

Copyright
by
Yarden Ran Finder
2021

AN EXPLORATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL
LEARNING AND OFFICE DISCIPLINE REFERRAL FREQUENCY

by

Yarden Ran Finder, MA

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of
The University of Houston-Clear Lake
In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements
For the Degree

DOCTOR OF PSYCHOLOGY

in Health Service Psychology

THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON-CLEAR LAKE

AUGUST, 2021

AN EXPLORATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL
LEARNING AND OFFICE DISCIPLINE REFERRAL FREQUENCY

by

Yarden Ran Finder

APPROVED BY

G. Thomas Schanding, Jr., Ph.D., Chair

Christine Walther, Ph.D., Committee Member

Valerie Morgan, Ph.D., Committee Member

RECEIVED/APPROVED BY THE COLLEGE OF HUMAN SCIENCES AND
HUMANITIES:

Samuel Gladden, Ph.D., Associate Dean

Glenn Sanford, Ph.D., Dean

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my family—near and far— who inspired me to pursue my doctoral degree. Thank you for believing in me.

In loving memory of my grandparents, Ami Shabaton, Avi Ran, and Rina Ran.
May their memory be a blessing.

והמופלא עוד יתרחש.

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. G. Thomas Schanding, the co-director of the Health Service Psychology (Psy.D.) doctoral program at The University of Houston-Clear Lake, who served as my supervisor throughout my doctoral program and as the chair of my dissertation committee. Dr. Schanding provided me with unparalleled guidance, expertise, and encouragement throughout my doctoral journey. Without his dedication, patience, and assistance, I would not have been able to complete this project. I am deeply appreciative of his support, persistence, and understanding –as well as for his faith in me.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Dr. Christine Walther and Dr. Valerie Morgan, the members of my dissertation committee. Their kindness, knowledge, and direction were crucial for the completion of my dissertation. Dr. Walther's assistance with my statistical analyses was critical to my success and Dr. Morgan's comments, knowledge, and ideas were invaluable throughout this undertaking.

Finally, I wish to express my very profound gratitude to my husband, Robert; my parents, Tsili and Yuval; my siblings, Amit, Noa, Michael, and Dana, and my grandparents, Bat Sheva Shabaton, Ami Shabaton (of blessed memory), Avi Ran (of blessed memory), and Rina Ran (of blessed memory). I could never have reached this milestone without your continuous support and seemingly infinite belief in me. I am truly blessed and thankful that you are all a part of my life. This dissertation belongs to all of us and represents all of our success. I am proud to carry on our family's legacy.

ABSTRACT

AN EXPLORATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL LEARNING AND OFFICE DISCIPLINE REFERRAL FREQUENCY

Yarden Ran Finder
University of Houston-Clear Lake, 2021

Dissertation Chair: G. Thomas Schanding, Ph.D.

High rates of student misbehavior within the American public school system are a chronic problem for many public schools. Public schools sometimes address the rising problem of student misbehavior in ineffective, unproductive, and often harmful ways; they punish and exclude students from the academic setting, thus fostering resentment in students who misbehave, wasting school resources, contributing to the “school-to-prison pipeline,” increasing disproportionality, and setting students up for negative long-term outcomes. Furthermore, schools may fail to assess for, identify, and address the skill deficits that lead students to misbehave. The implementation of Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) as a component of positive behavior supports, as well as the integration of universal screening for students to determine the risk of future school misbehavior, could help schools address discipline problems more proactively, effectively, and efficiently. The current study sought to examine whether SEL is a predictor of office discipline referral (ODR) frequency by using archival data of teacher ratings of

elementary, middle, and high school students' social-emotional learning skills. The results obtained from the data analyses indicated that SEL competencies predicted ODR frequency in the elementary school, middle school, and high school samples. Taken together with the existing and emerging literature base, these findings suggest that SEL interventions might contribute to decreases in ODR frequency. These findings are encouraging to school psychologists seeking to understand, prevent, and decrease the frequency of ODRs and their negative consequences.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| List of Tables | xi |
| CHAPTER I: REVIEW OF LITERATURE..... | 1 |
| School Discipline in Public Schools | 2 |
| Types of Student Misbehavior | 2 |
| Misbehavior Frequency Variations Within School Levels | 3 |
| Daily or Weekly Disciplinary Problems | 5 |
| Current Disciplinary Practices | 7 |
| Negative Outcomes of Punishment & Exclusion-Based Disciplinary Practices | 10 |
| Early Identification and Prevention of Misbehavior Through Universal Screening | 12 |
| Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) | 16 |
| Development of SEL | 17 |
| The CASEL Model of SEL | 17 |
| SEL Deficits and Misbehavior | 20 |
| SEL and Social-Emotional-Behavioral Outcomes | 24 |
| SEL and Academic Performance | 25 |
| SEL and Discipline | 25 |
| Purpose of the Current Study | 25 |
| Research Questions and Hypotheses | 26 |
| CHAPTER II: METHODOLOGY | 27 |
| Participants | 27 |
| Measures | 27 |
| Student Demographic Data | 27 |
| Social-Emotional Learning Skills Inventory (SELSI) | 28 |
| Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) | 29 |
| Research Design | 29 |
| Data Collection Procedures | 30 |
| Data Analysis | 31 |
| Dummy Coding Race | 31 |
| Dummy Coding Ethnicity | 33 |
| Conducting the Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses | 33 |
| CHAPTER III: RESULTS | 36 |
| Testing Assumptions | 36 |
| Descriptive Statistics & Internal Reliability | 36 |
| Elementary School: Total SEL Score | 36 |
| Elementary School: Subsequent Models for Specific SELSI Subscales | 37 |

| | |
|---|--------|
| Self-Awareness | 37 |
| Self-Management | 38 |
| Social Awareness | 38 |
| Relationship Skills | 39 |
| Responsible Decision-Making | 39 |
| Middle School: Total SEL Score | 40 |
| Middle School: Subsequent Models for Specific SEL SELSI Subscales | 41 |
| Self-Awareness | 41 |
| Self-Management | 41 |
| Social Awareness | 42 |
| Relationship Skills | 42 |
| Responsible Decision Making | 43 |
| High Schools: Total SEL Score | 43 |
| High Schools: Subsequent Models for Specific SEL Subscales | 44 |
| Self-Awareness | 44 |
| Self-Management | 45 |
| Social Awareness | 45 |
| Relationship Skills | 46 |
| Responsible Decision-Making | 46 |
| CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION | 47 |
| Total SEL Score Predictions Across Grade Levels | 47 |
| Self-Awareness | 48 |
| Self-Management | 49 |
| Social Awareness | 49 |
| Relationship Skills | 50 |
| Responsible Decision-Making | 50 |
| Connection to the Literature | 50 |
| Implications | 51 |
| An SEL Perspective of ODRs | 51 |
| MTSS & Universal Screening | 54 |
| Misbehavior Patterns in the Schools | 56 |
| Limitations and Future Directions | 56 |
| Excluded Predictors | 56 |
| Rate of ODR Frequency | 57 |
| Generalizability | 58 |
| Lack of Parent and Student Perspectives | 59 |
| ODRs as a Measure of Misbehavior | 60 |
| Number of Actual Versus Potential Participants | 61 |
| Comparison to Different Screeners in the Literature | 61 |
| REFERENCES | 63 |

APPENDIX A: TABLES..... 89

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table 1 Elementary, Middle, and High School Demographics..... | 89 |
| Table 2 Office Discipline Referral Frequency in Elementary, Middle, and High School Samples, 2017-2018..... | 91 |
| Table 3 SELSI Teacher Form Ages 2-5 Descriptive Statistics & Internal Reliability (N = 655)..... | 92 |
| Table 4 SELSI Teacher Form Ages 6-11 Descriptive Statistics & Internal Reliability (N = 721)..... | 93 |
| Table 5 SELSI Teacher Form Ages 12-21 Descriptive Statistics & Internal Reliability (N = 1282)..... | 94 |
| Table 6 Elementary Schools: Total SEL Score Predicting Office Discipline Referrals..... | 95 |
| Table 7 Elementary School: Self-Awareness as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals..... | 97 |
| Table 8 Elementary School: Self-Management as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals..... | 99 |
| Table 9 Elementary School: Social Awareness as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals..... | 101 |
| Table 10 Elementary School: Relationship Skills as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals..... | 103 |
| Table 11 Elementary School: Responsible Decision-Making as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals..... | 105 |
| Table 12 Middle School: Total SEL Score Predicting Office Discipline Referrals..... | 107 |
| Table 13 Middle School Self-Awareness as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals..... | 109 |
| Table 14 Middle School Self-Management as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals..... | 111 |
| Table 15 Middle School: Social Awareness as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals..... | 113 |
| Table 16 Middle School: Relationship Skills as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals..... | 115 |
| Table 17 Middle School: Responsible Decision-Making as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals..... | 117 |
| Table 18 High School: Total SEL Score Predicting Office Discipline Referrals..... | 119 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table 19 High School: Self-Awareness as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals | 121 |
| Table 20 High School: Self-Management as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals | 123 |
| Table 21 High School: Social Awareness as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals | 125 |
| Table 22 High School: Relationship Skills as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals | 127 |
| Table 23 High School: Responsible Decision-Making as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals | 129 |
| Table 24 Trends Per School Level: Unique Variance (sr^2) in ODRs Accounted for by SEL Skills Increases as School Level Increases | 131 |

CHAPTER I: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Student misbehavior within the school system is not a new concern. Since schools were established, students have been misbehaving for various reasons (Allman & Slate, 2011; Morris & Howard, 2003). Additionally, school disciplinary techniques are not a novel concept. Since the 1700s, discipline techniques have been implemented to try to resolve the issue of student misbehavior (Butchart, 1998; Cameron & Sheppard, 2006). Despite the existence of school disciplinary policies intended to combat student misconduct, student misbehavior— as well as the manner in which it is often addressed— continue to be unresolved problems within United States public schools (Farmer et al., 2007; Jimenez & Estevez, 2017; Martinez et al., 2016; Peguero, Connell, & Hong, 2018; Skiba & Losen, 2016; Sugai & Horner, 2008; Wilson & Lipsey, 2007). These problems are often characterized by misbehaving students being punished for their misbehavior and/or excluded from the curriculum (Allman & Slate, 2011; American Academy of Pediatrics, 2003; Black, 2016; Bowman-Perrot et al., 2011; Christie et al., 2005; Curran, 2017; Fabelo et al., 2011; Simson, 2014; Skiba et al., 2003). Rather than address the deficits and weaknesses that lead students to behave in this way, public schools across the United States at times fail to see students as individuals who would behave better if they only knew how (Greene, 2014). Instead, some schools attempt to use an oversimplified behavioral model that focuses almost exclusively on punishment to deter students from misbehaving. As a result, this has led to negative outcomes for students and schools alike (Curran, 2017).

A more effective and research-based approach to decreasing student misbehavior would consist of components such as prediction, prevention, early identification, and early intervention, which are currently under-utilized in the educational system (Dupper,

2010; Farmer et al., 2007; Skiba & Losen, 2016; Sullivan & Bradshaw, 2012; Swearer et al., 2009; Wilson & Lipsey, 2007). One such component involves schools becoming proactive instead of reactive when dealing with student misbehavior. In order to be proactive, schools must address the problem of misbehavior at its root before it manifests behaviorally. If schools have a way of predicting which students are at the highest risk of misbehavior, they can identify these students earlier and more accurately. They can then conduct early interventions with these at-risk students. Thus, prediction and prevention are at the heart of the solution to the problem of school misbehavior and discipline referrals (Farmer et al., 2007; Martinez et al, 2016; Johnson et al., 2019; Reis et al., 2007; Trentacosta et al., 2013; Wilson & Lipsey, 2007).

School Discipline in Public Schools

Types of Student Misbehavior

Student misbehavior is often discussed as a unitary concept, but it is composed of different types of misbehaviors that range in their frequency and severity. Examples of types of misbehavior range from less severe behaviors such as verbally disrespecting a teacher or being disruptive in class to more severe behaviors such as sexually assaulting a peer, physically attacking others with a weapon, and possessing an explosive device or a firearm. Several large-scale reports have examined student misbehavior types within the public school system in order to clarify which problematic behaviors are taking place within the United States public school system. One such study conducted by Diliberti et al. for the United States Department of Education (2019) examined student misbehavior and school discipline during the 2017-2018 academic year. The statistics gathered from this report demonstrated high rates of student misbehavior and discipline within the public-school system (Diliberti et al., 2019). One key finding from the report was that an estimated 476,000 nonviolent incidents and 962,300 violent incidents occurred in U.S.

public schools throughout the 2017-2018 school year. These violent incidents included both serious violent incidents (i.e., sexual assault, rape, robbery with or without a weapon, threats of physical fight or attack with a weapon, and physical attacks or fights with a weapon) and violent but non-serious incidents (i.e., physical attacks or fights without a weapon and threats of physical attacks without a weapon). Of the violent incidents during the 2017-2018 school year, 54,500 were serious violent incidents. Of these serious offenses, 10,500 incidents involved a physical attack or fight with a weapon, 26,700 involved the threat of a physical attack with a weapon, and 9,100 involved a robbery with or without a weapon (Diliberti et al., 2019).

Misbehavior Frequency Variations Within School Levels

In order to fully grasp the scope of the problem, it is necessary to study not only the nature of the misbehaviors that are currently taking place but also the frequency of these misbehaviors. Diliberti et al. (2019) examined this issue within public schools in the United States during the 2017-2018 school year and was based on a random, nationally representative sample of 4,803 public schools. The study aimed to provide estimates of violent incidents, violent attacks with and without a weapon, drug use, possession or distribution, bullying, and cyberbullying, among others. The report provided an especially informative perspective by breaking down data provided by participating schools into elementary, middle, and high school levels. Thus, it provided a glance into the rates of all violent incidents, serious violent incidents, theft, and other incidents at different levels of the educational system (Diliberti et al., 2019). Diliberti et al. (2019) examined all violent incidents, which they defined as including serious violent incidents, physical attacks or fights without a weapon, and threats of physical attack without using a weapon. Their report found that 59.1% of primary schools, 89.8% of middle schools, and 90.4% of high schools reported experiencing incidents of student

misbehavior falling under the definition of “violent incidents” during the 2017-2018 school year. In total, 74.4% of all public schools reported experiencing violent incidents in the 2017-2018 school year (Diliberti et al., 2019). Overall, the percent of schools that experienced violent incidents appeared to increase as the level of the school increased from elementary to middle school and from middle school to high school.

The data gathered by Diliberti et al. (2019) on serious violent incidents within U.S. public schools, which they defined as including “rape, sexual assault other than rape (including threatened rape), physical attack or fight with a weapon, threat of physical attack with a weapon, and robbery (taking things by force) with or without a weapon” (p. 6), supported an increase in incidents as the level of the school increased. For instance, regarding public schools, 13.9% of primary schools reported having experienced a serious violent incident in the 2017-2018 school year. In middle schools, this percentage jumped to 32.5%, and, in high school, this percentage increased even more to 35.5%. In sum, 22.9% of all public schools reported having experienced serious violent incidents throughout the 2017-2018 school year.

Diliberti et al. (2019) also examined the rates of “nonviolent incidents” at U.S. public schools. They defined nonviolent incidents as including “theft, possession of a firearm or explosive device; possession of a knife or sharp object; distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs or alcohol; vandalism; and inappropriate distribution, possession, or use of prescription drugs” (Diliberti et al., 2019, p. 6). The percentage of nonviolent incidents follows a similar pattern to all violent incidents, serious violent incidents, and theft. For instance, 51.3% of elementary schools reported that they experienced such incidents in the 2017-2018 school year, as did 84.1% of middle schools and 89.4% of high schools. In total, 70.4% of all public schools reported experiencing nonviolent incidents in the 2017-2018 school year (Diliberti et al., 2019). To this end, it

can be concluded that the percentage of student misbehavior increased as the school level increased.

Daily or Weekly Disciplinary Problems

In addition to exploring the types of student misbehaviors that had taken place within the past year, Diliberti and his colleagues also sought to explore the frequency with which selected types of misbehavior took place within U.S. public schools. Thus, participating schools were instructed to select from several response options how frequently each of the following misbehaviors took place at their school: (a) student racial or ethnic tensions; (b) student bullying; (c) cyberbullying among students who attend the school; (d) student sexual harassment of other students; (e) widespread disorder in classrooms; (f) student verbal abuse of teachers; (g) student acts of disrespect for teachers other than verbal abuse; (h) and gang activities. Schools reported the frequency of each type of behavior by selecting one of the following response options: (a) happens daily; (b) happens at least once a week; (c) happens at least once a month; (d) happens on occasion; and (e) never happens. Diliberti and his colleagues were most interested in misbehaviors that occurred most frequently, and thus chose to examine misbehaviors that schools rated as either happening daily or as happening at least once a week. For each of the three school levels (elementary, middle, and high school), they considered what percentage of schools rated these misbehaviors as happening daily or at least once a week. They then calculated the percent of each school level that rated each misbehavior as happening frequently—that is, daily or at least once a week.

Interestingly, the results obtained by the authors somewhat contrasted with the authors' previous results, with a higher percent of middle schools (as opposed to high schools) reporting that a misbehavior had occurred on a daily or weekly basis on their campus. having experienced experiencing almost generally having higher rates of almost

every misbehavior than elementary or high schools. This finding applied to (a) student racial/ ethnic tensions (4.9% of middle schools, compared to 4.5% of high schools and 1.9% of elementary schools); (b) student bullying (27.9% of middle schools, compared to 15.8% of high schools and 8.7% of elementary schools); (c) cyberbullying among students who attend the school (33.1% of middle schools, 30.2% of high schools, and 4.5% of elementary schools); (d) student sexual harassment of other students (3.3% of middle schools compared to 2.8% of high schools); (d) widespread disorder in classrooms (5.5% of middle schools, compared to 2.6% of high schools and 2.6% of elementary schools); (e) student verbal abuse of teachers (10.3% of middle schools, compared to 7.1% of high schools and 4.6% of elementary schools); and (f) student acts of disrespect for teachers other than verbal abuse (17.3% of middle schools compared to 13.1% of high schools and 10.1% of elementary schools). The only exception to this pattern was gang activities, which were rated as occurring daily or at least once a week by 1.9% of high schools and 0.6% of middle schools. Estimates for the percentage of elementary schools reporting daily or weekly sexual harassment or gang activities could not be made, and were thus left out of the report. Otherwise, a notably smaller percentage of elementary schools reported experiencing each type of misbehavior when compared to middle and high schools (Diliberti, 2019).

The results from the Diliberti et al. (2019) study demonstrated that school misbehavior occurs at an alarming rate and that the types of misbehavior, as well as the frequency of misbehavior, differ when the three school levels are compared to each other. The discrepancy in types and frequency of misbehavior among elementary, middle, and high schools signals that perhaps misbehaviors within each school level have predictor variables that differ from those of other school levels.

Current Disciplinary Practices

Current disciplinary practices often focus on punishment or exclusion to deter student misbehavior. Within the realm of psychology, punishment is defined as any undesired or unpleasant consequence or event that takes place after a behavior that reduces the future occurrence of the behavior (Bear, 2010). When used effectively, fairly, and in an authoritative (rather than authoritarian) fashion, punishment can be both effective and necessary within the educational system (Bear, 2010). However, when punishment is used in an overly harsh, unfair manner or when educators rely solely on punishment to manage student behavior, punishment can be ineffective and, in more extreme cases, harmful (Allman & Slate, 2001; Ambrose & Gibson, 1995; Balfanz et al., 2014; Costenbader & Markson, 1998; Davis & Jordan, 1994; Hemphill et al., 2006; Jenkins, 1997; Perry & Morris, 2014, Raffaele-Mendez, 2003; Ritter, 2018; Tobin et al., 1996). One type of punishment that can have extremely negative consequences is exclusionary discipline (Marchbanks et al., 2014; McNeill et al., 2016; Noltemeyer & Mcloughlin., 2010a; Noltemeyer & Mcloughlin, 2010b; Pane et al., 2014; Skiba et al., 2014a).

Exclusionary discipline practices are “actions that remove students from their regular classroom instruction for disciplinary reasons” (Nishioka et al., 2017, p. 2). They consist of any instance in which a child who is deemed to be disrupting the mainstream learning environment is removed from their regular classroom environment for some period of time (Brown, 2007). Within the United States’ public school system, these practices usually consist of out-of-school suspension (OSS), in-school suspension (ISS), disciplinary alternative education programs (DAEPs), and expulsion (Allman & Slate, 2011). Exclusionary discipline is a widespread problem in the United States. In the 2015-2016 school year (the most up-to-date national data currently available), over 2.7 million

public school students in kindergarten through 12th grade received at least one out-of-school suspension. This number represents around 5-7% of all public-school students in the United States (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 2019). When this number is divided by 180—the approximate number of school days in a school year—it becomes apparent that about 15,000 students receive out-out-school suspensions per day. Losen and Martinez (2020) calculated that during the 2015-2016 school year, out-of-school suspensions led to a loss of 11,392,474 days of instruction, a number equivalent to a loss of 62,596 years of instruction.

