

Monitoring and Promoting Well-Being in Education

Principles and possible approaches to child well-being indicators

Working Paper
Education for Well-Being Europe Consortium
July 2009

Scherto Gill,
Guerrand-Hermès Foundation for Peace

Introduction

As we have explored in our conceptual framework, well-being of the child is inherently about being and becoming human, realising one's potential and living a flourishing life. Well-being is achieved through engaging in relationships with self, and other, and through the interaction with the environments where the child finds him or herself. These give rise to meaning and enable a person to aspire for living a good life with and for others (Dubois, 2009).

Within the conceptual foundation of the four domains of well-being definition – (1) well-being as realising the rights of the child; (2) well-being as flourishing; (3) well-being as the multi-dimensional experience of the whole child; (4) well-being as the primary aim of education, the vision of 'Education for Well-Being' suggests a number of principles that are important in characterising the approaches to monitoring and developing child's well-being within diverse educational and learning environments.

In this paper, I briefly examine the existing approach to child well-being indicators and point out the importance of involving the child in understanding their well-being and integrating the child's own perception in monitoring well-being and identifying change. Then I move on to put forward a set of methodological principles derived from our conception of well-being as a basis for developing indicators. Lastly, I make some concrete methodological suggestions in terms of how we might approach to the development of well-being indicators.

A: Child well-being indicators – some existing approaches

Ben-Arieh & Frønes (2007) point out that to improve the child's experience of life, it is of growing importance to measure and monitor their well-being. For the last thirty years, measuring the child's well-being has been done through the use of indicators. The authors maintain that

Identifying relevant indicators, procedures, and guidelines will therefore enable us not only to measure the well-being of children more effectively, but also to move the implementation and evaluation of policies into a more central role in of the development of indicators (p. 2).

Lippman (2005) proposes that the field of child well-being indicators has its origin in the use of social indicators. According to Moore et al (2003), (social) indicators are statistical

markers which are used to identify patterns and trends over time. They serve broadly five purposes: describing, monitoring, setting goals, increasing accountability, and 'reflective practice'. Fattore et al (2006) identified four dominant but not mutually exclusive applications of child indicator research, including (1) quality of life approach; (2) domain approach; (3) developmental health and well-being approaches; (4) 'state of the child' reports¹.

Fattore et al (2006) go on to critique that the dominant approaches are essentially positivist models to research knowledge. They are often measuring the child's development against linear paths of growth detached from the influences from socio-cultural, political and economic factors. The dominant models' focus on the problems of 'ill-beings' and the measurement of the child's well-being against 'successful attainment of developmental milestones' (p. 9). Thus '(s)tandard measures on educational achievement, for instance, tell us little about children's own perceptions about the quality of their education or the processes by which they learn' (ibid.). The conventional measurements are often limited to formal service systems such as schools, or social care institutions, and so on, ignoring the actual social life of the child outside of formal institutions. Once again the measurements focus the lenses more often on 'ill-beings' for the convenience of target settings and maintaining policy regime.

Critics of conventional measurement also point out that the over emphasis on changing and improving external factors does not necessarily lead to the child's subjective well-being. In fact, there has been considerable research demonstrating that having one's physical and material needs satisfied beyond a certain basic level does not necessarily increase the levels of reported happiness or life satisfaction (Marks, et al., 2004). This has been shown repeatedly through indices of GNP increasing with no corresponding improvement in life satisfaction. However, this by no means to suggest that measuring the provision of basic entitlement is unnecessary. Thus Camfield et al. (2009) state that '(w)hile ultimately there is no guarantee that provision of basic entitlements will result in subjective well-being, these can for the most part be seen as a pre-requisite' (p. 97).

Fattore et al. (2006) further assert that measuring well-being through the positivist quantifiable (external) variables undermines the fact that well-being is culturally and socially contingent, and are 'prone to change and redefinition over time' (p. 11). Furthermore, there lies a fundamental difference in the meanings that the adult and the child attribute to the concept well-being and amongst children from diverse backgrounds, including social class, cultural, economic, gender, age, and more.

