


Neuroscience of engagement and SCARF: why they matter to schools

Dr. Giselle O. Martin-Kniep



This article was published in the

NeuroLeadership **JOURNAL**

ISSUE THREE 2010

The attached copy is furnished to the author for non-commercial research and education use, including for instruction at the author's institution, sharing with colleagues and providing to institutional administration.

Other uses, including reproduction and distribution, or selling or licensing copies, or posting to personal, institutional or third-party websites are prohibited.

In most cases authors are permitted to post a version of the article to their personal website or institutional repository. Authors requiring further information regarding the **NeuroLeadership JOURNALs** archiving and management policies are encouraged to send inquiries to: support@neuroleadership.org

www.NeuroLeadership.org

This article was published in the **NeuroLeadership JOURNAL**. The attached copy is furnished to the author for non-commercial research and education use, including for instruction at the author's institution, sharing with colleagues and providing to institutional administration.

Other uses, including reproduction and distribution, or selling or licensing copies, or posting to personal, institutional or third-party websites are prohibited.

In most cases authors are permitted to post a version of the article to the personal website or institutional repository. Authors requiring further information regarding the **NeuroLeadership JOURNAL's** archiving and management policies are encouraged to send inquiries to: support@neuroleadership.org

Neuroscience of engagement and SCARF: why they matter to schools

Dr. Giselle O. Martin-Kniep

President, LCI Learner-Centered Initiatives, Ltd, Floral Park, New York

gisellemk@lci ltd.org

More than 50 years ago Professor James B. Conant, former president of Harvard, wrote that the education system “works, most of us like it, and it appears to be as permanent a feature of our society as most of our political institutions” Conant (1959). In the years of debate over the efficacy of the education system that ultimately ensued, it is probably most fair to say that at least the latter part of his statement remains true. With regard to the former, within a decade of Professor Conant’s optimistic assessment, demands for education improvement, reform, and change began to be raised (Holt, 1969; Silberman, 1970; Illich, 1971). A variety of both government and non-government studies brought to light system shortcomings in fundamental skill mastery (particularly in the sciences), school-to-work relationships, dropout rates, teacher turnover, school leadership, and other ailments (Goldberg, 1996; U.S. National Commission, 1983; Ravitch, D., 2010). The situation confronting the education system, and the stakeholders it was intended to serve, was perhaps best expressed by Mr. Silberman, who at the time of his writing was an editor at *Fortune* magazine:

“It is not possible to spend any prolonged period visiting public school classrooms without being appalled by the mutilation visible everywhere – mutilation of spontaneity, of joy in learning, of pleasure in creating, of sense of self. The ... schools... are the kind of institution one cannot really dislike until one gets to know them well. Because adults take the schools so much for granted, they fail to appreciate what grim, joyless places most ... schools are, how oppressive and petty are the rules by which they are governed, how intellectually and aesthetically barren the atmosphere.” (Silberman, p. 10)

In the decades that followed, educational reform took on a variety of forms, all intended to bring about needed changes. These reforms can be categorized generally as calling for changes in content (Evans, 2005; Goodson, 1993), expectations (Weinstein, 2004), time (Kneese, 2009), teaching and assessment (Martin-Kniep & Picone-Zocchia, 2009), and infrastructure (Adelman & Taylor, 2007; Donaldson, 2006). Virtually all Western governments responded by enacting legislation and creating commissions intent on reforming the educational process (Boyd-Barret & O’Malley, 1995; Ibáñez-Martín & Jover, 2010). Despite these well intended efforts, and with educational improvement and reform a continuing priority worldwide, the search for viable solutions continues today.