For every 100 students across all grades, 23 days of instruction were lost due to out-of-school suspensions in the 2015-2016 school year. However, this number obscures the true nature of the rate of loss of instruction days for different groups of students. For example, secondary schools lost instruction dates at a rate over five times that of elementary schools (37 instruction days per 100 students compared to 7 instruction days per 100 students, Losen & Martinez, 2020). Within secondary schools, while White students lost 21 instruction days per 100 enrolled students, Black students lost 103 days per 100 students. More specifically, Black males lost 132 school days per 100 students enrolled. As another example, at the secondary level, students with disabilities lost around 68 instruction days per 100 enrolled students—a rate about twice as high as that of peers without disabilities (Losen & Martinez, 2020).

Zero-tolerance policies within schools or school districts strictly set and enforce harsh, predetermined consequences for specific student misbehaviors (American Academy of Pediatrics, 2003). Under zero-tolerance policies, students who engage in specific misbehaviors get the predetermined punishment, regardless of the extenuating circumstances surrounding the situation, the reason that the student engaged in the behavior, and whether or not a student has received disciplinary infractions in the past.

Zero-tolerance policies were introduced in the early 1990s, where many were developed after the passing of the 1994 Gun-Free Schools Act, which mandated that every student who brought a gun to school regardless of the reason or surrounding circumstances would be expelled. The logic behind this policy was that by implementing consistent, severe punishments for students who engaged in this behavior, schools would be able to drastically reduce the incidence. Over time, schools began implementing zero-tolerance policies for other types of student misbehaviors, ranging from more severe behaviors like making threats, fighting, or possessing alcohol, tobacco, or illegal drugs on campus to less serious offenses such as being disruptive in a classroom or being verbally disrespectful to a teacher (Monahan et al., 2014; Skiba, 2000).

Despite the good intentions of the creators of zero-tolerance policies, these policies can be overly harsh and strict since they call for the implementation of harsh consequences without considering extenuating circumstances and can lead to the punishment of undeserving students. In one instance, a 10-year-old girl was expelled from school for possession of a weapon after she handed over to a teacher a small knife that her mother had placed in her lunchbox so she could cut an apple (“Educational Intolerance,” 2001, as cited in American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008). In another instance, a student spoke on his cell phone with his mother, a deployed soldier in Iraq with whom he had not talked in 30 days. Because this student had violated a zero-tolerance policy by speaking on his cell phone at school, he was expelled (The Associated Press, 2005). A “one-size-fits-all” approach to student discipline does not work for every case of student misbehavior. When harsh punishments are meted out to students without examining individual details and circumstances surrounding each case of misbehavior, it results in zero-tolerance policies being implemented unfairly (Skiba & Noam, 2001).

Not only can zero-tolerance policies be unfair, but they can also be harmful and contribute to disproportionality. For instance, students of color and students with disabilities have continued to be disproportionately suspended and expelled compared to their peers (American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008; Girvan et al., 2017; Tefera & Fischman, 2020). Furthermore, African American students and students with disabilities receive harsher and more severe punishments when engaging in less serious misbehavior or in misbehavior that can be judged more subjectively (American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008; Girvan et al., 2017; Kincaid & Sullivan, 2019; Skiba et al., 2002; Tefera & Fischman, 2020). Additionally, zero-tolerance policies have increased the number of students whose cases are handled by the juvenile justice system rather than by the school system, as they had been in the past (American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008). The increasing numbers of students referred to the juvenile justice system raise the question of whether each referred student's constitutional rights have been violated (Advancement Project, 2003; American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008).

Negative Outcomes of Punishment & Exclusion-Based Disciplinary Practices

Research has found that punishing students causes a slew of adverse outcomes, including apathy, anger, disengagement, an increased likelihood of repeated misbehavior, higher rates of future suspensions, and antisocial behavior (Balfanz et al., 2014; Costenbader & Markson, 1998; Davis & Jordan, 1994; Hemphill et al., 2006; Jenkins, 1997; Perry & Morris, 2014; Raffaele-Mendez, 2003; Ritter, 2018; Tobin et al., 1996). Indeed, students who are suspended from school end up experiencing negative outcomes, such as becoming repeat offenders in the school setting, instead of learning a lesson and improving their behavior (Allman & Slate, 2001; Ambrose & Gibson, 1995; Costenbader

& Markson, 1998). Additionally, students who receive OSS or expulsion end up being unsupervised during the suspension period, leading to more opportunities for unsupervised misbehavior (Allman & Slate, 2011). Specific negative consequences include lower grades in school and a decreased performance on cognitive tests (Perry & Morris, 2014). Evidence of the negative impact of punishment on academic performance was demonstrated in a quasi-experiment conducted by Arcia (2006), who followed groups of students who had been suspended and had not been suspended but had otherwise been matched according to social traits. After the students had been followed for two years, the group that had been suspended trailed the non-suspended group by almost five grade levels (Arcia, 2006; Perry & Morris, 2014). In addition, a study by Perry and Morris (2004) found that students who were enrolled in schools with relatively higher OSS rates displayed lower achievement levels than students at schools with lower rates of out-of-school suspensions. This finding still held even if the students did not personally receive an OSS, demonstrating that a punishing school climate negatively affects all students, not just ones who receive exclusionary punishments (Perry & Morris, 2004).

Other research studies have demonstrated an association between exclusionary discipline, grade retention, and school drop-out (American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008; Raffaele-Mendez, 2003, Ritter, 2018). Researchers have also found that exclusionary discipline occurs at much higher rates for students belonging to Black and Hispanic students, as well as students with disabilities (Dupper, 2010; Losen et al., 2015; Raffaele-Mendez, 2003; Ritter, 2018; Skiba et al., 2011; Skiba et al., 2014b; Welch & Payne, 2010; Welch & Payne, 2012). The U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights (2014) claimed that this disproportionality begins as early as preschool. Students who are punished and excluded from the school system have

an increased likelihood of juvenile delinquency, a phenomenon titled “the school-to-prison pipeline” (American Academy of Pediatrics, 2013; Balfanz et al., 2014; Fabelo et al., 2011; Ritter, 2018).

Exclusionary discipline does not explicitly teach students alternative behaviors to replace their misbehavior; it teaches students how not to act or how not to get caught rather than teaching them how to behave appropriately (Bear, 2010). By not teaching students new skills and giving them a chance to improve, exclusionary discipline often hurts students’ future outcomes. In fact, research evidence shows that these practices may harm children’s health and safety rather than address the root problem of the misbehavior (American Academy of Pediatrics, 2003). Other research has found that exclusionary discipline has negative impacts not only on the students who receive it but also on schools. For instance, several studies have demonstrated that the use of a punitive approach to discipline in a school was correlated with higher fear that crimes would take place at the school (Hinze-Pifer & Sartain, 2018, Schrek & Miller, 2003; Steinberg et al., 2011) and with increased levels of teacher attrition (Hinze-Pifer & Sartain, 2018). Essentially, excluding students from the educational system does not solve the problem of the students’ misbehavior; it merely serves as a band-aid for the problem of the student misbehavior. Furthermore, the use of punitive, exclusionary policies has not proven sufficient in the battle to prevent school violence and make schools safer (Skiba & Peterson, 1999; Skiba & Peterson, 2003). They are used quite frequently and are ineffective, and as some have argued, they are immoral (Morris, 2012; Noguera, 2003; Perry & Morris, 2014; Skiba & Peterson, 1999).

Early Identification and Prevention of Misbehavior Through Universal Screening

One way to address misbehavior proactively is through universal screening. Ikeda et al. (2008) stated that universal screening is a process in which all students in a specific

component of a school—whether a grade, school, or school district—are methodically assessed for specific indicators or skills that are considered important by a school or a community. Students can be assessed on various skills, ranging from academic competencies to behavioral, social, or emotional abilities. Universal screeners can provide school administrators with data to determine whether the educational environment and curriculum are sufficient and effective. Thus, they can allow schools to prepare and tailor their resources to the different types of challenges students struggle with (Dowdy et al., 2015). Universal screening can also provide each student with a chance to be identified early and receive services for whichever difficulties they might be facing (Dowdy et al., 2015). Universal screeners can also be used to help school personnel decide whether students need additional instruction or intervention beyond the instruction and support provided by the general curriculum. Universal screening is an especially essential tool for schools trying to manage student misbehavior because it can help schools assess students' skills (or skill deficits) that predict student misbehavior and, in turn, discipline referral frequency (Ikeda et al., 2008).

Moreover, research shows that universal screening is an essential component of preventing student misbehavior because it allows school personnel to identify at-risk students early and thus predict and prevent negative future outcomes for these students before their symptoms turn into outright disorders (Coffee et al., 2013; Dowdy et al., 2015). Also, universal screening has been shown to improve the early identification of at-risk students compared to the methods that schools currently use for early identification (Eklund & Dowdy, 2013). Typically, early identification and prevention efforts within the school aim to decrease the negative outcomes of the social-emotional or academic component of functioning. Early identification is beneficial, as it can help reduce emotional and behavioral problems in children (Dowdy et al., 2015; Eklund et al., 2009).

Prevention, which focuses on reducing the prevalence (the current number of cases) or incidence (the frequency of new cases) of an adverse, clearly defined outcome, has also been shown to be beneficial (Strein & Koehler, 2008). Prevention programs are needed within the school setting for several reasons. One primary reason is that the number of students requiring psychological services far outweighs the number of school psychologists available to provide these services. Although the National Association of School Psychologists recommends a 1 to 500-700 ratio of school psychologists to students, in numerous communities around the country, this ratio far exceeds the recommended rate (National Association of School Psychologists, 2010). Thus, even though there is a great need for psychological services within the school system, there is often a lack of service providers who can treat all individuals in need. Prevention efforts provide school psychologists with a way to provide services to all students in need. They are especially effective when implemented within a multi-tiered framework that provides universal prevention programs to all students (on the first or universal level) and selective prevention programs to students who are at-risk or experiencing minor problems as well as to those experiencing more severe problems (Strein & Koehler, 2008).

Another reason that prevention programs have proven to be especially appealing is that they offer an evidence-based approach to decreasing negative future outcomes. Prevention approaches ideally allow all children to receive high-quality instruction and support in social-emotional learning and academics, which reduces future student needs for remediation, as well as the stigmatization that remedial programs can have for students. This is especially relevant because when schools react to student behavioral difficulties rather than prevent them, they end up overlooking many at-risk students who have less severe behavioral difficulties (Schanding & Nowell, 2013). Additionally, a reactionary rather than a preventive approach can cause schools to delay treatment for

children who need it, which may increase the severity of their future symptoms and comorbid conditions (Kessler et al., 2008; Schanding & Nowell, 2013).

According to Schanding and Nowell (2013), failure to prevent misbehavior can not only result in unwanted outcomes for students and schools, but also for society. For instance, according to one estimate, individuals who have a serious mental illness earn \$16,306 less per year than their counterparts who do not have a serious mental illness. Thus, on a larger scale, society loses around \$193.2 billion per year due to individuals with serious mental illnesses (Kessler et al., 2008). Perhaps if more schools prevented student difficulties rather than reacted to them, the individual and societal costs of serious mental illness would be reduced.

Furthermore, the existing evidence base shows that prevention efforts can improve academic, social, emotional, and behavioral outcomes and increase the probability of all students receiving treatment for the problems or deficits they face (Schanding & Nowell, 2013). When children are provided with evidence-based reading instruction, they have a significantly reduced likelihood of being identified as having reading disabilities throughout their educational trajectory (Shaywitz, 2003). Prevention programs have also decreased rates of special education placement, grade retention, and dropping out (Schweinhart & Weikart, 1989). Also, they have been found to reduce psychopathological symptoms like depression, anxiety, and aggression, and other factors related to the development of mental disorders (Greenberg et al., 2001). A further benefit of prevention programs is that they can be more cost-effective than treatment programs, which focus on providing services only to individuals with specific diagnoses or with a high level of symptoms (Greenberg et al., 2017). As demonstrated by the literature, prevention is an essential component of a school's attempt to decrease misbehavior and frequent discipline referrals. Thus, when combined with school-wide positive behavior

supports (SWPBS) and social-emotional learning (SEL), it can help schools teach kids the skills that they lack before their skill deficits have a chance to lead to negative outcomes and costly interventions.

Social and Emotional Learning (SEL)

The term SEL refers to a series of behavioral, cognitive, and affective capacities that enable individuals to effectively identify and regulate their own emotions, understand the emotions and points of view of others, build positive relationships with others, and act responsibly in their lives (CASEL, 2021). Elias et al. (1997) described social-emotional learning as the ability to manage, understand, and express the emotional and social components of one's own life so that the individual can successfully manage and thrive in different tasks of life. These tasks include problem-solving, learning, creating and maintaining relationships with others, growing, and developing appropriately. Greenberg et al. (2003) provided the following definition: "through developmentally and culturally appropriate classroom instruction and application of learning to everyday situations, SEL programming builds children's skills to recognize and manage their emotions, appreciate the perspectives of others, establish positive goals, make responsible decisions, and handle interpersonal situations" (p. 468).

Zins et al. (2004) provided a slightly different definition, stating that "SEL is a process through which we learn to recognize and manage emotions, care about others, make good decisions, behave ethically and responsibly, develop positive relationships, and avoid negative behaviors" (p. 4). Social-emotional competence requires an awareness of the self, the ability to cooperate with others and control impulses, and a sense of caring for others and oneself. Thus, the process of acquiring the values, skills, and abilities needed for social and emotional competence is often referred to as SEL.

Development of SEL

Learning theories provide a pathway for the development of SEL competencies. Social learning theory is particularly relevant to SEL. This theory emphasizes that verbal instruction, role modeling, social interactions, supervised support, and supervised feedback encourage the acquisition of new behaviors (Bandura et al., 1977). Its influence can be easily detected in many social-emotional learning curricula that aim to increase children's skills through explicit teaching, modeling, practicing, and incentivizing (Brackett et al., 2015). For example, a lesson plan aiming to teach a child the relationship skill of sharing might provide direct instruction about the need for sharing, how sharing makes other people feel, and why sharing helps others and the child. The instructor might model what sharing a snack might look like and have the child practice sharing a snack with another person. This way the behavior can be reinforced to encourage the child to continue to perform this behavior in the future.

Systems theories also serve as a foundation for social-emotional learning. According to these theories, people live in and are influenced by complex contexts and environments. These complex environments, which often entail unique cultural contexts, behavioral norms, roles, and relationships, must be taken into account explicitly if a SEL intervention is to maximally benefit a child (Brackett et al., 2015). For example, in one culture, a child's making eye contact with an adult might indicate respect and attention, whereas, in another culture, a child's eye contact with an adult might indicate defiance and a desire to challenge the adult's instructions.

The CASEL Model of SEL

The Collaborative for Social-emotional Learning (CASEL) has identified five SEL domains that can be taught to children as tools for succeeding academically and socially. Their identified competencies model includes self-awareness, which refers to the

ability to identify different thoughts, emotions, values in oneself, and self-management, which refers to the ability to manage feelings, cognitions, and behaviors and the ability to inhibit impulses and set goals. Zins et al. (2004) described each of the five competencies identified by CASEL. Commenting on this description, Merrell and Gueldner (2010) emphasized that, while other models of SEL have included a focus on the environment, settings, and surroundings of individuals, the person-centered perspective of SEL competencies proffered by Zins et al. focused more on internally regulated competencies that require awareness and regulation of cognitive, affective, and behavioral states of being.

In describing their person-centered SEL competencies, Zins et al. (2004) detailed each of the five aptitudes on which they focus. The five CASEL competencies are self-awareness, social awareness, responsible decision-making, self-management, and relationship skills. CASEL defines self-awareness as “the ability to accurately recognize one’s own emotions, thoughts, and values and how they influence behavior,” and as “the ability to accurately assess one’s strengths and limitations, with a well-grounded sense of confidence, optimism, and a ‘growth mindset’” (CASEL, 2021, “Self-Awareness” section).

In addition, self-awareness is composed of the ability to identify emotions, recognizing strengths, accurate self-perception, self-efficacy, and self-confidence (CASEL, 2021). Further, social awareness is described as “the ability to take the perspective of and empathize with others, including those from diverse backgrounds and cultures,” and as “the ability to understand social and ethical norms for behavior and to recognize family, school, and community resources and supports” (CASEL, 2021, “Social Awareness” section). According to CASEL, components of this competency

include empathy, perspective-taking, respecting others, and appreciating diversity (CASEL, 2021).

Moreover, CASEL defines responsible decision-making as “the ability to make constructive choices about personal behavior and social interactions based on ethical standards, safety concerns, and social norms,” and as “the realistic evaluation of consequences of various actions, and a consideration of the well-being of oneself and others” (CASEL, 2021, “Responsible Decision-Making” section). The organization notes that responsible decision-making includes factors such as problem identification, situation analysis, problem-solving, evaluating solutions to problems, reflecting on one’s actions and their consequences, and ethical responsibility (CASEL, 2021).

The next component of the SEL model is self-management, which consists of “the ability to successfully regulate one’s emotions, thoughts, and behaviors in different situations—effectively managing stress, controlling impulses, and motivating oneself” (CASEL, 2021, “Self-Management” section). CASEL further defines this component as the ability to set and work toward personal and academic goals and comments that include stress management, impulse control, self-motivation, self-discipline, organizational skills, and goal setting (CASEL, 2021).

Finally, CASEL discusses the competency of relationship skills, which it defines as “the ability to establish and maintain healthy and rewarding relationships with diverse individuals and groups,” and as “the ability to communicate clearly, listen well, cooperate with others, resist inappropriate social pressure, negotiate conflict constructively, and seek and offer help when needed” (CASEL, 2021, “Relationship Skills” section). According to CASEL, this competency comprises social engagement, communication, teamwork, and relationship building (CASEL, 2021).

SEL Deficits and Misbehavior

A strong evidence base supports the notion that deficits in SEL competencies often lead students to misbehave and receive discipline referrals. For instance, research has shown that individuals who are easily angered and experience anger more frequently and intensely are more likely to act out; furthermore, it has been shown that individuals who have difficulty regulating their own emotions—especially frustration, anger, or rage—are more likely to engage in antisocial behavior (Arsenio et al., 2004; Camodeca & Goosens, 2005; de Castro et al., 2005; Deming & Lochman, 2008; Geunyoung et al., 2007; Hubbard et al., 2001). Research has also demonstrated that individuals who lack empathy are more likely to engage in antisocial behavior, which can lead to discipline referrals. This includes individuals who do not feel the same emotion that other people experience in a given situation, such as an individual who does not care about how others feel, ignores others who are in pain, or laughs when others are sad or distressed (Eisenberg et al., 2006; Hoffman, 2000; Jolliffe & Farrington, 2004; Lovett & Sheffield, 2007).

There are certain components of guilt and shame associated with a higher likelihood of engagement in antisocial behavior. Individuals who lack guilt (i.e., do not feel responsible for their own behavior), shame (i.e., do not feel bad about themselves after hurting others), or both guilt and shame (i.e., someone who is callous and cold and does not feel regretful after committing transgressions) are more likely to behave antisocially. This includes individuals who do not take pride in behaving morally and do not consider behaving morally to be an essential component of their self-esteem (Ahmed, 2006; Eisenberg et al., 2006; Frick & White, 2008; Hoffman, 2000; Menesini & Camodeca, 2008; Tangney et al., 2007).

Deficits in moral reasoning and motivation have also been shown to be related to antisocial behavior. Individuals with such deficits are likely to be morally immature and self-centered; instead of making moral decisions based on feeling responsible for others or acting justly, they are likely to make decisions motivated by acquiring rewards and avoiding punishment (Bear, 2010). Such individuals are likely to believe that it is acceptable to behave antisocially if it helps them attain the rewards one seeks. These individuals are likely to behave antisocially so that they can achieve self-serving goals (Arsenio & Lemerise, 2004; Bear & Rys, 1994; Blair et al., 2001; Covington, 2000; Crick & Ladd, 1990; Guerra et al., 1995; Kuther, 2000; Liabe et al., 2008; Malti et al., 2009; Manning & Bear, 2002; O'Brennen et al., 2009; Palmer & Hollin, 2001; Quiggle et al., 1992; Sijtsema et al., 2009; Stams et al., 2006; Weiner, 2006).

Deficits in emotional awareness and sensitivity have also been demonstrated to lead to antisocial behavior. For instance, individuals who have trouble recognizing when other people have emotional reactions to their behavior are likely to misbehave; thus, a child who continues threatening another child in the hallway may continue to do so, despite the principal standing nearby growing visibly angrier by the minute. Individuals who have trouble identifying others' emotions may also have trouble seeing a situation from another person's perspective. They may also lack the ability to determine whether a moral or social problem exists in a certain situation. For example, students may be unaware that they need to act respectfully towards school staff. Furthermore, such students often misinterpret social cues and read them incorrectly; they may assume that another person who accidentally ran into them in the hallway did so intentionally and out of malice. Thus, these weaknesses make such individuals more prone to misbehaving (Cohen & Strayer, 1996; Hoglund et al., 2008; Hubbard et al., 2001; Schultz et al., 2000).

