<div style="text-align:center">CHAPTER 30</div>

SEL and Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports

George G. Bear, Sara A. Whitcomb, Maurice J. Elias, and Jessica C. Blank

Throughout the history of American education, educators have been challenged with two primary aims related to school discipline and classroom management: (1) the short-term aim of managing and correcting student behavior and (2) the long-term aim of developing students' self-discipline (Bear, 2005). Unlike management and correction of behavior, which is largely adult-directed, "self-discipline" involves students inhibiting inappropriate behavior and exhibiting prosocial behavior under their own volition. This requires social, emotional, and behavioral competencies that underlie self-regulated behavior. Over the years, approaches to school discipline and classroom management have varied greatly in their emphases on these two aims, and in the strategies and techniques used to achieve them. This is as true today as in the past, as now seen in differences between three popular approaches to school discipline and prevention of behavior problems: (1) the zero-tolerance approach (see American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008), (2) the social and emotional learning (SEL) approach (Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011; Zins & Elias, 2006), and (3) the schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports

(SWPBIS) approach (Sugai & Horner, 2009; Sugai et al., 2010).

The primary aim of the zero-tolerance approach is the short-term management of student behavior. Often framed in the context of school safety, students' behavior problems are to be corrected immediately, irrespective of circumstances involved, while relying primarily on punitive techniques. Removal of misbehaving students from the classroom or school is the most common, and controversial, technique employed in this approach. Sharing an emphasis on preventing behavior problems, and using positive rather than punitive techniques, the SEL and SWPBIS approaches stand in contrast to the zero-tolerance approach. However, as seen in this chapter, these two popular approaches also can stand in contrast to one another, with the two having a different primary aim and emphasizing different strategies and techniques to achieve it. As found in the zero-tolerance approach, the primary aim of the SWPBIS approach is the adult management of student behavior. In contrast, the primary aim of the SEL approach is the long-term development of social and emotional competence of self-discipline, so that students are inclined to govern themselves not only while in school but also upon

<div style="text-align:center">453</div>

leaving school. Consistent with the differing primary aims of the SEL and SWPBIS approaches, different strategies and techniques are emphasized in each, although few, if any, cannot be found to one degree or another in both approaches.

Given the popularity of the SEL and SWPBIS approaches, as well as their focus on differing yet perhaps equally important aims of school discipline, it is not uncommon that schools consider, or are challenged with, integrating the two. To best integrate the two approaches, it is necessary that educators understand the fundamental principles and practices driving each approach, so that they may see overlapping and complementary, and what might also be viewed as conflicting, features of these initiatives. This chapter is written primarily for those educators.

In this chapter we first give an overview of the SEL and SWPBIS approaches and describe their key features. Because the SEL approach is covered extensively throughout this volume, greater attention is directed to the SWPBIS approach. Next, we highlight strengths and limitations of the two approaches. We argue that the primary strengths of the SEL approach, which is developing self-discipline, and of the SWPBIS approach, which is managing student behavior, are largely complementary. As such, the primary strength of each approach addresses the primary weakness of the other (Osher, Bear, Sprague, & Doyle, 2010). Last, we discuss potential problems and pitfalls that schools are likely to encounter when integrating the two approaches, and how these might be surmounted.

The SEL Approach

Historically and theoretically, the SEL approach is rooted heavily in developmental psychology, and particularly constructivist learning theories (Piaget, 1932/1965; Vygotsky 1934/1987) and research on prevention and resilience (Greenberg, Domitrovich, & Bumbarger, 2001; Zins & Elias, 2006). It also draws from a range of theories related to human development and behavior, including, but not limited to, social cognitive theory, social problem solving, positive youth development, resilience, moral and prosocial

development, emotional development, student engagement, authoritative discipline, and the ecology of human development. The SEL approach represents a comprehensive articulation of a system for developing SEL competencies that have long been recognized as important for personal growth and effective performance in school, family, workplace, and civic contexts (Elias et al., 1997). These include the five sets of SEL competencies elaborated elsewhere throughout this volume: (1) responsible decision making at school, home, and in the community; (2) self-management of emotions and behavior; (3) relationship skills, (4) social awareness, and (5) self-awareness. Included in these five sets of skills are a number of specific social cognitive and emotional skills and processes that research has shown to underlie self-discipline and prosocial behavior.

To properly understand SEL, one must think of it not only as a set of competencies but also the following:

- Systematic instruction and practice in SEL skills with explicit links to academics in a multiyear format with clear grade-by-grade articulation.
- Promotion of positive school culture and climate with unifying themes, such as respect, responsibility, fairness, and honesty.
- Developmentally appropriate instruction in specific, evidence-based health promotion and problem behavior prevention approaches.
- Services and systems that enhance students' coping skills and provide social support for handling transitions, crises, and conflicts.
- Systematic opportunities for positive, contributory service within and/or outside the school, as appropriate (Elias, Wang, Weissberg, Zins, & Walberg, 2002; Elias et al., 1997).

The richness and depth of SEL as a construct, linked to a wide range of prior research, is connected to the longitudinal and complex nature of interventions designed to develop the SEL skills noted earlier. Having a sustained and intensive impact on the context in which skills develop is essential. Relatedly, because of the constructivist nature of SEL theory, internal development

of skills and mechanisms of self-discipline are seen as vital to long-term skills acquisition and generalization.

The SEL approach places great emphasis on achieving social, emotional, and behavioral competencies in contexts of supportive relationships. Research shows that warm and supportive relationships foster the development of SEL skills, as seen in the internalization of teachers' values (Hughes, 2012); they promote students' academic achievement (Danielsen, Wiium, Wilhelmsen, & Wold, 2010) and motivate students to act responsibly and prosocially (Wentzel, 2006). Positive teacher–student relationships are critical in the prevention and correction of behavior problems (Hamre, Pianta, Downer, & Mashburn, 2008), including bullying (Gregory et al., 2010). Research also strongly supports the role of peer relationships and classroom norms in preventing behavior problems and promoting academic achievement (Stearns, Dodge, & Nicholson, 2008; Thomas, Bierman, & the Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 2006). Finally, research supports the importance of building and maintaining supportive teacher–parent communication and relationships, with studies demonstrating that parents exert a great influence on their children's academic, social, and emotional development (Parke & Buriel, 2006).

