Efficacy of a K-1 Social-Emotional Learning Intervention for Students At-Risk for Emotional and Behavioral Disorders: Exploring Moderation Effects

In the current context of high stakes evaluations and initiatives (Every Student Succeeds Act, 2015), many school professionals focus heavily on developing academic skills to the neglect of social-emotional learning (SEL), even though children's early school success depends heavily on successful social-emotional development (see e.g., Blair & Diamond, 2008; Downer & Pianta, 2006). An increasing number of researchers (Hemmeter, Ostrosky, & Fox, 2006; Riggs, Greenberg, Kusche', & Pence, 2006) emphasize the role that motivation, self-esteem, and selfregulation play in a child's adjustment and connection to school, particularly at the critical transition from pre-school settings to Kindergarten and the primary grades. As social-emotional growth and academic learning are inextricably connected (Blair & Diamond, 2008), it is conceptually and practically sound to integrate a SEL curriculum to reduce risk for emotional and behavioral disorders (EBD) within English Language Arts instruction. The Social-Emotional Learning Foundations (SELF) curriculum is designed to promote the development of languagesupported self-regulation, specifically for primary grade children at early risk for EBD, including both internalizing and externalizing problems. SELF lessons incorporate instructional strategies that promote children's use of SEL related vocabulary, self-talk, critical thinking, and application of learned concepts through discourse focused on social-emotional competencies. SELF smallgroup lessons maximize opportunities for teacher modeling and language interactions that incorporate vocabulary critical to social-emotional development. The integration of SEL and academic instruction is critical for supporting both behavioral and learning related outcomes.

Theoretical Framework

Successful social-emotional growth requires the development of self-regulatory skills that underlie healthy social, emotional, and behavioral functioning (Blair & Diamond, 2008; Riggs et al., 2006). When these processes are under-developed, children may exhibit a variety of maladaptive behavior, particularly related to skills needed for successful adjustment to school. Self-regulatory skill development is thought to contribute significantly to a child's socialcognitive and behavioral functioning (Greenberg et al., 2004; Zelazo & Cunningham, 2007) and is closely related to the development of self-regulation (McClelland & Cameron, 2012). Most important, teaching students to verbally identify and label their feelings can have a powerful effect on the ability to manage emotions and regulate behavior, and encouraging children to talk about emotional experiences further strengthens the neural integration that contributes to selfregulation (Greenberg, Kusche, & Riggs, 2004).

Researchers find that both internalizing and externalizing behaviors are associated with increases in negative academic and quality of life outcomes (Fite, Stoppelbein, Greening, & Dhossche, 2008; Masten et al., 2005), but each has unique symptomology associated with distinct outcomes and support needs (Eisenberg et al., 2009). Psychometric studies have also shown that observers often can detect externalizing problems more readily than internalizing problems (Glaser, Calhoun, Bradshaw, Bates, & Socherman, 2001), suggesting a "squeaky wheel" phenomenon, such that children with overt behavioral issues are more likely to receive school-based services than those with less obvious issues, i.e., internalizing problems (Bradshaw, Buckley, & Ialongo, 2008).

Researchers have also noted that classroom climate, indicated by the quality of teacherstudent interactions, can either support or hinder the development of students' social-emotional competence (Hughes, Cavell, Meehan, Zhang, & Collie, 2005). Climate has been shown to influence aspects of students' social-emotional and academic development (Hamre, Goffin, & Kraft-Sayre, 2009) and has been associated with the effectiveness of social-emotional learning programs (Finlon et al., 2015) and interventions aimed at reducing student problem behavior (Williford et al., 2017). In addition to investigating SELF's impact on student outcomes, therefore, we wanted to explore factors that may moderate its efficacy, specifically, whether teachers identified students as showing internalizing versus externalizing behaviors, and whether treatment condition and/or treatment efficacy is related to classroom climate.

