Social Development: Why It Is Important and How To Impact It
William G. Huitt
Courtney Dawson

Human beings are inherently social. Developing competencies in this domain enhance a person's ability to succeed in school as well as positively influence mental health, success in work, and the ability to be a citizen in a democracy. This paper outlines research and theories related to the development of social competence and provides a literature review of theory and research supporting the vital importance of social competence, including a discussion of empirically-based interventions and measurement tools that educators can use to facilitate development of social competence.

When Aronson (2003) first published *The Social Animal* in 1972, he confirmed scientifically what people knew experientially: Human beings are social in their very nature. In fact, Dunbar (1998) hypothesized that the large human brain evolved primarily to adapt to an increasingly complex social environment. As Goleman (2006) puts it: "[W]e are wired to connect."

The domain of social intelligence and development is a critical component of descriptions of human ability and behavior (Albrecht, 2006; Gardner, 1983/1993, 2006). Social skills are important for preparing young people to mature and succeed in their adult roles within the family, workplace, and community (Ten Dam & Volman, 2007). Elias et al. (1997) suggested those involved in guiding children and youth should pay special attention to this domain: social skills allow people to succeed not only in their social lives, but also in their academic, personal, and future professional activities. For educators, it is increasingly obvious that learning is ultimately a social process (Bandura, 1986; Dewey, 1916; Vygotsky, 1978). While people may initially learn something independently, eventually that learning will be modified in interaction with others.

Defining Social Intelligence

As with other domains, there are inconsistences within and between the definitions of social intelligence (a capacity or potential) and social competence (an achievement or actualization of potential). For example, Gardner (1983/1993) defined social intelligence (labeled interpersonal intelligence) as the "ability to notice and make distinctions among other individuals and, in particular, among their moods, temperaments, motivations, and intentions" (p. 239). Goleman (2006) defined social intelligence as "being intelligent not just *about* our relationships but also in them" [p. 11, emphasis in original]. His definition includes both the capacity to be *socially aware* (with components of primal empathy, attunement, empathetic accuracy, and social cognition) as well as the ability to develop *social skill or facility* (including components of synchrony, self-preservation, influence, and concern). The latter is Albrecht's (2006) primary focus—he defined social intelligence simply as "the ability to get along well with others and to get them to cooperate with you" (p. 3). In our opinion, Albrecht's definition is

closer to defining social competence rather than social intelligence. A definition of intelligence should focus on the ability to learn to do something rather than being competent at it.

In each of these definitions, cognitive/thinking, affective/emotional, and conative/volitional components are considered important because they provide the foundation for the establishment and maintenance of interpersonal relationships. Therefore, any attempt to develop social capacity (i.e., intelligence) into social competence will need to consider these other domains as well.

There is some controversy about whether social intelligence really exists in a manner similar to cognitive intelligence and the extent to which it can be developed through learning experiences (Weare, 2010). There are similar controversies when discussing other domains such as emotion (Brett, Smith, Price, & Huitt, 2003) and conation (Huitt & Cain, 2005). However, there is no debate about whether people vary in their ability to learn and develop social skills.

Defining Social Competence

Bierman (2004) defined social competence as the "capacity to coordinate adaptive responses flexibly to various interpersonal demands, and to organize social behavior in different social contexts in a manner beneficial to oneself and consistent with social conventions and morals" (p. 141). Broderick and Blewitt (2010) identified four categories of foundational social competencies: (1) affective processes (including empathy, valuing relationships, and sense of belonging), (2) cognitive processes (including cognitive ability, perspective taking, and making moral judgments), (3) social skills (including making eye contact, using appropriate language, and asking appropriate questions), and (4) high social self-concept.

The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL, 2003, 2007), one of the leaders in the development of social-emotional learning (SEL), identified five teachable competencies that they believe provide a foundation for effective personal development:

1. *Self-awar*eness: knowing what one is feeling and thinking; having a realistic assessment of one's own abilities and a well-grounded sense of self-confidence;
2. *Social awareness*: understanding what others are feeling and thinking; appreciating and interacting positively with diverse groups;
3. *Self-management*: handling one's emotions so they facilitate rather than interfere with task achievement; setting and accomplishing goals; persevering in the face of setbacks and frustrations;
4. *Relationship skills*: establishing and maintaining healthy and rewarding relationships based on clear communication, cooperation, resistance to inappropriate social pressure, negotiating solutions to conflict, and seeking help when needed; and
5. *Responsible decision making*: making choices based on an accurate consideration of all relevant factors and the likely consequences of alternative courses of action, respecting others, and taking responsibility for one's decisions.

Based on extensive research over the past two decades, many investigators proposed that school curricula must provide learning experiences that address students' development in the cognitive/academic, emotional, social, and moral domains (Cohen, 2006; Elias, & Arnold, 2006; Narvaez, 2006), Zins, Weissberg, Wang, & Walberg, 2004).

As with the definitions of social intelligence, the different components of social competence provided by Broderick and Blewitt (2010) and CASEL (2003, 2007) involve the

domains of cognition/thinking (perspective taking, making moral judgments, responsible decision making), affect/emotion (empathy, valuing relationships, self-awareness, and handling one's emotions), and conation/self-regulation (self-management—setting and accomplishing goals; persevering), in addition to the social domain (social awareness, relationship skills such as making eye contact and using appropriate language). Broderick and Blewitt's inclusion of social self-views provides an insight into the complexity of addressing social competence. Therefore, an effective social development program will include elements of developing the foundational competencies in other domains that support and enrich it and will do so in a way that the child or adolescent has high social self-esteem in a variety of social situations.

Based on the discussion above, a comprehensive definition of social competence would include a person's knowledge, attitudes, and skills related to at least six components: (1) being aware of one's own and others' emotions, (2) managing impulses and behaving appropriately, (3) communicating effectively, (4) forming healthy and meaningful relationships, (5) working well with others, and (6) resolving conflict.

The remainder of this paper outlines research and theories related to the development of social competence and how it is directly related to education and schooling. The next section offers a literature review of theory and research supporting the vital importance of social competence to academic achievement as well as successful adulthood. The final two sections provide a discussion of empirically-based interventions and measurement tools as well as additional resources for teachers and administrators.

Understanding Social Development

This section is organized around two different perspectives on understanding social development: theories and research.

Theories Related to Social Development

According to Bowlby (1969/1982, 1988), an infant's attachment to a caregiver serves as the foundation for all future social development. He suggested that attachment is biologically-based and is intended to ensure that infants and children have enough support and protection to survive until they are able to function independently (Gilovich, Keltner & Nisbett, 2006).

Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall (2015) found four distinct categories of attachment: *securely attached* (about 65%)*, avoidant-insecurely attached* (about 20%), *anxious-ambivalently* attached (about 10%), and about 5% whose attachment was categorized as *disorganized-disoriented*. According to Ainsworth et al., the attachment patterns developed in infancy and toddlerhood are fairly stable throughout the lifespan. In a study of children attending summer camp at age 10, Sroufe, Egeland, Carlson, and Collins (2005) found that securely attached children tended to have more friends and better social skills. Likewise, in a cross-sectional study using self-report data, 15-18-year-olds with good parental attachment had better social skills and, subsequently, better competence in developing friendships and romantic relationships (Engles, Finkenauer, Meeus, & Dekovic, 2005). Ainsworth et al. found that the *anxious-ambivalently* attached are especially at-risk for later behavioral problems, including aggressive conduct. These data suggested it is vital for the one-third of children who do not develop a secure attachment as infants be provided opportunities to repair the original attachment relationship or

construct some form of attachment outside the home, perhaps through interaction with a teacher or mentor.

Erikson (1950) provided another important theory related to social development; his *psychosocial theory* of personality development emphasized the interplay between the social and emotional domains. Erikson highlighted the importance of the person resolving a series of conflicts where interpersonal relationships play an important role. In infancy, the conflict is *Trust versus Mistrust*. Erikson hypothesized that an infant will develop trust through interaction with a warm, available, and responsive caregiver or the infant will develop mistrust through interaction with a negative or unresponsive and unavailable caregiver. Subsequently, it is this development of trust in infancy that allows an individual to succeed in the next stage of toddlerhood called *Autonomy versus Shame and Doubt.* In this stage, the toddler is more likely to develop a sense of his independence and control over his own behavior and environment if she has the base of trust in a caregiver developed in the first stage. The next two stages, the development of *Initiative versus Guilt* and *Industry versus Inferiority* are especially critical for educators. Early childhood is quite often the age when children first begin their involvement in formal education. Children must learn to integrate their interest in personal exploration and the use of their imaginations with working with others involved in the same task. For elementary-aged children, the task of integrating personal interests and needs with those of others becomes even more complex. They must learn to follow rules and "get things right" while at the same time learning to take the perspective of others and work with others in group projects**.** Failing in either of these stages leads to children being at-risk for an inability to take action on their own and/or developing a sense of inferiority, unproductiveness, and feelings of incompetence in regards to their peers and their social roles and abilities.

Vygotsky (1978), another well-known theorist in the areas of social development and education, argued that cognitive functions are connected to the external (or social) world. He viewed the child as an apprentice guided by adults and more competent peers into the social world. Vygotsky explained that children learn in a systematic and logical way as a result of dialogue and interaction with a skilled helper within a *zone of proximal development* (ZPD). The lower boundary of the ZPD are activities the learner can do on his or her own without the assistance of a teacher or mentor. Similarly, the upper limit of the ZPD are those learning outcomes that the learner could not achieve at this time even with the assistance of a competent teacher or mentor.

