THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Educating for well-being in Scotland

policy and philosophy, pitfalls and possibilities

Citation for published version:
Thorburn, M 2014, 'Educating for well-being in Scotland: policy and philosophy, pitfalls and possibilities', *Oxford Review of Education*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 206-222. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2014.891981

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):
10.1080/03054985.2014.891981

Link:
Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Published In:
Oxford Review of Education

Publisher Rights Statement:
This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Oxford Review of Education on 25/02/2014, available online: http://wwww.tandfonline.com/10.1080/03054985.2014.891981

General rights
Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy
The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Download date: 17. Nov. 2026

Educating for well-being in Scotland: policy and philosophy; pitfalls and possibilities

Abstract
In recent years there has been a heightened interest in educating for well-being; the belief that even when beset by economic gloom, schools can be a civilizing force for good and can help make young people's lives more fulfilling and meaningful. However, the relative lack of conceptual analysis on well-being values and how they can flourish in schools coupled with ambiguities on curriculum implementation plans have limited progress to date. The paper addresses these concerns, through analyzing recent theorizing on values which contain a focus on personal growth, relationships with others and engagement with activities of interest. In reviewing these values in relation to the 'Curriculum for Excellence' (CfE) policy context in Scotland, the paper discusses ways in which current policy and practice uncertainties could be improved by greater philosophical clarity on well-being values and by the development of pedagogical models which highlight how effective learning could take place. These improvements, if supported by key policy revisions and by commissioning practitioners to design more appropriate teaching resources, could provide the basis for greater teacher engagement with well-being agendas and the avoidance of policy stasis.

Introduction

Across the United Kingdom, a consensus has emerged in various public sector agencies and charitable organizations that well-being requires greater central government support (Ecclestone, 2012). Various policy reports e.g., Bacon and Mguni (2012) have commented on the need to address young people's low self-confidence, lack of self-esteem, weak resilience and limited aspiration to better their lives during a time when economic deficits may last for generations to come. In Scotland, the introduction of restrictive smoking legislation in 2006 and unit alcohol prices in 2012 are trying to address wider health concerns, while the need to measure people's quality of life and well-being (Scottish Executive, 2006a) based on a perceived sense of national loss of confidence (Craig, 2003) is also evident. In terms of well-being, these developments raise fresh issues about how schools should contribute to wider societal ambitions. Ecclestone (2012) considers that, to date, two connected sets of problems have limited progress; a lack of robust conceptual critique and poor evaluations of practice which often privilege easily measurable constructions of well-being. In acknowledging these problems, this paper focuses on reviewing the main conceptual questions associated with personal well-being as well as the major practical steps policy makers and practitioners need to consider if well-being is to flourish in contemporary curriculum. In order to

contextualize later discussion, the paper begins by outlining the overarching educational ambitions and well-being values which underpin CfE policy documents in Scotland.

Educating for well-being in Scotland: The development of policy

The national debate on education in 2002 reported excellent relationships between teachers and parents and pupils, and a strong commitment towards comprehensive schooling. However, in order to reflect global changes, there was a perception that curriculum aims needed review. Against this backdrop the Minister for Education and Young People established a short-life Curriculum Review Group with the aim of anticipating twenty-first century educational needs. Their report (Scottish Executive, 2004) resulted in CfE; a curriculum with a heightened emphasis on active pupil engagement and interdisciplinary and integrated learning. The report, acclaimed as 'one of the most ambitious programmes of educational change ever undertaken in Scotland' (Scottish Government, 2008, p. 1), is based on enhancing four generic learning capacities, namely, for young people to become 'successful learners', 'confident individuals', 'effective contributors' and 'responsible citizens'. CfE is further supported by an encouragement for teachers to make greater use of their professional autonomy and curriculum decision-making responsibility. Teachers are urged to share examples of their practice across the Glow intranet network; an online resource platform designed to help create communities of practice and to offer practitioners new opportunities to share and collaborate. These intended transformational developments are scheduled to take place under familiar schooling arrangements; with primary schools continuing for pupils between 5-11 years and secondary schools for pupils until 16 years old, with the majority of pupils opting to remain in full-time secondary education until 18 years old.

Prior to the launch of CfE in 2011-2012, policy attention often focused on articulating how the four capacities could be developed. A series of *Building the Curriculum* publications were issued between 2006 and 2010 with an emphasis on curriculum areas, learning and teaching and a framework for assessment (Scottish Executive, 2006b; Scottish Government, 2008; 2010). The first

of these largely confined itself to defining how learning in the CfE capacities might be realized through the familiar subject areas of language, mathematics, science, expressive arts, social studies, technologies, religious and moral education along with the new disciplinary area of health and well-being. Classroom practice examples (rather than academic references) were used to describe subject contributions and to highlight possible interdisciplinary connections (Scottish Executive, 2006b). This guidance also signposted the six areas of health and well-being which would later be specified as curriculum outcome areas (Learning and Teaching Scotland, 2009a). By this time, it was clear the enhanced dual position that health and well-being occupied through being, along with literacy and numeracy, a key responsibility of all teachers (Learning and Teaching Scotland, 2009b) plus a subject specific responsibility for some teachers.