Method

Sample and Setting

Our paper describes preliminary findings from a three-year federally funded efficacy study to evaluate the effects of SELF. Our results reflect data from Years 1 and 2 samples totaling 122 Kindergarten and 100 first grade teachers from 39 Title I schools across 8 school districts within one southeastern state. Schools were randomly assigned to the SELF condition or to business as usual (BAU). The resulting student sample (*n*=876) consisted of 437 students (SELF) and 439 (BAU) across grade levels. Sixty percent of the students were White, 22.5 percent were African American, 10 percent were Hispanic, and 7.5 percent were from other ethnic backgrounds. In addition, 63.5 percent were male and 36.5 percent were female; 83.5 percent were receiving free or reduced-price lunch; 6 percent were identified as English Language Learners; and 20 percent were receiving services for exceptional students (ESE).

Intervention Description

SELF consists of a carefully coordinated set of materials and pedagogy to promote the development of language supported self-regulation, specifically for primary grade children at early risk for EBD. SELF lessons (approximately 50 for each grade level) are organized around 17 SEL topics within five critical competencies. Lessons incorporate instructional strategies that promote children's use of SEL related vocabulary, self-talk, critical thinking, and application of learned concepts. SELF combines whole-group (the first lesson in each topic) and small-group lessons (the 2nd and 3nd in each topic) to maximize opportunities for teacher modeling and language interactions and offers a feasible and substantial opportunity within the classroom to provide a small-group social-emotional learning intervention integrated with K-1 literacy-related instruction for students at risk.

Research Questions

- 1. Are teacher judgments of student behavior across internalizing and externalizing (I/E) dimensions related to treatment effectiveness?
- 2. Are teachers' domain scores on the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS)

used to assess classroom climate related to treatment condition and/or student outcomes?

Research Procedures

Prior to random assignment to treatment condition (SELF or BAU), we asked each teacher to identify 8 students, 4 with internalizing and 4 with externalizing behaviors, and rank order each group on severity of behavior, using The *Systematic Screening for Behavior Disorders* (SSBD; Walker & Severson, 1992). Starting with the top two students in each group, each teacher solicited parental consent until obtaining consent for 3-5 students to participate in the research. The consent document informed parents about assessment and the possibility of small-group instruction in the SELF curriculum. We trained all teachers and research project staff on the informed consent process to assure compliance with human subject protection, and we followed our institution's participant consent protocols.

Study Design

The study design is a pretest-posttest cluster randomized efficacy trial with one fixed between-subjects factor to test SELF effects against the effects of BAU. Schools were randomly assigned to condition; randomization at the school level addresses potential contamination between classrooms within schools, as most elementary schools operate with grade level teams who interact on a regular basis. In addition, teachers are nested in schools and are a second random factor. Initial assessments completed by teachers followed professional development (PD); thus we labeled them "POST PD", rather than "pre" assessments. We collected POST data on all outcome variables for all student participants (SELF and BAU) in April-May of the school year.

Data Sources

- The Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function- Teacher Form (BRIEF-T; Gioia, Isquith, Guy, & Kenworthy, 2000) was used to evaluate emotional and behavioral self-regulation and contains 86 items comprising 8 clinical scales that form the Behavioral Regulation Index (BRI), Cognitive Regulation Index (MI), and the Emotion Regulation Index (ERI). The BRIEF assesses behavioral aspects of children's EF from respondents with knowledge relevant to self-regulation in the school environment.
- The Clinical Assessment of Behavior Teacher Rating Form (CAB-T; Bracken & Keith, 2004) consists of 70 questions that comprise 3 clinical scales, 3 adaptive scales, and 4 educationally related clinical clusters. We analyzed scores from 4 subscales: internalizing, externalizing, social skills, and competence.
- Devereux Student Strengths Assessment (DESSA; LeBuffe, Shapiro, & Naglieri, 2008) is a 72item, standardized, norm-referenced behavior rating scale measuring SEL competencies that serve as protective factors for children in grades K - 8.
- SELF Vocabulary Assessment. The researchers designed this curriculum-based measure during SELF development to assess knowledge of key social-emotional learning related vocabulary, measuring both receptive and expressive vocabulary (van der Wissel, 1988). Each item includes 3 tasks: (a) provide a definition, (b) use the vocabulary word in an example, and (c) apply the word by answering a multiple-choice question.