Another of Vygotsky's (1978) concepts for guiding learning is *scaffolding,* by which he meant the process by which the teacher constantly changes the level of assistance given to the learner as the learning needs change. When engaged in scaffolding a teacher or coach is involved in every step during the initial stage of instruction**.** As the teacher observes the child correctly demonstrating partial mastery of the skill or task the teacher provides increasingly less support, with the child eventually demonstrating independent mastery of the task or skill. Both of these constructs are important in describing how a child becomes socially competent.

Bandura (1965, 1977, 1986), in his theories of social learning and social cognition, theorized three categories of influences on developing social competence: (1) behaviors children and adolescents observe within their home or culture, (2) cognitive factors such as a student's own expectations of success, and (3) social factors such as classroom and school climate. Bandura's *reciprocal determinism model* stated that these three influences are reciprocally related. That is, each factor influences others equally and changes in one factor will result in changes in the others. In the classroom, for example, a child's beliefs about himself and his

competence (*self-efficacy*) can affect social behavior which, in turn, will have an impact on the classroom environment. At the same time, changes in the classroom that lead to a change in competence will have an impact on self-efficacy. Many researchers support this reciprocal view of the construction of a variety of self-views (Harter, 1999).

Bronfenbrenner (1979) provided an expanded view regarding the impact of the environment on human development. His *ecological theory* stated that people develop within a series of three environmental systems. At the core of his theory are *microsystems*, which include the few environments where the individual spends a large part of his time. According to Bronfenbrenner, the school and the classroom represent a significant microsystem of social development for children. His theory also emphasized the importance of the *macrosystem*, including the factors that are impacting all individuals such as the movement from the agricultural age to the industrial age to the information/conceptual age (Huitt, 2007). Bronfenbrenner also highlights the importance of the *mesosystem* which he views as the link between various microsystems (e.g., the link between family experiences and school experiences) as well as the interpreter of the macrosystem to the individual child or youth. Bronfenbrenner's work adds support to the importance of communication and collaboration between the family and school in a child's social development.

Research Support for Developing Social Competence

Researchers have been studying the connection between social development and academic achievement for decades and have come to a startling conclusion: the single best predictor of adult adaptation is not academic achievement or intelligence, but rather the ability of the child to get along with other children (Hartup, 1992). Additionally, Wentzle (1993) found that prosocial and antisocial behavior are significantly related to grade point average and standardized test scores, as well as teachers' preferences for the student. These studies, and others like them, indicate that a socially adjusted child is more likely to be the academically successful child.

As an explanation for why social development is important to the academic learning process, Caprara, Barbanelli, Pastorelli, Bandura and Zimbardo (2000) noted that aggression and other maladaptive behaviors detract from academic success by 'undermining academic pursuits and creating socially alienating conditions' for the aggressive child. Studies show also that if children are delayed in social development in early childhood they are more likely to be at-risk for maladaptive behaviors such as antisocial behavior, criminality, and drug use later in life (Greer-Chase, Rhodes, & Kellam, 2002). In fact, Kazdin (1985) noted that the correlations between preschool-aged aggression and aggression at age 10 is higher than the correlation between IQ and aggression.

Studies done with students at the ages of middle childhood and adolescence support the notion that those social skills acquired in early education are related to social skills and academic performance throughout school-aged years. One such longitudinal study done with third- and fourth-grade students found that social skills were predictive of both current and future academic performance (Malecki & Elliot, 2002). Mitchell and Elias (as cited in Elias, Zins, Graczyk, & Weissberg, 2003) found similar results; they showed that academic achievement in the third grade was most strongly related to social competence, rather than academic achievement, in the second grade. Similarly, Capara, Barbanelli, Pastorelli, Bandura, and Zimbardo (2000) found that changes in achievement in the eighth grade could be predicted from gauging children's

social competence in third grade. At the high school level, Scales et al. (2005) measured students' level of 'developmental assets', (positive relationships, opportunities, skills, values and self-perceptions) and its relationship to academic achievement. In this study, seventh, eighth, and ninth grade students with more increased 'developmental assets' had higher GPAs in tenth through twelfth grade than those with less assets. These findings support the view that a broad focus on social and emotional development promotes academic achievement throughout middle and high school.

A study completed by Herbert-Myers, Guttentag, Swank, Smith, and Landry (2006) provided a glimpse into the complexity and multidimensionality of developing social competence. They found that "social connectedness, compliance, and noncompliance with peer requests were predicted by concurrent language skills, whereas concurrent impulsivity and inattentiveness were important for understanding frustration tolerance/flexibility with peers" (p. 174). They also found that language and skills used in toy play at age three were directly related to language competence and attention skills at age eight. Their conclusion was that early social and language skills influenced later social competence through both direct and indirect means.

Summary

This short review of theory and research related to social development highlights the following issues:

1. Social intelligence and social competence, while defined differently by various theorists and researchers, all point to a definition that includes multiple components (at the very least, self-views, social cognition, social awareness, self-regulation, and social facility or skill). Some researchers would add moral character development to this list.
2. An individual's self-views are (1) constructed in social settings, (2) an important component of developing social competency, and (3) vary depending upon the social situation in which the individual is engaging.
3. The relationships between early social development, the concomitant foundational competencies, and later social development are complex and not always direct and linear. This suggests a systems approach would provide the best framework to describe how best to influence the development of social competency; both in terms of a view of individual human beings as well as the environment or ecology within which that development occurs

Fortunately, research on social and emotional interventions in the early childhood years showed the potential to positively impact maladaptive social behavior. Hemmeter, Ostrosky, and Fox (2006) summarized research showing that the outcomes of early childhood interventions included decreased aggression and noncompliance, improved peer relationships, increased academic success, and increased self-control, self-monitoring, and self-correction. These issues will be discussed in the next section.

Impacting Social Development

As discussed previously, the initial development of social competency takes place within the home and is initiated with the infants' attachment to his or her primary caregiver. As such, the quality of the parent-infant interaction is an important influence on the development of a

quality level of attachment. A key issue for infant attachment is the sensitivity of the primary caregiver to the infant's psychological and behavioral processes and states (De Wolff & van IJzendoorn, 1997). While there is evidence to support a genetic link to sensitivity levels (Scarr, 1993), there is also evidence that sensitivity has a learning component (Baumrind, 1993).

As the infant becomes a toddler and then moves into early childhood, Baumrind (1989, 1993) as well as Parke and Buriel (2006) found that other dimensions became important. These included such factors as parental warmth (e.g., being aware and responsive to a child's needs) and demandingness (e.g., limiting inappropriate behaviors and reinforcing socially acceptable behaviors). Brooks-Gunn, Berlin, and Fuligni (2000) suggested that these skills neither come naturally nor are developed automatically by all parents and, therefore, it is necessary to include the education of the family in any effective early childhood development program.

Much of the current research on the importance of social-emotional learning (SEL) points to the years of pre-kindergarten through first grade as the *sensitive period* for social development. Not only are young brains still developing rapidly during these years (Sigelman & Rider, 2006), but normally children are having their first social interactions outside of the home. Most often, those programs focus on developing school readiness to learn in formal learning environments (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000).

However, critics suggest that society should not expect schools to make up all deficits in home and community functioning. Fox, Dunlap, Hemmeter, Joseph, and Strain (2003) advocated developing a school-wide approach to developing social and emotional competence in young children that includes links to families and community. They presented their model in the form of a pyramid with activities designed for all stakeholders at the bottom and activities targeted to specific individuals with particular challenges at the top. The four levels are: (1) building positive relationships with children, families and colleagues; (2) designing supportive and engaging environments both at the school and classroom level; (3) teaching social and emotional awareness and skills, often in short, explicit lessons, and (4) developing individualized interventions for children with the most challenging behavior, such as children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder or Autism Spectrum Disorders.

Home and Community

Brooks-Gunn, et al. (2000) suggested that, at the very least, schools need to have a parent education component for their early childhood programs. In a review of 800 meta-analyses of factors related to school achievement, Hattie (2009) found that the home environment and parental involvement with their child's school as two of the 66 most significant variables predicting academic achievement (see Huitt, Huitt, Monetti, & Hummel, 2009, for a review of this research). A wide variety of other researchers concluded that positive connections among the home, school, and community establishes a sociocultural climate that is conducive to any number of desired developmental outcomes (Epstein, & Sanders, 2000; Henderson, & Mapp, 2002; Roehlkepartain, Benson, & Sesma, 2003). CASEL (http://www.casel.org/) as well as The Search Institute (http://www.search-institute.org/) are two excellent resources for material on how to establish these connections.

Supportive and Engaging Environments

Even though the home environment is a powerful influence on social development, Sroufe, (1996) provided evidence that the quality of the social interactions after infancy can modify early attachment experiences. An important component of that influence is to have a learning environment that students perceive as safe and supportive (Caprara et al., 2000). Bub (2009) showed specifically that children had better social skills and few behavior problems when enrolled in preschool, first-, and third-grade classrooms that were more emotionally supportive rather than academically focused.