Figure 1 shows the shared vision, common goal and main generic purposes of health and well-being (Learning and Teaching Scotland, 2009b). The eight indicators, namely: Safe, Healthy, Achieving, Nurtured, Active, Respected, Responsible and Included (SHANARRI) articulate closely with the 'Getting it Right for Every Child' (GIRFEC) ambitions, the broad equivalent of the 'Every Child Matters' programme in England and Wales. The GIRFEC documentation is supported by references in the form of: Scottish policy reports and specifications; the United Nations 1989 statement on the rights of the child and two books on child protection and vulnerable children (Scottish Government, 2012). Legislation plans are underway to ensure that Scotland's thirty-two unitary authorities speed up implementation of GIRFEC.

Enter Figure 1 close to here

In terms of teaching towards and assessing set outcomes the policy intention is that health and well-being responsibilities will reside with personal and social education, physical education and home economics teachers. The six specific areas of health and well-being identified are:

- Mental, emotional, social and physical wellbeing

- Planning for choices and changes
- Physical education, physical activity and sport
- Food and health
- Substance misuse
- Relationships, sexual health and parenthood

The links to subject areas are most immediately identifiable in the last four of the six areas listed. These first two areas are the most generic in nature and represent the newest of the challenges for all teachers in terms of supporting their school environment, promoting positive behavior and encouraging pupils to make informed choices about their well-being. Thus, a key need is for teachers to understand, conceptually and pedagogically, how developments which focus on an integrated (mental, emotional, social and physical) view of well-being and which enable pupils to plan and make coherent and informed choices can occur.

In 2012 a series of three wellbeing National Qualifications were also introduced. The highest of these (Level 5) approximates with the awards pupils complete in the middle years of secondary education (14-16 years) and which are the broad equivalent of standards defined at GCSE level in England and Wales. At Level 5 the award consists of two units: 'Exploring Wellbeing' and 'Improving Wellbeing'. These units encourage pupils to 'develop an understanding of personal wellbeing as a holistic concept, influenced by individual, social, global and environmental factors' (Scottish Qualifications Authority, 2012, p. 5). The unit descriptions consist of the following outcomes and assessment criteria (Table 1). Units can be assessed by 'any form appropriate' e.g., written records, interviews, blogs, diaries, videos, photographs (Scottish Qualifications Authority, 2012, p. 7).

Enter Table 1 close to here

Defining well-being: philosophical considerations

Historically, definitions of personal well-being centered on whether people were happy, well-paid, educated, married and religious (Wilson, 1967). By the turn of the twenty-first century, details were becoming more nuanced. Diener et al. (1999, p.295) conclude that well-being is characterized by someone who has 'a positive temperament, tends to look on the bright side of things, and does not ruminate excessively about bad events … has social confidants, and possesses adequate resources for making progress towards valued goals.' More recently Tiberius (2008), concerned by the relatively modest reasoning powers of people and the weakness many have in developing the reflective skills necessary to evaluate how well their lives are faring, has teased out further the traits which underpin personal well-being. Tiberius (2008) considers four virtues are necessary for human flourishing, namely: attention flexibility, perspective, self-awareness and optimism. Attention flexibility helps you balance being reflective with periods when you are less reflective. This is necessary in order to discover your passions in life and to learn from experiences which capture your initial interest. Perspective helps you review your future plans in a measured way. As such, perspective can help refocus your thoughts, feelings and actions in line with your overall values. Moderate self-awareness enables you to make decisions which fit in with your interests, abilities and values. This helps ensure that you avoid unhelpful self-absorption and wasteful over-analysis. Realistic optimism enables you to live a life which is better from your point of view, but also one which is able to appreciate the moral benefits of being good to others and of seeing the potential for goodness in human nature. Tiberius (2008) considers that these four virtues should be used to cultivate helpful reflective habits. Overall, the version of well-being being developed is one which includes more than living by instinct but which nevertheless is not constrained by dwelling on matters unnecessarily. It adopts a middle path along which there is a need to balance achievable norms in areas such as personal growth, relations with others as well as recognizing the importance of being absorbed in experiences which fully engage with our interests, skills and capacities.

