic insights leading to more effective action.

6) *Two-way communication*: Goals should be matched by strategy to achieve them; and communicating these would be of utmost importance. Communicating the reform strategy will clarify it to others as well as in own minds while providing opportunities for feedback and refinement. Communication to the broader public can increase public confidence and help mobilize support. Change strategies can be complex, and often people do not see the big picture. People can interpret the same things differently, and policies and strategies may need many more communications than you rationally feel is sufficient.

According to Fullan (2009), these six inter-related components need to be addressed for change to be embraced and implemented effectively. These components are not only consistent with the whole-school approach described earlier, but also complement it very well. The whole-school approach as described by St Leger et al. (2010) emphasize more on the content of student wellbeing promotion, and Fullan's (2009) theory of action emphasize the form or the procedural aspects of change.

Inspirational and Sustainable Change

According to Hargreaves (2009), "A viable theory-in-action of educational change must rest on the basic principles of sustainability" (p.17). His theory-in-action for change highlights

purpose, partnership, professionalism, and coherence. Hargreaves (2009) emphasizes that, sustainable educational change depends on the following "Five Pillars of Purpose and Partnership":

1) *An inspiring and inclusive vision*, or a compelling moral purpose that "steers a system, binds it together, and draws the best people to work in it" (p.18).

2) *Public engagement* to increase involvement and understanding that goes beyond consulting just a few focus groups or elite representatives.

3) *Shared responsibility* - parents, communities, and society must work with schools to succeed; and take increased responsibility to match school professional accountability.

4) *Corporate educational responsibility* - corporate social responsibility should extend to schools and education.

5) *Students as partners in change* - students are targets of change efforts but rarely change partners even though they are knowledgeable about things that impact them. Being partners in change means taking responsibility and being involved in decision-making.

These five pillars emphasize the importance of all stakeholders working in partnership towards a shared and compelling moral purpose. Additionally, Hargreaves (2009) views teachers as the 'ultimate arbiters' of change. Hence, for change to be sustainable, he reccomends "Three Principles of Professionalism": (1) high quality teachers through good and supportive work conditions, and quality training; (2) powerful professionalism through continuous professional development and high professional standards; and (3) lively learning communities with collaborative cultures that promote mutual learning and moral support.

Finally, Hargreaves (2009) points out that the biggest challenge of educational change is the challenge of coherence, or bringing together diverse stakeholders to work together skilfully and effectively towards a common goal. This can be achieved through building sustainable leadership; and supportive network that relies on a democratic and strategic approach that puts responsibility before accountability. He suggests a distributed leadership approach that emphasizes a culture of collective responsibility; networks that facilitate innovation, learning and building supportive relationships to increase professional motivation and reduce inequities; a

"build from the bottom, steer from the top" approach where responsibility comes before accountability as some of the key strategies.

Fullan (2009) and Hargreaves (2009) advocate that for change to be effective, it has to be systemic and sustainable. Collaboration among all stakeholders including the involvement of private sector and students form a key aspect of effective change, in addition to others such as leadership, resource support, and continuous feedback for improvement. Put together, they highlight the following for change to be effective and sustainable:

1) A compelling vision or moral purpose that is inspiring and inclusive;
2) Leadership that is distributed and sustainable;
3) Capacity building through continuous professional development and creation of learning communities;
4) Communication and collaboration for public engagement, enlisting corporate educational responsibility, managing distractors, and building supportive networks;
5) Continuous evaluation for critical feedback, and accountability through shared responsibility;
6) Supportive infrastructure and resources; and
7) Student involvement or students as partners in change.

Within the framework of Lewin's theory, these represent the key driving forces that need to be focussed on for change to effectively take place as it goes through different stages. They provide further details to the basic framework to understand implementation of change, and serve as a guide to thinking and action. Fullan (2001) maintains that definitive theories of change do not and cannot exist. They may be useful to stir one's thinking but one has to develop one's mindset, cultivate knowledge, understanding, and skills of complexity science, charting one's way along a non-linear path with unforeseen consequences. Nonetheless, the seven key factors listed above, can provide a framework for analysing the implementation of student wellbeing promotion as change that is both effective and enduring.

In summary, the process of change can be seen as a three-stage reiterative and overlapping process that involve the tasks of motivating, dealing with resistance and distractions to gain commitment, momentum and stability; and further improvement. This entails identifying

the driving forces as well as the restraining forces, and addressing them. Fullan (2009) and Hargreaves (2009) propose a whole systems approach that identify a set of key drivers that need to be addressed for change to be effective and sustainable. The whole-school approach discussed in the previous chapter draws on similar principles, particularly in recognizing it as a shared responsibility of all stakeholders. Both the action theories and the whole-school approach emphasize that for student wellbeing promotion to be effective and sustainable there is a need to go beyond curriculum, teaching, and learning interventions to include strategies that address ethos, organization and environment, and partnerships with other stakeholders.

Implementation of Change

The implementation of change is a critical phase in the change process that is complex and influenced by a range of factors. The following section looks at implementation of change and the factors influencing it.

Fullan (2001) identifies three broad phases to the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. The initiation phase involves a decision to adopt or proceed with the change; the implementation phase entails the experiences of the first attempts in putting change into practice; and the institutionalization phase refers to incorporating or stabilizing change as a regular part of system practices. These phases are not linear and straightforward but in fact merge with forward and backward movement between the phases (Fullan, 2001; Marsh, 2000). Implementation is the process of enacting a reform design or project. Weinbaum and Supovitz (2010) describe it as the uncertain process between design and desired student outcomes during which several forces often cause the programme to mutate in unpredictable ways.

The implementation of change as a complex process requiring attention came to light in the 1970s when it was discovered that huge investments with top-down education reforms did not result in expected outcomes. Until then education reforms generally assumed a direct link between policy inputs and programme outcomes ignoring the proverbial "black box" of local practices, beliefs and traditions (Fullan, 2005; McLaughlin, 2005). Most notably, the landmark

RAND Change Agent study in the mid- 1970s that described implementation as essentially a process of "mutual adaptation" in which reform projects have to adapt to institutional settings and schools must adapt to the demands of the projects (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978).

The quality of change can only be as good as its implementation. Several studies link school reform success and positive outcomes with quality of implementation (for e.g., Datnow, Borman & Stringfield, 2000; Supovitz & May, 2004; Zhang, Shkolnik & Fashola, 2005). Nevertheless, while school reform programmes may be research evidence-based, schools implement them with varying degrees of fidelity (Berends, Bodilly, & Kirby, 2002), and therefore, experience varying outcomes. McLaughlin (2005) points out that it is the local choices about practice that dominate outcomes of change. Schools are bound to differ because not every school shares the same kind of environmental and resource support. Their leadership and teachers can differ in their views of education and approaches used, as may their policies and practices. Even within schools, all teachers make adaptations to programmes (Datnow & Castellano, 2000), and in different ways leading to different consequences (Klinger, Cramer & Harry, 2006). It is now well-recognized that there are too many factors at play than can be controlled through a rigorously designed and well-structured programme for reform initiatives to succeed. In the words of Hopkins (2001), "Educational change is not simply about policies, although they do provide a framework for action, but about the *implementation* of the policies - how they are interpreted by and impact on students, teachers and schools" (p.34). In addition to those in school, there are various other stakeholders involved in it who are bound to act or react in numerous ways that impact the change process. Hence, understanding the dynamics involved in the implementation process is key to ensuring effective change.

Given the potential complexity involved in implementing a whole-school approach that requires active participation by all stakeholders, a consideration of the factors known to influence implementation becomes very important. This section looks at a range of factors at various levels that are known to influence implementation, and thereby outcomes associated with change in school settings.

What Influences Implementation?

Action theories described earlier identify a range of factors that play important roles in the educational change process in general. Several studies and review of studies (e.g., Desimone, 2002; Dusenbury, Brannigan, Falco & Hansen, 2003; Guhn, 2009; Supovitz & Weinbaum, 2010) conclude that implementation as a key stage in the process is influenced by an interaction of numerous factors and conditions. They are often classified into categories such as teacher characteristics, programme characteristics, and organizational characteristics (Dusenbury et al., 2003; Fullan, 2001); or levels such as local, organizational, and external factors (Fixsen, Naoom, Blase, Friedman, & Wallace, 2005; Fullan, 2001).

What follows is a brief outline of important factors that influence implementation that are identified in the literature. They are discussed under four broad categories of programme characteristics such as design and requirements; teacher characteristics and professional development; school organizational and contextual factors; and factors external to school. Needless to say, these are clearly interlinked and overlap, and it is likely that the interaction amongst these influence implementation more than each one by itself.

Programme Characteristics

Several programme related factors such as its degree of complexity, clarity of guidance provided, affinity to existing policies and practices, assessment and feedback, duration and whether it meets perceived need(s), can affect implementation. The whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion is not only complex, but also requires a shift in thinking as well as doing things. Factors such as the provision of guidance and how it fits in with other school policies and practices, the extent to which it is valued, and carefully planned to demonstrate positive change and improvement are bound to influence effective implementation.

Complexity, clarity, and degree of structure

Kurki, Boyle and Aladjem (2006) report that programme guidelines and practices provided by programme developers significantly predict the level of implementation. Programmes that provide clear instructions to simplify the implementation tasks while at the

same time explicitly state the essential elements are more likely to be implemented with fidelity (Dusenbury et al., 2003). On the other hand, Desimone (2002) points out that the more specific and detailed the programme, the less creativity is required of teachers and thereby moving away from teacher professionalism, a crucial aspect of change sustainability according to Hargreaves (2009).

An often held assumption is that highly structured programmes with explicit instructions can lead to programmes being delivered with fidelity and thereby resulting in effective implementation. Klinger, Cramer, and Harry (2006) in their study of the implementation of Success For All, a highly structured and achievement-focussed reading programme observed that highly effective teachers adapted it to address the need of struggling readers, whereas it did not really help with the limitations of teachers with weak instructional and classroom management skills. Highly prescriptive and rigid programmes can curtail creativity while lack of details can make them prone to undesirable mutations. Hence, it may be useful to have some flexibility with a clear statement of the non-negotiable components to allow some room for innovative and skilful teachers to adapt, while unambiguous instructions to simplify tasks may provide sufficient support for the inexperienced and less skilled to meet the minimum required standards. Training and support can be used to complement the programme design and materials.

Fitness to need and alignment with broader goals and other programmes

The extent to which there is a 'fit' between the new programme and the school needs, as well as the importance that they attach to it relative to other competing needs determine how well it is implemented (Fullan, 2001). Programmes that are externally imposed and complex are less likely to find this fit if implementers are not able to see the need, and often in complex changes they may not be understood until they start implementing it. Programmes that are designed to address issues that are seen to be problematic by the school staff and are central to the work that they do are more likely to engage them to implement (Weinbaum & Supowitz, 2010). They also tend to be implemented more accurately (Slavin & Madden, 1999).

Reform efforts that connect well with ongoing state and district level reform efforts are likely to receive support, and therefore are found to make greater progress (Desimone, 2002;

Weinbaum & Supovitz, 2010). Programmes that have clear links with other reform efforts, require less change, and suits school's culture and environment are more likely to be better implemented (Desimone, 2002).

Assessment and feedback

Noell and Gansle (2009) identify assessment of implementation and performance feedback as an important support for effective programme implementation and for sustaining programmes. They serve the dual purpose of monitoring progress as well as identifying support needs. Guhn (2009) points out that formative assessment can be used as an effective way of addressing the individual and cultural or contextual differences in support needs. Deschesnes, Martin and Hill (2003) identify process evaluation that provides information on problems and need for adjustments as an essential condition for achieving sustainable implementation. Similarly, Desimone (2002) point out that use of benchmarks against which to measure progress, and communication and support between the design team and schools can facilitate effective implementation by providing information, monitoring, and evaluation.

Programme duration

Desimone (2002) maintains that programme designs must make allowances for necessary time for programmes to be fully implemented and become stable, as the desire for immediate results can make schools to give it up too early as not working. Longer duration of implementation is associated with better outcomes. For example, Borman's (2009) meta-analysis of 29 Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) models show that increases in achievement outcomes are consistently associated with greater number of years of implementation. Substantial increases were observed after the fifth year of implementation even though a slight decline has been observed after the first year. Sterbinsky, Ross and Redfield (2006), in their quasi-experimental study over three years report that CSR schools showed marked improvement and substantial changes in achievement, and implemented methods and approaches consistent with the orientation of reform models compared to their control group by the third year. Another study by Zhang, Shkolnik and Fashola (2005) report similar results and attribute it mainly to higher levels of implementation. These suggest that sustained implementation over a number of years is important for effective outcomes.

Understanding programme characteristics could be an area of special relevance for the implementation of student wellbeing promotion, particularly because it tends to be viewed as peripheral 'add-on' programme that may not necessarily be aligned to existing goals and other programmes. They are also rarely assessed or evaluated, and therefore, also taken less seriously as compared to the academics. Programme characteristics such as degree of structure, alignment to needs, duration, and assessment represent but some among a range of key factors that will need to be addressed as part of a whole-school approach implementation.

School Organizational and Contextual Factors

Quality of leadership, school culture, staff morale, and the provision of adequate time and resources are known to play important roles in implementation success (Desimone, 2002; Dusenbury et al., 2003; Kurki, Boyle & Aladjem, 2006); whereas they tend to be consistently underestimated (Elias, Zins, Graczyk & Weissberg, 2003). School ethos, organization, and environment is identified as one of the three key components of a whole-school approach. Having well-defined policies, structures, and physical as well as social environments that are safe and engender positive relationships are considered critical to promoting wellbeing in school (St. Leger et al., 2010). For example, studies have reported concerns regarding staff attitudes (Ainley et al., 2006), and time and resources support (Hargreaves, 2009; Hazell, 2005; Orpinas et al., 2000) for effective implementation.

Leadership

In schools, there are formal leaders and informal leaders who do not hold formal titles but nevertheless are very influential and looked upon by peers as leaders (Riggan & Supovitz, 2008). Formal leadership such as principals, deputy principals, and subject department heads play central roles in implementing change. Not only is the active involvement of principal in a programme makes it most likely to succeed, but it also serves to legitimize whether the change is to be taken seriously (Fullan, 2001). Weinbaum and Supovitz (2010), based on their study, report that the school leadership's advocacy and attention established the reform agenda and created the pressure through expectations as well as incentives for staff to implement. Both Kotter (2007)

and Fullan (2009) emphasize the importance of forming a guiding coalition or a critical mass of reform-minded people to lead the change effort.

Support from school leaders is likely to serve as a motivating factor for teachers to implement reforms. For instance, Ransford, Greenberg, Domitrovich, Small, and Jacobson (2009) report that teachers who perceived higher support from the school administration reported higher quality of implementation whereas those who reported negative perceptions of support reported low levels of implementation. Massey, Armstrong, Boroughs, Henson, and McCash (2005) found the support of school administrators to be critical to successful programme integration. In addition to support from formal school leaders, Weinbaum and Supovitz (2010) point out that informal leaders as fellow teachers sharing the same experience of implementation are in a position to provide a different kind of support as colleagues grapple with the fine-grained details of reform implementation.

On the other hand, schools that are successful in making dramatic improvements are often driven by charismatic leaders, and their success cannot be sustained once the leaders leave (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2009), fostering dependency rather than enlightenment (Fullan, 2001). High rate of teacher and administrator turnovers can adversely impact reform initiatives. Stable leadership and at least a critical mass of teachers that are pro-reform initiative will be critical for a reform to be stable. Due to the slow pace of school reform that typically takes at least five years for transformations to occur, the stability of teachers and principals as well as the school environment and policies become very important (Desimone, 2002).

Culture

Just as making changes in the environment is expected to work for students, so must teachers' environment be addressed for change to work (Noell & Gansle, 2009). Existence of sound teacher community with shared values and goals play very important roles in promoting implementation with high fidelity (Kurki, Boyle & Aladjem, 2006). Weinbaum and Supovitz (2010) assert that personal connections and relational aspect of support play very important roles in enhancing implementation fidelity. According to Fullan (2001), implementation is affected by both individual teacher characteristics as well as the collective or collegial factors. The quality of

101

working relationships among teachers that are characterized by collegiality, open communication, trust, support and help can positively influence implementation. Professional learning communities, for instance, effectively use a "pressure and support" strategy through a 'lateral accountability' that enhances successful implementation. Implementation of reforms is found to be slower in secondary schools, particularly in traditionally structured ones, than in elementary schools (Desimone, 2002). Hargreaves (1995) highlight how secondary schools tend to be 'balkanized' into 'departmental cubby holes'; and how surveillance and bureaucracy can lead to contrived collegiality in the name of collaboration.

Leaders play the crucial role of creating the right climate for sustaining commitment for effective change. According to Lee (2004), culture change begins with transforming the mindset of leaders, and the leadership style of the managers is the most significant determinant of an organization's culture.

Time and resources support

Reform programmes often entail increased workload in addition to learning how to do things differently. Implementation of change entails upsetting well-established behavioural ecologies requiring changes in relationships and novel practices that require time and effort (Noell & Gansle, 2009). However, often making necessary time concessions can be overlooked given the busy and routinized nature of school work.

Policy and resource support provide a strong impetus for achieving change in practice settings (Rowling & Samdal, 2011). Allocation of time and resources communicate support and lends authority to it (Desimone, 2002). Programmes that start off well can be cut short by withdrawal of funding before it becomes institutionalized.

In the context of the implementation of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion, being time poor is a common feature in the list of challenges reported by schools (Hazell, 2005; Khan, Bedford & Williams, 2011; Orpinas et al., 2000; Wyn et al., 2000).

Student involvement

Hargreaves (2009) point out that students are usually targets of change efforts and services, but rarely change partners even though they are knowledgeable about things that impact them. According to him, empowering students to take responsibility and being involved in decision-making is in itself a great way of creating change agents. Engagement of students can range from just consulting students to providing training and opportunity for student leadership and active participation in decision-making (Holdsworth & Blanchard, 2006). However, Norman (2001) points out that implementing effective student participation will require shifts in attitudes of both students and adults amongst other things. Rowling and Samdal (2010), based on consultations with young people, recommend use of age appropriate models for them to be able to develop a sense of control, connectedness, and meaning that matches their cognitive and social skill levels.

Factors such as leadership, school culture, time and resource support, and student involvement are bound to impact the implementation of student wellbeing promotion, but it will be useful to understand the nature and dynamics of their influence within the context of a whole-school approach.

Teacher Characteristics and Professional Development

Effective implementation requires the acceptance of implementers who will need to be equipped with the required knowledge and skills to change (Fullan, 2005). Teachers play the most critical role in school reform (Barber & Mourshed, 2007), particularly in implementing reform initiatives. Supovitz and May (2004) in their study of implementation of America's Choice comprehensive school reform model found that variability in implementation is greater at teacher level than school level suggesting teachers' practices to be a stronger driving force than school-level factors. It is, therefore, no surprise that the lack of teacher knowledge and skills to implement also figure as a prominent concern in student wellbeing promotion (Khan, Bedford & Williams, 2011; Lam & Hui, 2010). In the context of a whole-school approach, teacher competence is critical since it requires not only the teaching of knowledge, skills, and attitudes to promote wellbeing, but also modelling it in their everyday interactions, and in response to conflict or critical incidents.

Competence and professional development

Change and new commitments require new competences. Darling-Hammond (2009) points out that no policies exist that can improve schools if people in them are not armed with the knowledge and skills they need. School leaders and teachers form the two main categories of people who will drive the change process. It is their competences that need to be addressed for any change to be successful and sustainable.

Teacher training or professional development is an important element of successful implementation (Dusenbury et al., 2003; Elias et al., 2003; Noell & Gansle, 2009). Preparation of teachers for change initiatives reported in the literature usually consists of a few hours or days' training prior to the implementation or on-going professional development spread over different stages of implementation. According to Dusenbury et al. (2003), specific characteristics that should constitute trainings are not very well understood. However, there are enough pointers from research literature that can help shape a reasonably effective professional development. Teacher professional development is believed to be most effective when it is provided to the whole school rather than a select group, and tailored to teacher and school needs (Desimone, 2002). Since implementation entails being able to know as well as do, direct instructions on how to implement followed by monitored in-vivo practices (Noell & Gansle, 2009) help develop both knowledge and skills. Opportunities to observe already established or working models are found to be effective (Desimone, 2002). Fixsen et al. (2005) in their review of implementation research conclude that information dissemination such as literature reviews and practice guidelines, or training by themselves are ineffective implementation methods. Face-to-face consultation and coaching, on the other hand, are found to be effective.

Elias et al. (2003) point out that often reform initiatives do not ensure the explicit communication of the operating theory of learning and action. Klinger, Cramer and Harry (2006) concur and suggest that trainings should include not only what and how of programmes but also on why and when. Stead, Stradling, MacNeil, MacKintosh, and Minty (2007), based on the evaluation study of a multi-component drug education programme, points out that even when teachers implemented the programme contents and activities with fidelity, they found that

teachers did not necessarily understand the underpinnings of the programme such as the importance of interactivity and how normative education is supposed to work.

To summarize , professional development that are frequent, tailored to needs, and with proximity to designers; opportunities to observe established sites in operation; and whole-school training are found to facilitate effective implementation (Desimone, 2003).

Teacher attitude and buy-in

Teacher attitude towards change or acceptance of change initiatives can have an impact on implementation success. Dusenbury et al. (2003) in their review of literature on implementation fidelity found teacher support for the programme, along with their confidence and ability to use interactive methods to be positively associated with programme adoption. Likewise, Desimone (2002) report that reform initiatives with genuine teacher buy-in tend to be better implemented and sustained. Datnow and Castellano (2000) contend that teacher buy-in and training is critical for implementation because, despite all the provision of support, inevitably once teachers closed the doors to their classrooms, it is all up to them. They found that teachers embraced a programme when there was an ideological fit with what they believe to be good teaching or approach, but had reservations or often complained about materials or activities not fitting their preferred way of doing things because the programme was externally designed without their involvement. Desimone (2002) suggests that teacher participation in decision-making is a good way of encouraging them to support reform initiatives.

Teacher experience

There is some evidence to suggest that teacher experience may have a bearing on implementation. Kurki, Boyle and Aladjem (2006) in their study of CSR programme implementation report that new teachers who have been less than a year in a school show significantly lower implementation fidelity. But, Stead et al. (2007) did not find any significant difference in the quality of implementation of an evidence-based programme between novices and teachers with prior experience of drug education, given the necessary training, materials and support. According to Klinger, Cramer and Harry (2006), highly skilled and experienced teachers can adapt to local contexts to overcome programme limitations whereas inexperienced

and not well-prepared teachers could potentially limit it by adapting it to fit their existing notions.

Teachers are key to any successful reform in schools. It is the teachers who will drive the implementation of student wellbeing promotion, and hence understanding the role of teacher characteristics such as their knowledge, skills, and attitudes; and experience in implementing a whole-school approach to student wellbeing is important.

External Influences

Successful systemic change requires participation by all parts of the system that is collaborative in nature. As a system grows, adapts, and evolves, it is the quality of the relationship among members in the system that determines its long-term success (Fullan, 1999). Collaborative cultures provide support and recognize the value of conflicts and use them to innovate.

Support and guidance from the district as well as the central office, and the involvement of parents and community gives change initiatives authority, and thereby contributes to its success. This corresponds to the partnership and services component of the whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion. It recognizes that the influences on student wellbeing as well as the impact of student wellbeing promotion extends far beyond the school. External partnerships can potentially open doors to a wealth of resource support such as expert knowledge and funding support.

Support and guidance from district and central office

School district and community authorities as well as central government agencies play important roles in providing the support for implementation. Fullan (2001) points out that where they are actively working together, with clear roles and expectations, and regular forums of communication, the likelihood of successful implementation is enhanced substantially.

The support that district and other key central administrators show as well as their active knowledge and understanding of the realities of attempting to put a change into practice affect the quality of implementation. Generally, policies and resource allocations originate from the district and central offices; and the extent to which they align with reform initiatives can have a direct bearing on support for its implementation.

Collaboration with parents and community

Sustainable change involves collaborations not just within the school but also with parents, communities, and society. Hargreaves (2009) points out that public engagement in education which involves more than consulting a few focus groups, or elite representatives in decision-making can help secure their support. They can open up opportunities to engage with businesses for corporate social responsibility. Parent and community involvement also contributes to successful implementation by lending authority to the change initiative (Desimone, 2002). Deschesnes, Martin and Hill (2003) highlight school, family, and community partnership to be an important condition for effective implementation.

Partnership with parents and community forms one of the three key areas within a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion. It is also the one about which very little has been reported (Langford et al., 2014).

In summary, it is evident that educational change implementation is a function of interplay between numerous variables inherent in programmes, factors within the school as well as outside the school, making it highly complex. These factors "form a *system of variables* that interact to determine success or failure", making educational change, "a dynamic process involving interacting variables over time" (Fullan, 2001, p.71). Successful implementation efforts are those that require longer-term multi-level approach (Fixsen et al., 2006).

While research literature is helpful in identifying factors that influence implementation success, there is little information on the processes used to gain access to and secure the cooperation of individuals, organizations, departments, and groups (Fixsen et al., 2005). In the context of mental health implementation, Ringeisen, Henderson and Hoagwood (2003) point out

a lack of information on contextual understanding. Fixsen et al. (2005) point to a need to determine "effectiveness of implementation strategies and procedures as they are actually used in practice" (p.75). They also point to a gap in the available literature concerning interaction effects among implementation factors and their relative influences over time. The complexity and multiplicity of variables and actions involved over a period of time makes it very challenging to carry out a comprehensive study.

In conclusion, this review of literature on school reform implementation suggests that notwithstanding the best of intentions, plans and preparations, effective implementation of reform initiatives can be influenced by a range of factors such as programme characteristics, school organization and context, teachers, and external support of parents and community. Many of these factors were also identified in the previous chapter as factors influencing the adoption of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion.

Implementation of Student Wellbeing Promotion

The two preceding chapters reviewed literature on wellbeing. In chapter 2, the subject of human wellbeing as conceptualized across different disciplines was explored, and the key factors that determine wellbeing were identified based on a review of research literature. These fall into the three levels of individual, relational, and contextual factors suggesting that our wellbeing is a function of interactions and inter-relationships between personal, social, and environmental factors. In other words, they are intricately connected, and therefore, require a collective response. This makes wellbeing an important human pursuit that is worthy of a place in education. Across literature, whether it is the development of attitudes and skills for a healthy life, building social capital for a vibrant community, promoting a just and equitable society, or development that is sustainable; education and in particular, schools have been identified as ideal sites of intervention for it to be most effective and enduring.

This brings us to student wellbeing promotion, which was the topic of discussion in Chapter 3. The meaning and practice of student wellbeing promotion has changed over the years (for e.g., from a focus on welfare and discipline to wellbeing). It also continues to be a highly

fragmented area with various traditions that focus on specific aspects such as welfare, mental health, or human rights; quite often co-existing as different programmes within the same school system (for e.g., pastoral care, counselling, and health education). Traditionally, student wellbeing promotion is also relegated to a peripheral support role to the central academic and intellectual development role in schools; whereas the importance of wellbeing in our everyday lives not just as individuals but also as global citizens tell us that education and schools have a critical role in promoting wellbeing.

In recent times, a whole-school approach has been proposed as a way of effectively addressing student wellbeing promotion, by making it an integral part of what schools do, and also potentially facilitating an integration of what has thus far been a fragmented approach. However, due to the fact that a whole-school approach entails simultaneously addressing various factors across the three components of ethos, organization, and environment; curriculum, teaching, and learning; and partnerships and services, it also involves numerous challenges of implementation. For example, Deschesnes, Martin and Hill (2003) outline four key conditions that will need to be addressed for a whole-school approach to student wellbeing to be implemented successfully. They are:

1)   systematic and negotiated planning and coordination in order to translate into practice the global and integrated nature of the approach;

2)   inter-sectoral action that relies on mechanisms that facilitate effective partnership among members involved in the intervention (e.g. shared vision, participation in the decision-making process);

3)   political and financial commitment from various decision makers, which is essential to attain the intensity of implementation needed to yield substantial health and educational gains, without unnecessarily draining the energies of those who deliver them; and

4)   process evaluation as a way to support refinement of the intervention and full implementation.

Rowling and Samdal (2011) further elaborate on this to identify eight components of implementation that need to be put into action for a whole-school approach to be effective. They include preparing and planning for school development, policy and institutional anchoring,

professional development and learning, leadership and management practices, relational and organisational context, student participation, partnerships and networking, and sustainability. These conditions and components recommended by Deschesnes, Martin and Hill (2003) and Rowling and Samdal (2011) are consistent with the action theories proposed by Fullan (2009) and Hargreaves (2009) suggesting a strong agreement in areas of focus for effective implementation of student wellbeing promotion. In addition, the literature on educational change provides a rich source of information on how a range of factors at various levels influence implementation. It is this knowledge that this study draws on to understand the practice of student wellbeing promotion.

The field of educational change, and school reform implementation in particular, despite being only a few decades old as an area of research interest provides a rich source of information that can be applied to understand the implementation of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion as a reform. It provides a theory of action, and rich and useful information on factors that influence change implementation. These provide the guidelines and the lens through which the challenges of the implementation of student wellbeing can be explored. It is the foundation on which this study is based.

Conclusion

Wellbeing is constitutive of personal, relational, and collective aspects that necessitate interventions to promote student wellbeing to be comprehensive, and addressing various layers of factors that influence it. Such a holistic approach is very challenging to implement not only because of its complex nature involving multiple factors at different levels, but also because it entails a shift in how student wellbeing promotion is usually perceived and practiced. The literature on educational change provides some guidance and insights into managing the implementation of student wellbeing promotion as change. It proposes action theories to guide reform initiatives, and identifies a range of factors that are known to influence school change.

Nevertheless, as Fixsen et al. (2005) point out, schools as "organizations exist in a shifting ecology of community, state, and federal social, economic, cultural, political, and policy

environments that variously and simultaneously enable and impede implementation and program operation efforts" (p.58). Whereas research literature has identified influencing factors, it provides very little information of how these numerous factors interact and play out in schools and restrain or challenge effective implementation; and the extent to which evidence-based research finds application in real school change efforts. Much less is known about how the principles drawn from action theories, and the influencing factors identified affect the implementation of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion, particularly as experienced by key implementers in schools. It is this aspect of student wellbeing promotion and change that this study aimed to explore.

CHAPTER 5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Wellbeing is as much an individual as it is a societal aspiration. In so far as education is a preparation for life, schools have the responsibility to promote wellbeing, whether it is to address the personal wellbeing of students, or to prepare them as agents of societal change. Social change forces that impact on young people as well as society in general has drawn attention to the need to address wellbeing. Within education and at school level, there is a growing recognition for a more holistic approach involving the whole school and community to address student wellbeing. This means making it integral to what schools do, as well as making it a shared responsibility of all stakeholders; and moving away from its treatment as a peripheral activity that is the responsibility of a few people. Research literature suggests that a whole-school approach is most promising in promoting wellbeing to achieve the goals of personal as well as collective wellbeing. Nevertheless, due to complexities involved in engaging all aspects of school life involving multiple domains and stakeholders, studies report several challenges in its implementation. Research literature in educational change identifies quality of implementation of change initiatives as a key determinant of effectiveness, despite being most challenging. This is particularly likely in the case of a whole-school approach because implementing it would require a fundamental shift in the way schools think about student wellbeing as well as the ways in which they are organized.

At the same time, there exists a gap in qualitative information on the nature of challenges that implementers experience. Whereas research literature provide guiding principles for action, and identify key factors influencing implementation, very little is known about how they apply to the implementation of student wellbeing promotion. This is particularly true in the case of a whole-school approach using the Health Promoting School model which has its origins in health, and needs to be aligned with education and schools (Samdal & Rowling, 2011). There is abundant theoretical guidance but not enough information from implementation and practice. It is this aspect of student wellbeing promotion that this study investigated, and filling the existing gaps in knowledge that it attempts to contribute towards.

The research methodology for this study draws on the literature on implementation of educational change, and wellbeing, particularly student wellbeing promotion to guide both data collection and interpretation. It views the implementation of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion as a reform initiative; and drew on the literature on student wellbeing and educational change to frame the research data-collection.

This chapter discusses the research methodology chosen for this study and its philosophical and theoretical underpinnings. It begins with a brief discussion of the theoretical perspectives informing the study; followed by an outline of the research design and methods such as sampling, data collection, data analysis, strategies for validating findings, and ethical issues. The rationale or justifications for the choices as well as the procedures involved in the research project are discussed.

Research Approach and Theoretical Perspective

Based on a review of literature on wellbeing and educational change, the basic premise of this study is that wellbeing is a fundamental goal that we all aspire for as individuals as well as communities or societies; and that the promotion of student wellbeing in schools should be about preparing students to achieve this goal. As an approach, the whole-school approach that emphasizes making wellbeing integral to what education and schools stand for, and a shared responsibility of all stakeholders shows great promise in achieving this. However, as in all education reform work, initial reports suggest that implementation in schools represent one of the key challenges. Research literature on the implementation of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion is not only scanty, but has very little to provide on the experiences of key implementers in schools. As the main actors leading implementation, their views and experiences are likely to enrich our understanding of the implementation process and associated challenges, and how they can be addressed. This study is intended to contribute towards filling this implementation knowledge gap by exploring the perceptions, experiences, and aspirations of those leading implementation of student wellbeing promotion in schools.

Consistent with the ecological-systems theory (Bronfenbrenner, 2005), this study views

schools as systems with distinct cultures embedded within broader contextual systems with reciprocal influences between student wellbeing and wellbeing in general. It draws on action theories for school change by Fullan (2009), and Hargreaves (2009); and the Health Promoting School model of a whole-school approach as described in Chapters three and four. This study is therefore framed within these perspectives while every effort have also been made to be open to the views and experiences of the participants.

The participants for this study come from school systems in two different countries that are geographically, socio-economically, and culturally very different as outlined in Chapter one. However, both the systems advocate a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion, even though they are at different stages of implementation. CEOM schools have systematically promoted a whole-school approach for nearly over a decade, whereas it has only been a recent development in Bhutan, most notably with the introduction of the E4GNH initiative. This presents the opportunity of learning about the implementation of student wellbeing promotion in very different contexts as well as at different stages of development.

Theoretical Perspective

All research is guided by some theoretical orientation often referred to as the research paradigm or a theoretical perspective, whether it is implicit or explicitly stated. A paradigm or theoretical perspective refers to the ways of looking at the world and what makes it work usually articulated in the form of a loose collection of logically related assumptions, concepts, or propositions (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). According to Creswell (2007), such worldviews are usually based on philosophical assumptions about the nature of reality (ontology), the relationship between the researcher and the researched (epistemology), the role of values in research (axiology), methods used in the process (methodology), and the language of research (rhetoric). These philosophical and theoretical positions set the intent, motivation and expectations for the research; and influence the way knowledge is studied and interpreted (Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006). In the words of Denzin and Lincoln (2005), "Every researcher speaks from within a distinct interpretive community that configures, in its special way, the multicultural, gendered components of the research act" (p.21).

Cresswell (2007) identifies four distinct worldviews that inform qualitative research: post-positivism, constructivism, advocacy/ participatory, and pragmatism. This study conforms to the constructivist interpretive paradigm. A constructivist interpretive paradigm assumes a relativist ontology, subjectivist epistemology, and a naturalistic methodology (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Ontologically, it holds that there are multiple constructed realities. It recognizes that truth and knowledge are subjective and socially constructed. According to Charmaz (2006), we are part of the world we study, we seek to understand the world in which we live, and develop varied and multiple subjective meanings that are negotiated socially and historically. Hence, epistemologically, the researcher and participants co-create meaning and understanding. Social life exists as people experience it and give it meaning rather than independently existing 'out there'. People are engaged in creating flexible systems of meanings through social interaction which they use to interpret their social world and make sense of it (Neuman, 1999). It then follows that the data or empirical evidence for this is best collected from the natural setting that relies on the participants' views and experiences of the situation or phenomenon being studied leading to an inductive development of a pattern of meanings. There are no objective and accurate observations or inner experiences to discover or uncover. It subscribes to the postmodernist and poststructuralist views that there is no clear window into inner experiences, and that everything is filtered through the lenses of language, gender, class, race, and ethnicity adding to the innumerable subtle variations in human experience (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005).

Guba and Lincoln (2005) point out that values should be part of the foundational dimension of paradigm as it would embed ethics within a paradigm and contribute to the consideration of the role of spirituality in human inquiry. Constructivist interpretive paradigm recognize that researchers as well as participants come with personal biographies such as class, gender, race, culture, and ethnicity, underlying which are different value systems that come into play as they interact. Values are infused in everything we do and there can be no value-free research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Neuman, 1999).

As a rhetoric convention, constructivist interpretive researchers believe in giving voice to participants' experiences as well as their own interpretations within the social, cultural, and historical context of the study. It privileges rich and diverse perspectives.