Cognitive scripts can also lead individuals to act antisocially by setting up “rules” that individuals believe they have to follow. For instance, an individual with the cognitive script that says, “if others dare to look your way, hit them” is more likely to engage in antisocial behavior than an individual with a cognitive script that states, “if others look like they need assistance, help them.” Thus, cognitive scripts often reflect an individual’s values or beliefs and can therefore increase the likelihood that someone with prosocial deficits in these skills will misbehave (Burks et al., 1999; Crozier et al., 2008; Huesmann, 1988; Werner & Nixon, 2005; Zelli et al., 1999). Similarly, a hostile attributional bias can also make an individual more likely to behave antisocially. An individual with a hostile attributional bias is likely to attribute neutral situations as threatening or antagonistic and is likely to behave accordingly. For instance, if an individual with a hostile attributional bias overhears classmates laughing, they is likely to believe that the classmates are laughing at him, rather than assume that they are laughing at a different stimulus (Camodeca & Goosens, 2005; Crozier et al., 2008; de Castro et al., 2002; Lansford et al., 2006). An increased awareness of one’s cognitive scripts, which relates to CASEL’s core competence of self-awareness, can be a helpful tool to a student who is gaining social-emotional learning competencies.

Similarly, struggles with impulsivity can lead individuals to behave antisocially, most often when individuals have difficulty inhibiting aggressive, rude, or socially unacceptable impulses. Individuals who struggle with impulsivity are likely to respond to a stimulus immediately instead of stopping, considering all options, reflecting on the potential outcomes of each option, and implementing the best option possible. Thus, a student who struggles with impulsivity may immediately hit another student who calls him a name rather than pause to think about the consequences and make a more prosocial decision, or a student who is upset over a low test grade may hurl obscenities at their

teacher in the middle of class, rather than pause to reflect on whether any other actions might be more effective in the short and long term (Barkley et al., 2002; Deming & Lochman, 2008; Losel et al., 2007).

When difficulties with impulsivity are combined with difficulty coming up with alternative solutions to a problem, students are even more likely to misbehave. Students who struggle to generate different solutions to a problem are at a higher risk of engaging in antisocial behavior. For instance, a school principal may call in a student to chastise them for starting a fight in the cafeteria. The student has several options available, including going to speak with the principal and apologizing for their actions, apologizing to those they have hurt, refuse to meet with the principal, or act violently towards the principal. If this student only knows how to solve problems through violence and cannot generate alternative solutions, they might punch the principal when asked to come into the office. Thus, this lack of psychological flexibility can lead to antisocial behavior and discipline referrals (Crozier et al., 2008; Fontaine et al., 2009; Guerra, 1989; Guerra & Slaby, 1989; Lansford et al., 2006; Losel et al., 2007; Mikami et al., 2008). Without impulse control—an essential component of the self-management competency within CASEL’s model—students are more likely to react quickly without considering consequences, which can quickly lead to misbehavior and punitive outcomes.

Cognitive distortions that allow individuals to morally disengage from their own actions can also increase the likelihood that someone will behave in an antisocial manner. Cognitive distortions can allow individuals who have broken the rules or hurt others to avoid feeling negative emotions by rationalizing their behavior and deflecting responsibility to others. For instance, a student who choked another student might believe that “they had it coming” or that “they deserved it” instead of taking responsibility for their wrongdoing (Bandura, 2002; Bandura et al., 2001; Gini, 2006; Weiner, 2006).

An individual's perception of self-efficacy can also affect whether they are likely to behave antisocially. If an individual does not feel confident in their ability to act in a certain way (e.g., to behave appropriately and politely in the classroom) but feels confident in their ability to behave antisocially (e.g., to yell at their teacher to "shut up" when overwhelmed), they are more likely to misbehave (Bandura, 1997; Erdley & Asher, 1999; Quiggle et al., 1992). Thus, as the research demonstrates, students lacking in social-emotional skills are at a higher risk for misbehavior, antisocial behavior, and discipline referrals (e.g., Ahmed, 2006; Arsenio et al., 2004; Arsenio & Lemerise, 2004; Bandura, 2002; Bandura et al., 2001; Barkley et al., 2002; Bear & Rys, 1994; Blair et al., 2001; Deming & Lochman, 2008; Frick & White, 2008; Geunyoung et al., 2007; Losel et al., 2007; Lovett & Sheffield, 2007; Malti et al., 2009; Menesini & Camodeca, 2008; Mikami et al., 2008; O'Brennen et al., 2009; Palmer & Hollin, 2001; Quiggle et al., 1992; 2007; Weiner, 2006; Werner & Nixon, 2005; Zelli et al., 1999).

SEL and Social-Emotional-Behavioral Outcomes

Researchers have found that SEL can lead to positive outcomes, such as improved self-esteem, improved ethical values, improved relationships with teachers, increased prosocial behavior, decreases in risk-taking behavior, and improved conflict resolution skills (Zins & Elias, 2006; Zins et al., 2003). SEL can have long term effects on other areas of life, including physical health, citizenship, and job success, while decreasing the possibility of negative emotions, substance abuse, violence, and maladjustment (Elias et al., 1997; Zins et al., 2007; Zins & Elias, 2006). It can also decrease children and adolescents' vulnerability to peer pressure, substance abuse, teen pregnancy, truancy, and quitting school early (Elias et al., 1997). Research shows that social-emotional learning can lead to positive outcomes such as improved self-esteem, improved ethical values, improved relationships with teachers, increased prosocial behavior, decreases in risk-

taking behavior, and improved conflict resolution skills (Zins & Elias, 2006; Zins et al., 2003).

SEL and Academic Performance

Research has demonstrated that SEL has a positive impact on academic outcomes. Moreover, research has shown that social-emotional learning is essential for student academic success (Payton et al., 2008). Students who have received SEL programming showed not only an improvement in school attitudes and behaviors but also a gain in school achievement by 11 percentile points (Durlak et al., 2011).

SEL and Discipline

There is limited evidence demonstrating a relationship between student social-emotional learning competencies and their misbehavior at school, as measured by their discipline referral frequency. Hemmeler (2011) examined the use of the Devereux Elementary Student Strengths Assessment (DESSA) in predicting exclusionary disciplinary occurrences for students in 8th grade. There was a negative correlational relationship between the Social and Emotional Composite (SEC) and exclusionary behavioral practices that accounted for 21% of the variance. The Social and Emotional Composite accounted for the most variance in discipline referrals compared to ethnicity, gender, and disability status. Hemmeler (2011) discovered that, when included in the same model, demographic factors did not predict ODR frequency, while SEL did predict ODR frequency. Additionally, Hemmeler found that SEL skills were the strongest predictor of ODR frequency in almost all of the models (2011).

Purpose of the Current Study

As noted, there is limited research related specifically to the utility of SEL competencies in predicting office discipline referral (ODR) frequency for students. Despite evidence that SEL competencies can predict exclusionary discipline and student

misbehavior, there is a need for additional research that addresses whether SEL competencies can predict ODR frequency across a greater developmental range within schools. The current study examined how SEL competencies could predict ODR frequency for students in elementary, middle, and high school grades. The following research questions were addressed in this study.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

RQ1: Does social-emotional learning skill competence predict the frequency of discipline referrals for elementary school students (grades 1-5?)

H1: SEL skill competence will significantly predict office discipline referrals for elementary school students.

RQ2: Does social-emotional learning competence predict the frequency of discipline referrals for middle school students (grades 6-8?)

H2: Social-emotional learning skill competence will significantly predict office discipline referrals for middle school students.

RQ3: Does social-emotional learning competence predict the frequency of discipline referrals for high school students (grades 9-12?)

H3: Social-emotional learning skill competence will significantly predict office discipline referrals for high school students.

CHAPTER II: METHODOLOGY

Participants

The participants in this study were 792 elementary school students, 503 middle school students, and 890 high school students from a school district in the southeastern United States. All teachers at the school district completed ratings of students' SEL competencies as part of a district universal screening initiative. Teachers were asked to complete ratings on students in their homeroom (for elementary student) or if they were the first period teacher (for middle and high school students) and if they knew the student for at least one month. Teachers filled out the measures in January and February of 2017. Following the approval of the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects at the University of Houston-Clear Lake (UHCL CPHS), archival demographic data were collected on the students. This data included participant variables such as race, ethnicity, special education status and categorical eligibility, limited English proficiency/English language learner status, and scores on statewide assessments in academic subjects (e.g., reading, math, writing, etc.), and the frequency of student office discipline referrals.

Measures

Student Demographic Data

The district provided de-identified demographic data for the students (the research team did not have any personally identifiable information). This demographic data included and analyzed in this study included race, ethnicity, special education status and categorical eligibilities, limited English proficiency/English language learner status, and frequency of office discipline referrals. Demographic characteristics of the elementary, middle, and high school samples are presented in Table 1.

Social-Emotional Learning Skills Inventory (SELSI)

The SELSI is a narrowband instrument that allows parents and teachers to report on children and adolescents' social-emotional learning competencies. It contains five subscales: Self-Awareness (SFA), Self-Management (SMG), Social Awareness, (SOC), Relationship Skills (REL), and Responsible Decision-Making (RDM) that are based on the theoretical model posed by the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL). It contains an additional scale, Total SEL Score, that provides a global score of a participant's overall social-emotional learning competencies. The SELSI contains different forms for youth of different ages; there is a form for youth 2-5 years, 6-11 years, and 12-21 years of age. It also contains separate parent and teacher rating forms. Thus, participants who fill out the SELSI can choose the form that best fits their relationship to the youth and the youth's age (i.e., Parent 2-5, Parent 6-11, Parent 12-21, Teacher 2-5, Teacher 6-11, and Teacher 12-21).

The SELSI Teacher forms were used for this study. Each form contains a different number of items, depending on the age of the student being rated (i.e., the Teacher 2-5 form contains 46 items; the Teacher 6-11 form contains 58 items, and the Teacher form 12-21 form contains 59 items). The SELSI can be used as a universal screener for students in Tier I or as a targeted screener for students in Tier II. The SELSI identifies children and adolescents' strengths or weaknesses in SEL competencies; thus, it identifies students who would likely benefit from explicit SEL skill instruction. The tool can be used as a research instrument or as a clinical instrument. Raters complete the items on the scale, which describe the youth's behavior and competencies, by indicating the frequency of a student's behaviors on a 4-point Likert scale (i.e., Never, Sometimes, Often, Almost Always). Raw scores on the SELSI are converted to T-scores, with higher scores indicating higher levels of social-emotional competence.

In this study, reliability coefficients for each of the Early Childhood (ages 2-5) form were as follows: $\alpha = .93$ for the Relationship Skills subscale, $\alpha = .88$ for the Responsible Decision-Making subscale, $\alpha = .87$ for the Self-Awareness subscale, $\alpha = .84$ for the Self-Management subscale, $\alpha = .91$ for the Social Awareness subscale, and $\alpha = .97$ for the Total SEL composite. Reliability coefficients for each of the Childhood (ages 6-11) subscales were as follows: $\alpha = .95$ for the Relationship Skills subscale, $\alpha = .91$ for the Responsible Decision-Making subscale, $\alpha = .92$ for the Self-Awareness subscale, $\alpha = .90$ for the Self-Management subscale, $\alpha = .95$ for the Social Awareness subscale, and $\alpha = .98$ for the Total SEL composite. Reliability coefficients for each of the Adolescent (ages 12-21) subscales were as follows: $\alpha = .95$ for the Relationship Skills subscale, $\alpha = .92$ for the Responsible Decision-Making subscale, $\alpha = .95$ for the Self-Awareness subscale, $\alpha = .88$ for the Self-Management subscale, $\alpha = .96$ for the Social Awareness subscale, and $\alpha = .99$ for the Total SEL composite.

Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs)

ODRs served as the main dependent variable for the study. The district provided the total frequency of ODRs for students. If students did not have at least one discipline referral listed in the dataset provided by the school district, it was assumed that they had not received any discipline referrals in the 2017-2018 school year. These ODRs are based on the district's student code of conduct. The frequency and percent of ODRs for each school level (i.e., elementary, middle, and high school, respectively) are presented in Table 2.

Research Design

The purpose of this study was to address this gap in the literature by examining the relation between SEL skills and high ODR frequency. Specifically, the researcher used hierarchical multiple regression to predict student discipline referral frequency from

student SEL competency. Student discipline referral frequency was based on discipline referral data provided by the school district, and student SEL competency was based on student SEL Total score on the SELSI. SELSI subscale scores were also used in separate, respective analyses to gain additional qualitative information about the nature of student SEL competencies. Thus, a non-experimental, associational research design was used in the study.

Data Collection Procedures

The participants' student identification numbers were collected along with this data, and the data collected were de-identified. Following the approval of the UHCL CPHS, teacher ratings were collected on the social-emotional learning competencies of students within the school district. Participants were included in the study if they had both SELSI scores (generated from teacher reports of their social-emotional learning competencies) and discipline data (including students who had received no discipline referrals). Students missing SELSI scores were excluded from the study. Since the study focused on students aged 4-21 years, any students above or below this age threshold were excluded from the study. Thus, the study included data on children in grades ranging from kindergarten through 12th grade. Any children in other grades (e.g., preschool) were excluded from the study.

Demographic data on 2,185 (of approximately 8,000) students were collected from a school district in the southeastern United States. The data collected spanned the 2017-2018 academic year. The data were collected as identifiable information; after matching discipline data to SELSI data per student, the data were de-identified by the researchers. The data that were collected included the following variables: race, ethnicity, special education status and categorical eligibilities, limited English proficiency/ English language learner status, scores on statewide assessments in reading, writing, math,

science, and social students, local assessment data including the Texas Primary Reading Inventory, and frequency of discipline referrals.

The researcher used the SELSI teacher rating forms to measure each participants' social-emotional learning competencies. The SELSI was administered online, and administration data was collected through the Qualtrics system of The University of Houston-Clear Lake, which secures and encrypts data. The researcher emailed a link to the SELSI, which allowed teachers to access the SELSI in an online format. At the beginning of the survey, teachers were presented with an informed consent document available in Spanish and English, the district's primary languages. This form required teachers to enter their names and the name of the student they were rating. After reading the informed consent form, participants indicated whether they consented to participate in the study by clicking a button. Participants who did not click this button could not advance to the next step in the study.

Data Analysis

Hierarchical multiple regression was used to predict student discipline referral frequency (as measured by district data) from student social-emotional learning competency (as measured by Total SEL score), which served as the main predictor variable. Race, gender, ethnicity, and special education eligibility were also included as covariates in the model, and each was dummy coded. Race and ethnicity were dummy coded in a more complex manner than the other variables due to the manner in which the school district coded for race and ethnicity. This process is detailed below.

Dummy Coding Race

The data set received from the school district included data about five race categories with which students identified: White, Black, American Indian/ Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and Asian. Students could identify as more than one

race. These race groupings complicated the analysis and interpretation of the data, which emphasized the study of students belonging to one race at the exclusion of other races. Thus, in order to simplify the analysis and interpretation of the data, the researcher had to recode and dummy code the race groups in several steps.

First, each of the five race groups were dummy coded, where the number 1 indicated belonging to a group and 0 indicated not belonging (e.g. for the Asian race group, 1= Asian and 0 = not Asian). Next, the researcher computed a new variable that added up the numbers of the race groups to which each individual belonged. On this variable, scores equal to or greater than two indicated that the participant belonged to two or more race groups, and was thus considered multiracial for the purposes of the study. A new variable was created to demonstrate whether participants were multiracial or not, with 1 indicating multiracial identification and 0 indicating identification with a single race.

While the majority of the literature on ODR frequency is concerned with students identifying as exclusively White, Black, or American Indian/Alaska Native, less attention has been paid to participants who identify as multiracial, Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander, or Asian. Because this study introduced the concept of social-emotional learning as a potential predictor of office discipline referral frequency, the researcher sought to tailor this research to align with existing findings in the literature. Thus, the researcher maintained the three groups of students identifying as one race exclusively (i.e. White, Black, and American Indian/ Alaska Native). The researcher created a variable called “Other” to represent students who identified as either multiracial, exclusively Asian, or exclusively Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. Thus, race, which had originally consisted of five groupings, was regrouped into four mutually exclusive groups: White (1 = White, 0 = Non-White), Black (1 = Black, 0 = Non-Black), American Indian/ Alaska Native

(1=America Indian/ Alaska Native, 0 = non-America Indian/ Alaska Native), and Other (1 = multiracial, Asian, or Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander, 0 = non-multiracial, Asian, or Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander).

Dummy Coding Ethnicity

The data set received from the school district contained two options for participant ethnicity: participants were identified as either Hispanic or non-Hispanic. This variable was originally coded with the letter “Y” indicating Hispanic ethnicity and the letter “N” indicating non-Hispanic ethnicity. The researcher dummy coded this variable into a new variable titled “Hispanic,” with the number 1 indicating Hispanic ethnicity and the number 0 indicating non-Hispanic ethnicity.

Conducting the Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses

Eighteen three-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between the outcome variable (office discipline referral frequency) and the predictor variables. The predictor variables included participant race, ethnicity, sex, age, special education eligibility, and each of the six SELSI subscales (Relationship Skills, Responsible Decision Making, Self Awareness, Self Management, Social Awareness, and SELSI Total). Notably, only one of the six SELSI subscales was entered into the model for each of the hierarchical multiple regressions that was conducted.

All statistical analyses were conducted in IBM SPSS Statistics, Version 25 (SPSS). Having split the participants into three school level groups, the researcher began by selecting cases from only one school level at a time. In keeping with the six-subscale structure of the SELSI, the researcher conducted six hierarchical multiple regression analyses per school level. Each hierarchical multiple regression analysis examined the relation between one SELSI subscale and ODR frequency in a specific school level.

Given that the researcher conducted six analyses per school level and that there are three levels, the researcher conducted a total of 18 hierarchical multiple regression analyses. Conducting analyses per subscale for each respective school level allowed the researcher to closely examine the relationship between different social-emotional competencies at different ages. All analyses were conducted using listwise deletion.

All 18 hierarchical multiple regression analyses followed a similar format and contained similar independent variables which were entered in the same order; each analysis contained a unique combination of a SELSI subscale and one of the three school levels. The order of the variables entered, as well as the number and order of the blocks, were informed by a review of the literature as well as the data obtained from the school district and the SELSI scores. The strongest, most well-established predictors of ODR frequency were placed in the first model (Model I). Thus, Model I of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis included the following variables, which were entered in the following order: Male, Black, American Indian/ Alaska Native, Other Race, Hispanic Ethnicity, and Age. Next, special education-- a slightly less well-established predictor of ODR frequency-- was included in the second model (Model II) for all analyses. One of the six SELSI subscales (Relationship Skills, Responsible Decision Making, Self Awareness, Social Awareness, Self Management, or SELSI Total) was included in the third model (Model III) of the hierarchical multiple regression. This allowed the researcher to determine whether the variable of interest in the third block accounted for any additional variance in ODR frequency, above and beyond that explained by previously-established predictors. If the data demonstrated that a SELSI variable accounted for additional variance in ODR frequency, then it would provide support for the hypothesis that social-emotional skills help predict the frequency with which students receive office discipline referrals for misbehavior.

The steps taken in each of the hierarchical multiple regression analyses, as well as their results, are presented in the Results section. Their interpretation and implications are discussed in the Discussion section.

CHAPTER III:

RESULTS

Testing Assumptions

Prior to conducting hierarchical multiple regression analyses, several assumptions were tested. The assumption of independence of residuals was tested using the Durbin-Watson test value, which indicated that it had been met. Next, the assumption of multicollinearity was tested; the resulting VIF, tolerance value, and inter-variable correlations indicated that the assumption was met. The researcher tested for outliers in the continuous and categorical variables to ensure the integrity of the data. Potential outliers were identified using several statistics. The outliers were identified, analyzed, and either removed from the data set or corrected as appropriate. Further testing revealed that the functional form had been correctly specified. The assumptions of normality and homoscedasticity were of low concern due to the large sample size. Overall, data were assumed to be missing at random.

Descriptive Statistics & Internal Reliability

Descriptive statistics (mean, range, standard deviation) and internal consistency values were calculated for each of the three forms of the SELSI. These results are presented in tables 3-5.

Elementary School: Total SEL Score

The researcher conducted a hierarchical multiple regression analysis to examine whether each of the three models explains a significant proportion of the variance in office discipline referral frequency in elementary school students. The researcher also conducted this hierarchical multiple regression analysis to determine the amount of change created by the addition of Total SEL to Model III within this subsample. Thus, the researcher first selected cases of participants in the Elementary School level so that

the analysis would include only participants in this level while excluding participants in the Middle and High School levels. Next, the researcher added several predictors (Male, Black, American Indian/ Alaska Native, Other Race, Hispanic Ethnicity, and Age) to Model I. In Model II, the researcher added Special Education Eligibility as an additional predictor. Finally, in Model III, the researcher added Total SEL as a predictor.

The first variable set, which consisted of demographic variables (sex, race, ethnicity, and age), accounted for a statistically significant 5% increase in the variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .05, p < .001$). The second variable set, to which the Special Education eligibility variable was added, failed to significantly increase the variance in ODR frequency explained by the variable set ($\Delta R^2 = .00, p = .155$). Total SEL was added to the third and final variable set, which accounted for a statistically significant 4% increase in variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .04, p < .001$). Total SEL was negatively associated with ODR frequency ($\beta = -.22, p < .001$) and uniquely accounted for 4% of the variance in ODR frequency ($sr^2 = .04, p < .001$). The results from this analysis are presented in Table 6.

Elementary School: Subsequent Models for Specific SELSI Subscales

The researcher also conducted a hierarchical multiple regression to examine the ability of each of the five subscales on the SELSI and their ability to predict variance in ODRs. The same procedure that was followed for the Total SEL analysis was followed for each SELSI subscale, respectively. See Table 7-11 for the results of each specific subscale.

