



Original Article

Beyond Academic Achievement: Positioning Emotional Wellbeing as a Core Construct in Student Development

BK Tannu Mehta¹, Dr. Suresh Kumar Murugesan²

¹Ph. D. Research Scholar, Manipur International University, India

²Ph. D. Research Guide & Head, PG Department of Psychology,
The American College, Madurai, India

Manuscript ID: *Abstract*

JRD -2025(I)-170902

ISSN: 2230-9578

Volume 17

Issue 9(III)

Pp. 13-23

Sept. 2025

Submitted: 12 Aug. 2025

Revised: 22 Aug. 2025

Accepted: 20 Sept. 2025

Published: 30 Sept. 2025

Emotional wellbeing has emerged as a critical determinant of student success and holistic development, extending far beyond the traditional boundaries of academic achievement. While education systems globally have historically prioritized cognitive outcomes such as grades and test performance, growing empirical evidence suggests that emotional wellbeing plays a foundational role in learning, resilience, social functioning, and long-term life satisfaction (Keyes, 2006; Seligman, 2011; WHO, 2020). Students with higher emotional wellbeing demonstrate stronger academic engagement, better coping strategies, and greater adaptability to challenges (Ravens-Sieberer et al., 2021). Conversely, neglect of emotional wellbeing is associated with stress, burnout, anxiety, and dropout risks (Beattie et al., 2019). This conceptual paper positions emotional wellbeing as a core construct in student development, arguing for its integration into educational policy, pedagogy, and institutional practices. The paper also outlines a framework that redefines success in education to encompass emotional, social, and cognitive growth.

Keywords: emotional wellbeing, student development, academic achievement, holistic education, resilience

Introduction

Background and Rationale

Historically, education systems have measured success primarily through academic achievement, such as standardized test scores, grades, and progression rates (OECD, 2019). While these metrics provide an objective measure of performance, they often neglect the emotional and psychosocial dimensions of learning. Contemporary psychological research indicates that emotional wellbeing is not merely complementary but foundational to learning outcomes, personal growth, and long-term success (Diener et al., 2018; Suldo, 2021). Emotional wellbeing encompasses positive affect, resilience, self-regulation, and a sense of meaning, which together foster adaptability and motivation in students (Keyes, 2006; Seligman, 2011). Global organizations such as UNESCO (2021) and the World Health Organization (WHO, 2020) have highlighted emotional wellbeing as integral to the holistic development of young people. For example, UNESCO's *Futures of Education* framework emphasizes the necessity of embedding social-emotional competencies within curricula to prepare students for 21st-century challenges. Evidence also shows that students with higher emotional wellbeing demonstrate improved academic engagement, reduced stress, and enhanced social functioning (Ravens-Sieberer et al., 2021; Beattie et al., 2019). This growing body of research calls for reorienting educational systems to view emotional wellbeing as a central construct rather than a secondary concern.



Quick Response Code:



Website:
<https://jrdrv.org/>



Creative Commons (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/) Public License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work noncommercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

Address for correspondence:

BK Tannu Mehta, Ph. D. Research Scholar, Manipur International University, India

How to cite this article:

Mehta, B. T., & Murugesan, S. K. (2025). *Beyond Academic Achievement: Positioning Emotional Wellbeing as a Core Construct in Student Development*. *Journal of Research & Development*, 17(9(III)), 13–23.



Problem Statement

Despite increasing recognition of the importance of emotional wellbeing, most educational systems continue to prioritize academic achievement as the dominant marker of success (Eccles & Roeser, 2011). This academic-centric model often underestimates the role of emotional and psychological factors in shaping learning outcomes and overall development. Students worldwide report rising levels of stress, anxiety, and depression, particularly in highly competitive educational environments (Auerbach et al., 2018; Patel et al., 2018). These challenges are further compounded by social pressures, digital overexposure, and uncertain career trajectories. Neglecting emotional wellbeing has significant consequences. Research indicates that poor emotional wellbeing is linked to school disengagement, higher dropout rates, substance use, and long-term mental health difficulties (Suldo, 2021; WHO, 2020). In contrast, fostering emotional wellbeing not only improves learning outcomes but also equips students with resilience, empathy, and adaptability essential for life beyond academia (Huppert, 2009). There is thus a pressing need to reconceptualize student development frameworks to prioritize emotional wellbeing alongside cognitive competencies.

Objectives of the Paper

This paper seeks to advance the conceptualization of emotional wellbeing as a core construct in student development. The specific objectives are:

1. **To examine the conceptual foundations of emotional wellbeing** by integrating perspectives from humanistic psychology, positive psychology, and developmental theories.
2. **To analyze the role of emotional wellbeing in cognitive, social, and behavioral domains** of student development, highlighting both protective and risk factors.
3. **To critique existing achievement-centered models of education** and argue for a paradigm shift that recognizes emotional wellbeing as central to student success.
4. **To propose a conceptual framework** that positions emotional wellbeing as both an outcome of education and an enabler of holistic student growth.
5. **To outline implications for policy, pedagogy, and research**, emphasizing strategies for embedding emotional wellbeing into institutional practices and educational systems.

II. Conceptual Foundations of Emotional Wellbeing

A. Defining Emotional Wellbeing

Distinction from Related Constructs

Emotional wellbeing is broadly conceptualized as the presence of positive emotions, emotional balance, and the capacity to manage negative affect effectively in daily life. While it overlaps with constructs such as mental health, life satisfaction, and resilience, it is not identical to them.

Mental health is defined by the World Health Organization (WHO, 2020) as “a state of mental well-being that enables people to cope with the stresses of life, realize their abilities, learn well and work well, and contribute to their community.” Mental health encompasses both emotional wellbeing and the absence of mental disorders. Emotional wellbeing, however, emphasizes affective experiences and regulation rather than diagnostic categories (Keyes, 2006).