As reviewed most extensively elsewhere in this volume (see Williford & Wolcott, Chapter 15, this volume), research indicates that SEL programs that include curriculum lessons targeting social–emotional competencies, and do so within a context of supportive relationships, are effective in achieving a wide range of valued academic, social, and emotional outcomes. Those outcomes include greater social and emotional skills, more positive attitudes toward self and others, more positive social behavior, fewer conduct problems, less emotional distress, and greater academic performance (Durlak et al., 2011).

The SWPBIS Approach

The recent popularity of the term "positive behavioral interventions and supports" (PBIS), including SWPBIS, can be directly linked to inclusion of PBIS in the amend-ments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA; 2004). IDEIA requires PBIS at the individual level, not the schoolwide level, for children with disabilities whose behavior impedes their learning or the learning of others [20 U.S.C. §1414(d)(3)(B)(i). The act also provides funding to states that is earmarked specifically for staff training and for technical assistance in implementing SWPBIS. The purpose of such funding is to prevent academic and behavioral problems, therefore reducing "the need to label children as disabled in order to address the learning and behavioral needs of such children" [20 U.S.C. § 145(a)(3)(B)(iii)(I)]. Despite the inclusion of the term PBIS, SWPBIS is not defined in IDEIA, or elsewhere in federal legislation. Likewise, as with the SEL approach, there is no single framework for SWPBIS (Knoff, 2008). Its developers have argued that SWPBIS is best viewed as simply positive behavior supports (PBS), as used with students with disabilities, applied to *all* students (Dunlap, Sailor, Horner, & Sugai, 2009). From this viewpoint, to understand SWPBIS one must first understand PBS and how it evolved into SWPBIS.

In brief, the term PBS was first introduced by Horner and colleagues (2009) to describe the "technology of nonaversive behavioral support" that they applied to individuals with severe disabilities, especially those adults exhibiting self-injurious, aggressive, and severely disruptive behaviors (Dunlap et al., 2009). The goal of PBS was to implement positive interventions and supports (i.e., PBIS) to increase adaptive behavior through the use of positive reinforcement instead of aversive forms of punishment such as electric shock, physical restraint, and exclusion. Those positive interventions and supports were guided by a functional behavioral assessment (FBA), which is viewed as an "essential foundation of PBS" (Dunlap et al., 2009, p. 8). Underlying FBA is the understanding that nearly all behaviors can be linked to two primary functions or purposes: obtaining desired events such as seeking attention and rewards or avoiding/escaping from aversive stimuli (Crone & Horner, 2003).

Because PBS was found to be effective in managing serious behavior problems of individuals with severe disabilities in institu-

tions, it was then applied to students with emotional and behavioral disorders and young children with disabilities (Dunlap et al., 2009). The next step in PBS's progression to a schoolwide approach was guided by the developers' belief that techniques of PBS with individuals would be largely ineffective "if they were implemented in the context of chaotic classrooms and schools, where teachers were constantly addressing behavior problems of multiple students and where schoolwide or classroom-wide discipline was clearly absent" (p. 11). It was therefore in the context of disruptive schools and classrooms, and teachers lacking behavior management skills, that Horner, Sugai, and colleagues at the University of Oregon created SWPBIS (Dunlap et al., 2009; Sprague & Horner, 2006). In doing so, they applied FBA and general principles of applied behavior analysis (ABA) to a three-tier model of prevention, as commonly found in the literature on prevention and mental health (i.e., with Tier 1 focusing on the universal level; Tier 2 on the selected or secondary level; Tier 3 on the indicated or tertiary level).

Sugai and Horner (2009) emphasized that the theoretical and conceptual foundations of PBS and SWPBIS "are firmly linked to behavioral theory and applied behavior analysis" (p. 309). Similar to SEL, SWPBIS places great emphasis on system change, with the aim of preventing school problems and improving not only student behavior but also the "social culture" of the school. This emphasis is seen in the definition of SWPBIS in the 2010 Implementers' Blueprint and Self-Assessment (Sugai et al., 2010). Published by the Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, the blueprint is designed to guide schools in their implementation of SWPBIS. In the blueprint, SWPBIS is defined as "a framework or approach comprised of intervention practices and organizational systems for establishing the social culture, learning and teaching environment, and individual behavior supports needed to achieve academic and social success for all students" (p. 13). Similar to other popular definitions of SWPBIS (e.g., see Horner, Sugai, Todd, & Lewis-Palmer, 2005; Sugai & Horner, 2009), this definition is sufficiently broad and nonspecific

to capture almost any program or model of school discipline and preventive mental health. Although the foundation of SWPBIS in ABA and PBS is lost in these definitions, the defining features of SWPBIS, delineated in the blueprint and commonly cited in the literature, clearly emphasize its theoretical foundation in ABA and PBS. Those features are summarized below.

Defining Features

Five defining features of SWPBIS are commonly cited in the literature (Horner et al., 2005; Sugai, Horner, & McIntosh, 2008; Sugai et al., 2010): *valued outcomes, ongoing collection and use of data for decision making, systems change, research-validated practices*, and *foundation in applied behavior analysis and biomedical sciences*.

Operationally Defined and Valued Outcomes

SWPBIS emphasizes that valued academic and behavioral outcomes are to be identified and targeted for intervention. Consistent with principles of ABA, outcomes are operationalized, measured, and routinely monitored to determine whether the use of SWPBIS practices positively affects students' behavior (George, Kincaid, & Pollard-Sage, 2009). Although office disciplinary referrals (ODRs) and suspension data are the most common outcomes measured (e.g., Bradshaw, Mitchell, & Leaf, 2010; Mass-Galloway, Panyan, Smith, & Wessendorf, 2008), other valued outcomes in studies of SWPBIS are school climate and academic achievement (e.g., Horner et al., 2009).

Ongoing Collection and Use of Data for Decision Making

ODR and suspension data are not only used to measure program effectiveness but also commonly collected and analyzed for formative decision making. These data are to be analyzed from the perspective of FBA (Crone & Horner, 2003; George et al., 2009). For example, if data show that a large number of ODRs come from fifth graders in math class, it might be hypothesized that those students are acting inappropriately to avoid what they find aversive (i.e., math) or to receive attention from peers or the teacher.

The decision might then be made to provide greater reinforcement of their on-task behavior and make math instruction and assignments more motivating.