Self-Awareness

As demonstrated below in Table 7, the first variable set, which consisted of demographic variables (sex, race, ethnicity, and age), accounted for a statistically significant 5% increase in the variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .05, p < .001$). The

second variable set, to which the Special Education eligibility variable was added, failed to significantly increase the variance in ODR frequency explained by the variable set ($\Delta R^2 = .00, p = .155$). Self-Awareness was added to the third and final variable set, which accounted for a statistically significant 3% increase in variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .03, p < .001$). Self-Awareness uniquely accounted for a statistically significant 3% of the variance in ODR frequency ($sr^2 = .03, p < .001$) and was negatively associated with ODR frequency ($\beta = -.19, p < .001$).

Self-Management

As demonstrated below in Table 8, the first variable set, which consisted of demographic variables (sex, race, ethnicity, and age), accounted for a statistically significant 5% increase in the variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .05, p < .001$). The second variable set, to which the Special Education eligibility variable was added, failed to significantly increase the variance in ODR frequency explained by the variable set ($\Delta R^2 = .00, p = .155$). Self-Management was added to the third and final variable set, which accounted for a statistically significant 4% increase in variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .04, p < .001$). Self-Management uniquely accounted for 4% of the variance in ODR frequency ($sr^2 = .04, p < .001$) and was negatively associated with ODR frequency ($\beta = -.22, p < .001$).

Social Awareness

As demonstrated below in Table 9, the first variable set, which consisted of demographic variables (sex, race, ethnicity, and age), accounted for a statistically significant 5% increase in the variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .05, p < .001$). The second variable set, to which the Special Education eligibility variable was added, failed to significantly increase the variance in ODR frequency explained by the variable set ($\Delta R^2 = .00, p = .155$). Social Awareness was added to the third and final variable set,

which accounted for a statistically significant 4% increase in variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .04, p < .001$). Social Awareness uniquely accounted for 4% of the variance in ODR frequency ($sr^2 = .04, p < .001$) and was negatively associated with ODR frequency ($\beta = -.21, p < .001$).

Relationship Skills

As demonstrated below in Table 10, the first variable set, which consisted of demographic variables (sex, race, ethnicity, and age), accounted for a statistically significant 5% increase in the variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .05, p < .001$). The second variable set, to which the Special Education eligibility variable was added, failed to significantly increase the variance in ODR frequency explained by the variable set ($\Delta R^2 = .00, p = .155$). Relationship Skills was added to the third and final variable set, which accounted for a statistically significant 4% increase in variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .04, p < .001$). Relationship Skills uniquely accounted for a statistically significant 4% of the variance in ODR frequency ($sr^2 = .04, p < .001$) and was negatively associated with ODR frequency ($\beta = -.21, p < .001$).

Responsible Decision-Making

As demonstrated below in Table 11, the first variable set, which consisted of demographic variables (sex, race, ethnicity, and age), accounted for a statistically significant 5% increase in the variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .05, p < .001$). The second variable set, to which the Special Education eligibility variable was added, failed to significantly increase the variance in ODR frequency explained by the variable set ($\Delta R^2 = .00, p = .155$). Responsible Decision-Making was added to the third and final variable set, which accounted for a statistically significant 4% increase in variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .04, p < .001$). Responsible Decision-Making uniquely accounted

for a statistically significant 4% of the variance in ODR frequency ($sr^2 = .04, p < .001$) and was negatively associated with ODR frequency ($\beta = -.22, p < .001$).

Middle School: Total SEL Score

The researcher conducted a hierarchical multiple regression analysis to examine whether each of the three models explains a significant proportion of the variance in office discipline referral frequency in middle school students. The researcher also conducted this hierarchical multiple regression analysis to determine the amount of change created by the addition of Model III within this subsample. Thus, the researcher first selected cases of participants in the Middle School level so that the analysis would include only participants in this level while excluding participants in the Elementary and High School levels. Next, the researcher added several predictors (Male, Black, American Indian/Alaska Native, Other Race, Hispanic Ethnicity, and Age) to Model I. In Model II, the researcher added Special Education Eligibility as an additional predictor. Finally, in Model III, the researcher added Total SEL as a predictor.

As demonstrated in Table 12, the first variable set, which consisted of demographic variables (sex, race, ethnicity, and age), accounted for a statistically significant 3% increase in the variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .03, p < .05$). The second variable set, to which the Special Education eligibility variable was added, accounted for a statistically significant 1% increase in the variance of ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .01, p < .05$). Total SEL was added to the third and final variable set, which accounted for a statistically significant 5% increase in variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .05, p < .001$). Total SEL uniquely accounted for 5% of the variance in ODR frequency ($sr^2 = .05, p < .001$) and was negatively associated with ODR frequency ($\beta = -.24, p < .001$). The results from this analysis are presented in Table 12.

Middle School: Subsequent Models for Specific SEL SELSI Subscales

The researcher also conducted a hierarchical multiple regression to examine the ability of each of the five subscales on the SELSI to predict the variance in ODRs. The same procedure that was followed for the Total SEL analysis was followed for each SELSI subscale, respectively. See Tables 13-17 for the results of each specific subscale.

Self-Awareness

As demonstrated below in Table 13, the first variable set, which consisted of demographic variables (sex, race, ethnicity, and age), accounted for a statistically significant 3% increase in the variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .03, p < .05$). The second variable set, to which the Special Education eligibility variable was added, accounted for a statistically significant 1% increase in the variance of ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .01, p < .05$). Self-Awareness was added to the third and final variable set, which accounted for a statistically significant 3% increase in variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .03, p < .001$). Self-Awareness uniquely accounted for 3% of the variance in ODR frequency ($sr^2 = .03, p < .001$) and was negatively associated with ODR frequency ($\beta = -.18, p < .001$).

Self-Management

As demonstrated below in Table 14, the first variable set, which consisted of demographic variables (sex, race, ethnicity, and age), accounted for a statistically significant 3% increase in the variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .03, p < .05$). The second variable set, to which the Special Education eligibility variable was added, accounted for a statistically significant 1% increase in the variance of ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .01, p < .05$). Self-Management was added to the third and final variable set, which accounted for a statistically significant 6% increase in variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .06, p < .001$). Self-Awareness uniquely accounted for 6% of the variance in

ODR frequency ($sr^2 = .06, p < .001$) and was negatively associated with ODR frequency ($\beta = -.25, p < .001$).

Social Awareness

As demonstrated below in Table 15, the first variable set, which consisted of demographic variables (sex, race, ethnicity, and age), accounted for a statistically significant 3% increase in the variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .03, p < .05$). The second variable set, to which the Special Education eligibility variable was added, accounted for a statistically significant 1% increase in the variance of ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .01, p < .05$). Social Awareness was added to the third and final variable set, which accounted for a statistically significant 5% increase in variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .05, p < .001$). Social Awareness uniquely accounted for 5% of the variance in ODR frequency ($sr^2 = .05, p < .001$) and was negatively associated with ODR frequency ($\beta = -.23, p < .001$).

Relationship Skills

As demonstrated below in Table 16, the first variable set, which consisted of demographic variables (sex, race, ethnicity, and age), accounted for a statistically significant 3% increase in the variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .03, p < .05$). The second variable set, to which the Special Education eligibility variable was added, accounted for a statistically significant 1% increase in the variance of ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .01, p < .05$). Relationship Skills was added to the third and final variable set, which accounted for a statistically significant 5% increase in variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .05, p < .001$). Relationship Skills uniquely accounted for 5% of the variance in ODR frequency ($sr^2 = .05, p < .001$) and was negatively associated with ODR frequency ($\beta = -.23, p < .001$).

Responsible Decision Making

As demonstrated below in Table 17, the first variable set, which consisted of demographic variables (sex, race, ethnicity, and age), accounted for a statistically significant 3% increase in the variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .03, p < .05$). The second variable set, to which the Special Education eligibility variable was added, accounted for a statistically significant 1% increase in the variance of ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .01, p < .05$). Responsible Decision-Making was added to the third and final variable set, which accounted for a statistically significant 1% increase in variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .01, p < .05$). Relationship Skills uniquely accounted for 6% of the variance in ODR frequency ($sr^2 = .06, p < .001$) and was negatively associated with ODR frequency ($\beta = -.25, p < .001$).

High Schools: Total SEL Score

The researcher conducted a hierarchical multiple regression analysis to examine whether each of the three models explains a significant proportion of the variance in office discipline referral frequency in middle school students. The researcher also conducted this hierarchical multiple regression analysis to determine the amount of change created by the addition of Total SEL to Model III within this subsample. Thus, the researcher first selected cases of participants in the High School level so that the analysis would include only participants in this level while excluding participants in the Elementary School and Middle School levels. Next, the researcher added several predictors (Male, Black, American Indian/Alaska Native, Other Race, Hispanic Ethnicity, and Age) to Model I. In Model II, the researcher added Special Education Eligibility as an additional predictor. Finally, in Model III, the researcher added Total SEL as a predictor. The results from this analysis are presented in Table 18 in the Results section and discussed in the Discussion section.

As demonstrated in Table 18, the first variable set, which consisted of demographic variables (sex, race, ethnicity, and age), accounted for a statistically significant 3% increase in the variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .03, p < .01$). The second variable set, to which the Special Education eligibility variable was added, failed to significantly increase the variance in ODR frequency explained by the variable set ($\Delta R^2 = .00, p = .857$). Total SEL was added to the third and final variable set, which accounted for a statistically significant 6% increase in variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .06, p < .001$). Total SEL uniquely accounted for 6% of the variance in ODR frequency ($sr^2 = .06, p < .001$) and was negatively associated with ODR frequency ($\beta = -.26, p < .001$).

High Schools: Subsequent Models for Specific SEL Subscales

The researcher also conducted a hierarchical multiple regression to examine the ability of each of the five subscales on the SELSI and their ability to predict variance in ODRs. The same procedure that was followed for the Total SEL analysis was followed for each SELSI subscale, respectively. See Tables 19-23 for the results of each specific subscale.

Self-Awareness

As demonstrated below in Table 19, the first variable set, which consisted of demographic variables (sex, race, ethnicity, and age), accounted for a statistically significant 3% increase in the variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .03, p < .01$). The second variable set, to which the Special Education eligibility variable was added, failed to significantly increase the variance in ODR frequency explained by the variable set ($\Delta R^2 = .00, p = .857$). Self-Awareness was added to the third and final variable set, which accounted for a statistically significant 4% increase in variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .04, p < .001$). Self-Awareness uniquely accounted for 4% of the variance in ODR

frequency ($sr^2 = .04, p < .001$) and was negatively associated with ODR frequency ($\beta = -.21, p < .001$).

Self-Management

As demonstrated below in Table 20, the first variable set, which consisted of demographic variables (sex, race, ethnicity, and age), accounted for a statistically significant 3% increase in the variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .03, p < .01$). The second variable set, to which the Special Education eligibility variable was added, failed to significantly increase the variance in ODR frequency explained by the variable set ($\Delta R^2 = .00, p = .857$). Self-Management was added to the third and final variable set, which accounted for a statistically significant 6% increase in variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .06, p < .001$). Self-Management uniquely accounted for 6% of the variance in ODR frequency ($sr^2 = .06, p < .001$) and was negatively associated with ODR frequency ($\beta = -.25, p < .001$).

Social Awareness

As demonstrated below in Table 21, the first variable set, which consisted of demographic variables (sex, race, ethnicity, and age), accounted for a statistically significant 3% increase in the variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .03, p < .01$). The second variable set, to which the Special Education eligibility variable was added, failed to significantly increase the variance in ODR frequency explained by the variable set ($\Delta R^2 = .00, p = .857$). Social Awareness was added to the third and final variable set, which accounted for a statistically significant 7% increase in variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .07, p < .001$). Social Awareness uniquely accounted for 7% of the variance in ODR frequency ($sr^2 = .07, p < .001$) and was negatively associated with ODR frequency ($\beta = -.26, p < .001$).

Relationship Skills

As demonstrated below in Table 22, the first variable set, which consisted of demographic variables (sex, race, ethnicity, and age), accounted for a statistically significant 3% increase in the variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .03, p < .01$). The second variable set, to which the Special Education eligibility variable was added, failed to significantly increase the variance in ODR frequency explained by the variable set ($\Delta R^2 = .00, p = .857$). Relationship Skills was added to the third and final variable set, which accounted for a statistically significant 5% increase in variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .05, p < .001$). Relationship Skills uniquely accounted for 5% of the variance in ODR frequency ($sr^2 = .05, p < .001$) and was negatively associated with ODR frequency ($\beta = -.24, p < .001$).

Responsible Decision-Making

As demonstrated below in Table 23, the first variable set, which consisted of demographic variables (sex, race, ethnicity, and age), accounted for a statistically significant 3% increase in the variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .03, p < .01$). The second variable set, to which the Special Education eligibility variable was added, failed to significantly increase the variance in ODR frequency explained by the variable set ($\Delta R^2 = .00, p = .857$). Responsible Decision-Making was added to the third and final variable set, which accounted for a statistically significant 8% increase in variance in ODR frequency ($\Delta R^2 = .08, p < .001$). Responsible Decision-Making uniquely accounted for 8% of the variance in ODR frequency ($sr^2 = .08, p < .001$) and was negatively associated with ODR frequency ($\beta = -.29, p < .001$).

CHAPTER IV:

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to examine the relation between SEL skills and ODR frequency. More specifically, this study set out to investigate whether SEL skills predicted ODR frequency in samples that varied according to school level: elementary, middle, and high school. Regarding the research questions, the current data indicate that SEL competencies emerged as a predictor of ODR frequency in each of the three samples used in the analyses, further supporting findings from Hemmeler (2011). The results of this study have raised questions about the nature of ODR frequency in the schools and why SEL reliably predicted ODR frequency. When considered together with the existing literature, the findings from this study suggest a potential role for using SEL interventions to decrease ODR frequency. These findings and their implications make important contributions to scholars and practitioners alike as the field of school psychology continues seeking ways to decrease high ODR frequency and its associated antecedents and outcomes.

Total SEL Score Predictions Across Grade Levels

The three main research questions in the present study explored the nature of the relation between SEL skills and ODR frequency in elementary, middle, and high school samples. Prior studies have demonstrated that SEL skills can predict ODR frequency and disciplinary offenses (e.g., Hemmeler, 2011). Thus, it was hypothesized that adding overall SEL skill competence (Total SEL) to the model would result in a statistically significant increase in explained variance in ODRs, above and beyond the variance explained by student demographic factors in the three samples. Indeed, in each sample, the results of the hierarchical multiple regression supported this hypothesis; a summary of the results is presented in Table 24.

When Total SEL was added to the final elementary school model, the final model predicted 9% of the variance in ODR frequency. When it was added to the middle school model, it also predicted 9% of the variance in ODR frequency, and when it was added to the high school level, it predicted 9% of the variance in ODR frequency. On its own, Total SEL independently predicted 4% of the variance in ODR frequency in the elementary school sample, 4% of the variance in the middle school sample, and 6% of the variance in the high school sample. In each of the samples, SEL Total score was the strongest predictor of ODRs when compared to the other predictors in the final model.

Five additional hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine the relation between more specific components of SEL (i.e., Relationship Skills, Responsible Decision-Making, Self-Awareness, Self-Management, and Social Awareness) and ODR frequency within the elementary school population. As a whole, all of the analyses supported the respective hypotheses that each SEL skill competency (as measured by one of the five SELSI subscales) would significantly predict ODR frequency. This held true when each SEL predictor was considered as a part of the model and on its own as an individual variable.

Self-Awareness

A hierarchical multiple regression that included the Self Awareness subscale in its final model was conducted for each school level. When Self Awareness was added to the final model for the elementary school sample, the final model accounted for 8% of the variance in ODR frequency. When it was added to the final model for the middle and high school samples, respectively, the final model accounted for 7% of the variance in ODR frequency. When considered on its own, the Self Awareness variable accounted for 3% of the variance in ODR frequency in both the elementary and middle school samples. However, in the high school sample, it accounted for 4% of the variance in ODR

frequency. In the elementary and high school samples, the Self Awareness variable was the strongest predictor in the final model. However, in the middle school sample, the strongest predictor in the final model was the Black race, and the Self Awareness variable was a close second.

Self-Management

A hierarchical multiple regression that included the Self-Management subscale in its final model was conducted for each school level. In the final model of the hierarchical multiple regression, the Self-Management variable accounted for 9% of the variance in ODR frequency for all three school levels (i.e., elementary, middle, and high school). When considered on its own, the Self-Management variable uniquely accounted for 4% of the variance in ODR frequency for the elementary school sample. However, for both the middle and the high school sample, it uniquely accounted for 6% of the variance, respectively. Self-Management was the strongest predictor of ODR frequency in the final model for the elementary, middle, and high school samples.

Social Awareness

A hierarchical multiple regression that included the Social Awareness subscale in its final model was conducted for each school level. For each of the three school levels, when Social Awareness was added into the final model for the elementary school sample, the final model accounted for 9% of the variance in ODR frequency. When considered on its own, Social Awareness uniquely accounted for 4% of the variance in ODR frequency in the elementary school sample, 5% of the variance in ODR frequency in the middle school sample, and 7% of the variance in ODR frequency in the high school sample. Social Awareness was the strongest predictor in each of the final models for each of the three school levels.

Relationship Skills

A hierarchical multiple regression that included the Relationship Skills subscale in its final model was conducted for each school level. In the elementary school sample, the Relationship Skills subscale accounted for 9% of the variance in ODR frequency. However, in both the middle school and the high school samples, it accounted for 8% of the variance in ODR frequency. The Relationship Skills subscale uniquely accounted for 4% of the variance in ODR frequency in the elementary school sample, 5% of the variance in ODR frequency in the middle school sample, and 6% of the variance in ODR frequency in the high school sample. This subscale was the strongest predictor in the final model for the elementary, middle, and high school samples.

Responsible Decision-Making

A hierarchical multiple regression that included the Responsible Decision-Making subscale in its final model was conducted for each school level. When the Responsible Decision-Making variable was added to the final model in the elementary school sample, the final model predicted 9% of the variance in ODR frequency. When Responsible Decision-Making was added to the final model of the middle school sample, it predicted 10% of the variance in ODR frequency, and when it was added to the final model of the high school sample, it predicted 11% of the variance in ODR frequency. The Responsible Decision-Making variable was the strongest predictor of ODR frequency in the final model for each of the three school levels.

Connection to the Literature

The results of the hierarchical multiple regression indicated that SEL competencies predicted ODR frequency in all three samples: elementary, middle, and high school. Interestingly, SEL competencies were the strongest predictor in almost all of the hierarchical multiple regressions calculated. Although they are relatively few in

number, other studies have begun to explore whether SEL skills can serve as a predictor of ODR frequency. For example, Hemmeler (2011) found that SEL predicted ODR frequency, while the demographic variables that were included in the same model did not. Unlike Hemmeler's results, in the present study, ODR frequency was predicted by both demographic predictors and SEL skills; however, as found by Hemmeler (2011), SEL skills predicted ODR frequency and were the strongest predictors of ODR frequency in almost all models. The findings from both of these studies strengthen the idea that SEL can serve as an unexpected and significant predictor of ODR frequency.

The findings of the present study are also supported by intervention studies and meta-analyses of intervention studies. The majority of these studies demonstrate that SEL interventions reduce disruptive, externalizing, antisocial behavior, and conduct problems. For example, several meta-analyses found that SEL programs lead to decreased conduct problems, reduced risk-taking behavior, and reduced criminal behavior (Durlak et al., 2010; Durlak et al., 2011; Farrington et al., 2012; Hawkins et al., 2008; Sklad et al., 2012; Weissberg et al., 2015). Although most of these studies do not directly examine ODRs, they examine the externalizing behaviors that have been shown to be related and lead to—ODRs. Thus, when taken together with the previous research, the data from the present study suggest that SEL skills may help to decrease ODR frequency indirectly by decreasing the behaviors that can lead students to receive ODRs.

Implications

An SEL Perspective of ODRs

The issue of effective service provision for students who receive frequent ODRs is one of the most significant current discussions within the field of school psychology. Educators may inappropriately assume that all students come in with strong SEL competencies. This inappropriate assumption may lead teachers to engage in disciplinary

practices to punish behaviors rather than focus on teaching appropriate behaviors. Often unfamiliar with the unwritten rules and behavioral expectations imposed by schools, these students frequently lack the prerequisite social, emotional, behavioral, and academic skills that would otherwise prepare them to fully engage in and benefit from the learning process (Naser et al., 2018; Stormont et al., 2012; Young & Michael, 2014). Perhaps driven by skill deficits and lacking knowledge or ability to conform to school behavioral requirements, these students tend to experience a person-environment mismatch due to their failure to meet the demands of their environment appropriately (Gresham, 2002; Gresham, 2015).

When environmental expectations exceed these students' skills and capacities, they may engage in internalizing and externalizing behaviors as a way to cope and meet their needs. While internalizing students' behaviors are more likely to go unnoticed by teachers and administrators, externalizing students' behaviors are more likely to get teachers' and administrators' attention (McIntosh et al., 2010; Pas et al., 2011; Simpson, 2017; Sprague et al., 2001). Although these students' externalizing behaviors may meet their own needs, they disrupt the classroom and school environment. When teachers or other administrators witness this disruptive behavior, they often give students ODRs, which result in the student being removed from the classroom and sent to the office of an administrator in charge of school discipline. However, many of the ODRs that are given to students often result in students receiving punishments that exclude them from the educational environment and otherwise harm them. As a result of the sequence of events that originates from these ODRs, these students often face various negative outcomes (Naser et al., 2018).