 The Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS; Pianta, La Paro, & Hamre, 2008), for grades K-1 assesses classroom interaction quality across 10 dimensions organized in three domains: Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support. Certified CLASS observers blind to treatment condition completed four observation cycles of participating teachers in both treatment and control.

Data Analyses

We used a 3-level structural equation model (ML-SEM) to analyze the data. The independent (exogenous) variables were Internalizing-Externalizing (IE), a child-level variable; Grade (G), a class-level variable; and Treatment (T), a school-level variable. We also included the three possible two-way interactions TxIE, GxIE, and TxG, as well as the three-way interaction TxGxIE. T was coded -.5 for BAU and .5 for SELF; G was coded -.5 for Kindergarten and .5 for first-grade. For subscales of BRIEF2, CAB, and DESSA, the dependent (endogenous) variables were scores obtained POST PD and at POST. For the total SELF Vocabulary Assessment and subscales, the dependent variables were scores obtained prior to PD and at POST. The model included child-level, class-level, and school-level residuals. At each level, residuals were allowed to co-vary over occasions. We used robust maximum likelihood in M*plus* to estimate coefficients and test hypotheses. Robust maximum likelihood is intended to provide protection against the effects of non-normality in the residuals and misspecification of the covariance structure for the residuals.

Results

Research Question 1

Note: From the sample of 876 K-1 children, we obtained IE scores on 835. Nine were classified as both internalizing and externalizing and were excluded, resulting in a total sample of 826 for IE related analyses.

For each outcome variable, we conducted tests of the SELF versus BAU treatment (T), grade (G), and IE main effects, and the TxIE, GxIE, TxG, and GxTxIE interactions on scores obtained POST PD and at POST. To answer Research Question 1, we focused on the interactions involving T and IE. We used the Benjamin-Hochberg false discovery rate (FDR) to correct for multiplicity over subscales and time of assessment.

Significant findings. The GxTxIE interaction was significant on POST for DESSA Self-Awareness after correction for multiplicity, z = -2.752, p = .006. Means in Table 1 indicate that for Kindergarten children, the size of the treatment effect is approximately the same for children classified as internalizing versus externalizing; thus IE did not moderate the effect of treatment. Conversely, for first grade children, the treatment effect is larger for children classified as internalizing that treatment was moderated by IE. A more complete presentation of descriptive and inferential statistics is included in the Appendix; see Tables A1 and A2.

Table 1

ML POST Cell Means by Grade, Internalizing-Externalizing, and Treatment for DESSA Self-Awareness

Grade	IE	BAU	SELF
K	Internal	14.790	17.156
Κ	External	14.041	17.163
First	Internal	13.508	17.773
First	External	14.427	15.975

In addition, the TxIE Interaction was significant after correction for multiplicity for POST PD on the BRI subscale of the BRIEF2, z = 2.422, p = 0.015. The means in Table 2 indicate that BRI scores were higher on average for children in the SELF group classified as externalizing compared to scores for children in the BAU group, z = 2.243, p = 0.025, higher BRI scores indicating more behavior regulation problems. A more complete presentation of descriptive and inferential statistics is included in the Appendix; see Tables A3 and A4.

Table 2

ML POST PD Cell Means by Internalizing-Externalizing and Treatment for BRIEF2 BRI

IE	BAU	SELF
Internal	22.352	21.599
External	31.135	32.725

In addition to significant findings related to the effects of treatment, there were also significant main effects of IE for all subscales of the BRIEF2, CAB, and DESSA on POST PD scores, and all subscales except DESSA Self-Awareness on POST scores. Similarly, there were significant main effects of IE on SELF Vocabulary POST PD and POST scores. In general, teachers rated students classified as internalizing more positively at both POST PD and POST on measures related to behavior and social-emotional competence. Conversely, students classified as internalizing performed less well on direct assessments of SELF Vocabulary. IE main effects were not a focus of this paper. Therefore, specific results of analyses related to these findings are not included.