A more recently proposed solution showing considerable promise is the application of neuroscience to the educational environment (Sousa, 2010). Over the past decade significant advances in brain-imaging technology, most specifically in the use of the fMRI, have provided neuroscientists, social psychologists and instructional theorists with significant new insights into the functioning of the brain (Ochsner & Lieberman 2001; Geary, 2007). In fact, back in 1997 there were just ten such studies published; in 2007, there were nearly eight per day (*Editorial*, 2008). Taken together, and particularly in the case of driving change, this neuroscience and social psychology research has the potential to significantly advance our understanding of how school leaders can improve the quality of their areas of responsibility – improving both student and teacher productivity, creativity, and ability to solve problems. Despite its relative youth, neuroscience research and the

tools it suggests have brought about considerable interest in neuroscience's applications to teaching (Jensen, 2005); learning (Sousa, 2005); the curriculum (Costa, 2009); and education science in general (Tokuhama-Espinosa, 2010). Utilizing the lens of neuroscience, this note looks at the potential application of the Status, Certainty, Autonomy, Relatedness and Fairness (SCARF) model (Rock, 2008, 2009) to the education system, specifically considering its ability to elevate the engagement level of the school learning and teacher working environments.

The notion of engagement in schools

In general, the term 'engagement' refers to the degree to which a person is committed or dedicated to an organization or relationship (Rutledge, 2005); Rock & Tang, 2009). In the workplace, it refers to the degree of positive emotion a person attaches to the organization, their job and their colleagues. When a person is engaged, they are attracted to, inspired by, committed to, and even fascinated by their work, or their input to the relationship. Students are said to be 'engaged' when they make a psychological investment in learning, are involved in their school and its activities, persist despite challenges and obstacles, and take visible pride in accomplishing learning objectives beyond grades (Newmann, 1989; Newmann, 1992; Gordon, 2006). Student engagement in schools has been found to be one of the most robust predictors of student achievement (Guthrie *et al.*, 2001), regardless of the student's economic and social stature (Klem & Connell, 2004).

In exploring the issue of the 'engaged student', students fall into five main categories of engagement (see Figure 1):

- **Actively disengaged:** a high average threat state.
- **Disengaged:** an average threat state.
- **Neutral:** midway between threat and reward states.
- **Engaged:** on average a reward state.
- **Deeply engaged:** strong average reward state.

Student engagement in schools has been found to be one of the most robust predictors of student achievement . . .

Students in the first category have the potential to undermine the learning environment. By contrast, an engaged student is positive for everyone – fellow students, teachers, administrators, and parents (Gordon, 2006).




Figure 1: Levels of Engagement.

SCARF in schools: an illustration

How might using SCARF increase students' ability to assume greater responsibility for their own learning? How might it help parents expand on their use of rewards for motivating their children? What role might SCARF play in the development and support of teachers' learning and work? Let's begin with a brief preview of how SCARF plays out in the world of schools from first the student perspective and then from that of teachers and administrators.

Self-regulation is a critical function of our brain and is central to our capacity to control our impulses, make strategic decisions, moderate our emotions and pursue our goals.

SCARF elements and the student

Janira is a 12-year-old student in an urban middle school. She is an avid doodler in class. She is also prone to distractions and has a hard time sitting still during her teacher's lectures. She is articulate, opinionated, and passionate about lots of things including art, music, animals, people, and culture, but has a difficult time connecting any of her interests with the actual classroom material provided by her teachers. Her disengagement reveals itself in constant acts of defiance, including talking back to her teachers, refusing to complete work, doing homework, or finishing tests. These acts have earned her a long-standing reputation of a rebel if not a bully. In the past three months, she has gone to school detention ten times and has been suspended twice. Despite her parents' attempts to reason with her, or with the school, nothing has changed. Her parents mirror the school's punishments with curfews and loss of privileges that Janira finds a way to defy on a regular basis. Janira feels increasingly alienated and disengaged. She has befriended a small group of peers who

no longer attend school and who do all kinds of drugs, and has become the leader of that group.