Life satisfaction refers to a cognitive, evaluative judgment about one's life as a whole (Diener et al., 2018). Emotional wellbeing differs in that it emphasizes the day-to-day balance of positive and negative affect, rather than overall cognitive appraisal. For example, an individual may report high life satisfaction but still experience emotional distress in academic or social settings, highlighting the distinct yet related nature of these constructs.

Resilience describes the capacity to adapt and recover from adversity or stress (Masten, 2014). While resilience contributes to emotional wellbeing, the latter encompasses a broader state of emotional health that includes positive affect, engagement, and fulfillment (Huppert, 2009). Thus, resilience can be considered a protective factor that sustains and enhances emotional wellbeing rather than a substitute for it.

Taken together, emotional wellbeing may be understood as an integrative construct that bridges the affective, cognitive, and adaptive domains of human functioning, supporting both short-term emotional balance and long-term flourishing.

Psychological Perspectives

Psychological frameworks situate emotional wellbeing at the core of human development and functioning. From the humanistic perspective, Rogers (1961) emphasized congruence, unconditional positive regard, and authenticity as essential to wellbeing. Similarly, Maslow's (1968) hierarchy of needs situates emotional wellbeing within the fulfillment of psychological and self-actualization needs. Positive psychology further expanded this conceptualization. Seligman's (2011) PERMA model includes positive emotion as a key pillar, positioning emotional wellbeing as central to flourishing. Fredrickson's (2001) broaden-and-build theory posits that positive emotions expand cognitive and behavioral repertoires, thereby strengthening resilience and long-term wellbeing. Empirical evidence supports the role of emotional wellbeing in promoting self-regulation, problem-solving, and motivation among students (Suldo, 2021).



Social Perspectives

From a social perspective, emotional wellbeing is shaped by the quality of relationships, community belonging, and supportive social environments. Social support networks are consistently linked with higher emotional wellbeing in students (Rueger et al., 2016). Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecological systems theory emphasizes that the immediate social context (family, peers, teachers) and broader structures (educational institutions, cultural norms) critically influence emotional wellbeing. Moreover, the presence of peer connectedness and school belonging has been associated with reduced emotional distress and enhanced engagement in adolescents (Allen et al., 2018). These findings highlight that emotional wellbeing is not only an individual phenomenon but also socially embedded.

Educational Perspectives

Within educational settings, emotional wellbeing is increasingly recognized as foundational to academic engagement and student development. The OECD (2019) and UNESCO (2021) have underscored the need for education systems to foster wellbeing alongside cognitive skills. Emotional wellbeing in schools is linked to improved motivation, lower dropout rates, and higher levels of achievement (Ravens-Sieberer et al., 2021). Educational psychology research emphasizes socio-emotional learning (SEL) as a structured approach to enhance emotional wellbeing, equipping students with self-awareness, emotional regulation, empathy, and relationship skills (Taylor et al., 2017). Furthermore, academic stress, competitive environments, and digital overexposure are emerging challenges that directly influence students' emotional wellbeing, making it a critical area for educational intervention (Beattie et al., 2019).

B. Theoretical Underpinnings

Humanistic Psychology

Humanistic psychology laid the foundation for conceptualizing emotional wellbeing as a central element of human development. Maslow's (1968) hierarchy of needs theory posits that individuals must first satisfy basic physiological and safety needs before achieving higher-order psychological growth. Emotional wellbeing aligns closely with the fulfillment of belongingness, esteem, and self-actualization needs, which contribute to feelings of competence, acceptance, and purpose. Self-actualization, the pinnacle of Maslow's model, reflects the realization of personal potential and the presence of psychological growth, both of which are directly linked to emotional wellbeing. Rogers (1961) advanced this perspective by emphasizing the importance of congruence, unconditional positive regard, and authenticity in fostering psychological health. According to Rogers' person-centered theory, emotional wellbeing arises when individuals experience alignment between their real self and ideal self, facilitated by environments characterized by acceptance and empathy. These humanistic foundations highlight the importance of nurturing environments and personal growth as determinants of emotional wellbeing.

Positive Psychology

Building on humanistic psychology, positive psychology positions wellbeing as a scientific focus of study. Seligman's (2011) **PERMA model** identifies five pillars of flourishing: Positive emotion, Engagement, Relationships, Meaning, and Accomplishment. Emotional wellbeing is directly reflected in the positive emotion domain and indirectly supported by engagement, relational quality, and meaning. This framework situates emotional wellbeing not merely as the absence of distress but as the presence of thriving across multiple domains. Keyes (2006) introduced the dual-continua model, distinguishing between mental illness and mental health, and argued that flourishing—characterized by high levels of emotional, psychological, and social wellbeing—represents the optimal state of functioning. Empirical research supports this model, demonstrating that students who report higher levels of flourishing show greater resilience, academic engagement, and lower incidence of mental health difficulties (Suldo, 2021; Huppert, 2009). Fredrickson's (2001) broaden-and-build theory further explains how positive emotions expand cognitive and behavioral repertoires, allowing individuals to build enduring resources such as resilience, social bonds, and problem-solving capacities. These theories collectively underscore that emotional wellbeing is not simply reactive but also proactive, cultivating resources that support long-term development.