Systems Change

Systems change (also often referred to as "supportive systems") is not new to schools (e.g., see Fullan, 2007), and the aspects of systems change in SWPBIS are shared by most other school reform initiatives. Those aspects include team-based selection and implementation of research-validated practices, data-based decision making, administrative and team leadership, staff commitment, communication and information systems, adequate personnel and time, and budgeted support. A major way in which the SWPBIS approach differs greatly from other systems change efforts, however, and reflecting the approach's behavioral perspective, is the recommended composition of the leadership team. To ensure that the evidence-based interventions are those associated with ABA and PBS, in the blueprint it is recommended that the leadership team include at least two individuals with expertise and experience in ABA.

Research-Validated Practices

The SWPBIS approach emphasizes implementation of "research-validated" practices (Sugai et al., 2010, p. 15) for preventing problem behavior and achieving valued outcomes. In SWPBIS, "research validated refers to studies that directly and systematically examine whether a functional relationship exists between the accurate implementation of a practice and important changes in the behavior or performance of the recipients of the practice" (p. 14). Four major research-validated practices, as described below, characterize SWPBIS schools.

1. *Clearly defined behavioral expectations.* Staff members are to develop three to five positively worded behavioral expectations that are clearly defined and related to specific observable behaviors in multiple locations throughout the school (e.g., cafeteria, hallway, and classroom; George et al., 2009). They often are presented in a matrix that specifies what behaviors students are expected to exhibit in each location of the building (e.g., to be respectful "walk quietly in the hallway").

2. *Direct teaching of behavioral expectations.* Staff members are to teach behavioral expectations to all students in a direct manner to ensure that they know school and classroom rules and develop social competencies (McIntosh, Filter, Bennett, Ryan, & Sugai, 2010). Rules and behavioral expectations, often delineated in a matrix, are taught throughout the school and in a manner similar to academic instruction; educators use a lesson plan that includes direct instruction, modeling, feedback and positive reinforcement, and role-playing examples of expected behavior (Sugai et al., 2010).

3. *Reinforcement of appropriate behavior.* Staff members are to acknowledge systematically, or positively reinforce, students for demonstrating behavior consistent with the school's behavioral expectations, particularly those expectations identified in the matrix developed by the school's SWPBIS team (Sugai et al., 2010). Various forms of positive reinforcement, such as tangible rewards (e.g., tokens, tickets), access to privileges or preferred activities, social recognition, and verbal praise, are to be used not only to teach new skills and to motivate students (George et al., 2009), but also to foster positive teacher–student relationships (McIntosh et al., 2010). Tokens and tickets also serve the purpose of prompting adults to reinforce targeted behaviors more frequently.

4. *A system for responding to inappropriate behavior.* Staff members are to develop a continuum of consequences that is aligned with the severity of inappropriate behavior. Educators are expected to use evidence-based behavioral techniques, including punishment (e.g., response cost, verbal reprimands), reteaching and practicing behavioral expectations. Minor behavior problems that should be managed by teachers in the classroom are distinguished from major problems that should be managed by administrators in the office.

Foundations in ABA and Biomedical Sciences

Application of principles of ABA are seen throughout each of previously described

defining features (Dunlap et al., 2009; Sugai & Horner, 2009). In the blueprint, it is stated that SWPBIS also is grounded in "biomedical sciences." It is unclear, however, exactly what this term means as applied to SWPBIS and how it translates into educational practice, especially beyond principles of ABA. The authors simply state that there are five "major assumptions associated with adopting a behavioral and biomedical perspective" (Sugai et al., 2010, p. 15). Those assumptions are that behavior (1) can be taught, (2) is environmentally manipulable, (3) is lawful and predictable, (4) is affected by environmental factors, and (5) interacts with biophysical factors. Thus, biomedical science seems to be equated largely with ABA.

Major Strengths and Limitations of the SEL and SWPBIS Approaches

With any evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of the two approaches, it must be recognized that the substantial differences in programs *within* each approach may be as great as differences *between* the two approaches. As such, it is not always clear whether a program falls under the general umbrella of SEL, SWPBIS, or both, and why. This is especially true for many schools that embrace elements of both approaches. For SWPBIS, it is particularly difficult to identify its strengths and weaknesses when it is unclear whether the approach consists of the wide range of programs and practices referred to in some popular definitions of SWPBIS (e.g., Sugai & Horner, 2009; Sugai et al., 2010), or whether SWPBIS is the specific approach developed by Horner and Sugai that is wedded to ABA and PBS, and entails the previously described defining features and characteristics. If it is the former—anything that is effective in achieving outcomes valued by an individual school—then the approach adds little to the existing literature on school discipline, classroom management, and school reform. It also offers little with respect to guiding educational policy and practice, as considerable variance in programs and practices would be expected across schools. However, if SWPBIS is viewed as comprising the defining features and characteristics presented earlier, then its strengths and weaknesses

can be identified, as we attempt to do below. A similar criticism, however, applies to the SEL approach. That is, SEL programs differ widely in their primary aims, as well as emphases on SEL strategies for achieving them. For example, multiple programs target specific areas of prevention, such as substance abuse and school violence; others target one or two specific SEL skills, such as empathy and social decision making; and still others target a wide range of SEL skills, including all five areas of SEL competency listed previously.

Commonalities and Strengths

In general, there are more commonalities and strengths than differences and weakness in the practices of SWPBIS and SEL. Both are school-based initiatives that are committed to increasing the social competencies of students while either explicitly or implicitly discouraging student problem behavior. Both value prevention over correction. Neither considers zero-tolerance or punishment-focused disciplinary policies particularly effective in creating safe and healthy schools, and both are committed to providing all students with critical life skills, a foundation on which academic success can be realized (Greenberg et al., 2003; Horner et al., 2005). Consistent with research on school reform (e.g., Fullan, 2007), both approaches recognize that successfully implementing any schoolwide program entails an ongoing process of systems change, which takes time. Both provide schools with valuable resources and supports for implementing their approach (see *www.casel.org* and *www.pbis.org*). For example, the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL; 2012) provides an extensive guide to support districts and schools as they plan to assess the social–emotional needs of their school population and the professional development needs of staff, select an appropriate SEL program or approach, and monitor the implementation and effectiveness of the implemented program (Devaney, O'Brien, Resnick, Keister, & Weissberg, 2006). Likewise, the Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports offers a large number of assessment and implementation tools and recommended practices.