Janira experienced very little status in her school so she sought it elsewhere. The constant detentions and suspensions did little to change her negative outlook about school or to provide her with a sense of fairness. Her ability to relate to her peers at school was greatly diminished by her being singled out and separated from them, so she found relatedness with her new peers. She sought autonomy outside of the school setting since no one had legitimately involved her in shaping the scenarios that could lead her to experience a different reality at school. Her certainty was situational and was limited to the positive and negative consequences she could predict from her experiences in school and with her new friends. Now, what might have happened if Janira's parents and the school had increased her autonomy by providing her with the opportunity to shape some of her work in school, perhaps by asserting greater control over what she learned, or how she could demonstrate her learning? How might her sense of certainty and fairness have changed if she had been encouraged to define goals and accept the consequence for not meeting them, or if she could have defined and monitored the actions she was taking towards meeting her goals? How might her status have increased if her teachers, or the school administrator, had enabled her to share her talents and passion at school?

SCARF elements: teachers and administrators

While one may think that Janira represents a rather extreme case of a student, she is not unique. Many schools struggle to accommodate the needs of students who do not conform in one way or another. Furthermore, alienation such as Janira's is found among other school actors as well. A few months ago I was faced with a group of educators immobilized by a deep collective anxiety. The group included school superintendents, technology and data specialists, and school officials charged with helping schools use inquiry and data. The anxiety they displayed resulted from changes in city and state government legislation that called for a reorganization of the Department of Education. As a result, many of the people wondered about what their new positions would be. Whereas one might consider this situation as one that warranted such anxiety, these individuals had deep familiarity with changing legislation and its consequences for schools. Approximately 85 percent of these individuals had experienced at least two reorganizations in the past, and most of them had been working in the educational system for over 15 years. However, despite their prior experiences with significant reorganizations, the group felt demoralized and anxious about their future. During my time with them, they struggled to assimilate the material we were exploring, arguing that they were not sure of the specific situations in which they could apply them.

On the morning of my third day with the administrators, I referred to SCARF as a means to help individuals reframe their thinking around the domains they had some control over. We determined that status, certainty, autonomy, and fairness were not rewards they could access or tap into in their present situation. We then explored the role that relatedness had played in building the individual and collective resilience of this group, and brainstormed additional strategies for explicitly using relatedness to strengthen their motivation and increase their collective self-efficacy. We identified the givens and uncertainties of their positions, and the group was able to generate tangible strategies for strengthening their social and professional relatedness, including scheduled meetings, informal gatherings and information-technology networks. Having SCARF as a framework for identifying coping strategies lightened the load everyone was carrying and changed the tenor of the room, thereby enabling them to operate as learners rather than reactors.

The case for SCARF in schools in building an engaged school

I found my SCARF experience with administrators to be quite enlightening and insightful. What follows is a modest attempt at exploring the status and value of different SCARF rewards for different stakeholders in schools along with some guiding questions they could pose as they consider those rewards within schools.

Recent studies have revealed that there is a positive relationship between our status and our dopamine receptors.

Status

Status refers to the ascribed position in which we place ourselves relative to others in our different communities. Recent studies have revealed that there is a positive relationship between our status and our dopamine receptors (Martinez *et al.*, 2010). This suggests that people who have higher status have a greater ability to experience pleasure. For the most part, administrators possess high status among teachers and students in terms of defining the terms of engagement and enacting policies, programs

and practices. This status is higher for building and district leaders than for middle-level administrators. With ever-increasing external accountability requirements (Abernathy, 2007), such status is threatened if the school is not meeting standards, but can be enhanced when administrators are able to redirect their attention to the ways in which they inspire, enable or influence the people they are responsible for. Administrators can increase the status of adults and students in the school by identifying formal leadership roles and providing them with greater autonomy. Questions that administrators could pursue if they wanted to develop distributed leadership structures in the school and increase status rewards for teachers and other adults include:

- How can teachers feel empowered? What actions would increase their status?
- What policies could result in a greater distribution of student status?
- How might the school leverage high quality work in the school to increase the status of those who produce it?
- How might the teacher evaluation process be redirected towards a focus on growth and improvement?
- How might listening and communication behaviors be used to increase status among staff members, students, and parents?
- What routines or policies might increase our regard for parent input or contributions towards their children's education?