Furthermore, these ODRs and the punitive disciplinary strategies that follow often fail to result in a safer school climate and improved student behavior in the long term

(Skiba & Peterson, 1999; Skiba & Peterson, 2003). In theory, the more severe a student's behavior, the more severe the consequence stemming from the ODR; thus, more severe behaviors are likely to be punished more harshly, with perpetrating students more likely to be excluded from the curriculum, experience disproportionality, and begin to progress along the school-to-prison pipeline. Consequently, the students who need the most help often do not receive it. Instead, they are increasingly alienated from the socializing and educational process of school attendance, where responsible adults supervise them and help them meet their needs in an adaptive, age-appropriate manner.

It is commonly assumed that all students are capable of detecting, understanding, internalizing, and acting according to the unwritten social-emotional rules that often govern everyday interactions. Also, it is often assumed that students have had the necessary exposure to and instruction in the proper ways to behave in social interactions with others (Hemmeler, 2011). However, when students lack the skills to get their needs met in a socially acceptable manner, they may resort to engaging in socially unacceptable but effective behaviors, such as stealing or fighting. Greene (2014) summarized this sentiment in his work, arguing that children do well when they can. He also advocated for the perspective that all children want to do well, arguing that when children cannot do well, it is not because they are attention-seeking, manipulative, or unmotivated; rather, it is because they lack the skills to meet behavioral expectations in a non-challenging manner (Greene, 2014). According to Greene's model, reward and punishment are unlikely to improve behavior when a skill deficit is the problem since skill deficits are best remediated when they are identified and remediated.

If it is assumed that some students may misbehave due to SEL skill deficits, then perhaps SEL interventions can decrease ODR frequency by teaching socially desirable SEL skills to students. Explicit instruction of SEL skills is a core component of an SEL

framework. (Durlak et al., 2010; Durlak et al, 2011; Elias, et al., 2015). If students were to use their newfound, socially acceptable skills instead of their older, socially unacceptable skills, this might lead to them receiving a decreased number of ODRs. Viewing ODRs from the perspective of lacking social-emotional skills can help explain why some students who receive frequent ODRs continue to do so while providing a potential mechanism for school staff to intervene. This may explain why teachers at all school levels report valuing social behaviors, such as controlling temper around peers and adults, conflict management, attending to instructions, and following directions, as essential in determining students' success in the classroom (Elliot et al., 2015; Hersh & Walker, 1983; Lane et al., 2004; Lane et al., 2007).

Taken in conjunction with the existing literature base, the present study's findings provide additional support for using SEL as screeners that may assist in identifying appropriate SEL programs as interventions that could help decrease ODR frequency. If accurate, this hypothesis is encouraging in an area with many questions and few answers because “[SEL skills] are malleable and are logical targets for intervention due to the theoretical relevance of these competencies to positive youth development, resilience, and risk prevention” (Williamson et al., 2015, p. 181). If SEL skills could affect ODR frequency, then SEL interventions could be a very useful mechanism in schools' attempts to decrease ODR frequency.

MTSS & Universal Screening

Should schools decide to pursue SEL interventions, one concern they might encounter is how to best integrate SEL into their curriculum. Schools are a particularly good setting for prevention and early intervention efforts with students who receive frequent office discipline referrals because they often already implement prevention and early intervention frameworks. One potential prevention and intervention framework into

which schools might consider integrating SEL is the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) framework. The MTSS framework allows schools to separate students into different tiers, each of which represents an increasingly intensive need for supports and interventions. In order to help group students into respective tiers, schools often engage in universal screening. Usually, most students do not require intervention or support beyond what is typically provided to the general student population; these students are placed in Tier 1. A smaller group of students that requires more intensive interventions is placed in Tier 2, and an even smaller group with higher needs for supports and interventions is placed in Tier 3 (Coffee et al., 2013; Dupper, 2010).

SEL interventions are compatible with the MTSS framework that incorporates a universal screening model. Engagement in the universal screening of SEL skills and the provision of SEL interventions to students according to their level of need might help schools improve student misbehaviors and decrease ODR frequency in an organized manner. Data from this study suggest the SELSI can be a helpful tool for not only universal screening, but also progress monitoring of students. The SELSI could prove especially helpful because it could be used to screen and monitor student progress from the perspective of different raters, such as parents, teachers, or even students themselves. It could also prove to be useful due to its five additional subscales (Self-Awareness, Self-Management, Social Awareness, Relationship Skills, and Responsible Decision-Making) in addition to the overall Total SEL composite. These subscales could allow interventions to be individualized to an even greater extent, according to the specific skill areas in which a student might have deficits. By helping to screen students, track progress, and individualize interventions that might decrease student conduct problems, the SELSI can offer a practical way to understand and address ODR frequency from an SEL perspective.

Misbehavior Patterns in the Schools

The study of the relation between SEL and ODRs can also be helpful in terms of understanding patterns of ODRs in the schools. The current study and existing literature suggest that different grade levels have different levels of ODRs; the overall patterns indicate that as grade level increases, ODR rates increase (Kaufman et al., 2010; Martinez et al., 2016; Putnam et al., 2003; Spaulding et al., 2010, Spaulding & Frank, 2009; Sprague et al., 1999; Woidneck, 2011). The present study and the existing literature on SEL might help schools better understand this phenomenon. Perhaps one reason this occurs is that as children proceed through different school levels, the demands of the social-emotional environment become much more nuanced and complicated. If their social-emotional deficits were never identified and remediated at a young age, then students who had these deficits as young children will continue to have them as they grow up. Because they never possessed the foundational skills upon which more mature and complex SEL skills are built, these students increasingly struggle as the gap between their abilities and the social-emotional demands of their environment widens. Additionally, as school levels increase, schools' expectations that students will have mastered social-emotional skills also increase; at the same time, tolerance for failures to acquire these skills decreases, as do opportunities that students have to learn and master these essential skills. The difficulties faced by these students make yet another argument for the use of SEL as a universal screener and as a part of MTSS within the schools.

Limitations and Future Directions

Excluded Predictors

One limitation of this study is that additional individual and contextual predictors of office discipline referrals were not included in the analysis. For instance, research has found that socioeconomic status is a predictor of office discipline referral frequency

(Gerewitz, 2015). However, due to the constraints of data collection from the school district, data on student socioeconomic status could not be collected. As another example, a growing body of literature has found that the context in which students receive ODRs also affects student ODR frequency. For instance, one study found that when high-risk students were placed in low-aggression classrooms, they had a higher likelihood of suspension than high-risk students placed in high-aggression classrooms (Petras et al., 2011). As another example, Hellman and Beaton (1986) found that a positive relationship existed between middle school suspension frequency and student-teacher ratio. Future research should attempt to include as many individuals and variables as possible to facilitate a clearer picture of the predictors of office discipline referral frequency and how they relate to each other.

Rate of ODR Frequency

This study was also limited by the difference in the rate of ODR frequency in each sample when compared to samples more representative of most schools in the United States. Although there is no national “gold standard” of office discipline referral frequency, several resources provide data that can be used as a benchmark (Woidneck, 2011). In one large-scale study, Spaulding et al. (2008) reported an ODR rate of 0.37 per 100 students for elementary schools ($SD = 0.45$), 1.05 per 100 students for middle schools ($SD = 1.06$), and 1.32 per 100 students for high schools ($SD = 1.45$). In another study, Spaulding and Frank (2009) reported on rates of ODRs in 1,129 elementary, middle, and high schools. They found average rates of ODRs to be 0.36 per 100 students at the elementary school level ($SD = 0.42$), 0.86 per 100 students at the middle school level ($SD = 0.71$), and 0.99 per 100 students at the high school level. When compared to the frequency of office discipline referrals found in the current study’s samples, each school level in the study had a much greater relative rate of ODR frequency than the rates

calculated by the two large scale studies: the elementary school sample had 5.30 ODRs per 100 students; the middle school sample had 41.35 ODRs per 100 students, and the high school sample had 36.18 ODRs per 100 students.

One factor that likely accounts for these differences is that not all potential participants (only approximately 25% of all eligible participants) provided responses in the current study. Additionally, because this study gathered only teacher responses, teachers may have been more motivated to participate if they could report on students who had SEL skill deficits. Future research is needed to examine SEL as a predictor of ODR frequency in school-level samples with ODR levels that are more representative of those found in large-scale studies.

Generalizability

An additional limitation of the current study is the difference in the racial and ethnic makeup of each school-level sample in comparison with the demographic makeup of students across the United States. Within the current study, all students were identified as one of the following race categories: White, Black, American Indian/ Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander, Asian, biracial, or multiracial. Additionally, in terms of ethnicity, all students identified as either Hispanic or non-Hispanic. Thus, in terms of race, percentages were as follows: 50.2% White, 26.4% Black, 19.1% American Indian/Alaska Native, and 4.1% Other—a group that included Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander, Asian, biracial, or multiracial. All students chose at least one of the race options.

In terms of student ethnicity, 66.3% of students identified as Hispanic, and 33.7% identified as non-Hispanic. The National Center for Education Statistics measured race and ethnicity slightly differently than it was measured within the school district: if an individual identified as either Hispanic only or as Hispanic and any race, they were

considered “Hispanic,” and none of the race groups were reported. If an individual did not identify as Hispanic, they could choose to identify as one of the following races: American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, or Two or More Races (National Center for Education Statistics, n.d.).

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2020), in the fall of 2017, White students made up 48% of enrolled students; Black students made up 15%; Hispanic students made up 27%; Asian/ Pacific Islander made up 6%, and American Indian/Alaska Native made up 1% of enrolled students. Due to differences in racial and ethnic groupings, it is somewhat difficult to compare this distribution with that of the current study; however, it is apparent, in general, that the sample of the current study had a larger enrollment of minoritized students (e.g., Black, Hispanic, Asian, Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaska Native, and Two or More Races) compared to the overall enrollment of students across the United States. Future studies should consider using groupings similar to those used by the National Center for Education Statistics for further ease of comparison and increased generalizability.

Lack of Parent and Student Perspectives

The present study’s dependence on teacher perspectives and lack of parent data or student data is another limitation that needs to be acknowledged. Although the SELSI has parent-report and self-report forms, they were not used in this study. Thus, within this study, there were fewer informants reporting on student SEL skills. This means that there was no way to establish interrater reliability and determine whether teachers’ ratings are a good representation of other raters’ perspectives. Future research might consider administering not only the teacher form of the SELSI but also a parent-report and self-report form that can be given to students. This will enable data collection on various

perspectives, which may give a more comprehensive picture of student SEL skills and how they relate to ODR frequency.

ODRs as a Measure of Misbehavior

Another limitation of the study was its use of ODR frequency as a measure of student misbehavior. The existing literature on ODRs has demonstrated that while ODRs are often a good measure of school misbehavior, they are not a perfect measure and can be subjective. For example, some studies have shown that Black males are more likely to receive ODRs for subjective misbehaviors (e.g., making too much noise or being disrespectful) than white, non-Hispanic students (Skiba et al., 2002). Additionally, a growing body of literature has found that the context in which students receive ODRs also affects student ODR frequency. For instance, one study compared “high-risk” students (defined as students who were Black, received reduced or free school lunch, were seven years or older when they started first grade, and were more aggressive than average first graders by one standard deviation) with “low-risk” students (defined as White students who did not receive reduced or free school lunch, who were 5- or 6-years old when they started first grade, and who were less aggressive than the first-grade sample mean by one standard deviation). The study found that when “high-risk” male students were placed in low-aggression classrooms, they had a higher likelihood of suspension than high-risk male students placed in high-aggression classrooms (Petras et al., 2011). Petras et al.’s study revealed that classroom contexts could contribute to teachers’ misbehavior tolerance threshold, which can then contribute to a student’s likelihood to receive an ODR (Martinez et al., 2016).

An additional complication showcasing the potential subjectivity of ODRs is posed by the fact that different school levels may vary in their willingness to give students ODRs. More specifically, elementary schools may have had fewer because they

are more willing than middle or high schools to handle disciplinary problems without giving ODRs. Because they can be so dependent on the opinions and interpretations of school staff or the culture of a school, ODRs cannot be considered a “pure” and objective measure of student misbehavior (Martinez et al., 2016). Thus, future research is needed to determine the relation between SEL skills and additional student outcomes related to student misbehavior. Additionally, researchers who use ODRs in the future should remain aware of this potential disadvantage of using this variable.

Number of Actual Versus Potential Participants

The present study is also limited by the fact that not all potential participants in the study ended up participating; only about 25% percent of potential students were included in the ratings. This limitation relates to the demographic characteristics of the sample in that it was difficult to obtain and explore more nuanced data on the effects of different social identities (such as race and ethnicity) on ODRs. Part of the difficulty in obtaining this data was due to the small number of participants who identified as certain races and ethnicities. Future studies should consider ways to increase participation in similar studies. In particular, they should focus on finding ways to increase participation of minority groups so that more nuanced data can be collected on how SEL may affect ODR frequency.

Comparison to Different Screeners in the Literature

One final promising direction for future research is comparing the SELSI with other screeners designed to measure social-emotional learning, such as the Behavioral and Emotional Screening System (BESS), Social, Academic, and Emotional Behavior Risk Screener (SAEBRS), and the Devereux Student Strengths Assessment (DESSA) (Denham, 2015; Fastbridge, n.d.; Kamphaus & Reynolds, n.d.; Lebuffe et al., 2009; Naglieri et al., 2011; Nickerson & Fishman, 2009). Comparison to such screeners could

give insight into the different properties of each measure and how well the scales and subscales of each measure predict ODR frequency. One potential area of exploration could be whether any of these measures have ever been used to predict ODR frequency. An additional area of interest could involve exploring whether measures that have been used for ODR prediction also found that SEL accounts for some of the variance in ODRs. If SEL was found to account for some of the variance in ODRs, an additional future direction of research might involve exploring how much of the variance in ODRs was accounted for by different scales and subscales. Exploring how much variance in ODRs is predicted by measures such as the BESS, SAEBRS, DESSA, could inform the use and development of the SELSI in the future.

Overall, although more research regarding the relationship between SEL and ODR frequency is needed, the data from the current study and the existing literature is promising.

As this literature base continues to expand, so does the hope that the students who receive frequent ODRs will be better understood and receive interventions that will suit their needs and the expectations of their respective campuses.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, E. (2006). Understanding bullying from a shame management perspective: Findings from a three-year follow-up study. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 23, 26-40. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2006-10794-004>
- Allman, K. L., & Slate, J. R. (2011). School discipline in public education: A brief review of current practices. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 47, 175-180. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ973838>
- Ambrose, M., & Gibson, M. (1995). Does suspension work? *NEA Today*, 13, 39. <https://www.nea.org>
- American Academy of Pediatrics. (2003). Out-of-school suspension and expulsion. *Pediatrics*, 112 (5), 1206-1209. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2012-3932>
- American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force. (2008). Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools? *American Psychologist*, 852-862. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.9.852>
- Arcia, E. (2006). Achievement and enrollment status of suspended students: Outcomes in a large, multicultural school district. *Education and Urban Society*, 38, 359-369. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0013124506286947>
- Arsenio, W. F., Gold, J., & Adams, E. (2004). Adolescents' emotion expectancies regarding aggressive and nonaggressive events: Connections with behavior problems. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 89, 338-355. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2004.08.001>
- Arsenio, W. F., & Lemerise, E. A. (2004). Aggression and moral development: Integrating social information processing and moral domain models. *Child Development*, 75, 987-1002. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2004.00720.x>
- Balfanz, R., Byrnes, V., & Fox, J. (2014). Sent home and put off-track: The

- antecedents, disproportionalities, and consequences of being suspended in the ninth grade. *Journal of Applied Research on Children: Informing Policy for Children at Risk*, 5(2), 1-19.
- <https://digitalcommons.library.tmc.edu/childrenatrisk/vol5/iss2/13>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (2002). Selective moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Moral Education*, 31, 101-119.
- <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305724022014322>
- Bandura, A., Adams, N. E., & Beyer, J. (1977). Cognitive processes mediating behavioral change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35(3), 125-139.
- <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.35.3.125>
- Bandura, A., Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Pastorelli, C., & Regalia, C. (2001). Sociocognitive self-regulatory mechanisms governing transgressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 125-135.
- <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.80.1.125>
- Barkley, R. A., Shelton, T. L., Crosswait, C., Moorehouse, M., Fletcher, K., Barrett, S., Jenkins, L., & Metevia, L. (2002). Preschool children with disruptive behavior: Three-year outcome as a function of adaptive disability. *Development and Psychopathology*, 14, 45-67. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0954579402001037>
- Bear, G. G. (2010). *School discipline and self-discipline*. The Guilford Press.
- Bear, G. G., & Rys, G. (1994). Moral reasoning, classroom behavior, and sociometric status among elementary school children. *Developmental Psychology*, 30, 633-638. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.30.5.633>
- Black, D. W. (2016). Reforming school discipline. *Northwestern University Law Review*, 111(1), 1-74. https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/law_facpub/271/

- Blair, R. J. R., Monson, J., & Fredrickson, N. (2001). Moral reasoning and conduct problems in children with emotional and behavioural difficulties. *Personality and Individual Differences, 31*, 799-811. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(00\)00181-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(00)00181-1)
- Bowman-Perrott, L., Benz, M. R., Hsu, H., Kwok, O., Eisterhold, L.A., Zhang, D. (2011). Patterns and predictors of disciplinary exclusion over time: An analysis of the SEELS national data set. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 1-14*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1063426611407501>
- Brackett, M. A., Elbertson, N. A., & Rivers, S. E. (2015). Applying theory to the development of approaches to SEL. In J. A. Durlak, C. E. Domitrovich, R. P. Weissberg, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Handbook of social and emotional learning: Research and practice* (pp. 20-32). The Guilford Press.
- Brown, T. M. (2007). Lost and turned out: Academic, social, and emotional experiences of students excluded from school. *Urban Education, 42*(5), 432-455. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085907304947>
- Burks, V. S., Laird, R. D., Dodge, K. A., Pettit, G. S., & Bates, J. E. (1999). Knowledge structures, social information processing, and children's aggressive behavior. *Social Development, 8*, 220-236. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9507.00092>
- Butchart, R. E. (1998). Punishments, penalties, prizes, and procedures: A history of discipline in U.S. schools. In R. E. Butchart & B. McEwan (Eds.), *Classroom discipline in American schools: Problems and possibilities for democratic education*. State University of New York Press.

- Cameron, M., & Sheppard, S. M. (2006). School discipline and social work practice: Application of research and theory to intervention. *NASW Children and Schools*, 28(1), 15-22. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cs/28.1.15>
- Camodeca, M., & Goosens, F. A. (2005). Aggression, social cognitions, anger and sadness in bullies and victims. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 46, 186-197. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2004.00347.x>
- CASEL (2021). *SEL: What are the core competence areas and where are they promoted?* CASEL. <https://casel.org/core-competencies/>
- Christie, C. A., Jolivette, K., & Nelson, C. M. (2005). Breaking the school to prison pipeline: Identifying school risk and protective factors for youth delinquency. *Exceptionality*, 13(2), 69-88. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327035ex1302_2
- Coffee, G., Ray-Subramanian, C. E., Schanding, G. T., Jr., & Feeney-Kettler, K. A. (2013). *Early childhood education: A practical guide to evidence-based, multi-tiered service delivery*. Routledge.
- Cohen, D., & Strayer, J., (1996). Empathy in conduct-disordered and comparison youth. *Developmental Psychology*, 32, 988-998. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.32.6.988>
- Costenbader, V. K., & Markson, S. (1998). School suspension: A survey of current policy and practices. *NASSP Bulletin*, 78, 103-107. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019263659407856420>
- Covington, M. V. (2000). Goal theory, motivation, and school achievement: An integrative review. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, 171-200. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.51.1.171>
- Crick, N. R., & Ladd, G. W. (1990). Children's perceptions of the outcomes of aggressive strategies: Do the ends justify being mean? *Developmental*

- Psychology*, 26, 612-620. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.26.4.612>
- Crozier, J. C., Dodge, K. A., Fontaine, R. G., Lansford, J. E., Bates, J. Pettit, G. S., & Levenson, R. (2008). Social information processing and cardiac predictors of adolescent antisocial behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 117, 253-267. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.117.2.253>
- Curran, F. C. (2017). Influence over school discipline policy: Variation across levels of governance, school contexts, and time. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 25(119), 1-31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.25.3141>
- Davis, J. E., & Jordan, W. J. (1994). The effects of school context, structure, and experiences on African American males in middle and high schools. *Journal of Negro Education*, 63(4), 570-587. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2967296>
- de Castro, B. O., Veerman, J. W., Koops, W., Bosch, J., & Monshouwer, J. J. (2002). Hostile attribution of intent and aggressive behavior: A meta-analysis. *Child Development*, 73, 916-934. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00447>
- de Castro, B. O., Merk, W., Koops, W., Veerman, J. W., & Bosch, J. D. (2005). Emotions in social information processing and their relations with reactive and proactive aggression in referred aggressive boys. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 34, 105-116. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15374424jccp3401_10
- Deming, A. M., & Lochman, J. E. (2008). The relation of locus of control, anger, and impulsivity to boys' aggressive behavior. *Behavioral Disorders*, 33, 108-119. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43153794>
- Denham, S. A. (2015). Assessment of SEL in educational contexts. In J. A. Durlak, C. E. Domitrovich, R. P. Weissberg, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Handbook of social and emotional learning: Research and practice* (pp. 285-300). The Guilford Press.