Major Differences in Primary Aims and How to Achieve Them

Despite commonalities and strengths, the two approaches differ greatly in their primary aims, and the emphases on different strategies and techniques for achieving them. As noted previously, whereas the primary aim of the SEL approach is developing social and emotional competencies of self-discipline, the primary aim of the SWPBIS approach is preventing and managing challenging behavior. The difference in these two primary aims, and strategies and techniques for achieving them, reflects each approach's theoretical framework. Any evaluation of the strengths and limitations of the two approaches must be in light of these major differences in primary aims.

Major Strength of SEL and Limitation of SWPBIS: Developing Cognitions, Emotions, and Behaviors of Self-Discipline

An essential element of SEL programming is developmentally appropriate and sequenced practices that include proactive instruction in SEL skills—skills that reflect how students think, feel, and act. The approach's focus on student behavior and on emotions and cognitions that underlie prosocial behavior and self-discipline differentiates it most greatly from the SWPBIS approach. Primary among the emotions and cognitions that research has shown to be linked to prosocial behavior and self-discipline are empathy, regulation of anger, moral reasoning, problem solving, and self-efficacy (Bear, 2012). Most SEL programs target those emotions and cognitions, and include structures designed to develop related skills and support their practice, maintenance, and generalization across time and settings (see CASEL, 2012, for reviews of programs, preschool through high school). For example, the *Responsive Classroom* approach includes practices such as daily morning meetings, student involvement in rule generation, use of positive teacher language, open-ended questioning, respectful listening, and problem-solving strategies that work to increase student self-efficacy, academic achievement, social skills, and positive relationships in school (Rimm-Kaufman & Chiu, 2007). The *Social Decision Making* approach has a specific set of prompts and cues that are used schoolwide

to promote application of skills in varied contexts (Elias & Bruene, 2005). At a broader level, Durlak and colleagues (2011) suggest that the best SEL practices and programming are those that are sequenced, active, focused, and explicit (SAFE). Practices should include lesson content that is *systematic* and *sequenced*. *Active* practices are those that include role plays and other experiential activities. *Focused* programming includes adequate allotted instructional time, and *explicit* practices are those that focus on building and applying specific skills. Almost all evidence-based SEL programs have multiyear, nonrepeating lesson structures.

Ample research supports the SEL approach in achieving its primary aim and more. In the most comprehensive review of SEL interventions to date, which included a meta-analysis of 213 published studies of universal SEL interventions for children in preschool through 12th grade, Durlak and colleagues (2011) found that students in SEL programs had statistically significant and meaningful improvements in social–emotional skills, socially appropriate behavior, positive attitudes, and academic performance. Additionally, statistically significant decreases were found in conduct problems and emotional distress.

Whereas the development of SEL skills is a major strength of the SEL approach, it is a major weakness of the SWPBIS approach. Consistent with its ABA theoretical framework, little recognition is given to the importance of children's cognitions and emotions in behavior. Instead of targeting how children think and feel, the focus is on the use of teacher-centered behavioral practices to teach behavioral expectations and manage externally or control students' behavior. With its roots in behaviorism and ABA, SWPBIS assumes that environmental factors (i.e., educator practices) are primarily accountable for students' behavior problems; thus, educators are expected to change their practices more than students changing how they think, feel, and act.

Strength of SWPBIS and Limitation of SEL: Teacher-Directed Techniques for Managing Student Behavior

If one's aim is development of self-discipline, then SWPBIS's emphasis on teacher-directed

techniques is a limitation of that approach, but this limitation mirrors its primary strength when one's aim is the management of student behavior. The opposite holds true for SEL: Its strength of developing self-discipline mirrors its limitation of teachers' managing student behavior. The SWPBIS approach provides a full range of evidence-based behavioral techniques, both preventive and corrective, for the effective short-term management of student behavior, and does so within a common framework for teachers and support staff. Behavioral techniques, particularly positive reinforcement, negative reinforcement, extinction, response cost punishment, and punishment involving aversives, are strongly supported by research as to their effectiveness in managing individual student behavior, especially in the short-term (Landrum & Kauffman, 2006). To one extent or another, all teachers, including those adhering to the SEL approach, use these behavioral techniques, typically in combination with other techniques (Bear, 2005; Brophy, 1996). They are common elements of nearly all models and approaches to schoolwide discipline, with research supporting their schoolwide application in preventing and correcting behavior problems (e.g., Embry, 2002; Gottfredson, Gottfredson, & Skroban, 1996).

Nevertheless, behavioral techniques, and particularly the systematic use of positive reinforcement, receive much greater emphasis in SWPBIS than in the SEL approach. Positive reinforcement, using tangible rewards (e.g., tokens, tickets), access to privileges or preferred activities, social recognition, and verbal praise, is the cornerstone of the SWPBIS approach. It is systematically applied as a mechanism for recognizing positive behavior and "motivating students to use new skills" (George et al., 2009, p. 390). This systematic application of positive reinforcement, combined with active supervision, is designed not only to manage student behavior directly but also to increase indirectly the ratio of positive-to-negative interactions that staff members have with students, and therefore foster teacher–student relationships (McIntosh et al., 2010).

The effectiveness of the behavioral techniques in managing student behavior is well established in the SWPBIS approach, as seen in a large number of studies demonstrating reduced ODRs and suspensions (e.g.,

Bradshaw et al., 2010; Flannery, Fenning, Kato, & McIntosh, 2014; Mass-Galloway et al., 2008), and a randomized-control group study finding reduced bullying behaviors (Waasdorp, Bradshaw, & Leaf, 2012). That said, it is not clear that the systematic application of behavioral techniques as used in the research context of these studies is necessary for all students, or needed in the many classrooms and schools characterized by effective classroom management (Bear, 2013). Moreover, it remains to be determined whether those techniques lead to lasting change in student behavior or to a more positive school climate (other than as measured by ODRs; Bear, 2010; Osher et al., 2010). Research indicates that social skills taught using behavioral techniques seldom persist and often fail to generalize to other settings when instruction ends, and adults and consequences are no longer salient (Landrum & Kauffman, 2006).

The systematic application of behavioral techniques is most valuable when addressing the behavioral needs of students who fail to exhibit self-discipline, and especially those who are at risk of, or who currently exhibit, serious or chronic behavior problems (i.e., students needing support at Tiers 2 and 3). The SWPBIS approach provides greater guidance and wider range of evidence-based techniques than does the SEL approach for meeting the needs of those students. Direct teaching of behavioral expectations across settings (what behavior looks like in those settings), consistent application of consequences, use of a functional perspective of behavior (adjusting the antecedents and consequences to meet the function of the behavior to promote behavioral change), and establishment of a consistent message and structure in which students receive specific guidance from adults have been shown to be effective with students with behavioral problems and those who are not intrinsically motivated to engage in appropriate behaviors (Epstein, Atkins, Cullinan, Kutash, & Weaver, 2008).