Teachers tend to have high status among students in terms of enforcing rules and policies, enacting practices, and ascribing value to student work. Their status among peers is less dependent on seniority than on their perceived influence in school. Such status can be threatened by low student performance or by political strife among staff within the school. Teachers can increase the status of students in their classes by ascribing them with formal leadership roles, providing them with a structure that maximizes their choice and autonomy, and giving them opportunities to excel in self-defined areas. Some of the questions that teachers can pursue as they consider enhancing their own status and the status of their students include:

- How can you use or disseminate your expertise about teaching and learning to help others?
- What projects, activities or routines might reward students for their thinking, work or values?
- What are the different ways in which students' talents and interests could be acknowledged and fostered?
- What activities or structures could you use to increase the status of students in your own classes and in the school at large?
- What grouping structures might increase students' ability to relate to each other in ways that could increase their status and interdependence?

Teachers tend to have high status among students in terms of enforcing rules and policies, enacting practices, and ascribing value to student work.

Parents have significant status at home, but their perceived status in schools varies depending on a number of factors, including the school's culture and the ways in which schools invite and engage parental input and participation. In many schools students have low status in terms of decision-making about rules, norms, and work in the school. Their status with peers is dependent on the perceived pecking order of the traits that students in the school community value. Student status is increased by grades, awards, and by excelling in behaviors that are valued. Status is threatened if they do not meet minimum standards or if they go against student-developed norms and behaviors. Questions students and parents could consider to enhance their status include:

- What do you know, do well, or care about that could help your peers, teachers, or someone else in the school?
- How can you share or use your passions and interests to help others?
- How can your work help someone else learn or do something?
- In what ways could you share what you care about with others?
- Who can you support or help?

Certainty

Certainty refers to the ability to predict the future based on previous experiences and patterns. Having access to new information, in and of itself, is highly connected to certainty and is rewarding to the brain. For both administrators and teachers certainty is high in terms of job security when they are tenured, but it is often compromised in terms of knowing what is expected of them with increasing external accountability demands.

Middle-level managers and teachers experience more or less certainty depending on their specific school assignments since such assignments are sometimes made with limited

input from them. Administrators can increase the certainty among those who work for them through transparent and continuous communication, and by involving them in decision making, securing their input in terms of job-related responsibilities and giving them greater control over the allocation or use of school and other resources.

Students' sense of certainty is high in terms of classes, school routines, and expectations. It is also high in terms of their anticipating future subjects, grades, and standards.

When students' locus of control is external, or when their teachers are inconsistent in terms of their routines, standards and expectations, their certainty in terms of predicting their ability to cope or succeed may be compromised.

School administrators and teachers can increase student certainty by ensuring that teachers share similar expectations for student behavior, performance and work quality, through access to explicit and attainable opportunities to learn, and through the enforcement of consistent norms.

Questions that increase certainty for all school stakeholders include:

- What can we do to increase our sense of certainty about our values and commitments (at home or at school)?
- What are some non-negotiables we want to abide to (in school, at home)?
- What policies, processes and practices do we need to establish, and consistently enforce, to increase everyone's sense of certainty?
- Who can students, teachers, administrators, and others depend on for advice? Support? How can support be more accessible to others?
- In what contexts do individuals and group members feel safe?
- How do we increase the sense of safety for everyone?
- How can we manage information flow and exchanges to promote certainty?
- How can we create a bridge between the sense of certainty all stakeholders feel at home and at school?

Autonomy

Autonomy is the ability to have and make choices, and in a sense, to have the illusion of control. It is highly connected to our sense of efficacy. For administrators, autonomy is very much dependent on their specific job assignment. District and building leaders tend to have a high degree of autonomy in terms of hiring, allocating and managing resources, and setting policies. The autonomy of middle-level administrators and other staff members is very much dependent on the leadership style of their supervisors and on opportunities they provide related to the allocation of resources and the shaping and implementation of policies, processes, programs, and practices.