As previously mentioned, activities and programs focused on impacting social development generally also focused on emotional development, referred to as social emotional learning (SEL). Proponents of SEL are not arguing for a reduced focus on academic learning, but rather a balanced curriculum that incorporates academic *and* social/emotional learning (Merrell & Guelder, 2010). A variety of researchers demonstrated that a focus on SEL can aid in the academic learning process and lead to increased scores on academic tests. For example, Wang, Haertel, and Walberg (1990) examined 28 categories of variables that influence learning. They found that 8 of the 11 most influential categories predicting improved academic learning were related to social and emotional factors such as social interactions, classroom climate, and relationships with peer groups. Elias et al. (1997) supported that finding: "[W]hen schools attend systematically to students' social and emotional skills, the academic achievement of children increases, the incidence of problem behaviors decreases, and the quality of relationships surrounding each child improves" (p. 1). Ryan and Patrick (2001) found that

> When students believe they are encouraged to know, interact with, and help classmates during lessons; when they view their classroom as one where students and their ideas are respected and not belittled; when students perceive their teacher as understanding and supportive; and when they feel their teacher does not publicly identify students' relative performance, they tend to engage in more adaptive patterns of learning than would have been predicted from their reports the previous year (p. 441).

Relatively simple actions teachers can use to impact the classroom climate include greeting each child at the door by name, posting children's work at their eye level, praising students' work, encouraging students who are not immediately successful, and sending home positive notes about students' classroom behavior (Fox et al., 2003).

The next sections will focus on the development of social competencies. However, this focus should be integrated with a focus on developing cognitive, affective, conative, and moral competencies as these are interwoven when social competencies are being developed and demonstrated.

Integrating a Focus on Developing Academic and Social Competence

There are basically four different categories of approaches to developing social competencies in a school setting: (1) integrate a focus on social development within traditional methods of teaching; (2) develop academic lessons and units that utilize an instructional approach that highlights a focus on developing social competence; (3) develop a holistic approach to instructional design with corresponding connections to curriculum and assessment that identify social development as one of several domains that will be the focus of competency development; and (4) directly teach social skills. Examples of these four approaches will be discussed below. There will also be a short discussion of the necessity to develop a classroom management system that complements the selected approach to instruction.

Integrate a focus on social development within traditional methods of teaching.
There are quite a number of lesson plans available that integrate a focus on developing social
competency within a traditional direct instruction lesson format. For example, Huitt (2009b,
2010) worked with practicing PreK-5 classroom teachers to develop lessons that integrate
academic reading lessons with more holistic objectives identified in the Brilliant Star framework.
Lessons dealing with developing social competencies focus on making friends and interacting
with family members. CASEL provides a set of links to resources that provide similar lesson
plans (see http://www.casel.org/programs/activities.php). Another excellent set is provided by
Lesson Planet (go to http://www.lessonplanet.com and use the search terms "social emotional
development"). The Caring School Community project also has lessons for K-6 classrooms
available for purchase; these have been developed as part of an on-going research and
development program (see http://www.devstu.org/product/complete-caring-school-community-
package-grades-k-6).

For the most part, a focus on developing social competency utilizes instructional methods
associated with cooperative learning. One of the most widely used is referred to as Think-Pair-
Square-Share (Kagan, 1989). In this method, the teacher asks a question and has each student
write down his or her thoughts. The students then work in pairs to discuss their thoughts; at a
minimum this means that every student is involved in a conversation on the topic. Next, students
get in groups of four and share the ideas they discussed while in pairs, working on building a set
of shared ideas. Finally, one member of the group shares the group's thinking with the class
while the teacher integrates and organizes the different viewpoints. A to Z Teacher Stuff
provides an excellent resource for lesson plans utilizing cooperative learning strategies (see
http://lessonplanz.com/Lesson_Plans/Cooperative_Learning/index.shtml).

Develop socially-oriented academic lessons and units. Another approach to integrating
a focus on developing social competence with academic competence is to use a method of
instruction that imbeds developing social competence into the events of instruction. For
example, the 4MAT system developed by McCarthy (2000) includes eight steps designed to
address different learning styles and brain lateralization dominance of students (see Huitt, 2009a,
for an overview.) Each lesson is comprised of two instructional events that answer the primary
question of four different types of learners: (1) Why?; (2) What?; (3) How?; and (4) If? The
developer advocates extensive social interaction throughout each lesson and has resources
showing exemplary lessons for all academic areas in K-12 classrooms available at her website
(see http://www.aboutlearning.com/products/teacher-resources).

The Character Through the Arts program is an excellent example of reorganizing
instruction so that it focuses both on academic learning as well as developing more holistic
competencies. It has as its foundation the Artful Learning Model developed by Leonard
Bernstein (see http://www.leonardbernstein.com/artful_learning.htm) and adds to that an
integration of skills associated with a holistic view of human development similar to that of
CASEL (e.g., Cohen, 2006; Elias, & Arnold, 2006; Zins, et al., 2004) and Narvaez (2006). Each
lesson has four different steps: Experience, Inquire, Create, and Reflect. These are very similar
to those used in 4MAT system, but are more constructivistically-oriented rather than using direct
instruction. Sample lessons from Prek through 12th grade are provided (see
http://www.characterthroughthearts.org/). A follow-up program provides links to units for a
variety of content areas in grades PreK-8 (see
http://www.characterthroughthearts.org/stcttadefault.asp).

CASEL provides links to a variety of other resources on integrating and teaching social and emotional skills (see http://www.casel.org/programs/activities.php). Most of these are focused on early and middle childhood. Another excellent program, *Being A Writer* was developed at the Developmental Studies Center (see http://www.devstu.org/site-map). This program teaches specific skills such as listening, brainstorming, and writing that allow children to work in pairs and groups, as well as the whole class, to improve the academic skills used in writing.

Develop a holistic approach to instructional design. There are a variety of programs that take a more holistic approach to developing children and youth; these programs not only advocate developing lessons and units, but also advocate assessing the development of competencies across a wide range of domains. For example, the Habits of Mind program developed by Costa and Kallick (2000, 2008; Costa, 2009) described 16 habits of mind that all children and youth need to develop. Three of those relate to competencies in the affect/emotion domain (listen with understanding and empathy, respond with wonderment and awe, and find humor) and two relate to competencies in the social domain (think and communicate with clarity and precision; think interdependently). Their approach is very similar in many ways to the SEL approach developed by CASEL (e.g., Cohen, 2006; Elias, & Arnold, 2006; Zins, et al., 2004) and the moral character development program developed by Narvaez (2006). Sample lesson plans are provided through Costa's website (see http://www.artcostacentre.com/).

One of the most complete school-based approaches to developing the whole person is the International Baccalaureate (IB) program. Central to each of the three programs (Primary Years Program, Middle Years Program, and Diploma Program) is the Learner Profile (International Baccalaureate Organization, 2006) that lists nine desired attributes. In addition to two that focus on the social domain (communicators and open-mindedness), two focus on the self (balanced and reflective), two are categorized in the cognitive/thinking domain (knowledgeable and thinkers), one in the affective/emotion domain (caring), one in the conative/volitional domain (risk-takers), and one in the moral/character domain (principled).

A foundational principle of all IB programs is "learner as inquirer" and the inquiry units have collaboration in groups as a primary activity.   For teachers in an IB program there are a wide variety of lesson plans and units for all subjects in all grade levels. Examples of an IB Diploma level lesson (Grades 11 and 12) for global poverty and a Middle Years lesson (Grades 6-10) can be viewed at http://globalengage.ibo.org/eng/ib-global-lessons-2008-global-poverty.

Directly teach social skills. There are times when it is necessary to directly teach social skills in order to prepare students to work successfully in cooperative groups. The Department of Education in Contra Costa County, California has provided an excellent resource with lessons covering a wide range of topics (see http://www.cccoe.net/social/skillslist.htm). There are lessons addressing basic skills such as introducing one's self and reading body language, social skills used in the classroom such as listening to others and being in a group discussion, skills used in interacting with peers such as expressing empathy and arguing respectfully, and skills used in interacting with adults such as completing agreements and proper theater behavior. This website would be a good place to start when looking for ideas on directly teaching social and emotional skills.

Another organization, Wings for Kids, provides sample lessons that address developing social competence (see http://www.wingsforkids.org/experience/hot-wings). There are lessons designed to address specific areas such as expressing emotions, becoming socially aware,

improving decision making, and coping with anger and stress. These lessons are aimed primarily at elementary-aged children.

Another excellent resource is provided by Teacher Vision (see http://www.teachervision.fen.com/emotional-development/teacher-resources/32913.html). In addition to lessons focused directly on teaching social and emotional skills, there are also many that integrate these issues with academic content.

Classroom management. Designing lessons that address the development of social and emotional skills must be done within the context of providing a learning environment that supports the instructional lessons. Norris (2003) makes the case that developing a school-wide classroom management program focusing on the social and emotional skills identified by CASEL (Elias et al., 1997) is the best way to address these issues. Not only does classroom management set the climate for learning, it is also where the need for developing social and emotional skills is seen most directly. Her major point, as a principal of an elementary school, is that developing these skills must be seen as a year-long process and that one should not expect to see instant results. Teachers need to be trained, parents need to be involved, and children need to systematically develop and practice the skills over an extended period of time. At the same time, teachers found that when they took the time to directly teach these skills, less time was needed to attend to classroom management issues and more time was provided for teaching necessary academic content. Zins et al. (2004) make much the same case in their review of the connection between social and emotional learning and school academic success.