Whereas most SEL programs include proactive instruction for students on how to handle negative emotions, how to engage empathically, and how to make healthy behavioral choices, few have built-in strategies and structures that guide teachers in deescalating major challenging behaviors or effective use of punishment (e.g., strategies

to decrease negative behaviors). In this way, SEL programming might seem limiting, particularly for schools that are struggling to deal with large numbers of incidents of challenging behaviors.

A related strength of the SWPBIS approach is its emphasis on the ongoing collection and analyses of data to demonstrate that its targeted outcomes are attained, including the aim of managing student behavior. This is especially important when accountability data are highly valued. The routine gathering of not only multiple kinds of data on student behavior problems (e.g., office disciplinary referrals, suspensions) but also data on the school's strengths and needs, fidelity of implementation, and other student and school outcomes, enhances the ability of schools to target effectively areas of greatest need. Another advantage of collecting valid and multiple forms of data, as emphasized in SWPBIS, is that such data are often valuable in in persuading others (e.g., school boards and parents) that additional resources are needed. The kinds of data commonly used in the SWPBIS approach are discussed later in this chapter.

What Is Best for One's School: SEL, SWPBIS, or Both?

A school's choice between the two approaches might well depend on not only its primary aim, or aims, but also an assessment of the extent to which the two traditional aims of school discipline and classroom management are currently being achieved. That is, if student misbehavior is a major problem, and an environment exists that is not conducive to learning, including learning SEL competencies, then adoption of the SWPBIS approach would be a wise decision. Adding techniques commonly found in the SEL approach also would be wise not only to support short-term compliance but also to develop self-discipline in the long term. However, there would be little need to adopt the SWPBIS approach in schools implementing the SEL approach where few behavior problems are evident. There are many schools in which integrating *both* approaches would seem most appropriate, such as when both aims are highly valued and neither is being fully achieved. And there are schools that are given no choice—

they are required, or mandated, to implement both approaches.

Integrating the two is most problematic, however, when SWPBIS and SEL are viewed as incompatible and separate rather than complementary. If viewed as polar opposites, if their underlying philosophies are understood too simplistically, or if evidence-based or promising practices stemming from either approach are avoided because of perceptions that they are either too complex or too limited, then the two approaches and the techniques and strategies inherent in each are likely to be perceived as incompatible. Under these circumstances, problems are likely to emerge, resulting in practices that are implemented ineffectively, incompletely, or not at all. In practice, where both exist, it is unlikely that one will be dropped, at least not in its entirety, and schools will likely find themselves working to accommodate both. For example, in Maryland and Illinois, where a large number of studies on the SWPBIS approach have been conducted (e.g., Bradshaw et al., 2010), schools are required to implement character education (Maryland) or SEL (Illinois). In a randomized controlled group study of SWPBIS in elementary schools in Maryland, Bradshaw and colleagues (2010) found that an average of 5.1 programs was being introduced in each school on "character education and /or development, social–emotional or social skills, bullying prevention, drug prevention (e.g., D.A.R.E. [Drug Abuse Resistance Education]), and conflict resolution and/or peer mediation" (p. 146).

Examples of potential strategies for integration of SWPBIS and SEL and common pitfalls that may occur with integration are highlighted in this section. We focus on four areas in which integration or pitfalls often occur when these approaches are implemented simultaneously. Specifically, we address (1) short-term and long-term aims of programming; (2) use of external rewards; (3) leadership structures for targeting behaviors, thoughts, and emotions; and (4) assessment and evaluation efforts.

Short-Term and Long-Term Aims

It may be useful to consider how schools and districts can use the most promising aspects of both SWPBIS and SEL to create a hybrid model of comprehensive and efficient ser-

vice delivery that supports all children and values traditional aims of both school discipline and classroom management: managing student behavior in the short-term and developing self-discipline in the long-term. Such a combination of aims, and techniques and strategies for achieving them, would be consistent with an authoritative approach to child rearing (Baumrind, 2013) and school discipline (Bear, 2010; Brophy, 1996; Gregory et al., 2010). In authoritative discipline, both responsiveness (also often called *support*) and demandingness (also often called *structure*) are equally valued, and together are viewed as instrumental for effective discipline—in both the short and the long term. *Responsiveness* is best described as supportive and reciprocal relationships, and sensitivity to children's developmental needs, as emphasized in the SEL approach. *Demandingness* emphasizes clear behavioral expectations, rules, and accountability structures, as found in the SWPBIS approach.

Whereas techniques of SWPBIS may be most effective for demandingness and achieving short-term goals, their ultimate success lies in having a connection to and articulation with the techniques of SEL that lead to internalized skill gains, including those of self-discipline. Thus, techniques associated with demandingness, whether positive or punitive, would be linked with responsiveness-focused techniques of SEL to achieve *both* short- and long-term goals. For example, if a SWPBIS schoolwide expectation is "respect others," and behavioral examples of respect or routines are defined by teachers (potentially with input from students) as "wait your turn to speak" and "listen," then providing children with explicit praise as they learn these rules is important to establish the behavior initially. However, the additional discussion of such rules (e.g., reasons why they are important other than the immediate consequences to oneself), and habitual practice and application of these behaviors, may serve to scaffold instruction and integration of important SEL competency building, such as relationship development and responsible decision making. Another example might be when a teacher institutes a behavioral consequence such as "time-out from reinforcement," in which a student is temporarily removed from a situation that appears to be reinforcing his or her

challenging behavior. Linking this practice with follow-up teaching or reflecting on the behavior may help the child to try a different way to engage in the future. In these examples, the approach to SWPBIS teaching would be in sync with an SEL approach, and could ensure continuity and synergy of learning.

Use of External Rewards

In the SEL approach, adults are certainly expected to acknowledge and encourage the practice of SEL skills, but compared to the SWPBIS approach, there is much less emphasis in SEL on using tangible rewards, and especially to control student behavior externally. Given the often opposing perspectives on use of external rewards in SWPBIS and SEL, it might be helpful for professionals to reconceptualize this issue and think about using external rewards as a short-term bridge toward the longer-term development of SEL competencies, while also using them strategically (e.g., sparingly, only as needed, not in a contracted or social comparative manner, and while relying more on praise, privileges, and other forms of private and public recognition and feedback; Bear, 2010). The strategic use of external rewards, including tangible ones, may be completely appropriate, especially when problem behaviors are evident. Most aligned with an SEL orientation would be the use of classroom- or school-level rewards, with contingencies linked to cooperation and teamwork, and use of praise and rewards to reinforce not only desired behaviors but also the underlying cognitions and emotions.