Teachers who are tenured operate mostly without significant oversight or supervision. Untenured teachers have far less autonomy and experience a great degree of oversight during their untenured period. Their autonomy is greatly increased when they have opportunities to design or revise curriculum and assessment, and when they can provide input on policies, programs, and schedules. Both tenured and untenured teachers operate under the pressure of external accountability forces that greatly curtail their perceived autonomy.

Administrators and teachers can increase their own autonomy and the autonomy that they provide others by addressing questions such as:

- How can teachers assume greater control and responsibility for curriculum, instruction, or assessment decisions while staying true to the mission and vision of the school?
- In what ways could teachers support each other's learning and work without administrative oversight?
- What school or classroom routines could be implemented and monitored by others? Could be self-monitored?
- How might we increase the amount of discretion or choice that teachers and other staff members have without compromising a unified vision?
- In what context could students have greater choice about what they learn, how they learn, or how they demonstrate their learning attainment?
- How can the evaluation process for both staff members and students incorporate greater attention to goal setting and strategic planning?
- How might teacher and other staff members' goals become a greater focus of school-related activities and work?

In many schools student autonomy is low in terms of determining what to learn, how to learn, and how to demonstrate such learning. Teachers and parents can greatly enhance student autonomy by enabling students to set learning goals, determine the means to attain them, and helping them monitor them. They can also increase students' autonomy by providing students with choice in terms of what they learn or how they can demonstrate an understanding of what they have learned.

- In what contexts could students have greater choice about what they learn or do, how they learn it or do it, and how they demonstrate their learning attainment?
- What culminating projects or experiences would increase students' choice and control over their work and presentations?
- How can classroom routines incorporate more and clearer options for students to exercise?
- How could students be encouraged to have greater control over how they spend time in class? At home?
- How can the student evaluation process incorporate greater attention to goal setting and strategic planning?

Relatedness

Relatedness has to do with whether we consider others friends or foes, and about who is in our 'in group' and who is in our 'out group'. The degree to which relatedness is a reward in a school depends very much on the size and the culture of the school. For the most part, much of the school day is structured in ways that minimize opportunities for significant adult-to-adult communication so relatedness occurs informally and is fostered primarily among students and between teachers and students.

The degree to which relatedness is a reward in a school depends very much on the size and the culture of the school.

Administrators can increase relatedness for teachers and other adults in the school with opportunities for teachers to work with their peers and with school staff and community members. Teachers can increase relatedness by providing students with varied learning configurations including peer-to-peer, and varied forms of group work. Students' sense of relatedness varies in terms of their formal and informal opportunities for relationships with peers and family. Parents' sense of relatedness varies depending on the extent to which they feel welcomed and an integral part of the school community. Schools can increase relatedness with opportunities for students to learn and work collaboratively with peers and with other students and adults in the school and in the community. Questions that increase relatedness between and among all school stakeholders include:

- Who has a sense of community in our school?
- What do we celebrate? When do we celebrate? How can we structure formal and informal opportunities to celebrate what we care about or value?
- What opportunities could we create for teachers, parents, students, and others to learn more about each other's interests, passions, and work?
- How might we increase our ability to work together towards shared goals and interests?
- In what ways and to what ends do we encourage collaboration?
- What can we collaborate on which might increase our regard for each other's expertise?
- How do we minimize cliques?

Fairness

Fairness is the perception of, and need for, equitable exchange and has to do with our feeling that we are treated justly and equitably. According to various neuroscientists, the social pain system in the brain that relates to fairness may have been piggybacked onto the physical pain system during mammalian evolution (Eisenberg & Lieberman, 2004; Panksepp, 1998).

Depending on their position, administrators may experience a sense of fairness with respect to defining policies, processes, and practices, that establish what is fair or not. Depending on their place within the school hierarchy, they may have more or less control related to transmitting or enforcing regulations and policies. They can increase a sense of fairness for adults and students with clear external expectations for policies and practices and by consistently enforcing incentives and consequences.