- Diliberti, M., Jackson, M., Correa, S., & Padgett, Z. (2019). Crime, violence, discipline, and safety in U.S. public schools: Findings from the school survey on crime and safety: 2017–18. U.S. Department of Education.
<https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2019/2019061.pdf>
- Dowdy, E., Furlong, M., Raines, R. C., Boverly, B., Kauffman, B., Kamphaus, R. W., Dever, B., Ridget, V., Price, M., & Murdock, J. (2015). Enhancing school-based mental health services with a preventive and promotive approach to universal screening for complete mental health. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Consultation*, 25(2/3), 178-197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10474412.2014.929951>
- Dupper, D. R. (2010). *A new model of school discipline: Engaging students and preventing behavior problems*. Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195378078.001.0001>
- Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school based universal interventions. *Child Development*, 82(1), 405-432. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x>
- Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., & Pachan, M. (2010). A meta-analysis of after-school programs that seek to promote personal and social skills in children and adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 45, 294-309.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-010-9300-6>
- Educational intolerance. (2001, May 14). *St. Petersburg Times*, p. 8A.
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., & Spinrad, T. L. (2006). Prosocial behavior. In N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.) & W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds.-in-Chief), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (6th ed., Vol. 3., pp. 646-718). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470147658>

- Eklund, K., & Dowdy, E. (2013). Screening for behavioral and emotional risk versus traditional school identification methods. *School Mental Health, 6*(1), 40-49.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-013-9109-1>
- Eklund, K., Renshaw, T. L., Dowdy, E., Jimerson, S. R., Hart, S. R., Jones, C. N., & Earhart, J. (2009). Early identification of behavioral and emotional problems in youth: Universal screening versus teacher-referral identification. *The California School Psychologist, 14*, 89-95. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03340954>
- Elias, M. J., Zins, J. E., Weissberg, R. P., Frey, K. S., Greenberg, M. T., Haynes, N. M., Kessler, R., Schwab-Stone, M.E., & Shriver, T. P. (1997). *Promoting social and emotional learning: Guidelines for educators*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. <https://earlylearningfocus.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/promoting-social-and-emotional-learning-1.pdf>
- Elliot, S. N., Frey, J. R., & Davies, M. (2015). Systems for assessing and improving students' social skills to achieve academic competence. In J. A. Durlak, C. E. Domitrovich, R. P. Weissberg, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Handbook of social and emotional learning: Research and practice* (pp. 301-319). The Guilford Press.
- Erdley, C. A., & Asher, S. R. (1999). A social goals perspective on children's social competence. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 7*, 156-167.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/106342669900700304>
- Fabelo, T., Thompson, M. D., Plotkin, M., Carmichael, D., Marchbanks, M. P. III, & Booth, E. A. (2011). *Breaking schools' rules: A statewide study of how school discipline relates to students' success and juvenile justice involvement*. Council of State Governments Justice Center & the Public Policy Research Institute at Texas A&M University.
<https://csgjusticecenter.org/publications/breaking-schools-rules/>

- Farmer, T. W., Farmer, E. M. Z., Estell, D. B., & Hutchins, B. C. (2007). The developmental dynamics of aggression and the prevention of school violence. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders* 15(4), 197-208.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/10634266070150040201>
- Farrington, C. A., Roderick, M., Allensworth, E., Nagaoka, J., Keyes, T. S., Johnson, D. W., Nagaoka, J., Roderick, M., & Beechum, N. (2012). *Teaching adolescents to become learners- the role of noncognitive factors in shaping school performance: A critical literature review*. University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research. https://consortium.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/2018-10/Noncognitive%20Report_0.pdf
- Fastbridge. (n.d.). *The social, academic, and emotional behavior risk screener*.
Fastbridge. <https://www.fastbridge.org/saebrs/>
- Fontaine, R. G., Yang, C., Dodge, K. A., Pettit, G. S., & Bates, J. E. (2009). Development of response evaluation and decision (RED) and antisocial behavior in childhood and adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 45, 447-459.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014142>
- Frick, P. J., & White, S. F. (2008). Research review: The importance of callous-unemotional traits for developmental models of aggressive and antisocial behavior. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 49, 359-375.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01862.x>
- Gerewitz, J. L. (2015). *High school discipline practices and associated future student infractions* (Publication No. 10004997.) [Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
<https://doi.org/10.7282/T37946MF>

- Geunyoung, K., Walden, T., Harris, V., Karrass, J., & Catron, T. (2007). Positive emotion, negative emotion, and emotion control in the externalizing problems of school aged children. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, 37, 221-239. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10578-006-0031-8>
- Gini, G. (2006). Social cognition and moral cognition in bullying: What's wrong? *Aggressive Behavior*, 32, 528-539. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20153>
- Girvan, E. J., Gion, C., McIntosh, K., & Smolkowski, K. (2017). The relative contribution of subjective office discipline referrals to racial disproportionality in school discipline. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 32(3), 392-404. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000178>
- Greenberg, M. T., Domitrovich, C., & Bumbarger, B. K. (2001). The prevention of mental disorders in school-aged children: Current state of the field. *Prevention & Treatment*, 4, 1-62. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1522-3736.4.1.41a>
- Greenberg, M. T., Domitrovich, C. E., Weissberg, R. P., & Durlak, J. A. (2017). Social and emotional learning as a public health approach to education. *The Future of Children*, 27(1), 13-32. <https://doi:10.1353/foc.2017.0001>.
- Greenberg, M. T., Weissberg, R. P., O'Brien, M. T., Zins, J. E., Fredericks, L., Resnik, H., & Elias, M. (2003). Enhancing school-based prevention and youth development through coordinated social, emotional, and academic learning. *American Psychologist*, 58, 466-474. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.58.6-7.466](https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.58.6.7.466)
- Greene, R. W. (2014). *Lost at school: Why our kids with behavioral challenges are falling through the cracks and how we can help them*. Simon & Schuster, Inc.
- Gresham, F. M. (2002). Teaching social skills to high-risk children and youth: Preventive and remedial strategies. In M. A. Shinn, H. M. Walker, & G. Stoner (Eds.),

- Interventions for academic and behavior problems II: Preventive and remedial approaches* (pp. 403-432). NASP Publications.
- Gresham, F. M. (2015). *Disruptive behavior disorders: Evidence-based practice for assessment and intervention*. The Guilford Press.
- Guerra, N. G. (1989). Consequential thinking and self-reported delinquency in high-school youth. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 16*, 440-454.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854889016004004>
- Guerra, N. G., Huesmann, L. R., & Hanish, L. (1995). The role of normative beliefs in children's social behavior. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Social development: Review of personality and social psychology* (pp. 140-158). Sage.
- Guerra, N. G. & Slaby, R. G. (1989). Evaluative factors in social problem solving by aggressive boys. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 17*, 277-289.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00917399>
- Hawkins, J. D., Kosterman, R., Catalano, R. F., Hill, K. G., & Abbott, R. D. (2008). Effects of social development intervention in childhood 15 years later. *Archives of Pediatric Adolescent Medicine, 162*(12), 1133-1141.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/archpedi.162.12.1133>
- Hellman, D. A., & Beaton, S. (1986). The pattern of violence in urban public schools: The influence of school and community. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 23*(2), 102-127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427886023002002>
- Hemmeler, M. R. (2011). *Social and emotional competency and exclusionary discipline*. [Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global. http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=osu1301855137
- Hemphill, S. A., Toumbourou, J. W., Herrenkohl, T. I., McMorris, B. J., & Catalano, R. G. (2006). The effect of school suspensions and arrests on subsequent adolescent

- antisocial behavior in Australia and the United States. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 39(5), 736-744. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2006.05.010>
- Hersh, R., & Walker, H. M. (1983). Great expectations: Making school effective for all students. *Policy Studies Review*, 2, 47-188.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED280199.pdf#page=146>
- Hinze-Pifer, R. & Sartain, L. (2018). Rethinking universal suspension for severe student behavior. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 93(2), 228-243.
<https://consortium.uchicago.edu/publications/rethinking-universal-suspension-severe-student-behavior>
- Hochman, S. R., & Worner, W. (1987). In-school suspension and group counseling: Helping at-risk students. *NASSP Bulletin*, 71, 93-97.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/019263658707150124>
- Hoffman, M. L. (2000). *Empathy and moral development: Implications for caring and justice*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511805851>
- Hoglund, W. L. G., Lalonde, C. E., & Leadbeater, B. J. (2008). Social-cognitive competence, peer rejection and neglect, and behavioral and emotional problems in middle childhood. *Social Development*, 17, 528-553.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.14679507.2007.00449.x>
- Hubbard, J. A., Dodge, K. A., Cillessen, A. H., Coie, J. D., & Schwartz, D. (2001). The dyadic nature of social information processing in boys' reactive and proactive aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 268-280.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.80.2.268>
- Huesmann, L. R. (1988). An information processing model for the development of aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 14, 13-24. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-2337\(1988\)14:1<13::aid-ab2480140104>3.0.co;2-j](https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-2337(1988)14:1<13::aid-ab2480140104>3.0.co;2-j)

- Ikeda, M. J., Neessen, E., & Witt, J. C. (2008). Best practices in universal screening. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 103-114). National Association of School Psychologists.
- Jenkins, P. H. (1997). School delinquency and the school social bond. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 34(3), 337-367.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427897034003003>
- Jiménez, T. I., & Estévez, E. (2017). School aggression in adolescence: Examining the role of individual, family, and school variables. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 17, 251-260.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijchp.2017.07.002>
- Johnson, Z. D., Goldman, Z. W., & Claus, C. J. (2019). Why do students misbehave? An initial examination of antecedents to student misbehavior. *Communication Quarterly*, 67(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2018.1483958>
- Jolliffe, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2004). Empathy and offending: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Aggressive and Violent Behavior*, 9, 441-476.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2003.03.001>
- Kamphaus, R. W., & Reynolds, C. R. (n.d.). BASC-3 Behavioral and Emotional Screening System. Pearson. <https://bit.ly/2RN5LGn>
- Kaufman, J. S., Jaser, S. S., Vaughan, E. L., Reynolds, J. S., Di Donato, J., Bernard, S. N., & Hernandez-Brereton, M. (2010). Patterns in office referral data by grade, race/ethnicity, and gender. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 12(1), 44-54.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300708329710>
- Kessler, R. C., Heeringa, S., Lakoma, M. D., Peukhova, M., Rupp, A. E., Schoenbaum, M., Wang, P. & Zaslavsky, A. M. (2008). Individual and societal effects of

- mental disorders on earnings in the United States: Results from the national comorbidity survey replication. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 165(6), 703-11.
<https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2008.08010126>
- Kincaid, A. P., & Sullivan, A. L. (2019). Double jeopardy? Disproportionality in first juvenile court involvement by disability status. *Exceptional Children*, 85(4), 453-470. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0014402918819101>
- Kuther, T. L. (2000). Moral reasoning, perceived competence, and adolescent engagement in risky activity. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23, 599-604.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/jado.2000.0346>
- Lane, K. L., Givner, C. C., & Pierson, M. R. (2004). Teacher expectations of student behavior: Social skills necessary for success in elementary school classrooms. *Journal of Special Education*, 38, 104-110. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00224669040380020401>
- Lane, K. L., Stanton-Chapman, T., Jamison, K. R., & Phillips, A. (2007). Teacher and parent expectations of preschoolers' behavior: Social skills necessary for success. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 27, 86-97.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/02711214070270020401>
- Lansford, J. E., Malone, P. S., Dodge, K. A., Crozier, J. C., Pettit, G. S., & Bates, J. E. (2006). A 12-year prospective study of patterns of social information processing problems and externalizing behaviors. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 34, 715-724. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-006-9057-4>
- Lebuffe, P. A., Shapiro, V.B., & Naglieri, J. A. (2009). *The Devereux Student Strengths Assessment (DESSA)*. Kaplan Press.

- Losel, F., Bliesener, T., & Bender, D. (2007). Social information processing, experiences of aggression in social contexts, and aggressive behavior in adolescents. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34, 330-347. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854806295833>
- Losen, D. J. (2015). Introduction. In D. J. Losen (Ed.), *Closing the school discipline gap: Equitable remedies for excessive exclusion* (pp. 1-13). Teachers College Press.
- Losen, D. J., Hodson, C., Keith, M., Morrison, K., & Belway, S. (2015). *Are we closing the school discipline gap?* Civil Rights Project, University of California-Los Angeles. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2t36g571#author>
- Losen, D. J., & Martinez, P. (2020). *Lost opportunities: How disparate school discipline continues to drive differences in the opportunity to learn*. Learning Policy Institute & The Center for Civil Rights Remedies at the Civil Rights Project. <https://bit.ly/3zo7OBB>
- Lovett, B. J., & Sheffield, R. A. (2007). Affective empathy deficits in aggressive children and adolescents: A critical review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 27, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2006.03.003>
- Malti, T., Gasser, L., & Buchmann, M. (2009). Aggressive and prosocial children's emotion attributions and moral reasoning. *Aggressive Behavior*, 35, 90-102. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20289>
- Marchbanks III, M. P., Blake, J. J., Smith, D., Seibert, A., Carmichael, D., Booth, E. A., & Fabelo, T. (2014). More than a drop in the bucket: The social and economic costs of dropouts and grade retentions associated with exclusionary discipline. *Journal of Applied Research on Children: Informing Policy for Children at Risk*, 5(2), 1-34. <http://digitalcommons.library.tmc.edu/childrenatrisk/vol5/iss2/17>

- Martinez, A., McMahon, S. D., & Treger, S. (2016). Individual- and school-level predictors of student office discipline referrals. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorder, 24*(1), 30-41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1063426615588289>
- McIntosh, K., Frank, J. L., & Spaulding, S. A. (2010). Establishing research-based trajectories of office discipline referrals for individual students. *School Psychology Review, 39*(3), 380-394. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.2010.12087759>
- McKevitt, B. C., & Braaksma, A. D. (2008). Best practices in developing a positive behavior support system at the school level. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology* (Vol. 5, pp. 735-747). National Association of School Psychologists. https://thewatsoninstitute.org/nu_upload/files/PBIS%20Best%20Practices.pdf
- McNeill, K. F., Friedman, B. D., & Chavez, C. (2016). Keep them so you can teach them: Alternatives to exclusionary discipline. *International Public Health Journal, 8*(2), 169-181. <https://bit.ly/3zomBfD>
- Menesini, E., & Camodeca, M. (2008). Shame and guilt as behaviour regulators: Relationships with bullying, victimization, and prosocial behaviour. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 26*, 183-196. <https://doi.org/10.1348/026151007X205281>
- Merrell, K.W. & Gueldner, B.A. (2010). *Social and emotional learning in the classroom: Promoting mental health and academic success*. The Guilford Press.
- Mikami, A. Y., Lee, S. S., Hinshaw, S. P., & Mullin, B. C. (2008). Relationships between social information processing and aggression among adolescent girls with and without ADHD. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 37*, 761-771. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-007-9237-8>

- Monahan, K. C., Van Derhei, S., Bechtold, J., & Cauffman, E. (2014). From the school yard to the squad car: School discipline, truancy, and arrest. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 43, 1110-1122. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-014-0103-1>
- Morris, M. W. (2012). *Race, gender, and the school to prison pipeline: Expanding our discussion to include black girls*. African American Policy Forum. <http://schottfoundation.org/resources/race-gender-and-school-prison-pipeline-expanding-our-discussion-include-black-girls>
- Morris, R.C. & Howard, A.C. (2003). Designing an effective in-school suspension program. *The Clearing House*, 76(3), 156-159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00098650309601994>
- Naglieri, J. A., LeBuffe, P., & Shapiro, V. B. (2011). Universal screening for social-emotional competencies: A study of the reliability and validity of the DESSA-Mini. *Psychology in the Schools*, 48, 660-671. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20586>
- Naser, S., Brown, J., & Verlenden, J. (2018). The utility of universal screening to guide school-based prevention initiatives: Comparison of office discipline referrals to standardized emotional and behavioral risk screening. *Contemporary School Psychology*, 22(4), 424-434. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-018-0173-2>
- National Association of School Psychologists (2010). *Model for comprehensive and integrated school psychological services*. <https://www.nasponline.org/x40589.xml>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (n.d.). *Collecting race and ethnicity data from students and staff using the new categories*. <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/report-your-data/race-ethnicity-collecting-data-for-reporting-purposes>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2020). *Racial/ ethnic enrollment in public schools*.

- https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cge.asp#:~:text=In%20fall%202017%2C%20of%20the,million%20were%20American%20Indian%2FAlaska
- Nickerson, A. B., & Fishman, C. (2009). Convergent and divergent validity of the Devereux Student Strengths Assessment. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 2, 357-372. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015147>
- Nishioka, V., Shigeoka, S., & Lolich, E. (2017). *School discipline data indicators: A guide for districts and schools* (REL 017-240). <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED573680.pdf>
- Noguera, P. A. (2003). Schools, prisons, and social implications of punishment: Rethinking disciplinary practices. *Theory into Practice*, 42(4), 341-350. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1477398>
- Noltemeyer, A., & Mcloughlin, C. S. (2010a). Patterns of exclusionary discipline by school typology, ethnicity, and their interaction. *Perspectives on Urban Education*, 27-40. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ894465.pdf>
- Noltemeyer, A., & Mcloughlin, C. S. (2010b). Changes in exclusionary discipline rates and disciplinary disproportionality over time. *International Journal of Special Education*, 25(1), 59-70. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED573680.pdf>
- Palmer, E. J., & Hollin, C. R. (2001). Sociomoral reasoning, perceptions of parenting, and self-reported delinquency in adolescents. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 15, 85-100. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-0720\(200101/02\)15:1<85::AID-ACP691>3.0.CO;2-6](https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-0720(200101/02)15:1<85::AID-ACP691>3.0.CO;2-6)
- Pane, D. M., Rocco, T. S., Miller, L. D., & Salmon, A. K. (2014). How teachers use power in the classroom to avoid or support exclusionary school discipline practices. *Urban Education*, 49 (3), 297-328. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085913478620>

- Pas, E. T., Bradshaw, C. P., & Mitchell, M. M. (2011). Examining the validity of office discipline referrals as an indicator of student behavior problems. *Psychology in the Schools, 48*(6), 541-555. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20577>
- Peguero, A. A., Connell, N. M., & Hong, J. S. (2018). Introduction to the special issue: "School violence and safety." *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 16*(2), 119-123. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204016680404>
- Perry, B. L. & Morris, E. W. (2014). Suspending progress: Collateral consequences of exclusionary punishment in public schools. *American Sociological Review, 79*(6), 1067-1087. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122414556308>
- Petras, H., Masyn, K. E., Buckley, J. A., Ialongo, N. S., & Kellam, S. (2011). Who is most at risk for school removal? A multilevel discrete-time survival analysis of individual- and context-level influences. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 103*, 223-237. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021545>
- Putnam, R. F., Luiselli, J. K., Handler, M. W., & Jefferson, G. L. (2003). Evaluating student discipline practices in a public school through behavioral assessment of office referrals. *Behavior Modification, 27*, 505-523. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0145445503255569>
- Quiggle, N. L., Garber, J., Panak, W. F., & Dodge, K. A. (1992). Social information processing in aggressive and depressed children. *Child Development, 63*, 1305-1320. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1131557>
- Raffaele-Mendez, L.M. (2003). Predictors of suspension and negative school outcomes: A longitudinal investigation. *New Directions for Youth Development, 2003*(99), 17-33. <https://doi.org/10.1002/yd.52>
- Reis, J., Trockel, M., & Mulhall, P. (2007). Individual and school predictors of middle school aggression. *Youth & Society, 38*(3), 322-347.