A common pitfall often associated with SWPBIS, and particularly with an emphasis on teacher-centered practices, is the assumption that the systematic and frequent use of praise and rewards is sufficient for behavioral change—both short-term and long-term—and is easy to implement effectively. As noted in Brophy's (1981) extensive review of the research literature on praise and rewards, their effectiveness at the classroom level "has been seriously oversold" (p. 19). Implementing them strategically and wisely, especially classwide and schoolwide, is often a daunting task in light of the multiple demands on the teacher, and the effects on behavior are often minimal (Brophy, 1981). Their use also is inconsistent with the training of many

general education teachers (Brownell, Ross, Colón, & McCallum, 2003), who learn that under certain conditions (e.g., used in a controlling manner and when social comparisons are highlighted; Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, 2001) rewards and even praise can be detrimental to students' intrinsic motivation. When thinking about reward systems that are "scaled up," such as in SWPBIS practices, getting teachers and staff members to implement rewards in a systematic and strategic manner is particularly challenging. When teachers are asked to change their current practices and to implement the "scaled-up" reward system, particularly when there is little evidence to indicate a need for change or that the new system will more effective than current practices, resistance should be expected, and rightfully so (Bear, 2013).

Whereas false promise of quick and lasting behavior change with the use of systematic reinforcement of specific behavioral expectations is a likely pitfall of the SWP-BIS approach, a failure to appreciate the potential value of the strategic and wise use of praise and rewards in not only managing student behavior but also in developing self-discipline is a likely pitfall of the SEL approach. That is, following an overly rigid interpretation of a constructive approach, external rewards may be used too little, especially when new skills are being taught, when intrinsic motivation is lacking, and when desired behaviors are not exhibited. To be sure, the use of rewards and their potential harm to intrinsic motivation has been the subject of ongoing controversy and debate for several decades (see Cameron & Pierce, 1994; Deci et al., 2001). Such debate is likely to continue; however, it also is likely that the frequently voiced extremes in this debate (i.e., rewards are never harmful to intrinsic motivation, and rewards are almost always harmful) are equally wrong. Recent research suggests that when used in the context of an integrated SEL and SWPBIS approach, frequent use of praise and rewards is associated with greater extrinsic and intrinsic motivation for prosocial behavior (Bear, Blank, Mantz, & Farley-Ripple, 2015).

Leadership Structures

The SWPBIS and SEL literatures share consistent messages regarding the importance of building a school's capacity for sustainable and effective routines and practices. Both literatures suggest starting with a steering committee or leadership team (Devaney et al., 2006; Sugai et al., 2010). The representativeness of this group is particularly important, in that each member can serve as a liaison to various members of the school network (e.g., administrators, grade-level teacher teams, specialists, parents). Common pitfalls occur when there are too many teams facilitating too many initiatives, or when the team membership does not truly mirror the school community, such as when the number of special education and support staff on the team is not proportionate to the number of general education teachers in the school, or vice versa. When this occurs, resistance from the underrepresented members is likely.

A representative leadership team might develop a scope and sequence for a hybrid model of SWPBIS and SEL practices. For example, they might explicitly link each of the selected schoolwide behavioral expectations to particular SEL lessons from an adopted curriculum. With this road map, educators may have an easier time conceptualizing the overlaps between SWPBIS and SEL, and clearly and consistently communicating such overlaps to all students in their instructional delivery. Given the potential for competing practices and pitfalls, it is crucial that leadership committees guide the effort in clearly identifying developmentally appropriate, contextually fitting SEL and SWPBIS practices, and communicate the linkages between initiatives. If the goal is to create an atmosphere that includes both responsive relationships and demandingness, leadership committees and school professionals need to work from a relatively sophisticated understanding of the culture of reform in their particular school environment and the social–emotional needs of students.

Having an understanding of what innovations are already in place within a school is important for effective integration of new practices. For example, SWPBIS is based on a structured, tiered model of intervention that increases in intensity based on student need. Universal practices, focused on defining and teaching behavioral expectations to students across settings and acknowledg-

ing students for meeting such expectations, are typically enacted in a coordinated way among school staff members. If a school already has this coordinated structure in place, a natural extension of these practices would be formally to incorporate more student-centered strategies and techniques of SEL. SEL would extend students' understanding of the importance of core expectations (e.g., respect, kindness, responsibility), as well as help them to build skills that may be implicitly linked to expectations (e.g., conflict resolution, emotion regulation). In this way, practice of SEL skills may be more easily integrated across school settings and situations, and the frequent and systematic use of rewards (if needed) could be used strategically when new behaviors or routines are being taught and when students lack motivation to apply the skills. Such use of external rewards may not be necessary when students have consistent opportunities to reflect upon and internalize the links between behavioral expectations and social–emotional processes such as empathy, pride, and self-identity.

As a school moves through the implementation process, the leadership committee continues to serve as a data team that creates action plans based on regular analysis of assessments. Analysis of student outcome data may help to identify students in need of more intensive support, and analysis of implementation data helps to identify the extent to which practices are consistently being implemented schoolwide. The leadership committee could also use such data to plan staff professional development activities focused on the social–emotional instructional core originally defined by the school.

Assessment and Evaluation

Given that the leadership team facilitating SEL and SWPBIS must rely on accurate and efficient collection and management of data, a potential measurement pitfall that can occur is incomplete data collection. For example, schools may put intensive energy into the analysis of schoolwide office disciplinary data, while missing other important elements of behavioral change that have occurred as a result of either/both SWPBIS and SEL practices, and particularly those elements related to their long-term goals (e.g., increased prosocial behavior). On the

other hand, schools may put energy into use of specific tools associated with perceptions of social and emotional behavior but have no system for collecting and analyzing data for decision making on a frequent, ongoing basis that can be easily used.