Teachers' sense of fairness may be different in terms of their perceptions of the school at large vis-à-vis their own classrooms where they can generate and enforce rules, responsibilities, and expectations. They may have a low sense of fairness if they equate fairness with equal treatment, and if they feel unfairly treated by externally driven policies and regulations. Their sense of fairness can be increased by clear expectations for practices and consistently enforced incentives and consequences and by opportunities to inform expectations and policies. Students are highly sensitive to 'unfair' treatment by peers and others. Teachers and administrators can increase their sense of fairness with clear, explicit expectations and consistently applied norms, incentives and consequences, and by opportunities to participate in the norm-setting or review processes.

The following questions might help teachers and administrators who want to engender a greater sense of fairness for them and for other members of the school community.

- What social justice agendas do we want to promote?
- How do we help everyone understand the distinction between fair and equitable?
- What school initiatives, programs, or activities can we incorporate which include explicit opportunities for students and others to do good deeds?
- What appeals processes could we implement to promote fair treatment or a more equitable allocation of resources?
- How might we increase the transparency of our standards and expectations?
- How can we ensure a greater constancy in teachers or parent expectations?
- In what ways could we engage staff, student or parent input in the development, review, or evaluation of policies or in the identification of standards?

Summary and conclusion

Learning occurs only if we are motivated to learn. SCARF enables us to better understand motivation, rewards, and threats in a far more sophisticated manner than the 'carrot-and-stick' approach. If status, certainty, autonomy, relatedness and fairness serve as stimuli to the brain's threat and reward circuitries, contributing to our motivation to learn, it is critical for individuals and for schools to consider ways of allocating these rewards so as to maximize learning for all.

A growing body of neuroscience research shows that every action a teacher takes, and every decision a teacher makes, either supports or undermines the perceived levels of status, certainty, autonomy, relatedness and fairness among students. In fact, this may be why teaching is so challenging – knowing that every word and glance carries with it social meaning. Sentences and gestures are noticed and interpreted, magnified, and combed for meanings the teacher often never intended. Neuroscience supports the notion that often what the teacher is saying may not be what the students are hearing.

The SCARF model provides a means of alerting the teacher (bringing conscious awareness) to students' core concerns (which they may not even understand themselves) and shows the teacher how to calibrate his or her words and actions to better effect. The process starts by reducing the threats inherent in the classroom and in teacher behavior. Students cannot think creatively, work well with others, or make informed decisions when their threat responses are on high alert. Skilled teachers understand this and act accordingly. The SCARF model also provides a means for students to become more aware of their own needs and the conditions that support their learning. Advancing school practices could enable students to appropriate this knowledge and use it to become more efficacious learners.

For years economists have argued that people will change their behavior if they have sufficient incentive. We now have reason to believe that economic incentives are effective only when people perceive them as supporting their social needs. The SCARF model thus provides students, teachers, and administrators with more nuanced and effective ways to expand the definition of *reward*. In doing so, SCARF principles also provide a more granular understanding of the state of engagement, in which students can give their best performance. Engagement can be induced when people working toward objectives feel rewarded by their efforts, with a manageable level of threat: in short, when the brain is generating rewards in SCARF-related dimensions.