Bailey's (2001) conscious discipline program is an excellent example of directly teaching the skills necessary to developing a classroom climate that allows academic learning to flourish. Two principles provide the foundation for the conscious discipline program: (1) classroom discipline must be focused on developing community rather than compliance with rules; and (2) the human brain is structured to process information in certain, specific ways. Most importantly from the perspective taken in this paper, there must be a focus on developing student's thinking, emotional, conative, and social skills in the context of the individual person taking responsibility for his or her own behavior and contributing to positive social interactions. The program emphasizes that everyone has seven powers (perception, unity, attention, free will, love, acceptance, and intention); the teacher and students are both responsible for setting the conditions and making the effort to develop these powers.

Developing Individualized Interventions

Despite all the best efforts that a school and classroom teachers can make to develop a positive and engaging environment, provide opportunities to develop social skills within academic settings, and teach these skills directly to all students, there will always be children and youth who need additional learning opportunities to develop these skills. Most likely these will be students with challenging mental, emotional, and/or behavioral issues that stem from a particular diagnosis associated with Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) or emotional and behavioral disorders (EBD) (Quinn, Kavale, Mathur, Rutherford , & Forness, 1999). However, White, Keonig, and Scahill (2007) make a case that social cognition is such an important process that special effort must be made to create the types of environments and provide the support that will result in even the most challenged students developing social competency.

Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD). Winner (2007) reviewed research on three separate theories that explain deficits that most children will learn as a matter of normal

development, but that must be addressed specifically for students with ASD: (1) central coherence theory; (2) executive dysfunction theory; and (3) theory of mind. Firth (as cited in Winner) defines the primary issue of central coherence as the ability to "conceptualize to a larger whole…to relate their information back to a larger pattern of behavior and thought" (p. iv). People with ASD will often become so focused on a specific, concrete detail that they are unable to relate that detail to other details or to a larger whole. There is a tendency to isolate each and every stimulus into its own separate category. This makes establishing social relationships very difficult because they simply do not perceive a back and forth connection between their thoughts and actions and those of others.

McEvoy, Rogers, & Pennington (as cited in Winner) defined the primary issue of executive dysfunction theory as the "ability to create organizational structures that allow for flexibility and prioritization" in moment-to-moment and day-to-day activities (p. v). Students who have difficulty in this area simply follow a step-by-step procedure for doing whatever needs to be done. If anything changes from the pattern they have memorized, they get very upset and confused. Again, this makes it difficult to form and engage in social relationships because they seldom follow a set pattern.

Baron-Cohen, Leslie, & Frith (as cited in Winner) stated that the major issue in the theory of mind is the ability to "intuitively track what others know and think across personal interactions" (p. vi). Pelicano (2010) suggested that one's theory of mind is a somewhat abstract concept and dependent upon one's level of central coherence and executive functioning. He suggests that those two areas should be the focus of interventions.

Emotional and behavioral disorders (EBD). In a review of the literature on teaching social skills to students with symptoms of EBD, Maag (2006) found that literally hundreds of studies had been published on developing their social skills. He discussed the difference between developing social skills (the learning of specific behavioral practices) and developing social competence (a more general term describing the ability to establish and maintain relationships and work in groups). He concluded that social skill development does not automatically mean the development of social competence.

The interventions Maag (2006) reviewed represented selections from a wide variety of different learning theories: operant conditioning (rehearsal, reinforcement), information processing (goal setting, problem solving), observational (modeling), and social cognitive (group discussions, self-monitoring, self-evaluation). In general, meta-analyses showed interventions had only a moderate impact on behavior (effect size = 0.35). His overall conclusion was that the impact of social skills training on EBD students ranged "from dismal to guarded optimism" (p. 14). It would appear that the best advice for classroom teachers is to develop very targeted interventions for specific individuals based on what they believe to be the most important deficits that the student needs to address. Whatever success they may have will likely be as good, but no worse, than what the experts have devised.

Assessing, Measuring, and Evaluating Social Competence

Those interested in developing students' social competencies must address the existing pressure on schools to be accountable for student learning as measured by scores on standardized academic tests and the lack of attention paid to other aspects of the developing student (Braun, 2004). The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act (U.S. Department of Education, 2001) and the more recent *Race to the Top* legislation (U.S. Department of Education, 2009) have codified an

emphasis building for over three decades since the publication of A *Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) which, in turn, was a restatement of a concern stated two decades earlier (Carroll, 1963; Coleman et al., 1966). Fortunately, there is ample evidence to show that a focus on SEL increases academic test scores rather than causing then to drop (Durlak et al, 2011; Payton et al., 2008; Zins et al., 2004). In addition, a wide variety of researchers have shown that SEL is important for mental health, success in work, and living in a democracy (Berkowitz, 2007; Cohen, 2006: Goleman, 2006; Payton et al.,2000). However, one result of the focus on academics has been that areas of schooling such as art or music, and even recess, where students would more likely focus on components of social and emotional development, have been reduced (Center on Education Policy, 2007).

      It is vital that parents, educators, and community members who value the development of competencies in the social domain recognize that efforts to do so must be held accountable for success. This means that evidence must be collected, organized, analyzed, and programs evaluated using the best information available.

      Gresham (1983) made the case that there is a difference between assessing social skills (thought to be discrete components of social competence) and social competence itself. He suggested there are three types or categories of measures focused on social development: socially-valued goals, observations in natural environments, and standardized measures. Each of these types will be discussed in the following sections.

Socially-valued Goals

      Gresham (1983) provided examples of socially-valued goals that are of concern to the general public as well as parents and educators; these would include such school related factors as school attendance, disciplinary referrals, and school suspensions. He also included such non-school related factors as interaction with law enforcement. Other researchers have identified such factors as engaging in less risky behavior (Zins, Payton, Weissberg, & O'Brien, 2007) and knowledge of community and national affairs, involvement in volunteering, voting, or engaging in leadership in youth organizations that should be desired outcomes of schooling and education (Moore, Lippman, & Brown, 2004) .

      While social competence has been shown to be related to these indicators and could certainly point to desirable outcomes for children and youth, these types of indicators are not very sensitive when evaluating the relatively short-term school-based programs discussed in this paper. Additionally, there are many other factors that could influence these types of measures such as home environment (Roehlkepartain, Scales, Roehlkepartain, & Rude, 2002) and community interactions (Devaney, O'Brien, Tavegia, & Resnik, 2005). Therefore, while they may be valuable in investigating the overall mental health and well-being of a community, they should not be used for evaluating programs focused on addressing the development of social competencies.

Observations in Natural Environments

      Gresham (1983) identified a number of measures derived from observations in natural environments that could better serve as indicators of social competence in school-related settings. These include such factors as peer acceptance (or rejection), making and maintaining friendships, and successfully working in groups. Other researchers would add reports of

bullying or being bullied, engaging in nonviolent conflict resolution, resisting negative peer pressure, and self-report measures on attitudes towards school to this list (Moore et al., 2004; Roehlkepartain et al., 2003; Zins et al., 2007).

It is also possible to collect evidence directly on the social competencies discussed previously such as social awareness and relationship skills (Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL), 2003, 2006; Goleman, 2006). For example, in a study of peer social status during middle childhood and adolescence, Cole, Dodge, and Coppotelli (1982) identified five groups: (1) popular, (2) average, (3) neglected, (4) rejected, and (5) controversial. In a follow-up study by Dodge, Schlundt, Schocken, and Delugach (1983), students categorized as popular had high levels of perspective taking skills, self-regulation, and communication and language skills. They also had higher levels of cognitive and social problem-solving abilities and were assertive, but not deliberately antagonistic or disruptive to others. In general, students in the average group had lower levels of social competence than did those classified as popular. They also showed less aggression than did those classified as rejected. The neglected group had these same characteristics with the addition of being less likely to be visible in a social group. On the other hand, those classified as rejected displayed higher levels of aggression, were more likely to behave in ways that were potentially embarrassing to peers, and were more likely to be socially withdrawn. These students also had lower levels of perspective taking and self-control as well as less well-developed social interaction skills. Finally, those students classified as controversial had higher levels of cognitive ability and social interaction skills, but also had higher levels of aggressive behavior.

There are at least two challenges that must be of concern when collecting these types of data. First, social competence is a composite of many different types of skills, attitudes, and knowledge. Guiding students to developing new knowledge or changing an attitude or a skill, may or may not impact social competence as defined in such activities as making and maintaining relationships and working in groups. Gresham, Sugai, and Horner (2001) suggested measures of skills displayed in role-play tests and assessments of problem-solving or social cognition might be especially vulnerable to a lack of predictive validity.

A second challenge in collecting these types of data is the necessity of training educators and parents to collect data that are both reliable and valid. Chan, Ramey, Ramey, and Schmitt (2000) found that teachers and parents made quite different assessments of children's developing social skills in kindergarten through third grade. Parents saw their children as developing social skills in an absolute sense, although teachers judged children as not meeting their expectations of appropriate social behavior for their age group. Therefore, while these types of data are potentially useful in determining the success or failure of interventions, care must be taken to provide adequate training for the observers and to determine the relationship of discrete measures of knowledge, attitudes, and skills to social competence.