Research Question 2

We found no significant correlations between ratings of teachers on the three domains of the CLASS and either treatment condition or student outcomes. Statistics describing the correlations between CLASS domains and student outcome variables are presented in Appendix Tables A5-A8; inferential statistics depicting the relation between CLASS scores and treatment, grade, and their interaction are presented in Appendix Table A9.

Discussion

Our preliminary findings from this three-year randomized efficacy trial indicate that there were few moderation effects by the internalizing-externalizing classification. First, students in the first grade rated as at risk for internalizing problems improved in self-awareness significantly more than first grade students rated as externalizing, while there were no differences between these two groups among Kindergarten students. We hypothesize that first grade teachers noted improvements in the identification of feelings (self-awareness) among internalizing students who might not have been as likely to express themselves prior to intervention. Conversely, Kindergarten students with internalizing behavior may not have expressed their feelings as noticeably to teachers who completed ratings of Self-Awareness.

Students with internalizing behavioral issues tend to receive less attention in school settings than students with externalizing problems, even though internalizing behaviors such as anxiety and depression are the most frequently occurring mental health concern in children and adolescents (see Costello, Egger, Copeland, Erkanli, & Angold, 2011). Children who are relatively withdrawn and quiet create fewer classroom disruptions and management problems for teachers (Lynam, 1996). While not a primary focus in this study, the significant main effects of internalizing versus externalizing on almost all outcome variables indicate that teachers tend to rate internalizing children more positively regardless of treatment condition, consistent with the likelihood that they cause fewer disruptions in the classroom (Lynam). As such, and given treatment related improvement in self-awareness for internalizing students specifically, we are hopeful that SELF, and other interventions that explicitly teach social-emotional language and SEL competencies, may offer a proactive way to serve students who may not attract as much attention from teachers but still benefit from interventions. The findings of this study may help promote future research about how the internalizing-externalizing dimension affects intervention efficacy.

Second, we found that following professional development (POST PD) but prior to treatment, teachers in the SELF group compared to teachers in BAU rated students with externalizing behaviors worse on behavior regulation. We hypothesize that our focus on self-management during PD as a key SEL competency increased SELF group teachers' awareness of optimal behaviors, such that they tended to rate students they classified as externalizing more stringently than teachers in the BAU group who had not received the training. As a result, we controlled for the effects of PD by including POST PD scores in statistical analyses used to evaluate treatment effects on all outcome variables.

Finally, we did not find a relation between CLASS scores and student outcomes or treatment condition. We expected that teachers who scored higher on the emotional support domain of the CLASS, in particular, might be more effective teachers of the SELF curriculum, but we did not find evidence to support this. We also hypothesized that participating in SELF PD and lesson implementation might affect scores on the CLASS domains of instructional and/or emotional support, as SELF focused on implementing instructional strategies that included teacher modeling using think-alouds and language interactions situated within social-emotional content. This hypothesis also was not supported. It may be that a more extended professional development and coaching are necessary for teaching strategies to generalize to other

instructional periods (e.g., language arts, mathematics lessons) during which the CLASS assessments were conducted in our study.