To the sides of the middle path sketched are more subjective and objective theories of well-being. The main challenge for subjective theories of well-being is to indicate how self-beliefs can provide an account of values and worthwhileness which moves beyond satisfying individual needs and preferences, where the person is considered as the final authority on their well-being (Sumner, 1996). In educational contexts, such a version of well-being might lack a sufficient engagement with learning experiences and critical reflection. By contrast, the main issue with more instrumental theories is how to ensure that there is coherence between a person's internal values and those they aspire towards or which are set for them as objectives. If objectives are perceived as a list against which measurements of well-being can be made, there is the risk of a superficial regard for reflection and review. These contrasting versions of well-being are an early indicator of the challenge educators face unless there is clarity and detail about the version of well-being being advanced.

Even though the account of reflective wisdom by Tiberius (2008) is not written with school education specifically in mind, White (2011, p.147) considers that Tiberius provides 'a good account of the virtues of reflectiveness, perspective and self-knowledge', and his own elaboration on well-being is mostly based on similar virtues. For example, White's (2011. p.135) outlines the need for the 'whole-heartedness of engagement in valuable pursuits' in ways which articulate with Tiberius's notion of attention flexibility. Gaining a sense of perspective links with White's (2011) view that in our increasingly consumerist western society 'temperance' is required, as is the ability to say 'no' and to regulate your life in self-aware ways. White (2011, p.133) also talks of the need for dispositions to be 'held together in some form of unity' and that a balance needs to be struck between 'getting so caught up in our pursuits that we do not stop to think things over when thinking is necessary; and on the other, losing ourselves in over-reflectiveness'(p.133). Such sentiments link with Tiberius's views on the importance of self-awareness. In ways which connect with Tiberius's (2008) notion of realistic optimism, White (2011, p.61) outlines the need to avoid being held back

by a ‘generally anxious disposition’ and to ‘encourage citizens to adopt a conception of their own well-being that brings maximal overlap with others’ (p. 115).

Despite the general consensus between Tiberius (2008) and White (2011), settling on a permanent set of values is not necessarily intended or desirable. Values differ within cultures and change due to societal influences. Furthermore, small differences in values are important to consider when taking curriculum thinking forward. White, for example, is keener to recognize personal qualities such as courage, relative to Tiberius. These differences can matter, as there is the potential for a bifurcation between psychologically-driven emotional definitions of well-being with their reliance on dispositions such as resilience and determination and more cognitive-informed definitions which emphasize more the importance of reflecting critically on happiness, relationships and needs (Clack, 2012). A bias towards emotional definitions of well-being could manifest itself in curriculum attempts to diagnose, train and regulate feelings, and to manage some pupils’ behavioural excesses better. Adherence to this line of thought could result in well-being becoming viewed more as a skills-based curriculum supplement for some pupils rather than as a central curriculum entitlement for all pupils. Ecclestone and Hayes (2009) are critical of some of the more assertive claims which are often made for emotional definitions of well-being as they lack the supporting evidence required. Similarly, Myers (2012, p. 421) calls for the complexities of childhood to be understood better as a consequence of ‘a more critical and reflexive debate, and one (which is) informed by a sophisticated sense of social change and a deeper understanding of children’s agency, than is evident in the current debate around the crises of childhood.’ These contributions serve to highlight the ongoing need to review specific curriculum construction and conceptions of professionalism concerns long after generic policy aspirations have been set out.

For the present however the CfE policy context is one where cultivating well-being values through greater integrated learning is to be a feature of mainstream curriculum. Such an approach is

consistent with how greater devolved governmental responsibility for education has been handled in Scotland since 1999; as evident by the on-going attention there has been towards core skills competencies being embedded in subject-based curriculum awards. In this respect, policy in Scotland is coherent with the descriptive typology utilized by Ecclestone and Hayes (2009) which highlights how there is a strand of well-being advocacy which sees connection building possibilities with other whole-school curriculum interventions such as 'learning to learn' and 'assessment is for learning' programmes; all of which aim to make education more personalized and meaningful for pupils. Such a policy perspective also appears consistent with the 'middle path' values outlined earlier.

However, despite growing signs of policy and philosophy coherence on values and well-being leading thinkers in the field view matters differently when reviewing the extent of changes to curriculum and schooling required. White (2011, p. 3) considers that if we really wish to take well-being seriously, there are many fundamental ways in which schools might need to change e.g., with regard to: the greater involvement of parents; a reduction in the privileging of a knowledge driven curriculum; improving conventional assessment arrangements and trying to sort out the 'conceptual fog on the links between moral goodness and personal flourishing.' By contrast, others such as Cigman (2012) highlight the importance subject mastery plays in improving pupils' confidence. Her concern is that those advocating an enhancement agenda for well-being (such as White) should not be over-privileged in curriculum decision-making relative to those highlighting the importance of subject knowledge. As such, subjects should not be 'consigned to the curriculum scrap heap' if they fail to pass some form of well-being test (Cigman, 2012, p.449). Humes (2011, p. 10) in a Scottish context, endorses these sentiments and advises that pedagogically the 'most effective contribution teachers can make to the welfare and development of their pupils might be to impart as much competence as possible in their own area of specialism'. Noting the retention of subject areas in curriculum policies (Scottish Executive, 2006b) and the continuation of existing age and stage

schooling arrangements suggests that the promotion of well-being is likely to continue to be considered as part of the revised general recommendations on educational values, curriculum and pedagogy, rather than as a contributor to arguments outlining the need for more radical changes in education and schooling.