Within the broad framework of constructivist interpretive paradigm, this study attempted to creatively use materials, methods, and strategies to piece together a set of representations guided by the idea that research is an interactive process shaped by one's own personal history, biography, gender, social class, race, and ethnicity, and by those of other people in the setting (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Each participant has been approached as a unique individual despite any similarities in characteristics such as their role, age, gender, and culture. This is, however, not to negate any similarities and shared experiences. In fact, common themes are bound to emerge as at a broader level, all participants share the common role of being responsible for student wellbeing despite being situated in very different context and culture. Utmost care was taken to be mindful that it is not just about identifying and describing patterns in the responses to pre-determined or preconceived questions, but also exploring the views and experiences of the participants in-depth as they emerge in the course of the study. Throughout the study, efforts were made to not just look for causes and consequences, but also try to understand the actions and the contexts.

Research Design

According to Denzin and Lincoln (2005):

A research design describes a flexible set of guidelines that connect theoretical paradigms first to the strategies of inquiry and second to methods for collecting empirical materials. A research design situates the researcher in the empirical world and connects him or her to specific sites, persons, groups, institutions, and bodies of relevant interpretive material, including documents and archives" (pp. 24-25).

In the research design that follows, for each of the research questions set; the sources, sites, and strategies of gathering data are outlined.

The primary research question that this study set out to answer was: "*How do student wellbeing leaders interpret and negotiate the implementation of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion*?" More specifically, this study explored the perceptions and experiences of key informants on what they considered to be the driving and restraining forces; and the factors that challenged them the most in their student wellbeing roles.

The research design (see Table 5.1 below) is based on a framework that is guided by the literature on educational change and student wellbeing promotion, particularly Fullan (2009)'s Theory of Action for System Change and the Health Promoting Schools model. They represent, to a large extent, the current state of evidence-based knowledge and practices that relate to educational change and student wellbeing.

Table 5.1: *Research Design*

Research Question	Evidence required to answer this question	How this evidence will be gathered?
How are student wellbeing programmes designed?	• Rationale, policies, design process used • definition of wellbeing	• Analysis of documents • Interviews
How are student wellbeing programmes implemented, and what are its challenges?	• experiences and perceptions of school wellbeing leaders • Policy documents • research literature • school and curriculum documents	• Interviews • Analysis of policy, curriculum, and other school documents • Literature review
How are wellbeing programmes assessed or evaluated?	• school reports; research reports • perceptions of change or improvement	• Interviews • Literature review
How is student wellbeing understood, and student wellbeing programmes perceived?	• participants' views of student wellbeing and related programmes • school documents on student wellbeing	• Interviews • Analysis of documents

(see Appendix I for a detailed version of research design)

Whereas the research questions listed above can be most comprehensively answered by using various means, the focus for this study was on the perspectives and experiences of Student Wellbeing Leaders as they play the central role in implementation of student wellbeing programmes in their schools. They represent the most important and critical link between the

professional body of knowledge and skills in student wellbeing promotion, and principals, teachers, parents, and students. They embody the professional knowledge and skills that others in schools may lack, and also have direct contact with students and other key stakeholders on almost daily basis. Most importantly, it is officially their primary role, or at least one of their primary roles. While the perspectives of various other stakeholders such as policy-makers, school leaders, parents, and students would no doubt provide a much more comprehensive information, given the limitations of time and resources available as a research student, the focus of this study is on the perspectives of Student Wellbeing Leaders in secondary schools in two different education systems.

Data Collection Procedures

This section describes the sampling strategy used; the participants and their contextual background; and the data collection instruments used. It also discusses briefly the justification of the choices, where necessary and relevant.

Sampling and participants

Secondary schools in the Catholic system in Melbourne and the public school system in Bhutan were chosen as the sites. Both these contexts have been introduced and described more elaborately in Chapter 1. The Catholic school system in Melbourne officially advocate a whole-school approach to student wellbeing and schools have been implementing student wellbeing promotion along these lines for several years. Schools in Bhutan are in the early stages of putting in place a more systematic approach to student wellbeing. The two school contexts were chosen as they present a unique situation that can contribute to greater understanding of implementation in two important ways. Firstly, it provides an opportunity to understand how similar or different are the experiences and challenges of implementing a whole-school approach in contexts that are very different from each other, not just socio-economically but also geographically and culturally whether it is the broader societal culture or the micro culture at school level. Secondly, it presents an opportunity to understand how the various factors reported to influence implementation in the literature play out in relation to the duration or number of years of implementing a whole-school approach, and also the kind of preparation that was involved. More

importantly, as indicated in Chapter 3, not only are studies detailing qualitative experiences of implementation rare (Blank et al., 2009), but even rarer are studies carried out in economically developing or underdeveloped contexts, and those involving more than one context (Langford et al., 2014), leaving our understanding of the implementation of student wellbeing rather biased and incomplete.

Secondary schools were chosen because of the urgent nature of wellbeing issues that often emerge during this stage. While the wellbeing of students in primary schools is equally important, they often tend to be better addressed because they are in more close-knit classrooms. Primary students also have better family support at home, and developmentally not as prone to many wellbeing issues as in secondary schools. Student wellbeing programme implementation and educational change in general has been reported as being much more complicated and challenging in secondary schools than in elementary schools. They tend to be traditionally structured in hierarchies and departments (Hargreaves, 1995), making implementation of change slower and harder than in primary schools (Desimone, 2002).

A purposeful sampling strategy was used. A purposeful sampling is one in which you "intentionally sample a group of people that can best inform the researcher about the research problem that is under examination" (Creswell, 2007, p.118). According to Devers and Frankel (2000), this kind of sampling is often employed in qualitative research as it suits its goals and logic of enhanced understandings of experiences which is usually sought by "selecting "information rich" cases that provide the greatest insight into the research question" (p.264). Gatekeepers and a selection criteria were used to ensure purposeful selection of participants who can generate rich data based on their lived experiences.

Miles and Huberman (1994) point out that qualitative studies also rely on smaller number of participants with the aim of studying in depth and detail. Participants were selected using a purposeful sampling method to ensure gathering of rich data to engage in exploration focussing on depth to obtain insights into processes and practices, rather than to make inferences or generalizations. It was guided by Onwuegbuzie and Leech's (2007) advice that a sample size "should not be too large that it is difficult to extract thick, rich data" (p.242). Limitations of time

and resources available as well as the limited experience of the researcher as interviewer, however, also played a role in keeping the numbers manageable.

Student Wellbeing Leaders in four schools each were chosen from the two systems making a total of eight participants. According to Yin (2003), selecting multiple cases translates to applying a replication logic. Schwandt (2001) has also argued that such arrangements can facilitate more predictable findings or better understanding as they can generate similar as well as different data through cross-case analyses. The sample size in each group is consistent with Onwuegbuzie and Leech's (2007) suggestion that studies comparing sub-groups should select at least three cases per sub-group.

Since, the study aimed to understand the challenges and opportunities of student wellbeing promotion based on their experiences, two basic criteria were used in selecting participants. One is that the school in which they work should have an organized student wellbeing programme in place. The other was that the participants should have had some training in student wellbeing promotion, and experience of working in a student wellbeing role. According to Johnson (2002), participants who have been thoroughly encultured in the setting and have recent membership participation are considered important characteristics to look for when using in-depth interviewing, in addition to some provisional interest in assisting the researcher; and having adequate time and resources to participate.

The participants represent a wide diversity in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, culture, work experiences, educational background, and professional training. Table 5.2 below provides a brief introduction of the participants and their work contexts. The names used are pseudonyms, and not the real names of participants. These names will be used throughout this report. Contextually, they come from two very different school systems in culturally very distinct countries. Despite the similarity of school level, the settings in which the participants work are diverse in terms of the way they are organized and supported. Box 5.1 below provides a brief introduction to each participant's setting. These will be further elaborated on in the subsequent

chapters.

Table 5.2: *Participant Background Information*

Participant	Gender	Age	Qualification	School type	Wellbeing Experience	Teaching Experience
Teyndel	M	31	BA (English); PGCE	rural, co-ed	6 years	6 years
Lhazom	F	28	BA (Sociology); PGCE	semi-urban, co-ed	4 years	4 years
Pedrup	M	30	BA (English); PGCE	urban, co-ed	6 years	6 years
Keldon	F	26	BA (English) PGCE	urban, co-ed	5 years	5 years
Ken	M	48	B Ed; M Ed (Student Wellbeing)	semi-urban, co-ed	26 years	26 years
Irene	F	50	BA (Social work); M Ed (Student Wellbeing), GDE	semi-urban, co-ed	15 years	N/A
Sharon	F	31	BA; M Ed (Student Wellbeing), GDE	urban, girls only	3 years	7 years
Bella	F	47	BA; M Ed (Student wellbeing); GDE	urban, girls only	15 years	24 years

(Note: PGCE = Postgraduate Certificate in Education; GDE = Graduate Diploma in Education)

Box 5.1: Introduction to participants

Bella is the Assistant Principal (Students) at a girls-only school of about 650 students. Her school has students from diverse communities in about 17 suburbs, with nearly 20% of families supported by Education Maintenance Allowance from the government. She leads the Wellbeing Team consisting of a Learning Support Coordinator, School Counsellor, and Student Administrator, and Year-Level Coordinators.

Irene is a Student Wellbeing Coordinator. Her school is relatively new and growing very fast. It has grown from about 300 students to over 1200 students in about 13 years. It has had huge teacher turnovers including principals and deputy principals in its brief history. Her school does not have a Student Wellbeing Team, but is in the process of working towards it.

Ken is the Deputy Principal of a co-ed school that has about 600 students studying in grades 7 to 10. He chairs the Wellbeing Forum which consists of Year-Level Coordinators, School Counsellor, and Education Support Coordinator.

Sharon is a Year-Level Coordinator in a girls-only school that caters mainly to children of high-SES parents. She reports to the Deputy Principal (Pastoral Care) and leads the Homeroom teachers for her year level in addition to being an academic subject teacher. The Student Wellbeing Team in her school consists of Year-Level Coordinators and the School Counsellor headed by the Deputy Principal.

Teyndel is the School Guidance Counsellor of a semi-urban high school with boarding facilities. The school has the enrolment of close to a thousand students in grades 9 to 12. Besides providing counselling services, he is a full-time academic subject teacher. In his counselling role, he reports to the school's Discipline Committee chaired by the Principal.

Lhazom is the School Guidance Counsellor of a semi-urban high school with about 500 students studying in grades 7 to12. Her school has a Pastoral Care Team that includes herself as the Guidance Counsellor, a Scout Master, and House Advisors. However, this is only an administrative category label, and they rarely work as a team. She provides counselling services and career and value education classes, in addition to teaching an academic subject.

Pedrup is a School Counsellor in an urban high school that has over 1400 students in grades 9 to 12. He is responsible for teaching Career Education and Life Skills classes for all grades; and providing counselling services. His school has a Student Support Department headed by a Vice Principal.

Keldon is a Teacher Counsellor of a high school with over a thousand students in grades 9 to 12. She is a full-time academic subject teacher in addition to being a teacher counsellor. In her role as a teacher counsellor, she is part of the Student Support Unit which is headed by a Deputy Principal.

Participants were sought through the help of gatekeepers and others knowledgeable in the area. They consisted of education officials, principals, university professors, and other professionals who had not only had sound knowledge of student wellbeing, but also had links with schools in

their professional capacities. Their support was not only helpful in selecting participants but also locating potential participants and approaching them. Besides the consent of the participants, permissions were sought from the school principals, the CEOM and the Ministry of Education (Bhutan) before data collection started.

Participants from CEOM schools consisted of a deputy principal (student wellbeing), assistant principal (students), a student wellbeing coordinator, and a year-level coordinator. Participants from Bhutan were designated either as a school guidance counsellor or teacher counsellor.

Instrumentation

Creswell (2007) classifies qualitative information into four basic types: (a) observations, (b) interviews, (c) documents, and (d) audio-visual materials, of which interviewing and observing being the most common and widely used in qualitative studies irrespective of the theoretical approach. Face-to-face interview was the main method of data collection used in this study. Documents and technical literature as well as field notes and memos were used to supplement the interviews, and for triangulation.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) describe the face-to-face interview as a very powerful tool that can be used for "obtaining *here-and-now constructions; reconstructions* of past experiences; *projections* of future expected experiences; verification, emendation, and extension of information obtained from other sources (*triangulation*) or constructions developed by inquirer (*member checking*)" (p.268). Hence, they are ideal for engaging in in-depth conversation with participants to gain an understanding of their perspectives and experiences. They are particularly useful in interpretive inquiry as they allow in-depth exploration of a topic; and are well suited to elicit views of a person's subjective world (Charmaz, 2006). According to her, they provide both flexibility and control - you can pick up and pursue certain themes in the interview, as well as come back to gather focussed data and fill in conceptual gaps.

The approach used for interviewing in this study was to begin with semi-structured open-ended questions to explore a range of perspectives, and increasingly focus on topics of interest

and issues of concern in the subsequent interviews (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). The aim was to encourage and allow a great degree of latitude to the participants to tell their stories, and the researcher to probe and pick on topics and issues the participants initiate that are of the research interest with care and sensitivity. Charmaz (2006) advises that broad, open-ended, non-judgmental questions can help encourage unanticipated statements and stories to emerge; and the researcher should express interest in knowing more by using questions that invite reflections and deeper details involving thoughts, feelings or actions while being respectful and appreciative. This strategy also allows the interviewer to build confidence and enhance the comfort level to ask more probing or challenging questions.

An interview protocol was used as a guide to focus on topics of interest (see Appendix II for details). The general approach used was to begin broadly and dig deeper by following the participants' leads of what they saw as important or problematic as far as possible. According to Richards (2009), "Qualitative data are not collected, but made collaboratively by the researcher and the researched" (p.49). This study subscribed to the view that research interviews are in essence an "inter-change of views" between the interviewer and interviewees to "co-construct knowledge" (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009), in as much as the interviews sought to uncover the views and experiences of the participants in the most authentic manner.

A pilot test of the interview protocol was carried out with two Student Wellbeing Leaders in Melbourne and one in Bhutan. This proved to be very helpful in not only refining the questions but also in understanding the nuances of interviewing such as probing, pausing, using a voice recorder, and watching time without being too conscious of it.

Participants were first contacted by email, and then followed up with a telephone call two to three days later. Upon their willingness to participate, permission was sought from the school's principal, and a meeting was set up to discuss the schedule for interviews as well as to explain the study and the commitments it will require of them. A plain language statement specifying the details of the study was also mailed to each participant along with the invitation to participate.

Interviews were preceded by a visit to the schools to get a feel for the school context and to schedule dates and time that were mutually convenient. This time was also used to clarify any questions or concerns participants may have about the study, and to collect the written consent forms they were required to sign.

Each participant was interviewed three times with at least a gap of one week in between interviews. This allowed the researcher enough time to listen to the interview and prepare for the next interview accordingly. It was also hoped that this gap would provide the interviewees enough time to refresh their thoughts without being too long to forget discussions from the previous interview. Each interview lasted up to an hour, and they were held in the schools where the participants worked. Participants either had their own office space or kindly arranged for a quiet room conducive for the interviews to take place and be audio-recorded.

DiCicco-Bloom and Crabtree (2006) recommend asking broad and open-ended questions in the first interview to counter the apprehension due to uncertainty stemming from the strangeness of a new context before exploring in more depth. They point out that once a comfort level and degree of trust is established, more sensitive questions can be asked. The first round of interviews focussed mainly on gaining a broader perspective of student wellbeing as practiced within the context of each participant. It was used to encourage emergence of topics or issues of interest to participants as far as possible. Subsequent interviews were intended to dig deeper to elaborate on the topics of interest and issues brought up by the participants in relation to the research questions. In reality, however, participants were often keen to candidly discuss certain topics or issues at much deeper or greater length than was expected, soon after the first five to ten minutes into the initial interview. Having more than one interview with each participant allowed the researcher to pick up points that were missed, or questions that were forgotten to be asked in the previous interviews. Even though the interviews were semi-structured with open-ended questions around themes, participants were encouraged and often prompted to elaborate on topics and issues they brought up rather than sticking to a uniform set of questions and sequencing of questions for all participants. Throughout the interviews, the goal was to encourage the interviewees to share as much information as possible, unselfconsciously and in their own words as advised by Johnson (2002).

Initial apprehensions about being able to elicit rich responses were laid to rest after the first few interviews. Participants, especially those in Melbourne, were very forthcoming and ready to share issues and concerns soon after the first five to ten minutes of sharing during which I mostly sought to familiarise myself to the overall student wellbeing context in their schools. Bhutan participants in general required more explicit questioning, prompting, and probing but were equally candid in sharing their experiences, even from the very first interviews.

In both the contexts, by the end of the second round of interviews, there were very few new themes that emerged from the interviews. The third interviews, for the most part was elaboration and re-confirming of themes that have previously emerged. All the interviewees kindly consented to be contacted by phone or email, and in some cases even offered the option of scheduling another interview if need be. However, based on the data that was already available around the themes discussed, it was deemed not necessary to contact them further, except to authenticate the transcripts.

All interviews were recorded using a voice-recorder in order to capture the exact words and tone. Notes were used occasionally to capture nonverbal cues, describe the setting, and maintain record of own thoughts during or soon after the interviews. A simple one-page questionnaire (see Appendix III for a sample) to collect background information about the participants was given to each participant to be filled out during the first meeting.

Memos and field notes were maintained to record observations, experiences, and reflections. Memos are "in-depth thoughts about an event, usually written in conceptual form after leaving the field" (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p.124). They point out that these form a critical part of the data collection and analyses process, and prompt you to analyse data and codes early in the research process. According to Charmaz (2006), writing successive memos throughout the research process keeps one involved in the analysis and helps to increase the level of abstraction of ideas. Field notes consisted of observations of events and thoughts while on field visits. They were used to make up for any non-verbal and other contextual information that the interview recordings lacked. Richards (2009) warns that otherwise, the act of recording data can strip the

data events from their context. According to Bogdan and Biklen (2007), keeping detailed field notes including reflections on own subjectivity can guard against biases by making aware of them. Trying to eliminate biases, they advise, may be neither possible nor desirable but it may be desirable to be aware and reflective of how who you are will shape what you do.

Documents and technical literature such as policies, newsletters, brochures, reports, and website information were collected to fill in contextual information gaps and corroborate information obtained from interviews and observations. The description of the two contexts or school systems in Chapter 1 is based on these sources; and much of the prompting and probing during the interviews were based on these. Corbin and Strauss (2008) point out that technical literature can be a useful source for making comparisons, questions for initial interviews or during analysis, enhance sensitivity, and confirm, contradict, or complement explanations of a phenomenon.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Data analysis in qualitative studies generally consist of the three stages of (a) preparing and organizing data, (b) reducing data into themes or coding, and (c) representing the data in the form of figures, tables, or a discussion (Creswell, 2007). These, according to him, are not distinct steps in a linear process but are interrelated and go on simultaneously in a process of 'analytic circles'. Additionally, Johnson (2002) points out that due to the iterative nature of the qualitative research process, preliminary data analysis coincides with data collection often resulting in altering questions as the investigator learns more about the subject. He also goes on to say that the interviewer should be prepared to deviate from what was planned during the interview because digressions can be very productive as they follow the interviewee's interest and knowledge. Data analysis in this study followed this iterative process.

Analysis, to some extent, began with data collection in that the information from the preceding interviews often informed the questions asked in subsequent interviews. Each interview was listened to at least once in entirety soon after the interview. This was very helpful in visualizing the interview and noting the use of gestures and the context, and thinking about their relevance or meaning. Simple notes were sometimes made of what appeared to be

interesting or needed to be pursued further in the following interview. Interview data was carefully transcribed and returned to the participants to confirm that they have not been misunderstood or misrepresented. Once the data was transcribed and verified by the interviewees, it was first read as a whole, and then re-read to code.

Corbin and Strauss (2008) point out that analysis and interpretation involves the art of creatively constructing a coherent and explanatory story from data as well as being scientific in systematically grounding concepts in data that is rich and full of numerous possibilities depending on the prisms researchers use. Data analysis involved the identification of concepts in data and coding them into categories or themes while taking care not to foreclose possibilities and jump to conclusions. Coding refers to "naming segments of data with a label that simultaneously categorizes, summarizes, and accounts for each piece of data" (Charmaz, 2006, p.43). Coding was based on what emerged from the interview data, and later expanded to include areas of interest to the research question. The following steps suggested by Charmaz (2006), and Corbin and Strauss (2008) were used for coding. During the first step of coding, transcripts were read from beginning till end to get a vicarious experience of the participants' point of view, trying to feel what they experienced and listen to what they are trying to say. Segments of data were coded and compared against each other for similarities and differences. Following initial coding, the most significant and/or frequent codes were further grouped according to their shared properties and dimensions into categories.

Data analysis involved a thorough comparative analysis of data, codes, and categories across cases and contexts. In the first instance, data collected in Melbourne was analysed to identify and describe key themes or categories that emerged. A similar process was used for the data from Bhutan, and finally for both the data put together. This was followed by a further analysis of the themes in the light of the research questions. Data analysis, therefore, constituted a continuous process of generating, developing, and verifying concepts from the data.

Kvale and Brinkman (2009) identify three broad approaches to interview analysis – analysis focussing on meaning, analysis focussing on language, and eclectic and theoretical

analysis. This study adopted an eclectic approach. In this, interview analysis is seen as a "bricolage". According to Kvale and Brinkman (2009):

> The bricolage interpreter adapts mixed technical discourses, moving freely between different analytic techniques and concepts. This eclectic form of generating meaning - through a multiplicity of ad hoc methods and conceptual approaches - is a common mode of interview analysis (p.233).

Having a scheme to organize and manage data was crucial given the extent of data that was generated. The primary data from interviews consisted of over 24 hours of conversations amounting to roughly 280 single spaced A4 pages. Computer assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) is widely advised for effective and efficient data management (Bazeley, 2007; Creswell, 2007; MacMillan & Koenig, 2004). Nvivo 9 was used for data management in this study. This software was found to be convenient as well as time and effort saving as was reported in the literature. However, NVivo 9 was used for data management to facilitate efficient data analysis, but not for analysis and interpreting. Bringer, Johnston, and Brackenridge (2006) report that NVivo allows for convenient coding, memo-writing, and visual modelling, but it is the researcher who will have to do the analysis and interpreting. Corbin and Strauss (2008) recommend it because it helps with all the tedious work of sifting and sorting the data, and frees time and effort for researchers to do the creative and thinking work.

Strategies for Ensuring Trustworthiness

Traditionally, quality in research is measured in terms of their reliability and validity. In qualitative studies, however, trustworthiness, credibility, and applicability are more commonly used measures; and considered more appropriate. Unlike quantitative studies that use randomized representative samples and control confounding variables, trustworthiness in qualitative inquiry can only persuade at best and not compel or be unassailable due to its openness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Qualitative researchers view reliability as a fit between what they record as data and what actually occurs in the setting under study rather than literal consistency across observations. As Bogdan and Biklen (2007) point out, two researchers studying the same setting may come up with different data but their reliability can only be questioned if they come up with contradictory or incompatible findings. Researchers also adopt different perspectives and

therefore pose different questions to the same data, and come up with different interpretations of meaning. When it is made explicit, such perspectival subjectivity or multiple perspectival interpretations are not a weakness, but testify to the fruitfulness and the vigour of interview research (Kvale & Brinkman, 2009).

Validity as it is used in the conventional sense cannot be applied in qualitative studies that assume multiple realities. The equivalent operational term used when talking about qualitative research is "credibility" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). It means that findings are trustworthy and believable because they reflect the participants', researchers', and readers' experiences but at the same time the explanation is only one among several "plausible" interpretations possible (Corbin & Strauss, 2008).

Glaser & Strauss' (1967) identify two sets of criteria for judging trustworthiness: credibility and applicability. "Credibility" or believability of a study can be judged by determining whether it is sufficiently detailed to provide a vicarious experience for the readers to judge it for themselves; whether sufficient evidence of how data was gathered and analysed is provided so that readers can assess findings; and whether clear specification of the kinds of data on which the interpretation rests is given. According to them, the use of multiple comparison groups also enhance credibility as findings are based on more than one group. "Applicability" of the theory can be judged based on four criteria: (a) it will "fit" the area from which it was derived and in which it will be used; (b) it is readily "understandable" to laymen as well as professionals; (c) it is "general" enough or sufficiently applicable to diverse situations and populations; and (d) it is "modifiable" to provide users with sufficient control to bring about change in situations. Corbin & Strauss (2008) contend that if research findings are "credible", and "applicable", then philosophical debates about "truth", "validity", and "reliability" are superfluous. According to Kvale and Brinkman (2009), "validation permeates the entire research process", and "rests on the quality of the researcher's craftsmanship throughout an investigation, on continually checking, questioning, and theoretically interpreting the findings" (p.249). Ideally, this leads to transparent research procedures and convincing evident results, embedding validation in every stage of an interview inquiry. This study subscribed to these views on ensuring credibility and trustworthiness.

The following measures were taken in this study to establish trustworthiness:

1) Member checks to verify data with the participants.

2) Triangulation or steps to corroborate information against at least one other source. In this case, it involved comparing data across and within interviews, with field notes, and available documents and literature.

3) Peer debriefing and support sessions at periodic intervals with non-involved professional peers and supervisors. According to Padgett, Mathew and Conte (2004), this is particularly helpful in exposing researcher biases, testing emerging ideas, receiving constructive feedback, improving methodological rigour, and clarifying thoughts and feelings that emerged during the study and their potential interference or significance.

4) Maintaining an audit trail by systematically documenting all aspects of study such as the data gathered, processes involved, and the choices or decisions made by the researcher during the study as suggested by Bowen (2009).

Ethical Issues

Two important issues that need to be addressed in research with human subjects are informed consent, and protection from harm (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Participation was sought on a voluntary basis, and the permission to collect data and time commitment expected were negotiated in advance. Participants were informed about the purpose and procedures involved in the study including any potentials risks, and commitments expected of them. In order to formalize this, they were required to sign a written informed consent form that specified the purpose, procedures, potential risks and benefits, commitments, right to publish, and the right to withdraw at any time.

Confidentiality is an important issue that needs to be addressed in qualitative research, especially with interviews where private conversations will be made public in study reports (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Qualitative research interviews, Brinkman and Kvale (2005) point out, allow researchers access to participants' subjective experiences and intimate aspects of their worlds, and therefore entail moral and ethical issues. In order to ensure protection of privacy, any

personal information collected that can identify participants were stored safely separate from the interview data. Pseudonyms were assigned in place of real names both in the data sets as well as the report for anonymity. Participants were also explained about how their identities will be protected and kept in confidence at the start of the data collection. Care was taken in reporting the findings with sensitivity to ensure that their anonymity has not been compromised in ways that could lead to potentially adverse consequences.

Ethics approval was obtained from the University of Melbourne's Human Research Committee (HREC:1033112), and permission to carry out the study was obtained from the Catholic Education Office (Melbourne), Ministry of Education (Bhutan), and the principals of participants' schools.

One way of engaging in ethical research behaviour in interview research according to Kvale and Brinkman (2009) is to engage in 'thick ethical description'. Brinkman and Kvale (2005) define it as the ability to see and describe events in their value-laden contexts, and judge accordingly. This can be achieved by (a) writing thick descriptions to situate events in context; (b) writing narratives that situate events temporally and socially; (c) focussing on particular examples with concrete particularities of people, places, time in specific research situations; and (d) consulting and receiving feedback from others in the community of practice. Following these can help one understand the situation well and facilitate ethically sound decisions. In writing the report, these have been adhered to not only because it is ethical research behaviour, but also because it is, as mentioned earlier, an important way of validating and ensuring trustworthiness.

Role of the Researcher

In qualitative studies, particularly where interviews are the primary source of data, the role of the researcher becomes critical and requires careful consideration. The researcher is the main instrument of data collection. Lincoln and Guba (1985) explain that in a qualitative study of this nature, humans are instruments of choice because they possess a number of distinct characteristics. They can sense and respond to all personal and environmental cues; collect information about multiple factors and at multiple levels simultaneously; grasp all the buzzing

confusion of a phenomenon and its surrounding context in one view; simultaneously function in the domains of propositional and tacit knowledge; process data as soon as they become available; summarize the data on the spot and feed them back for clarification, correction or amplification; and explore atypical or idiosyncratic responses. Despite the advantages, this is largely dependent on the skills and experience of the researcher and it therefore, puts a great deal of demands on the researcher as the instrument. As Kvale and Brinkman (2009) point out, "When the person of the researcher becomes the main research instrument, the competence and the craftsmanship – the skills, sensitivity, and knowledge – of the researcher become essential for the quality of the knowledge produced" (p.84).

The meaning that research participants attach to the researcher can also have implications for how effectively data is collected. Bogdan and Biklen (2007) caution that factors such as gender, ethnicity, race, disability, status, and age has to be carefully taken into account and strategies worked out to convert any potential difficulties into advantages. Who you are to different participants and what it means to them at various stages of study is bound to influence the interview conversation. For instance, participants may view the researcher as an outsider, a research student, or an educator which may determine the ways in which they share information as well as the content of it. Similarly, differences in factors such as the cultural background, work experiences, values, and beliefs can influence interactions in innumerable ways. Hence, exercising reflexivity, or understanding and laying open one's preconceptions, acknowledging social roles, and becoming aware of the situational dynamics in which the researcher and participants are involved in the research process becomes important (Atkinson & Coffry, 2001). Johnson (2002) considers it an ethical imperative to examine "own personal ideas, occupational ideologies, assumptions, common sense, and emotions as crucial resources" (p.105) for what one sees or hears in a research interview as it is often what the researcher's cultural knowledge or intellectual and ethical development that has prepared them to hear, and may not necessarily be what participants tell them. It is, therefore, as Richards (2009) points out, important to reflect on one's own role in data-making as a researcher in terms of the baggage you bring in the form of biases, interests, and ignorance.

In this study, the maintenance of field notes and memos were mainly aimed at practicing reflexivity. Dealing with participants from two very culturally different groups, and my own social roles in these contexts made the need for exercising reflexivity even more pronounced. In one setting I am a student researcher from a culturally and ethnically different background from the participants, whereas in another context a familiar teacher educator at an institute from where they would have graduated, and sharing a similar cultural background that tends to value hierarchy. These required different kinds of sensitivity and approach to achieve levels of comfort and confidence to engage in deep conversations within trusting relationships.

Limitations

Limitations of this study include a limited and time constrained perspective, and the researcher's interviewing skills and experience.

Despite being semi-structured, this study encouraged to follow participants' lead in trying to encourage what the participants deemed most important. In doing so, given the limited number of participants involved and a relatively short duration, while every effort was made, it was not possible to ensure a comprehensive coverage of all issues and factors that may be at play. Hence, the topics and issues discussed may represent only those that were primary on the minds of participants at that point of time.

Whereas a sound and complete understanding of the challenges and issues of implementing a whole-school approach will require perspectives of all the stakeholders involved, this study only focussed on the perspectives of Student Wellbeing Leaders only. Even though as key implementers, they are likely to be most knowledgeable and have first-hand experience, it is still an incomplete view. Besides, the small number of participants can be hardly representative of the diversity that secondary schools are.

Finally, the richness of interview data can only be as good as the interviewing skills of the researcher. As a novice interview researchers, it is more than likely that the richness of the

participants' experiences could not be tapped into as well as it could have been with the skills of an experienced and expert interviewer.

Conclusion

This study used the Health Promoting Schools model of whole-school approach, and action theories of school reform proposed by Fullan (2009) and Hargreaves (2009) as the framework to study the promotion of student wellbeing in secondary schools. It focussed on the challenges of implementation of student wellbeing promotion as experienced by those who lead the implementation of student wellbeing promotion in schools in two socio-economically and culturally different countries. The two schools also markedly varied in their number of years of implementation.

This study is based on a constructivist interpretive theoretical orientation that assumes multiple constructed realities, and views truth and knowledge are subjective and socially constructed. Within this framework, this study set out to understand the perspectives of Student Wellbeing Leaders on the implementation of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion guided by literature on educational change and student wellbeing.

The focus of the study was on the perspectives and experiences of Student Wellbeing Leaders as key implementers of student wellbeing programmes in schools. A small number of "information-rich" participants from secondary schools in Melbourne (Australia) and Bhutan were carefully chosen through a purposeful sampling strategy, and interviewed face-to-face in school settings. Interviews were recorded, transcribed, and analysed using an eclectic approach. In addition to embedding findings in rich contextual descriptions as far as possible, member checks, triangulation, peer debriefing and maintaining an audit trail were some of the strategies used to ensure trustworthiness.

Written informed consent was sought from both individual participants and institutions involved; and measures were taken to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. Given the centrality

of researcher as the instrument of data collection, steps such as by making field notes and memos whenever appropriate were used to practise reflexivity.

Analyses of the data revealed insights into a number of challenges of implementation. These fall into three key themes of meaning, context/ culture, and time. The following chapters discuss each of these in detail.

CHAPTER 6. THE MEANING OF STUDENT WELLBEING AND ITS PROMOTION

Introduction

This chapter looks at the meanings of student wellbeing as perceived by Student Wellbeing Leaders. It explores their diverse meanings, and views on student wellbeing promotion as well as the meanings and views they believe to be held by others in their schools, and the challenges these pose to the implementation of student wellbeing promotion. It examines the links between prevalent views on student wellbeing, and the possible beliefs and assumptions underlying these views. The analysis draws on the literature on the meaning of wellbeing to highlight the ways in which Student Wellbeing Leaders view it. It draws out some key themes that can be used to understand student wellbeing promotion; and the related challenges of implementing student wellbeing programmes.

In Chapter 2, we have seen that wellbeing as a social construct can be understood in different ways. It is an elusive and multifaceted concept (Ereaut & Whiting, 2008); and also tend to be used in an unreflective way, assuming an uncontested and shared meaning (Cronin de Chavez, Backett-Milburn, Parry, & Platt, 2005). Nevertheless, wellbeing in the current literature accentuate three inter-related levels: individual, relational, and collective (Evans & Prileltensky, 2009). Wellbeing is a multi-layered and complex subject on which different perspectives are held along disciplinary lines. These have led to different models that either emphasize behavioural and lifestyle change, the quality of physical and social environment, and now increasingly on the interaction between individual factors and the environmental factors (Earls & Carlson, 2001; Taylor & Hawley, 2010). The important question is how do these conceptions of wellbeing translate in schools to shape student wellbeing? Given that wellbeing is both individual as well as a societal goal, and that education has arguably the most important role in preparing students towards this end, how wellbeing is understood and addressed in schools becomes very important. It is against the backdrop of discourses around wellbeing and its meaning in the prevailing literature, that an analysis of the views on student wellbeing expressed by the participants is presented.

This chapter begins by describing a range of ways in which the participants view wellbeing. It then compares and contrasts these definitions to highlight similarities and differences within as well as across the two school systems. Finally, it looks at how the participants' observations of how their own views on student wellbeing are often at odds with how others in school perceive it, and why this is problematic.

Meanings of Student Wellbeing

The meaning of student wellbeing came up as an important theme in the interviews as an influential factor affecting implementation. In speaking about meaning, participants not only defined what student wellbeing meant to them, but also spoke about the place of wellbeing or its value in children's education. In both the instances, they often compared and contrasted their own views with those of others in school, and their implications for implementation of wellbeing programmes and activities.

This section looks at the diverse array of meanings of student wellbeing as expressed by the participants; their interpretation of the views on student wellbeing that others hold; and their implications for the promotion of student wellbeing in schools. In the following paragraphs, I attempt to elucidate different conceptions of wellbeing from how participants have defined or described student wellbeing throughout the interviews by using specific instances as examples to illustrate them. They revolve around the themes of control, safety and security, rights, relationships, prevention, and skills development, often in combinations of varying emphases. One observation is that in the extant literature, wellbeing in the context of children and education is increasingly seen as holistic and all-round development (for e.g., Awartani, Whitman, & Gordon, 2007, De Jong & Kerr-Roubicek, 2007; Pollard & Lee, 2003), emphasizing themes such as rights, relationships, prevention, and skill development, while control is rarely discussed in the context of student wellbeing.

The discussion in this chapter is mainly based on the participants' responses to questions such as 'what does wellbeing or student wellbeing mean to you?' or 'what do you understand by student wellbeing?' This was often accompanied by probes to illustrate how wellbeing was being

promoted in their schools, and what they believed to be the ideal form of student wellbeing promotion. However, spontaneous references to their understanding of student wellbeing during the course of interviews are also used to elaborate where deemed appropriate. This was most prominent when they compared and contrasted differing views on wellbeing, typically to illustrate how a lack of shared understanding with others in school posed a challenge in promoting a whole-school approach.