Developmental Frameworks

Developmental theories also provide a critical foundation for understanding emotional wellbeing across the student lifespan. Erikson's (1968) psychosocial theory highlights adolescence and young adulthood as stages where identity formation, intimacy, and social role integration are central tasks. Successful navigation of these stages contributes to self-esteem, social competence, and emotional stability, whereas failure may result in confusion and distress (Kroger, 2017). Emotional wellbeing thus serves as both a developmental outcome and a resource that enables healthy progression through psychosocial stages. Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecological systems theory emphasizes that wellbeing is embedded within interconnected systems—microsystems (family, peers, school), mesosystems (interactions between contexts), exosystems (community, institutional policies), and macrosystems (cultural norms). This ecological view positions emotional wellbeing as a product of both individual and contextual factors. For students, supportive family environments, positive peer interactions, and inclusive school climates are all protective influences that enhance emotional wellbeing (Allen et al., 2018). Together, these developmental frameworks illustrate that



emotional wellbeing is not static but evolves dynamically, shaped by individual maturation and the broader ecological contexts in which students are embedded.

III. Emotional Wellbeing and Student Development

A. Cognitive Outcomes: Emotional Regulation and Cognitive Performance

Emotional wellbeing has a direct impact on students' cognitive functioning. Emotional regulation, defined as the ability to monitor, evaluate, and modify emotional responses, is closely linked to attention, working memory, and problem-solving skills (Gross, 2015). Students who demonstrate effective emotional regulation are better able to sustain concentration and perform complex cognitive tasks under stress (Blair & Raver, 2015).

Neuroscientific research highlights that positive affect enhances executive functioning by activating the prefrontal cortex, thereby improving decision-making and learning outcomes (Schmeichel & Tang, 2015). Conversely, chronic emotional distress—such as anxiety or depression—has been associated with deficits in memory, impaired attention, and reduced academic performance (Owens et al., 2012). This evidence underscores the importance of emotional wellbeing as a foundation for optimal cognitive outcomes in educational contexts.

B. Social Outcomes: Peer Relationships, Empathy, and Interpersonal Competence

Emotional wellbeing plays a pivotal role in shaping social development among students. High levels of wellbeing are associated with greater empathy, prosocial behavior, and interpersonal competence (Schonert-Reichl, 2017). Peer relationships, particularly during adolescence, are central to identity formation and emotional stability (Bukowski et al., 2020). Supportive peer connections foster a sense of belonging, reduce feelings of loneliness, and buffer against emotional distress (Rueger et al., 2016). Conversely, poor emotional wellbeing is linked to social withdrawal, peer rejection, and susceptibility to bullying (Allen et al., 2018). Educational interventions such as social-emotional learning (SEL) programs have demonstrated significant improvements in students' empathy and relationship skills, further affirming the reciprocal link between social competence and emotional wellbeing (Taylor et al., 2017).

C. Behavioral Outcomes: Engagement, Co-Curricular Involvement, Lifestyle Choices

Students with higher emotional wellbeing are more likely to engage actively in learning and co-curricular activities. Wellbeing promotes intrinsic motivation, persistence, and academic engagement (Reschly & Christenson, 2012). Participation in extracurricular and co-curricular activities, such as sports, arts, and student clubs, has been linked to enhanced self-esteem, reduced stress, and improved life satisfaction (Fredricks & Eccles, 2006). Lifestyle choices are also influenced by emotional wellbeing. Students reporting higher wellbeing are more likely to adopt healthy behaviors, including regular exercise, adequate sleep, and balanced nutrition, which in turn reinforce cognitive and emotional functioning (El Ansari et al., 2011). On the contrary, diminished emotional wellbeing has been associated with risk behaviors such as substance use, poor sleep hygiene, and sedentary lifestyles (Patel et al., 2018). These findings highlight the behavioral dimension of wellbeing as central to holistic student development.

D. Protective and Risk Factors: Family Support, Peer Pressure, Socio-Economic Influences, Digital Media

Emotional wellbeing among students is shaped by a complex interplay of protective and risk factors. **Family support** is one of the most consistent predictors of positive wellbeing outcomes, providing emotional security and buffering against stress (Fergus & Zimmerman, 2005). Conversely, family conflict or lack of parental involvement increases vulnerability to emotional distress.

Peer influence also plays a dual role. Supportive peer groups enhance resilience and belonging, while negative peer pressure may increase susceptibility to risky behaviors and emotional dysregulation (Steinberg & Monahan, 2007).

Socio-economic status (SES) is another critical determinant. Students from lower SES backgrounds are at increased risk for stress, limited access to resources, and poorer emotional wellbeing (Reiss, 2013). However, supportive school environments and targeted interventions can mitigate these disparities. Finally, **digital media** exerts both positive and negative influences. While online platforms can foster social connectedness and identity exploration, excessive screen time and exposure to cyberbullying are linked with anxiety, depression, and reduced emotional wellbeing (Twenge & Campbell, 2018). Promoting digital literacy and balance is therefore essential to maintaining student wellbeing in the 21st century.

IV. Emotional Wellbeing as a Core Construct

A. Critique of Achievement-Oriented Models: Limitations of Grades and Test-Based Metrics

Educational systems worldwide have historically relied on grades, standardized testing, and academic performance as the primary indicators of student success (OECD, 2019). While such metrics provide measurable outcomes for cognitive achievement, they fail to capture the emotional, social, and psychological dimensions that shape holistic development (Eccles & Roeser, 2011). Overemphasis on grades has been associated with heightened academic stress, test anxiety, and reduced intrinsic motivation among students (Putwain, 2017). For example, excessive performance pressure has been linked to emotional distress, burnout, and mental health concerns in adolescents and young adults (Pascoe et al., 2020). Furthermore, academic metrics often overlook disparities related to socio-economic status, language, or cultural context, thereby reinforcing systemic inequities (Reardon, 2011). The "achievement-only" paradigm also undervalues critical non-cognitive competencies such as emotional regulation, interpersonal skills, and adaptability, which are increasingly recognized as essential for success in higher education and the workforce.