To avoid assessment pitfalls, it is critical that schools implementing SWPBIS and SEL use a comprehensive and multimethod approach in assessing needs (e.g., professional development, organizational support), fidelity of implementation, and program effectiveness. Readers are encouraged to refer to more in-depth analysis of SEL assessments elsewhere in this handbook. An example provided here includes the multimethod assessment approach used in Delaware's statewide school climate initiative, which integrates the SWPBIS and SEL approaches. Three different assessments are used to identify a school's strengths and weaknesses in four areas of comprehensive school discipline: developing self-discipline, preventing behavior problems, correcting behavior problems, and addressing the needs of students with serious and chronic behavior problems. The fifth key area assessed is staff development and program evaluation. As part of the three assessments, students, teachers/staff, and parents first complete the Delaware School Climate Survey (Bear, Gaskins, Blank, & Chen, 2011). Next, within the context of a professional learning community, school staff members complete and discuss a comprehensive strengths and needs assessment that consists of their ratings of 10 items linking each of the five previously mentioned areas. Finally, external evaluators complete a separate needs assessment in the same five areas based on interviews with teachers, staff, administrators, and students; school observations; and review of materials and policies (for the previously mentioned assessment tools, see *www.delawarepbs.org*). Upon their completion, schools are challenged to address identified barriers and obstacles in program implementation and to establish a school improvement plan. This plan might include strategies for minimizing barriers and maximizing effective and efficient program implementation.

In addition to gathering data that help staff members to understand stakeholders' perceptions of climate and the reach of service delivery, it may also be useful to con-

sider universal assessment of individual student strengths and assets, and to screen for social and emotional deficits. Such added assessment may help schools to identify clearly which students are not responding to universal SEL–SWPBIS practices and may need more intensive, strengths-oriented interventions. In conjunction with analysis of climate and disciplinary data, universal social–emotional screening assessments allow professionals to compile information on all students' social–emotional behaviors within a school quickly and efficiently, which builds the capacity for more targeted intervention planning and progress monitoring.

Summary

In this chapter, we have compared the SEL and SWPBIS approaches, including a brief history of the SWPBIS approach and its defining features and characteristics. The primary strength and limitation of each approach was highlighted. We have argued that the foremost strength of each approach is the weakness of the other approach, particularly when one respects the two traditional aims of school discipline and classroom management—managing student behavior and developing self-discipline. The SWPBIS approach provides educators with evidence-based behavioral techniques, when needed, for managing student behavior. These teacher-centered techniques are often necessary when common student-centered techniques of SEL are insufficient for achieving this important short-term aim of school discipline. However, the SWPBIS approach largely neglects the long-term aim of developing self-discipline, especially emotions and cognitions related to self-discipline. In contrast, this is a strength, and primary focus, of the SEL approach, whereas managing student misbehavior is a relative weakness. Together, they provide a blend of demandingness (or structure) and responsiveness (or support) that defines authoritative discipline. Because many schools are now asked to implement the SWPBIS and SEL approaches, we have identified several major potential pitfalls that schools are likely to face with such integration and have offered suggestions for addressing them.

References

American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force. (2008). Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools?: An evidentiary review and recommendations. *American Psychologist, 63*, 852–862.

Baumrind, D. (2013). Authoritative parenting revisited: History and current status. In R. E. Larzelere, A. S. Morris, & A. W. Harrist (Eds.), *Authoritative parenting: Synthesizing nurturance and discipline for optimal child development* (pp. 11–34). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Bear, G. G. (with A. Cavalier & M. Manning). (2005). *Developing self-discipline and preventing and correcting misbehavior.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bear, G. G. (2010). *School discipline and self-discipline: A practical guide to promoting prosocial student behavior.* New York: Guilford Press.

Bear, G. G. (2012). Self-discipline as a protective asset. In S. Brock, P. Lazarus, & S. Jimerson (Eds.), *Best practices in crisis prevention and intervention in the schools* (2nd ed., pp. 27–54). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Bear, G. G. (2013). Teacher resistance to frequent rewards and praise: Lack of skill or a wise decision? *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 23*, 318–340.

Bear, G. G., Blank, J., Mantz, L., & Farley-Ripple, E. (2015). *Are the use of punishment, praise, and rewards in schools associated with more or less intrinsic motivation?* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Bear, G. G., Gaskins, C., Blank, J., & Chen, F. F. (2011). Delaware School Climate Survey—Student: Its factor structure, concurrent validity, and reliability. *Journal of School Psychology, 49*, 157–174.

Bradshaw, C. P., Mitchell, M. M., & Leaf, P. J. (2010). Examining the effects of schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports on student outcomes. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 12*, 133–148.

Brophy, J. E. (1981). Teacher praise: A functional analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 51*, 5–32.

Brophy, J. E. (1996). *Teaching problem students.* New York: Guilford Press.

Brownell, M. T., Ross, D. R., Colón, E. P., & McCallum, C. L. (2003). *Critical features of special education teacher preparation: A comparison with exemplary practices in general teacher education* (COPSSE Document No. RS-4). Gainesville: University of Florida, Center on Personnel Studies in Special Education.

Cameron, J., & Pierce, W. D. (1994). Reinforcement, reward, and intrinsic motivation: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 64*, 363–423.

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL). (2012). *2013 CASEL guide: Effective social and emotional programs—Preschool and elementary edition.* Chicago: Author.

Crone, D. A., & Horner, R. H. (2003). *Building positive behavior support systems in schools: Functional behavioral assessment.* New York: Guilford Press.

Danielsen, A. G., Wiium, N., Wilhelmsen, B. U., & Wold, B. (2010). Perceived support provided by teachers and classmates and students' self-reported academic initiative. *Journal of School Psychology, 48*, 247–267.

Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (2001). Extrinsic rewards and intrinsic motivation in education: Reconsidered once again. *Review of Educational Research, 71*(1), 1–27.

Devaney, E., O'Brien, M. U., Resnick, H., Keister, S., & Weissberg, R. P. (2006). *Sustainable schoolwide social and emotional learning (SEL).* Chicago: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning.

Dunlap, G., Sailor, W., Horner, R. H., & Sugai, G. (2009). Overview and history of positive behavior support. In W. Sailor, G. Dunlap, G. Sugai, & R. Horner (Eds.), *Handbook of positive behavior support* (pp. 3–16). New York: Springer.

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*, 474–501.

Elias, M. J., & Bruene, L. (2005). *Social Decision Making/Social Problem Solving: A curriculum for academic, social, and emotional learning, grades 4–5.* Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Elias, M. J., Wang, M. C., Weissberg, R. P., Zins, J. E., & Walberg, H. J. (2002). The other side of the report card: Student success depends on more than test scores. *American School Board Journal, 189*(11), 28–30.