Wellbeing as External Control

When asked about his vision of a school with effective student wellbeing programme in place, Teyndel used words and phrases such as 'well-behaved' and 'well-coordinated' to describe an ideal state of student wellbeing. This is suggestive of maintenance of order or an emphasis on student behaviour management and control. There appears to be an assumption that students need to be controlled for their own wellbeing and that clear boundaries need to be put in place by adults as custodians who are more knowledgeable and experienced. According to Teyndel, a school with an effective student wellbeing programme is where you have:

> students who are well-behaved...very peaceful school where everything is well coordinated. Everybody understands what they should do or not do…there will be less students involved in behavioural issues, less students missing classes, less students with long hair; and most of the teachers will be aware of what they are doing and they really stay in touch with their students. All the students coming to this school would get the feeling that they are very welcome. That is what I would envision actually.

Teyndel's description is consistent with the traditional notions of maintaining discipline in order to create the right learning environment, in that didactic methods require paying focused and uninterrupted attention by the entire class to the knowledge dispenser. This disciplinary aspect of wellbeing promotion does not receive much attention in the wellbeing literature reviewed even though it appears to be a prominent aspect of student wellbeing promotion as understood in schools. Indeed, discipline and classroom management form an area of attention in its own right in Education literature, more as a way of clearing the ground for academic learning to take place than as a student wellbeing concern. Calvert (2009) describes it as a predominant

pastoral care practice that existed several decades ago, but not only does it still appear to persist in practice albeit in less explicit forms. It may even be warranted and necessary to prevent, for instance, physical violence that pose threats to safety and security. Underplaying its role in student wellbeing as opposed to explicit discussions of it may in fact serve to confound the understanding of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing.

All the participants spoke of being involved in student behaviour management either as a member of the School Discipline Committee, school's senior leadership team member or coordinator, or as classroom teachers. Additionally, they provide remedial counselling services to students with behavioural issues or are involved in resolving conflicts. Ken and Bella, in particular, also mentioned about administering consequences for disciplinary infractions as part of their roles.

Wellbeing as Internal Control

In contrast to the idea of student wellbeing as external control is the notion of student wellbeing as internal control. All the four Bhutan participants alluded to internal control as an important aspect of wellbeing. In particular, they made references to the daily school-wide practice of mindfulness meditation. For example, Lhazom articulates her views on how it contributes to student wellbeing as follows:

..when we say GNH for Education, we are talking about training of mind in schools in such a way that their actions benefit themselves and others. So, when we talk about training their minds, we're talking about making themselves aware of what they are doing. If they're sick they know they are physically unwell; if they are not getting along with friends, they know what they lack and what is wrong. So, mentally they are aware when their mind is trained. They know that whatever they do also affect not only themselves but others also. So, in that way, it also covers health. Similarly if they are aware of their interests and abilities, they can match it with the jobs available in the market. I think training of the mind takes care of everything – if mind is trained, if mind is focussed, and if they are aware of what they are doing, then no problems would arise.

Just like Lhazom, for the other three Bhutan participants, student wellbeing is mainly about Educating for GNH, a key component of which is the mindfulness training. According to Thinley (2007), 'Training the mind' which is a literal translation of '*sem go choep zo ni*' in Dzongkha, Bhutan's National Language, is a key element of quality education for Bhutan. He defines it as "enabling children to use their minds and hearts to positive ends, for themselves, their families, and the country." Hence, even though it begins with the exercise of self-control, underlying it are the values of interdependence and altruism. The emphasis on families and nation is a strong feature of Bhutanese Education discourse. Therefore, 'training the mind' as a wellbeing concept refers to the ability to exercise self-control as well as being socially responsible. The ability to exercise self-control is well-recognized as a protective factor against developmental risks such as substance abuse, and behavioural disorders (Strayhorn Jr, 2002). It is also found to be positively associated with happiness and life satisfaction (Hofmann, Luhmann, Fisher, Vohs, & Baumeister, 2014). Self-regulation or internal control is likely to be much more enduring than external control, in addition to promoting a sense of agency that young people themselves describe as a key aspect of wellbeing (Fattore, Mason & Watson, 2007). In a review of literature on mindfulness with young people, Weare (2013) concludes that when taught and practiced on a regular basis, mindfulness practice is capable of bringing about a range of positive outcomes for wellbeing including mental health, positive behaviour and academic learning.

Wellbeing as Rights to be Safe and Secure

Among the Bhutanese participants, promotion of student wellbeing is also seen as entailing protecting students' rights to be safe and secure. For example, Pedrup points out that student wellbeing is about creating a "very congenial learning environment" that is "safe and friendly" and conducive to both physical and mental growth. He said:

> I think it should be based on the idea of Child Friendly School. Everybody who comes to school should feel safe and should be free from harm, physical or mental. Help should be readily accessible and everyone should be made aware of its existence in the school. Other than that, school should also be a drug-free zone including alcohol and smoking. I think it is of foremost importance for someone like me in this post to value and believe in individual self-worth, and that everyone is deserving of respect and that every

143

individual has the potential for growth and development given the right kind of conditions and guidance.

Pedrups' use of language such as 'freedom from harm' and 'individual self-worth' directly speak to the United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child that forms the basis of a rights-based approach to student wellbeing. The Child Friendly School model advocates a school environment that is physically safe, emotionally secure, and psychologically enabling (UNICEF, 2012). Such a rights-based view can contradict more traditional views that advocate external control and management discussed earlier, but they appear to co-exist in schools. For instance, while Keldon believes that student wellbeing is about "wholesome development of a child, all the personal, emotional, and physical needs of a child"; she also advocated the use of advising, scolding, and even use of physical punishment as effective and warranted under certain circumstances, such as when counselling did not work.

Melbourne participants also made references to importance of safety and security by pointing out school policies on ethics of care, and practices such as having teachers on yard duty during recess times. Social justice and welfare were also described as being part of the Catholic ethos. For example, in Sharon's school, social justice work by students to help those in need is part of requirement for graduation. Bella described at least two occasions when she was required to stand up for students against their teachers. Both Pedrup and Lhazom occasionally encountered similar challenges as a result of conflicts between students and colleagues. However, these references to safety were not expressed within a rights discourse. Rather, they were more concerned with resolving conflicts and restoring relationships.

Safety in schools continue to be a concern as they not only negatively impact on academic and social functioning, but are also linked to student's later life outcomes. Bullying, for instance, remain a rampant safety concern in schools, most notably in secondary schools (Neiman & DeVoe, 2009). Students who are victims of bullying feel less connected and less engaged in school, and thus adversely affecting their academic and social growth (Macmillan & Hagan, 2004). It is also linked to longer-term negative effects on wellbeing such as psychological and health problems, as well as disrupted educational and occupational attainment (Macmillan &

Hagan, 2004; Schreck & Miller, 2003). Other forms of safety and security concerns such as physical violence and use of weapons, although less prevalent than bullying but with potentially more damaging consequences, also appear to be on the rise. These suggest that student safety and security should be a primary concern of student wellbeing promotion.

Wellbeing as Helping and Support Services

Along with the emphasis on discipline and rights, Teyndel also describes provision of help and support to students as central to their role. Teyndel defines student wellbeing as "basically helping and providing guidance; may be showing them the right directions, helping them with emotional needs, and may be academically also. Basically, overall it's providing help and support". Similarly, Lhazom sees it as "catering to the needs of the students,... or supporting them when they have problems with their studies, with their friends or family; covering all social, emotional, intellectual and physical needs of the students." For the Bhutan participants, this view of promoting student wellbeing via provision of helping or support services is the one that is most consistent with expectations of others of their positions as school counsellors. They are expected to solve emotional and behavioural problems, more than they are expected to prevent them. Their role in teaching knowledge, skills, and attitudes for prevention is less prominent in their definitions even though all of them engage in it in varying degrees, except for Pedrup, for whom it is the main responsibility to teach the guidance and career education curriculum.

Among the CEOM participants, helping and support services formed a part of their role descriptions even though their definitions of student wellbeing focused on prevention and building positive relationships. Their roles involved providing counselling but in varying degrees, and at least in two cases, providing welfare services or liaising with community agencies and family services formed an important part of student wellbeing work.

This view of wellbeing clearly has its roots in the biomedical approach that focus on remediation of pathology and a service delivery model (Gutkin, 2012). Its focus is on interventions in response to problems at individual levels; and addressing risk behaviours and healthy lifestyles (Taylor & Hawley, 2010). In Bhutan schools, student wellbeing programmes

are classified as falling under student support services, whereas in CEOM schools, it is sometimes referred to as student welfare even though the participants made a clear distinction between wellbeing and welfare. In both the systems, participants indicated that helping and providing support services is what is mostly expected of them by others in the school.

Wellbeing as Relationship-Building

One of the consistent themes that run across the interviews with CEOM participants is the emphasis on positive relationship-building as key to student wellbeing promotion. It is seen as a necessary condition for student wellbeing promotion. For example, this is how Bella describes it:

> I think that if you talked to students or have parents who say, 'my daughter loves coming to school', I think that is an example of student wellbeing working. I don't think it's a matter of saying, 'These are the wellbeing programmes in our school. These are good. Tick, tick, tick.' I think it's something that permeates all relationships in school, and I think relationship is the key.
> Even before I would be saying, 'here are the policies and guidelines, I would be saying this is about relationships, this is what student wellbeing is about. It's about building relationships, giving opportunities to students to talk about things that are happening...and if it doesn't come out in action, having a policy on a bit of a paper doesn't mean anything.

Positive relationship is believed to be the "key" to wellbeing. In other words, wellbeing is enhanced when living with positive relationships, or when it is fostered. Hence, promoting student wellbeing is essentially building or engaging in positive relationships with and among students. Genuinely connecting with students at close personal levels in respectful ways make them feel safe and secure, and gets across the message that you care and expect them to be well and do well. Ken describes this as "connecting with students at a deeper level" or "getting to know them well." This, he believes, can be achieved by doing things that are as simple as asking students how they are, how things are at home, or connecting with students at a more personal level in the course of their work. According to him, it is also something that can be done whilst

teaching math, language, or any other subject through respectful engagement with students, and giving students opportunities to talk, without assuming things or judging them.

Likewise, Sharon points out that it is usually when this kind of positive relationship is absent that responsive services are increasingly called for. She often finds herself "picking up the pieces for those teachers who don't put in the effort to focus on relationships" in her role. For Irene, relationship skills are not just important for wellbeing in school, but are important skills for life that schools are best placed to teach.

Among the Bhutan participants, only Pedrup emphasized the importance of building positive teacher-student relationships for student wellbeing promotion; but unlike Ken, he feels that programmes and activities that allow teachers and students to socialize outside the classroom as the way to achieve it rather than inside the classroom.

Healthy relationships is an important component of wellbeing. Research literature suggests that supportive relationships derived from experiences of trust, nurturance, and affection are important for wellbeing (Evans & Prilleltensky, 2007; Demir, 2008; Demir & Weitenkamp, 2007; Layard, 2005; Myers, 1999, 2000). In a study of young people across Australia, it was found that "the most important factors connecting young people to school were linked to relationships - friendship with other students and relationships with teachers that involved mutual respect and responsibility" (Stokes, Tyler, Holdsworth, Brown & Mukherjee, 2001, p.7). Satisfaction with social relationships in school predict a sense of school belonging (Cemalcilar, 2010); and those with positive relationships are less likely to be socially isolated (Blum & McNeely, 2002), and become targets of bullying (Rodkin & Hodges, 2003).

Wellbeing as Prevention and Life Skills Development

Among the CEOM participants, using a 'proactive approach' focussing on enhancing 'protective factors' to 'minimize risk factors', build 'resilience' and 'teach social and emotional skills' are some of the terms that were used constantly to describe the promotion of student wellbeing. Their definitions of wellbeing emphasized that being proactive and reaching out to all students rather than only responding to those who are in immediate and extreme need as an

important feature of student wellbeing promotion. According to Irene, promoting student wellbeing should be mainly about teaching social and emotional skills:

> ... kids learn best when their basic needs are met, when they are confident, when they articulate, when they have good ability to think about where they're at, make good choices, um...have high expectations, and all of that sort of stuff; and that is very much social and emotional skills or wellbeing if you like.
>
> We see a lot of kids here one-on-one, kids who are troubled, whose lives have gone in all sorts of directions either through bad choices they've made or because of bad circumstances – parents splitting up, poverty, depression, mental health issues, whatever. We really do good work with them but that's what - 10% of the population? We have all the others that we want to try and cater for as well and it's about teaching them good skills, and to help them be more positive about life and to be less vulnerable to some of the things that are likely to happen to them – more resilient.

Her expression of difficulties that she face in reconciling her own vision for student wellbeing in the face of the practical realities of what is required of her by the school illustrate the distinction of student wellbeing as proactive and reactive work. For her prevention and skill-building holds the key to wellbeing both in school and beyond school; while in practice, she is mostly required to respond to problems. For Pedrup, on the other hand, development of skills is an important aspect of student wellbeing promotion because students are at a vulnerable life stage requiring knowledge and skills "for coping with their everyday challenges."

This view is consistent with, and informed by the growing evidence base in prevention science and mental health (for e.g., Durlak & Wells, 1997, 1998), particularly the rise of social and emotional learning in the past two decades (CASEL, 2003b; Durlak et al., 2011). Ken, for example, points out that "evidence-based research is telling us that preventative strategy is the way to be going." While the provision of reactive support services remained very much a prominent part of their responsibilities, CEOM participants emphasized the preventive roles of developing skills and building positive relationships. In Bhutan schools, teaching the guidance and career education, and life skills classes form one of the official roles of the participants.

However, it was not as prominent in the ways they defined or described student wellbeing.

The different meanings of student wellbeing discussed above lend support to wellbeing as a multi-dimensional or a multi-layered concept; and the potential complexity involved in its promotion. It is about control as much as it is about empowering; it is about prevention as well as remediation; and it is about rights as well as relationships. Even though there are both similarities as well as differences in the way Student Wellbeing Leaders across the two school systems view wellbeing, the following section looks at what stands out as prominent in the two school systems.

Views of Student Wellbeing in the Two Systems

Bhutan participants' views of student wellbeing promotion appear to subsume the exercise of control and discipline both from within and outside; and provision of help or support services amongst other things. Other aspects of wellbeing such as structuring the environment or building relationships were talked about less frequently and inconsistently. This is indicative of a primarily individual wellbeing focussed bio-medical approach although other aspects of wellbeing are considered in more subdued ways. Their roles of providing counselling services in relation to discipline and control come across more prominently than those for knowledge, skills, and attitudes development. Counselling services belong within the psychotherapeutic approach to wellbeing, sometimes criticized as indicative of views of students as needy, weak and vulnerable (Ecclestone & Hayes, 2009). Development of competencies and skills, on the other hand, belong to an educative tradition that can be empowering, but it can also put the burden of responsibility for maintaining wellbeing on the individual. The view of wellbeing that emphasize 'training of mind" to be aware and reflective of one's actions, intentions and their consequences also has its focus on the individual as the site of wellbeing through exercise of self-control and cultivation of altruistic thought. Social and environmental determinants of wellbeing were less elaborated on and hence appear to receive less attention even though they have been mentioned. Similarly, relationships did not form an important part of their discourse on student wellbeing, even though it was not totally absent.

The two themes that most consistently appear in the CEOM participants' conceptions of student wellbeing were a preventive and proactive approach to wellbeing focussing on resilience building, and positive relationship building as the cornerstone of student wellbeing promotion. Even though participants spoke about variations in the extent to which they are able to implement these in their schools, all of them consistently referred to relationship-building, and evidence-based practices with an emphasis on preventive or proactive approach as the ideal way to enhance student wellbeing. Even though many references were made of responsive services, behaviour management, and social justice; relationship-building and prevention stood out in the ways they explained what student wellbeing meant to them. In fact, responsive services such as counselling, crisis and conflict management formed an important part of their roles in practice for all of them. These suggest a strong emphasis on development of skills and competencies, and relational wellbeing. The emphasis on a proactive stance to reach out to all students with a strong focus on prevention, addressing risk and protective factors, building resilience, and research evidence-based strategies are key characteristics of a prevention science and educative approach to student wellbeing. In summary, it can be said that there is an emphasis on the individual and relational dimensions of wellbeing in the ways in which student wellbeing is perceived. There is also an emerging recognition of the importance of social and collective dimension in that participants saw parental and community involvement as an important part of student wellbeing promotion that is more pronounced than is the case with Bhutan participants.

In general, in terms of how Student Wellbeing Leaders conceptualize student wellbeing, it can be said that there is a much stronger focus on the personal and relational aspects of wellbeing than the collective. This, however, does not necessarily mean that schools do not have any programmes and activities to address the collective aspect of wellbeing. On the contrary, schools do engage in programmes such as community social work and partnerships with communities or community agencies. It only means that it does not figure as much in the way that the participants talked about student wellbeing. Part of the reason for the absence of the collective wellbeing may be due to a stronger influence of a bio-medical approach observed. Besides, programmes addressing collective wellbeing such as social work, and environmental protection programmes are considered separate from student wellbeing that tends to centre round their health and behaviour management.

Strong influences of psychology-based approach to wellbeing can be observed. Both groups see the provision of support services (e.g. counselling) and skills education (e.g. SEL) as a means to promote student wellbeing. These suggest strong influences of a psychotherapeutic approach for support services as well as draw upon resilience building and strength-based approaches from prevention science, and positive psychology that use an educative approach. It is interesting to note the difference in thinking and approach between the two school systems that perhaps illustrate a shift from a psychotherapeutic to a positive psychology approach. CEOM participants emphasize proactive positive relationship-building as central to student wellbeing whereas Bhutan participants did not, but every other student wellbeing issue they spoke about revolved around poor or problematic relationships. Whereas aspects of relational wellbeing were mentioned, and was most pronounced in the case of CEOM; very little was mentioned of social and environmental factors beyond the immediate school environment in their responses of what wellbeing means to them. This is despite the fact that the CEOM students engage in social justice work in their communities and in one case even internationally; and Bhutan schools implement the concept "Green School" that involve ideas and practices of education for sustainable development as part of the E4GNH.

While both groups made references to wellbeing as consisting of multiple dimensions such as physical, mental, and social; in sharing their views, they did not explicitly talk of whole-school approach as in the literature. There was more explicit emphasis on involvement of whole of school as a community rather than as a holistic approach addressing its curriculum, ethos, environment, and partnerships. However, they spoke of programmes and practices that cover all aspects of a whole-school approach, but with varying emphases in each case. These variations may be a function of factors such as the socio-cultural context, the degree to which student wellbeing is understood and integrated in the school system through its policies and preparation of those who lead it.

Ways in which wellbeing is conceptualized may depend on the socio-cultural context of the school system. For instance, Keldon defined wholesome development as consisting of "the personal, emotional, and physical needs of a child"; and Irene spoke of student wellbeing

promotion focus in her school as "very much on the psychological, emotional, and social development of the young people". The omission of 'social' in the former and the 'physical' in the latter may be indicative of the differences in priorities. Assuming that the 'social' here stands for relational wellbeing, it is possible that, as a small and closely-knit society, this does not receive much attention as Bhutan schools are yet to recognize the potential decline in social fabric that can lead to serious wellbeing issues as manifest in most large urbanized societies. Similarly, physical wellbeing may not be as big a concern for Student Wellbeing Leaders in Melbourne given a more advanced healthcare system, including the provision of school nurses to take care of student health issues. On the other hand, for Teyndel, it is his number one goal for the next few years as his school has students falling sick every day and missing classes.

In general, it can be said that even though the views of student wellbeing leaders are indicative of an understanding of wellbeing as a complex and multidimensional concept, they struggle to come up with definitions that capture all three individual, relational, and collective dimensions, and their inter-relationships. In both the systems, there is a strong emphasis on the individual dimension whether it is through the preventive psycho-educational classroom work or helping and support services outside classroom. This is not surprising because the dominant forces influencing student wellbeing practices in schools originate from the disciplines of health and psychology, more specifically mental health, psychotherapy, and behaviour management. CEOM participants placed a lot of emphasis on relationships, but this was in stark contrast to Bhutan participants' views that highlight 'control' and discipline. In addition to the influences of the importance of social capital for wellbeing; and the emphasis on the 'interpersonal' and 'intrapersonal' skills as key aspects of social and emotional learning; this may also be reflective of the broader culture. For example, hierarchy based on factors such as age, experience, and position is a strong feature of Bhutanese culture that is manifest in everyday speech and mannerism.

Different Ways of Looking at Student Wellbeing

In looking at the ways in which Student Wellbeing Leaders conceptualize student wellbeing, some fundamental distinctions can be observed in the ways the promotion of student

152

wellbeing is approached and the assumptions that underlie these. These represent variations in focus rather than mutual exclusivity. Nevertheless, they portend potential influences on practice.

Wellbeing from 'Inside-out' and 'Outside-in'

In the previous section, we have seen that CEOM participants emphasized positive relationship-building as key to student wellbeing whereas Bhutan participants emphasized "training the mind". For example, Lhazom reasoned that if every individual's mind is trained to benefit each other, positive relationships would follow. This can be called an "inside-out" approach to wellbeing in that wellbeing is assumed to come from being mindful of one's own actions and intentions. By contrast, building positive relationships with those around you through one's interactions to achieve wellbeing is mainly working from 'outside-in', or building relationships with those around you to experience an inner sense of wellbeing.

They represent two distinct approaches even though they are not mutually exclusive. In fact, they can be complementary. Addressing the inner sense of calmness and composure as well as being socially adept both play important roles in bringing about a sense of wellbeing, and they may in fact, supplement and reinforce each other. Goleman (1995), for instance, define emotional intelligence as consisting of intrapersonal skills and interpersonal skills that people possess in varying degrees, but that can be both developed. The differences in the preference or focus on one rather than the other may be reflective of a cultural difference. For example, a quiet classroom is a sign of respect and disciplined behaviour well-suited for a traditionally didactic classroom; whereas a lively classroom is often seen as signifying engagement in modern Western view of active learning and autonomy.

Student Wellbeing as 'Being' and 'Doing'

Student wellbeing promotion programmes and activities can be distinguished as either proactive or reactive in approach. Programmes and activities that are aimed at prevention, either through teaching of skills or through development of positive relationships are proactive in nature; whereas counselling to deal with student problems or behaviour management through use of sanctions or consequences are reactive in nature. A proactive approach, as Irene points out,

153

generally addresses the needs of all students; whereas a reactive approach generally entails working with a small proportion of children who have problems or are at-risk.

A proactive approach involves student wellbeing promotion as a way of 'being', orpromoting a certain culture. It refers to the ways in which the school environment is organized and structured to promote wellbeing. Building positive relationships by connecting with students and getting to know them well, or being aware of oneself and exercising self-control are examples of ways of 'being' that promote wellbeing.

Student wellbeing promotion also entails teaching skills or providing support services, which are acts of 'doing' something to or for students. In his definition of student wellbeing, Ken contrasts "student welfare" as primarily "doing things to or for students", with "student wellbeing" which is more about "doing with students" in addition to doing it to or for them. A direct and preventive 'doing' approach to promotion of student wellbeing is teaching them knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be resilient or socially adept.

In a proactive approach, you not only explicitly teach the skills to build relationships, but more importantly practice them in all your dealings with students. A reactive approach, on the other hand, focuses on reacting to or dealing with problems and issues when they arise, such as providing counselling services or providing meals to those who come from disadvantaged backgrounds. One is educational and future-oriented whereas the other therapeutic and problem-solving in approach. From the prevention science perspective discussed in Chapter 3, the former represent primary prevention for the entire population, and the latter secondary and tertiary prevention aimed at those at-risk and symptomatic (Mrazek & Haggerty, 1994; O'Connell, Boat & Warner, 2009).

Hence, it is a combination that will be required to address the full spectrum of wellbeing concerns, just like Irene aptly point out: "there will always be need for counselling services no matter how much you work on the prevention." Both literature from prevention science as well as the comprehensive school counselling model recommend that a variety of programmes that reach out to all students are more likely to be effective (Durlak et al., 2011; Whiston, 2007). In

other words, rather than responding only to those that manifest problems, it will be equally important to teach students skills that will prevent as well as help them cope with difficulties when they arise.

Student Wellbeing as 'Instrumental' to learning or 'Integral' to Learning

Even though it is not always explicitly stated, underlying the meanings that the participants attach to student wellbeing, are two fundamental assumptions. They are the assumptions that student wellbeing is either 'instrumental' to learning, or 'integral' to learning. This distinction is important to understand because this may very well inform the scope and focus of student wellbeing promotion. These can be observed in the ways in which programmes and activities to promote student wellbeing are justified.

One justification used for promoting student wellbeing is that it is important because it contributes to academic attainment. They include statements such as:

"It is important for schools to keep the students happy, we have to ensure that their problems are taken care of, and only if they are happy will they be able to focus on their studies" (Lhazom).

"if kids are happy and in a good place emotionally, then they are in the best position to learn" (Irene).

"If a student is taken good care of and is well, academics would be taken care of; and if he or she is not given good care, academics may suffer" (Teyndel).

"For me personally, if you relate well with kids and have good relationships with kids, it actually enhances your teaching. You can do more and try different things with the assurance that kids will allow you to do that. I think if you're approachable to kids and respectful of them, then that's reciprocated in how they deal with you" (Ken).

They imply that wellbeing is important because it is instrumental to the achievement of the primary goal of academic achievement, not necessarily an important aspect of learning in itself. Approaches to student wellbeing promotion that is mainly reactive and emphasize support services such as counselling exemplify this stance. Student wellbeing promotion is important but only a means to an end, and therefore peripheral rather than a central concern.

In contrast to this view, is the reasoning that student wellbeing is an important area of learning in its own right, in addition to contributing to academic learning and achievement. It views school as the right time and place for development of socio-emotional skills, and addressing fundamental human values that will stand in good stead for life beyond school. In Sharon's words, schools are places "where we develop whole individuals, and you cannot teach children without addressing their social and emotional needs." According to her, "in a perfect world, it would be something that which is not necessarily separate from the curriculum." It is not just focussed on achieving the end goal but also emphasizes the process, or the importance of 'wellbeing as a way of being' through positive relationships; and sees wellbeing for all students, and not just as specialized services to the problematic or needy few. Bella points out that it is a process that requires time and persistence to integrate it into different aspects of school life until it becomes its culture:

> I think it's part and parcel of what we do, very closely integrated, and in some ways almost impossible to separate it; and I do think that comes so much from doing work with staff over the years; and I think people who come in new to the school have a sense of it almost straight away – that's how we deal with things, and they know what all the policies are. They get it as part of the induction. So, I think it's very clear. It's pretty much innate in terms of the way we manage situations in the school.

According to this, building collaboration and a shared understanding or recognition of the importance of student wellbeing promotion consistently over time appear to be a way to establish it as integral to education.

Whereas, I have tried to delineate conceptions of student wellbeing into different forms it take, it will be important to note that these distinctions are but a way of trying to understand what entails the promotion of student wellbeing, and not to create or identify exclusive categories. Yet, some are more likely to be pronounced than others, but this identification of different forms or meanings is but a way of exploring possibilities for an appropriate balance.

The distinctions of wellbeing as 'inside-out' or 'outside-in', and wellbeing as 'being' or 'doing' represent preferences in the approach used to promote wellbeing, but can be viewed as complementing each other much like the 'yin' and 'yang' of student wellbeing promotion. However, wellbeing as 'instrumental' or 'integral' is a distinction of the value attached to student wellbeing as an undertaking in schools. This, in my view, is fundamental and is likely to shape the practice of student wellbeing promotion profoundly both as a way of 'being' as well as 'doing'. Some aspect of this is evident in the ways in which the participants described how others in school viewed the promotion of student wellbeing that I turn to next.

Other Meanings of Student Wellbeing

In articulating their views on student wellbeing promotion, and talking about its implementation, participants often spoke about competing views held by others and the challenges they pose for effective implementation of student wellbeing programmes. They mainly spoke about competing meanings of student wellbeing that are held by others in the school such as school leaders and teachers. They represent some of the key challenges Student Wellbeing Leaders face in promoting student wellbeing programmes. Some of them have referred to these as the challenge of 'changing mindsets'. These are beliefs and views about student wellbeing held by others, or their attitudes towards student wellbeing promotion. Student Wellbeing Leaders see these as posing a challenge to the promotion of student wellbeing. Conflicting teacher views and attitudes towards student wellbeing promotion has been reported as a significant barrier by Ainley et al. (2005); whereas teacher buy-in or acceptance and support positively influence implementation success (Datnow & Castellano, 2000; Desimone, 2002; Dusenbury et al., 2003). For example, this is how Ken described his challenge as a Student Wellbeing Leader:

It is a job that can be very frustrating because unlike other industries where if you want change whether it's a reduction line, you just put in place a machinery that will do X,Y and Z or a procedure that one just has to follow. In schools there are different perspectives on how things should be done or could be done, and it becomes challenging because there are diverse thinkers amongst the educators. What someone thinks is a good idea is not necessarily what everyone thinks. So, from that point of view, yeah, there are frustrations in the role.

These differences in perspectives in relation to promotion of student wellbeing revolve around three themes discussed below.

Teachers of Subject, Not Teachers of Students

One of the mindsets that pervade secondary school teachers is the belief that "I teach a subject – I'm a math teacher, I'm a science teacher" (Ken). In other words, teachers believe that their role is to teach their subjects, and do not usually believe that student wellbeing is their responsibility. Irene and Pedrup made similar comments on how teachers in secondary schools are more concerned with their subject curriculum delivery, and less about student wellbeing as compared to their counterparts in primary schools. One reason they all attribute it to is the limited period of time that teachers have with their students compared to teachers in primary schools. At the same time, they also believe that there is a lot that can be achieved despite the time constraint when it comes to promoting wellbeing through positive relationship-building. Ken points out that:

All it might require is to connect with students and build positive relationships irrespective of whether you teach English, Math, Science, Humanities, or PE, may be simply to ask a student, "how was your weekend?" And if the student says, 'Ah, it wasn't that good'; to then take 30 seconds to ask, 'Oh, what happened?' Or simple things like getting to know the kids' names because they much prefer being called by their names rather than no name being spoken when you're in contact with them.

Thus, according to Ken, much of building positive relationships can be done in the process of everyday interactions without any implications of time and resources. However, Ken points out that teachers tend to be more comfortable with the traditional consequence-based approach that entail imposing sanctions after the fact as a deterrent, and arrangements that allow problem students to be referred to others as problems get escalated. Sometimes, however, changes do imply time commitment as well as skill sets (Khan, Bedford & Williams, 2011; Lam & Hui, 2010). On the other hand, this reluctance may be associated with the beliefs and assumptions about the position and role of teachers which is discussed next.

Teachers Control (You're the Boss)

Student Wellbeing Leaders, on many occasions, alluded to a tendency among teachers to equate wellbeing with control and behaviour management, consistent with a view of 'student wellbeing as instrumental', primarily as a way of managing them for academic learning to take place. At least five of the eight participants spoke about how teachers in their schools who actively obstruct or object to student wellbeing initiatives that did not fit this view. One example of this is the criticism of counselling services in the case of Bhutan participants. According to Lhazom:

> Here in the school, most of our Dzongkha Lopens (National Language Teachers) are against counselling. We often debate in the staffroom about it. They are of the opinion that corporal punishment is always better, and that counselling might be stirring up more problems and issues than solving them….They also think that there is a decline in the respect for teachers because of counselling making things more informal.

This is an experience shared by Teyndel and Pedrup as well. Pedrup points out that many of his colleagues not only undervalued counselling and guidance classes, but they are also blamed for making things worse:

> I find that many teachers have a wrong notion of counselling being part of the school system, and sometimes we become some sort of an anvil to hit on. If they have a classroom disruption, they come and say it is because of this; and if there are some

mishaps, they come and say it's because of this, because so much liberty is given to students. What I notice is that the traditional notion of the teacher-student relationship in our culture is still very strong especially among the teachers. There are high expectations and of obedience and compliance. Student attitude toward teachers, I think we can feel it, because they are brought up in a different time; so they don't have that obedience and compliance, and so now I think teachers need to change their attitudes, our approach, and expectations a little bit.

They point out that it becomes extremely difficult to justify the effectiveness of a more time-intensive approach when the common measure used is short-term compliance and control.

Teachers are used to doing things in certain ways, through training or the ways in which they have been treated as students themselves. For example, Ken points out that "When I started, your advice was don't smile in the first term, be very firm because once you back down, you can't increase it; and really that you don't need to be friendly with kids because you're the boss." This suggests that for many teachers, it may be an inadvertent result of their own education as teachers or beliefs on what one should or should not do as teachers, passed down over the years. For example, this may also explain the fact that most Dzongkha teachers are themselves educated in traditional systems where physical punishment used to be a norm. Turning around such beliefs and mobilizing support from colleagues to make it a shared responsibility can be hard work. Hence, this may mean that an unlearning or undoing of the old ways will have to take place in order for the new one to take its place. Change literature highlight this kind of unlearning or 'unfreezing' and motivation for change as an important step in the change process before new learning can take place (Lewin, 1997; Marcus, 2000).

Student Wellbeing as Addressing Problems and Providing Non-Academic Services

Just like the association of student wellbeing with control and management, Student Wellbeing Leaders find that student wellbeing is also often viewed as only constituting of providing non-academic student services, whether it is to maintain discipline, manage student behaviour, or other forms of help and support. For example, Irene observed that the senior leaders at her school as well as some other schools she know of understood student wellbeing

promotion as being primarily related to behaviour management, provision of support services, and others such as school canteen and uniform. In her case, despite the role description for Student Wellbeing Coordinator in her school emphasizing prevention work, in practice she was mainly required to provide counselling services. Teyndel points out that, his role as a school counsellor is reduced to dealing with students with behavioural issues, to problem-solve these within short time-frames:

> for many teachers counselling is for mentally unsound students or simply means that a student with a problem goes to it and should come out with problems solved and often in a short period. When that does not happen, then it is not working.

These suggest an implicit underlying thinking that wellbeing is separate from learning, and that it only plays a secondary role of removing hurdles to academic learning. Student wellbeing is justified as it would contribute to academic achievement rather than as an important aspect of learning in itself.

Conclusion

This chapter looked at some of the views of wellbeing held by Student Wellbeing Leaders that participated in this study as well as their perceptions and experiences of how others in their schools viewed student wellbeing. It involved an exploration and discussion of the diverse perspectives on wellbeing highlighting its multiple dimensions.

The ways in which the Student Wellbeing Leaders defined student wellbeing indicate their awareness of wellbeing as multi-dimensional in that it consists of individual, relational, and collective dimensions that are intricately inter-related. However, they are inclined towards highlighting certain dimensions and underplaying others, which will likely have ramifications for their choice of strategies and approaches to promote wellbeing. This is reflective of the complexity of the subject, and the complications this can create for implementation of programmes and activities to promote student wellbeing.

Student wellbeing means a range of diverse things to different people in schools; and these revolve around the themes of control and management, safety and security, relationship building, support services, and development of skills. Not only are there diverse views on what wellbeing should be, but also differences on how its promotion should be pursued. These range from a focus on developing an individual sense of self control, working on social relationships and surroundings, to the explicit teaching of skills to be well. Implicit in the definitions and descriptions are also fundamental assumptions regarding the value and purpose of student wellbeing promotion. It is either seen as 'instrumental' to academic achievement, the main goal; or an 'integral' part of learning in itself.

Despite the advocacy and the value attached to a whole-school approach, one of the challenges of implementation appear to be that schools, although in varying degrees, continue to be deeply entrenched in traditional beliefs of control and compliance, and a bio-medical approach of treating the unwell. While these may still be relevant, the challenge is in reconciling their central position to create a more holistic approach that also includes a proactive approach of strength-building, and making it a shared responsibility. This will mean moving away from prevalent views of "teachers of subject", and "wellbeing as (merely) control and services;" to a whole-school approach to student wellbeing that advocates active involvement of all through collaborations.

Effective implementation of a whole-school approach will, therefore, minimally require a shared understanding of what student wellbeing means. Fullan (2001), for example, points out that successful adoption and implementation of reforms will depend on a shared understanding of what the changes mean to all stakeholders. Participants in this study spoke about 'changing mindsets' or in other words, resolving fundamental differences in the meanings held by different people about student wellbeing as one of the key challenges they face in implementing student wellbeing programmes and activities. This concern is consistent with Fullan (2009), and Hargreaves (2009) both of whom assert that a shared understanding is key to establishing as well as implementing programmes and practices consistent with a "compulsive vision" or "moral imperative" that drives a change initiative. According to Fullan (2010), achieving 'system coherence' with shared mindsets is critical to achieving sustainable change.

While establishing a shared meaning and vision may be a necessary pre-requisite, implementation entails enacting the vision in a given setting with a certain organizational structure and culture. Schools have distinctive organizational structures and cultures, and these pose further challenges in implementing a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion. The next chapter looks at some of the challenges of organizational structure and culture.