Developments in Scotland are both similar and different to those in England. They are similar in that the dispositional development of qualities, skills and attitudes covers comparable areas of well-being such as: choice; relationships; health; safety and managing risks. However, as personal well-being is a non-statutory part of the English curriculum it lacks the elevated status it possesses in Scotland. The situation is also different with regard to 'Citizenship' which is statutory part of the National Curriculum in England and which pursues an understanding of: Democracy and Justice; Rights and Responsibilities and Identities and Diversity. By contrast, in Scotland, 'Education for Citizenship' is one of a number of less specific themes of learning which are designed to permeate the overall CfE curriculum. Ecclestone (2013) considers in her discussions of both countries that the general privileging of dispositions (as in the Scottish context) can seek to undermine the importance of subject knowledge and alter the ways in which teachers interpret reforms and relate to pupils. Biesta (2013, p. 115) is also concerned that the personal emphasis in becoming a responsible citizen depoliticizes citizenship and makes it more difficult for pupils to explicitly focus 'on the democratic ideal of a common life informed by the values of equality, justice and freedom.'

Educating for well-being in Scotland: pitfalls and possibilities

The development of health and well-being in Scotland has, so far, not been to the satisfaction of all. In particular, the dual functioning of health and well-being being a pedagogical responsibility for all teachers but an additional teaching and assessment priority for some teachers has perplexed some. MacLaren (2008, p. 412) is highly critical of the marginalizing of personal and social education through placing it predominantly under the health and well-being subject umbrella, rather than

casting it as a more distinct holistic and integrated contributor to curriculum; a situation which he considers represents 'more black hole rather than blue-sky thinking on the part of government.' Gillies (2006) is unsurprised that these types of concerns have occurred, as the aims and values informing CfE were not sufficiently consulted on as part of the policy process. Endorsing this view, Humes (2013, p. 8) considers that there 'is no extended philosophical justification for the particular values which are highlighted: they are asserted rather than argued for.' Furthermore, the new style of policy reporting is characterized more by general aspiration than by detailed elaboration on implementation specifics. For example, the outlines provided in the new National Qualifications in well-being only take up a few hundred words (Scottish Qualifications Authority, 2012). As such, there has been some difficulty in connecting wider societal ambitions with more rationalist informed issues about what counts as subject knowledge (and the relative importance assigned to it), and of how integrated learning and teaching might take place. Priestley and Humes (2010) in reviewing whether CfE really is an ambitious, progressive and transformative programme of education reform, conclude that it is not; as fundamentally it is a mastery curriculum where vague definitions of content have been framed as objectives and learning outcomes. The authors express concern that lack of subject content clarity and the retention of curriculum areas will lead to the status quo. Priestley (2011) considers that CfE is representative of a style of policy making which is common across the Anglophone world where neo-liberalist interests continue to be pursued under a progressive education guise. Furthermore, teachers through manipulating existing practices to fit new arrangements, rather than engaging in a more thorough review of pedagogy and practice, can end up acquiescing with this charade.

Despite the risk of resultant innovation without change, evaluations of teachers' beliefs report that most teachers endorse the broad aspirations informing CfE. Furthermore, practice data has reported on 'greater levels of experimentation, more active and collaborative lessons, more open and exploratory styles of learning, and a general move away from traditional, content-driven forms of

teaching' (Priestley and Minty, 2012, p. 2). With regard to the specific challenges involved in promoting greater integrated learning in schools, Priestley and Minty (2012, p. 4) found that some teachers who were 'involved in developing interdisciplinary learning were highly positive about it' while at the same time noting that lack of clarity on curriculum guidance was a major barrier in preventing other teachers in experimenting with new pedagogical approaches. In these circumstances, building the curriculum around brief examples of classroom practice (Scottish Executive, 2006b) was always likely to be a problematic strategy, especially when no supporting references on educational values, curriculum content and pedagogy were provided. Consequently, the thinking which informs well-being often appears rather opaque with complex sentences difficult to fathom e.g., 'personalisation, critical thinking, active learning and the development of practical and performance skills and practical abilities should be features of the learning and teaching in health and wellbeing programmes' (Scottish Executive, 2006b, p. 10). Furthermore, reviewing the outcomes statements, adds to the complexity of the task, as the four aspects of well-being have been largely separated out 'for practical purposes' (Learning and Teaching Scotland, 2009a, p. 1). Not only does this make it more difficult to gain an integrated and holistic view of well-being, but the eight statements advanced for mental and emotional well-being are identical across the entire five levels which describe learning between 3 to 15 years. The same applies to the six statements on social well-being and the four on physical well-being. As such, the progression which is evident in other subject areas is missing for health and well-being. Matters are made even more problematic through the advised personalized nature of learning being used as a device for describing outcome statements. Thus, in order to avoid making achievements relative to other pupils these are written in a first person and rather vague process-informed manner where subject knowledge is not clearly specified. For example, teachers are expected to create learning environments which support outcome statements such as:

- I am learning skills and strategies which will support me in challenging times, particularly in relation to change and loss (mental and emotional well-being)
- I value the opportunities I am given to make friends and be part of a group in a range of situations (social well-being)
- I know and can demonstrate how to travel safely (physical well-being).

The sum of these pitfalls supports Eccelestone's (2012) concern that more detailed conceptual and pedagogical insights into how teachers can engage with the intricacies of curriculum change are needed if pupils' learning experiences in well-being are to be of sufficiently high quality to be worthwhile. Accordingly, the following review of CfE possibilities is informed by recent theorizing on well-being values allied to highlighting how a new holistic model for learning and teaching might help outline more coherently how improvements could take place. Progress in this way could help overtake Priestley's (2011) concerns over CfE policy stasis and Priestley and Minty's (2012) findings that for some teachers alleviating concerns on subject knowledge is needed as well as greater clarity being provided on how integrated well-being could be conceived and taught.

In making values decisions, there seems good grounds for taking forward the four traits which underpin Tiberius's (2008, p. 201) account of reflective wisdom, as 'developing good habits, learning from experience, and making good choices' are key to evaluating whether lives are being lived wisely. There is also a broad consensus between Tiberius and White's (2011) definition of well-being values, plus Cigman (2012) also includes perspective and optimism in her view of well-being. Furthermore, her notion of mastery links to pursing interests and with the rather cumbersome term 'attention flexibility' Tiberius (2008) uses to describe activities which capture your curiosity. For this reason 'interest' suggests itself as a more appropriate term to build a framework of well-being around along with perspective, self-awareness and optimism.

Figure 2 provides a model-based description of how a holistic model of learning and teaching could be taken forward. It builds on Thorburn and Horrell's (2012) recommendation that there is a need to identify more clearly those areas of CfE where teachers are active curriculum decision-makers rather than passive receivers of policy. This is evident by the teachers' active areas of CfE responsibility being highlighted in the central area of the elliptical oval under the productive pedagogies headings of intellectual, connected, supportive and valuing difference. The idea of using productive pedagogies to observe and explore teaching practices that can benefit the subject knowledge and social outcomes of all pupils emerged from the Queensland School Reform Longitudinal Study (QSRLS) (Lingard et al., 2001). The study highlighted that the key determinant of high quality learning experiences were the pedagogical practices of teachers. The QSRLS and numerous associated studies have sought to outline, in detail, the type of craft improvements that enhance pupil learning (Lingard et al., 2003; Hayes, et al., 2006). The imperatives of productive pedagogies are consistent with the aspirations of CfE, where there is an expectation that teaching will be: engaging and active; set challenging goals; contain shared expectations; be both personal and collaborative and reflect the different ways learners progress (Scottish Government, 2008). Briefly, the intellectual quality dimension of the productive pedagogies model emphasises the importance of all pupils having access to experiences which engage them intellectually. This will challenge pupils on open-ended creative tasks and conversations, and avoid over-repetition in a misguided attempt to achieve attainment outcomes. Connectedness links with the Deweyian notion of making learning relevant. This can be achieved by taking note of pupil's background, past experiences and existing knowledge, and of integrating knowledge across subject boundaries when designing problem solving tasks. Supportive learning environments highlight the need for pupils to be active co-constructors in making decisions about the future direction of their learning. These ambitions can be enhanced by there being: mutual respect between teachers and pupils; explicit criteria for tasks and by codes of behaviour being implicitly understood by all rather than explicitly

stated. Valuing difference highlights the need for learning environments to recognise cultural variances as part of being, in effect, a responsible citizen (Hayes et al., 2006).