An alternative proposal for monitoring the child's well-being may be discussed in light of the non-positivist and interpretive/social-constructivist approach to epistemology (Fattore et al. 2006, Crivello, et al., 2009). Because well-being is a complex holistic concept with multiple layers of meaning and contexts involved, a mixed-method approach is often favoured to allow individual perceptions and meanings to unfold with regard to a person's multi-faceted life. It focuses on the research participants as social actors and understanding of their lives must start from their own perspectives and how they make sense of their lived experience, and what interpretation and meaning they bring to their experience (see Cohen et al, 2005; Denzin & Lincoln, 1998; Hitchcock & Hughes, 1998). In addition, research process is also a

¹ For more information on the overall trends of child well-being indicator research and development over time, please refer to Lippman (2005); Camfield, et al (2009), and Ben-Arieh, et al. (2001).

site for collaborative meaning-making where the researcher and the participants cooperate in interpreting and making sense of the social worlds where we are all a part. In this way, the child will be the co-constructor of knowledge and meaning and partners in shaping the world around them and their experience within the world.

Camfield *et al* (2009, p. 95) assert that the binary of subject meanings vs social indicators ‘reproduces the qual-quant distinction’ and ‘is not accurate’, since both types of research use qualitative and quantitative data. Furthermore, the combination of child’s voice and (social) indicators can ‘increase our understanding of the subjective aspects of children’s experiences’ (*ibid.*). Indeed, Fattore *et al* (2006) identified a fifth approach to well-being indicators: participatory and child-focused approach (Hood, 2005; Camfield *et al.*, 2009) which has begun to be applied since 2000s. The child-focused approach examines the child’s well-being from a ‘beyond survival’ perspective to include the child’s development, protection, provision and above all, participation.

Ben-Arieh *et al.* (2001) also identified three shifts in the focus of child well-being indicators: (1) from survival towards well-being, (2) from negative indicators to positive indicators, and (3) from focusing on adulthood and measuring the child’s potential as an adult, to focusing on childhood as a period of human life. The authors assert that children ought to be involved in the effort of measuring and monitoring their well-being, and it is important to place indicators alongside the child’s own perceptions and experiences. Child-focused indicators differ from other social and psychosocial indicators in two ways: it allows the real focus to be centred on the child as the unit of observation and analysis. At the same time, it draws on all contextual factors, such as significant others, relationships, environments, participation, risks, and relevant services and policies to be examined in relation to the child (Hood, 2007). Crivello, *et al.* (2009) maintain that child-focused research ‘positions children at the centre around which key research questions, descriptions, interpretations and analyses are made’ (p.52). It recognises the child as a competent social actor and an expert in their own life.

There has been important work being done by many researchers and organisations on developing definitions and indicators of child well-being. These include for example the childhood poverty research (eg. the recent EU index of child poverty, the ESRC Wellbeing in Developing Countries www.wedev.org.uk; the Young Lives project www.younglives.org.uk; or and the development of social indicators (eg. the UNICEF Innocenti publications www.unicef-icr.org; the International Society of Child Indicators www.childindicators.org, and so forth). These organisations have used the conventional positivist approaches to objective-measure of index and indicators, as well as more participatory and in-depth qualitative investigation, and the combination of both.

Most of the mainstream research into the child’s well-being has also identified the significant role of education in promoting well-being and they shed light on the principles we are proposing below, which in turn attempt to build upon the strengths of these well-established approaches such as respecting the child as a social agent, integrating objective and subjective measures, regarding the child as a unit of observation and analysis with all significant others, relationships, contexts and environments being examined in relation to the child, including broader social factors in the analysis such as children and youth subcultures, socio-cultural values and religious beliefs, community participation, personal resourcefulness and resilience, and other positive indicators.

B: Monitoring child well-being in education – some principles

Despite the recent burgeoning use of the child's perception in developing indicators, more is needed to articulate the methodological implications of integrating the child's perspectives in the development of indicators and in monitoring well-being and identifying change. The well-being concept being holistic and multi-facet determines that it must be explored from different perspectives centring the child and his/her life. In the space below, we attempt to discuss some of our own thinking within five broad inter-related headings:

- (1) The centrality of the child's 'voice'
- (2) Focusing on the holistic processes of education and schooling
- (3) The importance of consulting the child about their well-being in education
- (4) Engaging the child's unique experience and individual perception
- (5) Taking into account multiplicity of learning environments

Before we begin articulating some of the principles emerging from our conceptual discussion, it is important to point out that our approach goes beyond perceiving the child's involvement as valid way of generating research data and developing indicators about well-being. Our approaches propose that the process of engaging the child in monitoring their own well-being is the change and innovation in itself. As Amartya Sen points out, a child-centred engagement in developing well-being and attending to the child's voice is essential part of their well-being and is an end in itself. They are not mere research methods.