References

- Blair, C., & Diamond, A. (2008). Biological processes in prevention and intervention: The promotion of self-regulation as a means of preventing school failure. *Development and Psychopathology*, 20, 899-911.
- Bracken, B. A., & Keith, L. K. (2004). *Clinical Assessment of Behavior*. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Bradshaw, C. P., Buckley, J. A., & Ialongo, N. S. (2008). School-based service utilization among urban children with early onset educational and mental health problems: The squeaky wheel phenomenon. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *23*(2), 169-186.
- Costello, E. J., Egger, H. L., Copeland, W., Erkanli, A., & Angold, A. (2011). The developmental epidemiology of anxiety disorders: Phenomenology, prevalence, and comorbidity. In W. K. Silverman & A. P. Field (Eds.), *Anxiety disorders in children and adolescents: Research, assessment and intervention* (pp. 56–75). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Downer, J. T., & Pianta, R. C. (2006). Academic and cognitive functioning in first grade: Associations with earlier home and child care predictors and with concurrent home and classroom experiences. *School Psychology Review*, *35*(1), 11-30.
- Eisenberg, N., Valiente, C., Spinrad, T. L., Cumberland, A., Liew, J., Reiser, M., ... & Losoya, S.
 H. (2009). Longitudinal relations of children's effortful control, impulsivity, and negative emotionality to their externalizing, internalizing, and co-occurring behavior problems. *Developmental psychology*, 45(4), 988-1008.
- ESSA (2015). Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, Pub. L. No. 114-95 § 114 Stat. 1177 (2015-2016).
- Finlon, K. J., Izard, C. E., Seidenfeld, A., Johnson, S. R., Cavadel, E. W., Ewing, E. S., & Morgan, J. K. (2015). Emotion-based preventive intervention: Effectively promoting emotion knowledge and adaptive behavior among at-risk preschoolers. *Development and Psychopathology*, 27, 1353-1365. doi:10.1017/s0954579414001461
- Fite, P. J., Stoppelbein, L., Greening, L., & Dhossche, D. (2008). Child internalizing and externalizing behavior as predictors of age at first admission and risk for repeat admission to a child inpatient facility. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 78(1), 63-69.
- Gioia, G. A., Isquith, P. K., Guy, S. C., & Kenworthy, L. (2000). Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function Professional Manual. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
- Glaser, B. A., Calhoun, G. B., Bradshaw, C. P., Bates, J. M., & Socherman, R. E. (2001). Multiobserver assessment of problem behavior in adjudicated youths: Patterns of discrepancies. *Child & Family Behavior Therapy*, 23, 33–45.
- Greenberg, M. T., Kusche, C. A., & Riggs, N. (2004). The PATHS curriculum: Theory and research on neurocognitive development and school success. In J. E. Zins, R. P. Weissberg, M. C. Wang. & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say*?(170-188). New York: Teachers College Press.

- Hamre, B. K., Goffin, S. G., & Kraft-Sayre, M. (2009). Classroom Assessment Scoring System Implementation Guide: Measuring and Improving Classroom Interactions in Early Classroom Settings.
- Hemmeter, M. L., Ostrosky, M., & Fox, L. (2006). Social and emotional foundations for early learning: A conceptual model for intervention. *School Psychology Review*, 35(4), 583-601.
- Hughes, J. M., Cavell, T. A., Meehan, B. T., Zhang, D., & Collie, C. (2005). Adverse school context moderates the outcomes of selective interventions for aggressive children. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73, 731–736.
- LeBuffe, P. A., Shapiro, V. B., & Naglieri, J.A. (2008). *The Devereux Student Strengths* Assessment (DESSA). Lewisville, NC: Kaplan Company.
- Lynam, D. R. (1996). Early identification of chronic offenders: Who is the fledgling psychopath? *Psychological Bulletin*, *120*(2), 209-234.
- Masten, A. S., Roisman, G. I., Long, J. D., Burt, K. B., Obradović, J., Riley, J. R., ... & Tellegen, A. (2005). Developmental cascades: linking academic achievement and externalizing and internalizing symptoms over 20 years. *Developmental psychology*, 41(5), 733.
- McClelland, M. M., & Cameron, C. E. (2012). Self-regulation in early childhood: Improving conceptual clarity and developing ecologically valid measures. *Child Development Perspectives*, 6(2), 136–142.
- Pianta, R. C., La Paro, K. M., & Hamre, B. K. (2008). *Classroom Assessment Scoring System™*: *Manual K-3*. Paul H Brookes Publishing.
- Riggs, N. R., Greenberg, M. T., Kusche´, C. A., & Pentz, M. A. (2006). The mediational role of neurocognition in the behavioral outcomes of a social-emotional prevention program in elementary school students: *Effects of the PATHS curriculum*. *Prevention Science*, 7(1), 91-102.
- Simeonsson, R. J. (Ed.). (1994). Risk, resilience & prevention: Promoting the well-being of all children. Baltimore, MD, US: Paul H Brookes Publishing.
- Van der Wissel, A. (1988). Hampered production of words as a characteristic of school failure. *Journal of learning disabilities*, 21(8), 517-518.
- Walker, H.M., & Severson, H.H. (1992). Systematic Screening for Behavior Disorders (SSBD): User's Guide and Administration Manual. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.
- Williford, A. P., LoCasale-Crouch, J., Whittaker, J. V., DeCoster, J., Hartz, K. A., Carter, L. M., Wolcott, C. S., & Hatfield, B. E. (2017). Changing teacher–child dyadic interactions to improve preschool children's externalizing behaviors. *Child development*, 88(5), 1544-1553. doi:10.1111/cdev.12703
- Zelazo, P. D., & Cunningham, W. A. (2007). Executive Function: Mechanisms underlying emotion regulation. In J. Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of emotion regulation*. New York: Guilford.