(Heckman & Kautz, 2012). This critique highlights the inadequacy of traditional evaluation systems in addressing the multidimensional nature of student development.

B. Rationale for Emotional Wellbeing as Core

Links to Resilience, Adaptability, Employability, and Long-Term Success

Emotional wellbeing is increasingly understood as foundational to resilience, adaptability, and employability. Resilience, defined as the capacity to adapt to adversity, is strongly influenced by emotional regulation and wellbeing (Masten, 2014). Students with higher emotional wellbeing demonstrate greater adaptability to academic challenges, life transitions, and workplace demands (Martin & Marsh, 2009). Longitudinal research indicates that emotional wellbeing predicts not only academic engagement but also long-term life satisfaction and career success (Keyes, 2006; Diener et al., 2018). For instance, a study by Kern et al. (2015) found that wellbeing indicators in adolescence were predictive of adult health, relationship quality, and occupational attainment. This evidence underscores emotional wellbeing as both a short-term academic facilitator and a long-term determinant of holistic success. Employers also increasingly value socio-emotional skills such as emotional intelligence, teamwork, and resilience as critical competencies for employability in the 21st-century workforce (Côté, 2014; World Economic Forum, 2020). These findings make a compelling case for integrating emotional wellbeing into the core mission of educational systems.

Global Frameworks and Policy Directions

Global education frameworks further affirm the centrality of emotional wellbeing. UNESCO's *Futures of Education* report calls for a "new social contract for education" that prioritizes wellbeing, sustainability, and equity alongside knowledge acquisition (UNESCO, 2021). Similarly, the WHO (2020) recognizes emotional wellbeing as integral to the definition of health, advocating for school-based mental health promotion programs as part of public health strategies. The OECD's *Learning Compass 2030* highlights "wellbeing" as a key outcome of learning, emphasizing competencies such as resilience, responsibility, and collaboration as essential for future-ready education (OECD, 2019). Together, these frameworks signal a paradigm shift in international educational policy, urging institutions to balance cognitive and emotional dimensions in student development.

C. Proposed Conceptual Model

Emotional Wellbeing as Both an Outcome and Enabler

This paper proposes a conceptual model in which emotional wellbeing is positioned as both an outcome of education and an enabler of holistic student development. As an **outcome**, emotional wellbeing reflects the effectiveness of educational systems in promoting positive affect, resilience, and psychological growth. As an **enabler**, it facilitates enhanced cognitive performance, social relationships, and behavioral engagement, thereby amplifying academic and personal outcomes (Suldo, 2021).

Integration with Academic, Social, and Personal Growth

The model emphasizes three interdependent domains of student development:

Academic Growth – Emotional wellbeing enhances motivation, concentration, and problem-solving skills, which directly support academic achievement (Blair & Raver, 2015).

Social Growth – Wellbeing fosters empathy, prosocial behavior, and collaboration, essential for peer relationships and community belonging (Schonert-Reichl, 2017).

Personal Growth – It contributes to identity formation, life satisfaction, and the ability to make adaptive lifestyle choices, supporting long-term flourishing (Huppert, 2009).

This integrative framework redefines educational success as a dynamic balance of cognitive, emotional, and social outcomes. It positions emotional wellbeing not at the periphery but at the core of student development, serving as both a measurable goal of education and a mechanism through which academic and life success are achieved.

V. Implications for Educational Practice

A. Curriculum Design: Socio-Emotional Learning, Mindfulness, and Resilience-Building

Integrating emotional wellbeing into curriculum design is a critical step toward holistic education. **Socio-emotional learning (SEL)** frameworks, which emphasize self-awareness, emotional regulation, empathy, and responsible decision-making, have been shown to significantly improve both social outcomes and academic performance (Taylor et al., 2017). SEL programs implemented across diverse cultural contexts demonstrate reductions in emotional distress, improvements in prosocial behavior, and increased academic engagement (Durlak et al., 2011).

Mindfulness-based practices have also been adopted in educational settings to promote attention, emotional regulation, and stress reduction. Systematic reviews indicate that mindfulness interventions improve psychological wellbeing, reduce anxiety, and enhance resilience in students (Zenner et al., 2014; Kuyken et al., 2019).

Resilience-building interventions, such as programs focused on growth mindset, coping skills, and positive psychology exercises, further strengthen students' capacity to adapt to academic and social challenges. These approaches equip students with tools to manage adversity, thereby supporting long-term emotional wellbeing (Yeager & Dweck, 2012). Curriculum design that embeds these practices fosters not only academic achievement but also sustainable emotional development.



B. Institutional Policies: Wellbeing Audits, Student Support Services, Inclusive Environments

Educational institutions play a pivotal role in creating environments that support emotional wellbeing. **Wellbeing audits**—systematic evaluations of student experiences, stress levels, and support systems—help institutions identify gaps and implement targeted interventions (OECD, 2019). Embedding wellbeing indicators alongside academic metrics ensures a balanced assessment of student success (UNESCO, 2021).

Student support services, including counseling centers, peer support groups, and crisis intervention programs, are essential in addressing both preventive and responsive needs. Evidence suggests that accessible mental health services within schools and universities reduce stigma and improve help-seeking behaviors (Gulliver et al., 2010).

An **inclusive environment**, characterized by equity, diversity, and psychological safety, is equally critical. Inclusive policies addressing marginalized groups—such as first-generation students, those from low socio-economic backgrounds, or LGBTQ+ students—are associated with improved engagement and wellbeing outcomes (Anderman, 2002; Walton & Cohen, 2011). Institutions that prioritize inclusivity create climates in which students feel valued and supported, thereby enhancing both academic and emotional outcomes.