Standardized Measures

There are a wide variety of standardized instruments that have been used to assess both social skills and social competence (Elias et al., 1997; Sosna, & Mastergeorge, 2005; Yates, Ostrosky, Cheatham, Fettig, Shaffer, & Santos, 2008). Some instruments, such as the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ), the Social Emotional section of the ASQ (ASQ: SE), the Denver Developmental Screening Test, and the Parents Evaluation of Developmental Status (PEDS) are used more for screening purposes in order to identify at-risk children (Ringwalt, 2008). These

types of instruments are used frequently at the behest of state and local governments to identify those who may be delayed, or at risk for delay, in social emotional development (p. ii, Rosenthal & Kaye, 2005). While these might be useful for describing student characteristics upon entering school, they do not provide the opportunity to assess change over the full range of years a child or youth would likely be in school and, therefore, are of limited use for assessing the development of social competency. An important caveat when using these screening instruments is that they should not be used as the sole criterion for making a judgment regarding a child's readiness for school. Rather they should be used in conjunction with other approaches, such as observations in naturalistic environments, in order to increase the validity of any placement decisions. A second issue is that they should be administered by trained and qualified personnel. There are nuances in collecting and analyzing data that are not obvious to an untrained practitioner.

There are three widely accepted standardized assessments used regularly in research on social and emotional competence for K-12 (ages 5 to 18) children and youth. These include the School Social Behavior Scales (SSBS, Merrell, 1993; SSBS2, Merrell, 2008), Home and Community Social Behavior Scales (HCSBS, Merrell & Caldarella, 2008), and the Social Skills Rating System (SSRS). There are also a variety of new instruments that focus on social competence such as the Social Skills Improvement System (SSIS, Gresham & Elliott, 2009), meant as a replacement for the SSRS and the Initiation-Response Assessment (IRA, Cummings Kaminski, & Merrell, 2008). Each of these will be briefly discussed in this section.

School Social Behavior Scales (SSBS2). The School Social Behavior Scales (SSBS), developed by Merrell (1993) and recently updated (Merrell, 2008), is one of the most widely used assessment instruments for students in K-12 classrooms. It is a rating scale designed to be used by classroom teachers or other educators and takes less than 10 minutes to complete. The SSBS2 is actually comprised of two scales: (1) the Social Competence Scale, and (2) the Antisocial Behavior Scale. In turn, the Social Competence Scale is comprised of three subscales: (1) interpersonal skills, (2) self-management skills, and (3) academic skills.

Taub (2001) provided an excellent example of research using the SSBS. She evaluated the implementation of a violence prevention program in a rural elementary school. The instrument was sensitive to change in social competence and anti-social behavior over the duration of the one-year program and matched results of observations of actual classroom behavior. No published data beyond that of validating the revision of the SSBS2 is available at this time.

Home and Community Social Behavior Scales (HCSBS). The Home and Community Social Behavior Scales (HCSBS) is a 65-item instrument designed for use by parents and caretakers. It is seen as a compliment to the SSBS/SSBS2 (Merrill, Streeter, Boelter, Caldarella, & Gentry, 2001; Merrell, & Caldarella, 2008) and is comprised of the same two subscales: Social Competence and Anti-social behavior.

Zion and Jenvey (2006) provided an example of how the HCSBS (as well as the SSBS2) are used in research. They studied intellectually challenged children aged 9-12 and children with average IQ children in two types of school environments—a regular school and a special education school. The differences they found between ratings of parents and teachers confirmed previous research (Chan et al., 2000) in that parents tended to rate their children higher on social competence and lower on anti-social behavior than did their children's teachers. This is a very important issue when implementing programs designed to address social development in school-

aged children, especially when educators attempt to communicate with parents regarding their children's classroom and school behavior.

Social Skills Rating System (SSRS) and Social Skills Improvement System (SSIS). The Social Skills Rating System (SSRS) was developed by Gresham and Elliott (1990) (see http://www.cup.ualberta.ca/index.php for a review of this instrument). It is comprised of three separate questionnaires to be completed by teachers, parents, and children with third-grade reading skills and generally takes 15-25 minutes to complete.

The SSRS comprises three subscales: Social Skills, Problem Behaviors, and Academic Competence. Of most interest to educators focused on developing social competence, the Social Skills subscale includes five subscales: Empathy, Assertion, Responsibility, Self-control, and Cooperation. Notice that these overlap quite well with Goleman's definition of social intelligence (social awareness and social skills) as well as the conceptions of social competence developed by Broderick and Blewitt (2007) and CASEL (2003, 2007).

McKown, Gumbiner, Russo, and Lipton (2009) provided an excellent example of research completed using this instrument. They used a number of different instruments to assess different factors thought to be related to social competence. They found that SEL Skill level (a combination of three latent variables—nonverbal awareness, social meaning, and social reasoning) was a relatively good predictor of the score on the SSRS social competence subscale. However, measures of self-regulation were even more strongly related, confirming that this conative/volitional component must be addressed in addition to social awareness, social competence, and social skills in order for social competence to be demonstrated in natural environments such as home and school.

The Social Skills Improvement System (SSIS) was developed by Gresham and Elliott (2009) as a replacement for the SSRS. While little research has been conducted using this instrument, a school-based intervention program has been developed using the research that lead to its development (Elliott, & Gresham, 2007). Those interested in using one of these instruments should consult with the authors as to which one would be most appropriate for a specific application.

Initiation-Response Assessment (IRA). The Initiation-Response Assessment (IRA) is a classroom behavior observation process used to collect data on social competence while students engage in prescribed cooperative learning tasks (Cummings, Kaminski, and Merrell, 2008). This approach provides an opportunity to collect data on classroom behavior using a standardized process. First-grade students were videotaped while they engaged twice in four activities in an 8-week period. The videotapes were then coded for children's engagement in four categories of social interaction: (1) frequency of social interactions (were the interactions goal-directed or non-goal directed), (2) helpful/encouraging/facilitative (HEF), (3) overall level of task engagement (on/off-task or cooperative), and (4) negative behavior (either weak or strong). Scores on these categories were compared with SSBS developed by Merrell (1993). Four summary scores were then developed using the behavioral data. The authors reported that "Correlations between scores on the IRA and the SBSS "tended to correlate in expected directions with the SSBS and its subscales" (p. 939). However, the authors stated these correlations are difficult to interpret and a great deal more work is needed in this area.

An advantage of developing observation protocols for social skills and social competence is that teachers trained as observers become more sensitive to the specific behaviors for which they are trained to observe (Huitt, Caldwell, Traver, & Graeber, 1981). Developing videos of children and youth engaging in standardized social interaction activities and then using those to

train educators to collect reliable and valid data on important knowledge, attitudes, and skills related to social competence could be one of the most effective and efficient methods for addressing the development of social competence in the classroom.

A Caveat. In a comparison of 19 instruments used to assess social skills and social competence, Caldarella and Merrell (1997) found three dimensions were covered about half the time (Peer Relations, Self-management, Academic Success) while two more were covered about one-third of the time (Compliance and Assertion.) The specific behaviors that comprised these dimensions varied widely. Therefore, it is critical that project implementers must carefully compare specific behaviors assessed in any given instrument with behaviors addressed in the project to make sure there is adequate overlap. It is very possible to have changes in social knowledge, attitudes, and skills as well as social competence that are not demonstrated in the assessment process.

Warnes, Sheridan, Geske, and Warnes (2005) provided another important warning when using standardized assessments to study social behavior. They used qualitative methodology to identify important social skills for second- and fifth-graders. A major findings was that the social behaviors considered important changed in that brief time period. Second-graders (and their parents and teachers) focused more on rule-governed behaviors when defining social competence such as "being respectful of others and their property, following and respecting rules, being fair, and having manners" (p. 183). Just three years later, there was more of a focus on factors dealing with verbal communication such as "communicating verbally about problems and frustrations, being a good listener, giving praise and compliments to others" (p. 183). While the overall definition of social competence did not seem to have changed in that time period, the underlying discrete behaviors used to make that judgment did change. This is similar to assessing academic competencies involved in reading and mathematics. The specific skills used to define competencies in those academic subjects will change as the child progresses through school.

Summary and Conclusions

A common question asked by parents and educators alike is: "If there is so much research to support the importance of social development in academic performance and personal success, why has it been cut out of the mission statements and primary activities of educational institutions?" There are several common arguments against promoting social development in schools (Weare, 2010).

One critique is that a focus on SEL is not the role of the educators; rather it is the parents' responsibility. Critics argue that parents do not want educators involved in the social and emotional development of their children. This critique does not acknowledge that not all students have the support they need from their parents. Even children from families who are not battling factors that increase the likelihood of abuse or neglect such as low socio-economic status, single-parenthood, parental mental health or criminality are likely to benefit from further guidance in the classroom. Knitzer and Lefkowitz (2005) stated that parents play the most vital role in a young child's life, but parenting is a challenge even in the best of circumstances. Support from the school and community organizations can provide support even when parents are appropriately guiding the development of SEL in the home (Roehlkepartain et al., 2002).

Some administrators argue that they already have a school-based program to provide some guidance and support for developing social competence. The challenge is that these are

most often targeted at specific individuals in Fox et al.'s (2003) pyramid discussed above; some schools may have several social development programs in place. The view taken by Greenberg, et al. (2003) is that the impact of such programs in the schools has a 'splinter' effect and limits their effectiveness. Greater impact could be made by a school-wide intervention program that addresses social development for all children and connects with families and community for increased support.

Teachers argue that there is not enough time in the day, and teaching and measuring social development will take valuable time away from making sure their students can pass their standardized tests for academics. Again, this is not a question of teaching one or the other, rather it is training educators to address them both, simultaneously. As seen in the research cited in the previous section, putting social skills education into the curriculum does detract from academic learning time, it makes it more efficient.