1. Centrality of the child's voice

As set out by the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), the child has rights to participate in the decision that affect the quality of their life and education. Therefore the voice of the child must be integrated in monitoring and developing their well-being and ought to play a central role in helping to improve well-being. Voice is perceived by Amartya Sen as an essential constituent of well-being, and not just as an instrument, but an end in itself (Sen, 2000). We propose that there are four crucial aspects involved in the 'Voice of the Child' concept:

First, the notion of the Voice of the Child recognises 'the child as a full human being with integrity and personality and the ability to participate freely in society' (Freeman, 1996 cited in Lundy, 2007, p. 928). Respecting the child and their integrity can avoid the error of seeing 'voice' as a mere gesture of allowing the child to have a say in order that they can tell the adults what they want. The intention is to genuinely value, appreciate and empower the child. Therefore the manner of listening and attending to the child must not risk using the child's voice in a paternalistic and tokenistic way which hence guarantees the absence of the voice (Cruddas, 2007, p.480).

Second, 'voice' is a metaphor for the child's perspectives. It is not exclusively focusing on verbal expressions or discourse. An acknowledgement of this is an appreciation of the individual's unique strengths and potential. It is also an inclusive practice to engage children and young people who may be less able to articulate their views verbally, and/or who may have special educational needs and are less able to articulate their views verbally and through spoken language. The metaphor also includes children who have the linguistic

capacity and sensitivity, but want to be listened to and accepted for expressing themselves in their own ways, such as through drawings, music, dance, drama and movement, and so forth.

Third, connected to this point is that the Voice of the Child is the development of their language sensitivity. Echoing Sen, we perceive language not a tool for communication. Rather it is more like the architecture of thinking or an essential aspect of our mode of being. This in turn is connected to the way that the child is treated on day-to-day basis, at school or other educational and social institutions, and most importantly at home. The child's 'voice' and their language sensitivity is determined by the way they are spoken to, and talked to and the way they are listened to as well as the manners they are related by the significant others around them. In other words, the child's language sensitivity is embedded in and developed through webs of relationships.

Fourth, to extend from the third point, the 'Voice of the Child' concept contains mutually constitutive pragmatic concerns of the adult: the encouragement and facilitation of the diverse ways a child expresses his/her views and perspectives on the one hand, and practising the art of listening, observing, attending to and being sensitive to and appreciative of the child's voice on the other. The reason why these are mutually constitutive is because adult guidance and support is a key ingredient in the child's voice. In the meantime, the UN Convention sets out that the child's perspectives are given due weight in accordance to their age and maturity. This accepts the fact that sometimes the child's views are in the process of forming and it requires a caring relationship with adults in order to support, facilitate and affirm the 'voice' of the child. With such caring and supportive relationship, the child is more likely to be truly empowered to participate meaningfully in matters affecting him/her.

Fifth, Lundy's (2007) reading of the Convention highlighted the above processes, but added a fourth process: the child's view must be acted upon, as appropriate. To act upon the perspectives of the child promises a new way of engaging the child in social change where the child enters partnerships with adults in order to promote well-being for themselves and for and with those around them.

Thus the main thrust of the Voice of the Child concept is ultimately about the question of power and ownership of policy development. The Voice of the Child, only when it is based on genuine respect, trust, and ownership in 'carving a new order of experience', can be a response to 'the changing nature of childhood and the importance of listening to young people in order to bring about the necessary change in "the deep structure" of schooling' (Fielding, 2007, p. 326). We will return to this discussion later to explore more specifically how the child can play a part research and change towards well-being in their learning environments including schools, communities and other environments.

Therefore, for the development of well-being indicators, it is necessary to take seriously the views and perspectives of the child, nurture them, attend to them with respect, act upon them, and involve children in the processes of (educational) change. Adults must be mindful of the perpetual power imbalance in attempts to engage the child, and take a dialogic approach to identifying (with the child) key domains of child well-being indicator, and act as 'advocates for children' and 'represent them in the policy arena' (Fattore, et al. 2006, p. 16).

In the development of child well-being indicators, it ought to begin with a definition of well-being that is consistent with the child's own understanding of what constitutes well-being for them at the time, and how these definitions are located in their everyday experience.