C. Role of Teachers and Counselors: Emotional Literacy, Mentoring, and Support Strategies

Teachers and counselors are frontline facilitators of student wellbeing. **Emotional literacy training**, which equips educators with the skills to recognize, label, and respond to emotions, enhances classroom climates and supports student regulation (Brackett et al., 2011). Teachers who model positive emotional expression foster empathy and resilience among students (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009).

Mentoring relationships further strengthen emotional wellbeing. Research demonstrates that mentorship enhances student self-efficacy, belonging, and engagement (Crisp & Cruz, 2009). Counselors, in particular, play a crucial role by delivering targeted interventions, offering psychoeducation, and providing individualized guidance for students experiencing emotional challenges (Brown, 2017).

Support strategies such as restorative practices, stress management workshops, and referral systems ensure that emotional wellbeing is systematically addressed across educational settings. The professional development of educators in these areas is vital for embedding emotional wellbeing within daily educational practice.

D. Technology and Digital Wellbeing: Balancing Screen-Time, Preventing Cyberbullying, Promoting Healthy Digital Use

In an era of pervasive digital technology, emotional wellbeing is increasingly shaped by online experiences. **Balancing screen-time** is critical, as excessive digital use has been linked to lower psychological wellbeing, sleep disturbances, and reduced academic performance (Twenge & Campbell, 2018). Educational initiatives that promote digital literacy and time management skills help students maintain healthier digital habits (Uhls et al., 2017).

Cyberbullying prevention is another urgent priority. Exposure to online harassment significantly undermines students' mental health, contributing to anxiety, depression, and academic disengagement (Kowalski et al., 2014). Whole-school anti-bullying programs that incorporate digital citizenship education have been effective in reducing cyberbullying prevalence and improving emotional outcomes (Hutson et al., 2018).

Finally, promoting **healthy digital use**—such as using online platforms for collaboration, learning, and peer support—can enhance engagement and social connectedness (Best et al., 2014). Educational institutions must balance risks and opportunities by creating structured policies, integrating digital wellbeing education into curricula, and equipping students to navigate the digital world responsibly.

VI. Research and Policy Directions

A. Future Research Needs

Conceptual clarity and measurement

Despite rapid growth in the literature, “emotional wellbeing” is often operationalized inconsistently (e.g., affect balance, flourishing, life satisfaction), creating construct proliferation and hindering cumulative science (Diener et al., 2018; Huppert, 2009). Future work should articulate **clear construct boundaries** and **theory-driven nomological networks** that distinguish emotional wellbeing from related constructs (e.g., symptoms, resilience, life satisfaction) while specifying shared variance (Keyes, 2006; Suldo, 2021).

Methodologically, progress requires **multi-method, multi-informant** assessment that combines self-report with teacher/parent ratings, ecological momentary assessment (EMA), and behavioral/cognitive indices (Butler & Kern, 2016; Watson et al., 1988). Researchers should preferentially use measures with strong evidence of **structural validity**, **internal consistency**, **test–retest reliability**, and **responsiveness to change**, and report these properties transparently per contemporary measurement standards.

Validated instruments that can anchor future studies include: the **PERMA-Profiler** (Butler & Kern, 2016); the **Warwick–Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS)** (Tennant et al., 2007); the **WHO-5 Well-Being Index** (Topp et al., 2015); the **Flourishing Scale** (Diener et al., 2010); and adolescent-specific tools such as **EPOCH** (Engagement, Perseverance, Optimism, Connectedness, Happiness) (Kern et al., 2016). For school contexts, measurement strategies should also integrate **academic engagement** and **school belonging** as correlates/outcomes to test theorized mechanisms (Allen et al., 2018).



Psychometric work should prioritize **measurement invariance** (configural/metric/scalar) across sex, age, language, and socioeconomic groups using multi-group CFA or IRT, to ensure comparability (Cheung & Rensvold, 2002; Reise, 2012). Item-level analyses, differential item functioning, and modern IRT/Rasch modeling can refine scales for brevity and clarity in educational settings (Reise, 2012). Combined with **preregistered analysis plans** and **open materials/data**, these practices will strengthen reproducibility and cross-study synthesis.

Cross-cultural and longitudinal research

Because schooling systems and cultural emotion norms vary widely, **cross-cultural validation** is essential (OECD, 2019; UNESCO, 2021). Studies should use **back-translation**, cognitive interviewing, and invariance testing to adapt tools across contexts, followed by **multisite** sampling to estimate contextual moderators (Stevanovic, 2016; Kern et al., 2015). Longitudinally, research should deploy **growth-curve**, **cross-lagged panel**, and **latent transition** models to map reciprocal pathways between emotional wellbeing and academic, social, and health outcomes from primary through tertiary education (Curran et al., 2010; Singer & Willett, 2003). Designs that integrate **developmental milestones** (e.g., school transitions, examinations) and **policy shocks** (e.g., curriculum changes) can test causal theorized mechanisms. Emerging methods—**EMA**, **digital phenotyping** (passive smartphone/sensor data), and **learning analytics**—offer fine-grained temporal resolution for emotion regulation, sleep, and stress exposures; their use must be guided by robust ethics, privacy protection, and student agency (Onnela & Rauch, 2016; Prinsloo & Slade, 2017).

B. Policy Implications

Wellbeing indicators in educational quality frameworks

International frameworks now position wellbeing as an explicit outcome of schooling (OECD, 2019; UNESCO, 2021; WHO, 2020). At the system level, ministries and accreditation bodies should include **standardized wellbeing indicators**—alongside literacy/numeracy—in dashboards for quality assurance and school improvement. Indicators may include: (a) validated student-reported wellbeing scales (e.g., WEMWBS or PERMA-Profiler); (b) **school belonging** and **safety** indices; (c) **help-seeking access** and **service utilization**; and (d) **equity gaps** (e.g., SES, gender) in wellbeing outcomes (Allen et al., 2018; OECD, 2019).