Another criticism of SEL implementation is that empirically-based interventions have not been available and measuring progress or delay in social development is not as easy as documenting change in academic achievement. However, research in the past two decades reviewed in this paper have identified a number of very promising approaches. While more research is certainly needed, there is ample evidence to support an approach that addresses multiple domains that contribute to the development of social competency (CASEL, 2003, 2007) and the need to include connections among families, schools, and community in such programs (Epstein & Sanders, 2000).

One the other hand, surveys completed by such groups as Gallup, Metlife, and Public Agenda found that most educators, parents, students, and members of the public support an educational agenda that facilitates the social-emotional development of students (Greenberg et al., 2003). Given the importance of social development for life success and its positive influence on academic learning, it seems the relevant question should no longer be "Why?", but "How?".

In our opinion, one of the most important findings is that successful programs are more likely to focus on multiple domains, focus on all students in a school rather than just a subset of "problem " students, and involve parents and community in at least the implementation, if not the development of the program (Brookes-Gunn et al., 2000; Fox et al., 2003; Patrikakou & Weissberg, 2007; Weare, 2010; Zins et al., 2007). Another important finding is that developing social competency is done best within social interactions, not in teaching students cognitively about social competency (Zins et al., 2007). The practical implication of this finding is that social and emotional learning activities must be incorporated into the day-to-day instructional and classroom management strategies of the school. At the same time, Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger (2011) found that "programs are likely to be effective if they use a sequenced, step-by-step training approach, use active forms of learning, focus sufficient time on skill development, and have explicit learning goals" (p. 408). These four components are used to make the acronym SAFE and are highlighted by four questions:

1. Does the program use a connected and coordinated set of activities to achieve their objectives relative to skill development? (Sequenced, step-by-step)
2. Does the program use active forms of learning to help youth learn new skills? (Active)
3. Does the program have at least one component devoted to developing personal or social skills? (Focused)

4. Does the program target specific SEL skills rather than targeting skills or positive development in general terms? (Explicit) (p. 410)

Not only must the program meet specific requirements, but implementing change requires training and expert support for teachers as well as administrative supports and policies (Hemmeter, Ostrosky, & Fox, 2006). Because of the necessary time investment in successful program implementation, faculty and staff turn-over is another obstacle that must be considered. Elias et al. (2003) stated that it can be a 5- to 10-year process to implement a program effectively and in this time there is likely to have been a dramatic change in administration, teachers, and leaders of the program.

Having several school leadership teams involved in implementing reform, rather than one primary 'change agent', will limit the effects of turn-over. Senge (1990) describes this as an important component of developing a learning organization. Senge, Scharmer, Jaworski, and Flowers (2004) expand on this fundamental concept and describe the process of a learning organization emerging from the interactions of its component parts (e.g, administrators, teachers, parents, students). Their view is that learning takes place through cycles of reflection-action-reflection and that consultation among group members is essential to developing a shared understanding of the needs of the present moment.

Losada (2008a&b) adds some specificity to the development of flourishing teams that provide the foundation for a learning organization. He states that high flourishing teams have high ratios of inquiry to advocacy, positive statements to negative statements, and other to self when engaging in group consultation. One of his most important findings is that average (languishing) teams have a ratio close to 1:1 for positive versus negative statements, whereas flourishing teams have a ratio between 3:1 and 11:1. An interesting research study might investigate the relationship between classroom teachers' demonstration of these consultation skills and their impact on the development of social competencies among their students. It is certainly conceivable that teachers who participate in flourishing teams will be more likely to model these behaviors in the classroom and be more sensitive to their expression in their students.

References

Adelman, H., & Taylor, L. (2000). Moving prevention from the fringes into the fabric of school improvement. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 11*(1), 7-36.

Ainsworth, M., Blehar, M., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (2015). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. New York, NY: Routledge. [Originally published in 1978].

Albrecht, K. (2006). *Social intelligence: The new science of success*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Aronson, E. (2007). *The social animal* (10th ed.). Worth Publishers.

Bailey, B. (2001). *Conscious discipline: 7 basic skills for brain smart classroom management*. Ovledo, FL: Loving Guidance, Inc.

Bandura, A. (1965). Influence of models' reinforcement contingencies on the acquisition of imitative response. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1,* 589-595.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. New York: General Learning Press.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social-cognitive theory*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Baumrind, D. (1989). Rearing competent children. In W. Damon (Ed.), *Child development today and tomorrow* (pp. 349-378). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Baumrind, D. (1993). The average expectable environment is not good enough: A response to Scarr. *Child Development, 64*, 1299-1317.

Berkowitz, M. (2007). *Social and emotional learning: The true purpose of education*. Committee for Children. Retrieved from http://www.cfchildren.org/issues/sel/education/index.cfm?print

Bierman, K. L. (2004). *Peer rejection: Developmental processes and intervention*. New York: Guilford Press.

Bowlby, J. (1969/1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Parent-child attachment and healthy human development*. New York: Basic Books.

Braun, H. (2004, January 5). Reconsidering the impact of high-stakes testing. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 12*(1). Retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v12n1/v12n1.pdf

Brett, A., Smith, M., Price, E., & Huitt, W. (2003). The affective domain. *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. Retrieved from http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/papers/affectdev.pdf

Broderick, P., & Blewitt, P. (2010). *The life span: Human development for helping professionals* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Brooks-Gunn, J., Berlin, L., & Fuligni, A. (2000). Early childhood intervention programs: What about the family? In J. Shonkoff, & S. Meisels (Eds.), *Handbook of early childhood intervention* (pp. 549-588; 2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bub, K. (2009). Testing the effects of classroom support on children's social and behavioral skills at key transition points using latent growth modeling. *Applied Developmental Science, 13*(3), 130-148.

Caldarella, P., & Merrell, K.W. (1997). Common dimensions of social skills of children and adolescents: A taxonomy of positive behaviors. *School Psychology Review, 26*, 264–278.

Caprara, G., Barbanelli, C., Pastorelli, C., Bandura, A., & Zimbardo, P. (2000). Prosocial foundations of children's academic achievement. *Psychological Science, 11*, 302-306.

Carroll, J. (1963). A model of school learning. *Teachers College Record, 64*, 723-733.

Center on Education Policy. (2007). *Choices, changes and challenges: Curriculum and instruction in the NCLB era*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.cep-dc.org/cfcontent_file.cfm?Attachment=McMurrer%5FFullReport%5FCurricAndInstruction%5F072407%2Epdf

Chan, D., Ramey, S., Ramey, C., & Schmitt, N. (2000). Modeling intraindividual changes in children's social skills at home and at school: A multivariate latent growth approach to understanding between-settings differences in children's social development. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 35*(3), 365-396.

Cohen, J. (2006). Social, emotional, ethical, and academic education: Creating a climate for learning, participation in democracy, and well-being. *Harvard Educational Review, 76(2),* 201–237.

Cole, J., Dodge, K., & Coppotelli, H. (1982). Dimensions and types of social status: A cross-age perspective. *Developmental Psychology, 18*, 557-570.

Coleman, J., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, J. Mood, A., Weinfeld, F., & York, R. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL). (2003). *Safe and sound: An educational leader's guide to evidence-based social and emotional learning programs*. Chicago, IL: Author. Retrieved from http://casel.org/publications/safe-and-sound-an-educational-leaders-guide-to-evidence-based-sel-programs/

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL). (2007). *What is SEL? Skills and competencies*. Chicago, IL: Author. Retrieved from http://casel.org/why-it-matters/what-is-sel/

Costa, A. L., & Kallick, B. (2000). *Habits of mind: A developmental series.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Costa, A., & Kallick, B. (Ed.). (2008). *Learning and leading with habits of mind: 16 essential characteristics for success*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Costa, A. (Ed.). (2009). *Habits of mind across the curriculum: Practical and creative strategies for teachers.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Cummings, K., Kaminski, R., & Merrell, K. (2008). Advances in the assessment of social competence: Findings from a preliminary investigation of a general outcome measure for social behavior. *Psychology in the Schools, 45*(10), 930-946.

Devaney, E., O'Brien, M., Tavegia, M., & Resnik, H. (2005, Winter). Promoting children's ethical development through social and emotional learning (SEL). *New directions for youth development, 108,* pp. 107-116.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: MacMillan. Available online at http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Democracy_and_Education

De Wolff, M., & van IJzendoorn, M. (1997). Sensitivity and attachment: A meta-analysis on parental antecedents of infant attachment. *Child Development, 68*(4), 571-591. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.1997.tb04218.x

Diener, M., Russell, I., Behunin, M., & Wong, M. (2007). *Attachment to mothers and fathers during middle childhood: Associations with child gender, grade and competence*. Salt Lake City, Utah: Blackwell Publishing.

Dodge, K., Schlundt,D., Schocken, I., & Delugach, J. (1983). Social competence and children's sociometric status: The role of peer group entry strategies. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 29*, 309-336.