The child's understanding of well-being should also be perceived in light of the understanding of their carers, families and teachers. Some researchers have used 'focus group' approach and/or participatory action research method to engage the child in defining well-being and identifying key domains for indicators. Often this may involve in-depth and semi-structured individual and group interviews, and age-relevant activities such as games, music and drama, journal writing, mapping drawings, photographs and other child-generated artefacts (See Crivello et al. 2009 for a more detailed review on the different participatory methods in monitoring child well-being). These approaches can help develop valuable insights into the thoughts, feelings, cultural norms and language of expression that make sense to the child.

2. Focusing on the holistic processes of education and schooling

As we have seen that education plays an important part in the child's life and well-being. To such extent, we have argued that human flourishing should be the core aim of education, and that education ought to be directed at the child as a whole, nurturing their diverse qualities and virtues as well as their inner integrity and harmony. Another critical point we made is that education is not a means to an end. Rather, it is the process of equipping the individual with values, virtues and other qualities that make us all more fully human.

Undoubtedly, schooling does not equate education. Schools are formal educational environments that uniquely serve the child during his/her formative years. Children naturally learn from other environments outside the formal educational settings. In addition, we also stress the significance to acknowledge that education of the child is the responsibility of all. Both formal and informal education should play an integral part in the child's life, i.e. cultivating and nurturing their interest and love for learning for its intrinsic value, and initiating and equipping the child for a more independent life in the community and society. Thus when examining different approaches to Universal Primary Education, Thin (2007) maintains that a well-being approach forces us to evaluate our schooling systems and quality of education within such systems. It helps identify if schooling is making a good contribution to the child's enjoyment of life and whether the environments around the child are conducive to 'translating' good schooling into good life.

Recognising the significant contribution of education and schooling to the child's well-being, recently in Europe, there have been initiatives to nurture the child's personal, emotional and social well-being, such as the Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE) and Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) programmes in schools in England; Scottish National Mental Health programme for children and young people; Good and healthy schools in Germany (Paulus, 2007); early years education focusing on play and socialisation; promoting adolescent mental health, and so forth.

However, the growing awareness of the importance of social and emotional well-being also gives rise to a number of concerns: first, it endangers perceiving well-being as instrumental or as a support to academic learning, i.e. the child learns more effectively when they are happy. This instrumental view of well-being disregards what we have argued early that learning constitutes achieving well-being and well-becoming, and is about developing human qualities. Academic qualities and social and emotional well-being are part of the child's overall development, they are means to ends to each other. Second, it risks well-being becoming a mere add-on school programme or subject, rather than integral to education and learning. Third, it might create a situation where the child's subjective 'happiness' and other

‘felt good’ psychological experience such as self-esteem undermines the child’s ability to overcome adversity and resilience when being confronted with challenges and other risks (Craig, 2009). Lastly, it risks well-being to be merely available for the ‘at-risk’ children rather than those who appear to be doing well.

Paulus (2007) offers an example of how the consideration of health is directly integrated to the holistic education processes rather than serving as an add-on component or programme in the ‘good schooling movement’ in Germany. The initiative sees health as a ‘throughput’ factor instead of outcome factor. According to Klaus, the key to changing the mindset of policy-makers towards this shift is the active involvement of children, teachers and parents and the recognition of their attitudes, beliefs and values in developing good and health schools.

Thus, when reviewing and monitoring the child’s well-being in education, it is necessary to examine how educational processes nurture the child’s well-being from a holistic perspective. For formal education, it ought to be a whole-school process in partnership with the communities in and outside of the school. This is because the different aspects of education and schooling must work synergistically and they are mutually constitutive in all educative endeavours. These include curriculum, pedagogy and assessment (and qualifications); the quality of various relationships involved, social and cultural values and personal attitudes in relation to the intention and aims of education, the physical environments of the school (and family and the local community), and the well-being of the significant others surrounding the child (see UEF, 2007).

This aspect of education as a holistic endeavour would be a necessary element/theme to be included in the child well-being indicators. Other important elements/themes to be considered would be the wellness of those around the child, including teachers, parents, peers, and other members in the communities, and whether children and young people can act as collaborators with adults in determining what to learn, how to learn, and when and where to learn, and in shaping their learning environments towards their well-being.