Measurement should be **developmentally tiered** (primary, secondary, tertiary), scheduled (e.g., annual/biannual), and embedded within **responsible data governance** and “assessment for improvement” (not high-stakes accountability) to avoid unintended pressure or gaming (UNESCO, 2021; Prinsloo & Slade, 2017). Linking wellbeing indicators to **school self-evaluation**, external review, and targeted support can enable iterative improvement cycles.

Institutional and national adoption of wellbeing-centered policies

At institutional level, policies should mandate a **whole-school approach** that integrates curriculum (SEL, mindfulness, resilience training), staff professional development, accessible counseling, and inclusive climate initiatives (Durlak et al., 2011; Taylor et al., 2017; Kuyken et al., 2019). Clear **pathways to care** (tiered supports, referral protocols, crisis procedures) and **student voice** mechanisms (wellbeing councils, co-design) are pivotal (WHO, 2020; UNESCO, 2021). At national/state level, **strategic guidance** should:

1. Define emotional wellbeing and its measurement standards for schools/HEIs;
2. Fund **implementation support** (training, supervision, fidelity monitoring) and **equitable resource allocation** for disadvantaged settings;
3. Require **reporting of wellbeing indicators** with disaggregated equity analyses; and
4. Stimulate **research–practice partnerships** to evaluate effectiveness, scalability, and cost-effectiveness (OECD, 2019; UNESCO, 2021; WHO, 2020).

Economic analyses increasingly suggest that school mental health promotion can yield downstream benefits in **educational attainment**, **employment**, and **healthcare cost offsets**, strengthening the public value case for sustained investment (Kuyken et al., 2019; Durlak et al., 2011).

VII. Conclusion

Summary of Arguments

This paper has argued that emotional wellbeing must be positioned as a **core construct** in student development, rather than a peripheral concern. The review of literature and theoretical foundations demonstrated that emotional wellbeing is conceptually distinct from—but strongly interconnected with—mental health, life satisfaction, and resilience (Keyes, 2006; Diener et al., 2018). Drawing upon humanistic, positive, and developmental psychology frameworks, emotional wellbeing emerges as both an **outcome** of supportive educational systems and an **enabler** of academic, social, and personal growth (Maslow, 1968; Rogers, 1961; Seligman, 2011; Erikson, 1968). Evidence further indicates that emotional wellbeing influences critical developmental domains. Cognitively, it enhances emotional regulation, attention, and problem-solving (Blair & Raver, 2015). Socially, it strengthens peer relationships, empathy, and interpersonal competence (Schonert-Reichl, 2017). Behaviorally, it supports engagement, healthy lifestyle choices, and participation in co-curricular activities (Fredricks & Eccles, 2006). Emotional wellbeing also interacts with protective and risk factors such as family support, peer influence, socioeconomic background, and digital media exposure, shaping overall developmental outcomes (Fergus & Zimmerman, 2005; Twenge & Campbell, 2018). At the



systems level, overreliance on achievement-oriented models—measured primarily by grades and standardized testing—has been shown to narrow the definition of success, overlook psychosocial competencies, and contribute to heightened stress and inequity (Pascoe et al., 2020; Reardon, 2011). By contrast, emotional wellbeing equips students with resilience, adaptability, and socio-emotional skills that are indispensable for long-term flourishing, employability, and societal contribution (Heckman & Kautz, 2012; Kern et al., 2015).

Call for a Paradigm Shift

The evidence presented calls for a **paradigm shift in education**—from a narrow focus on achievement to a **holistic model of student development** that values cognitive, social, and emotional growth equally. Such a shift is consistent with global frameworks that increasingly recognize wellbeing as a legitimate educational outcome. UNESCO's *Futures of Education* report (2021), the OECD's *Learning Compass 2030* (2019), and the WHO's mental health promotion guidelines (2020) converge on the argument that wellbeing should be central to policy, curriculum, and assessment. This shift requires structural reforms: integrating socio-emotional learning, mindfulness, and resilience-building into curricula (Taylor et al., 2017); conducting institutional wellbeing audits and creating inclusive learning environments (Allen et al., 2018); equipping teachers and counselors with emotional literacy and mentoring skills (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009); and addressing digital wellbeing challenges such as cyberbullying and screen-time balance (Kowalski et al., 2014; Twenge & Campbell, 2018).

Vision for Education Systems Valuing Cognitive, Social, and Emotional Growth Equally

The vision for future education systems must be one in which **wellbeing is both a right and a measurable outcome** of schooling. Such systems will move beyond equating success with test scores to **holistic indices of development** that capture how students think, feel, and engage with the world. In this model, emotional wellbeing becomes a cornerstone of lifelong learning, enabling young people to cultivate resilience, empathy, adaptability, and meaning—competencies that are critical in navigating the uncertainties of the 21st century (World Economic Forum, 2020; Huppert, 2009). Ultimately, the call is for education to be **redefined as a vehicle for human flourishing**. By integrating emotional wellbeing into the heart of student development, educational systems can produce not only academically competent graduates but also emotionally resilient, socially responsible, and psychologically healthy individuals. This transformation, grounded in evidence and supported by global policy, represents a necessary evolution in the mission of education: preparing students not merely to achieve, but to **thrive**.