- <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118x06287688>
- Ritter, G. W. (2018). Reviewing the progress of school discipline reform. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 93(2), 133-138.
- <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956x.2018.1435034>
- Schanding, G. T., Jr., & Nowell, K. P. (2013). Universal screening for emotional and behavioral problems: Fitting a population-based model. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 29(1), 104-119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15377903.2013.751479>
- Schultz, D., Izard, C. E., & Ackerman, B. P. (2000). Children's anger attribution bias: Relations to family environment and social adjustment. *Social Development*, 9, 284-301. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9507.00126>
- Schweinhart, L. J., & Weikart, D. P. (1989). Early childhood experiences and its effects. In L. A. Bond & B. E. Compas (Eds.), *Primary prevention and promotion in the schools* (pp. 81-105). Sage Publications, Inc.
- Shaywitz, S. (2003). *Overcoming dyslexia: A new and complete science-based program for reading problems at any level*. Knopf.
- Short, P.M. (1988). *Planning and developing in-school suspension programs*. Monographs in Education Number 9.
- Sijtsema, J. J., Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., & Salmivalli, C. (2009). Empirical test of bullies' status goals: Assessing direct goals, aggression, and prestige. *Aggressive Behavior*, 35, 57-67. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20282>
- Simpson, R. G. (2017). *A case study of the perceived impact of disruptive behavior among grades 9 and 11 students on their academic performance at a corporate high school* (Publication No. 10683742) [Doctoral dissertation, Temple University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. <https://bit.ly/3viFUDL>

- Simson, D. (2014). Exclusion, punishment, racism, and our schools: A critical race and theory perspective on school discipline. *UCLA Law Review*, *61*, 506-563.
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2129117
- Skiba, R. J. (2000). *Zero tolerance, zero evidence: An analysis of school disciplinary practice*. Indiana Education Policy Center.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/yd.23320019204>
- Skiba, R. J., Arredondo, M. I., & Williams, N. T. (2014a). More than a metaphor: The contribution of exclusionary discipline to a school-to-prison pipeline. *Equity & Excellence in education*, *47*(4), 546-564.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2014.958965>
- Skiba, R. J., Chung, C., Trachok, M., Baker, T., Sheya, A., & Hughes, R. (2014b). Parsing disciplinary disproportionality: Contributions of infraction, student, and school characteristics to out-of-school suspension and expulsion. *American Educational Research Journal*, *51*, 640-670.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831214541670>
- Skiba, R., & Losen, D. (2016). From Reaction to Prevention: Turning the Page on School Discipline. *The American Educator*, *39*, 4-11, 44. <https://bit.ly/2TW00GU>
- Skiba, R. J., Michael, R. S., Nardo, A. C., & Peterson, R. (2002). The color of discipline: Sources of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment. *Urban Review*, *34*, 317-342. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/A:1021320817372>
- Skiba, R. J., & Noam, G. G. (2001). Editors' Notes. *New Directions for Youth Development*, *2001*(92), 1-6.
<https://doi-org.libproxy.uhcl.edu/10.1002/yd.23320019202>

- Skiba, R. J., & Peterson, R. L. (1999). The dark side of zero tolerance: Can punishment lead to safe schools? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(5), 372-382.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/20439450>
- Skiba, R. J., & Peterson, R. L. (2003). School discipline at a crossroads: From zero tolerance to early response. *Exceptional Children*, 66(3), 335-347.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/001440290006600305>
- Skiba, R., Simmons, A., Staudinger, L., Rausch, M., Dow, G., & Feggins, R. (2003). *Consistent removal: Contributions of school discipline to the school-prison pipeline*. School to Prison Pipeline Conference: Harvard Civil Rights Project.
<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Consistent-Removal%3A-Contributions-of-School-to-the-Skiba-Simmons/37323a791d865434710670bdfbcbcc27dd899bd9>
- Sklad, M., Diekstra, R., De Ritter, M., & Ben, J. (2012). Effectiveness of school-based universal, social, emotional, and behavioral programs: Do they enhance students' development in the area of skill, behavior, and adjustment? *Psychology in the Schools*, 49, 892-909. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.21641>
- Spaulding, S. A., Irvin, L. K., Horner, R. H., May, S. L., Emeldi, M., Tobin, T. J., & Sugai, G. (2008). School-wide social-behavioral climate, student problem behavior, and administrative decisions: Empirical patterns from 1,510 schools nationwide. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 12, 69-85. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300708329011>
- Spaulding, S. A., & Frank, J. L. (2009). *Evaluation brief: The relation between office discipline referrals and school enrollment status: Do rates differ based on enrollment size?* Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports.
<https://bit.ly/3xm5UPY>

- Spaulding, S. A., Irvin, L. K., Horner, R. H., May, S. L., Emeldi, M., Tobin, T. J., & Sugai, G. (2010). School-wide social-behavioral climate, student problem behavior, and related administrative decisions: Empirical patterns from 1,510 schools nationwide. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 12*, 69-85.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300708329011>
- Sprague, J. R., Sugai, G., Horner, R., & Walker, H. M. (1999). Using office discipline referral data to evaluate school-wide discipline and violence prevention interventions. Oregon School Study Council.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED427438.pdf>
- Sprague, J. R., Walker, H. M., Stieber, S., Simonsen, B., Nishioka, V., & Wagner, L. (2001). Exploring the relationship between school discipline referrals and delinquency. *Psychology in the Schools, 38*(2), 197-206.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.1010>
- Stams, G. J., Brugman, D., Dekovic, M., van Rosmalen, L., van der Laan, P., & Gibbs, J. C. (2006). The moral judgment of juvenile delinquents: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 34*, 697-713. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-006-9056-5>
- Steinberg, M. P., Allensworth, E., & Johnson, D. W. (2011). *Student and teacher safety in Chicago public schools: The roles of community context and school social organization*. University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED519414.pdf>
- Stormont, M., Reinke, W. M., Herman, K. C., & Lembke, E. S. (2012). *Academic and behavior supports for at-risk students: Tier 2 interventions*. The Guilford Press.
- Strein, W. & Koehler, J. (2008). Best practices in developing prevention strategies for school psychology practice. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in*

- school psychology* (Vol. 4, pp. 1309-1322). National Association of School Psychologists. <https://bit.ly/35j9Yoh>
- Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2008). What we know and need to know about preventing problem behavior in schools. *Exceptionality, 16*(2), 67–77.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09362830801981138>
- Sullivan, T. N., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2012). Introduction to the special issue of Behavioral Disorders: Serving the needs of youth with disabilities through school-based violence prevention efforts. *Behavioral Disorders, 37*(7), 129-132.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/019874291203700301>
- Swearer, S. M., Espelage, D. L., & Napolitano, S. A. (2009). *Bullying prevention and intervention: Realistic strategies for schools*. The Guilford Press.
- Tangney, J. P., Stuewig, J., & Mashek, D. J. (2007). Moral emotions and moral behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 345-372
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070145>.
- Tefera, A. A., & Fischman, G. E. (2020). How and why context matters in the study of racial disproportionality in special education: Toward a critical disability education policy approach. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 53*(4), 434-449.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2020.1791284>
- The Associated Press. (2005, May 7). *National briefing: South: Georgia: Student suspended after call*. The New York Times.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2005/05/07/us/national-briefing-south-georgia-student-suspended-after-call.html>
- Tobin, T., Sugai, G., & Colvin, G. (1996). Patterns in middle school discipline records. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 4*(2), 82-94.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070145>

- Trentacosta, C. J., Hyde, L. W., Goodlett, B. D., & Shaw, D. S. (2013). Longitudinal prediction of disruptive behavior disorders in adolescent males from multiple risk domains. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development, 44*(4), 561-572.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10578-012-0349-3>
- U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (2019). *Beyond suspensions: Examining school discipline policies and connections to the school-to-prison pipeline for students of color with disabilities*. <https://www.usccr.gov/pubs/2019/07-23-Beyond-Suspensions.pdf>.
- U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights. (2014). *Civil rights data collection data snapshot: School discipline*. <https://ocrdata.ed.gov/assets/downloads/CRDC-School-Discipline-Snapshot.pdf>
- Weiner, B. (2006). *Social motivation, justice, and the moral emotions: An attributional approach*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410615749>
- Weissberg, R. P., Durlak, J. A., Domitrovich, C.E., & Gullotta, T.P. (2015). Social and emotional learning: Past, present, and future. In J. A. Durlak, C. E. Domitrovich, R. P. Weissberg, & T .P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Handbook of social and emotional learning* (pp. 3-19). The Guilford Press.
- Welch, K., & Payne, A. A. (2010). Racial threat and punitive school discipline. *Social Problems, 57*, 25-48. <https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2010.57.1.25>
- Welch, K., & Payne, A. A. (2012). Exclusionary school punishment: The effect of racial threat on expulsion and suspension. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 10*(2), 155-171.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204011423766>

- Werner, N., & Nixon, C. L. (2005). Normative beliefs and relational aggression: An investigation of the cognitive bases of adolescent aggressive behavior. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 34, 229-243. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-005-4306-3>
- Williamson, A. A., Modecki, K. L., & Guerra, N. G. (2015). SEL programs in high school. In J. A. Durlak, C. E. Domitrovich, R. P. Weissberg, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Handbook of social and emotional learning: Research and practice* (pp. 181-196). The Guilford Press.
- Wilson, S. J., & Lipsey, M. W. (2007). School-based interventions for aggressive and disruptive behavior: Update of a meta-analysis. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 33(2), S130-S143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2007.04.011>
- Woidneck, M. (2011). *Exploring the relation between office discipline referrals and reinforcement rates in schoolwide positive behavior support programs*. (Publication No. 3440437) [Doctoral dissertation, Utah State University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/19681516.pdf>
- Young, N. D., & Michael, C. N. (2014). *Betwixt and between: Understanding and meeting the social and emotional development needs of students during the middle school transition years*. Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Zelli, A., Dodge, K. A., Lochman, J. E., & Laird, R. D. (1999). The distinction between beliefs legitimizing aggression and deviant processing of social cues: Testing measurement validity and the hypothesis that biased processing mediates the effects of beliefs on aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 150-166. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.77.1.150>
- Zins, J. E., Bloodworth, M. R., Weissberg, R. P., & Walberg, H. J. (2007). The scientific base linking social and emotional learning to school success. *Journal of*

Educational and Psychological Consultation, 17, 191-210.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10474410701413145>

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

Zins, J. E., Elias, M. J., & Greenberg, M. (2003). Facilitating success in school and in life through social and emotional learning. *Perspectives in Education*, 21(4), 55–67.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/297376674_Facilitating_success_in_school_and_in_life_through_social_and_emotional_learning

APPENDIX A:

TABLES

Table 1

Elementary, Middle, and High School Demographics

| Demographic Characteristic | Elementary School Frequency (Percent) <i>n</i> = 792 | Middle School Frequency (Percent) <i>n</i> = 503 | High School Frequency (Percent) <i>n</i> = 890 |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Sex | | | |
| Female | 402 (50.8) | 276 (54.9) | 473 (53.1) |
| Male | 390 (49.2) | 227 (45.1) | 417 (46.9) |
| Ethnicity | | | |
| Hispanic | 534 (67.4) | 311 (61.8) | 606 (68.1) |
| Non-Hispanic | 258 (32.6) | 192 (38.2) | 284 (31.9) |
| Race | | | |
| Black | 186 (23.5) | 168 (33.4) | 221 (24.8) |
| White | 506 (63.9) | 240 (47.7) | 356 (40.0) |
| American Indian/ Alaska Native | 65 (8.2) | 79 (15.7) | 273 (30.7) |
| Other | 35 (4.4) | 16 (3.2) | 38 (4.3) |
| Age | | | |
| 5 | 27 (3.4) | 0 (0.00) | 0 (0.00) |
| 6 | 383 (48.4) | 0 (0.00) | 0 (0.00) |
| 7 | 85 (10.7) | 0 (0.00) | 0 (0.00) |
| 8 | 25 (3.2) | 0 (0.00) | 0 (0.00) |

Table 1 (continued)*Elementary, Middle, and High School Demographics*

| Demographic Characteristic | Elementary School Frequency (Percent) | Middle School Frequency (Percent) | High School Frequency (Percent) |
|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 9 | 100 (12.6) | 0 (0.00) | 0 (0.00) |
| 10 | 132 (16.7) | 0 (0.00) | 0 (0.00) |
| 11 | 37 (4.7) | 19 (3.8) | 0 (0.00) |
| 12 | 0 (0.00) | 172 (34.2) | 1 (0.10) |
| 13 | 0 (0.00) | 170 (33.8) | 16 (1.8) |
| 14 | 0 (0.00) | 119 (23.7) | 223 (25.1) |
| 15 | 0 (0.00) | 22 (4.4) | 241 (27.1) |
| 16 | 0 (0.00) | 0 (0.00) | 217 (24.4) |
| 17 | 0 (0.00) | 1 (0.20) | 169 (19.0) |
| 18 | 0 (0.00) | 0 (0.00) | 19 (2.1) |
| 19 | 0 (0.00) | 0 (0.00) | 3 (0.3) |
| 20 | 0 (0.00) | 0 (0.00) | 1 (0.1) |
| 21 | 0 (0.00) | 0 (0.00) | 1 (0.10) |
| Special Education Eligibility | | | |
| Eligible | 98 (12.4) | 35 (7.0) | 59 (6.6) |
| Not Eligible | 694 (87.6) | 468 (93.0) | 831 (93.4) |

Table 2

Office Discipline Referral Frequency in Elementary, Middle, and High School Samples, 2017-2018

| Number of ODRs | Elementary School | Middle School | High School |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Frequency (Percent) | Frequency (Percent) | Frequency (Percent) |
| 0 | 768 (97.00) | 391 (77.70) | 735 (82.60) |
| 1 | 18 (2.30) | 65 (12.90) | 85 (9.60) |
| 2 | 3 (0.40) | 24 (4.80) | 25 (2.80) |
| 3 | 2 (0.30) | 12 (2.40) | 22 (2.50) |
| 4 | 1 (0.10) | 4 (0.80) | 9 (1.00) |
| 5 | 0 (0.00) | 3 (0.60) | 4 (0.40) |
| 6 | 0 (0.00) | 1 (0.20) | 7 (0.80) |
| 7 | 0 (0.00) | 2 (0.40) | 2 (0.20) |
| 8 | 0 (0.00) | 1 (0.20) | 0 (0.00) |
| 9 | 0 (0.00) | 0 (0.00) | 1 (0.10) |
| Total | 792 | 503 | 890 |

Table 3*SELSI Teacher Form Ages 2-5 Descriptive Statistics & Internal Reliability (N = 655)*

| | Range | Min. | Max. | Mean | SD | α |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------|
| Relationship Skills | 46.20 | 20.73 | 66.93 | 49.95 | 9.98 | .933 |
| Responsible Decision-Making | 46.82 | 20.98 | 67.80 | 49.96 | 9.99 | .877 |
| Self-Awareness | 49.44 | 18.98 | 68.43 | 49.98 | 10.01 | .867 |
| Self-Management | 48.51 | 20.21 | 68.73 | 49.97 | 10.00 | .844 |
| Social-Awareness | 47.61 | 21.08 | 68.69 | 49.97 | 10.00 | .909 |
| Total SEL | 48.79 | 20.58 | 69.37 | 49.96 | 9.99 | .974 |

Table 4*SELSI Teacher Form Ages 6-11 Descriptive Statistics & Internal Reliability (N = 721)*

| | Range | Min. | Max. | Mean | SD | α |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------|
| Relationship Skills | 38.96 | 24.39 | 63.35 | 50.01 | 10.01 | .950 |
| Responsible Decision-Making | 47.28 | 17.32 | 64.60 | 50.01 | 10.00 | .907 |
| Self-Awareness | 42.90 | 22.23 | 65.13 | 50.02 | 10.01 | .924 |
| Self-Management | 42.63 | 22.36 | 64.99 | 50.01 | 10.01 | .896 |
| Social-Awareness | 42.64 | 21.01 | 63.65 | 50.00 | 10.01 | .947 |
| Total SEL | 41.51 | 23.47 | 64.97 | 50.01 | 10.01 | .983 |

Table 5*SELSI Teacher Form Ages 12-21 Descriptive Statistics & Internal Reliability (N = 1282)*

| | Range | Min. | Max. | Mean | SD | α |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------|
| Relationship Skills | 41.60 | 22.31 | 63.90 | 49.99 | 10.00 | .950 |
| Responsible Decision-Making | 45.00 | 18.48 | 63.48 | 49.99 | 10.00 | .922 |
| Self-Awareness | 38.92 | 24.83 | 63.75 | 49.99 | 10.00 | .952 |
| Self-Management- | 45.54 | 18.75 | 64.29 | 50.00 | 10.00 | .877 |
| Social-Awareness | 39.36 | 23.36 | 62.62 | 49.99 | 10.00 | .959 |
| Total SEL | 42.52 | 21.72 | 64.24 | 49.99 | 10.00 | .986 |

Table 6*Elementary Schools: Total SEL Score Predicting Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR^2 | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 1 | .22 | .05**** | .000 | .04 | .05**** | .000 | | | | | .05 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .002 | -3.07 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .11** | .002 | 3.08 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .16** | .002 | 3.05 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind./ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AK Nat. | | | | | | | -.02 | .682 | -.41 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .06 | .098 | 1.66 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .04 | .427 | .80 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | .11** | .001 | 3.23 | .01 | |
| Model 2 | .22 | .05**** | .000 | .04 | .00 | .155 | | | | | .00 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .002 | -3.18 | .00 | |
| Male | | | | | | | .12** | .001 | 3.28 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .16** | .002 | 3.06 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind./ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AK Nat. | | | | | | | -.01 | .692 | -.40 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .06 | .098 | 1.66 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .04 | .446 | .76 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | .12** | .001 | 3.42 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | -.05 | .155 | -1.42 | .00 | |

Table 6 (continued)

Elementary Schools: Total SEL Score Predicting Office Discipline Referrals

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR ² | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|--------|--------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 3 | .30 | .09*** | .000 | .08 | .04*** | .000 | | | | .00 | .05 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .033 | 2.14 | .00 | |
| Male | | | | | | | .08* | .033 | 2.14 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .16** | .003 | 2.99 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind./ AK Nat. | | | | | | | -.01 | .793 | -.26 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .06 | .120 | 1.56 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .07 | .195 | 1.30 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | .10** | .004 | 2.91 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | -.10** | .005 | -2.81 | .01 | |
| Total SEL | | | | | | | - | .000 | -5.96 | .04 | |
| | | | | | | | | .22*** | | | |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 7*Elementary School: Self-Awareness as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR^2 | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|---------------|--------------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 1 | .22 | .05*** | .000 | .04 | .05*** | .000 | | | | | .05 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .002 | -3.07 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .11** | .002 | 3.08 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .16** | .002 | 3.05 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | -.02 | .682 | -.41 | .00 | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | | .06 | .098 | 1.66 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .04 | .427 | .80 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | .11** | .001 | 3.23 | .01 | |
| Model 2 | .22 | .05*** | .000 | .04 | .00 | .155 | | | | | .00 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .002 | -3.18 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .12** | .001 | 3.28 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .16** | .002 | 3.06 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | -.01 | .692 | -.40 | .00 | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | | .06 | .098 | 1.66 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .04 | .446 | .76 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | .12** | .001 | 3.42 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | -.05 | .155 | -1.42 | .00 | |

Table 7 (continued)

Elementary School: Self-Awareness as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR ² | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 3 | .29 | .08*** | .000 | .07 | .03*** | .000 | | | | | .04 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .112 | 1.59 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .09* | .012 | 2.51 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .16** | .003 | 2.95 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | -.01 | .740 | -.33 | .00 | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | | .06 | .104 | 1.63 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .05 | .356 | .92 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | .11** | .002 | 3.16 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | -.09* | .010 | -2.58 | .01 | |
| Self-Awareness | | | | | | | -.19*** | .000 | -5.28 | .03 | |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 8*Elementary School: Self-Management as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR^2 | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|-----------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|---------------|--------------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 1 | .22 | .05*** | .000 | .04 | .05*** | .000 | | | | | .05 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .002 | -3.07 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .11** | .002 | 3.08 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .16** | .002 | 3.05 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK Nat. | | | | | | | -.02 | .682 | -.41 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .06 | .098 | 1.66 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .04 | .427 | .80 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | .11** | .001 | 3.23 | .01 | |
| Model 2 | .22 | .05*** | .000 | .04 | .00 | .155 | | | | .00 | .00 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .002 | -3.18 | .00 | |
| Male | | | | | | | .12** | .001 | 3.28 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .16** | .002 | 3.06 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK Nat. | | | | | | | -.01 | .692 | -.40 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .06 | .098 | 1.66 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .04 | .446 | .76 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | .12** | .001 | 3.42 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | -.05 | .155 | -1.42 | .00 | |

Table 8 (continued)

Elementary School: Self-Management as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR ² | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|---------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 3 | .30 | .09*** | .000 | .08 | .04*** | .000 | | | | .00 | .05 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .054 | 1.93 | .00 | |
| Male | | | | | | | .09* | .014 | 2.45 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .15** | .003 | 2.96 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | -.01 | .829 | -.22 | .00 | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | | .05 | .151 | 1.44 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .08 | .135 | 1.50 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | .11** | .002 | 3.06 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | -.10** | .006 | -2.74 | .01 | |
| Self- Management | | | | | | | -.22*** | .000 | -5.91 | .04 | |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 9*Elementary School: Social Awareness as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR^2 | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|---------------|--------------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 1 | .22 | .05*** | .000 | .04 | .05*** | .000 | | | | | .05 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .002 | -3.07 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .11** | .002 | 3.08 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .16** | .002 | 3.05 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.02 | .682 | -.41 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .06 | .098 | 1.66 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .04 | .427 | .80 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | .11** | .001 | 3.23 | .01 | |
| Model 2 | .22 | .05*** | .000 | .04 | .00 | .155 | | | | | .00 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .002 | -3.18 | .00 | |
| Male | | | | | | | .12** | .001 | 3.28 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .16** | .002 | 3.06 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.01 | .692 | -.40 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .06 | .098 | 1.66 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .04 | .446 | .76 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | .12** | .001 | 3.42 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | -.05 | .155 | -1.42 | .00 | |