References

- Abernathy, S. (2007). *No Child Left Behind and the Public Schools*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Adelman, H. S. & Taylor, L. (2007). Systematic change for school improvement. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 17(1), 56-77.
- Arnsten, A. F. T. (1998). The biology of being frazzled. *Science*, 280, 1711-1712.
- Boyd-Barret, O. & O'Malley, P. (1995). *Education Reform in Democratic Spain*. New York: Routledge Education.
- Cacioppo, J. T. & Patrick, B. (2008). *Loneliness: human nature and the need for social connection*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Chiao, J. Y., Bordeaux, A.R. & Ambady, N. (2004). Mental representations of social status. *Cognition*, 93(2), 49-57.
- Cohen, D. K., Hill, H. C. & Hill, H. (2001). *Learning Policy: When State Education Reform Works*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Conant, J. B. (1959). *The American High School Today*. New York: Signet Books.
- Costa, A. L. (2009). Habits of mind across the curriculum: Practical and creative strategies for teachers. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.
- Diaz, R. M., Neal, C. J. & Amaya-Williams, M. (1990). The social origins of self-regulation. In L. C. Moll (Ed.), *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology* (127-154). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Donaldson, G. A. (2006). Cultivating leadership in schools: Connecting people. *Purpose & Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Donny, E. C., Bigelow, G. E. & Walsh S. L. (2006). Comparing the physiological and subjective effects of self-administered vs yoked cocaine in humans. *Psychopharmacology*, 186(4), 544-52.
- Dworkin, S. I., Mirkis, S. & Smith J. E. (1995). Response-dependent versus response-independent presentation of cocaine: differences in the lethal effects of the drug. *Psychopharmacology*, 117(3), 262-266.
- Editorial: Connecting the dots. *Nature Neuroscience*, 12(2), 99 (February 2009).
- Eisenberger, N. I. & Lieberman, M. D. (2004). Why it hurts to be left out: The neurocognitive overlap between physical and cognitive pain. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 8, 294-330.
- Eisenberger, N. I. & Lieberman, M. D. (2003). Does rejection hurt? An fMRI study of social exclusion. *Science*: 302(5643), 290-292.
- Evans, N. (2005). *Curriculum change in secondary schools, 1957-2004: A curriculum roundabout?* New York: Routledge Education.
- Frederickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56, 218-226.
- Friedman, R. S. & Forster, J. (2001). The effects of promotion and prevention cues on creativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(6), 1001-1013.
- Geary, D.C. (2007). Educating the evolved mind: conceptual foundations for an evolutionary educational psychology. In J.S. Carlson & J.R. Leven (eds.) (2007). *Psychological Perspectives on Contemporary Educational Issues*, Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Giselle Martin-Kniep, G. & Picone-Zocchia, J. (2009). *Changing the Way You Teach, Improving the Way Students Learn*. Alexandria, VA.: ASCD.
- Goldberg, B. (1996). *Why Schools Fail: The Denial of Individuality and The Decline of Learning*. Washington, D.C.: Cato Institute.
- Gordon, E. (2000). Bringing together biological, psychological and clinical models of the human brain. In: Gordon E. *Integrative Neuroscience*. Harwood Academic Publications.
- Gordan, G. (2006). *Building Engaged Schools: Getting the Most out of America's Classrooms*. New York: Gallup Press.
- Guthrie, J., Schafer, W. D. & Huang, C. (2001). Benefits of opportunity to read and balanced instruction on the NAEP. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 94 (3), 145-162.
- Hedden, T. & Gabrieli, J. D. E. (2006). The ebb and flow of attention in the human brain. *Nature Neuroscience*, 9, 863-865.
- Holt, J. C. (1969). *The Underachieving School*. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation.
- Ibáñez-Martín, J. A. & Jover, G. (Eds.) (2010). *Education in Europe: Policies and Politics*. New York: Springer.
- Illich, I. (1971). *Deschooling Society: World Perspectives*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Goodson, I. F. (1993) *School Subjects and Curriculum Change (Studies in Curriculum History)*. New York: Routledge Education.
- Jensen, E. (2005). *Teaching with the Brain in Mind*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.
- Jung-Beeman, M, Collier, A. & Kounios, J. (2009). How insight happens: learning from the brain. *NeuroLeadership Journal*, 2, 20-25.