CHAPTER 7. CHALLENGES OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CULTURE

Introduction

Addressing school ethos, organization, and environment are key components of a whole-school approach. This includes the important role of school culture, and often the need for its transformation, for bringing about effective and sustainable change, or student wellbeing promotion in this case. Looking at school culture and structure is important because it determines actual practice. It has been observed that school reform initiatives often result in increased knowledge and awareness, but bring about little change in policies and practices (Mitchell, Palmer, & Davies, 2000). In speaking about the challenges of student wellbeing programme implementation, participants of this study referred to facets of school organization and culture as prominently associated with challenges of implementation. Throughout the interviews, in sharing their experiences of the challenges they face in implementing student wellbeing programmes, participants either made explicit statements or implied school organizational culture as an important aspect that needed to be addressed.

Culture is usually defined in simple terms as "the way we do things around here" (Deal, 1993; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1996); or as consisting of "norms, values, beliefs, traditions, and rituals built over time" (Peterson & Deal, 1998, p.29). It consists of the more obvious aspects of physical settings, stories, ceremonies, customs and symbols, accepted standards or norms of behaviour, rules and procedures; and the basic assumptions, shared values and beliefs of a society at a deeper level. School culture in this study refer to the policies, procedures and practices within a school community; and the assumptions, beliefs and the values underlying these. These could range from a school's vision, mission, and values; its physical, social, and emotional climate; to the ways in which they are structured as organizations. It constitutes a complex interplay of numerous aspects that are both tangible and intangible. Whilst similarities do exist, schools have distinctive cultures often characterized by combinations of sub-cultures. During implementation of change initiatives, adaptations are usually required to suit local contexts, and to be effective (Botvin, Griffin & Nichols, 2006). Schools not only differ in the environmental and resource support available, but also differ in their views and approaches, or

policies and practices (McLaughlin, 2005). In Chapter 3, we have seen that school organizational features such as policies, curriculum, social relationships, and services (St Leger et al., 2010), leadership (Fullan, 2001; Weinbaum & Supowitz, 2010) and teacher buy-in (Datnow & Castellano, 2000; Dusenbury et al., 2003;) are some important factors that have been reported to influence implementation of reforms in schools. Experiences shared by the Student Wellbeing Leaders in this study highlight some of these such as the role of leadership, teacher beliefs and attitudes, relationships, and the ways in which schools are structured.

This chapter looks at how the ways in which schools are organized, the prevalent norms, beliefs, and values affect the implementation of student wellbeing promotion in schools across the two school systems. It identifies some features of school organizational culture and structure that pose challenges to the implementation of student wellbeing promotion. Based on the examples and observations of implementation challenges related to school organization and culture raised by the participants, a simple way of conceptualizing or understanding school organization and culture for student wellbeing implementation is proposed.

Student Wellbeing and Organizational Culture in CEOM Schools

This section explores school organization and culture in CEOM schools in relation to the promotion of student wellbeing in these schools. It begins by analysing two cases to highlight aspects of school culture and their influence on the implementation of student wellbeing promotion. Irene's and Bella's schools are the two most distinct from each other, and they provide a useful starting point to identify issues of relevance for discussion; and illustrate how the ways in which schools are organized and beliefs about what student wellbeing promotion should entail influence the promotion of student wellbeing.

Irene's school

Irene's school is relatively new but growing very fast. When she joined the school in its third year, it had only a few hundred students, and today after nine years, it has over 1200 students. She remembers a greater sense of connectedness and collaboration, and more opportunities to "have a say" in things in the beginning when the school was small. As the school

grew bigger in size, she experienced that the opportunities to be involved in decision-making becoming lesser and limited to only a small leadership group. In addition, the high rate of staff turnovers that the school has experienced over the years made it even more challenging for wellbeing initiatives to be sustained. She explained that "when you've got staff and leadership that come and go at such a high rate, it's trying to maintain the focus, I kind of feel like it's lost every time, and you've to start again and reinvent the wheel and so you don't much build on past learning and it's so much harder." Over a span of twelve years, her school had three different Principals, five Deputy Principals and very rarely the same year-level coordinators from year to year. At the time of the interviews, the school was anticipating changes in leadership the following year; and she was apprehensive of initiating anything new until the new academic session began, even though she feels that there is an urgent need to. She said:

> I'd rather establish something in the new structure, in the new administration structure, so I'm marking time, I'm holding off with that one but a conversation came up with the two heads of school (the school is split into junior and senior schools for management purposes) with me and it was a very friendly conversation and their concern was: Hang on, how can you, meaning me, at the level I am in the structure, how can I be implementing a new structure within the college, a student wellbeing team; and therein lies the problem, because I'm not at that level. The question is a genuine question, anything at that level should come from this level and not from the level I am in (hand gesturing with palms at forehead level and below chest level respectively). So, even though I see the challenge, I see the vision, and I see the problems, the problems endemic in the way we do things, what they were really saying is that really it's not your role to be doing this, it is our role.

Unlike in the other three schools, her school had only just taken up the School Improvement Framework which necessitates the creation of a Wellbeing Core Team led by someone from the senior management, which was yet to be established.

When she was first appointed in the role, her position title was student welfare coordinator, later changed to student wellbeing coordinator to include broader wellbeing

responsibilities that are mainly preventive in nature. However, with the successive changes in school leadership and staff, and a fast growing number of students over the years, it became increasingly difficult to promote the proactive aspects of the role amidst the pressing need to respond to student emotional and mental health issues. She explains that:

> if you're to ask the Principal here what my role is or if you have a look at my job description, it very clearly talks about prevention and wellbeing initiatives and all of that part of it. So, at one level there is an acknowledgement of it, but in terms of the day to day demands, in the end, because you have the kids knocking at the door, and all the major dramas are happening, the major problems – the kid who has run away from home, the kid who is depressed or going to kill himself, or whatever. Then of course, you ought to respond to that first, and that leaves very little time.

Despite the role description and her own aspirations to reach out to all students and do more preventative work; in practice, her role for the most part remains restricted to providing counselling services. While she, along with other counsellors, provide good counselling services to about 10% of the children needing such services, it leaves her with no time to teach students "good skills, help them be more positive about life, and to be more resilient", which she feels is very important. In fact, her observation is that a lack of focus on prevention is not just in her school, but also prevalent in many other schools, even when there are leadership positions dedicated to student wellbeing:

> I've been to a number of schools in the last couple of weeks, and I've noticed that they've got the Director or Deputy Principal of student wellbeing positions, but when you look at what they do, it's about dealing with the naughty children without the visionary stuff. I kind of feel disappointed when I see that because, yes, you've got the naughty kids that you need to work with but if you don't have the broader visionary thing, it's just ad hoc, reactionary stuff. So, trying to keep proactive is so important, and having the broader vision but that's so much harder when you have people coming and going, and people who have a different way of looking at things.

Even though she feels the importance of student wellbeing being represented in school's leadership team to "flag the flag for you", she also feels that it can be futile without the right kind of vision of student wellbeing. Her biggest concern is the lack of strategic planning or direction for student wellbeing – one which involves a proactive and preventive approach, and preparation for life; without which student wellbeing tends to be carried out in bits and pieces, and in reaction to incidents requiring intervention. While she feels supported in many ways, she feels constrained by the lack of opportunity to influence the strategic direction for student wellbeing that goes beyond just reacting to problems:

> If I say, you know I think this needs to happen, or we need to run this group, so long as we can afford it I suppose, and so long as it doesn't interfere too much with the day-to-day stuff, yeah go and do it. So, that's great, I don't know if it's the same in other schools. I feel personally in that way quite supported. It's more the strategic sort of thing that concerns me, because I can see it dying.

Without a student wellbeing core team, and the limitations of her own involvement in strategic planning as outside the school's leadership team; she finds it extremely difficult to affect any change towards her aspirations to implement a more balanced and holistic approach to student wellbeing promotion.

Bella's school

Bella's school is a well-established girls' school with students coming from diverse socio-economic backgrounds. Bella is the Assistant Principal for Student wellbeing. She works with the Assistant Principal (Learning), with a clear and shared understanding that both the aspects are equally important. According to her, the Principal's support for this kind of collaboration helps get across the right message to the rest of the school, when she said:

> I work very closely with the Assistant Principal (learning). So, she does the curriculum and I do the students, wellbeing and things like that; and we have a very good understanding between us that you can't have one without the other and I think that because we operate in that way in the school, it's become...it's almost understood.

…the work that I do with the other Assistant Principal of learning is extremely well supported by the Principal. If that weren't the case, then I think there would be mixed messages, and may be the staff here won't be hearing the same thing and seeing the link between one and the other, but because a lot of the stuff we do is presented together, there's no way you can see it as separate; and the support from the Principal makes it more valid.

We try to marry the ideas so that we have the same approach. It's not that learning is one thing and wellbeing is another. We need to have different people who manage things but in doing that they have to appreciate the ideas of student wellbeing, and in managing student wellbeing, you have to understand that students come to school to do their work. We may need extra time or work in a different way but there has to be an understanding of both and I think in a school where you have a very good relationship like that, the students benefit. I think the outcome is a very positive one for the students and the parents get it. I think that's important and the teachers understand too.

In her school, student wellbeing is viewed as integral to learning, and it is a view that is made clear right from the start when staff join the school, and it is consistently reinforced. According to Bella, communicating this view of student wellbeing and learning as integral to each other form an important aspect of staff recruitment interviews and orientation, parent meetings, school website, and school diary. It is a school culture that is nurtured over time persistently and with consistency:

I think over time, people get used to doing things and operating in a certain way. I don't think it happens in a day or two. I don't think we can say 'this is what we are going to do' and expect it to happen tomorrow. I think it takes a few years, and it has taken a few years here. I think people here understand that these are the things valued by the school, this is the way we treat kids, this is the way we operate.

Ensuring that teachers are up-to-date with information about students in their charge is an important aspect of their school work culture. According to Bella, "if you give people information, they are much more supportive of what you're trying to do. If they don't know, then

you set them up, and then set the student up for a really bad experience." She not only sees this as a way of supporting teachers to support students more effectively, but also as a way of communicating trust and engendering positive relationships. Information is shared through meetings, both formal and informal, in groups or individually with various people; through monthly review reports; and informal discussions as and when situations necessitate them. The Wellbeing Team meets every week, and Bella has meeting with senior and junior year-level coordinators every other week, all these interspersed with lots of informal one-on-one meetings with other members of the team.

Care and concern for every student and ensuring that they succeed is viewed as a sacred responsibility. Bella asserts that, "we've gone wrong somewhere along the line if at all we had to come to a point where we had to ask someone to leave, and so we work very hard to make sure we don't get there." Further, she emphasized that "We don't ask girls to leave if they are naughty. We work with them to make sure they're okay. We support them in every way. We sometimes take in students who have been asked to leave other schools, who need a fresh start, and we work very closely with them to make sure they are successful." The Student Wellbeing Team in her school begins each year with a meeting with teachers of each class to discuss students who have specific support needs, and how they may be best supported. She also emphasizes that building positive relationships is the key to promoting wellbeing, not just among those within the school, but also as much through developing and maintaining links with parents and agencies in the community.

Challenges of school organizational culture

The two cases described above highlight some important aspects of school culture worthy of consideration for promoting student wellbeing. Irene is concerned about the strategic direction for student wellbeing promotion, or rather the lack of it, as she grapples with responding to wellbeing issues in a rapidly growing school size riddled with staff turnovers. In practice, she finds herself limited to reacting to student problems and less involved in preventive work as required by her official role description. Part of this, she feels is due to differing views or a lack of a shared understanding of student wellbeing within the school, particularly with the school's senior leadership team. In Bella's school, on the other hand, student wellbeing is viewed as

integral to learning and the overall school culture based on positive relationship, and duty of care is emphasized through consistent communication and information sharing. Embedded in the descriptions above are a number of themes that represent key aspects of school culture, and their influences on implementation of programmes and activities to promote student wellbeing. These include leadership, strategic direction, organizational structure, and beliefs about student wellbeing and approaches to its promotion. These resonate with educational change literature, particularly the components of action theories discussed in Chapter 4; and their emphases on the role of a compelling vision or moral purpose, and leadership (Fullan, 2009; Hargreaves, 2009) as fundamental for effective change implementation. Factors such as leadership support (Fullan, 2001; Ransford et al., 2009; Weinbaum & Supovitz, 2010); teacher buy-in and stability (Desimone, 2002), and a sound teacher community with shared values and goals (Kurki, Boyle & Aladjem, 2006); and open communication, and trust (Fullan, 2001; Hargreaves, 1994; Weinbaum & Supovitz, 2010) have been identified as critical for successful implementation of change in schools.

Leadership and Strategic Direction

One of the key differences that can be seen in Irene's and Bella's school is the role of leadership and developing a shared understanding of the role and place of student wellbeing promotion. Bella's school benefits from a shared understanding of student wellbeing as integral to learning that is consistently communicated to the rest of the school through various means; whereas in Irene's case, differences exist in views about what student wellbeing should entail, which is further exacerbated by a context riddled with turnovers and transitions. Not only this, Irene is also constrained by the limited opportunity to participate in decision-making related to student wellbeing promotion, particularly its strategic direction. As a result, Irene feels the absence of leadership to 'flag the flag' for student wellbeing promotion more strategically, as she finds herself largely bogged down with stop-gap measures. As in Bella's school, both Ken and Sharon's schools have a student wellbeing core team, of which they are members. Sharon's school has a Deputy Principal responsible for student wellbeing who is trained in student wellbeing promotion, and Ken is himself in that position. While both Ken and Sharon spoke of challenges in getting all staff on board to implement student wellbeing as integral to learning, they enjoy school leadership and policy support. Hence, one of the key differences between

Irene's school and the others is a leadership that is well-versed in student wellbeing at the senior management level, and a core team that drives the programme. This is consistent with Fullan's (2001) assertion that both leadership and a critical mass of reform-minded staff are important for implementing change in schools. Bella's experiences also suggest that a shared understanding and commitment on the part of school's leadership team is linked to making student wellbeing integral to school life and culture.

A clear framework to provide direction goes hand in hand with good leadership. Schools are guided by the CEOM's policy framework that promote the adoption of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion, and supported with funding as well as professional development opportunities. The School Improvement Framework (SIF) provides a framework for schools assess to their wellbeing needs as well as progress, and set targets for improvement that are both short- and long-term. Under this Framework, schools are required to assess the wellbeing needs of their students, and create school policies and programmes to address the needs. The SIF requires the formation of a core team led by a member of senior management team to carry out these functions. Irene's school has only recently adopted the SIF, and have just begun to plan its implementation, unlike the other three schools that already implement it. Her school is yet to form this core team, and she feels that this is the reason why her school lacks a strategic direction for student wellbeing promotion. In the other schools, as a result of the SIF, they have been able to institute student wellbeing programmes tailored to their school needs. Two examples of these include a boys' education programme at Ken's school to prevent boys from being disconnected with school, and the Big Sister peer mentoring programme at Sharon's school to ensure new students have a smooth transition, and also learn to take similar responsibilities when they become seniors.

Even though Irene's school recognized the importance of wellbeing a several years ago when the school was relatively smaller in size, and under a different leadership that was supportive of the wellbeing agenda; both leadership as well as staff turnovers have resulted in change of plans, and it could not be stabilized in the absence of a policy framework to guide such as the SIF. The change in her title from school counsellor to student wellbeing coordinator and her job description that specifies proactive and preventive roles for her bear testimony to this.

With a change in school leadership and restructuring to manage the school's fast growing size, the focus of student wellbeing work shifted to reactive care, control and management. However, with the introduction of the Staff Improvement Group (SIG) programme in her school, she has managed to start a SEL group that is actively working to integrate SEL into subjects they teach. This has helped create an awareness of the proactive student wellbeing work that can be done without the requirement of additional time allocation, as well as the important wellbeing roles that all teachers can play. The SIG programme allows teachers to form interest groups for their professional development in topics that are relevant to their school work.

Supportive leadership and policy direction are clearly important ingredients of effective implementation. However, change takes time, and turnovers can work against change being stabilized, especially in the absence of clear policy framework and consistent leadership. In addition to the formal leadership teams, Irene's initiatives with the SIG suggest that, given the opportunity and passion, mid-level and informal leaderships can also stimulate change in positive directions.

Organizational Structure

In general, student wellbeing programmes in the CEOM schools are led by a member of the school's senior management team, typically an assistant or deputy principal. There is usually a wellbeing core team which is responsible for making key decisions on student wellbeing promotion, led by a member of the school's senior management, and guided by the CEOM's School Improvement Framework (SIF). The wellbeing core team is supported by year level coordinators and other support service personnel such as school counsellors and learning support coordinators, and homeroom teachers.

Unlike Bella's schools where both the Assistant Principals leading Curriculum and Wellbeing work with a shared understanding of the how their roles complement each other, having leadership positions has not necessarily led to similar outcomes for the others. Sharon points out that "We have Deputy Principal, curriculum, and Deputy Principal, wellbeing, and that's important; but sometimes they seem to be mutually exclusive". Ken also voiced a similar concern:

Structurally at the moment we still have the student wellbeing team, quite separate to the curriculum team. Part of the challenge I've got in discussing with the head of teaching-learning here is to say, 'we need to have some time for both forums together to talk about the needs of the students from a wellbeing point of view and learning point of view, and that's something we try to work towards.

Nonetheless, both Sharon and Ken's schools have better support than Irene's. They have been able to institute some pastoral classes, and initiate proactive prevention programmes to promote student wellbeing.

Whereas all of them aspire for student wellbeing to be a shared responsibility, it is a task that is easier said than done. In fact, without measures to collaborate, there is risk that it could lead to further segregation of responsibilities with teachers increasingly inclined to avoid dealing with disciplinary issues. For instance, Sharon finds that many teachers would rather send students to the year-level coordinator even when the issues involved are minor and could be more effectively and easily dealt with at their level. As passionate as she is about helping out and responding when her help is sought, she sometimes finds it overwhelming because she feels that teachers "sometimes rightly or wrongly just take advantage of people in my role who are proactive and have more responsibility rather than taking initiatives on their own." She strongly feels a need to work on building a culture of shared responsibility for student wellbeing:

it's about making sure that the processes that we have enable other members of the staff to have more of a part in the process or asking them to be more accountable, and so changing the way we do things sometimes because it's easier for us to do things and we just do too much. We need to start putting back responsibility to other people. So, I think we do have the discussions on how to change the culture and the processes in the long-term way as well.

While it is important to have an organized structure that support the promotion of student wellbeing, the challenge appears to be to avoid narrow compartmentalization of roles, and to

foster a culture of shared responsibility. Hargreaves (1994) observed this in secondary schools where teachers tend to work in compartmentalized departments, and called this a 'balkanized' culture, where change and collaboration can be very difficult. In the case of Bella, whose school reportedly enjoys a culture of shared responsibility and collegiality, she attributes it to a combination of factors such as the Principal's support, reflecting it in school's policy, and persistently enforcing it with consistency over a long period of time. On the contrary, this is something Irene's school finds it very difficult to achieve given the frequent turnovers.

The multiple roles that Student Wellbeing Leaders are required to play pose challenges. In their roles, wellbeing leaders are required to deal with a range of issues, sometimes seemingly contradictory in nature. For instance, they experience a certain degree of tension between their roles that involve dealing with disciplinary issues on the one hand, and those that involve dealing with relationship-building and mental health issues. One requires them to administer consequences with consistency and the other requires them to be an empathic helper. Sharon points out that even as she works hard to be approachable, students tend to see her position as coming with an "unspoken authority":

> I think that even our role is to provide structure and discipline, I think the most important thing is you're approachable. If a child is upset or alone or isolated or feels that they're having a hard time, that they can come to you; and everyday you've got to kind of send them the message that they can come to you. .. I think sometimes with the discipline side of things, I know in my last school, sometimes I don't think those kids understood that the house coordinators weren't just the ones who gave out the detentions, they are the ones who are meant to support them when they needed that.

On the other hand, Bella is of the view that it is possible to do justice to both within the context of a trusting relationship and fairness. She maintains that, "You have to have good relations with the students. I'm the one who suspends students, gives detentions, tells them about uniforms, but I have a fantastic relationship with students in the school. You can be both – you can be quite firm and very kind in the way you do it." This may mean that potential role tensions are less

likely or better resolved within an overall context of a trusting relationship and acknowledgement of student wellbeing as integral to school culture.

Organizing into structures often imply demarcating boundaries, something that may run contrary to the idea of integration, or wellbeing as integral to learning. Similarly wellbeing can be perceived as contradicting notions of discipline. These suggest that at least part of the challenges of implementation may be related to reconciling such perceived dichotomies.

Beliefs and Approaches to Student Wellbeing Promotion

A key dimension of student wellbeing that all four participants advocate is the need to emphasize a proactive and preventive approach. Within this approach, they identify two aspects: positive relationship building, and teaching social and emotional skills to help students develop resilience. All four participants emphasize the centrality of a culture of positive relationships, such as through "relating well" with students, and school staff "being approachable" for promoting student wellbeing. For example, Ken explains that:

> if you relate well with kids and have good relationships with kids, it actually enhances your teaching. You can do more and try different things with the assurance that kids will allow you to do that. I think if you're approachable to kids and respectful of them, then that's reciprocated in how they deal with you. So, as an example, I would walk into the yard and talk to kids to say hello to them – to get to know who they are, but also to make them feel that I'm approachable, so they not only see it as you only come here when you're in trouble.

He finds that this often has a "positive spin-off" in that students come to see him for informal chats about things that concern them and take responsibility not just for their own wellbeing but also of the school as a community.

Similarly, pastoral classes focus on topics such as SEL, bullying prevention, and conflict resolution. This emphasis on prevention is consistent with good practices in mental health and wellbeing reported in recent literature (e.g., Durlak et al., 2002, 2011). However, participants

177

spoke of challenges in implementing them that relate to ways in which schools are structured as well as the beliefs and attitudes of other staff. For instance, finding a place in a rigid scheduling of activities in school can be a challenge. This is discussed more elaborately in the next chapter. In three of the schools where they have pastoral classes, it is shared with school assemblies. But the ways in which pastoral classes are designed and delivered to make the best of the limited time available is of interest here. It is usually the year-level coordinator or Student Wellbeing Leaders who design wellbeing lessons, and it is the home-room teachers who deliver them in classrooms. Sharon points out that this can be problematic "if you don't have a positive, proactive homeroom teacher". She points out that:

> There are teachers who believe in and support the wellbeing aspect of teaching and there are teachers who don't believe in it, not interested, and relationships aren't as important. That's always an issue even in the classroom but then when it comes to delivering a pastoral care programme, I think home-room teachers can be either unfamiliar with the content, not very confident about what they are delivering. For instance, if they are older and if they're not very IT savvy and they have to deliver a programme on cyber bullying you know, or they're just apathetic.

Ultimately, it is the beliefs, knowledge and skills of homeroom teachers that will determine how well the programmes run irrespective of how well they have been designed by the coordinator. The same wellbeing programmes can play out very differently in different classrooms depending on the enthusiasm and skills of homeroom teachers, the relationships they share with their students, and the extent to which they subscribe to the importance of wellbeing for their students. Bella also noted that the effective implementation of pastoral classes is mainly dependent on teachers, who may not necessarily possess the required knowledge, skills, and attitude.

Promoting relationship building presents similar challenges. Building positive relationships can be best modelled in everyday interactions, and teachers are the best placed as they are most in direct contact with their students on a daily basis. However, not all teachers subscribe to the view that it is the role of teachers to deliberately engage in positive relationship building with their students. Sharon points out that some teachers:

They build relationships, they care about the students, but they don't put the wellbeing tag on it… but also some people are resistant to discussions surrounding the topic as well because they want to focus on the academics... and look, there are some people who might not subscribe to that whole wellbeing philosophy but who in the classroom have wonderful rapport with their students and do that anyway, and then there are some who just don't put any efforts into those relationships and who I don't think really get a lot out of the job as a result. I don't see how you can because the students respond much better to you when you have developed rapport. I think that's a frustration as a coordinator because you're picking up the pieces for those teachers who don't put in the effort to focus on the relationships. Often they're the ones who'd like to 'hand-ball' as we'd like to say, pass it off.

Teachers as the direct point of contact with students on a daily basis have a key role in relationship building. However, because there is a different teacher for every subject, and each teacher interacts with several hundred students across classes, and only for brief periods, wellbeing leaders believe that knowing each student to bond with them is much harder compared to primary schools where teachers have longer periods of time with their students. Teachers in secondary schools, according to the participants, see themselves as "teachers of subjects" responsible for the subject that they teach rather than as "teachers of students" responsible for their all-round development and wellbeing. This was also reported in an earlier study that looked at a whole-school approach to mental health in schools (Askell-Williams et al., 2005). The ways in which schools are organized and structured may work to perpetuate such views. These are important issues that will need to be seriously considered because teacher buy-in and training have been found to be critical to effective implementation of change (Fullan, 2005; Datnow & Castellano, 2000; Desimone, 2002). In this regard, Irene's initiatives to integrate SEL into different subjects is a good example of achieving teacher buy-in whilst also making wellbeing an integral part of learning.

In summary, these suggest the following: Leadership support for student wellbeing as integral to learning is critical for legitimizing and putting it on the agenda; traditional structures

modelled on academic departments may not be conducive for the promotion of student wellbeing; and without a change in the beliefs and attitudes about teachers' roles in promoting wellbeing, any efforts for an effective and sustainable student wellbeing programme is not very likely to happen. This implies the importance of the development of teacher competencies, in addition to a collaborative culture of shared responsibility, and supportive school leadership.

Student Wellbeing and Organizational Culture in Bhutan Schools

Interviews of Bhutan participants raise concerns and implementation challenges that revolve around the ways in which the schools are organized, school leadership's support, professional authority and legitimacy, and beliefs and norms.

Organizational Structure and Strategic Direction

Organizationally, all four participating schools have a student support services department or unit headed by a vice principal. Various programmes such as career guidance, counselling, values education, E4GNH, school health, and school discipline come under the purview of student services as distinct from the academics. These programmes are coordinated and/ or implemented by different people, typically in addition to full-time teaching responsibilities.

In the interviews with the participants, the School Discipline Committee featured quite prominently as a having a strong influence on student wellbeing programmes in their schools. This is the body that decides on the consequences for students involved in disciplinary issues. Consequences may range from formal warnings to suspension, or sometimes even expulsion; and counselling is generally used as a measure that can be employed to avoid these, often at the discretion of the Discipline Committee or school's leadership. Students are encouraged to seek help from school counsellors, but the ways in which schools are structured and scheduled leaves very little time and space for this to happen. For instance, both Keldon and Lhazom were very apologetic that they had very little time and opportunity to provide counselling services even when they knew that some of their students needed it. The best that they could do was to use the

recess between classes to briefly listen to them, or stay back after the school hours which was neither convenient for them nor to the students.

The Student Wellbeing Leaders' roles include teaching the guidance and career education classes, organizing and coordinating student wellbeing related events and activities, and providing counselling services. In addition, three of the four participants teach at least one academic subject. Only Pedrup did not have an academic subject to teach, but in practice, he spent much of his time substituting for other teachers. Officially, Pedrup's teaching responsibility is to teach only guidance and career education classes. The others, on the other hand, had a reduced teaching load for guidance and career education so that they could teach other subjects such as English and Math.

The schools do not have an overarching guiding document or policy framework for student wellbeing promotion that map the various wellbeing programmes. However, there are documents issued by the Ministry of Education such as the curriculum framework for guidance and career education, and a guidebook on suggested activities for Educating for GNH.

While there are several programmes and activities that contribute to student wellbeing, their impact may be undermined by the lack of a cohesive and coordinated approach, guided by an overarching and strategic policy framework. It is very rarely, if at all, that the different groups and people with responsibilities for student wellbeing come together to specifically discuss student wellbeing, not very different from balkanized, departmental cubbyhole culture described by Hargreaves (1994). Programmes tend to run parallel, often coordinated by different individuals with little effort to integrate or collaborate. While classes are allocated for guidance and career education, they are often supplanted in case of shortfalls in academic subjects. It is characteristic of an 'add-on' approach without infusing it as an integral part, sometimes called a 'Christmas Tree" approach to reform in which several attractive programs are strung together without coherence (Bryk, Easton, Kerbow, Rollow, & Sebring, 1993). Davis and Cooke (2007) report a similar disjuncture in schools promoting HPS and sustainable education. They argue that integration and collaboration is likely to be a greater force of transformation. Having multiple programmes that are coordinated and implemented by different people, especially in the absence

of a core strategic framework that bind them together is likely to be fragmented and therefore diminished in its impact. Desimone (2002), and Weinbaum and Supowitz (2010) emphasize that reform efforts that align or connect with other programmes or reform initiatives in school are likely to receive support and be more effectively implemented.

Principal's Support, Professional Authority and Legitimacy

Bhutan participants identified the Principal's leadership and support as an important factor influencing implementation of student wellbeing programmes, although in different ways. Keldon's experience, for instance, has been that the involvement of the Principal in programmes and initiatives serve to set a powerful example for others in school to emulate:

> My observation during the past five years here is that whatever the school does, it is taken very seriously, and particularly (if) the Head takes it very seriously and so do the teachers and the students; and so at the end 90% is always quality work.

Keldon feels that the Principal's involvement sends across a clear message for the rest of the school regarding its importance. Both Pedrup and Lhazom spoke of Principal's support being a critical factor in promoting and implementing the student wellbeing agenda in the face of strong opposition from many senior colleagues who prefer a more direct and punitive approach. This is consistent with Fullan's (2001) point that leadership support serves to legitimize the seriousness for change and foster accountability.

However, while acknowledging the influence that principals can exert, Teyndel's experience has been that it can be a sword that cuts both ways:

> Especially heads make a lot of difference; some are pro counselling, others are not, and they have their ideas of what counselling should be. So, heads make a big difference because they can influence. But with plans for full-time school counsellors and policies and laws that disallow physical punishment and such things are creating the opportunities. May be full-time school counsellors might make some difference

especially because it comes from up and I think if it is compulsory type, things might change. I think in Bhutan, we need to impose for things to eventually work out.

He notes that as a highly centralized system, a top-down approach can be used to leverage and enforce implementation. Even though he feels that the creation of a full-time counselling position will add legitimacy and authority to his work as a school counsellor, it is still because it "comes from the top". At the same time, it lends support to Lee's (2004) assertion that change should begin with the changing of the mindset of leadership. A more recent development is the proposal from the Department of Youth and Sports (Ministry of Education) for a full-time school counsellor, so that they can do justice to their roles unencumbered by other responsibilities such as teaching of academic subjects, as well as to provide greater professional authority and legitimacy to their role.

Lhazom also made similar references to challenges related to professional authority and legitimacy. Her experiences with the implementation of processes for student referral in her school is indicative of such a case. The official procedure for referral of students with behavioural issues in her school is to first try and address it at the classroom level, next to refer to the school counsellor if it could not be resolved, and then to the school's management for external referral or disciplinary action. When making referrals, teachers are required to fill out a form. However, in practice, she points out that what usually happens is:

> … they (teachers) would rather convey it to me verbally because the form requires them to fill out details of what has been tried and with what results and so on. They also think that I am also a teacher and not a full-time counsellor. When they refer, it is like you are also a teacher and you know how it feels when they don't do their work. Let's see what else you can do.

In many cases, teachers send students directly to the Vice Principal or Principal's office for disciplinary action. Despite agreed upon structures and procedures to deal with wellbeing related issues, there appears to be a tendency to look for easier and coercive measures, and seek out those in higher positions of power to impose consequences. This seems to suggest that in

Bhutan's context, Student Wellbeing Leaders' relative position in the school hierarchy has an influence on their ability to exert professional authority and add legitimacy to their role. Lhazom also pointed out how she was reminded of her junior status and inexperience each time senior teachers did not like the changes she proposed.

Underlying Beliefs and Approaches to Student Wellbeing

Not only do the ways in which schools view and approach student wellbeing vary between schools, but they also vary amongst people within the schools. This can be observed in Teyndel and Lhazom's experiences. They have both worked as school counsellors in two different schools, and spoke at length about how things worked differently in these schools. The following excerpts from the interview provide a glimpse of how Teyndel compares his role as a school counsellor in the two schools:

> ...one good thing about the system in the previous school was that I had more freedom. So, with any student who came to me, I had the full authority and all the options to deal with the student in the way I thought appropriate to change the behaviour, and so there was less interruption. Of course, later I had to go and give the report. The good thing about that is that you have full authority and liberty, and feel very confident in what you do. Whereas the other system, it's more like a directive...you have been directed to do something and you have to follow it according to the (Discipline) Committee's decisions and rules, and it limits your ability to change the behaviour of the students, and also you need to focus a lot on report writing using a prescribed format. So, sometimes it becomes difficult to exercise your skills properly because you have been bound by the rules, and so you feel a little disadvantaged.

In his previous school, Teyndel initiated the school guidance and counselling programme with full support from the Principal. But in his current school, he was required to step into a system that already existed, and struggled to adapt to, especially because it is inconsistent with his own beliefs and ideas about what needs to be done. Teyndel goes on to elaborate that:

I mean a counsellor should be given the authority to deal with students without anybody's interference but of course within prescribed guidelines and policies. The kind of interference we get from Discipline Committee saying, 'ok, counsel this student for these many weeks and let us see if there is any change, or else we may have to send him out.' I think the system should understand the students better and give more time for counselling to take effect and not specify time frames as per their convenience... It is not something that can be achieved overnight, and this is one problem we often face. The committee might want to see change overnight and say if you can't do that, then what is the use?

Lhazom also shared similar experiences of tension between her own views on student wellbeing and that of other school staff. In both the schools, she constantly faced the active opposition of senior members of the staff. Sharing her experience from her previous school, she said:

We had a Vice Principal who was so much against counselling, and he said you are very junior and first time in this school, and these kind of activities will never work. Instead, he would have the boys' head shaved and many a times we would have that kind of problem in the school. Every time I initiated a counselling or career education activity, he was there to tell me that it will not work because it is a boarding school and you are first time in the school, and that I would see all of the activities failing by the end of mid-term. Nevertheless, I never gave up even though he was there opposing me every time in the meetings.

In her current school, even though it has become easier for her to deal with them with more experience and support from few other colleagues and the Principal, she pointed out that, "Here also, the same thing happened. One of the senior teachers said, 'You are so new and a junior staff and you are trying to bring new things that never happened in our school', but I never took it too seriously because I thought what was important was whether we can make a difference…"

The experiences shared by Teyndel and Lhazom illustrate the differences in views and tensions that Student Wellbeing Leaders face when strategies for student wellbeing promotion are inconsistent, especially when they are deeply rooted in school cultures that have been in

existence for a long period of time. This is illustrative of the need to understand the promotion of student wellbeing as a change process, in particular the 'unfreezing' and establishing the motivation for change stage (Lewin, 1997; Marcus, 2000) described in Chapter 4. It also highlights the need to create a critical group of supporters or a guiding coalition to support change as suggested by Fullan (2001) and Kotter (2007).

A common theme that came up in the interviews with all four participants, is a tension between the punitive consequence-based approach to discipline, and the preventive and helping approach in school counselling that they experience. For example, Pedrup notes that:

> What I notice is that the traditional notion of the teacher-student relationship in our culture is still very strong especially among the teachers. There are high expectations of obedience and compliance. Student attitude toward teachers, I think we can feel it, because they are brought up in a different time; so they don't have that obedience and compliance, and so now I think teachers need to change their attitudes, our approach, and expectations a little bit.

He feels that such reliance on traditional notions of control and compliance as being disciplined and respectful comes in the way of teachers and students sharing a sense of connectedness to each other. He specifically referred to the use of physical punishment in his school by some teachers even when its use is officially forbidden. Both Lhazom and Teyndel spoke of it as a challenge that they are faced with almost on a daily basis. It is the subject of a spirited staffroom debate that they are occasionally engaged in but without little progress in changing things.

On the other hand, Keldon believes that the use of corporal punishment is sometimes necessary. She points out that:

> I understand that outside Bhutan, in Western countries, they don't use corporal punishment at all but here in Bhutan, I think we cannot do without it even when we are saying no. Yes, some of our colleagues, and even sometimes, I also feel that there are

times when you come across certain group of students, counselling does not work and you have to be hard on them and use different strategies.

Such faith in punitive measures and its efficacy perhaps is suggestive of the magnitude of the challenge, especially as proposed alternatives call for extra efforts but without equally efficient and immediate results. Under such circumstances, without working on creating the motivation for change (as suggested by Marcus, 2000; and Marsh, 2000), new approaches are likely to be framed within existing structures. For example, Teyndel's case illustrates how counselling is used within the framework of Discipline Committee's consequence-based system, and is even used to justify disciplinary sanctions against students. Similarly, Lhazom points out that:

> People think that counselling is required only when incidents come up, as a curative measure. The Discipline Committee is seen as a preventive measure whereby students are made aware that there is the Discipline Committee that will deal with them if they create problems, and so the fear is supposed to prevent.