Appendix

78 13.782 5.495

74 17.608 5.854 75 14.813 5.268

76 15.671 6.001

Means and Standard Deviations by Grade, Treatment, and Internalizing-Externaliz Devereux Students Strengths Assessment (DESSA) Self-Awareness Subscale									
Grade	Treatment	IE	N Post PD	Mean Post PD	SD Post PD	N Post	Mean Post	SD Post	
K	BAU	Internal	112	12.455	6.248	99	15.212	6.219	
Κ	SELF	Internal	111	10.09	5.242	98	16.99	5.878	
Κ	BAU	External	123	12.431	5.195	112	13.83	6.027	
Κ	SELF	External	108	12.157	5.501	98	17.153	5.787	

12.37

10.595

13.386

10.871

5.324

5.016

5.143

4.743

for

Table A1

First

First

First

First

BAU

SELF

BAU

SELF

Internal

Internal

External

External

Note. K = Kindergarten, First = first grade; BAU = business as usual, SELF = SELF intervention; Post PD = post professional development.

92

84

88

85

Table A2

Summary of Inferential Tests for Devereux Students Strengths Assessment (DESSA) Self-Awareness Subscale

			Standard			
SV	Variable	Estimate	Error	Ζ	р	ES
Treatment	Post PD	-1.562	0.956	-1.634	0.102	-0.292
Treatment	POST	2.825	0.742	3.807	0.000	0.481
Grade	Post PD	0.008	0.599	0.014	0.989	0.002
Grade	POST	-0.367	0.657	-0.558	0.577	-0.062
IE	Post PD	0.835	0.414	2.017	0.044	0.156
IE	POST	-0.405	0.339	-1.196	0.232	-0.069
TxG	Post PD	-0.613	2.006	-0.306	0.760	-0.115
TxG	POST	0.162	1.457	0.111	0.912	0.028
TxIE	Post PD	0.480	0.789	0.609	0.543	0.090
TxIE	POST	-0.980	0.670	-1.463	0.143	-0.167
GxIE	Post PD	-0.325	0.594	-0.547	0.584	-0.061
GxIE	POST	-0.068	0.633	-0.107	0.915	-0.012
TxGxIE	Post PD	-2.364	1.292	-1.829	0.067	-0.442
TxGxIE	POST	-3.473	1.262	-2.752	0.006	-0.592

Note. IE = Internalizing-Externalizing, TxG = treatment by grade, TxIE = treatment by Inernalizing-Externalizing, GxIE = grade by Internalizing-Externalizing, TxGxIE = treatment by grade by Internalizing-Externalizing; Post PD = post professional development.