Dunbar, R. (1998). The social brain hypothesis. *Evolutionary Anthropology, 6*, 178–90. Retrieved from http://psych.colorado.edu/~tito/sp03/7536/Dunbar_1998.pdf

Durlak, J., Weissberg, R., Dymnicki, A., Taylor, R., & Schellinger, L. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development, 82*(1), 405-432. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x

Elias, M. J., & Arnold, H. (Eds.). (2006). *The educator's guide to emotional intelligence and academic achievement: Social emotional learning in the classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Elias, M., Blum, L., & Schuyler, T. (2000). Voices from the field: Identifying and overcoming roadblocks to carrying out programs in social and emotional learning. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 11*(2), 253-272.

Elias, M., Zins, J., Graczyk, P., & Weissberg, R. (2003). Implementation, sustainability, and scaling up of social-emotional and academic innovations in public schools. *School Psychology Review, 32*(3), 303-319. Retrieved from http://olms.cte.jhu.edu/olms/data/resource/4008/SocialEmotional%20Innovations.pdf

Elias, M., Zins, J., Weissberg, R., Frey, K., Greenberg, M., Haynes, N., Kessler, R., Schwab-Stone, M., & Shriver, T. (1997). *Promoting social and emotional learning: Guidelines for educators.* Alexandria, VA. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Elliott, S. N., & Gresham, F. (2007). *Social Skills Improvement System (SSIS) classwide intervention program*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Assessments.

Elliott, S., Kratochwill, T., & Roach, A. (2003). Commentary: Implementing social-emotional and academic innovations: Reflections, Reactions and Research. *School Psychology Review, 32*(3), 320-326.

Engels, R., Finkenaur, C., Meeus, W., & Dekovic, M. (2005). Parental attachment and adolescents' emotional adjustment: The associations with social skills and relational competence. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 48*(4), 428-439.

Epstein, J. L., & Sanders, M. G. (2000). Connecting home, school, and community: New directions for social research. In M. Hallinan (Ed.), *Handbook of the sociology of education* (pp. 285-306). New York, NY: Klower Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Erikson, E. (1950). *Childhood and society*. New York: Norton.

Fox, L., Dunlap, G., Hemmeter, M. L., Joseph, G., & Strain, P. (2003, July). The teaching pyramid: A model for supporting social competence and preventing challenging behavior in young children. *Young Children, 58*(4), 48-52. Retrieved from http://csefel.vanderbilt.edu/modules/module4/handout7.pdf

Gardner, H. (1983/993). *Frames of mind*. New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (2006). *Multiple intelligences: New horizons in theory and practice*. New York: Basic Books.

Gilovich, T., Keltner, D., & Nisbett, R. (2006). *Social psychology*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books

Goleman, D. (2006). *Social intelligence: The revolutionary new science of human relationships.* New York, New York: Bantam Dell.

Granot, D., & Mayseless, O. (2001). Attachment security and adjustment to school in middle childhood. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 6,* 530-541.

Greenberg, M., Weissberg, R., O'Brien, M., Zins, J., Fredricks, L., Resnick, H., & Elias, M. (2003). Enhancing school-based prevention and youth development through coordinated social, emotional and academic learning. *American Psychologist, 58* (6/7), 466-474. Retrieved from http://www.casel.org/downloads/AmericanPsychologist2003.pdf

Greer-Chase, M., Rhodes, W., & Kellam, S. (2002). Why the prevention of aggressive disruptive behaviors in middles school must begin in elementary school. *The Clearing House, 75*(5), 242-245.

Gresham, F. (1983). Social validity in the assessment of children's social skills: Establishing standards for social competency. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 1*(3), 299-307.

Gresham, F., & Elliott, S. (1990). *Social Skills Rating System manual*. Circle Pines, MN: AGS.

Gresham, F., & Elliott, S. (2009). *Social Skills Improvement System: Teacher rating scales.* Bloomington, MN: Pearson Assessments.

Gresham, F., Sugai, G., & Horner, R. (2001). Interpreting outcomes of social skills training for students with high-incidence disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 67*(3), 331-344.

Harter. S. (1999). *The construction of self: A developmental perspective*. New York: Guilford Press.

Hartup, W. (1992). *Having friends, making friends, and keeping friends: Relationships as educational contexts*. ERIC Digest. Champaign, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education. ED 345 854. Retrieved from http://ceep.crc.illinois.edu/pubs/ivpaguide/appendix/hartup-friends.pdf

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. London & New York: Routledge.

Hemmeter, M., Ostrosky, M., & Fox, L. (2006). Social and emotional foundations for early learning: A conceptual model for intervention. *School Psychology Review, 35*(4), 583-601.

Henderson, A., & Mapp, K. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on school achievement*. Austin, TX: National Center for Family & Community Connections with Schools, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Retrieved from http://www.sedl.org/connections/resources/evidence.pdf

Herbert-Myers, H., Guttentag, C., Swank, P., Smith, K., & Landry, S. (2006). The importance of language, social, and behavioral skills across early and later childhood as predictors of social competence with peers. *Applied Developmental Science, 10*(4), 174-187.

Huitt, W. (2007). *Success in the Conceptual Age: Another paradigm shift.* Paper presented at the 32nd Annual Meeting of the Georgia Educational Research Association, October 26. Retrieved on from http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/papers/conceptual-age.pdf

Huitt, W. (2009a). Individual differences: The 4MAT system. *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. Retrieved from http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/topics/instruct/4mat.html

Huitt, W. (Ed.). (2009b, March). The Brilliant Star Integrative Reading Project (Grades 3-5). *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. Retrieved from http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/brilstar/integrative/upelem/index.html

Huitt, W. (Ed.). (2010, November). The Brilliant Star Integrative Reading Project (PreK-2). *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. Retrieved from http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/brilstar/integrative/index.html

Huitt, W., & Cain, S. (2005). An overview of the conative domain. *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. Retrieved from http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/papers/conative.pdf

Huitt, W., Caldwell, J., Traver, P., & Graeber, A. (1981). Collecting information on student engaged time. In D. Helms, A. Graeber, J. Caldwell, & W. Huitt (Eds.). *Basic skills instructional improvement program: Leader's guide for student engaged time*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc.

Huitt, W., Huitt, M., Monetti, D., & Hummel, J. (2009). *A systems-based synthesis of research related to improving students' academic performance*. Paper presented at the 3rd International City Break Conference sponsored by the Athens Institute for Education and Research (ATINER), October 16-19, Athens, Greece. Retrieved from http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/papers/improving-school-achievement.pdf

International Baccalaureate Organization (2006). *IB Learner profile booklet*. Cardiff, Wales, UK: Author. Retrieved from http://www.ibo.org/programmes/documents/learner_profile_en.pdf

Jacobson, L. (2000, September 13). School readiness seen to hinge on social, emotional adjustment. *Education Week,* 5.

Kagan, S. (1991). *Cooperative learning resources for teachers*. San Juan Capistrano, CA: Resources for Teachers.

Kazdin, A. (1985). *Treatment of antisocial behavior in children and adolescents*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Kellam, S., & Rebok, G. (1992). Building developmental and etiological theory through epidemiologically based preventative intervention trials. In J. McCord, & R. Tremblay (Eds.), *Preventing antisocial behavior: Interventions from birth through adolescence* (pp. 162-195). New York: Guilford Press.

Knitzer, J., & Lefkowitz, J. (2005). *Resources to promote social and emotional health and school readiness in young children and families.* New York: National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University.

Kress, J., & Elias, M. (2006). Building learning communities through social and emotional learning: Navigating the rough seas of implementation. *Professional School Counseling, 10*(1), 102-107.

Landry, S., Smith, K., & Swank, P. (2009). New directions in evaluating social problem solving in childhood: Early precursors and links to adolescent social competence. In C. Lewis & J. I. M. Carpendale (Eds.), Social interaction and the development of executive function. *New Directions in Child and Adolescent Development, 123*, 51–68.

Losada, M. (2008a, December 8). Want to flourish: Stay in the zone. *Positive Psychology News Daily*. Retrieved from http://pos-psych.com/news/guest-author/200812081289

Losada, M. (2008b, December 9). Work teams and the Losada line: New results. *Positive Psychology News Daily*. Retrieved from http://pos-psych.com/news/guest-author/200812091298

Maag, J. (2006). Social skills training for students with emotional and behavioral disorders: A review of reviews. *Behavioral Disorders, 32*(1), 5-17.

Maholmes, V. (2007). *Social and emotional learning: What school is all about*. Committee for Children. Retrieved on from http://www.cfchildren.org/issues/sel/school/index.cfm?print

Malecki C., & Elliot, S. (2002). Children's social behaviors as predictors of academic achievement: A longitudinal analysis. *School Psychology Quarterly, 17*(1), 1-23.

McCarthy, B. (2000). *About teaching: 4MAT in the classroom*. Wauconda, IL: About Learning.

McClellan, D. & Katz, L. (1992). *Young children's social development: A checklist*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education. Retrieved on October 15, 2008 from http://www.nldontheweb.org/Mcclellan_Katz.htm

McKown, C., Gumbiner, L., Russo, N., & Lipton, M. (2009). Social-emotional learning skill, self-regulation, and social competence in typically developing and clinic-referred children. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 38*(6), 858-871.

Merrell, K. (1993). Using behavior rating scales to assess social skills and antisocial behavior in school settings. *School Psychology Review, 22*(1), 115-133.

Merrell, K. (2008). *School social behavior scales: User's guide* (2nd ed.). Baltimore, MD: Brooks Publishing.

Merrell, K., & Caldarella, P. (2008). *Home & community social behavior scales (HCSBS): Users guide*. Baltimore, MD: Brooks Publishing.