3. Consulting the child about their well-being in education

Following on from our earlier discussion on the voice of the child, as well as nurturing the child in developing their voice, the child ought to be given the opportunity and be trusted to participate in re-shaping their experience in education and within learning environments in and out of the school. Rudduck (2006) saw two important aspects in involving the child’s voice in the school: ‘consultation’ and ‘participation’. Savage & Wood (2006) give an example of ‘consultation’ where children and young people are involved in observing teaching and learning activities in the school and offering feedback to the teachers and administrators on how to make their school and educational experiences better. The authors assert that a clear benefit of the child’s feedback is that ‘the impetus for change and development comes from the pupils themselves’, and that it serves ‘as a stimulus for reconceptualising pedagogy, in terms of students contributing to professional knowledge about teaching and learning and viewing their knowledge as central to enhancing learning’ (ibid.).

Consulting the child in monitoring well-being is also a participatory approach (Camfield et al, 2009). At the same time, in order to truly engage the child’s voice in education, listening and attending to the child’s perspectives and views ought to be included

in the teachers and other staff's ongoing professional learning and development. Fielding (2004) suggests that consulting the child is to be founded on dialogic approach to exchange of perspectives between the child and the adult, and 'active listening' from both.

According to Fielding (2004, p. 199), the voice of the child constitutes 'a range of activities that encourage reflection, discussion, dialogue and action on matters that primarily concern students, but also, by implication, school staff and the communities they serve'. The author proposes a number of ways to engage the child's voice including research inquiry, policy feedback, teaching and learning development and innovation, school improvement, and so forth. One proposal is that the child can act as a co-researcher and collaborator in the inquiries into the educational process and schooling. This would feature a child-led dialogue in the inquiry. Fielding & McGregor (2005) maintain that students can act as researchers, leading and initiating change, rather than playing a mere 'responsive role'. More crucially, it is the children who 'identify' topics and issues to be inquired into or examined; it is the children who 'undertake' the inquiry with the support from teachers and other staff; and it is the children who assume the responsibility to 'make sense' of research data, 'write' the research report representing their findings, and finally above all these, it is 'to the child' that the school management, teachers as well as others in the school community are 'bound to respond in ways which are respectful, attentive and committed to positive change' (ibid. p. 7).

Such proposal, despite being ambitious and optimistic, has its supporters. Ben-Arieh (2006) concurs that child-led approach can help define domains of interest and when combined with child-focus indicators, such research can identify and highlight areas of change. It enables the child to identify and assess the challenges to their well-being in the educational processes and schooling, and allows them to co-develop strategies to respond to these challenges, which could involve planning the curriculum, developing assessment and feedback mechanisms, reshaping pedagogy and re-designing the school environments, as well as identify other accompanying services such as counselling and mental health, mentoring, physical health, nutritional services, and more.

However, this is not to assume that all children of all ages have the ability to launch such inquiries, or they should be left alone to do the research. Nor does it imply that at any given schools such inquiry is possible because, as it was already pointed out, often it is a pre-requisite that the schools are willing to shift the power-relationship between the child and the adults, and give due respect to the child as co-creator of their educational experience and learning environment rather than a passive receiver of what is being provided for them.

Accordingly, for the development of child well-being indicators, it would be a key element/theme to provide space for child-led inquiry. The indicators ought to include the task of monitoring how well the child's qualities are nurtured, such as curiosity, caring, respect, and so forth; and how well the child is equipped with relevant research skills including asking questions, collecting evidence, taking a critical and analytical approach to data, and active listening and attending to other people's voices. The children's definitions of well-being must be located within the immediate contexts as well as the macro-contexts where they find themselves. The development of indicators ought to allow the child to further engage in the process of analysing and interpreting their definitions in order to identify key factors that impact their well-being as well as the key ingredients for change. It is also part of the task of the staff's professional learning in order to allow the child to be collaborator and co-creator in shaping their own learning experience and developing well-being.

In this way, the monitoring of well-being is the process of empowerment and change itself. Through participation and engagement, the child is beginning their own trajectories towards well-being.

4. Engaging the child's unique experiences and individual perceptions

As we have pointed out elsewhere (Gill & O'Toole, 2009), while there are common elements in the experience of human well-being, the child's well-being and flourishing are shaped in significant ways by the community, culture, socioeconomic status, politics, education, ethnicity, gender, physical ability, and more. At the same time, the person's personality, intention, values, worldviews and attitudes also determine how he/she engages with and responds to external circumstances. Thus we need to understand the relationship between conditions of people's lives and their actual experience of the quality of living. This, first and foremost, involves attending fully to the child's individual perception which ought to be central to the monitoring child well-being and innovation, and not as an add-on.

