

Mindfulness-Based School Program and Student Development Research Review

Posted on July 4, 2018

View this essay online:

<https://academic-master.com/mindfulness-based-school-program-and-student-development-research-review/>

Introduction

Schonert-Reichl and colleagues' study of the MindUP program examined whether a classroom-based social and emotional learning curriculum incorporating mindfulness could improve executive function, stress regulation, peer relationships, emotional well-being, and academic performance in elementary students. The study involved ninety-nine fourth- and fifth-grade students in four classrooms and compared MindUP with the schools' regular social-responsibility program (Schonert-Reichl et al., 2015). Its design is important because it used more than self-report: researchers included executive-function tasks, salivary cortisol, peer ratings, student reports, and academic outcomes. The central question is not whether "mindfulness works" in a universal sense, because MindUP combines mindful attention with lessons about the brain, perspective taking, gratitude, kindness, and prosocial behavior. The more defensible interpretation is that a multicomponent classroom program may influence several dimensions of student development. A rigorous review should therefore examine assignment, measurement, classroom clustering, teacher effects, statistical multiplicity, transfer to real learning, and the extent to which a small trial can justify broader educational adoption.

Design and Internal Validity

The study's randomized comparison is a meaningful strength, but the small number of classrooms limits how confidently teacher and classroom effects can be separated from program effects. Students within one classroom share the same teacher, schedule, peers, routines, and school environment, so ninety-nine students do not provide ninety-nine fully independent units of exposure. With only four clusters, differences in teacher enthusiasm, classroom climate, discipline, or implementation fidelity can influence results even when assignment is randomized. The active comparison condition is another strength because students received a regular social-responsibility curriculum rather than no instruction, reducing the likelihood that ordinary maturation alone explains differences. Even so, novelty, contact time, expectations, or instructor investment may have varied across conditions. These limitations do not invalidate the study; they define the level of certainty. A stronger replication would randomize many classrooms across multiple schools, document fidelity, use assessors blinded to condition where possible, preregister primary outcomes, and report how missing data and clustering were handled (Schonert-Reichl et al., 2015).

Measuring Cognition and Stress

The cognitive and physiological outcomes require equally careful interpretation. Executive functions include inhibitory control, working memory, cognitive flexibility, planning, and goal-directed attention, and the study reported improvement on selected tasks among MindUP students. Laboratory-style tasks can provide objective evidence, but better performance on a task does not automatically establish better reading, organization, classroom persistence, or long-term self-regulation. Transfer should therefore be measured directly. Salivary cortisol is also informative but complex because levels vary with time of day, sleep, illness, medication, pubertal development, food, and recent activity. A single higher or lower value is not inherently healthy. Physiological findings should be interpreted relative to collection timing, baseline patterns, and the overall design rather than treated as straightforward proof that stress declined. The study's use of multiple forms of evidence is valuable because converging findings are generally more persuasive than one questionnaire, yet each outcome still needs to be understood within its measurement limits and replicated in larger samples (Schonert-Reichl et al., 2015).

Social and Academic Outcomes

Social, emotional, and academic findings are promising but should not be overstated. MindUP students showed favorable differences on some measures involving empathy, optimism, prosocial behavior, peer acceptance, aggression, depressive symptoms, and mathematics performance (Schonert-Reichl et al., 2015). Several informants can strengthen interpretation because students, teachers, and peers observe different aspects of behavior, but each source introduces possible bias. Teachers knew which program they delivered, peer nominations can reflect popularity, and self-reports depend on comprehension and willingness to disclose. Academic grades may also reflect teacher judgment, assignment difficulty, and classroom expectations rather than standardized achievement alone. The study examined many outcomes, which increases the chance that some statistically significant differences appear by chance. Readers should therefore consider effect sizes, confidence intervals, prespecified outcomes, and whether findings remain stable across measures. The appropriate conclusion is not that mindfulness raises all academic performance, but that improved regulation or classroom climate may support some learning outcomes and deserves further testing rather than immediate universalization.

What Later Research Adds

Later research reinforces the need for measured conclusions. Systematic reviews have generally found small and variable effects of mindfulness-based interventions on cognition, anxiety, stress, and social-emotional outcomes in children and adolescents, with substantial differences in study quality, program design, and comparison conditions (Dunning et al., 2019; Zenner et al., 2014). The large

MYRIAD trial is particularly important because universal [school mindfulness](#) training did not outperform normal school social-emotional provision on its primary mental-health outcome and appeared less helpful for some students (Kuyken et al., 2022). This does not contradict the possibility that specific programs help particular students or classrooms. It shows that positive small trials do not guarantee broad effects at scale. Schools should therefore distinguish between a promising educational practice and a clinically proven treatment. Mindfulness activities can complement counseling, strong teaching, physical activity, special education, family support, and anti-bullying work, but they should not be presented as substitutes for those services or as a universal solution to structural problems affecting students.

Ethical and Inclusive Implementation

Implementation also needs to be trauma-sensitive, culturally responsive, and voluntary enough to protect students who find inward attention uncomfortable. Focusing on breath or bodily sensations can increase distress for some young people experiencing trauma, panic, dissociation, respiratory concerns, or hypervigilance. Alternatives such as eyes-open practice, attention to external sounds, movement, grounding through the feet, or quiet observation of an object can preserve choice. Students should not be forced to disclose personal experiences or punished for declining an exercise. Schools should also explain that contemporary programs draw partly from contemplative traditions, including Buddhism, while being taught in secular educational forms. Honest communication can reduce confusion without requiring religious participation. Cultural responsiveness further means avoiding the message that children must simply become calmer when they face racism, bullying, unsafe environments, or exclusion. Emotional regulation can help students choose responses, but institutions remain responsible for changing harmful conditions. Evaluation should therefore include adverse experiences, belonging, discipline equity, student feedback, teacher workload, and sustainability rather than measuring only quiet behavior or short-term symptom scores (Zenner et al., 2014).

Conclusion

In conclusion, the MindUP study provides useful evidence that a classroom program combining mindfulness and social-emotional learning may support selected cognitive, physiological, peer, emotional, and academic outcomes among fourth- and fifth-grade students. Its randomized comparison and use of several measurement types are important strengths, while the small number of classrooms, teacher effects, multiple outcomes, limited blinding, and uncertain generalizability require restraint (Schonert-Reichl et al., 2015). Later reviews and the MYRIAD trial show that school-based mindfulness produces mixed results across programs and populations rather than a uniform benefit (Dunning et al., 2019; Kuyken et al., 2022). The most responsible educational use is therefore cautious, transparent, and evaluative. Schools can pilot a program with trained staff, explain its purpose and alternatives, monitor both benefits and discomfort, and revise or discontinue it when

evidence does not justify continuation. Mindfulness may be one supportive practice within a broader school environment, but its value depends on implementation quality, student choice, cultural context, and whether improvements transfer to meaningful functioning rather than appearing only on selected research measures.

References

- Schonert-Reichl, K. A., et al. (2015). Enhancing cognitive and social-emotional development through a simple-to-administer mindfulness-based school program. *Developmental Psychology*, 51(1), 52–66.
- Dunning, D. L., et al. (2019). The effects of mindfulness-based interventions on cognition and mental health in children and adolescents. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 60(3), 244–258.
- Kuyken, W., et al. (2022). Effectiveness of universal school-based mindfulness training compared with normal school provision. *Evidence-Based Mental Health*, 25(3), 99–109.
- Zenner, C., Herrnleben-Kurz, S., & Walach, H. (2014). Mindfulness-based interventions in schools. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, 603.