The intention with Figure 2 is that its explicit focus on pedagogy can connect with CfE policy statements on well-being where there is an expectation that well-being is a responsibility of all teachers and a demonstrable feature of lesson planning. Thus, framed, pupils' cycles of experience and review can be designed around well-thought through integrated learning tasks that are informed by both subject knowledge and reflective values, and which can link with formative reviews of learning activities. On-going reviews should help inform teachers' decision making about the effectiveness of learning tasks set and of how these might be adapted in the future. The tilting of the elliptical oval also aims to show how progression is intended as cycles of integrated learning aim to build on pupils' previous learning experiences. Thus, while the key features of pupils' active learning and teachers' decision-making remain the same, subject knowledge complexity can be added as levels of learning increase, and as success criteria increase in-line with progression levels. In this way, connected and step-by-step cycles of integrated experiences can be reflected and reviewed as part of realising wider CfE and SHANARRI ambitions. Furthermore, by retaining distinct subject and well-being contributions to learning contexts, there is less likelihood of the dispositions associated with well-being becoming over-privileged in curriculum planning relative to subject knowledge imperatives, or alternately of the contribution of well-being becoming unduly indistinct and marginalised. Properly developed experiences should therefore challenge pupils, as they would require both cognitive resources to help construct coherent meanings and to reflect critically, plus an emotional engagement with learning tasks. In short, the aim would be for pupils to cultivate informed and stable values which were 'both personally significant and based on relevant information' (White, 2011, p. 50), and which enable the skills of well-being to be taught in combination with the skills of achievement (Seligman et al. 2009).

Enter Figure 2 close to here

In putting CfE related ideas for learning into action, Priestley et al. (2011, p. 268) consider that sustaining curriculum change is most likely to be highly dependent upon 'a mixture of top-down and bottom-up approaches to the management of change, involving coherent policy, good leadership and the situated expertise of practitioners.' Adopting a top-down approach appears rather contrary to the aspirations of CfE given the decade of endorsement there has been for promoting a model of curriculum design which makes a virtue of teachers' autonomy and their active input into curriculum decision-making. In terms of adopting bottom-up approaches, Kelly (2013) cites mixed fortunes in the exchanging of ideas and materials. He reports that insufficient numbers of teachers use the Glow network for it to work effectively and that established online discussion forums often tend to be quite negative meeting places. More encouragingly, Kelly (2013) reports that newer social media outlets have become a positive meeting forum for some teachers to learn from each other and for exploring ideas in depth. The more favoured method over recent decades has been to use the situated expertise of practitioners as development officer or staff tutors. This has typically involved seconding teachers from their normal teaching positions to fulfil remits at local authority and national level. Humes (2008, p. 78) argues that this long established practice places teachers in an awkward position as they attempt to satisfy two different audiences, namely 'policy makers at a national level who expect them to drive the changes forward, and teachers at local level, who expect them to understand pressures and constraints.' Furthermore, the erosion in subject-based development support at local authority level, as education advisers have increasingly taken on a greater quality assurance and school inspection roles (Cameron, 2008) continues to be reflected in secondary teachers CfE unease over resource support, excessive workload and rushed timescales (Educational Institute of Scotland, 2013).

These circumstances present a challenging practical backdrop against which to consider how the new imperatives for greater integrated learning in health and well-being can become a more active

responsibility of all teachers. These allied with the 'limited extent to which CfE has been informed by insights from research' (Humes, 2013, p. 11) makes achieving the professional aspiration of CfE being 'predicated on a model of sustained change which sees schools and teachers as co-constructors of the curriculum' (Scottish Government, 2011, p. 4) difficult to realise. However, given Humes (2013, p. 13) assessment that serious criticisms of CfE has mostly taken 'the form of grass-roots concerns about readiness rather than an ideological challenge directed at the underlying principles' is reflected in Priestley and Minty's (2012) empirical evidence of teacher enthusiasm for greater interdisciplinary learning, there seems merit in utilising the expertise of commissioned teachers to construct and share exemplar materials which are informed by models such as the holistic model of learning and teaching described earlier (Figure 2). This middle path (relative to top-down and bottom-up approaches for improving the learning, teaching and assessment of well-being) could have the potential to aid teachers' engagement with the change process; something which in a CfE context, Menter and Hulme (2013) consider critical to success as well as strengthening the research-informing-practice basis of CfE. Progress in these ways could also help address key pressure points in CfE e.g., during the middle and upper years of secondary schooling where there are concerns over subject knowledge and the assessment requirements of new national qualifications (Educational Institute of Scotland, 2013).

In relation to the points made by Priestley et al. (2011), regarding coherent policy and good leadership, the task of commissioned teachers in producing better quality and more appropriate exemplar materials would be made considerably easier if certain points of current policy detail were revised. Key to achieving change would be that future:

- statements about well-being (mental, emotional, social and physical) are integrated together and elaborated on in greater detail (and not separated out for practical purposes as they currently are);

- a series of revised and progressive outcome statements on well-being are produced (and not reproduced verbatim across levels as they currently are);
- process (skills) and cognitive (understanding) goals are integrated together within units of work (and not separated out as in existing National Qualifications);
- descriptions of values articulate clearly with societal goals (i.e., references are provided which acknowledge and discuss contrasting views of wellbeing).