Merrell, K., & Guelder, B. (2010). *Social and emotional learning in the classroom: Promoting mental health and academic success*. New York: Guilford Press.

Merrill, K., Streeter, A., Boelter, E., Caldarella, P., & Gentry, A. (2001). Validity of the home and community social behavior scales: Comparisons with five behavior-rating scales. *Psychology in the Schools, 38*(4), 313-325.

Moore, K., Lippman, L., & Brown, B. (2004). Indicators of child well-being: The promise of positive youth development. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 591*, 125-145.

Narvaez, D. (2006). Integrative ethical education. In M. Killen & J. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (703-728). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. Retrieved http://www.nd.edu/~alfac/narvaez/Narvaez%20HMD%2009.14.pdf

National Commission on Excellence in Education, The. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/index.html

National Education Summit. (1996, March). *Policy statement*. Washington, DC: Author.

Novick, B., Kress, J., & Elias, M. J. (2002). *Building learning communities with character: How to integrate academic, social and emotional learning.* Alexandria, Virginia. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

O'Hearn, T., & Gatz, M. (2002). Going for the goal: Improving youths' problem-solving skills through a school-based intervention. *Journal of Community Psychology, 30*(3), 281-303.

Papalia, D., Olds, S., & Feldman, R. (2007). *Human development* (10th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Parke, R. & Buriel, R. (2006). Socialization in the family: Ethnic and ecological perspectives. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *The handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (6th ed., Vol. 3, pp. 429-504). New York: Wiley.

Patrikakou, E., & Weissberg, R. (2007). School-family partnerships to enhance children's social, emotional, and academic learning. In R. Bar-on, J. Maree, & M. Elias, *Educating people to be emotionally intelligent* (pp. 49-77). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Payton, J., Wardlaw, D., Graczyk, P., Bloodworth, M., Tompsett, C., & Weissberg, R. (2000). Social and emotional learning: A framework for promoting mental health and youth. *Journal of School Health, 70*(5), 179-185.

Payton, J., Weissberg, R., Durlak, J., Dymnicki, A., Taylor, R., Schellinger, K., & Pachan, M. (2008). *The positive impact of social and emotional learning for kindergarten to eighth-grade students: Findings from three scientific studies.* [Executive Summary]. Chicago, IL: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL). Retrieved from http://www.casel.org/downloads/PackardES.pdf

Pelicano, E. (2010). Individual differences in executive function and central coherence predict developmental changes in theory of mind in Autism. *Developmental Psychology, 46*(2), 530-544.

Quinn, M., Kavale, K., Mathur, S., Rutherford , R., & Forness, S. (1999). A meta-analysis of social skill interventions for students with emotional or behavioral disorders. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 7*(1), 54.

Ringwalt, S. (Compiler). (2008). *Developmental screening and assessment instruments with an emphasis on social and emotional development for young children ages birth to five.* Chapel Hill, NC: The National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC). Retrieved from http://www.nectac.org/~pdfs/pubs/screening.pdf

Roehlkepartain, E., Benson, P., & Sesma, A. (2003). *Signs of progress in putting children first: Developmental assets among youth in St. Louis Park, 1997-2001.* Minneapolis, MN: Search Institute. Retrieved from http://www.search-institute.org/system/files/SignsofProgress-5-03.pdf

Roehlkepartain, E., Scales, P., Roehlkepartain, J., Rude, S. (2002). *Building strong families: Highlights from a preliminary survey on what parents need to succeed*. Chicago, IL and Minneapolis, MN: YMCA of the USA and Search Institute. Retrieved from http://www.search-institute.org/system/files/2002BuildingStrongFamilies-Highlights.pdf

Rosenthal, J., & Kaye, N. (2005). *State approaches to promoting young children's healthy mental development: A survey of Medicaid, maternal and child health, and mental health agencies*. Portland, ME: National Academy of State Health Policy. Retrieved from http://www.cyfdivision.com/documents/State_approaches_to_promoting_young_childrens_healthy_mental_development_11-05.pdf

Ryan, A., & Patrick, H. (2001). The classroom social environment and changes in adolescents' motivation and engagement during middle school. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(2), 437-460. doi: 10.3102/0002831203800243

Santrock, J. W., (2008). *Educational psychology* (3rd ed.). New York, New York. McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Scales, P. C., Benson, P. L. Roehlkepartain, E. C., Sesman, A., & van Dulmen, M. (2006). The role of developmental assets in predicting academic achievement: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Adolescence, 29*(5), 692–708.

Scarr, S. (1993). Biological and cultural diversity: The legacy of Darwin for development. *Child Development, 64*, 1333-1353.

Scott, T., Park, K., Swain-Bradway, J. & Landers, E. (2007). Positive behavior support in the classroom: Facilitating behaviorally inclusive learning environments. *International Journal of Behavioral Consultation and Therapy. 3*(2), 223-232.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art & practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday/Currency.

Senge, P., Scharmer, C. O., Jaworski, J., & Flowers, B. S. (2004). *Presence: Human purpose and the field of the future*. New York: Doubleday.

Shonkoff, J. (2000). Science, policy and practice: Three cultures in search of a shared mission. *Child Development, 71*(1), 181-187.

Sigelman, C., & Rider, E. (2006). *Human growth and development across the lifespan* (5th ed.). Belmont, California. Thompson Corporation.

Sosna, T., & Mastergeorge, A. (2005). *Compendium of screening tools for early childhood social and emotional development*. The Infant, Preschool, Family Mental Health Initiative. California Institute for Mental Health. Sacramento, California. Retrieved from http://www.cimh.org/downloads/The%20Infant,%20Preschool,%20Family,%20Mental%

		20Health%20Initiative%20Compendium%20of%20Screening%20Tools%20for%20Early
		%20Childhood%20Social-Emotional%20Deve.pdf
Sroufe, L. (1996). *Emotional development: The organization of emotional life in the early years*.
		New York: Cambridge University Press.
Sroufe, L., Egeland, B., Carlson, E., & Collins, W. (2005). *Minnesota Study of Risk and
		Adaptation from birth to maturity: The development of the person*. New York: Guilford
		Press.
Taub, J. (2001). Evaluation of the Second Step Violence Prevention Program at a rural
		elementary school. *School Psychology Review, 31*(2),186-200.
Ten Dam, G., & Volman, M. (2007). Educating for adulthood or for citizenship: Social
		competence as an educational goal. *European Journal of Education, 42*(2), 281-298.
U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *Fact sheet on the major provisions of the Conference
		Report to H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from
		http://www2.ed.gov/nclb/overview/intro/factsheet.html
U.S. Department of Education. (2009, July 24). *President Obama, U.S. Secretary of Education
		Duncan announce national competition to advance school reform*. Washington, DC:
		Author. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2009/07/07242009.html
Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind and society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Wang, M., Haertel, G., & Walberg, H. (1990). What influences learning? A content analysis of
		review literature. *Journal of Educational Research, 84*(1), 30-34.
Warnes, E., Sheridan, S., Geske, J., & Warnes, W. (2005). A contextual approach to the
		assessment of social skills: Identifying meaningful behaviors for social competence.
		Psychology in the Schools, 42(2), 173-187. doi: 10.1002/pits.20052
Weare, K. (2010). Mental health and social and emotional learning: Evidence, principles,
		tensions, balances. *Advances in School Mental Health Promotion, 3*(1), 5-17.
Wentzel, K. (1991). Social competence at school: Relation between social responsibility and
		academic achievement. *Review of Educational Research, 61*(1), 1-24.
Wentzel, K. (1993). Does being good make the grade? Social behavior and academic
		competence in middle school. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 85*(2), 357-364.
White, S., Keonig, K. and Scahill, L. (2007) Social skill development in children with Autism
		Spectrum Disorder: A review of intervention research. *Journal of Autism and
		Developmental Disorders. 37*, 1858-1868.
Winner, M. (2007). *Thinking about you, Thinking about me: Philosophy and strategies for
		facilitating the development of perspective taking for students with cognitive deficits* (2nd
		ed.). New York: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
Yates, T., Ostrosky, M., Cheatham, A., Fettig, A., Shaffer, L., & Santos, R. (2008). *Research
		synthesis on screening and assessing social-emotional competence*. Nashville, TN: The
		Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CSEFEL).
		Retrieved from http://csefel.vanderbilt.edu/documents/rs_screening_assessment.pdf
Zins, J., & Elias, M. (2006). Social and emotional learning: Promoting the development
		of all students. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 17*(2&3),
		233-255.
Zins, J., Bloodworth, M., Weissberg, R., & Walberg, H. (2004). The scientific base linking social
		and emotional learning to school success. *Journal of Educational and
		Psychological Consultation, 17*(2&3), 191-210.

Zins, J., Payton, J, Weissberg, R., & O'Brien, M. (2007). In G. Matthews, M. Zeidner, & R. D.
  Roberts (Eds.), *The science of emotional intelligence: Knowns and unknowns* (pp. 376-
  395). New York: Oxford University Press.
Zins, J., Weissberg, R., Wang, M., & Walberg, H. (2004). *Building academic success
  on social and emotional learning: What does the research say?* New York, NY: Teacher
  College Press.
Zion, E., & Jenvey, V. (2006). Temperament and social behavior at home and school among
  typically developing children and children with an intellectual disability. *Journal of
  Intellectual Disability, 50*(6), 445-456.