Elias, M. J., Zins, J. E., Weissberg, R. P., Frey, K. S., Greenberg, M. T., Haynes, N. M., et al. (1997). *Promoting social and emotional learning: Guidelines for educators.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Embry, D. D. (2002). The Good Behavior Game: A best practice candidate as a universal behavioral vaccine. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review, 5*, 273–297.

Epstein, M., Atkins, M., Cullinan, D., Kutash, K., & Weaver, R. (2008). *Reducing behavior problems in the elementary school classroom: A practice guide* (NCEE No. 2008-012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved January 8, 2013, from *http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides*.

Flannery, K. B., Fenning, P., Kato, M., McGrath, M. M., & McIntosh, K. (2014). Effects of schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports and fidelity of implementation on problem behavior in high schools. *School Psychology Quarterly, 29*, 111–124.

Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

George, H. P., Kincaid, D., & Pollard-Sage, J. (2009). Primary-tier interventions and supports. In W. Sailor, G. Dunlap, G. Sugai, & R. H. Horner (Eds.), *Handbook of positive behavior support* (pp. 375–394). New York: Springer Science and Business Media.

Gottfredson, D. C., Gottfredson, G. D., & Skroban, S. (1996). A multimodel school-based prevention demonstration. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 11*, 97–115.

Greenberg, M. T., Domitrovich, C., & Bumbarger, B. (2001). The prevention of mental disorders in school-aged children: Current state of the field. *Prevention and Treatment, 4*, 1–62.

Greenberg, M. T., Weissberg, R. P., Utne-O'Brien, M. T., Zins, J. E., Fredericks, L., Resnik, H., et al. (2003). Enhancing school-based prevention and youth development through coordinated social, emotional, and academic learning. *American Psychologist, 58*, 466–474.

Gregory, A., Cornell, D., Fan, X., Sheras, P., Shih, T., & Huang, F. (2010). Authoritative school discipline: High school practices associated with lower student bullying and victimization. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102*, 483–496.

Hamre, B. K., Pianta, R. C., Downer, J. T., & Mashburn, A. J. (2008). Teachers' perceptions of conflict with young students: Looking beyond problem behaviors. *Social Development, 17*, 115–136.

Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Smolkowski, K., Eber, L., Nakasato, J., Todd, A. W., et al. (2009). A randomized, wait-list controlled effectiveness trial assessing school-wide positive behavior support in elementary schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 11*, 133–144.

Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Todd, A. W., & Lewis-Palmer, T. (2005). Schoolwide behavior support. In L. M. Bambara & L. Kern (Eds.), *Individualized supports for students with problem*

behaviors: Designing positive behavior plans* (pp. 359–390). New York: Guilford Press.

Hughes, J. N. (2012). Teachers as managers of students' peer context. In A. M. Ryan & G. W. Ladd (Eds.), *Peer relationships and adjustment at school* (pp. 189–218). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 (2004).

Knoff, H. M. (2008). Best practices in implementing statewide positive behavioral support systems. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology* (5th ed., pp. 749–763). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Landrum, T. J., & Kauffman, J. M. (2006). Behavioral approaches to classroom management. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 47–71). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Mass-Galloway, R. L., Panyan, M. V., Smith, C. R., & Wessendorf, S. (2008). Systems change with school-wide positive behavior supports. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 10*, 129–135.

McIntosh, K., Filter, M. J., Bennett, J. L., Ryan, C., & Sugai, G. (2010). Principles of sustainable prevention: Designing scale-up of school-wide positive behavior support to promote durable systems. *Psychology in the Schools, 47*, 5–21.

Osher, D., Bear, G. G., Sprague, J. R., & Doyle, W. (2010). How can we improve school discipline? *Educational Researcher, 39*, 48–58.

Parke, R. D., & Buriel, R. (2006). Socialization in the family: Ethnic and ecological perspectives. In W. Damon & R. M. Learner (Series Ed.), & N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (6th ed., pp. 429–504). New York: Wiley.

Piaget, J. (1965). *The moral judgment of the child*. New York: Free Press (Original work published 1932)

Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., & Chiu, Y. I. (2007). Promoting social and academic competence in the classroom: An intervention study examining the contribution of Responsive Classroom. *Psychology in the Schools, 44*, 397–413.

Sprague, J. R., & Horner, R. H. (2006). Schoolwide positive behavioral supports. In S. R. Jimerson & M. J. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of school violence and school safety*: *From research to practice* (pp. 413–427). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Stearns, E., Dodge, K. A., & Nicholson, M. (2008). Peer contextual influences on the growth of authority-acceptance problems in early elementary school. *Merrill–Palmer Quarterly, 54*, 208–231.

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2009). Defining and describing schoolwide positive behavior support. In W. Sailor, G. Dunlap, G. Sugai, & R. Horner (Eds.), *Handbook of positive behavior support* (pp. 307–326). New York: Springer.

Sugai, G., Horner, R. H., Algozzine, R., Barrett, S., Lewis, T., Anderson, C., et al. (2010). *Schoolwide positive behavior support: Implementers' blueprint and self-assessment*. Eugene: University of Oregon. Retrieved January 8, 2013, from *www.pbis.org*.

Sugai, G., Horner, R., & McIntosh, K. (2008). Best practices in developing a broad-scale system of school-wide positive behavior support. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology* (5th ed., pp. 765–779). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Thomas, D. E., Bierman, K. L., & the Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group. (2006). The impact of classroom aggression on the development of aggressive behavior problems in children. *Development and Psychopathology, 18*, 471–487.

Vygotsky, L. (1987). Thinking and speech. In L. S. Vygotsky, R. Rieber, & A. Carton (Eds.), *The collected words of L. S. Vygotsky: Vol. 1. Problems of general psychology* (pp. 37–285). New York: Plenum Press. (Original work published 1934)

Waasdorp, T. E., Bradshaw, C. P., & Leaf, P. J. (2012). The impact of schoowide positive behavioral interventions and support on bullying and peer rejection: A randomized controlled effectiveness trial. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescence Medicine, 166*, 149–156.

Wentzel, K. R. (2006). A social motivation perspective for classroom management. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 619–643). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Zins, J. E., & Elias, M. J. (2006). Social and emotional learning. In G. G. Bear & K. M. Minke (Eds.), *Children's needs III: Development, prevention, and intervention* (pp. 1–13). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.