Making these changes would also help address the concern expressed by Souter at al. (2012, p. 133) that 'today's accountability culture may influence educators to rely upon more traditional, objectively-based metric of student wellbeing' rather than craft more sensitized measures which are more deeply connected with the lives of pupils, and which are informed by progressive cycles of experience and review (Figure 2). A similar process of adaptation is required for the new national qualification awards (Table 1), as it is simply not credible to mention in the 'Exploring Wellbeing' unit outline that 'differing views of mental, emotional, social and physical health and wellbeing will be considered and compared' without outlining what these differing views might be underpinned by (Scottish Qualifications Authority, 2012, p. 1).

Conclusion

The central argument advanced in the paper is that the policy prominence for well-being in Scotland may not be matched by improved and sustained changes in practice in schools unless educational ambitions are better supported. Greater philosophical clarity, model-based explanations about how well-being might be planned and pedagogically enacted and the development of more appropriate support materials are required. The current ill-fitting arrangements for assessing well-being should not distract teachers from critically engaging with reviews of how well-being can be incorporated into their learning and teaching plans. Priestley and Minty's (2012) evidence that many teachers are enthused by the prospect of greater integrated and interdisciplinary learning, especially when

supported by more detailed and informed curriculum guidance, should encourage policy makers to commission the development of improved resources. The holistic model of learning and teaching offered in the paper is intended as a contributor to such guidance. The model outlines how teachers through focusing on productive pedagogies can connect progressive cycles of subject knowledge and well-being planning with pedagogical tasks and ongoing review. The model aims to make full use of teachers' enhanced decision-making responsibility to design and construct more integrated learning opportunities for pupils. Developments of this type could help overtake the potential problems of curriculum stasis, where teachers tick boxes to declare that integration of well-being in lessons has happened but where more tangible evidence of change is difficult to detect. These developments might also play a constructive part in helping policy makers and teachers to engage with future research-informed well-being agendas.

References

Bacon, N and Mguni, N. (2012). *The wellbeing and resilience paradox.* London, The Young Foundation.

Biesta, G. (2013). 'Responsible Citizens: Citizenship Education between Social Inclusion and Democratic Politics' in: M. Priestley & G. Biesta (Eds) *Reinventing the Curriculum: New Trends in Curriculum Policy and Practice.* Bloomsbury, London, 99-115.

Cameron, A. (2008). 'Educational Development Services' in: T.G.K. Bryce & W.H. Humes (Eds) *Scottish Education.* Edinburgh, University of Edinburgh Press, 162-172.

Cigman, R. (2012). We need to talk about well-being, *Research Papers in Education,* 27, 449-462.

Clack. B. (2012). What difference does it make? Philosophical perspectives on the nature of well-being and the role of educational practice, *Research Papers in Education,* 27, 497-512.

Craig, C. (2003). *The Scots' Crisis of Confidence*, Glasgow: Big Thinking.

Diener, E., Suh Eunkook, M., Lucas, R.E. & Smith, H.L. (1999). Subjective Well-Being: Three Decades of Progress, *Psychological Bulletin,* 125, 276-302.

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

Ecclestone, K. (2012). Emotional well-being in education policy and practice: the need for interdisciplinary perspectives and a sociological imagination, *Research Papers in*

Education, 27, 383-387.

Ecclestone, K. (2013). 'Confident Individuals: The Implications of an 'Emotional Subject for Curriculum Priorities and Practices' in: M. Priestley & G. Biesta (Eds) *Reinventing the Curriculum: New Trends in Curriculum Policy and Practice.* Bloomsbury, London, 75-97.

Educational Institute of Scotland (2013). Final results of national CfE survey confirm Teachers' concerns. Available online at: http://www.eis.org.uk/CfE/CfE_survey_Final_results.htm (accessed 26 July 2013).

Gillies, D. (2006). A Curriculum for Excellence: a question of values. *Scottish Educational Review*, 38, 25-36.

Hayes, D., Mills, M., Christie, P. & Lingard, B. (2006). *Teachers & Schooling Making a Difference: Productive Pedagogies, Assessment and Performance,* Crow's Nest, NSW: Allen & Unwin.

Humes, W. (1999). 'Policy Making in Scottish Education' in: T.G.K. Bryce & W.H. Humes (Eds) *Scottish Education.* Edinburgh, University of Edinburgh Press, 73-82.

Humes, W. (2003). 'Policy Making in Scottish Education' in: T.G.K. Bryce & W.H. Humes (Eds) *Scottish Education.* Edinburgh, University of Edinburgh Press, 74-85.

Humes, W. (2008). 'Policy Making in Scottish Education' in: T.G.K. Bryce & W.H. Humes (Eds) *Scottish Education.* Edinburgh, University of Edinburgh Press, 69-79.

Humes, W. (2011). Creativity and Wellbeing: Possibilities, Tensions and Personal Journeys. Available online at: http://194.81.189.19/ojs/index.php/TEAN/article/viewFile/69/125 (accessed 25 July 2013).