	0	2 0			,		0	
Grade	Treatment	IE	N Post PD	Mean Post PD	SD Post PD	N Post	Mean Post	SD Post
K	BAU	Internal	112	21.045	7.865	99	19.465	7.233
Κ	SELF	Internal	113	20.283	6.801	100	17.95	5.623
Κ	BAU	External	123	30.577	7.041	113	29.566	7.669
Κ	SELF	External	110	32.955	6.058	99	28.97	7.35
First	BAU	Internal	92	23.543	7.865	78	23.192	8.235
First	SELF	Internal	84	22.988	7.47	74	19.311	6.365
First	BAU	External	88	31.807	6.023	75	29.92	6.614
First	SELF	External	85	32.247	5.148	76	27.118	7.377

Means and Standard Deviations by Grade, Treatment, and Internalizing-Externalizing for Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function (BRIEF2) Behavior Regulation Index (BRI)

Note. K = Kindergarten, First = first grade; BAU = business as usual, SELF = SELF intervention; Post PD = post professional development.

			Standard			
SV	Variable	Estimate	Error	Ζ	р	ES
Treatment	Post PD	0.418	0.717	0.583	0.560	0.049
Treatment	POST	-2.297	0.777	-2.955	0.003	-0.270
Grade	Post PD	1.352	0.683	1.980	0.048	0.158
Grade	POST	0.782	0.647	1.208	0.227	0.092
IE	Post PD	9.954	0.486	20.501	0.000	1.162
IE	POST	8.960	0.509	17.617	0.000	1.053
TxG	Post PD	-0.803	1.376	-0.584	0.559	-0.094
TxG	POST	-1.751	1.289	-1.358	0.174	-0.206
TxIE	Post PD	2.343	0.967	2.422	0.015	0.274
TxIE	POST	1.390	1.014	1.371	0.170	0.163
GxIE	Post PD	-2.350	1.136	-2.069	0.039	-0.274
GxIE	POST	-2.592	0.982	-2.638	0.008	-0.305
TxGxIE	Post PD	-2.471	2.238	-1.104	0.270	-0.288
TxGxIE	POST	-1.346	1.996	-0.674	0.500	-0.158

Summary of Inferential Tests for Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function (BRIEF2) Behavior Regulation Index (BRI)

Note. IE = Internalizing-Externalizing, TxG = treatment by grade, TxIE = treatment by Inernalizing-Externalizing, GxIE = grade by Internalizing-Externalizing, TxGxIE = treatment by grade by Internalizing-Externalizing; Post PD = post professional development.

Table A5 Teacher-Level Correlations of Classwide Assessment Scoring System Domains with BRIEF Subscales

Domain	Subscale	Corr	Se	Z	р
CORG	POST BRI	-0.130	0.137	-0.949	0.343
CORG	POST CRI	-0.074	0.120	-0.615	0.539
CORG	POST ERI	-0.212	0.131	-1.617	0.106
ESUP	POST BRI	-0.106	0.107	-0.991	0.322
ESUP	POST CRI	-0.053	0.102	-0.516	0.606
ESUP	POST ERI	-0.130	0.106	-1.225	0.221
ISUP	POST BRI	-0.142	0.152	-0.931	0.352
ISUP	POST CRI	-0.033	0.122	-0.270	0.788
ISUP	POST ERI	-0.247	0.116	-2.138	0.033

Note. CORG = Classroom Organization, ESUP = Emotional Support, ISUP = Instructional Support; BRI = Behavior Regulation Index, CRI = Cognitive Regulation Index, ERI = Emotion Regulation Index.

Domain	Subscale	Corr	Se	Z	p
CORG	POST COM	0.070	0.127	0.552	0.581
CORG	POST EXT	0.243	0.119	2.036	0.042
CORG	POST INT	0.129	0.097	1.330	0.183
CORG	POST SOC	0.149	0.122	1.222	0.222
ESUP	POST COM	0.040	0.121	0.332	0.740
ESUP	POST EXT	0.142	0.105	1.360	0.174
ESUP	POST INT	0.037	0.097	0.383	0.702
ESUP	POST SOC	0.078	0.116	0.677	0.499
ISUP	POST COM	-0.001	0.143	-0.009	0.993
ISUP	POST EXT	0.203	0.129	1.576	0.115
ISUP	POST INT	0.120	0.100	1.204	0.228
ISUP	POST SOC	0.086	0.140	0.615	0.538

Teacher-Level Correlations of Classwide Assessment Scoring System Domains with Clinical Assessment of Behavior (CAB) Subscales

Note. CORG = Classroom Organization, ESUP = Emotional Support, ISUP = Instructional Support; COM = Competence, EXT = Externalizing Behaviors, INT = Internalizing Behaviors, SOC = Social Skills.