In addition, at the heart of monitoring the child's well-being is also his/her unique experience as an individual. Whilst indicators grounded in children's experience are aimed for identifying factors that contribute to well-being and aspects for change and innovation, they are not necessarily reflecting such uniqueness in experience and individual perceptions.

The uniqueness of the child is exhibited in many different ways including how they learn and experience the world, talents and gifts, personality, resilience, sensitivity and imagination, identity and so forth. The child's self-concept and identity is an important contributor to their well-being and is actively constructed within the diverse contexts and backgrounds they find themselves. Using indicators to sum up the trends of the child well-being may endanger of losing the richness of individual's experiences by 'masking the differences between children' (Fattore et al., 2009, p. 74).

Therefore in developing approaches to monitoring the child's well-being, it is a necessary element/theme to observe how educational and other child-focused services take into account the uniqueness of the whole child, including their talent, interest, aspiration and sense of purpose, and so forth. When inquiring into factors that impact the child's well-being, the questions ought to be asked in such manners: How is the child doing in light of his/her own nature and potential? What is the child's need as an individual? How does the child think and feel at the time? What is the child's unique contribution to his/her own well-being? By addressing questions about the individual child, it is more likely that the development of the indicators collate a more complete picture about the child's well-being and their life within the larger structures, including family, school, community, society and the world.

Child-centred activities to engage in the development of well-being indicators such as those we proposed earlier ought to be sensitive in their designs in order to allow space for the child to participate in manners that are most suited to their unique nature and characteristics. Often psychology-based child developmental models can offer broad guidelines in terms of understanding the child's need and developmental characteristics at a certain stage in his/her life. For the development of indicators, it is more important to take into account the child's individual differences in growth and development instead of measuring their development rigidly against developmental models.

5. Integrating multiple learning environments and inter-disciplinary partnerships

The holistic character of the concept of well-being posits that it is necessary to approach it from multiple angles and diverse standpoints. Within the remit of ‘Education for Well-Being’, we want to highlight that learning (as well-being) takes place in diverse settings and in diverse manners including through social and collaborative engagement, individual and collective reflection, by being directly involved in real life experiences, and in participating in lived citizenship. We perceive these settings, activities, relationships and spaces as learning environments.

More specifically, diverse learning environments for a child may include: the school, family, community, peers, health services, public spaces, natural world, society, global contexts, work environments, as well as virtual environment brought to the child through media and information communication technology (ICT) such as the internet, and many others. What is consistent is the child’s ongoing interaction with the different environments at all time, which forms an important source of education and learning. Monitoring the child well-being ought to include periodic assessment of children’s activities and experiences in the diverse environments, and how they change over time, which is an integral part of the initiatives to improve the child’s life and experience of well-being.

As we have argued, well-being is inherently connected with the child’s capacity to find meaning and also actively engage in shaping their experience within contexts in order to ultimately play a big part in contributing to a flourishing life, which in turn, transforms the environments within which the child find him/herself. Once again, we highlight the child’s agency as a social actor and role as co-constructor of their educational experience and environments. Connected with this is the interplay and interdependent dimension of the child experiences with others and the multiple learning environments. Within this, interpersonal relationship can be important for the child’s perception of well-being (Crivello, et al., 2009). How the child is doing is profoundly determined by the ‘qualities and strength’ of their social relationships, including with family and peers, relationships in schooling, relationships within other institutional services and child-related services, and other significant people around the child within the wider community and society.

This means that well-being requires the collaboration of diverse groups of people in order to maximise their full potential and living a flourishing life. Although with education and schooling at the centre of the well-being endeavour, the Education for Well-being movement advocates a strong partnership between education, health, social services, development, environmental agencies, in view of the strong interdependence amongst all. The development of partnerships amongst the different sectors and agencies is critical to promote the child’s well-being.

Therefore, it is necessary to address the needs of specific environments but also to develop indicators that are meaningful for the well-being of children in general – ones that transcend the many environments can be applied in a variety of settings, and increase the integration of how well-being of children is viewed by society.

C: Summarising the characteristics of a child-centred approach to monitoring and promoting well-being

Our conceptual framework for understanding ‘Education for Well-being’ assumes a child-centred approach to monitoring and promoting well-being. Fundamentally, these recognise

the centrality of the Voice of the Child in defining and promoting well-being, emphasise the entire process of education and the child's unique experience and individual perceptions within it, give respect and trust the child to be the 'expert' in their own life and their capacity to drive the inquiry about their own well-being, and integrate the child's experience within diverse environments through interdisciplinary partnerships.