References

1. Allen, K. A., Kern, M. L., Vella-Brodrick, D., Hattie, J., & Waters, L. (2018). What schools need to know about fostering school belonging: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 30(1), 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-016-9389-8>
2. Anderman, L. H. (2002). School effects on psychological outcomes during adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(4), 795–809. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.94.4.795>
3. Auerbach, R. P., Mortier, P., Bruffaerts, R., Alonso, J., Benjet, C., Cuijpers, P., ... & WHO WMH-ICS Collaborators. (2018). WHO World Mental Health Surveys International College Student Project: Prevalence and distribution of mental disorders. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 127(7), 623–638. <https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000362>
4. Beattie, L., Stewart, S. H., & Walker, J. R. (2019). Stress and well-being in higher education: A critical review. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 38(6), 1103–1117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1615419>
5. Best, P., Manktelow, R., & Taylor, B. (2014). Online communication, social media, and adolescent wellbeing: A systematic narrative review. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 41, 27–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.03.001>
6. Blair, C., & Raver, C. C. (2015). School readiness and self-regulation: A developmental psychobiological approach. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 66(1), 711–731. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015221>
7. Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., Reyes, M. R., & Salovey, P. (2011). Enhancing academic performance and social and emotional competence with the RULER feeling words curriculum. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 22(2), 218–224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2010.10.002>
8. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.
9. Brown, C. (2017). Student counseling services and their impact on mental health outcomes in higher education. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy*, 31(3), 204–223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87568225.2017.1298708>
10. Bukowski, W. M., Laursen, B., & Rubin, K. H. (2020). *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and groups* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
11. Butler, J., & Kern, M. L. (2016). The PERMA-Profil: A brief multidimensional measure of flourishing. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 6(3), 1–48. <https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v6i3.526>
12. Cheung, G. W., & Rensvold, R. B. (2002). Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 9(2), 233–255. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_5



13. Côté, S. (2014). Emotional intelligence in organizations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 459–488. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091233>
14. Crisp, G., & Cruz, I. (2009). Mentoring college students: A critical review of the literature between 1990 and 2007. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(6), 525–545. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11662-009-9130-2>
15. Curran, P. J., Howard, A. L., Bainter, S. A., Lane, S. T., & McGinley, J. S. (2010). The separation of between-person and within-person components of individual change over time: A latent curve model with structured residuals. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 78(6), 904–916. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020116>
16. Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Tay, L. (2018). Advances in subjective well-being research. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2(4), 253–260. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0307-6>
17. Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2010). New well-being measures: Short scales to assess flourishing and positive and negative feelings. *Social Indicators Research*, 97(2), 143–156. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9493-y>
18. Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development*, 82(1), 405–432. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x>
19. Eccles, J. S., & Roeser, R. W. (2011). Schools as developmental contexts during adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 21(1), 225–241. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00725.x>
20. El Ansari, W., Stock, C., & Mikolajczyk, R. T. (2011). Relationships between food consumption and living arrangements among university students in four European countries – A cross-sectional study. *Nutrition Journal*, 10, 58. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2891-10-58>
21. Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. W. W. Norton.
22. Fergus, S., & Zimmerman, M. A. (2005). Adolescent resilience: A framework for understanding healthy development in the face of risk. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 26(1), 399–419. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.26.021304.144357>
23. Fredricks, J. A., & Eccles, J. S. (2006). Is extracurricular participation associated with beneficial outcomes? Concurrent and longitudinal relations. *Developmental Psychology*, 42(4), 698–713. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.42.4.698>
24. Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 218–226. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.218>
25. Gross, J. J. (2015). Emotion regulation: Current status and future prospects. *Psychological Inquiry*, 26(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2014.940781>
26. Gulliver, A., Griffiths, K. M., & Christensen, H. (2010). Perceived barriers and facilitators to mental health help-seeking in young people: A systematic review. *BMC Psychiatry*, 10(1), 113. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-244X-10-113>
27. Heckman, J. J., & Kautz, T. (2012). Hard evidence on soft skills. *Labour Economics*, 19(4), 451–464. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2012.05.014>
28. Huppert, F. A. (2009). Psychological well-being: Evidence regarding its causes and consequences. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 1(2), 137–164. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1758-0854.2009.01008.x>
29. Hutson, E., Kelly, S., & Militello, L. K. (2018). Systematic review of cyberbullying interventions for youth and parents with implications for evidence-based practice. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing*, 15(1), 72–79. <https://doi.org/10.1111/wvn.12257>
30. Jennings, P. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(1), 491–525. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308325693>
31. Kern, M. L., Benson, L., Steinberg, E. A., & Steinberg, L. (2016). The EPOCH measure of adolescent wellbeing. *Psychological Assessment*, 28(5), 586–597. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000201>
32. Kern, M. L., Waters, L. E., Adler, A., & White, M. A. (2015). A multidimensional approach to measuring well-being in students: Application of the PERMA framework. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 10(3), 262–271. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2014.936962>
33. Keyes, C. L. M. (2006). Mental health in adolescence: Is America's youth flourishing? *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 76(3), 395–402. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0002-9432.76.3.395>
34. Kowalski, R. M., Giumetti, G. W., Schroeder, A. N., & Lattanner, M. R. (2014). Bullying in the digital age: A critical review and meta-analysis of cyberbullying research among youth. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140(4), 1073–1137. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035618>
35. Kroger, J. (2017). Identity development in adolescence and adulthood. In S. J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V. L. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of identity theory and research* (pp. 65–80). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-7988-9_4