Table A7 Teacher-Level Correlations of Classwide Assessment Scoring System Domains with DESSA Subscales

Domain	Subscale	Corr	Se	Z	р
CORG	POST DM	0.170	0.109	1.557	0.119
CORG	POST RS	0.135	0.100	1.352	0.176
CORG	POST S-A	0.068	0.105	0.644	0.520
CORG	POST S-M	0.169	0.101	1.675	0.094
CORG	POST SA	0.173	0.110	1.577	0.115
ESUP	POST DM	0.115	0.093	1.235	0.217
ESUP	POST RS	0.075	0.084	0.890	0.373
ESUP	POST S-A	0.038	0.086	0.441	0.659
ESUP	POST S-M	0.094	0.083	1.132	0.258
ESUP	POST SA	0.108	0.097	1.107	0.268
ISUP	POST DM	0.082	0.129	0.633	0.527
ISUP	POST RS	0.075	0.106	0.712	0.476
ISUP	POST S-A	0.055	0.110	0.500	0.617
ISUP	POST S-M	0.103	0.122	0.844	0.399
ISUP	POST SA	0.109	0.125	0.869	0.385

Note. CORG = Classroom Organization, ESUP = Emotional Support, ISUP = Instructional Support; DM = Decision Making, RS = Relationship Skills, S-A = Self Awareness, S-M = Self Management, SA = Social Awareness.

Teacher-Level Correlations of Classwide Assessment Scoring System Domains with SELF Vocabulary Assessment Subscales

Domain	Subscale	Corr	Se	Z	р
CORG	POST SELF A	-0.130	0.097	-1.338	0.181
CORG	POST SELF B	0.002	0.102	0.017	0.987
CORG	POST SELF C	-0.102	0.090	-1.139	0.255
CORG	POST SELF T	-0.068	0.096	-0.715	0.475
ESUP	POST SELF A	-0.110	0.080	-1.383	0.167
ESUP	POST SELF B	0.030	0.080	0.377	0.706
ESUP	POST SELF C	-0.048	0.066	-0.726	0.468
ESUP	POST SELF T	-0.035	0.071	-0.493	0.622
ISUP	POST SELF A	0.050	0.113	0.447	0.655
ISUP	POST SELF B	0.027	0.115	0.237	0.813
ISUP	POST SELF C	0.141	0.096	1.468	0.142
ISUP	POST SELF T	0.059	0.110	0.538	0.591

Note. CORG = Classroom Organization, ESUP = Emotional Support, ISUP = Instructional Support; SELF A = Expressive Definition, SELF B = Use in Context, SELF C = Receptive Understanding.

Effect	Domain	Estimate	Se	Z	р	ES
Treatment	CORG	-0.230	0.207	-1.110	0.267	-0.224
Treatment	ESUP	-0.237	0.205	-1.154	0.248	-0.240
Treatment	ISUP	-0.192	0.270	-0.713	0.476	-0.159
Grade	CORG	-0.320	0.151	-2.121	0.034	-0.312
Grade	ESUP	-0.216	0.120	-1.804	0.071	-0.219
Grade	ISUP	0.128	0.167	0.768	0.442	0.106
TxG	CORG	-0.230	0.299	-0.770	0.441	-0.225
TxG	ESUP	0.041	0.236	0.175	0.861	0.042
TxG	ISUP	-0.149	0.335	-0.444	0.657	-0.123

Table A9Inferential Results by Effect and Classwide Assessment Scoring System Domain

Note, TxG = treatment by grade; CORG = Classroom Organization, ESUP = Emotional Support, ISUP = Instructional Support.