Humes, W. (2013). 'The Origins and Development of Curriculum for Excellence: Discourse, Politics and Control' in: M. Priestley & G. Biesta (Eds) *Reinventing the Curriculum: New Trends in Curriculum Policy and Practice.* Bloomsbury, London, 13-34.

Kelly, F. (2013). Online communities are transforming professional development for teachers. Available online at: http://www.guardian.co.uk/teacher-network/teacher-blog/2013/feb/07/online-communities-transforming-professional-development-teaching (accessed 18 March 2013).

Learning and Teaching Scotland (2009a) Health and wellbeing Outcomes. Available online at: http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/curriculumforexcellence/healthandwellbeing/index.asp (accessed 7 February 2013).

Learning and Teaching Scotland (2009b) Health and wellbeing across learning: principles and practice. Available online at: http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/Images/hwb_across_learning_principles_practice_tcm4-540402.pdf (accessed 7 March 2013).

Lingard, B., Ladwig, J., Mills, M., Bahr, M., Chant, D., Warry, M., Ailwood, J., Capeness, R., Christie, P., Gore, J., Hayes, D. & Luke, A. (2001). *The Queensland School Reform Longistudinal Study*. Brisbane: Education Queensland.

Lingard, B., Hayes, D. & Mills, M. (2003). Teachers and productive pedagogies: Contextualising, conceptualising, utilising. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society,* 11, 397-422.

McLaren, D.J. (2008). Pupil Support and PSE in the Secondary School, in: T.G.K. Bryce & W.H. Humes (Eds) *Scottish Education,* Edinburgh, University of Edinburgh Press, 402-422.

Menter, I. & Hulme, M. (2013). 'Developing the Teacher – or Not?' in: M. Priestley & G. Biesta (Eds) *Reinventing the Curriculum: New Trends in Curriculum Policy and Practice.* Bloomsbury, London, 165-186.

Myers, K. (2012). Marking time: some methodological and historical perspectives of the 'crises of childhood', *Research Papers in Education,* 27, 409-422.

Priestley, M. & Humes, W. (2010) The development of Scotland's Curriculum for Excellence: amnesia and déjà vu, *Oxford Review of Education,* 36, 345-361.

Priestley, M. (2011) Whatever happened to curriculum theory? Critical realism and curriculum change, *Pedagogy, Culture & Society,* 19, 221-237.

Priestley, M., Miller, K., Barrett, L. & Wallace, C. (2011). Teacher learning communities and educational change in Scotland: the Highland experience, *British Educational Research Journal*, 37, 265-284.

Priestley, M. & Minty, S. (2012) *Developing Curriculum for Excellence. Summary of findings from research undertaken in a Scottish local authority*, University of Stirling. Available online at: http://www.ioe.stir.ac.uk/research/projects/documents/StirlingCfEresearch-report_March2012.pdf

Scottish Executive. (2004). *A Curriculum for Excellence: the curriculum review group.* Edinburgh, Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive. (2006a) *Quality of Life and Wellbeing: Measuring the benefits of Culture and Sport*. Edinburgh, Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive. (2006b) *Building the Curriculum 1: the contribution of curricular areas.* Edinburgh, Scottish Executive.

Scottish Government. (2008) *Building the Curriculum 3: A Framework for Learning and Teaching.* Edinburgh, Scottish Government.

Scottish Government. (2010) *Building the Curriculum 5: A Framework for Assessment Reporting.* Edinburgh, Scottish Government.

Scottish Government. (2011). *Teaching Scotland's Future: Report of a review of teacher education in Scotland.* Edinburgh, Scottish Government.

Scottish Government. (2012). *Getting it right for every child.* Available online at: http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/0041/00411151.pdf

Scottish Qualifications Authority. (2012). *Specification for Wellbeing Award (SCQF level 3-5).* Available online at: http://www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/files_ccc/CfE_AwardSpec_L3toL5_Wellbeing.pdf

Seligman, M., Ernst, R., Gilham, J., Reivich, K., and Linkins, M. (2009). Positive education:

Positive psychology and classroom interventions, *Oxford Review of Education,* 35, 293-311.

Soutter, A.K., O'Steen, B. & Gilmore, A. (2012). Wellbeing in the New Zealand Curriculum, *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* 44, 111-142.

Sumner, L.W. (1996). *Welfare, Happiness and Ethics.* Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Thorburn, M. and Horrell, A. (2012). Grand Designs! Analysing the conceptual tensions associated with new physical education and health and wellbeing curriculum, *Sport, Education and Society.* Available online at: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13573322.2012.692670 (accessed 4 March, 2013).

Tiberius, V. (2008) *The Reflective Life: Living wisely with our limits.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

White, J. (2011). *Exploring Well-Being in Schools.* London, Routledge.

Wilson, W. (1967). Correlates of avowed happiness, *Psychological Bulletin,* 67, 294-306.