36. Kuyken, W., Nuthall, E., Byford, S., Crane, C., Dalgleish, T., Ford, T., ... & Williams, J. M. G. (2019). Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of school-based mindfulness training compared with teaching-as-usual for adolescents at risk of mental health problems: A randomized controlled trial. *The Lancet*, 394(10205), 2065–2075. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(19\)31258-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)31258-1)
37. Martin, A. J., & Marsh, H. W. (2009). Academic resilience and student engagement: The role of motivational and emotional resources. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(3), 573–582. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014239>
38. Maslow, A. H. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being* (2nd ed.). Van Nostrand Reinhold.
39. Masten, A. S. (2014). *Ordinary magic: Resilience in development*. Guilford Press.
40. OECD. (2019). *OECD future of education and skills 2030: OECD Learning Compass 2030*. OECD Publishing.
41. Onnela, J.-P., & Rauch, S. L. (2016). Harnessing smartphone-based digital phenotyping to enhance behavioral and mental health. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 41(7), 1691–1696. <https://doi.org/10.1038/npp.2016.7>
42. Owens, M., Stevenson, J., Hadwin, J. A., & Norgate, R. (2012). Anxiety and depression in academic performance: An exploration of the mediating factors of worry and working memory. *School Psychology International*, 33(4), 433–449. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034311427433>
43. Pascoe, M. C., Hetrick, S. E., & Parker, A. G. (2020). The impact of stress on students in secondary school and higher education. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 25(1), 104–112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2019.1596823>
44. Patel, V., Saxena, S., Lund, C., Thornicroft, G., Baingana, F., Bolton, P., ... & Unützer, J. (2018). The Lancet Commission on global mental health and sustainable development. *The Lancet*, 392(10157), 1553–1598. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)31612-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31612-X)
45. Prinsloo, P., & Slade, S. (2017). An elephant in the learning analytics room: The obligation to act. In *LAK17: Proceedings of the 7th International Learning Analytics & Knowledge Conference* (pp. 46–55). ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3027385.3027406>
46. Putwain, D. W. (2017). Fear appeals in the primary classroom: Effects on test anxiety and test performance. *Learning and Instruction*, 54, 150–157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2017.08.001>
47. Ravens-Sieberer, U., Kaman, A., Erhart, M., Devine, J., Schlack, R., & Otto, C. (2021). Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on quality of life and mental health in children and adolescents. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 31(6), 879–889. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-021-01726-5>
48. Reardon, S. F. (2011). The widening academic achievement gap between the rich and the poor: New evidence and possible explanations. In G. J. Duncan & R. J. Murnane (Eds.), *Whither opportunity? Rising inequality, schools, and children's life chances* (pp. 91–116). Russell Sage Foundation.
49. Reise, S. P. (2012). The rediscovery of bifactor measurement models. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 47(5), 667–696. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2012.715555>
50. Reiss, F. (2013). Socioeconomic inequalities and mental health problems in children and adolescents: A systematic review. *Social Science & Medicine*, 90, 24–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.04.026>
51. Reschly, A. L., & Christenson, S. L. (2012). Jingle, jangle, and conceptual haziness: Evolution and future directions of the engagement construct. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 3–20). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_1
52. Rogers, C. R. (1961). *On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy*. Houghton Mifflin.
53. Rueger, S. Y., Malecki, C. K., & Demaray, M. K. (2016). Relationship between multiple sources of perceived social support and psychological and academic adjustment in early adolescence: Comparisons across gender. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 45(6), 1226–1243. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-016-0430-0>
54. Schmeichel, B. J., & Tang, D. (2015). Individual differences in executive functioning and their relationship to emotional processes and responses. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 24(2), 93–98. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721414555178>
55. Schonert-Reichl, K. A. (2017). Social and emotional learning and teachers. *The Future of Children*, 27(1), 137–155. <https://doi.org/10.1353/foc.2017.0007>
56. Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. Free Press.
57. Singer, J. D., & Willett, J. B. (2003). *Applied longitudinal data analysis: Modeling change and event occurrence*. Oxford University Press.
58. Steinberg, L., & Monahan, K. C. (2007). Age differences in resistance to peer influence. *Developmental Psychology*, 43(6), 1531–1543. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.43.6.1531>
59. Stevanovic, D. (2016). Quality of life enjoyment and satisfaction questionnaire—Short form for quality of life assessments in clinical practice: A psychometric study. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 23(3–4), 185–195. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpm.12294>
60. Suldo, S. M. (2021). Promoting student happiness: Positive psychology interventions in schools. *Educational Psychologist*, 56(2), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2021.1887013>



61. Taylor, R. D., Oberle, E., Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2017). Promoting positive youth development through school-based social and emotional learning interventions: A meta-analysis of follow-up effects. *Child Development*, 88(4), 1156–1171. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12864>
62. Tennant, R., Hiller, L., Fishwick, R., Platt, S., Joseph, S., Weich, S., ... Stewart-Brown, S. (2007). The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS): Development and UK validation. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 5, 63. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7525-5-63>
63. Topp, C. W., Østergaard, S. D., Søndergaard, S., & Bech, P. (2015). The WHO-5 Well-Being Index: A systematic review of the literature. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 84(3), 167–176. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000376585>
64. Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2018). Associations between screen time and lower psychological well-being among children and adolescents: Evidence from a population-based study. *Preventive Medicine Reports*, 12, 271–283. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmedr.2018.10.003>
65. Uhls, Y. T., Ellison, N. B., & Subrahmanyam, K. (2017). Benefits and costs of social media in adolescence. *Pediatrics*, 140(Supplement 2), S67–S70. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2016-1758E>
66. UNESCO. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. UNESCO Publishing.
67. Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(6), 1063–1070. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063>
68. World Economic Forum. (2020). *The future of jobs report 2020*. World Economic Forum.
69. World Health Organization. (2020). *Mental health and psychosocial considerations for the COVID-19 outbreak*. WHO.
70. World Health Organization. (2020). *Mental health and well-being: Strengthening our response*. WHO.