School counselling is thus seen as a form of disciplining, and cast into a reactive and punitive framework. It is relegated to an 'incidental' role with very limited opportunities to do prevention work. In addition, Student Wellbeing Leaders can be under a lot of pressure to get things right in the face of limited support, and often with strong opposition. Lhazom points out that:

> Even when you argue that it is through counselling that there is a chance to bring the student to the right track, the argument I have to face is whether I will be willing to take responsibility if things don't work out, and how can I give the assurance. That's the big problem.

Pedrup pointed out that school counselling, or rather the school counsellor has become "an anvil to hit on" by other school staff. Whenever there is a problem involving students, his colleagues are quick to point out that it is "because so much liberty is given to students" through the student wellbeing programmes such as counselling.

Across the interviews, references were made to the prevalence of a strong belief in the use of consequences as a deterrent in relation to student behavioural problems and disciplining. The emphasis on disciplining is evident in the primacy accorded to the Discipline Committee whose main task is to decide on what punishment or consequences should be meted out to those who violate school rules and codes of conduct. The ways in which the Discipline Committee relates to school counselling and the roles that Student Wellbeing Leaders play provide useful insights into understanding the culture and context of schools and the related challenges. Student Wellbeing Leaders experience a tension between the punitive consequence-based approach to discipline, and the preventive and helping approach in school counselling. The centrality of the Discipline Committee in the school structure in Teyndel's school, for instance, sets the framework within which counselling is used turning it into a part of mechanism for punitive purposes, while undermining its underlying assumptions and purpose. The challenge for Student Wellbeing Leaders is how to fit new initiatives and the agenda for promoting student wellbeing into existing structures, or rather change them to reconcile contradictory beliefs and assumptions to gain a shared vision of what is to be achieved and how it is to be achieved. These highlight the relevance of drawing on the literature on educational change, in particular the change process and action theories of change as outlined in Chapter 4.

Understanding Challenges of Organization and Culture

Student Wellbeing Leaders' accounts of the challenges that relate to their school cultures in general are reflective of tensions between their aspirations for student wellbeing as integral to school culture and what exists in the prevailing school culture. They highlighted three key aspects of their school culture that have a strong bearing on the implementation of student wellbeing programmes. These relate to beliefs and assumptions about what constitute student wellbeing, leadership, and school organizational structure.

Student wellbeing promotion often tend to be viewed as a way of overcoming distractions to the primary goal of academic learning, relegating it to a mainly reactive work in response to problems. In comparison, proactive work through building relationships or teaching of skills receive less attention and support. As organizations, schools are structured in ways that are not

necessarily conducive to student wellbeing promotion. In policies and practices, Student Wellbeing Leaders' aspirations of creating supportive, open, and friendly learning environments is generally found to be at odds with traditional notions of discipline, order, and respect.

Leadership and Strategic Direction

Leadership and strategic direction are highlighted as playing critical roles in implementation of student wellbeing promotion, yet presenting challenges in both the school systems. Consistent with the literature on educational change, principal's active involvement and support is found to enhance the quality of implementation; whether it is by creating pressure through expectations or incentives for staff to implement (Weinbaum & Supowitz, 2010; Ransford et al., 2009). On the other hand, where there is a lack of support from the school's leadership or if they held differing views on what student wellbeing programmes should entail, Student Wellbeing Leaders are faced with a bigger challenge, that of getting the fundamental of transforming mindset of leaders to change the culture (Lee, 2004). Experiences of the CEOM participants suggest that having a leadership trained in student wellbeing promotion can make a big difference in providing leadership and support required for successful implementation. From this point of view, professional development of principals and members of school's leadership team on student wellbeing could prove to be critical for providing impetus to student wellbeing promotion as integral to what schools do.

In the case of CEOM schools, having a strategic framework such as the SIF that place student wellbeing as integral to school's vision, mission, and policies, led by a wellbeing core team, student wellbeing programmes appear to be more coherent and integrated, and therefore more likely to be accepted and implemented. In the absence of an overall framework, Bhutan schools tend to experience a fragmented approach with poor coherence among a variety of programmes independently coordinated by various individuals. This is also true to some extent in the case of Irene's school where they are yet to fully adopt and implement the SIF. These confirm the assertions in literature that policy support provide the required impetus for change implementation (Rowling & Samdal, 2011); and that a guiding coalition, or critical mass of reform-minded people to lead the change is important for implementation to succeed (Fullan, 2009; Hargreaves, 2009; Kotter, 2009). A strategic policy framework that outlines how student

wellbeing fits into the overall framework of what a schools views as its vision and mission can provide the basis for making the promotion of student wellbeing an integral aspect unlike being an add-on, peripheral activity of secondary importance as is often the case.

Organizational Structure

Both Bhutan and CEOM schools in general have student wellbeing structures that mirror the academic structure. Each one is led by a deputy or vice principal supported by wellbeing coordinators and subject department heads. However, when it comes down to implementation at classroom level, wellbeing is neither matched by competent implementers as subject teachers for the academics, nor in terms of the time required. Student Wellbeing Leaders have very limited opportunities to either directly engage with students in regular classes, or to engage with teachers to support them address student wellbeing needs. This serves to further perpetuate perceptions of an 'academic-wellbeing' split whereby teachers may be inclined to see student wellbeing as somebody else's responsibility, separate from the academics, and of secondary importance. It is indicative of an underlying principle that casts or adds on any new initiatives into the existing framework or mould rather than making adjustments to integrate. An example of this is the ways in which counselling is used to support the Discipline Committee's decisions in Teyndel's school; and Irene being forced to fully devote herself to counselling when her title as well as role description include proactive and prevention work. These lend support to Hargreaves' (1994) point that the problems secondary schools and teachers face are in fact a result of their persistent adherence to the monolithic, opaque and inflexible modern structures; whereas a culture of collegiality and collaboration is what is required. Additionally, Bhutan participants' experiences suggest that bureaucratic and hierarchical structures also serve to undermine professional autonomy and legitimacy. The weight of their voices in the decision-making process is often based on their relative position in the hierarchy rather than their competence as school counsellors or wellbeing leaders.

Beliefs and Approaches

One of the challenges that Student Wellbeing Leaders face in promoting a more holistic approach to student wellbeing is related to teacher beliefs or mindsets regarding wellbeing. In

Chapter 6, we have seen that notions of what student wellbeing constitute can range from managing and controlling students, providing helping services, to seeing it as an integral part of school learning. While reviews of literature on student wellbeing suggest a growing shift in thinking reflective of a whole-school approach, experiences of the participants suggest that in practice, to a large extent, old ways of thinking as well as doing persist among school staff. Such beliefs, norms, and values would have evolved over several years and are deeply entrenched (Hargreaves, 1994), often supported by structures that remain unchanged. Hence, in both systems, Student Wellbeing Leaders are required to face the challenge of dealing with tensions between more traditional views of control and management and a student wellbeing approach that is holistic and integral to learning. CEOM participants emphasize building positive relationships and development of skills as proactive measures, but these are not always shared by teachers who are the ones that are in direct contact with students on a daily basis. Bhutan participants, similarly struggle to find legitimacy in their work as school counsellors, and to prevent counselling from being used as a form of consequence within a punitive consequence-based system that is viewed as more effective and efficient. This resonates with Ainley et al.'s (2006) finding that the attitudes and priorities of teaching staff to be one of the strongest barriers to promotion of mental health and wellbeing in schools. Addressing beliefs and attitudes is critical because effective implementation requires that all implementers have a shared vision (Fullan, 2009; Hargreaves, 2009), and view the promotion of student wellbeing as a shared responsibility. This task is comparatively easier for CEOM with a common policy framework, and better resource support than in Bhutan schools. Professional development in student wellbeing promotion for both school leaders as well as teachers could be one of the ways of addressing this; but it also means that in the longer run, it may be better addressed through pre-service education of school leaders and teachers.

The Promotion of Student Wellbeing as Evolving Culture

Earlier descriptions of ways in which schools address student wellbeing are based on the locus of responsibility (Spratt et al., 2006) and the focus area of intervention (Stokols, 1996). According to Spratt (2006), schools either used an 'export' model and referred students to outside experts; used the 'import' model and employed experts in schools; or an 'ownership' model which put student wellbeing at the heart of its value system and worked in partnership

with other agencies to address it. Stokols (1996) described three inter-related perspectives that focus on changing behaviour, restructuring environment, and seeing the two as integrated. Based on the experiences of practice shared by the Student Wellbeing Leaders, an extension to these conceptualizations is to see student wellbeing promotion as an evolving culture. This is in recognition of the important role that school organizational culture and structure play in influencing change in general, and student wellbeing promotion in particular. It contributes to the understanding of 'ethos, organization, and environment', one of the key components of a whole-school approach.

School organizational cultures can be viewed as falling along a continuum of roughly three types based on the ways in which they organize to address student wellbeing. These are: (a) Student wellbeing as management and control; (b) Student wellbeing as reactive care; and (c) Student wellbeing as integral to learning (see Table 7.1 below).

Table 7.1: *Types of Student Wellbeing Cultures*

Student wellbeing as	Management & Control	Reactive Care	Integral to Learning
Meaning	Wellbeing as distinct from academics, important for removing hurdles to academic learning	Wellbeing as a response to problems; caring for students with difficulties	Wellbeing as an integral part of learning and preparation for life
Approach	Consequence-based, discipline and punish	Primarily reactive focused on needy students	Proactive and reaching out to all students
Focus	Discipline	Health issues	All-round development

In the first type, student wellbeing is about managing an orderly environment so that academic learning can take place smoothly. The 'reactive care' approach is based on a

heightened sense of mental health and social and emotional needs in addition to the focus on behaviour in the 'management and control' approach. The focus in both these is on ensuring that students are free of distractions and well enough to learn language, math, or science. In student wellbeing as 'integral to learning', wellbeing is not just a means to learning something else but a part and parcel of learning itself. A whole-school approach which views student wellbeing promotion as integral to learning does not preclude elements of 'management and control' and 'reactive care'. It views student wellbeing as a shared responsibility of all stakeholders, and reaches out to all students to help them learn to live well as opposed to making it solely a specialized responsibily of certain individuals or groups, and treating or managing only those who are deemed unwell or a threat to own and others' wellbeing. These do not necessarily represent a classification along which schools can be neatly categorized, but represent broad categories to help understand or explain the possible assumptions that underpin the practice of student wellbeing promotion in schools. While schools may identify with any one of the categories, it is important to take into account that cultures are dynamic and evolve, especially with concerted and persistent efforts to make changes.

Conclusion

Student Wellbeing Leaders' accounts of the challenges that relate to their school cultures are characterized by tensions between their aspirations that are more consistent with good practices as advocated by the extant literature, and prevalent views and structures that are often incompatible with these aspirations. Student Wellbeing Leaders view student wellbeing as integral to learning but school structures and practices relegate it to a peripheral role. They advocate a more proactive approach to build relationships and resilience, but they are often caught up with fixing problems or responding to behavioural, emotional, and mental health issues. These are manifest, albeit in varying degrees, across schools in both the systems.

This chapter highlighted the role school organizational culture and structure play in influencing the implementation of student wellbeing promotion. In particular, it looked at the ways in which leadership, strategic direction, organizational structures, and competing views, beliefs and approaches to student wellbeing affect implementation. Leadership and policy

193

support are not only likely to help put programme implementation on the agenda, but also provide a cohesive and coherent approach. However, there is a need for commensurate adjustments in structures to facilitate more collegiality and collaboration as a shared responsibility. Related to this is the challenge of resolving any differences in views and beliefs about student wellbeing; and the need to build the competency of school staff consistent with a whole-school approach. Finally, the promotion of student wellbeing in schools can be conceptualized as evolving cultures centred along key themes of control, care, and wellbeing as integral to learning. Schools are complex institutions with distinct cultures and structures that will require adjustments to accommodate changes. In the case of implementing a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion, it entails negotiating competing views, and redesigning incompatible structures that are time-tested which make it very challenging.

CHAPTER 8. THE CHALLENGE OF FINDING TIME FOR STUDENT WELLBEING PROMOTION

Introduction

According to the National Education Commission on Time and Learning (NECTL, 2005), time is an important variable that ought to be thought through carefully and allocated in any education reform initiative. Any initiative that does not do this may be doomed to failure. Hargreaves (1994) identifies shortage of time as a serious implementation problem within education reform and one of the main complaints of teachers. Implementing a student wellbeing initiative is no exception, especially when using a whole-school approach. Wyn et al. (2000) point out that implementing a whole-school approach is extremely challenging because it requires going beyond delivering classroom programmes to addressing school ethos and environment, policy and practices, and developing partnerships with parents, community groups or health agencies all of which involved additional time, energy and resources. In study reports on implementation of the MindMatters programme that uses a whole-school approach to mental health, time has been reported as one of the key concerns related to effective implementation. Even when the programme was well-supported, they did not translate into adequate time allocation for lessons due to a crowded curriculum, resulting in either content being cut down, or having to forego opportunities for relating it to student experiences in response to student questions and comments (Askell-Williams et al., 2005). Finding time to release staff for required planning and training was equally challenging (Hazell, 2005; Khan, Bedford & Williams, 2011). Implementing change involves a continuous process of learning that in itself takes time (Adelman, Eagle, & Hargreaves, 1997).

Time constraint represents a more specific manifestation of the deeper and broader challenges of meaning and culture discussed in the two preceding chapters. This chapter looks at the challenges of time as expressed by Student Wellbeing Leaders in secondary schools. In particular, it discusses the allocation of time for student wellbeing promotion in schools, Student Wellbeing Leaders' views on time requirements for student wellbeing programmes and activities to be effective, and the challenges they experience in bridging the gaps or mismatches between

the two. Student Wellbeing Leaders find themselves running short of time as they grapple with a multitude of roles and responsibilities.

This chapter begins by describing time allocation, use, and related challenges of implementation in the two school systems. It is followed by a discussion of ways of conceptualizing time for the promotion of student wellbeing in schools.

Student Wellbeing and Time in CEOM Schools

Student Wellbeing Leaders find themselves really hard-pressed for time. Statements such as "there's not enough time, or there's never enough time" were consistently spread across the interviews. This section looks at time allocation and use, and participants' views on time requirement, and the challenges associated with finding time in the CEOM schools. The following section analyses issues of time as experienced by the Bhutan participants.

Time Allocation and Use

Time allocations are made for student wellbeing responsibilities as part of Student Wellbeing Leaders' workload allocation. This includes time provided for wellbeing or pastoral classes. However, in reality, their student wellbeing responsibilities often stretch far beyond the official time allocation. Additionally, time allocation for some of their roles can only be approximations as they can be very unpredictable.

Student Wellbeing Leaders who participated in this study come from different levels in the hierarchy of the school organizational structure, and so their workloads for student wellbeing vary. Table 8.1 below shows the time officially allocated, and the time they actually spend on their student wellbeing roles as reported by the participants. Sharon is a year-level coordinator and is responsible for student wellbeing at one year level only. She also teaches English. Bella and Ken are in-charge of the wellbeing component in their schools; they teach some classes, and are also members of their school's senior leadership teams. Irene is the Student Wellbeing Coordinator for her school and her current role is primarily counselling students, which takes

about 80% of her time. She does not do any teaching except when she is invited as a guest speaker to talk about wellbeing related topics and issues by other teachers.

Table 8.1: *CEOM Student Wellbeing Leaders' Time Allocation and Use*

Participant	Designation	Time allocated/ week	Time spent/ week
Ken	Deputy Principal, Wellbeing	25-30 hrs	30-35 hrs
Irene	Student Wellbeing Coordinator	45 hrs	45 hrs
Shannon	Year-Level Coordinator	7 hrs	10+ hrs
Bella	Assistant Principal, Students	18 hrs	30 hrs

Irrespective of the level at which they are responsible as a leader of student wellbeing promotion, their reports of time allocated and spent suggest that they generally end up spending more time than is officially allocated. Irene is an exception because her role in practice is largely confined to counselling, and leading the coordination of student wellbeing programmes. Their time is spent on diverse activities such as dealing with critical incidents; social, emotional, behavioural or disciplinary issues; coordinating or organizing wellbeing-related programmes and activities; and meetings with staff, students, and parents.

Many of these tasks can be unpredictable - they emerge with urgency, and call for a great degree of flexibility whereas official time allocations are typically cast into time-tables. Here is an example - Sharon explains that:

> ...it's one of those jobs that you don't have much control over the way that the day pans out because often with welfare issues, often there are things that need to be addressed quite urgently. So, although we have that time, an issue might arise at lunch time with a group of students who I need to deal with, whether it be a disciplinary issue or an emotional issue, and I might have class after lunch time. It can be quite challenging sometimes trying to be a teacher as well as a coordinator and to be quite proactive in your dealings with your students whilst also having to stick to the time-table.

Sharon often finds that the planning and preparation work she needs to do cannot happen until after school. Others also described having to put on different hats almost every few hours and dealing simultaneously with students, parents, school staff, and external agencies. Hence, matching time allocation with required time, and balancing both the urgent and the strategic can be rather complicated in a Student Wellbeing Leader's role, especially if one has to teach classes as well.

Time allocation for student wellbeing on student time-table takes the form of pastoral classes. Schools vary in the ways they allocate this time. In two of the schools, a weekly period is shared between pastoral classes and school assembly; one school had roughly four lessons a semester; and one did not have any pastoral class. Pastoral classes are usually taught by homeroom teachers based on lessons prepared by Student Wellbeing Leaders in consultation with them. Sometimes, Student Wellbeing Leaders or other external experts teach them, in which case, larger groups of an entire year level or school may be involved.

The following is a brief description of how time allocated in student time-table is used in the four schools. In Ken's school, homeroom teachers get 10 minutes each in the morning and afternoon every day except on Friday when they have 20 minutes in the morning. Ken points out that, while this time is also intended to be for relationship-building, it is predominantly used up as administrative time with activities such as marking the roll, reading out student bulletin for the day, giving out information in terms of permission letters, prayer; and looking at student planners. In addition, they sometimes use school assembly time or organize special workshops to address student wellbeing needs and issues that concern the entire school. Sharon's school has three to four periods allocated each term where homeroom teachers implement activities that are planned and put together by her in consultation with them. Bella's school has a 40 minutes' pastoral class every week that is sometimes used for assemblies. In Irene's school, however, there is no specific time allocated for pastoral classes but she is sometimes invited to speak in some classes on wellbeing related topics (for e.g. dealing with grief and loss in the Religious Education class). Thus, time allocation for pastoral classes vary across the four schools in their duration, frequency, as well as focus. In Ken's school, the duration is short but it is regular, and

the intended focus is on relationship-building. In Sharon and Bella's schools, classes have a relatively longer time, but they are infrequent, and more focussed on building knowledge and skills. In Irene's school, they are subject to teacher demands, and have no time allocation.

In addition to pastoral classes, Student Wellbeing Leaders also deal with disciplinary issues, and critical incidents. A substantial amount of their time is spent on coordinating wellbeing related programmes and activities, involving collaboration with colleagues or other school staff, other schools, external agencies, and parents. For example, Sharon points out that,

> My job is a lot about organizing and liaising with teachers or even other schools to do that, which can be hard, dealing with adults, more than kids…. often when there's a disciplinary issue, you become a detective as well....and it gets busier and busier as the term progresses as more issues arise, and it's a lot of parent phone calls. The parents here kind of do expect a lot from the school, addressing their queries or concerns, dealing with student issues as they arise, pastoral care issues. So, often those things come up; and then organizing the programme and just making sure the day-to-day stuff happens. So, usually juggling a lot of different things.

In addition, there are wellbeing programmes and activities such as excursions, camps, talks and workshops involving external agencies, guest speakers, parents, and community that has to be coordinated by Student Wellbeing Leaders.

There is clearly a mismatch between time allocated and the tasks required of Student Wellbeing Leaders. There is, in general, a time deficit even though some of the roles Student Wellbeing Leaders are required to play are not exactly amenable to ways in which time allocations are traditionally made in schools.

Views on Time Requirement

Despite the differences in time allocation for pastoral classes, one thing that all four Student Wellbeing Leaders in these schools invariably concur on is the need for some structured

time to implement a proactive and whole-school wellbeing programme. Ken's statement below represents what the others also expressed in different ways:

> The other thing that we are very conscious of is that, what we need to map out is a preventative strategy across the whole school. So, whether it happens to be bullying or cyber bullying; whether it happens to be transitions into secondary environment... We sort of got this broader strategy but one that we are trying to develop because one of the concerns from the staff was when do we do it, and how do we develop it and how do we deliver our programme and the answer is we need to have some structured time to do it.

All of them had very clear ideas on what is needed to be addressed at different year levels based on the surveys that they have carried out in their school, what the research literature says about student wellbeing practices, and their own observations and experiences. A clear consensus is that there is just not enough time to address the basic knowledge, skills, and attitudes to promote student wellbeing within the time available for pastoral classes.

In Chapter 6, we have seen that relationship-building is viewed as central to student wellbeing promotion in CEOM schools. Relationship-building does not necessarily require additional time allocation, as it is one thing that can take place as part of everyday interactions. Ken points out that:

> Time is finite in one sense – fifty minutes is fifty minutes, but how you use that fifty minutes is critical. I think one of the things we've tried to develop in our staff is saying that in a fifty minutes period there are things that you can do to enhance student wellbeing through the process of getting to know the students at a more personal level, to do activities that are more engaging for the students and therefore build their connectedness with their class and with you as a teacher.
> I think it is a challenge because within a classroom environment where we run on a 45 or 50 minutes period here, and you're constantly moving as a teacher from one group to another, and potentially you could have about 250 students in a week that you're

interacting with. That makes it much more difficult than in a primary environment where 30 students are with you five days a week.

Even though additional time allocation specifically for relationship-building may not be required, it does require enough time for both teachers and students to know each other to be able to nurture it. For instance, keeping the same teachers with the same students for two or more years to provide better continuity in learning and build stronger relationships; and reduced student-teacher ratios for more one-on-one attention have been found to contribute to better teacher-student relationships, improved attendance and engagement in learning (Gambone, Klem, Summers, Akey & Sipe, 2004). In Ken's school, the boys-only class is mainly taught by two male teachers, and designed to enhance close bonding, role modelling, and catering to their learning styles.

As Ken points out, the ways in which secondary schools are structured makes it very challenging to promote relationship-building. As the subjects taught at secondary school gets more diverse and specialized with each passing year, it requires the time available to be split into segments that gets distributed among various subjects taught by different teachers. From a relationship-building point of view, this means that the time available to teachers to get to know their students and connect with them is substantially reduced as compared to primary schools. This is often further compounded by the belief that their job is to only 'teach the subject' that is held by many teachers.

Student Wellbeing Leaders find themselves short of time both in terms of providing the knowledge and skills for promoting wellbeing; and getting to know the students well to be able to build positive relationships. On top of these, they are required to respond to student care needs through services such as counselling and conflict resolution. Coordinating wellbeing programmes and activities, particularly those that involve external experts or agencies, other schools, and parents and community also tax the limited time at their disposal.

Challenges of Time

According to the Student Wellbeing Leaders, two factors that make it challenging for them to find time for student wellbeing promotion are an already overcrowded curriculum, and changing mindsets and priorities around past and established practices.

Competing for time in overcrowded curricula

One of the challenges faced by Student Wellbeing Leaders is finding time in an already tightly scheduled school environment. Allocation of time for anything new in the school system almost always means taking from one to give it to another whereas no one is keen on giving up. Given the numerous programmes schools are expected to run, student wellbeing is often seen as yet another one on the list of many vying for a slot of the limited time (Hazell, 2005). In addition to the academic subjects, there are several other competing co-curricular programmes that are equally demanding of the limited time that is available. Sharon points out the dilemma schools are often faced with:

> I think we have lot of interruptions with performing arts programme, music; we couldn't take any more time from the subjects because at the end of the day, they're here to learn but we have quite a few assemblies. We could take them out but then they serve their purpose and it's really hard to know…"

However, it has also been their experience that, inevitably, time is spent to address numerous wellbeing-related issues that crop up, more as a reactive measure without choice; whereas they believe that a proactive strategy to prevent and build resilience can be more effective as well as educative and enduring. Ken points out that:

> No teacher wants to lose time for their subject, but equally we're recognizing that more needs to be done. As an example this year, we've spent quite a lot of time taking kids out of class to run assemblies to address issues of cyber safety, cyber-bullying.

Similar challenges of finding a place in already overcrowded school curriculum has been reported by Askell-Williams et al. (2005), and Ainley et al. (2005) in their reports on implementing the MindMatters mental health programme.

Moving beyond past or established practices

In addition to the reality of a crowded curriculum, wellbeing leaders point out that there are also other factors such as teacher mindsets often reinforced by ineffective past practices that contribute to the reluctance in allocating time for student wellbeing. For example, Ken notes that:

There's probably been a lot of history, particularly in Catholic schools, of a pastoral care which in the past have been or may have been very ineffective because people did not use it to develop student wellbeing. They used it to, you know, to do a lot of different things like they used the period to do their work or to play a game outside but not necessarily structured approach to student wellbeing, and so there is a lot of apprehension with the staff when you talk about wellbeing. Their perception about that is it is a waste of time, and so it's about the change of mindset.

Hence, building a case for time allocation for student wellbeing requires time to engage staff through education and discussion around the what, why, and how of student wellbeing promotion, and mobilize their support. Student Wellbeing Leaders identify staff professional development as an obvious means of addressing this. Teacher professional development has been reported as effective in developing knowledge and skills, and changing classroom practices (Birman, Desimone, Garet, Porter & Yoon, 2001), especially when they are job-embedded (Wei, Darling-Hammond, Andree, Richardson & Orphanos, 2009). However, providing such opportunities is also equally constrained by lack of time and resources. Irene, for instance, had been trying to get a time slot for staff professional development in student wellbeing for the past two years. Despite the promises every year, each time it has been postponed because something more important and urgent in the school management's view came up. Where it occurs, they are typically restricted to short talks or workshops, and without much opportunities for any follow-up activities or further support to build on it due to time implications. In Ken's words, "it could be too much in one go for people to absorb" or too "large a concept for people's head to get

around." Short workshops may be helpful in raising awareness but teachers are usually required to do more than that, and change long-held beliefs and age-old practices without adequate time for reflection and practice. For example, Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloss and Shapley's (2007) analyses of 1,300 studies on professional development found that effective professional development programmes that impact student learning and teachers' practices were lengthy and intensive. Programmes that were shorter than 14 hours or one-shot workshops failed to increase student learning or change teaching practices.

One of the key challenges that Student Wellbeing Leaders face in relation to mindsets is in accommodating a proactive approach to student wellbeing promotion. Schools are more used to responding or reacting to issues after the event, be it behavioural or mental health issues. Adopting and implementing a proactive or preventive approach is not only subverting the norm or tradition, but also have implications on time and resources. New approaches require further teacher professional development to develop the required knowledge, skills, and attitudes. These in turn have implications for time and resources. Ken's experience of trying to introduce restorative practice in his school provides some idea of how time and 'skilling up' are connected:

> There's a perception that if you take the restorative path to addressing an incident, they're just going to take a long time to do, and when you're not familiar with it, the answer is probably it would take because you're guiding the students through the questions and you need to focus on the issues, and is lot less refined. I suppose that's where having done the student wellbeing masters, and having restorative training, it skills you up in those areas, and it is about skilling up because I think now I can have a dialogue between two students, going through those questions and coming up with awareness raising within a much shorter period of time. Fifteen to twenty minutes is more than enough.

In relation to the challenges of time and mindset, Ken's experiences also suggest the important role that pre-service teacher education programmes can play in addressing them. Inclusion of student wellbeing in teacher education programmes can potentially play an important role in not just recognizing the value of a proactive approach, but their important role as teachers of

students, not just subjects. It also means that they will have a basic minimum level of knowledge and skills to address student wellbeing.

When it comes to relationship-building, building positive relationships of respect, care, and support in classrooms and school in general does not necessarily require additional time allocations. It can be exuded in ways that teachers relate or interact with students every day, modelling a way of being, not just with students but also among staff. Nevertheless, key to this kind of approach is the extent to which teachers subscribe to it, that often requires a shift in mindset. Participants suggest that it requires a shift in the thinking and approach that many teachers find it difficult. Even here, such a shift in mindset is likely to be better facilitated if it formed part of teacher preparation programmes.

Student Wellbeing Leaders believe that more needs to be done to incorporate a proactive or preventive approach to student wellbeing promotion in order to reach out to all students instead of spending time only on responding to those with problems. Spending time on prevention can potentially reduce the time that have to be spent on reacting to problems. According to Ken, for example, students ought to be prepared to be resilient so that "they can bounce back in times of difficulty". While spending time on responding to problems and issues is not completely avoidable, Student Wellbeing Leaders would also like to see time allocations to develop student knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be resilient and prepare them for a fulfilling life. However, this can be problematic without making changes to prevalent beliefs and structures in school systems.

Participants mostly spoke about time needs for relationship-building and time for structured programmes in the form of wellbeing/ pastoral classes indicating the need to emphasize on proactive measures. This may be because responsive services and coordination functions have time allocations, and as such tend to be mostly taken care of. Schools also have school counsellors employed full-time or part-time to address students' behavioural or socio-emotional problems, even though Student Wellbeing Leaders reported spending a lot of their time providing counselling services themselves.

Wellbeing and Time in Bhutan schools

There are several student wellbeing related programmes and activities going on in the participants' schools in Bhutan. They are responsible for teaching the guidance and career education classes, providing counselling services to students, and coordinating career and wellbeing related programmes and activities such as parent education. Three of the participants were teaching at least one academic subject in addition to their wellbeing role on a regular basis while one was often required to substitute for other teachers on leave. Other wellbeing related programmes and activities such as the E4GNH, school health programme, scouting and social/community service programmes are coordinated by individuals other than the participants for this study even though they are also actively involved in these in non-leadership capacities.

Time Allocation and Use

Time allocation for their student wellbeing promotion roles varied among the participants as did their roles. Information collected on their time allocation and use (see Table 8.2 below) suggests that Teyndel and Lhazom have less than an hour allocated but spend much more, often extending beyond the school hours in Lhazom's case. On the other hand, Peldrup and Keldon have much more time allocated than they actually use for their wellbeing roles because they are required to attend to other things. The time allocated is for teaching guidance and career education classes, and does not account for their other wellbeing-related responsibilities. Secondary schools are expected to devote one period a week for every class to teach the

Table 8.2: *Bhutan Student Wellbeing Leaders' Time Allocation and Use*

Participant	Designation	Time allocated/ week	Time spent/ week
Teyndel	School Guidance counsellor	50 mins	3 hrs
Lhazom	School Counsellor	50 mins	5 hrs
Pedrup	School Counsellor	22 hrs	17 hrs
Keldon	Teacher Counsellor	10 hrs	8 hrs

guidance and career education curriculum by the Department of Youth and Sports (DYS), Ministry of Education. In these schools, any time spent on providing counselling services or coordinating the programme do not have an official time allocation; but it is usually considered a part of co-curricular responsibilities that all teachers are expected to take over and above their teaching load.

Teyndel and Lhazom both teach a 50 minutes class of guidance and career education every week in addition to teaching another academic subject. Keldon is expected to teach a much higher number of guidance and career education classes but only half as much as Pedrup. Unlike the other three, Pedrup is not normally required to teach another subject but teach at least one guidance and career class every week in every class in his school. Teyndel and Keldon's schools have guidance and career education classes only at some class levels, and this is a responsibility shared by some other colleagues. Lhazom's school has fewer guidance and career education classes per level, and some classes are held together in large groups in the form of workshops that also involve other colleagues.

Even though Pedrup's school has a time allocation consistent with the DYS directives, in reality, he is often required to give up his classes for other academic subjects that have run short of class time due to reasons such as teachers going on leave or to attend professional development programmes. However, unlike other participants, he does not have an additional academic subject to teach; but he is usually required to substitute for other teachers who are on leave even though this is not part of his job description. He is also the School Literary Coordinator, and a House Master. Houses represent division of students into large groups primarily for the purpose of intra-school competitions, ease of management, and pastoral care. House Masters are similar to the Year Level Coordinators in CEOM schools but have students from across all levels as opposed to just one grade level. Similarly, class teachers are the equivalent of homeroom teachers. Thus, despite the official allocation of time, in reality, both time and his services often get re-allocated for other things deemed more important by the school's management.

In Teyndel's school, even though there is class time allocated for guidance and career education, these classes are mostly taken by the Principal and Vice Principal so as to free him to teach English. Teyndel teaches English in the senior years which is about 15-18 periods or lessons a week. Besides being the school guidance counsellor, he is also in-charge of the Information Technology (IT) Programme at his school. This is a new programme at his school to enrich classroom teaching through use of IT. He runs the school IT Club, and is also a House Master.

At Keldon's school they have guidance and career education classes in class 10, and seminars and talks on guidance and career education for the other classes. This is because they do not have enough trained teachers and time to accommodate one period for guidance and career education in every class. Her teaching time is divided between teaching English and Career Education; and she is also a class teacher. The teaching period allocated for guidance and career classes is one hour a week for the entire academic year, but often she is required to give up some of the periods to academic subjects if for some reason they are not able to cover their syllabuses. However, she pointed out that due to her limited experience and training, and scarcity of resources, she finds herself spending more time preparing for her guidance and career education classes than for English lessons. She also sees herself more as an English teacher than a school counsellor given that she has more official time allocated for English teaching.

Lhazom has less than an hour of time allocated for her wellbeing role but she spends about five hours a week on average doing it. She teaches life skills classes to classes 10 and 12 which receives a time allocation of two hours per semester; and she also teaches some value education classes with the Principal. There are no class periods allocated for teaching of career education in her school, but they begin each semester with a crash course on select topics such as study skills, time-management, and goal-setting, where all the teachers and the Principal are also actively involved.

Two instances when they require a lot of time in their coordination role are for career education and parent education programmes that involve external speakers and participants. These happen once or twice a semester.

Hence, in the Bhutanese schools, Student Wellbeing Leaders have a diverse range of teaching and co-curricular responsibilities. Their primary role of teaching guidance and career classes is sometimes assigned a backseat as they are also full-time academic subject teachers; and whenever time requirements for academic subjects fall short.

No quantified time allocations are made in the Student Wellbeing Leaders' workloads for providing counselling services and carrying out coordination functions. However, all of them indicated that they are expected to provide such services. School counsellors receive a relatively smaller teaching load, and concessions made while considering their other co-curricular workloads. All teachers in Bhutan are expected to take on co-curricular responsibilities over and above their teaching loads. While the participants indicated that only a few students sought counselling services on their own, class teachers and the School Discipline Committee usually refer students with problems for counselling.

Whereas the descriptions above relate to the school/ teacher counsellors' time allocation and use, students are also engaged in numerous other wellbeing-related activities. For example, all the schools spend a few minutes each day at the start of the school to meditate. This is usually a whole-school activity in which all the teachers as well as students participate. In Lhazom's school they also a have a circle time of up to thirty minutes every week for every class involving all teachers. Schools also typically spend up to half a day each week to engage in various club activities that involve wellbeing-related activities such as community social services, religious or spiritual education programmes or activities, and development of socio-emotional, communication, and interpersonal skills. Hence, students do receive substantial exposure to and/or engagement in wellbeing-related programmes and activities that are, however, not necessarily coordinated within a more cohesive framework.

Views on Time Requirement

Only Pedrup's school provides the designated one period per week of guidance and career classes as per the DYS directives. Schools have either resorted to alternative measures such as provision of large group workshops as in the case of Lhazom's school; or having

someone else without required training but with time available on their work schedule as in Teyndel's case. There are also other wellbeing related subjects such as values education, life skills education, health and physical education, and E4GNH, all of which compete for a separate time slot. Due to these, Student Wellbeing Leaders fear that the guidance and career education classes, despite their good intentions and potential benefits for student wellbeing, may be gradually reduced to a perfunctory role.

Any counselling service that they provide happens after the school hours or in between classes, and it is usually not very easy to find a time when both the student and the counsellor are free. Pedrup points out that where counselling is possible, there are still problems of arranging subsequent meetings at appropriate intervals thereby undermining its effectiveness. Hence, not surprisingly, only few and sporadic counselling services are provided. Any counselling services that Lhazom is able to provide to students, for example, is usually managed on her own time after school hours.

Keldon finds very little time for providing any counselling services, but tries to reach out to students in need through more informal chats to listen to them during break times. She feels that students are reluctant to approach her for counselling as they see her primarily as a teacher with discipline-related roles and responsibilities. Teyndel, on the other hand, finds himself in a dilemma due to the ways in which the Discipline Committee has used his reports based on a few sessions of counselling to suspend or expel students as not making good enough progress.

All of them agree that providing counselling services require time and focus, but this is extremely difficult given the myriad roles and responsibilities they are required to fulfil, as well as the ways in which schools are structured. School time is neatly packed with classes interspersed with only short bathroom breaks, designed to keep students busy. It allows very little time concessions for any counselling to take place.