Table 9 (continued)*Elementary School: Social Awareness as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR^2 | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|---------------|--------------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 3 | .29 | .09*** | .000 | .08 | .04*** | .000 | | | | .00 | .04 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .058 | 1.90 | .00 | |
| Male | | | | | | | .08* | .029 | 2.19 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .16** | .003 | 2.95 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | -.01 | .783 | -.28 | .00 | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | | .05 | .131 | 1.51 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .06 | .285 | 1.07 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | .10** | .004 | 2.90 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | -.10** | .006 | -2.75 | .01 | |
| Social Awareness | | | | | | | - | .000 | -5.52 | .04 | |
| | | | | | | | .21*** | | | | |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 10*Elementary School: Relationship Skills as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR^2 | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|---------------|--------------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 1 | .22 | .05*** | .000 | .04 | .05*** | .000 | | | | | .05 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .002 | | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .11** | .002 | 3.08 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .16** | .002 | 3.05 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | -.02 | .682 | -.41 | .00 | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | | .06 | .098 | 1.66 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .04 | .427 | .80 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | .11** | .001 | 3.23 | .01 | |
| Model 2 | .22 | .05*** | .000 | .04 | .00 | .155 | | | | | .00 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .002 | -3.18 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .12** | .001 | 3.28 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .16** | .002 | 3.06 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | -.01 | .692 | -.40 | .00 | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | | .06 | .098 | 1.66 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .04 | .446 | .76 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | .12** | .001 | 3.42 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | -.05 | .155 | -1.42 | .00 | |

Table 10 (continued)*Elementary School: Relationship Skills as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR ² | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|------------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 3 | .29 | .09*** | .000 | .08 | .04*** | .000 | | | | | .04 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .050 | 1.96 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .08* | .031 | 2.17 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .16** | .002 | 3.04 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK Nat. | | | | | | | -.01 | .770 | -.29 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .06 | .109 | 1.61 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .07 | .193 | 1.30 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | .10** | .006 | 2.75 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | -.09* | .012 | -2.52 | .01 | |
| Relationship Skills | | | | | | | -.21*** | .000 | -5.63 | .04 | |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 11*Elementary School: Responsible Decision-Making as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR^2 | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|---------------|--------------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 1 | .22 | .05*** | .000 | .04 | .05*** | .000 | | | | | .05 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .002 | -3.07 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .11** | .002 | 3.08 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .16** | .002 | 3.05 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.02 | .682 | -.41 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .06 | .098 | 1.66 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .04 | .427 | .80 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | .11** | .001 | 3.23 | .01 | |
| Model 2 | .22 | .05*** | .000 | .04 | .00 | .155 | | | | | .00 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .002 | -3.18 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .12** | .001 | 3.28 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .16 | .002 | 3.06 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.01 | .692 | -.40 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .06 | .098 | 1.66 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .04 | .446 | .76 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | .12** | .001 | 3.42 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | -.05 | .155 | -1.42 | .00 | |

Table 11 (continued)

Elementary School: Responsible Decision-Making as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR ² | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 3 | .30 | .09*** | .000 | .08 | .04*** | .000 | | | | | .05 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .041 | 2.05 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .07* | .041 | 2.04 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .16** | .003 | 3.02 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AK Nat. | | | | | | | -.01 | .809 | -2.24 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .06 | .106 | 1.62 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .08 | .150 | 1.44 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | .11 | .002 | 3.07 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | -.10 | .006 | -2.76 | .01 | |
| Responsible | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Decision- | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Making | | | | | | | -.22*** | .000 | -5.94 | .04 | |

p* < .05, *p* < .01, ****p* < .001

Table 12*Middle School: Total SEL Score Predicting Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR ² | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 1 | .17 | .03* | .033 | .02 | .03* | .033 | | | | | .03 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .282 | 1.08 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .05 | .280 | 1.08 | .00 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .20* | .010 | 2.60 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.07 | .139 | -1.48 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .01 | .879 | .15 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .12 | .121 | 1.55 | .01 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.04 | .334 | -.97 | .00 | |
| Model 2 | .19 | .04** | .009 | .02 | .01* | .023 | | | | | .01 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .193 | 1.30 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .04 | .393 | .86 | .00 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .19* | .013 | 2.48 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.07 | .121 | -1.55 | .01 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .00 | .960 | .05 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .12 | .130 | 1.52 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.05 | .225 | -1.22 | .00 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | .10* | .023 | 2.27 | .01 | |

Table 12 (continued)*Middle School: Total SEL Score Predicting Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R2 | Sig. | Adj. R2 | Δ R2 | Sig. Δ F | β | Sig. | t | sr2 | f 2 |
|----------------|------------|---------------|-------------|------------|---------------|-----------------|---------|------|-------|-----|------------|
| Model 3 | .30 | .09*** | .000 | .08 | .05*** | .000 | | | | | .06 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 3.60 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | -.01 | .907 | -.12 | .00 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .16* | .031 | 2.16 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.10* | .039 | -2.07 | .01 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .02 | .680 | .41 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .13 | .085 | 1.72 | .01 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.08 | .085 | -1.73 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | .07 | .108 | 1.61 | .01 | |
| Total SEL | | | | | | | -.24*** | .000 | -5.40 | .05 | |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 13*Middle School Self-Awareness as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR^2 | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 1 | .17 | .03* | .033 | .02 | .03* | .033 | | | | | .03 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .282 | 1.08 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .05 | .280 | 1.08 | .00 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .20* | .010 | 2.60 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.07 | .139 | -1.48 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .01 | .879 | .15 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .12 | .121 | 1.55 | .01 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.04 | .334 | -.97 | .00 | |
| Model 2 | .19 | .04** | .009 | .02 | .01* | .023 | | | | | .01 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .193 | 1.30 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .04 | .393 | .86 | .00 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .19* | .013 | 2.48 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.07 | .121 | -1.55 | .01 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .00 | .960 | .05 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .12 | .130 | 1.52 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.05 | .225 | -1.22 | .00 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | .10* | .023 | 2.27 | .01 | |

Table 13 (continued)*Middle School Self-Awareness as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR ² | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | T | sr ² | f ² |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 3 | .26 | .07*** | .000 | .05 | .03*** | .000 | | | | | .03 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .004 | 2.85 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .00 | .935 | .08 | .00 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .19* | .014 | 2.48 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.09* | .046 | -2.00 | .01 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .02 | .733 | .34 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .14 | .076 | 1.78 | .01 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.06 | .153 | -1.43 | .00 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | .09 | .057 | 1.91 | .01 | |
| Self- Awareness | | | | | | | -.18*** | .000 | -3.94 | .03 | |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 14*Middle School Self-Management as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR^2 | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | T | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 1 | .17 | .03* | .033 | .02 | .03* | .033 | | | | | .03 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .282 | 1.08 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .05 | .280 | 1.08 | .00 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .20* | .010 | 2.60 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.07 | .139 | -1.48 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .01 | .879 | .15 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .12 | .121 | 1.55 | .01 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.04 | .334 | -.97 | .00 | |
| Model 2 | .19 | .04** | .009 | .02 | .01* | .023 | | | | | .01 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .193 | 1.30 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .04 | .393 | .86 | .00 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .19* | .013 | 2.48 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.07 | .121 | -1.55 | .01 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .00 | .960 | .05 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .12 | .130 | 1.52 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.05 | .225 | -1.22 | .00 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | .10* | .023 | 2.27 | .01 | |

Table 14 (continued)*Middle School Self-Management as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj . R ² | ΔR ² | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | T | sr ² | f ² |
|-----------------------|------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|-------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 3 | .31 | .09* ** | .000 | .08 | .06*** | .000** * | | | | | .06 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .001 | 3.49 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .01 | .883 | .15 | .00 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .15* | .046 | 2.00 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK Nat. | | | | | | | -.09 | .050 | -1.96 | .01 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .02 | .730 | .35 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .12 | .100 | 1.65 | .01 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.07 | .116 | -1.58 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | .06 | .180 | 1.34 | .00 | |
| Self- Management | | | | | | | - | | | | |
| | | | | | | | .25** | .000 | -5.53 | .06 | |
| | | | | | | | * | | | | |

p* < .05, *p* < .01, ****p* < .001

Table 15*Middle School: Social Awareness as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR ² | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | T | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 1 | .17 | .03* | .033 | .02 | .03* | .033 | | | | | .03 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .282 | 1.08 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .05 | .280 | 1.08 | .00 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .20* | .010 | 2.60 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.07 | .139 | -1.48 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .01 | .879 | .15 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .12 | .121 | 1.55 | .01 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.04 | .334 | -.97 | .00 | |
| Model 2 | .19 | .04** | .009 | .02 | .01* | .023 | | | | .00 | .01 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .193 | 1.30 | .00 | |
| Male | | | | | | | .04 | .393 | .86 | .00 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .19* | .013 | 2.48 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.07 | .121 | -1.55 | .01 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .00 | .960 | .05 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .12 | .130 | 1.52 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.05 | .225 | -1.22 | .00 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | .10* | .023 | 2.27 | .01 | |

Table 15 (continued)

Middle School: Social Awareness as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR ² | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | T | sr ² | f ² |
|-----------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 3 | .29 | .09*** | .000 | .07 | .05*** | .000 | | | | .00 | .05 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 3.66 | .00 | |
| Male | | | | | | | .00 | .945 | -0.07 | .00 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .17* | .027 | 2.22 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK Nat. | | | | | | | -.09* | .047 | -1.99 | .01 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .02 | .632 | .48 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .13 | .096 | 1.67 | .01 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.09 | .054 | -1.93 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | .08 | .083 | 1.74 | .01 | |
| Social Awareness | | | | | | | -.23*** | .000 | -5.16 | .05 | |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 16*Middle School: Relationship Skills as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR ² | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|-----------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 1 | .17 | .03* | .033 | .02 | .03* | .033 | | | | | .03 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .282 | 1.08 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .05 | .280 | 1.08 | .00 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .20* | .010 | 2.60 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK Nat. | | | | | | | -.07 | .139 | -1.48 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .01 | .879 | .15 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .12 | .121 | 1.55 | .01 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.04 | .334 | -.97 | .00 | |
| Model 2 | .19 | .04** | .009 | .02 | .01* | .023 | | | | | .01 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .193 | 1.30 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .04 | .393 | .86 | .00 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .19* | .013 | 2.48 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK Nat. | | | | | | | -.07 | .121 | -1.55 | .01 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .00 | .960 | .05 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .12 | .130 | 1.52 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.05 | .225 | -1.22 | .00 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | .10* | .023 | 2.27 | .01 | |

Table 16 (continued)

Middle School: Relationship Skills as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR ² | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|------------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 3 | .29 | .08*** | .000 | .07 | .05*** | .000 | | | | | .05 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .001 | 3.30 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .00 | .978 | -.03 | .00 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .17 | .026 | 2.23 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK Nat. | | | | | | | -.09 | .051 | -1.96 | .01 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .02 | .730 | .35 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .13 | .084 | 1.73 | .01 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.07 | .119 | -1.56 | .00 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | .08 | .089 | 1.71 | .01 | |
| Relationship Skills | | | | | | | -.23*** | .000 | -5.02 | .05 | |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 17*Middle School: Responsible Decision-Making as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR^2 | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------------|---------|------|--------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 1 | .17 | .03* | .033 | .02 | .03* | .033 | | | | | .03 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .282 | 1.077 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .05 | .280 | 1.083 | .00 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .20* | .010 | 2.597 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | -.07*** | .139 | -1.484 | .00 | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | | .01 | .879 | .152 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .12 | .121 | 1.552 | .01 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.04*** | .334 | -9.68 | .00 | |
| Model 2 | .19 | .04** | .009 | .02 | .01* | .023 | | | | | .01 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .193 | 1.303 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .04 | .393 | .856 | .00 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .19* | .013 | 2.483 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | -.07*** | .121 | -1.554 | .01 | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | | .00 | .960 | .050 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .12 | .130 | 1.517 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.05 | .225 | -1.215 | .00 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | .10* | .023 | 2.273 | .01 | |

Table 17 (continued)

Middle School: Responsible Decision-Making as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR ² | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------|------|--------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 3 | .31 | .10*** | .000 | .08 | .06*** | .000 | | | | | .07 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 3.740 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .00 | .998 | -.002 | .00 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .14 | .055 | 1.923 | .01 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.10* | .039 | -2.074 | .01 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .01 | .763 | .301 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | .12 | .119 | 1.561 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.08 | .059 | -1.895 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | .07 | .101 | 1.644 | .01 | |
| Responsible | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Decision- | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Making | | | | | | | -.25*** | .000 | -5.617 | .06 | |

p* < .05, *p* < .01, ****p* < .001

Table 18*High School: Total SEL Score Predicting Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR^2 | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 1 | .16 | .03** | .001 | .02 | .03** | .001 | | | | | .03 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 4.02 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .10** | .005 | 2.84 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | -.02 | .777 | -.28 | .00 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.02 | .524 | -.64 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .01 | .818 | .23 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | -.07 | .185 | -1.33 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.11** | .001 | -3.29 | .01 | |
| Model 2 | .16 | .03** | .002 | .02 | .00 | .857 | | | | | .00 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 4.02 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .09** | .005 | 2.82 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | -.02 | .771 | -.29 | .00 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.02 | .525 | -.64 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .01 | .823 | .22 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | -.07 | .187 | -1.32 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.11** | .001 | -3.29 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | .01 | .857 | .18 | .00 | |

Table 18 (continued)

High School: Total SEL Score Predicting Office Discipline Referrals

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR ² | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|--------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 3 | .30 | .09*** | .000 | .08 | .06*** | .000 | | | | | .07 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 6.82 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .07* | .035 | 2.11 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .00 | .948 | -.07 | .00 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | .00 | .928 | .09 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .00 | .975 | .03 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | -.05 | .398 | -.85 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | - | .000 | -3.95 | .02 | |
| | | | | | | | .13*** | | | | |
| SPED | | | | | | | -.03 | .386 | -.87 | .00 | |
| Total SEL | | | | | | | -.26 | .000 | -7.73 | .06 | |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 19*High School: Self-Awareness as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR^2 | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 1 | .16 | .03** | .001 | .02 | .03** | .001 | | | | | .03 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 4.02 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .10** | .005 | 2.84 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | -.02 | .777 | -.28 | .00 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.02 | .524 | -.64 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .01 | .818 | .23 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | -.07 | .185 | -1.33 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.11** | .001 | -3.29 | .01 | |
| Model 2 | .16 | .03** | .002 | .02 | .00 | .857 | | | | | .00 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 4.02 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .09** | .005 | 2.82 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | -.02 | .771 | -.29 | .00 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.02 | .525 | -.64 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .01 | .823 | .22 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | -.07 | .187 | -1.32 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.11** | .001 | -3.29 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | .01 | .857 | .18 | .00 | |

Table 19 (continued)

High School: Self-Awareness as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR ² | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 3 | .26 | .07*** | .000 | .06 | .04*** | .000 | | | | | .05 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 6.23 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .07* | .026 | 2.23 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .00 | .999 | .00 | .00 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | .00 | .983 | -.02 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .00 | .928 | .09 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | -.05 | .323 | -.99 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.13*** | .000 | -3.87 | .02 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | -.02 | .518 | -.65 | .00 | |
| Self-Awareness | | | | | | | -.21 | .000 | -6.31 | .04 | |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 20*High School: Self-Management as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR^2 | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 1 | .16 | .03** | .001 | .02 | .03** | .001 | | | | | .03 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 4.02 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .10** | .005 | 2.84 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | -.02 | .777 | -.28 | .00 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.02 | .524 | -.64 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .01 | .818 | .23 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | -.07 | .185 | -1.33 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.11** | .001 | -3.29 | .01 | |
| Model 2 | .16 | .03** | .002 | .02 | .00 | .857 | | | | | .00 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 4.02 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .09** | .005 | 2.82 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | -.02 | .771 | -.29 | .00 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.02 | .525 | -.64 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .01 | .823 | .22 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | -.07 | .187 | -1.32 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.11** | .001 | -3.29 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | .01 | .857 | .18 | .00 | |

Table 20 (continued)

High School: Self-Management as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR ² | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|---------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 3 | .29 | .09*** | .000 | .08 | .06*** | .000 | | | | | .06 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 6.73 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .08* | .011 | 2.54 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | -.01 | .909 | -.11 | .00 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | .00 | .995 | -.01 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .01 | .861 | .18 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | -.05 | .392 | -.86 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.13*** | .000 | -3.87 | .02 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | -.03 | .373 | -.92 | .00 | |
| Self- Management | | | | | | | -.25 | .000 | -7.52 | .06 | |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 21*High School: Social Awareness as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR^2 | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 1 | .16 | .03** | .001 | .02 | .03** | .001 | | | | | .03 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 4.02 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .10** | .005 | 2.84 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | -.02 | .777 | -.28 | .00 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.02 | .524 | -.64 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .01 | .818 | .23 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | -.07 | .185 | -1.33 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.11** | .001 | -3.29 | .01 | |
| Model 2 | .16 | .03** | .001 | .02 | .03** | .001 | | | | | .03 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 4.02 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .09** | .005 | 2.82 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | -.02 | .771 | -.29 | .00 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.02 | .525 | -.64 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .01 | .823 | .22 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | -.07 | .187 | -1.32 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.11** | .001 | -3.29 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | .01 | .857 | .18 | .00 | |

Table 21 (continued)

High School: Social Awareness as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR ² | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|---------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 3 | .30 | .09*** | .000 | .08 | .07*** | .000 | | | | | .07 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 6.92 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .07* | .045 | 2.00 | .00 | |
| Black | | | | | | | -.01 | .890 | -.14 | .00 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | .00 | .908 | .12 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .00 | .953 | -.06 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | -.04 | .405 | -.83 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.13*** | .000 | -3.99 | .02 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | -.03 | .430 | -.79 | .00 | |
| Social Awareness | | | | | | | -.26*** | .000 | -7.93 | .07 | |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 22*High School: Relationship Skills as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR^2 | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 1 | .16 | .03** | .001 | .02 | .03** | .001 | | | | | .03 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 4.02 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .10** | .005 | 2.84 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | -.02 | .777 | -.28 | .00 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.02 | .524 | -.64 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .01 | .818 | .23 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | -.07 | .185 | -1.33 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.11** | .001 | -3.29 | .01 | |
| Model 2 | .16 | .03 | .002 | .02 | .00 | .857 | | | | .00 | .00 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 4.02 | .00 | |
| Male | | | | | | | .09** | .005 | 2.82 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | -.02 | .771 | -.29 | .00 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.02 | .525 | -.64 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .01 | .823 | .22 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | -.07 | .187 | -1.32 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.11** | .001 | -3.29 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | .01 | .857 | .18 | .00 | |

Table 22 (continued)

High School: Relationship Skills as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR ² | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 3 | .28 | .08*** | .000 | .07 | .05*** | .000 | | | | .00 | .06 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 6.45 | .00 | |
| Male | | | | | | | .07* | .028 | 2.20 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | .00 | .984 | -.02 | .00 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | .00 | .991 | -.01 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .00 | .978 | .03 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | -.05 | .391 | -.86 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.12*** | .000 | -3.73 | .02 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | -.02 | .511 | -.66 | .00 | |
| Relationship | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Skills | | | | | | | -.24*** | .000 | -7.05 | .05 | |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 23*High School: Responsible Decision-Making as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR^2 | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 1 | .16 | .03** | .001 | .02 | .03** | .001 | | | | | .03 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 4.02 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .10** | .005 | 2.84 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | -.02 | .777 | -.28 | .00 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.02 | .524 | -.64 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .01 | .818 | .23 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | -.07 | .185 | -1.33 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.11** | .001 | -3.29 | .01 | |
| Model 2 | .16 | .03** | .002 | .02 | .00 | .857 | | | | | .00 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 4.02 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .09** | .005 | 2.82 | .01 | |
| Black | | | | | | | -.02 | .771 | -.29 | .00 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | -.02 | .525 | -.64 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .01 | .823 | .22 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | -.07 | .187 | -1.32 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.11** | .001 | -3.29 | .01 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | .01 | .857 | .18 | .00 | |

Table 23 (continued)*High School: Responsible Decision-Making as a Predictor of Office Discipline Referrals*

| | R | R ² | Sig. | Adj. R ² | ΔR ² | Sig. ΔF | β | Sig. | t | sr ² | f ² |
|------------------------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| Model 3 | .33 | .11*** | .000 | .10 | .08*** | .000 | | | | | .09 |
| (Constant) | | | | | | | | .000 | 7.42 | | |
| Male | | | | | | | .06 | .056 | 1.92 | .00 | |
| Black | | | | | | | -.02 | .771 | -.29 | .00 | |
| Am. Ind. / AK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat. | | | | | | | .00 | .937 | .08 | .00 | |
| Other | | | | | | | .00 | .959 | .05 | .00 | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | -.05 | .369 | -.90 | .00 | |
| Age | | | | | | | -.13*** | .000 | -4.10 | .02 | |
| SPED | | | | | | | -.03 | .309 | -1.04 | .00 | |
| Responsible Decision- Making | | | | | | | -.29 | .000 | -8.89 | .08 | |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 24

Trends Per School Level: Unique Variance (sr^2) in ODRs Accounted for by SEL Skills Increases as School Level Increases

| SELSI Scale | Elementary School | Middle School | High School |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------|
| SEL Total | .04 | .05 | .06 |
| Self-Awareness | .03 | .03 | .04 |
| Self-Management | .04 | .06 | .06 |
| Social Awareness | .04 | .05 | .07 |
| Relationship Skills | .04 | .05 | .05 |
| Responsible Decision-Making | .04 | .06 | .08 |