In this part, we summarise the key ideas put forward in this paper for the development of child well-being indicators.

1. The child-centred approach we propose goes beyond perceiving the child's involvement as research data or validating the research data. Our approach to monitoring well-being in itself a process of engaging the child in promoting their own well-being, change and innovation.
2. It is necessary to take seriously the views and perspectives of the child, nurture them, attend to them with respect, act upon them, and involve children in the processes of monitoring well-being and educational change.
3. The child ought to be involved in defining well-being and what constitutes well-being for them at the time, and how these definitions are located in their everyday experience. The child's understanding of well-being should also be perceived in light of the understanding of their carers, families and teachers.
4. Participatory approach focus group and action research using multiple methods or mixed-method can be a useful way to engage the child in defining well-being and identifying key domains for indicators. This will be central approach rather than a mere add-on to supplement quantitative data.
5. All activities and initiatives to engage the child ought to be sensitive to the child's unique nature and characteristics in their designs in order to allow space for the child to participate in manners that are most appropriate.
6. When reviewing and monitoring the child's well-being in education, it is necessary to examine it from a holistic perspective. This includes the wellness of those around the child, such as teachers, parents, peers, and other members in the communities.
7. One important theme for monitoring the child's well-being is whether they can act as collaborators with adults in determining what to learn, how to learn, and when and where to learn, and in shaping their learning environments towards their well-being.
8. Children and young people who are able should be provided with opportunity and support in order that they can drive the inquiry about their own well-being. This is infinitely linked to how well the educational process also nurtures the child's qualities to launch such inquiries. In this way, the monitoring of well-being is also a process of empowerment and change itself.
9. The well-being indicators ought to include a theme of how educational and other child-focused services take into account the uniqueness of the whole child, including their talent, interest, aspiration and sense of purpose, and so forth.

10. Child-centred approach to monitoring well-being ought to take into account the child's individual differences in growth and development instead of measuring their development rigidly against developmental models.
11. It is necessary to address the needs of specific environments, but also to focus on indicators that are meaningful for the well-being of children in general in so far as they transcend many environments, are applicable to a variety of settings, and increase the integration of how well-being of children is viewed by society.

References

- Ben-Arieh, A. & Goerge, R. (2001). How do we monitor the state of our children, *Children and Youth Services Review* 23(8), pp. 603–631.
- Ben-Arieh, A., Kaufman, Andrews, A., Goerge, R., Joo Lee, B & Aber, J. (2001). *Measuring and Monitoring Children's Well-being. Social Indicator Research Series 7.*
- Ben-Arieh & Frønes (2007)
- Camfield, L, Streuli, N. & Woodhead, M. (2009). What's the use of 'well-being' in contexts of child poverty? Approaches to research, monitoring and children's participation. *International Journal of Children's Rights* 17 pp. 65-109
- Cohen et al, 2005
- Craig, C. (2009). Well-being in schools: The curious case of the tail wagging the dog? Centre for Confidence and Well-being.
- Crivello, G., Camfield, L. & Woodhead, M. (2009). How can children tell us about their wellbeing? Exploring the potential of participatory research approaches within Young Lives, *Journal of Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 90, pp. 51-72
- Denzin & Lincoln, 1998
- Dubois, 2009
- Gill, S. & O'Toole, L. (2009). Understanding Well-Being: A Conceptual Framework, A 'Education By All for the Well-Being of Children Consortium' Working Paper, European Foundation Centre.
- Hitchcock & Hughes, 1998
- Lippman, L. (2005). Indicators and indices of child well-being: A brief history, A Kids Count Working Paper, The Anne E. Casey Foundation
- Lundy, L. (2007). "Voice' is not enough: conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child', *British Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 33:6, pp. 927- 942
- Moore, K., Brown, B. & Scarupa, M. (2003). The Uses (and Misuses) of Social Indicators: Implications for Public Policy, Child Trends Research Brief
- Paulus, P. (2006)
- Rudduck (2006)
- Sen, Amartya (2002). *Rationality and Freedom*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Thin (2007)
- Universal Education Foundation.(UEF) (2007). *The Voice of Children Component, Student Well-Being and the School Environment, Middle East Pilot. Preliminary Survey Results: Jordan, Lebanon and Palestine.* Ramallah, Palestine: Universal Education Foundation.