Participants also reported substantial time devoted to coordination roles such as organizing talks, seminars, or workshops involving external resource persons. For instance, Keldon finds it extremely difficult to juggle between her numerous responsibilities, many of

which do not necessarily have a formal time allocation. Citing the example of a two-day career conference she had to organize for class 12 students that involved inviting several resource persons from outside the school, she said:

> I had too many classes to teach, and the programme involves a lot of paper work and making calls. So, sometimes I ended up working as late as 1 a.m. in the morning. I remember taking leave but actually ended up doing the work for this programme.

Similarly, all schools have programmes for parents either to educate them or to discuss issues of concern related to students in which they are actively involved, either as leaders, members of a team, or resource persons. Often, they involved time commitment beyond school hours, and in addition to their usual teaching and co-curricular responsibilities.

Inadequate time provision is a persistent practical issue for every role that Student Wellbeing Leaders are required to play. It is an issue related to the multiple roles that they are required to play, particularly in addition to their roles as full-time academic subject teachers, whose primacy in the school's order of priority force them to relegate their wellbeing roles as secondary. Participants, however, also mentioned that a proposal for a full-time school counsellor is under process by the Ministry of Education, and remained hopeful that this will allow them to focus on student wellbeing promotion.

Challenges of Time

Whereas, one of their roles is to provide counselling services to students, participants find it most challenging of all to implement it. One of the reasons is because it is very difficult to find the time to provide such services given the numerous other things they are expected to do. As teachers teaching full-time and no alternative arrangements for students who need counselling, it is very difficult to find a time that is suitable to both parties. On the other hand, all four participants strongly believe that even being able to spend some time to listen to students with difficulties can be very helpful. School counsellors find themselves torn between working within official time allocations, and a duty of care they feel towards those who need their help. For example, this is what Lhazom said:

I know how little time I am able to allocate to my counselling role. I can only do more if I am given less of other responsibilities. We are so bogged down with too many activities and rarely find time to sit down with students and talk, and I have to use my time after school hours. A few times I found that it was dark by the time I was done, and it is difficult as a mother and also the lessons to prepare for the next day, but it gives me a sense of satisfaction to be able to give some time even if it is just to listen to my students who are in trouble.

Clearly her efforts to find time beyond the school hours are driven by a strong ethic of care and concern for the wellbeing of the students in need. However, without clear time allowances that make counselling accessible to both students and convenient for school counsellors, its implementation and effectiveness is undermined.

Related to this is the challenge of multiple roles that they are assigned, some of which can be contradictory. Participants point out that the traditional role expectations of a teacher as discipline master sometimes serve to undermine their role as a counsellor who can be easily approached during times of difficulties. This in turn adversely impact on the effective use of the limited time that they have in providing any help to those in need.

Time, recognition of relevance, and accountability

These Student Wellbeing Leaders believe that time allocation is largely influenced by the extent to which student wellbeing is considered important and relevant in an exam-oriented system of accountability. For instance, even though time may be allocated for guidance and career education classes, as required by DYS' expectations, they are not necessarily used as they are meant to be. Keldon points out that:

We are not always able to do justice to the career and guidance classes because, sadly if for some reason the academic subjects are not able to cover their syllabus, it is the career classes that get taken. Academic subjects have Board exams whereas this one doesn't. I also feel that students attach lesser importance and do not take it seriously because it is

not evaluated. I think if there is some evaluation or some weighting assigned to this subject, then they might take it very seriously.

Research literature on testing point to the adverse effect of high-stake tests on the quality of student learning and wellbeing. According to Polesel, Dulfer & Turnbull (2012), they impact on the quality of the learning by limiting the range of learning experiences to focus on outcome measures rather than the intrinsic processes of learning and acquiring knowledge; and negatively influence their wellbeing as a result of emotions such as fear, anxiety, and stress associated high pressures to perform, and the related issues of negative impacts on the self-esteem and self-image of those unable to perform well. As a system that emphasizes both student and teacher performances on results of examinations, it is only natural that more time and effort is put into what they are evaluated on. Pedrup points out that, "even the students don't tend to give importance to it (guidance and career education). If you take it from the examination point of view, because they are not evaluated or assessed on this subject, and so they have that kind of attitude". Schools would rather have more time to teach the academic subjects to improve student performance in examinations; and students are less likely to be serious about things that do not figure on their progress report card.

Time and competence

All four participants emphasize that having time allocation is important but not enough in itself, and that both themselves as well as teachers need to be trained adequately to provide the right kind of help and support. It is also their belief that better knowledge and awareness about wellbeing will lead to the recognition of its importance; and the provision of effective student wellbeing services will give it more credibility over short-term punitive measures. However, one of the issues they raised was the lack of opportunities for professional development as well as the inadequacy of pre-service training that they have received in terms of the skills required to deal with student wellbeing issues. In this regard, Purnell and Reichard (2000) highlight that, for reform initiatives to be successful and effective, substantial amount of training and planning time involving all staff is critical. All the four participants feel that a full-time person responsible for student wellbeing would be one solution to the issues of time. The current arrangement as an additional responsibility to their primary role as teachers, not only leaves them without enough

time to focus on it, but also undermines the importance of student wellbeing programmes. Yet at the same time, they are also conscious of the shortcomings in their competence to address the full spectrum of wellbeing concerns should they have adequate time allocations.

Time and beliefs about efficacy

In the previous Chapter, we have seen how a consequences-based punitive approach spearheaded by the Discipline Committee dominate dealings with student problems and issues. The short-term efficacy that is associated with such an approach vis-à-vis a relatively time intensive counselling, and the demands of time placed by a proactive and educational approach on an already time impoverished school curricula work against student wellbeing promotion. Many of their colleagues are sceptical of the efficacy of counselling as a more Western concept of little relevance to Bhutanese context, while students may be apprehensive for fear of being judged especially as they are known to them as teachers.

Lack of time do not permit Student Wellbeing Leaders to do justice to the school guidance and counselling role, which in turn shape or reinforce other people's beliefs about its efficacy. Student Wellbeing Leaders are required to do many things – classroom teaching, running co-curricular activities, being House Masters or Class Teachers, beside their school guidance and counselling programme responsibilities; and without clear time allocations for many of these. Time constraint is identified as one of the reasons that prevent them from carrying these out effectively. However, underlying the issues of time are deeper problems of the absence of a shared understanding of what student wellbeing entail and how it might be best achieved.

In summary, shortage of time is a challenge that Student Wellbeing Leaders in both the CEOM and Bhutan schools experience, but in different ways. The CEOM participants highlighted the need for more structured time for pastoral classes through which a proactive approach of teaching the necessary knowledge, skills, and attitudes can be fulfilled. They also point out how the ways in which secondary schools are structured, do not allow enough time for fostering positive teacher-student relationship building that is considered central to student wellbeing. On the other hand, Bhutan participants report a lack of time for providing counselling

services and their student wellbeing-related coordination roles. No clear time allocations are made for these roles, unlike in the CEOM schools. This is further exacerbated by the fact that they also have other co-curricular and teaching responsibilities.

In both the systems, a common challenge is that of finding a time slot within the already neatly and tightly distributed school time, often in competition with several other subjects or programmes. Closely related to this is the issue of the priorities that schools accord to different subjects of learning in school. Teacher beliefs about discipline, particularly the short-term efficacy of punitive consequence-based approach, make the implementation of student wellbeing with a proactive approach very challenging. In addition, participants also point out that, shortage of time means lesser opportunities for professional development when in fact introducing a complex change such as a whole-school approach to student wellbeing will require staff preparation or professional development for implementation. The centrality of equipping teachers with necessary knowledge and skills to effective implementation and sustainable change has been consistently highlighted in educational change and wellbeing literature (Darling-Hammond, 2009; Dusenbury et al., 2003; Elias et al., 2003; Noell & Gansle, 2009). Both Fullan (2009) and Hargreaves (2009) highlighted capacity-building through continuous professional development and creation of learning communities, as well as time and resources support as the key to effective implementation and sustainability. Yet, in practice, change seem to be rarely backed with adequate time and resources support in the case of student wellbeing. This is, however, much better addressed in the case of CEOM schools where professional development of the Student Wellbeing Leaders is a key area of intervention for student wellbeing promotion. In Bhutan schools, Student Wellbeing Leaders risk experiencing diminished or reduced competence with too many things to do without the necessary time and support, ultimately leading to reduced effectiveness, poorer reflection, and recognition of the programme.

Understanding Challenges of Time for Student Wellbeing Promotion

Experiences of implementation challenges related to time shared by the Student Wellbeing Leaders provide us with the information to understand and interpret the nature of issues involved and potential ways of addressing them. This section draws on the experiences of

participants in both the school systems to look at the nature of time requirements for student wellbeing promotion, and identifies the main issues and challenges of time that Student Wellbeing Leaders face.

In the context of student wellbeing as reported by the participants, time requirements fall into four categories:

(a) *relationship-building time* - time to be in touch with or connect with students at a more personal level in order to build relationships;

(b) *instructional time* to provide a structured wellbeing or guidance programme;

(c) *responsive services time* to respond to student problems through counselling, or address issues of discipline, conflict, or critical incidents; and

(d) *coordination and consultation time* for their leadership and coordination functions (e.g., meetings, organizing camps or programmes in collaboration with others both within and outside school); and consultation with teachers or others such as outside experts, agencies, or parents.

The extent to which time is spent or the focus on different functions vary between schools depending on what the schools consider a priority in their contexts. The focus of efforts can be broadly categorised as 'proactive' or 'reactive' depending on whether it is aimed at prevention or in response to issues or incidents. The nature of the tasks involved demand differing forms of time allocations. Some functions can be best achieved through structured or 'designated' time that can be scheduled in advance. Others such as responding to critical incidents cannot be scheduled but time provisions can be planned for, perhaps based on previous experiences and the contextual knowledge in a given school. 'Amorphous' time requirement that is not usually amenable to allocation, can be either embedded in everyday interactions as a way of being or in response to incidents that require immediate attention. Figure 8.1 below illustrates the nature of time requirement for student wellbeing promotion.

Instructional functions such as teaching pastoral classes, or coordinating a career fair or a camping trip are examples of activities that can be programmed, and are aimed at prevention and skill building. Sometimes, student wellbeing leaders are also required to coordinate activities in

Figure 8.1: Time requirement for student wellbeing promotion

Nature of task

		Proactive	Reactive
Designated		instructional; coordination	coordination/ consultation
Amorphous		relationship-building	counselling services

Time requirement

response to critical incidents such as death, violence, or accidents. Even though these are random occurrences, some provision of time will need to be factored in to be prepared. Wellbeing leaders also need time to work with teachers or parents of students that need extra care and support services. Relationship-building, on the other hand, does not require dedicated time allocation as a separate activity by itself. However, it will require the opportunities to interact and spend time together doing other activities such as class time. The provision of counselling services do require time but cannot completely be planned in advance. Nevertheless, this can be to some extent, determined based on previous years' experiences or the type of community that the school serves (for e.g., those located in communities with vulnerable groups or low-SES communities will mostly require more time).

Whether it is the preventive measures such as teaching the guidance curriculum or pastoral classes; relationship-building; and consultation, leadership, and coordination functions; or responsive services such as dealing with behavioural and socio-emotional issues; and critical incidents, time is closely implicated. Schools in this study had varying time allocations for different aspects of student wellbeing programme such as pastoral or guidance classes, responding to problems, consultation, and coordination functions. In general, Student Wellbeing Leaders in these schools spent more time on student wellbeing activities than was officially allocated, often out of care and concern for their students' wellbeing. However, as pointed out earlier, such gestures may not be sufficient and may even serve to undermine the importance of

student wellbeing and affect it adversely. There is a need to consider reconceptualising and reconfiguring time allocation and use in schools if student wellbeing promotion is to be an integral part of education.

Designated Time Requirement and Related Issues

The educational function of explicitly teaching knowledge, skills, and attitudes to promote wellbeing is one of the key areas that require time allocation. This is consistent with the strong beliefs in a proactive approach to student wellbeing expressed by the participants. This involves providing developmentally appropriate and context-relevant formal and structured pastoral/ guidance lessons, consistent with what is advocated in the extant literature as good practice (e.g., CASEL, 2003b; Durlak & Wells, 1997; Durlak et al., 2011). A key justification provided for this is the provision of prevention curriculum that reaches out to all students, prevents problems, and promotes wellbeing by educating students on how to prevent them or deal with them, and be more resilient.

We have seen that time allocation for guidance or pastoral classes while being different across schools, is in general viewed as insufficient in both school systems. They range from a few periods every term in CEOM schools to a period every week in two schools in Bhutan. CEOM participants have expressed the need for more structured time for pastoral classes, backed by clear ideas of how it will be used. On the other hand, in Bhutan, the DYS' expectations of one period a week for every class as per its Curriculum Framework has not completely translated into practice due to a number of reasons. These include inadequacy of training to deliver, shortage of trained personnel, or perceptions of lesser importance compared to academic subjects, and the need to invest more time on academic subjects for improved test performances. Official allocation of time in itself also may not be sufficient because time can be used for other purposes if the system's priorities are not revisited to accommodate or integrate changes as evident from Pedrup's experience.

Student wellbeing promotion entails both prevention work and responding to issues and incidents. Despite the proactive approach being consistent with good practice based on current research literature, the existing arrangements for time allocation allows it little room. Time as a

resource is finite and it is already neatly distributed among subjects in schools, and each one is unwilling to give up any. Hazell (2005) report that competing for time with other parallel programmes is a common feature of implementing new initiatives in schools. When schools do allocate time for student wellbeing, it is more than likely to be relegated to a few pastoral care classes per year (Ainley et al., 2006; Askell-Williams et al., 2005). Part of the difficulty or reluctance with allocation of time for wellbeing may be due to a lack of inadequate system of assessment, feedback, and accountability. Test results do this well for academic achievement, but there is nothing similar for student wellbeing. This is not to suggest that there should be similar testing for student wellbeing, but to suggest that some form of systematic assessment and accountability may be helpful. The surveys that CEOM schools carry out as part of the School Improvement Framework can be a useful tool or a measure of student wellbeing and programmes to promote it as long as they are acted upon and used to further improve student wellbeing.

Another aspect of student wellbeing promotion where time requirements may be overlooked is for programme coordination and consultation. Khan, Bedford, and Williams (2011) report that time is not only required for implementing the programme but also to plan, organize and coordinate amongst the various stakeholders involved from both inside and outside the school. Participants in both systems, but most notably in Keldon's case, point out how coordination functions can eat into the limited time that is available.

Addressing Amorphous Time Needs

Relationship-building was described by CEOM participants as the key to student wellbeing; whereas it did not figure in Bhutan participants' concerns about time and student wellbeing. Even though this is viewed as something that will not require additional time allocation as long as teachers espouse it as a way of everyday interactions with students or amongst themselves; the duration of time teachers have with students to be able to personally connect with each student is a concern, particularly for secondary schools. Teachers in secondary schools have only a limited period of time with each class, resulting in reduced opportunities to know their students well and bond with them in comparison to primary schools where students spend most of their day with one or two teachers. Farbman and Kaplan (2005), for instance, report that more time allows for greater interaction between teacher and students leading to better

teacher-student relationship, and this in turn can actually boost learning. It may be helpful to understand that time structures in schools can be changed to suit student needs, and need not necessarily be a tradition cast in stone. For example, Gambone et al. (2004) report a school reform programme where 'continuity of care' by keeping the same teachers with the same students for two or more years to provide better continuity in learning and to build stronger relationships was effective in turning around a school district with serious problems of low achievement, poor attendance, and high dropouts. While it may be challenging to carry it out school-wide, it is certainly possible to target vulnerable groups. The boys only classes taught predominantly by two teachers in Ken's school, to prevent them from becoming disengaged with school is an example of this.

Providing responsive services such as counselling and dealing with critical incidents takes time. However, they do not happen in predictable ways, except in a limited sense. For example, Sharon points out that she finds herself the busiest around the end of each term or year, particularly close to examination times, when stress levels tend to peak. In the CEOM schools, these are usually taken into account in the Student Wellbeing Leader's workload and time allocations made. Besides, they also have other professionals both within and outside schools from whom support can be sought or referrals made. This is not the case in Bhutan, and counselling services appear to be provided mostly at the behest of the Discipline Committee. In effect, this actually casts counselling into the old mould of a consequence-based model of control and disciplining; quite contrary to its helping orientation with longer-term goals. Its effectiveness is undermined by the limitations of time as school counsellors are expected to not only fix things within stipulated time frames, but also to find the time on their own without a clear accounting for how it fits in with their overall workload and the ways in which counselling services can be provided most conveniently both to students as well as the counsellors. A tricky aspect of the subjective nature of time allocation is the difficulty in measuring it. This can make time allocation problematic in a school system that is used to measuring time in blocks for distribution as well as control and accountability. Time "is something that is deeply embedded in the subjective life and work of those who experience it" (Hargreaves, 1997, p.88), and we can only really understand and address time issues by directly engaging in its personal meaning. Yet,

schools are used to seeing time as a scarce resource, every bit of which need to be controlled and accounted for.

Management and allocation of time may be best done through a shared understanding of issues related to time, whereby more responsibility, flexibility, and control can be accorded to especially those who implement the changes. Adelman, Eagle, and Hargreaves (1997) point out that "There is never enough time, but when time is fixed and chunked by external forces, it becomes the enemy. When it can be constantly molded and adapted to fit individual and group needs, it becomes an available resource" (p.36).

Time, Recognition, and Readiness

Experiences of Student Wellbeing Leaders in both school systems suggest that time allocations for student wellbeing is reflective of the views on student wellbeing held by school leaders and teachers in particular. Where student wellbeing is viewed as integral to student learning and all-round development of students, time allocations and its appropriate use are more likely to ensue. These may not necessarily have to be dedicated longer hours but rather subjective perceptions of adequacy based on a shared understanding of what wellbeing entails, and the notions of it as a shared responsibility. Bella's school illustrates this to some extent. On the other hand, where student wellbeing is subject to subordination and secondary considerations, it is less likely to be accorded the benefits of time. In fact, Bhutan participants' experiences suggest that time allocated for student wellbeing as mandated by policy can be taken away to make up for shortfalls in other areas deemed more important by those in positions of power. Many teachers, according to some participants, view student wellbeing as a waste of time; and suggest strong faith in the efficacy of a traditional and punitive, consequence-based disciplining for student management and control.

Aronson, Zimmerman, and Carlos (1998), in the context of extended learning time and student learning outcomes, emphasize that "it is actually the *quality of education* time that is the critical determinant of how students will learn" (p.6), than just the provision of time. In a similar vein, while time allocation is a necessary condition, it is observed that allocation of time alone is not enough to ensure student wellbeing. It is the appropriate use of time available that counts.

221

Effective use of time for student wellbeing is very much tied to the readiness or competence of those who are to implement it. Hence, professional development of Student Wellbeing Leaders as well as teachers in general is closely connected with the issue of time. Both groups have referred to the challenges they face in changing teacher mindsets to garner support for student wellbeing promotion. Participants from the CEOM schools, all of whom have a Masters degree in student wellbeing, report its influence both in terms of enhanced competence and confidence. This is evident in their articulation of the kinds of things that could be done given the additional time allocation for pastoral classes. Bhutan participants, whose training consisted only a few courses in school guidance and counselling expressed strong desires for further professional development. They report experiencing not only a sense of inadequacy but also issues related to questions of legitimacy and professional authority. Their desire to implement what is already within their level of competence is undermined by the lack of professional credentials as well as positional legitimacy. They tend to be recognized more as just 'another teacher' rather than as a school counsellor capable of providing expert help and support services.

For schools to accept and adopt a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion, the recognition of its importance by all stakeholders is crucial. Most notably, interviews suggest that its recognition and acceptance by teachers will be critical. Hargreaves (2009) considered teachers to the 'ultimate arbiters' of change; and highlighted the need to engage all stakeholder to promote change as a shared responsibility for it to be sustainable. Given its limited treatment in teacher preparation, staff professional development is the most obvious option. This again has both time and resource implications, and school policies as they exist do not place student wellbeing among its list of priorities. This was most starkly evident in Irene's school where her request for a time slot for a professional development on student wellbeing has been approved and postponed for the fourth time in two years.

Adding to the list of things to be achieved without commensurate time allocation "trivializes the effort. It sends a powerful message to teachers: don't take this reform business too seriously. Squeeze it in on your own time" (NECTL, 2005, p.19). Allocation of time is an indication of the importance student wellbeing is accorded as Bella points out:

When we were changed to four periods a day from the earlier seven periods a day, during the discussions we were able to allocate 40 minutes of pastoral care, and that really is a clear indication to staff, students, and parents that student wellbeing is an important part of the college, that we're going to give time in the time-table to it. A lot of schools can't or don't or haven't but for us it was a priority, and that certainly said to me that here's a school that's serious about it and here's a principal who is prepared to say, 'yes, let's have the time'.

Allocation of time is linked to the priority accorded to promoting student wellbeing. Bella's experience has been that when teachers are convinced of the importance, they are willing to give time, even beyond what they are officially required. This is also why Student Wellbeing Leaders spend more time than they are officially allocated for their wellbeing roles.

Time Allocation and Student Wellbeing

Studies reporting on reform in schools in general (e.g. Desimone, 2002, Gandara, 2000, Hargreaves, 1997, NECTL, 2005); and reports on implementation of student wellbeing programmes (e.g., Ainley et al., 2006; Askell-Williams et al., 2005; Lam & Hui, 2010; Wyn et al., 2000) have identified scarcity of time as a persistent challenge. This seems to be a code for 'low priority'. The experiences of participants in this study strongly support this. While these studies have mainly highlighted time as a resource in short supply, participants in this study also emphasize the influence of time as subjective in nature, and political in its allocation. This is consistent with Hargreaves' (1997) conceptions of time as essentially a subjective phenomenon; and time distributions as being reflective of configurations of power and status within school systems.

For instance, relationship building can take place in the process of every day classroom work with potentially very positive outcomes even for academic learning as well as modelling for everyday interactions in life beyond classroom and school. At the same time, often even within the classroom, potential learning time can be eroded by factors such as poor relationships that may lead to inattention or inappropriate behaviour, and having to manage these. Marzano, Marzano, and Pickering (2003) estimate that positive teacher-student relationship is associated

with a 31 percentile decrease in classroom disruptions. This is, however, subject to how positive relationship building gets adopted as a school policy or fostered as part of school culture, and how well teachers are trained or prepared for it to take place. This decision, in turn, is highly dependent on the importance and status student wellbeing is accorded vis-à-vis academic learning and other co-curricular activities; or the ways in which the relationships between these are perceived.

The thrust of interventions in dealing with time issues tend to be on manipulating and reorganizing time as a resource (NECTL, 2005; Gandara, 2000a, Farbman & Kaplan, 2005). This is important, but seeing it as subjective experiences and the political and quality dimensions of its use need to be taken into account in order to be able to address issues of time. As participants point out, there is only so much time, and part of the answers to dealing with challenges of time lie in how that time is used, and reconfiguring it to suit the needs of students and the ideas of what schools should teach.

Conclusion

Student Wellbeing Leaders have many functions to fulfil simultaneously – they have to deal with students, parents, colleagues, other school staff, and external agencies, often in relation to challenging issues. There are critical incidents to attend to, guidance or pastoral classes to teach, and programmes and activities to coordinate and lead. All these under the pressure of time with deadlines to meet or limitations of time that is made available, may lead to an experience or perception of too much and too diverse expectations being squeezed into a limited time frame.

The nature of their work requires them to be flexible in the ways they use time. Finding enough time for student wellbeing programmes and activities is challenging as there are several competing demands on the limited time that is available. For an effective outcome, time allocation is a necessary condition but not sufficient by itself. Using it well in the context of student wellbeing entails the recognition of the importance of student wellbeing, the knowledge and skills, and the commitment to implement it. It entails the conceptualization of time "as *content*: an entity that is managed and manipulated", and as *process*: a factor that shapes how

individuals experience efforts to create school change" (Gandara, 2000, p.2). Addressing issues of time need to go beyond simply manipulating and reorganizing time as a finite resource. It should take into account the subjective views of time as perceived by different stakeholders as well as the political dimensions of how time gets distributed and the basis on which they are made.

The issues of time constraints for implementing student wellbeing promotion is common to both school systems even though they are sometimes expressed differently due to the ways in which student wellbeing is framed in schools in the two systems. Lack of time is intricately linked to issues of meaning, value, and competence. Time allocation, for instance, is tied to the meaning and value that student wellbeing holds to those within schools as well as policy-makers. As Wyn (2007) points out, student wellbeing is marginal not because of a crowded curriculum but because not all elements have equal value.

CHAPTER 9. CONCLUSION

Introduction

This study explored the challenges of implementing student wellbeing promotion in secondary schools. It was premised on the belief that schools are ideal sites where enduring knowledge, skills, and attitudes that promote personal as well as collective wellbeing can be promoted. Schools engage in numerous programmes and activities that are labelled student wellbeing promotion work; whether it is recognized as an integral aspect of learning in schools, or as peripheral activities to address distractions to the central aim of academic and intellectual development.

A whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion calls for student wellbeing promotion that is embedded in a school's policies, curriculum, structures, and practices, and as a shared responsibility of all stakeholders. Such programmes that addressed the whole school have reported positive effects (e.g., Wilson & Lipsey, 2007, Tobler et al., 2000). However, their implementation in schools has been reported to be very challenging for a number of reasons such as the need for fundamental changes to the ways in which schools operate and are organized (WHO, 1997) for it to work. Implementing such changes, minimally involve gaining acceptance, development of capacity, and adequate support at the local level (Fullan, 2005). Literature on educational change identify effective implementation in schools as a challenge, but a crucial factor for positive outcomes (Fullan, 2005; Hopkins, 2001; McLaughlin, 2005).

However, very little has been written about the nature of challenges that implementers at the school level face, and this is particularly true in the case of student wellbeing promotion as an emerging area of interest. This study contributes to this gap in knowledge of implementation by drawing on the experiences of key implementers, and building on research literature on student wellbeing and educational change. This study used a qualitative approach using in-depth interviews to explore the experiences of people who are directly involved in implementation of student wellbeing programmes in schools. It involved participant groups from two very socio-economically and culturally different settings.

Findings suggest that Student Wellbeing Leaders face numerous challenges in implementing a whole-school approach to student wellbeing that revolve around the three themes of meaning, culture, and time.

Research Question and Methodology

The research methodology for this study draws on the literature on implementation of educational change, and wellbeing promotion with emphasis on student wellbeing promotion to guide both data collection and interpretation. It views the implementation of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion as a reform initiative. More specifically, this study used the Health Promoting Schools model of whole-school approach and the action theories of educational change and school reform literature as the lens through which the promotion of student wellbeing is implemented. These represent some of the good practices that have been widely reported and discussed in education literature in the past three decades.

A whole-school approach has been proposed as way of effectively addressing student wellbeing promotion, by making it an integral part of what schools do, and also potentially facilitating an integration of what has thus far been a fragmented approach to wellbeing and learning. This approach entails simultaneously addressing various factors across the three components of ethos, organization, and environment; curriculum, teaching, and learning; and partnerships and services.

The field of educational change provides a sound knowledge base that can be applied to study the implementation of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion. It includes action theories, and rich and useful information on factors that are known to influence change implementation providing a framework through which the challenges of the implementation of student wellbeing can be understood.

It is mainly building on the theoretical and guiding principles emanating from educational change that an exploration of hitherto lacking qualitative information based on practitioner experiences on student wellbeing was sought. This study, therefore, was aimed at seeking

qualitative information from key implementers of student wellbeing promotion in schools by exploring their perceptions, experiences, and aspirations. In-depth interviews were held with Student Wellbeing Leaders in two socio-economically, culturally, and geographically distinct school systems. The two school systems also varied in their exposure and experiences of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion.

The primary research question that this study set out to answer was: "*How do student wellbeing leaders interpret and negotiate the implementation of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion?*" The research design was based on a framework that is guided by the literature on educational change and the Health Promoting Schools model of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion.

Main Findings

This study points to three key areas of implementation challenges in student wellbeing promotion in secondary schools. They are challenges related to the meaning of student wellbeing, the organizational culture and structure of schools, and time constraints. These three areas stood out as consistent themes across interviews with the participants in both the school systems. While there were clear variations in how they manifest across the schools and the two systems, these themes were commonly shared by all.

The Challenge of Meaning

Student wellbeing means a range of diverse things to different people in schools. Participants in this study expressed a diverse range of views on the meaning of student wellbeing as well as its place in children's education. These revolved around the themes of control and management, safety and security, rights, relationship building, support services, and development of skills. Such diversity of meanings suggest the complexity and multi-dimensionality of student wellbeing as a concept. These are by and large consistent with definitions of student wellbeing in the extant literature, except in the case of control which is rarely discussed in the context of student wellbeing. Participant reports in this study suggest that it is an important element of student wellbeing. All the participants spoke of being involved in

student behaviour management in different capacities whether it is as a member of the School Discipline Committee, school's senior leadership team member, or as classroom teachers. Exercising both external control as well as fostering internal self-control appear to be important for promoting student wellbeing.

Student wellbeing is not only multi-dimensional but its promotion entail balancing between seemingly contradictory meanings and practices. It is about control as much as it is about empowering; it is about prevention as well as remediation; and it is about rights as well as relationships. Such seemingly dichotomous and competing characteristics that require the ability to match them to contextual needs while maintaining the right balance may be the reason why student wellbeing leaders struggle with its meaning, and most likely its practice.

Despite the indications of seeing it as complex, and multi-dimensional, participants in both systems defined student wellbeing to highlight certain aspects of it more than others. Bhutan participants' views of student wellbeing promotion highlighted the exercise of control and discipline, and the provision of help or support services, whereas the CEOM participants highlighted positive relationship-building and skill development. These suggest a primarily individual-focused approach in the bio-medical and psychotherapeutic tradition in the former, and a relational and skill development approach in psycho-educational tradition in the latter. The emphasis on the individual dimension, whether it is through the preventive psycho-educational classroom work or helping and support services outside classroom is not surprising because the dominant forces influencing student wellbeing practices in schools originate from the disciplines of health and psychology, more specifically mental health, and psychotherapy. The contrast in emphasis on relationships in CEOM and discipline in Bhutan participants' views seem to be reflective of the broader cultural context of the school systems. In both the systems, there is an emerging recognition of the importance of social and collective dimension in that parent and community involvement and social justice work are seen as important student wellbeing promotion activities; but this aspect did not figure as much in participant definitions or depictions of what they meant by student wellbeing.

In summary, meanings and definitions suggested a much stronger focus on the personal and relational aspects of wellbeing than the collective. These indicate a strong influence of a bio-medical or psychotherapeutic approach focusing on support services, but at the same time there is a growing preference for educative approach influenced by prevention science and positive psychology.

The variations in focus on conceptions of student wellbeing can be seen as falling along three dimensions or implicit assumptions with potential influences on practice:

a) promoting wellbeing is about developing an internal sense of control that influence the external behaviour ('*Inside-out*'), or a manipulation of the external and relationship-building to bring about an internal sense of wellbeing ('*Outside-in*');

b) wellbeing promotion is '*doing*' something to, for, or with students such as teaching social skills; or is a way of '*being*', and promoting a certain culture; and

c) student wellbeing is '*instrumental*' to the achievement of the primary goal of academic learning, or '*integral*' to learning and an important aspect of learning in itself.

These are not necessarily mutually exclusive categories, but distinctions to inform the scope and focus of student wellbeing promotion. Such variations in both approach and value attached to student wellbeing promotion appear to represent the cultural and contextual differences.

The meanings and beliefs attached to wellbeing underlie some of the deeper challenges of implementation. Participants referred to this as the challenge of 'changing mindsets'. Competing meanings or perspectives held by others in school such as student wellbeing being provision of non-academic support services, and that the role of a teacher is only to teach a subject.

The ways in which the Student Wellbeing Leaders defined student wellbeing indicate their awareness of wellbeing as multi-dimensional, but they struggle to come up with definitions that capture all three individual, relational, and collective dimensions, and their inter-

relationships. They highlight certain dimensions and underplay others, which will likely have ramifications for their choice of strategies and approaches to promote wellbeing. This is reflective of the complexity of the subject, and the complications this can create for implementation of programmes and activities to promote student wellbeing.

Despite the advocacy and the value attached to a whole-school approach, one of the challenges of implementation appear to be that schools, although in varying degrees, continue to be deeply entrenched in traditional beliefs of control and compliance, and a bio-medical approach of treating the unwell. While these may still be relevant, the challenge is in reconciling their central position to create a more holistic approach that also includes a proactive approach of strength-building, and making it a shared responsibility. This will mean moving away from prevalent views of "teachers of subject", and "wellbeing as (merely) control and services;" to a whole-school approach to student wellbeing that advocates active involvement of all through collaborations.

The Challenge of School Organizational Culture

Schools have distinctive organizational structures and cultures that pose challenges in implementing a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion. Student Wellbeing Leaders' aspirations for student wellbeing to be viewed as integral to school culture are often at odds with what exists in the prevailing school culture. Key aspects of school culture and structure such as the role of leadership and strategic direction, teacher beliefs and attitudes, relationships, and the ways in which schools are structured have a strong bearing on the implementation of student wellbeing programmes.

While leadership support and inclusion in school's strategic direction serve to legitimize and help put student wellbeing promotion on the agenda, lack of support from the school's leadership pose serious hurdles and require concerted efforts to mobilize their support. Strategic direction such as the School Improvement Framework and having a dedicated wellbeing core team in the case of CEOM schools provide the required impetus for student wellbeing promotion. In contrast, a largely fragmented approach with a variety of programmes

independently coordinated by various individuals in Bhutan schools tend to serve to dilute the efforts.

The ways in which schools are organizationally structured pose challenges to implementing a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion. Schools typically have parallel student wellbeing structures modelled on the academic department structure to convey a symbolic message of equal importance, but in reality, when it comes down to implementation at classroom levels where it matters, wellbeing is neither matched by competent implementers nor the time allocations required. It also casts student wellbeing onto the existing structural mould rather than making adjustments to integrate it.

A whole-school approach involves creating supportive, open, and friendly learning environments which is often found to be at odds with traditional notions of discipline, order, and respect, most notably the punitive consequence-based approach to discipline with its proven short-term efficacy. Addressing such beliefs and attitudes pose a challenge since effective implementation requires that all implementers have a shared vision, and see the promotion of student wellbeing as a shared responsibility.

Findings from this study suggest school organizational cultures with respect to student wellbeing promotion as falling into three categories that are mainly characterized by management and control, reactive care, and as integral to learning. These are evidently rooted in the meanings and beliefs held about student wellbeing. Student wellbeing promotion focused on behaviour is likely to be viewed as managing an orderly environment so that academic learning can take place. Those that focused on social and emotional needs or mental health issues view it as requiring responsive care; whereas those that view it as an aspect of learning in its own right in addition to ensuring that students are free of distractions and well enough to learn are likely to create a school culture where student wellbeing is an integral part of school life.

Student Wellbeing Leaders' accounts of the challenges that relate to their school cultures revolve around tensions between their aspirations that are more consistent with good practices as advocated by the extant literature, and prevalent views and structures that are often incompatible

with these aspirations. Student Wellbeing Leaders view student wellbeing as integral to learning but school structures and practices relegate it to a peripheral role. Student Wellbeing Leaders advocate a more proactive approach that builds relationships and resilience, but they are often caught up with fixing problems or responding to behavioural, emotional, and mental health issues. These are manifest, albeit in varying degrees, across schools in both the systems.

Schools are complex institutions with distinct cultures and structures that have withstood the tests of time. Hence, implementing a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion entails negotiating competing views, and reconfiguring or redesigning incompatible structures that are time-tested which make it very challenging. The challenge for Student Wellbeing Leaders is how to fit new initiatives and the agenda for promoting student wellbeing into existing structures, or change them to reconcile contradictory beliefs and assumptions to gain a shared vision of what is to be achieved and how it is to be achieved.

The Challenge of Time

Lack of time to implement is a common challenge that was reported by all participants in both the systems. This is evident in the mismatches between allocation of time for student wellbeing promotion and time requirements for carrying out a wide range of wellbeing programmes and activities. Student Wellbeing Leaders often spent more time on student wellbeing activities than was officially allocated, often out of care and concern for their students' wellbeing.

Student Wellbeing Leaders play a multitude of roles often on top of their roles as subject teachers. Promoting student wellbeing requires both structured time to teach the required knowledge, skills, and attitudes as well as time to respond to behavioural, social and emotional issues including managing conflict and crisis situations. Modelling and building positive relationships require extended periods of time with students, as do coordinating wellbeing programmes and consultation with parents, teachers, and external agencies.