- Klem, A. & Connell, J. (2004). Relationships matter: linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *Journal of School Health, 74*(7), 262-273.
- Kneese, C. (2009). *Balancing the School Calendar: Perspectives from the Public and Stakeholders*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Kosfeld, M., Heinrichs, M., Zak, P.J., Fischbacher, U. & Fehr, E. (2005). *Nature, 435*(2).
- Lieberman, M.D. & Eisenberg, N.I. (2008). The pains and pleasures of social life: a social cognitive neuroscience approach. *NeuroLeadership Journal, 1*, 48-43.
- McDonald, P. The potential contribution of neuroscience to authentic leadership. (2009) *NeuroLeadership Journal, 2*, 53-63.
- Martinez, D., Orlovskaa, D., Narendranc, R. Slifsteina, R., Liua, F., Kumara, D., Brofta, A., Van Heertumb, R. & Klebera, H.D. (2010). Dopamine type 2/3 receptor availability in the striatum and social status in human volunteers. *Biological Psychiatry, 67*(3), 275-278.
- Marzano, R. (2003). *What works in schools: translating research into action*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mitchell, J.P., Macrae, C.N., and Banaji, M.R. (2006). Oxytocin increases trust in humans: Dissociable medial prefrontal contributions to judgments of similar and dissimilar others. *Neuron, 50*, 655-663.
- Newman, F. M. (1989). Student engagement and high school reform. *Educational Leadership*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.
- Ochsner, K. N. & Lieberman, M. D. (2001). The emergence of social cognitive neuroscience. *American Psychologist, 56*(7), 17-734.
- Newmann, F. (1992). *Student Engagement and Achievement in American Secondary Schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Panksepp, (1998). *Affective Neuroscience*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Paris, S. G., Byrnes, J. P. & Paris, A. H. (2001). Constructing theories, identities, and actions of self-regulated learners. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement* (253-287). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ravitch, D. (2010). *The Death and Life of the Great American School System: How Testing and Choice Are Undermining Education*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ringleb, A.H. & Rock, D. (2008). The emerging field of neuroleadership. *NeuroLeadership Journal, 1*, 3-19.
- Rock, D. *Your Brain at Work*. New York: NY, Harper, 2009.
- Rock, D. (2008). SCARF: A brain-based model for collaborating with and influencing others. *NeuroLeadership Journal, 1*, 44-52, 2008.
- Rock, D. & Tang, Y. (2009). Neuroscience of Engagement. *NeuroLeadership Journal, 2*, 15-22.
- Sagor, R. (2002). Lessons from skateboarders. *Educational Leadership*, (September 2002), 34-38.
- Seymour, B., Singer, T. & Dolan, R. (2007). The neurobiology of punishment. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 8*, 300-311.
- Skinner, E. & Belmont M. (1991). *A longitudinal study of motivation in school: Reciprocal effects of teacher behavior and student engagement*. University of Rochester, New York.
- Schmitz, T.W. De Rosa, E. & Anderson, A, K. (2009). Opposing influence of affective state valence on visual cortical encoding. *Journal of Neuroscience, 29*(22), 7199-7207.
- Silberman, C. (1970). *Crisis in the Classroom*. New York: Random House.
- Sousa, D.A. (2005). *How the Brain Learns*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press
- Sousa, D.A. (2010). *Mind, Brain, and Education: Neuroscience Implications for the Classroom*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Stiver, J. & Cramer, S.F. (2009). *A Teacher's Guide to Change: Understanding, Navigating, and Leading the Process*. Thousand Oaks, Corwin Publishing.
- Tabibnia, G., Satpute, A. B. & Lieberman, M. D. (2008). The sunny side of fairness: Preference for fairness activates reward circuitry (and disregarding unfairness activates self-control circuitry). *Psychological Science, 19*, 339-347.
- Tang, Y.Y. & Posner, M.I. (2009). Attention training and attention state training. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 13*, 222-227.
- Tokuhama-Espinosa, T. (2010). *Mind, Brain, and Education Science: A Comprehensive Guide to the New Brain-based Teaching*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company
- U.S. National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform: A report to the Nation and the Secretary of Education, United States Department of Education*: Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Weinstein, R.S. (2004). *Reaching Higher: The Power of Expectations in Schooling*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- Zink, C. R., Tong, Y. Chen, Y. O., Bassett, D. S., Stein, J. L. & Meyer-Lindenberg, A. (2008). Know your place: neural processing of social hierarchy in humans. *Neuron, 58*, 273-283.