The issues of time constraints for implementing student wellbeing promotion is common to both school systems even though they are sometimes expressed differently due to the ways in

which student wellbeing is framed in schools in the two systems. In both the systems, common challenges in finding time include finding a time slot within the already neatly and tightly distributed school time, and changing teacher mindsets around student wellbeing practices.

Not only do student wellbeing promotion need to compete for time allocation with a number of ever-increasing programmes and activities schools are under pressure to include on top of the traditional academic subjects, but teacher beliefs about wellbeing as peripheral support services make it hard to make a case for time allocation. For instance, schools are more used to responding or reacting to issues after the event, and view the adoption of a proactive or preventive approach as a strain on the limited time and resources. Besides, factors such as a strong faith in the short-term efficacy of punitive consequence-based approach also serve to work against investing time and resources on a proactive and whole-school approach. The ways in which secondary schools are structured with time divisions in blocks along subject departments also make it difficult for allowing enough time to foster positive teacher-student relationships.

Time constraint represents a more specific manifestation of the deeper and broader challenges of meaning and culture. Underlying the issues of time are deeper issues of the absence of a shared understanding of what student wellbeing mean, and how it might be best achieved. Time allocation is influenced by the extent to which student wellbeing is considered important. Thus, addressing issues of time need to go beyond simply manipulating and reorganizing time as a finite resource. It should take into account the subjective views of time as perceived by different stakeholders as well as the political dimensions of how time gets distributed and the basis on which they are made. There is a need to re-conceptualize as well as reconfigure time allocation and use in schools if student wellbeing promotion is to be an integral part of education; and this must entail looking at the real meaning of wellbeing and how the school's culture and structure contribute to it. Allocations of time is intricately linked to meaning and value; and time is a resource that is prioritized for what is deemed important and worthwhile.

The goal for a whole-school approach is to promote student wellbeing as 'integral to learning' and prepare students for wellbeing in life. This involves approaching student wellbeing

as a shared responsibility by all concerned, and making it a part of the taught curriculum as much as a way of living in schools. However, schools have traditionally been organized and structured to view student wellbeing as separate from academic learning, and a way of ensuring orderly and appropriate conditions for academic learning to take place. These can be seen taking place in forms such as measures for disciplinary control and behaviour management, or provisions for addressing socio-emotional issues and concerns related to health. Such views and traditions are widely held and deeply entrenched in the way schools think about student wellbeing. It is these deeply held meanings and organizational culture and structures, and the need to re-shape them that pose the greatest challenge to implementing a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion. Not having enough time to implement although a classic complaint is but an example of how issues of meaning and culture manifest at a more discernible level.

Possible Areas for Future Research

For a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion to be effective, this study points to the need to work on a shared meaning of student wellbeing among stakeholders, and working on making school culture and structures consistent with the meaning. Hence, further studies on addressing these should contribute to a clearer understanding of the implementation of a whole-school approach. For example, studies that focus on the ways in which schools that have successfully implemented a whole-school approach work on shared meaning, school culture, and structures can provide helpful insights into promoting student wellbeing as integral to learning and school.

This study was based only on the views and experiences of Student Wellbeing Leaders. However, it is important to note that this is only one perspective or part of the jigsaw that is the implementation of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing. Studies that focus on perspectives of other stakeholders, particularly, principals, teachers, students, and parents will be as important to piece together a complete picture.

Definitions and descriptions of student wellbeing by participants in this study indicate a focus on personal and relational aspects of wellbeing. Further work on the promoting collective

aspects of wellbeing in schools will be an important area to study if schools are to promote wellbeing in its complete sense of meaning. Work on this will also most likely contribute towards building a shared understanding of wellbeing amongst all stakeholders. Involvement of parents and communities appear to be a weak link that will need to be studied and addressed. Student involvement, despite being an important aspect of school change, also did not feature much in the interviews for this study. This appears to be the case with research literature on student wellbeing as well; and hence a potential area deserving to be studied.

Significance of this Study

This study set out to explore the perceptions and experiences of key implementers of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion in order to gain an in-depth understanding of the key drivers and barriers that influence implementation from their perspectives. The findings, while confirming factors identified in the extant literature on educational change and whole-school approach, elaborate on and provide further insights under three key areas of meaning, culture, and time. Based on the findings, this study contributes to the literature by providing basic frameworks to understand the issues of meaning, culture, and time in the context of student wellbeing promotion.

Educational change theories emphasize the importance of a shared meaning to guide implementation of change (Fullan, 2009; Hargreaves, 2009). This sometimes almost sounds as if it is as simple as agreeing on a single view or meaning that can be adopted or shared. Findings from this study suggest that this is much more complex than it appears, especially in the case of student wellbeing promotion. Student wellbeing is understood in a multitude of ways, often with seemingly dichotomous and conflicting views. Whereas definitions of wellbeing or student wellbeing in the literature are often all-encompassing of the various aspects of wellbeing (e.g., Awartani, Whitman, & Gordon, 2007; Evans & Prilleltensky, 2007); in reality and practice, certain aspects are emphasized and others muted depending on contextual priorities, or individual as well as cultural dispositions. This suggests that arriving at a shared meaning or vision of student wellbeing will most likely require the negotiation of meaning amongst all stakeholders involving concerted efforts over an extended period of time. It cannot just be picked

up from the literature, taught, or dictated from the top; it will have to be negotiated and worked on.

Besides finding support for a range of factors related to organizational culture and context, this study identifies challenges related to school leadership and teacher beliefs and mindsets, strategic direction such as a policy framework, leadership support, and organizational structure as particularly key areas requiring attention for effective implementation.

This study not only confirms the criticality of transforming the mindset of the school leaders and teachers in implementing change initiatives reported in literature, but additionally recognizes that this is a daunting task. It is challenging because school leaders and teachers hold diverse views and beliefs about student wellbeing. Their responses to the notion of student wellbeing as integral to education range from outright rejection to acquiescing, contemplating, or accepting of it as an idea. However, these are far from practicing, which is what implementation is about. Such diversity in views and beliefs necessitate an equally diverse range of strategies or interventions to negotiate convergence on a shared understanding before this can be translated into practice.

Findings also suggest that a clear and comprehensive policy framework that embodies the shared meaning, and guides all student wellbeing promotion programmes and activities could be critical. This could potentially form the basis for a shared understanding that will still need to be negotiated and nurtured persistently over a period of time for it to take roots in practice. Reconciling and balancing aspects of wellbeing that emphasize control and discipline, provision of reactive care and support services, and a proactive educational approach will require both time and resources, in addition to concerted efforts and the involvement of all stakeholders.

An important finding from this study is that implementing change in schools will require commensurate changes in the ways that they are organized or structured. The ways in which student wellbeing programmes are structured as an 'add-on' mirroring the academic structure while making good sense for job descriptions and resource allocations also run the risk of

creating boundaries that contribute to an 'academic-wellbeing split' culture quite contrary to the notion of integration or wellbeing as integral to education.

Consistent with reports in the literature, findings confirm that shortage of time is indeed reported as one of the main challenges of implementing a whole-school approach in this study. However, in addition to previous reports that view time as a resource in short supply, findings of this study suggest that this is but a manifestation of the underlying issues of what schools mean by wellbeing, and what they consider to be important. The ways in which time is distributed, and the ways in which schools are organized or structured are based as much on what they deem to be important as they are on the dictates of time-honoured traditions. Making student wellbeing integral to what schools do will require reconceptualising and reconfiguring time use and allocation, and go beyond merely distributing them in standardized blocks.

Further, the findings also suggests that focus on wellbeing in schools must expand beyond the bio-medical approach of providing responsive services, and the proactive and educational work of prevention and skill-building to include the relational and collective aspects of wellbeing. Only then can we be promoting wellbeing in its true sense of being personal as well as societal good.

Findings from this study suggest that there are at least two fundamentals that need to be addressed in order for an effective implementation of a whole-school approach to student wellbeing promotion to take place. These are establishing a shared meaning of what student wellbeing entails, and working on the school organizational culture and structure to make it consistent with this shared meaning. Ideally, student wellbeing programmes should aspire to address personal, relational, and collective wellbeing. This means teaching students the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be well, as well as organizing the school in ways that promote personal as well as societal wellbeing.

REFERENCES

Adelman, N.E., Eagle, K.P.W, & Hargreaves, A. (Eds). (1997). *Racing with the clock: making time for teaching and learning in school reform.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Ainley, J., Withers, G., Underwood, C., Frigo, T. (2006). *National survey of health and well-being promotion policies and practices in secondary schools*. (Report to the Australian Principals' Associations Professional Development Council). Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research. Retrieved October 22, 2012 from http://www.mindmatters.edu.au/verve/_resources/nhpis_secondary.pdf

Antonucci, T.C., Lansford, J.E., & Akiyama, H. (2001). Impact of positive and negative aspects of marital relationships and friendships on well-being of older adults. *Applied Developmental Science, 5*, 68-75.

Argyle, M. (1999). Causes and correlates of happiness. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology* (pp. 353-373). New York: Russell Page Foundation.

Aronson, J., Zimmerman, J. & Carlos, L. (1998). *Improving student achievement by extending school: Is it just a matter of time?* San Francisco: WestEd.

ASCA. (2005). *The ASCA national model: A framework for school counselling programs* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Author.

Ashgrove, J. & Caroe, P. (2007). *Thriving lives: Which way for wellbeing?* Cambridge: Relationships Foundation.

Askell-Williams, H., Lawson, M.J., Murray-Harvey, R., & Slee, P. (2005). *An investigation of the implementation of a MindMatters teaching module in secondary school classrooms: Final report*. Adelaide, SA: Flinders University. Retrieved October 22, 2012 from: http://www.mindmatters.edu.au/verve/_resources/classroom_full.pdf

Aslund, C., Starrin, B., & Nilsson, K. (2010). Social capital in relation to depression, musculoskeletal pain, and psychosomatic symptoms: A cross-sectional study of a large population-based cohort of Swedish adolescents. *BMC Public Health 10*(715). Retrieved on March 2, 2012 from http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2458/10/715

Atkinson, P. & Coffry, A. (2001). Revisiting the relationship between participant observation and interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium, & J. A. Holstein (Eds.). *Handbook of interview research: context and method* (pp.801–14). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2012). *Year Book Australia 2012*. Retrieved June 20, 2012 from http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/1301.0

Awartani, M., Whitman, C.V., & Gordon, J. (2007). *The voice of children: Student well-being and the school environment.* United Education Foundation. Retrieved on April 11, 2012 from www.uef-eba.org.

Barber, M., & Mourshed, M. (2007). *How the world's best-performing school systems comes out on top*. Retrieved February 25, 2009 from http://mckinseyonsociety.com/downloads/reports/Education/Worlds_School_Systems_Final.pdf

Barry, M. & Jenkins, R. (2007). *Implementing Mental Health Promotion*. Elsevier.

Baumeister, R.F. & Leary, M.R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117* (3), 497-529.

Bazeley, P. (2007). *Qualitative data analysis with NVivo.* London: Sage.

Berends, M., Bodilly, S., & Kirby, S. N. (2002). *Facing the challenges of whole-school reform: New American Schools after a decade*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1978). *Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. VIII: Implementing and sustaining innovations*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.Bernstein, B. (1975). *Class, codes and control, Vol. 3: Towards a theory of educational transmission.* London: Routledge.

Best, R. (2007).The whole child matters: The challenge of Every Child Matters for pastoral care. *Education 3-13: International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early Years Education, 35* (3), 249-259.

Birman, B. F., Desimone, L., Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal. 38*(4), 915-945.

Blanchflower, D. & Oswald, A. (2004). Well-being in Britain and the USA. *Journal of Public Economics, 88,* 1359-87.

Blank, L., Baxter, S., Goyder, E., Guillaume, L., Wilkinson, A., Hummel, S., & Chillcot, J. (2009). *Systematic review of the effectiveness of universal interventions which aim to promote emotional and social wellbeing in secondary schools*. Sheffield, UK: ScHARR Public Health Collaborating Centre. Retrieved October 23, 2012 from http://www.nice.org.uk/nicemedia/live/11991/45543/45543.pdf

Blum, R. W., McNeely, C. A., & Rinehart, P. M. (2002). *Improving the odds: The untapped power of schools to improve the health of teens*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Adolescent Health and Development, University of Minnesota.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bolin, K., Lindgren, B., Lindstrom, M., & Nystedt, P. (2003). Investments in social capital implications of social interactions for the production of health. *Social Science and Medicine, 56* (12), 2379-90.

Bond, L., Patton, G., Glover, S., Carlin, J.B., Butler, H., Thomas, L., et al. (2004). The Gatehouse project: Can a multi-level school intervention affect emotional well-being and health risk behaviours? *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health, 58*, 997-1003.

Borman, G.D. (2009). *National efforts to bring reform to scale in America's high-poverty elementary and secondary schools: outcomes and implications*. Paper commissioned by the Center on Education Policy, Washington, D.C. for its project on Rethinking the Federal Role in Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Botvin, G.J., Griffin, K.W., & Nichols, T.D. (2006). Preventing youth violence and delinquency through a universal school-based prevention approach. *Prevention Science 7* (4), 403-408.

Bourke, L & Geldens, P. (2007). What does wellbeing mean? Perspectives of wellbeing among young people and youth workers in rural Victoria. *Youth Studies Australia 26* (1), 41-49.

Bowen, G.A. (2009). Supporting a grounded theory with an audit trail: An illustration. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 12*(4), 305-316.

Brigman, G. & Campbell, C. (2003). Helping students improve academic achievement and school success behaviour. *Professional School Counseling, 7*, 91-99.

Bringer, J., D, Johnston, L. H., & Brackenridge, C. H. (2006). Using Computer-Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software to develop a grounded theory project. *Field Methods, 18*(3), 245-266.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (2005). *Making human beings human: Biological perspectives of human development.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Brown, S.L., Nesse, R.M., Vinokur, A., & Smith, D.M. (2003). Providing social support may be more beneficial than receiving it: Results from a prospective study of mortality. *Psychological Science, 14*, 320–327.

Bryk, A.S., Easton, J.Q., Kerbow, D. Rollow, S. & Sebring, P.B. (1993). *A view from the elementary schools: The state of reform in Chicago.* Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago.

Burnes, B. (2004). Kurt lewin and the planned approach to change: A re-appraisal. *Journal of Management Studies, 41* (6), 977-1002.

Cahill, H., Wyn, J., & Smith, G. (2004). *The welfare needs of Victorian Catholic schools*. Melbourne: Australian Youth Research Centre.

Cahill, H., Shaw, G., Wyn, J., & Smith, G. (2004). *Translating caring into action: An evaluation of the Victorian Catholic Education Student Welfare Professional Development initiative.* Melbourne: Australian Youth Research Centre.

Calvert, M. (2009). From 'pastoral care' to 'care': Meanings and practices. *Pastoral Care in Education, 27*(4), 267–277.

Camfield, L., Choudhury, K. & Devine, J. (2008). Wellbeing, happiness, and why relationships matter. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 10* (1), 71-91.

Carstensen, L. L. (1995). Evidence for a life-span theory of socio-emotional selectivity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 4*, 151-156.

CASEL. (2003a). *Social and emotional learning (SEL) and student benefits: Implications for safe schools/ healthy students core elements.* Retrieved October 1, 2012, from http://casel.org/wp-content/uploads/1A_Safe__Sound-rev-21.pdf

CASEL. (2003b). *Safe and sound: An educational leader's guide to evidence-based social and emotional learning programs.* Retrieved October 1, 2012, from http://education.praguesummerschools.org/files/education/patrikakou_4.pdf

CASEL. (2008).*Social and emotional learning and student benefits: Implications for the Safe School/Healthy Students core elements*. Retrieved on June 2011 from http://casel.org/publications/social-and-emotional-learning-and-student-benefits-implications-for-the-safe-schoolhealthy-students-core-elements/

Catalano, R.F., Berglund, L., Ryan, A.M., Lonczak, H.S., & Hawkins, J. (2002). Positive Youth Development in the United States: Research findings on evaluations of positive youth development programs. *Prevention and Treatment, 5*, Article 15.

CEOM. (2006a). *Annual Report 2005*. Retrieved on November 17, 2009 from www.ceo.melb.catholic.edu.au

CEOM. (2006b). *School improvement framework: Overview document*. Retrieved November, 18, 2009 from http://www.ceo.melb.catholic.edu.au/

CEOM (2007a). *Social emotional learning (SEL) Research document 2*. Retrieved November, 18, 2009 from http://web.education.unimelb.edu.au/swap/resources/publications/

CEOM (2007b). *Schools as Core Social Centres Progress Report July 2007*. http://www.edfac.unimelb.edu.au/swap/wellbeing/teachers/partnerships/downloads/sacsc_progress_report.pdf

CEOM (2007c). *Restorative practices Research document 3*. Retrieved November, 18, 2009 from http://web.education.unimelb.edu.au/swap/resources/publications/

CEOM. (2008). *Clusters research document 4*. Melbourne: Author. Retrieved November, 18, 2009 from http://web.education.unimelb.edu.au/swap/resources/publications/

CEOM. (2009a).*Learning centred school, a sacred landscape: Learning and teaching framework and strategy 2009-2013.* East Melbourne, VIC: Author.

CEOM. (2009b). *Pastoral care of students in catholic schools.* Retrieved June 6, 2012 from http://www.ceomelb.catholic.edu.au/publications-policies/contentPubPolicies.aspx?id=1143

CEOM. (2011). *CEOM annual report 2010.* Retrieved on June 2, 2012 from http://www.ceomelb.catholic.edu.au/publications-policies/annual-reports/

CECV (May, 2004). The welfare needs of Victorian Catholic schools: Seminar 3. Retrieved on June 6, 2012 from www.cecv.catholic.edu.au/publications/seminars/seminar3.pdf

CECV. (2005). *Leadership in Catholic schools: Development framework and standards of practice.* East Melbourne, VIC: Author.

Cemalcilar, Z. (2010). Schools as socialisation contexts: Understanding the impact of school climate factors on students' sense of school belonging. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 59*(2), 243-272.

Chamberlain, C. & Mackenzie, D. (1998). *Youth homelessness: Towards early intervention and prevention.* Sydney: Australian Centre for Equity through Education.

Charles, S. T., Reynolds, C. A., & Gatz, M. (2001). Age-related differences and change in positive and negative affect over 23 years. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*(1), 136-151.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cheng, S. T. (2004). Age and subjective well-being revisited: A discrepancy perspective. *Psychology and Aging, 19*, 409-415.

City of Melbourne. (2012). City of Melbourne profile. Retrieved December 15, 2012 from http://www.melbourne.vic.gov.au/AboutMelbourne/MelbourneProfile/Pages/CityofMelbourneprofile.aspx

Cohen, S. (2004). Social relationships and health. *American Psychologist, 59*(8), 676-684.

Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory (3rd ed.).*Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cronin de Chavez, A., Backett-Milburn, K., Parry, O. & Platt, S. (2005). Understanding and researching wellbeing: Its usage in different disciplines and potential for health research and health promotion. *Health Education Journal, 64*(1), 70-87.

Cummins, R. A. (2000). Personal income and subjective well-being: A review. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 1*, 133-158.

Cummins, R.A., Eckersley, R., Pallant, J., Van Vugt, J., Msagon, R., (2003). Developing a national index of subjective well-being: the Australian Unity Wellbeing Index. *Social Indicators Research 64*, 159-190.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). Teaching and the change wars: The professionalism hypothesis. In A. Hargreaves & M. Fullan (Eds.), *Change wars* (pp. 35-51). Moorabbin, VIC: Hawker Brownlow Education.

Datnow, A., & Castellano, M. (2000). Teachers' Responses to Success for All: How Beliefs, Experiences, and Adaptations Shape Implementation. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*(3), 775-799.

Datnow, A., Borman, G., & Stringfield, S. (2000). School reform through a highly specified curriculum: A study of the implementation and effects of the Core Knowledge sequence. *The Elementary School Journal, 101*, 167-192.

Davis, J. M., & Cooke, S. M. (2007). Educating for a healthy, sustainable world: An argument for integrating Health Promoting Schools and Sustainable Schools. *Health Promotion International, 22*(4), 346-353.

Deal, T. E. (1993). The culture of schools. In M. Shaskin & H. J. Walberg (Eds.). *Educational leadership and school culture I* (pp. 3-18). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Company.

DEECD. (2011a). *Summary statistics for Victorian schools*. Retrieved November 11, 2011 from http://www.education.vic.gov.au/Documents/about/department/2011summarystats.pdf

DEECD. (2011b). *The state of Victoria's children 2010*. Melbourne: Author.

De Jong, T. & Kerr-Roubicek, H. (2007). Towards a whole school approach to pastoral care: A proposed framework of principles and practices. *Australian Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 17* (1), 1-12.

Demir, M. (2008). Sweetheart, you really make me happy: Romantic relationship quality and personality as predictors of happiness among emerging adults. *Journal for Happiness Studies, 9*, 257–277.

Demir, M. & Weitekamp, L.A. (2007). I am so happy cause today I found my friend: Friendship and personality as predictors of happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *8*, 181-211

DeNeve, K.M. & Cooper, H. (1998). The happy personality: A meta-analysis of 137 personality traits and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin, 124*, 197-229.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 1-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Department of Curriculum & Research, Ministry of Education. (2010). *Educating for Gross National Happiness: Refining our school practices*. Paro, Bhutan: Author.

Deschesnes, M., Martin, C., & Hill, A. J. (2003). Comprehensive approaches to school health promotion: How to achieve broader implementation? *Health Promotion International, 18*(4), 387-396.

Desimone, L. (2002). How can comprehensive school reform models be successfully implemented? *Review of Educational Research, 72*(3), 433-479.

DiCicco-Bloom, B. & Crabtree, B.F. (2006). The qualitative research interview. *Medical Education, 40,* 314-321.

Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin, 95* (3), 542-575.

Diener, E. (1996). Traits can be powerful, but are not enough: Lessons from subjective well-being. *Journal of Research in Personality, 30*, 389-399.

Diener, E. & Biswas-Diener, R. (2002). Will money increase subjective well-being? *Social Indicators Research, 57,* 119-169.

Diener, E. & Biswas-Diener, R. (2008). *Happiness: Unlocking the mysteries of psychological wealth.* Blackwell: Oxford.

Diener, E. & Chan, M.Y. (2011). Happy people live longer: Subjective wellbeing contributes to health and longevity. *Applied Psychology: Health and Wellbeing, 3* (1), 1-43.

Diener, E., & Lucas, R. E. (1999). Personality and subjective wellbeing. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology* (pp. 213-229). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Diener, E., & Seligman, M.E.P. (2002). Very happy people. *Psychological Science, 13*, 80-83.

Diener, E. & Seligman, M.E.P. (2004). Beyond money: Toward an economy of wellbeing. *Psychological science in the public interest 5*(1), 1-31.

Diener, E., Diener, M., & Diener, C. (1995). Factors predicting the subjective well-being of nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*, 851–864.

Diener, E., Suh, E., & Oishi, S. (1997). *Recent findings in Subjective Well-Being*. Retrieved February 20, 2011 from http://www.psych.uiuc.ed/-ediener/hottopic/paper2.html

Diener, E., Lucas, R., Schimmack, U. & Helliwell, J. (2009). *Well-being for public policy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dorji, L., Dema, Y., & Penjore, D. (2005). *Voices of Bhutanese youth: Through their dreams, experiences, struggles and achievements*. Thimphu: The Centre for Bhutan Studies.

Dorn, D., Fischer, J.A.V., Kirchgassner, G. & Sousa-Poza, A. (2007). Is it culture or democracy? The impact of democracy and culture on happiness. *Social Indicators Research, 82,* 505-526.

Doyal, L. & Gough, I. (1991). *A theory of human need.* London: Macmillan.

Durlak, J. A., & Dupre, E. P. (2008). Implementation matters: A review of research on the influence of implementation on program outcomes and the factors affecting implementation. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 41*, 327-350.

Durlak, J.A. & Wells, A.M. (1997). Primary prevention mental health programs for children and adolescents: A meta-analytic review. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 25*(2), 115-151.

Durlak, J.A., & Wells, A.M. (1998). Evaluation of indicated preventive intervention (secondary prevention) mental health programs for children and adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 26* (5), 775-802.

Durlak, J.A., Taylor, R.D., Kawashima, K., Pachan, M.K., DuPre, E.P., Celio, C.I., Berger, S.R., Dymnicki, A.B. & Weissberg, R.P. (2007). Effects of positive youth development programs on school, family, and community systems. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 39,* 269–286.

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

Dusenbury, L., Brannigan, R., Falco, M., & Hansen, W. B. (2003). A review of research on fidelity of implementation: Implications for drug abuse prevention in school settings. *Health Education Research: Theory & Practice, 18*(2), 237–256.

Earls, F. & Carlson, M. (2001). The social ecology of child health and well-being. *Annual Review of Public Health, 22,* 143-166.

Easterlin R., & Angelescu L. (2007). Modern economic growth and quality of life: Cross-sectional and time series evidence. *IZA Discussion Paper No. 2755*. Retrieved on September 2012 from http://ftp.iza.org/dp2755.pdf

Easthope, G. & White, R. (2006). Health & wellbeing: How do young people see these concepts? *Youth Studies Australia, 25*(1), 42-49

Ecclestone, K & Hayes, D. (2008). *The dangerous rise of therapeutic education*. London: Routledge.

Eckersley, R. (2004). *Well and good: How we feel and why it matters*. Melbourne: Text Publishing.

Edwards, L. (2003). *Promoting young people's wellbeing: A review of research on emotional health*. Glasgow: SCRE, University of Glasgow.

Elias, M. J., Zins, J. E., Graczyk, P. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2003). Implementation, sustainability, and scaling up of social emotional and academic innovations in public schools. *School Psychology Review, 32*(3), 303-319.

Ereaut, G., & Whiting, R. (2008). *What do we mean by 'wellbeing'? And why might it matter? : Linguistic landscapes*. Retrieved February 12, 2012 from www.dcsf.gov.uk/research

Erskine, J. A. K., Kvavilashvili, L., Conway, M. A., & Myers, L. (2007). The effects of age on well-being, psychopathology and repressive coping. *Aging and Mental Health*, *11*(4), 394-404.

Evans, R. (1996). *The human side of school change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Evans, S. D., & Prilleltensky, I. (2007). Youth and democracy: Participation for personal, relational, and collective well-being. *Journal of Community Psychology, 35*(6), 681-692.

Evans, S.D., & Prilleltensky, I. (2009). Critical psychology. In E. F. Provenzo (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of the social and cultural foundations of education*. Vol. 1 (pp. 251-253). London: Sage.

Farbman, D., & Kaplan, C. (2005). *Time for a Change: The Promise of Extended-Time Schools for Promoting Student Achievement (Research Report).* Boston: Massachusetts 2020.

Fattore, T., Mason, J. & Watson, L. (2007). *Ask the children: Overview of children's understandings of well-being*. NSW Commission for Children & Young People. Retrieved on December 18, 2009 from www.kids.nsw.gov.au

Ferragina, E. (2010). Social capital and equality: Tocqueville's Legacy. *The Toqueville Review, XXXI*, 73-98. Retrieved on February 8, 2012 from http://www.emanueleferragina.com/attachments/002_Ferragina%20Tocqueville%20review.pdf

Fitch, T. J., & Marshall, J. L. (2004).What counselors do in high achieving schools: A study on the role of the school counselor. *Professional School Counseling, 7*, 172-177.

Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M. & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature*. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, The National Implementation Research Network (FMHI Publication #231). Retrieved November 21, 2013 from: http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/sites/nirn.fpg.unc.edu/files/resources/NIRN-MonographFull-01-2005.pdf

Flay, B., Graumlich, S., Segawa, E., Burns, J.L., & Holliday, M.Y. (2004). Aban Aya Investigators. Effects of 2 prevention programs on high-risk behaviors among African American youth. A randomized trial. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, 158*, 377-384.

Fraillon, J. (2004). Measuring student well-being in the context of Australian schooling: Discussion paper. Camberwell, VIC: The Australian Council for Educational Research. Retrieved September 15, 2010 from

http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/Measuring_Student_Well-Being_in_the_Context_of_Australian_Schooling.pdf

Francis, L., Brown, L., Lester, D. & Philipchalk, R. (1998). Happiness is stable extraversion. *Personality and Individual Differences, 24*, 167–171.

Freeman, E. & Strong, D. (2004). The Course. In Cahill, H., Shaw, G., Wyn, J., & Smith, G. *Translating caring into action: An evaluation of the Victorian Catholic Education Student Welfare Professional Development initiative* (pp. 10-17). Melbourne: Australian Youth Research Centre.

Frey, B., & Stutzer, A. (2002). What can economists learn from happiness research? *Journal of Economic Literature, 40* (2), 402-435.

Fullan, M. (1997). Emotion and hope: Constructive concepts for complex times. In A. Hargreaves (Ed.), *Rethinking educational change with heart and mind: 1997 ASCD Yearbook* (pp. 216-233). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Fullan, M. (1999). Complexity and the change process. In *Change Forces: The sequel*. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Fullan, M. (2005). The meaning of change: A quarter of a century of learning. In Lieberman, A. (Ed.). *The roots of educational change.* (pp. 202-216). Dordrecht: Springer.

Fullan, M. (2009). Have theory, will travel: A theory of action for system change. In A. Hargreaves & M. Fullan (Eds.). *Change wars* (pp. 209-223). Moorabbin, VIC: Hawker Brownlow Education.

Fullan, M. (2010). *All systems go.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Fullan, M. (2011). *Change leader: Learning to do what matters most*. New York: Wiley.

Furnham, A. & Cheng, H. (1997). Personality and happiness. *Psychological Reports, 83*, 761-762.

Furstenberg, F. & Kiernan, K. (2001). Delayed parental divorce: How much do children benefit? *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 63,* 446-57.

Gallagher, M. W., Lopez, S. J., & Preacher, K. J. (2009). The hierarchical structure of well-being. *Journal of Personality, 77*(4), 1025-1049.

Gambone, M.A., Klem, A.M., Summers, J.A., Akey, T.A., & Sipe, C.L. (2004). *Turning the Tide: The Achievements of the First Things First Education Reform in the Kansas City, Kansas Public School District (Executive Summary)*. Philadelphia: Youth Development Strategies, Inc. Retrieved February 15, 2014 from: http://www.ydsi.org/ydsi/pdf/kcsexecsummaryrev6a.pdf

Gandara, P. (2000a). Rethinking time and teacher working conditions. In P. Gandara (Ed.). *The dimensions of time and the challenge of school reform.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. (pp. 69-87)

Gandara, P. (Ed.). (2000). *The dimensions of time and the challenge of school reform.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Gerdtham, U.G, & Johannesson, M. (2001). The relationship between happiness, health and socio-economic factors: Results based on Swedish micro data. *Journal of Socio-Economics, 30,* 553-557.

Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. London: Bloomsbury.

Gough, I., McGregor, J. A., & Camfield, L. (2007). Theorising wellbeing in international development. In I. Gough & J. A. McGregor (Eds.), *Wellbeing in developing countries: From theory to research* (pp. 3-43). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Graham, C. & Chattopadhyay, S. (2011). Gender and well-being around the world. *Global Economy & Development at Brookings*. Retrieved March 5, 2012 from http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/8/08-gender-well-being-graham/08-gender-and-well-being-graham.pdf

Greenberg, M. T., Domitrovich, C. E., & Bumbarger, B. (2001). The prevention of mental disorders in school-aged children: Current state of the field. *Prevention & Treatment, 4*, Article 1. Retrieved March 1, 2012, from http://journals.apa.org/prevention/volume4/pre0040001a.html

Greenberg, M. T., Weissberg, R. P., Zins, J. E., Fredericks, L., & Elias, M. J. (2003). Enhancing school-based prevention and youth development through coordinated social, emotional, and academic learning. *American Psychologist, 58*(6/7), 466-474.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 191-215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Guerra, N. G., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2008). Linking the prevention of problem behaviors and positive youth development: Core competencies for positive youth development. In N. G. Guerra, & C. P. Bradshaw (Eds.), *Core competencies to prevent problem behaviors and promote positive youth development: New Directions in Child and Adolescent Development, 122*, 1-17.

Guhn, M. (2009). Insights from successful and unsuccessful implementations of school reform programs. *Journal of Educational Change, 10*, 337-363.

Guo, B., Scott, A. & Bowker, S. (2003). *Suicide Prevention Strategies: Evidence from Systematic Reviews*. Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research, Health Technology Assessment, Report HTA 28.

Gutkin, T.B. (2012). Ecological psychology: Replacing the medical model paradigm for school-based psychological and psychoeducational services. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 22* (1-2), 1-20.

Gysbers, N. C. (2000). Implementing a whole school approach to guidance through a comprehensive guidance program. *Asian Journal of Counseling, 7* (2), 5-17.

Gysbers, N.C., & Henderson, P. (2006). *Developing and managing your school guidance program (4th ed.)*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Hagerty, M R. & Veenhoven, R. (2003). Wealth and happiness revisited: Growing national income does go with greater happiness. *Social Indicators Research, 64*, 1-27.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1997). In Conclusion: New ways to think about teachers & time. In Adelman, N.E., Eagle, K.P.W, & Hargreaves, A. (Eds). (1997). *Racing with the clock: making time for teaching and learning in school reform* (pp. 79-88). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A. (2009). The fourth way of change: Towards and age of inspiration and sustainability. In A. Hargreaves & M. Fullan. (Eds.), *Change wars* (pp. 9-33). Moorabbin, VIC: Hawker Brownlow Education.

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2009). Change wars: A hopeful struggle. In A. Hargreaves & M. Fullan (Eds.), *Change wars* (pp. 1-8). Moorabbin, VIC: Hawker Brownlow Education.

Hargreaves, A., Earl, L., Moore, S., & Manning, S. (2001). The emotional work of change. In *Learning to change: Teaching beyond subjects and standards* (pp. 136-156). San Francisco: Jossey-bass.

Hargreaves, D. (1995). School culture, school effectiveness and school improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 6*(91), 23-46.

Hargreaves, L.G. (2008). The whole-school approach to education for sustainable development: From pilot projects to systemic change. *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review, 6*, 69-74. Retrieved September 23, 2013 from: http://www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue6-perspectives2

Hawkins, J. D., Catalano, R., Kosterman, R., Abbot, R. D., & Hill, K. G. (1999). Preventing adolescent health-risk behavior by strengthening protection during childhood. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, 153*, 226-234.

Hayward, K. & Colman, R. (2010). Proceedings: Education for gross national happiness workshop 7-12 December 2009. GPI Atlantic, Canada. Retrieved February 16, 2012 from http://www.gpiatlantic.org/pdf/educatingforgnh/educating_for_gnh_proceedings.pdf

Hayward, K., Pannozzo, L. & Colman, R. (2009). Educating for Gross National Happiness in Bhutan: Developing curricula and indicators for an educated populace. Document prepared by GPI Atlantic for *Educating for Gross National Happiness Workshop* held in Thimphu, Bhutan, December 7-12, 2009.

Hazell, T. (2005). *Evaluation of the Professional Development Program and School-level Implementation: Final Report*. Hunter Institute of Mental Health. Retrieved October 22, 2012 from: http://www.mindmatters.edu.au/verve/_resources/pd_final.pdf

Headey, B., Muffels, R., & Wooden, M. (2008). Money does not buy happiness: Or Does It? A reassessment based on the combined effects of wealth, income and consumption. *Social Indicators Research, 87*, 65-82.

Hearn, L., Campbell-Pope, R., House, J. & Cross, D. (2006). *Pastoral care in education*. Child Health Promotion Research Unit, Edith Cowan University, Perth.

Helliwell, J.F. (2003). How's life? Combining individual and national variables to explain subjective well-being. *Economic Modelling, 20,* 331-360.

Helliwell, J.F. & Putnam, R.D. (2004). The social context of well-being. *Philosophical Transactions: Biological Sciences, 359* (1449), 1435-1446.

Helliwell, J.F. & Putnam, R.D. (2007). Education and social capital. *Eastern Economic Journal, 33* (1), 1-19.

Helliwell, J.F. & Wang, S. (2010). *Trust and wellbeing* (Working Paper 15911). National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series, Cambridge, MA.

Helliwell, J.F., Layard, R., & Sachs, J.D. (Eds.). (2012). *World happiness report.* New York: Earth Institute Columbia University. Retrieved January 15, 2013 from http://www.earth.columbia.edu/sitefiles/file/Sachs%20Writing/2012/World%20Happiness%20Report.pdf

Helliwell, J., Layard, R. & Sachs, J. (Eds.). (2013). *World happiness report 2013.* New York: Sustainable Development Solutions Network. Retrieved April 23, 2014 from http://unsdsn.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/WorldHappinessReport2013_online.pdf

Henderson, K. & Tilbury, D. (2004) *Whole-school approaches to sustainability: An international review of sustainable school programs*. Report Prepared by the Australian Research Institute in Education for Sustainability (ARIES) for Department of the Environment and Heritage, Australian Government.

Hintikka, J., Koskela, T., Kontula, O., Koskela, K., & Viinamaeki, H. (2000). Men, women and friends: Are there differences in relation to mental wellbeing? *Quality of Life Research, 9*, 841–845.

Ho, L. (2011). What is social justice? *Occasional Paper #1*: Sydney, Australia: National Pro Bono Resource Centre.

Hofmann, W., Luhmann. M., Fisher, R. R., Vohs, K.D. & Baumeister, R. F. (2014). Yes, but are they happy? Effects of trait self-control on affective well-being and life satisfaction. *Journal of Personality, 82* (4), 265-277.

Holdsworth, R. & Blanchard, M. (2006). Unheard voices: themes emerging from studies of the views about school engagement of young people with high support needs in the area of mental health. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 16* (1), 14-28.

Hopkins, D. (2001). *School improvement for real*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Horley, J. & Lavery, J. (1995). Subjective well-being and age. *Social Indicators Research, 34* (2), 275-282.

Howard, S., Dryden, J., & Johnson, B. (1999). Childhood resilience: Review and critique of literature. *Oxford Review of Education, 25*, 307-323.

Huppert, F. A., & Baylis, N. (2004). Well-being: Towards an integration of psychology, neurobiology and social sciences. *Philosophical Transactions: Biological Sciences, 359*(1449), 1447-1451.

Ingersoll-Dayton, B., Saengtienchai, C., Kespichayawattana, J., and Aungsuroch, Y. (2001). Psychological well-being Asian style: The perspective of Thai elders. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Gerontology, 16*, 283-302.

Inglehart, R. & Klingemann, H.D. (2000). Genes, culture, democracy, and happiness. Diener, E. & Suh, E. M. (Eds.). *Culture and subjective well-being.* (pp.165-184). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Jackson, L. (2007). Leading sustainable schools. Nottingham, UK: National College for School Leadership. Retrieved October 12, 2012 from: http://www.arcworld.org/downloads/14669_lead_sus_school%20%282%29.pdf

Johnson, J. M. (2002). In-depth interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and method* (pp.103-119). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kaufman, D., Kraay, A. & Mastruzzi, M. (2003). Governance matters III: Governance indicators for 1996-2002. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 3106*. Washington D.C.: World Bank.

Kesebir, P., & Diener, E. (2008). In defence of happiness: Why policymakers should care about subjective well-being. In L. Bruni, F. Comim & M. Pugno (Eds.), *Capabilities and happiness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Keyes, C. L. M. (1998). Social well-being. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 61*(2), 121-140.

Khan, R., Bedford, K. & Williams, M. (2011). Evaluation of the MindMatters buddy support scheme in southwest Sydney: Strategies, achievements and challenges. *Health Education Journal, XX* (X), 1-7.

Kim, H.K. & McKenry, P.C. (2002). The relationship between marriage and psychological well-being: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Family Issues, 23*, 885-911.

Kitayama, S., Mesquita, B., & Karasawa, M. (2006). Cultural affordances and emotional experience: Socially engaging and disengaging emotions in Japan and the United States. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*(5), 890-903.

Klugman, J., Rodríguez, F. & Choi, H. (2011). *The HDI 2010: New controversies, old critiques.* UNDP Human Development Report Office.

Kotter, J.P. (2007). Leading change: why transformational efforts fail. The tests of a leader. *Best of HBR: Harvard Business Review*, 96-103.

Kurki, A., Boyle, A., & Aladjem, D. K. (2006). Implementation: Measuring and explaining the fidelity of CSR implementation. *Journal of Education of Students Placed At Risk, 11*(3&4), 255-277.

Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: learning the craft of qualitative research (2ⁿᵈ ed).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lam, S.K.Y. & Hui, E.K.P. (2010): Factors affecting the involvement of teachers in guidance and counselling as a whole-school approach. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 38* (2), 219-234.

Langford, R. Bonell, C.P., Jones, H.E., Pouliou, T., Murphy, S.M., Waters, E., Komro, K.A., Gibbs, L.F., Magnus, D., & Campbell, R. (2014). The WHO Health Promoting School framework for improving the health and well-being of students and their academic achievement (Review). *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2014, Issue 4. Art. No.: CD008958.

Lapan, R.T., Gysbers, N.C & Kayson, K. (2007). *How implementing comprehensive guidance programs improves academic achievement for all Missouri students*. Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Division of Career Education.

Layard, R. (2005). *Happiness: Lessons from a new science.* London: Penguin Books.

Layard, R. & Dunn, J. (2009) A *Good Childhood: Searching for values in a competitive age*. London: The Children's Society.

Lee, A., Cheng, F.F.K., Fung, Y., & St Leger, L. (2006). Can Health Promoting Schools contribute to the better health and wellbeing of young people? The Hong Kong experience. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 60* (6), 530-536.

Lee, T. (2004). Cultural change agent: Leading transformational change. In C. Barker & R. Coy (Eds.). *The power of culture: Driving today's organisation*. McGraw Hill, Australia.

Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers of group dynamics: Concept, method and reality in social science, social equilibria, and social change. *Human Relations, 1*, 5-41.

Lewin, K. (1997). *Resolving social conflicts and field theory in social science*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Lin, N. (1999). Building a network theory of social capital. *Connections, 22* (1), 28-51.

Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Lister-Sharp, D., Chapman, S., Stewart-Brown, S., & Sowden, A. (1999). Health promoting schools and health promotion in schools: Two systematic reviews. *Health Technology Assessment*, *3*(22), 1-207.

Lu, L. (2001). Understanding happiness: A look into the Chinese folk psychology. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 2*, 407-432.

Lu, L., & Gilmour, R. (2004). Culture and conceptions of happiness: Individual oriented and social oriented SWB. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 5*, 269-291.

Lykken, D., & Tellegen, A. (1996). Happiness is a stochastic phenomenon. *Psychological Science, 7,* 186-189.

Lyubomirsky, S., Sheldon, K. M., & Schkade, D. (2005). Pursuing happiness: The architecture of sustainable change. *Review of General Psychology, 9*(2), 111-131.

Mackenzie, N. & Knipe, S. (2006). Research dilemmas: Paradigms, methods and methodology. *Issues in Educational research, 16*(2), 193-205.

MacMillan, K. & Koenig, T. (2004). The wow factor: Preconceptions and expectations for data analysis software in qualitative research. *Social Science Computer Review, 22*(2), 179-186.

Macmillan, R. & Hagan, J. (2004). Violence in the transition to adulthood: Adolescent victimization, education, and socioeconomic attainment in later life. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 14(2), 127-58.

Manderson, L. (2005). Social capital and inclusion: Locating wellbeing in community. In L. Manderson (Ed.). *Rethinking wellbeing*. Perth, WA: API Network.

Marcus, E. C. (2000). Change process and conflict. In M. Deutsch & P. Coleman (Eds.), *The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice* (pp. 366-381). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Markham, W.A. & Aveyard, P. (2003). A new theory of health promoting schools based on human functioning, school organisation and pedagogic practice. *Social Science and Medicine, 56,* 1209-1220.

Marsh, C.J. (2000). Innovation and change. In *Handbook for beginning teachers* (2nd ed., pp. 379-396). Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson Education Australia.

Marzano, R.J., Marzano, J.S. & Pickering, D.J. (2003). *Classroom management that works: Researched-based strategies for every teacher*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Massey, O. T., Armstrong, K., Boroughs, M., Henson, K., & McCash, L. (2005). Mental health services in schools: A qualitative analysis of challenges to implementation, operation, and sustainability. *Psychology in the Schools, 42*(4), 361-372.

McCrae, R., & Costa, P. T. (1991). Adding Liebe und Arbeit: The full five-factor model and well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17*(2), 227-232.

McCulloch, K., Tett, L. & Crowther, J. (2004). New community schools in Scotland: Issues for inter-professional collaboration. *Scottish Educational Review, 36* (2), 129-144.

McInerney, P. (2004). *Mapping the literature: Social justice and education*. Adelaide: Flinders University. Retrieved January 25, 2011 from: http://ehlt.flinders.edu.au/education/sjrc/docs/Mapping_the_literature1.doc

McKeown, R. (2002). *Education for sustainable development toolkit*. Retrieved August 15, 2012 from: http://www.esdtoolkit.org/esd_toolkit_v2.pdf

McLaughlin, M. W. (2005). Listening and learning from the field: Tales of policy implementation and situated practice. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), *The roots of educational change* (Vol. 1, pp. 58-72). Dordrecht: Springer.

MCTEEYA Taskforce for Student Learning & Support Services. (2003). *National safe school framework*. Retrieved March 12, 2012 from: http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/school_education/publications_resources/profiles/national_safe_schools_framework.htm

Mendelson, M.J. & Aboud, F.E. (1999). Measuring friendship quality in late adolescents and young adults: McGill Friendship Questionnaires. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science 31*, 130-132.

Miles, M. & Huberman, A. (1994) *An expanded source book: Qualitative data analysis (2nd ed.)*. London, Sage

Ministry of Education. (2010). Proceeding of educating for GNH workshop 7-12 December 2009. Retrieved June 19, 2012 from www.gpiatlantic.org/

Ministry of Education. (2011). *Annual Education Statistics*. Thimphu: Author.

Ministry of Education. (2012). *Annual Education Statistics*. Thimphu: Author.

Mitchell, J., Palmer, S., & Davies, G.P. (2000). A randomized trial of an intervention to develop health promoting schools in Australia: The South-Western Sydney study. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 24*, 242-245.

Mittra, S. & Kumar, B. (2004). *Encyclopedia of women in South Asia (Bhutan)*. New Delhi, India: Kalpaz Publications.

Mrazek, P. & Haggerty, R. (1994). *Reducing the risks for mental disorders: Frontiers for preventive intervention research*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Mukoma, W. & Flisher, A.J. (2004). Evaluations of health promoting schools: A review of nine studies. *Health Promotion International, 9* (3), 357-368.

Myers, D. G. (1999). Close relationships and quality of life. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology* (pp. 374-391). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Myers, D. G. (2000). The funds, friends, and faith of happy people. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 56-67.

National Education Commission on Time and Learning. (2005).*Prisoners of Time (*Reprint of the 1994 Report of the National Education Commission on Time and Learning with a new introduction and examples*).* The Education Commission of the States Education Reform Reprint Series. http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/64/52/6452.pdf

Neiman, S. & DeVoe, J.F. (2009). *Crime, violence, discipline, and safety in U.S. public schools: Findings from the school survey on crime and safety: 2007-08* (NCES 2009-326). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Neuman, W. L. (1999). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Needham Hieghts, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Noble, T., McGrath H., Wyatt T., Carbines R., & Robb L. (2008). *Scoping study in approaches to student wellbeing - Final report*. Canberra: Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.

Noddings, N. (2003). *Happiness and education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Noell, G. H., & Gansle, K. A. (2009). Moving from good ideas in educational systems change to sustainable Program implementation: Coming to terms with some of the realities. *Psychology in the Schools, 46*(1), 78-88.

Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Rusting, C. L. (1999). Gender differences in wellbeing. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology* (pp. 330-350). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Norman, J. (2001). Building effective youth-adult partnerships. *Transitions, 14* (1), 10-12.

Nussbaum, M. (2005). Wellbeing, contracts and capabilities. In L. Manderson (Ed.), *Rethinking Wellbeing* (pp. 27-44). Perth: API Network.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1990). Aristotelian social democracy. In R. B. Douglas, G. M. Mara, & H. Richardson (Eds.), *Liberalism and the good* (pp. 203–251). London: Routledge.

O'Connell, M.E., Boat, T., & Warner, K.E. (Eds.) (2009). *Preventing mental, emotional, and behavioural disorders among young people: Progress and possibilities*. Washintgton, DC: National Academies Press.

OECD. (2012). *Better Life Index*. Retrieved January 12, 2013 from http://www.oecdbetterlifeindex.org/about/better-life-initiative/

Onwuegbuzie, A.J. & Leech, N.L. (2007). Sampling designs in qualitative research: Making the sampling process more public. *The Qualitative Report, 12* (2), 238-254.

Oreopoulos, P., & Salvanes, K. (2011). Priceless: The nonpecuniary benefits of schooling. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *25*(1), 159-184.

Oreskes, N. (2004). Beyond the ivory tower: The scientific consensus on climate change. *Science, 306* (5702), 1686.

Orpinas, P., Kelder, S., Frankowski, R., Murray, N. Zhang, Q., & McAlister, A. (2000). Outcome evaluation of a multi-component violence prevention program for middle schools: The students for Peace project. *Health Education Research 15* (1), 45-58.

Ostroff, S., O'Toole, L., & Kropf, D. (2007). *Reflections on well-being for education*. Retrieved January, 20, 2010 from http://www.uefeba.org/documents/Reflections_on_Well-Being-200703.pdf.

Padgett, D.K., Mathew, R., & Conte, S. (2004). Peer debriefing and support groups: Formation, care, and maintenance. In D.K. Padgett (Ed.). *The qualitative experience* (pp. 225-235). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Pannozzo, L. & Colman, R. (2009). New policy directions for Nova Scotia: Using Genuine Progress Indicators to count what matters. Glen Haven, Nova Scotia: GPI Atlantic. http://www.gpiatlantic.org/publications/integrated.htm

Park, N., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M.E.P. (2004). Character strengths and well-being. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, Vol. 23* (5), 603-619.

Patterson, A. (2009). *Building foundations for mental health and wellbeing: Review of Australian and international mental health promotion, prevention, and early intervention policy*. Adelaide, SA: Australian Network for Promotion, Prevention and Early Intervention for Mental Health. Retrieved October 29, 2012 from http://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/mentalhealth/publications/strategic_documents/PPEI_Review.pdf

Patton, G.C., Bond, L., Carlin, J.B., Thomas, L., Butler, H., Glover, S., et al. (2006). Promoting social inclusion in schools: a group-randomized trial of effects on student health risk behaviour and well-being. *American Journal of Public Health, 96,* 1582-1587.

Pelden, S. (2010, August 10). The Downside of development: The concomitant of a rapid transitional society. *Kuensel*. Retrieved from http://www.kuenselonline.com/

Pelden, S. (2011, December 29). Lack of vitamin deficiency confirmed. *Kuensel*. Retrieved from http://www.kuenselonline.com/2011/?p=24081

Pelden, S. (2012, July 16). School diet found below standards. *Kuensel.* Retrieved from http://www.kuenselonline.com/2011/?p=32513

Pelzang, R. (2012). Pattern of psychiatric admission in a referral hospital, Bhutan. *WHO South-East Asia Journal of Public Health, 1*(1), 52-58.

Peterson, K. & Deal, T. (1998). How leaders influence the culture of schools. *Educational Leadership 56* (1), 28-30.

Phuntsho, K. (2011). Wisdom, Knowledge or Both: The Changing Ethos of Education in Bhutan. *Public seminar as part of Interesting Talks Oxford series* at the Centre for Comparative and International Education, University of Oxford, UK.

Planning Commission, Royal Government of Bhutan (1999). *Bhutan 2020: A vision of peace, prosperity and happiness.* Thimphu, Bhutan: Author.

Polesel, J., Dulfer, N., & Turnbull, M. (2012). *The experience of education: The impacts of high stakes testing on school students and their families*. Sydney, NSW: The Whitlam Institute within the University of Western Sydney. Retrieved November 11, 2014 from: http://www.whitlam.org/__data/assets/pdf_file/0008/276191/High_Stakes_Testing_Literature_Review.pdf

Pollard, E.L. & Lee, P.D. (2003). Child well-being: A systematic review of the literature. *Social Indicators Research, 61* (1), 59-78.

Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology, 24,* 1-24.

Prilleltensky, I. (2005). Promoting well-being: Time for a paradigm shift in health and human services. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health, 33*(Suppl 6), 53-60.

Purnell, S. & Reichardt, R. (2000). In P. Gandara (Ed.). *The dimensions of time and the challenge of school reform* (pp.31-48)*.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *The Journal of Democracy, 6*(1), 65-78.

Putnam, R. (2001). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Putnam, R.D., Leonardi, R. & Nanetti, R.Y. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ransford, C. R., Greenberg, M. T., Domitrovich, C. E., Small, M., & Jacobson, L. (2009). The Role of Teachers' Psychological Experiences and Perceptions of Curriculum Supports on the Implementation of a Social and Emotional Learning Curriculum. *School Psychology Review, 38*(4), 510-532.

Ratts, M., DeKruyf, L., & Chen-Hayes, S. (2007). The ACA advocacy competencies: A social justice advocacy framework for professional school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 11*, 90-97.

Richards, L. (2009). *Handling qualitative data* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Riggan, M. & Supovitz, J.A. (2008). Interpreting, supporting, and resisting change: The geography of leadership in reform settings. In J.A. Supovitz & E.H. Weinbaum (Eds.). *The implementation gap: Understanding reform in high schools.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Ringeisen, H., Henderson, K. & Hoagwood, K. (2003). Context matters: Schools and the 'research to practice gap' in children's mental health. *School Psychology Review, 32* (2), 153-68.

Rodkin, P.C., & Hodges, E. (2003). Bullies and victims in the peer ecology: Four questions for psychological and school professionals. *School Psychology Review*, *32*(3), 384-400.

Rowling, L., & Samdal, O. (2011). Filling the black box of implementation for Health-Promoting Schools. *Health Education, 5*, 347-356.

Royal Government of Bhutan. (2009). *Statements by Lyonchhen Jigme Y. Thinley, the Hon'ble Prime Minister of Bhutan (Volume II).* Thimphu, Bhutan.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 141-166.

Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. H. (2008). Know thyself and become what you are: A eudaimonic approach to psychological well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 9*, 13-39.

Sachs, J. (2012). Introduction. In J. Helliwll, R. Layard, & J. Sachs (Eds.). *World happiness report.* (pp.2-9). Retrieved December 15, 2012 from http://www.earth.columbia.edu/sitefiles/file/Sachs%20Writing/2012/World%20Happiness%20Report.pdf

Samdal, O. & Rowling, L. (2011). Theoretical and empirical base for implementation components of health-promoting schools. *Health Education, 111* (5), 367-390

Schreck, C. J. & Miller, J. M. (2003). Sources of Fear of Crime at School: What Is the Relative Contribution of Disorder, Individual Characteristics, and School Security? *Journal of School Violence*, 2(4), 57-79.

Schwandt, T. A. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schwartz, S. H. (1999). A theory of cultural values and some implications for work. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *48*, 23-47.

Scott, B. (2005). Getting to the heart of the matter: Examining the efficacy of a whole-school approach to behaviour management. *Kairanga, 6* (1), 29-34.

Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. New York: Free Press.

Seligman, M.E.P., Parks, A.C., & Steen, T. (2004). A balanced psychology and a full life. *Philosophical Transactions: Biological Sciences, 359* (1449), pp. 1379-1381.

Seligman, M. E. P., Steen, T. A., Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2005). Positive psychology progress: Empirical validation of interventions. *American Psychologist, 60*(5), 410-421.

Seligman, M.E.P., Ernst, R.M., Gillham, J., Reivich, K. & Linkins, M. (2009). Positive education: positive psychology and classroom interventions. *Oxford Review of Education, 35*(3), 293-311.

Sen, A. (1985). *Commodities and capabilities.* Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Sen, A. (2008). The economics of happiness and capability. Bruni, L., Comim, F., & Pugno, M. (Eds.). *Capabilities and happiness.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sheehan, P. (2004). *The contribution of catholic schools to the Victorian economy and community* (Report to the Catholic Education Commission of Victoria). Melbourne: Centre for Strategic Economic Studies, Victoria University.

Sink, C.A. (2005). Comprehensive school counselling programs and academic achievement – A rejoinder to Brown and Trusty. *Professional School Counseling, 9*, 9-12.

Sink, C. A., & Stroh, H. R. (2003). Raising achievement test scores of early elementary school students through comprehensive school counseling programs. *Professional School Counseling, 6*, 352-364.

Slavin, R.E., & Madden, N.A. (1999). *Success for All/Roots & Wings: 1999 summary of research on achievement outcomes*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk.

Smith, E. (2012). *Key issues in education and social justice.* London: Sage.

Sointu, E. (2005). The rise of an ideal: Tracing changing discourses of wellbeing. *The Sociological Review*, 255-274.

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.

St Leger, L., Young, I., Blanchard C., Perry, M. (2010). *Promoting health in schools: From evidence to action*. An International Union for Health Promotion and Education (IUHPE) publication. Retrieved October 23, 2012 from: http://www.iuhpe.org/uploaded/Activities/Scientific_Affairs/CDC/School%20Health/PHiS_EtA_EN_WEB.pdf

Stead, M., Stradling, R., MacNeil, M., MacKintosh, A. M., & Minty, S. (2007). Implementation evaluation of the Blueprint multi-component drug prevention programme: fidelity of school component delivery. *Drug and Alcohol Review, 26*, 653-664.

Sterbinsky, A., Ross, S. M., & Redfield, D. (2006). Effects of comprehensive school reform on student achievement and school change: A longitudinal multi-site study. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 17*(3), 367-397.

Sterling, S. (2001). *Sustainable Education: Revisioning Learning and Change*. Bristol, UK: Green Books.

Stevenson, B., & Wolfers, J. (2008). Economic growth and Subjective well-being: Reassessing the Easterlin paradox. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity,* 1-102.

Stewart-Brown, S. (2006). *What is the evidence on school health promotion in improving health or preventing disease and, specifically, what is the effectiveness of the health promoting schools approach?* Copenhagen: World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe. Retrieved October 23, 2012 from: http://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/74653/E88185.pdf

Stiglitz, J.E., Sen, A., & Fitoussi, J.P. (2009). Report by the Commission on the measurement of economic performance and social progress. Retrieved on September 23, 2012 from: www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.fr

Stokes, H., Tyler, D., Holdsworth, R., Brown, J. & Mukherjee, D. (2001). *Building relationships, making education work: A report on the perspectives of young people*. Canberra: Department of Education, Training & Youth Affairs.

Stokols, D. (1996). Translating social ecological theory into guidelines for community health promotion. *American Journal of health Promotion, 10*(4), 282-298.

Stormont, M., Reinke, W.M., & Herman, K.C. (2010). Introduction to the special issue: Using prevention science to address mental health issues in schools. *Psychology in the Schools, Vol. 47*(1), 1-4

Strayhorn Jr, J.M. (2002). Self-control: Toward systematic training program**.** *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 41* (1)**,** 17-27

Suicide Prevention Task Force. (1997). *Suicide prevention: Victorian Task Force Report.* Retrieved on March15, 2009 from

http://www.health.vic.gov.au/mentalhealth/suicide/suicide-prevention/task-force-report/index.htm

Supovitz, J. A., & May, H. (2004). A study of the links between implementation and effectiveness of the America's choice comprehensive school reform design. *Journal of Education of Students Placed At Risk, 9* (4), 389-419.

Supovitz, J.A. & Weinbaum, E. H. (2010). *The implementation gap: Understanding reform in high schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sutton, P. W., Love, J. G., Bell, J., Christie, E., Mayrhofer, A., Millman, Y., Williams, H., & Yuill, C. (2005). *The emotional well-being of young people: A review of the literature*. Aberdeen, Scotland: School of Applied Social Studies, Robert Gordon University. Retrieved March 17, 2011 from: http://www4.rgu.ac.uk/files/CL%20EWB%20Lit%20Review%20Feb%202005.pdf

Tashi, T. (2012, May 5). When was the first school started? *Kuensel.* Retrieved from http://www.kuenselonline.com/

Taylor, G. & Hawley, H. (2010). *Key debates in healthcare.* New York: Open University Press.

Teachman, B.A. (2006). Aging and negative affect: The rise and fall and rise of anxiety and depression symptoms. *Psychology and Aging, 21* (1), 201-207.

Tesch-Romer, C., Motel-Klingebiel, A., & Tomasik, M. J. (2008). Gender differences in subjective well-being: Comparing societies with respect to gender equality. *Social Indicators Research, 85*, 329-349.

Tett, L., Munn, P., Kay, H., Martin, I., Martin, J. & Ranson, S. (2001).Schools, community education and collaborative practice in Scotland. In *Education, social justice and inter-agency working* (pp.105-123). London, UK: Routledge.

The Constitution of the kingdom of Bhutan. (18 July, 2008). Retrieved August 16, 2010 from http://www.constitution.bt/TsaThrim%20Eng%20(A5).pdf

Thinley, P. (July, 2007). Annexure II: Letter to Principals by the Secretary of Education. In Planning Policy Division. *26th Education Policy Guidelines and Instructions*. Thimphu: Author.

Thoits, P.A., & Hewitt, L.N. (2001). Volunteer work and well-being. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 42*, 115–131.

Tkach, C., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2006). How do people pursue happiness?: Relating personality, happiness-increasing strategies, and wellbeing. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 7*, 183-225.

Tobler, N. S., Roona, M. R., Ochshorn, P., Marshall, D. G., Streke, A. V., & Stackpole, K. M. (2000). School-based adolescent drug prevention programs: 1998 meta-analysis. *Journal of Primary Prevention, 20*, 275–337.

Tshering, D. (2012, May). 8 students admitted to hospital. *Kuensel*. Retrieved
http://www.kuenselonline.com/2011/?p=31796

Uchida, Y., Norasakkunkit, V. & Kitayama, S. (2004). Cultural constructions of happiness:
Theory and empirical evidence. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 5*, 223-239.

UNDP. (2011). *Human development report 2011*. Retrieved July 21, 2012 from
http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/hdr/human_developmentreport2011.
html

UNESCO. (2004). *Embracing diversity: Toolkit for creating inclusive, learning-friendly
environments*. Bangkok, Thailand: UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for
Education.

UNESCO. (2006). *Framework for the UN DESD International Implementation Scheme*. Paris:
Author.

UNESCO. (2011). Bhutan. *World Data on Education (7th ed)*. Paris: Author.

UN General Assembly. (1948). *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Retrieved March
25, 2012 from http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/

UN General Assembly. (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child*. Retrieved March 25,
2012 from http://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/crc.aspx

UNICEF. (2006). (2006).*Child-friendly Schools*. Retrieved March 2, 2012 from
http://www.unicef.org/girlseducation/files/CFS1Web.pdf

UNICEF. (2007). *Child poverty in perspective: An overview of child wellbeing in rich countries.*
Florence, Italy: Innocenti Research Centre.

UNICEF (2012). Child Friendly Schools. http://www.unicef.org/lifeskills/index_7260.html

Ura, K., Alkire, S. & Zangmo, T. (2012). Case study: Bhutan - Gross National happiness and the
GNH Index. In Helliwell, J., Layard, R. & Sachs, J. (Eds.). (2012). *World Happiness Report*.
Retrieved April 23, 2014 from http://unsdsn.org/wp-
content/uploads/2014/02/WorldHappinessReport2013_online.pdf

van de Kerk, G. & Manuel, A. (2012). *Are human wellbeing and environmental wellbeing at
collision course? The role of good governance and other factors in preventing a collision*.
Sustainable Society Foundation. Retrieved October 2, 2012 from:
http://www.ssfindex.com/cms/wp-content/uploads/pdf/Research_paper-HW-EW.pdf

Veenhoven, R. (2000). The four qualities of life: Ordering concepts and measures of the good
life. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 1,* p1-39.

Veenhoven, R. (2002). Why social policy needs subjective indicators. *Social Indicators
Research, 58*, 33-45.

Victorian Curriculum & Assessment Authority (VCAA/ 2007). *Victorian Essential Learning Standards*. Retrieved on June 7, 2012 from http://vels.vcaa.vic.edu.au/overview/strands.html#strand.

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

Weare, K. (2013). Developing mindfulness with children and young people: A review of the evidence and policy context. *Journal of Children's Services, 8* (2), 141-153.

Weare, K., & Markham, W. (2005). What do we know about promoting mental health through schools? *Promotion and Education, XII* (3-4), 118-122.

Wei, R. C., Darling-Hammond, L., Andree, A., Richardson, N., Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad*. Dallas, TX: National Staff Development Council.

Weinbaum, E.H., & Supovitz, J.A. (2010). Planning ahead: Make program implementation more predictable. *Phi Delta Kappan, 91* (7), 68-71.

Weiss, A., Bates, T. C., & Luciano, M. (2008). Happiness is a personal(ity) thing: The genetics of personality and well-being in a representative sample. *Psychological Science, 19*(3), 205-210.

Wells, J., Barlow, J. & Stewart-Brown, S. (2003). A systematic review of universal approaches to mental health promotion in schools. *Health Education, 103* (4), 197-220.

Whiston, S. C. (2007). Outcomes research on school counselling interventions and programs. In B.T. Erford (Ed.). *Transforming the school counseling profession* (pp. 38–50). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

WHO. (1997). *Promoting health through schools: Report of Expert Committee on Comprehensive School Health Education and Promotion.* Geneva: Author.

WHO. (2003). *Investing in mental health.* Geneva, World Health Organization.

WHO. (2004a). *Promoting mental health : Concepts, emerging evidence, practice : Summary report /A report from the World Health Organization, Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse in collaboration with the Victorian Health Promotion Foundation (VicHealth) and the University of Melbourne*. Author: Geneva.

WHO. (2004b). *Prevention of mental disorders: Effective interventions and policy options, Summary Report.* A report of the World Health Organization, Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse in collaboration with the Prevention Research Centre of the Universities of Nijmegen and Maastricht. Geneva: World health Organization. Retrieved on March 10, 2010 from http://www.who.int/mental_health/evidence/en/prevention_of_mental_disorders_sr.pdf

WHO (2014). School youth and health: What is a health promoting school? Retrieved November 11, 2014 from: http://www.who.int/school_youth_health/gshi/hps/en/

Wierenga, A. & Stokes, H. (2006). *The situation of Bhutanese youth 2005-2006*. Thimphu, Bhutan: Ministry of Education & Youth Development Fund.

Wilkinson, R.G. & Pickett, K. (2009). *The spirit level: Why more equal societies do almost always better?* London: Allen Lane.

Wilson, S. J. & Lipsey, M. W. (2007). School-based interventions for aggressive and disruptive behavior: Update of a meta-analysis. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 33* (2S), S130-S143.

Wilson, S.J., Lipsey, M.W. & Derzon, J.H. (2003). The effects of school-based intervention programs on aggressive behaviour: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 71*(1), 136-149.

Woolcock, M. (2001). The Place of social capital in understanding social and economic outcomes. *Canadian Journal of Policy Research, 2*(1), 11-17.

World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wyn, J. (2007). Learning to 'become somebody well': Challenges for Educational Policy. *The Australian Educational Researcher,* 34 (4), 35-52.

Wyn, J. (2009). *Youth health and welfare: The cultural politics of education and wellbeing*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Wyn, J., Cahill, H., Holdsworth, R., Rowling, L., & Carson, S. (2000). MindMatters, a whole school approach to promoting mental health and wellbeing. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 34*, 594-601.

Yang, Y. (2008). Social inequalities in happiness in the United States, 1972 to 2004: An age-period-cohort analysis. *American Sociological Review, 73,* 204-226.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods: Vol. 5.* Applied social research methods series. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yoon, K.S., Duncan, T., Lee, S.W., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K.L. (2007). Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement. *Issues & Answers Report* (REL 2007-No. 033). Washington, DC: US Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved July 15, 2014 from: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/rel_2007033.pdf

Zhang, Y., Shkolnik, J., & Fashola, O. (2005). *Evaluating the implementation of comprehensive school reform and its impact on growth in student achievement*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. Retrieved October 2011 from:

http://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/AERA2005Implementation_of_CSR-Impact_on_Student_Achievement1_0.pdf

Appendix I: Research Design

Research Question	Evidence required to answer this question	How this evidence will be gathered?
1. How are student wellbeing programmes designed? • What are the overall vision and goals for education and the place of student wellbeing in it? • How are wellbeing programmes designed and by whom? • What assumptions underlie or inform them? • What does wellbeing/ student wellbeing mean to you?	• rationales & policies • design process used • concept of wellbeing used • definition of wellbeing • theoretical discussion of ontological assumptions	• Analysis of documents • Interviews
2. How are student wellbeing programmes implemented, and what are its challenges?	• experiences of school wellbeing leaders	• Interviews
(a) Organizaton, ethos & environment • How do policies relate to implementation and the realities of school context?	• Policies • experiences of wellbeing leaders	• Analysis of policy documents • Interviews
• What guiding bodies (department, division, unit, committee, etc.) exist to steer, support, and monitor student wellbeing? • What kind of structures (governance, management, coordination, collaboration) are important for effective student wellbeing programmes? • What are common distracters that take time away from student wellbeing work?	• organogram, documentation of roles & responsibilities • experiences of wellbeing leaders • work schedules, role descriptions	• Analysis of documents • Interviews
• What is a school environment that reflects or promotes wellbeing? • What are the challenges of creating such an environment?	• views and beliefs held by well-being leaders • observations of interactions in school • research literature	• Interviews • Observations • Literature review
(b) Curriculum: teaching, learning & assessment • What entails well-being curriculum, and curricular strategies to achieve wellbeing? • What are the challenges in implementing them? • How are student wellbeing activities assessed, and used for further improvement?	• Curriculum document, manuals or guide books; co-curricular activity plans & schedules	• Analysis of curriculum and related documents • Interviews • Literature review

	• experiences of wellbeing leaders • wellbeing leader perceptions of change or improvement	
(c) Collaboration, partnerships, & communication • What role does networking and partnership with others (both within and outside the school) play in student wellbeing? • What are the challenges of establishing partnerships that promote wellbeing? • How are vision, policies, and strategies communicated between and amongst various stakeholders?	• experiences of well-being leaders • research reports • school newsletters, annual reports, websites	• Interviews • Literature review • analysis of documents
(d) Leadership and Professional development • What are some of the critical knowledge, skills, and competencies required for student wellbeing programmes to be effective? • What role does school leadership play in making student well-being programme effective?	• experiences of well-being leaders • research reports	• Interviews • Literature review
(e) Resource support • What kinds or extent of investment in resources (funding, time, materials, infrastructure, expertise, etc.) does student wellbeing programmes require to be effective?	• plan documents • experiences of wellbeing leaders • observations of resource support in school sites	• Analysis of documents • Interviews • Observations • Literature review
3. What constitutes an effective wellbeing programme? • What is would an ideal wellbeing programme look like? • How can you tell if it is working?	• views of wellbeing leaders • research reports on effective programmes	• Interviews • Literature review
4. What are the challenges and opportunities in implementing a whole-school approach to wellbeing?	• views and experiences of wellbeing leaders • research literature	• Interviews • Literature review
5. How are wellbeing programmes assessed or evaluated? • What is the fit between programme goals and school outcomes? • How are assessments used?	• school reports; research reports • perceptions of change or improvement	• Interviews • Literature review

270

Appendix II: Interview Schedule

Some of the key questions asked during the interviews are as follows:

- What does wellbeing mean to you? What does it mean to be a (school wellbeing leader) for you?
- How are/were the wellbeing programmes and activities in your school decided on? Why? What was your role?
- How would you describe your school wellbeing programme three years from now, in comparison to what it is today?
- In what ways would you say that the wellbeing programme contribute to student and school wellbeing?
- Could you describe a typical day/ week in your role?
- What does student wellbeing constitute in your school? (prompts: policies, guiding bodies, programmes & activities, partnerships)
- What are some of the challenges of implementing a wellbeing programme? (prompts: competencies, resource support, networking/ coordination)
- What are the challenges and opportunities of implementing a whole school approach to wellbeing?
- How would you say that the way your school is organized promote student wellbeing?
- What and are the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that you teach in your school that you believe directly contributes to their wellbeing? How are they taught?
- Besides yourself, who are others actively involved in promoting student wellbeing, and how do they contribute?
- How do you go about resolving any difficulties that you come across in your role? What sources of support?
- What would you say are the important qualities or characteristics to be effective wellbeing leaders?
- How can you tell if the wellbeing programme or activity is actually contributing to student wellbeing? What measures do you use in your school?
- Could you describe the (most) important lesson(s) you learned in this role?
- What advice would you give to someone who is just starting out on this role? Or starting a wellbeing programme in their school?
- Tell me about how you came to be a (school wellbeing leader)?

Appendix III: Questionnaire on Demographic Information

Kindly answer the following questions about yourself. Please be assured that the information you provide will be kept confidential.

Full Name:	
Mailing address:	
Email:	
Phone number(s): (on which researcher can contact you)	
Name of school:	
Gender:	
Age:	
Ethnicity:	
Highest academic qualification:	
Professional qualification(s):	
Student Wellbeing related professional development (include here any training, workshop, seminar, etc. attended with duration):	
Years of experience as a teacher:	
Years of experience as a student wellbeing leader (student wellbeing coordinator/ school counsellor):	
Approximate number of hours *allocated* per week on student wellbeing responsibilities:	
Approximate number of hours *spent* per week on student wellbeing responsibilities:	
Signature with date:	

Thank you!