

Contact email: sbyun10@jhu.edu

Title: A Meta-Analytic Review of Research on Social and Emotional Learning Programs

Authors: Sooyeon Byun, Johns Hopkins University – Presenting Author
(sbyun10@jhu.edu)

Amanda J. Inns, Johns Hopkins University
(ainns1@jhu.edu)

Elizabeth Kim, Johns Hopkins University
(ekim116@jhu.edu)

Cynthia Lake, Johns Hopkins University
(clake5@jhu.edu)

Robert Slavin, Johns Hopkins University
(rslavin@jhu.edu)

Background

Identifying effective social and emotional learning (SEL) programs has become more critical under the recent ESSA law, which encourages schools to use nonacademic indicators. A number of reviews on SEL programs have contributed to identifying the effects of SEL interventions on children's wellbeing (e.g., Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011; Goldberg, Sklad, Elfrink, Schreurs, Bohlmeijer, & Clarke, 2019). Yet each of these studies has its own limitations.

Often, reviews have failed to set a minimum duration of intervention (e.g., Durlak et al., 2011; Goldberg et al., 2019; Wigelsworth et al., 2016). Short-term interventions can inflate effect sizes (de Boer, Donker, & Van der Werf, 2014) and limit external validity. Some reviews only included peer-reviewed articles (e.g., Boncu, Costea, & Minulescu, 2017), or significant outcomes (e.g., Grant et al., 2017), though these procedures can greatly overstate effect sizes (e.g., Polanin, Tanner-Smith, & Hennessey, 2016). Also, many studies limited the scope of review to particular topic areas (e.g., Cantone, et al., 2015), program (e.g., Maggin & Johnson, 2014), sample characteristics (e.g., Chung, Carter & Sisco, 2012), formats (e.g., Durlak, Weissberg, & Pachan, 2010), or types of outcomes (e.g., Corcoran, Cheung, Kim, & Xie, 2018).

The current study attempts to provide a stronger review on SEL programs with more thorough and rigorous inclusion criteria, building upon the previous reviews.

Purpose

This study aims to produce a comprehensive and rigorous up-to-date review on SEL programs, addressing limitations in previous reviews. Through its work, the study expects to promote effective use of proven SEL programs in school settings.

Method

The current study takes a best-evidence synthesis approach (Slavin, 1986), which is the combination of traditional meta-analysis (Lipsey & Wilson, 2001) with detailed descriptions of individual programs and studies.

Data Collection

A master list of SEL programs was created, integrating lists of SEL programs developed by credible organizations, such as Blueprints, CASEL, and the What Works Clearinghouse, with a well-developed systematic review (Grant et al., 2017). Initial electronic searches were made of educational databases including ERIC, JSTOR, and PsycInfo, to identify studies meeting inclusion criteria for each program. To locate unpublished reports and other possible inclusions, Google Scholar, citations from identified studies and previous reviews, and each program's official websites were also searched. New programs located in the search process were added to the master list.

Inclusion Criteria

Accepted studies must:

1. Be published between 1990 and 2019 (between 2000 to 2019 for programs using educational technologies).
2. Evaluate SEL programs for K-12 students.
3. Include a comparison group of children receiving "business as usual" services.
4. Take place in the United States.

5. Use either random assignment or quasi-experimental methods with adjustments for pretest differences. The level of assignment could be schools, teachers, or students.
6. Demonstrate baseline equivalence between groups based on the analytic sample (after attrition) of less than 0.25 SD for pretests of outcome measures, and 0.50 SD for demographic covariates.
7. Use quantitative measures of outcomes that examine actual behaviors or intention for behaviors (not attitudes or beliefs). Experimenter- or developer-made measures that were over-aligned to treatment were excluded.
8. Include at least 30 students and 2 teachers in each condition. When treatment was assigned at the cluster level, there needed to be at least two units in each condition.
9. Use duration of 12 weeks from the beginning of the intervention to the posttest.
10. Evaluate programs that would be replicated. If programs were delivered by research staff or provided levels of support which would not be feasible in actual practice, studies were excluded.

Analytic Plan

Effect sizes were calculated following Lipsey and Wilson's (2001) guidelines. The difference between adjusted posttest scores for treatment and control students were divided by the unadjusted standard deviation of the control group. When any of this information was unavailable, alternative procedures were used, as described by Lipsey and Wilson (2001).

In meta-analysis models, studies are weighted, each according to its precision, to give more weight to studies with the greatest precision (Hedges, Tipton, & Johnson, 2010), with adjustment for clustering (Hedges, 2007). Multivariate meta-regression models with robust variance estimation (Hedges et al., 2010) were estimated, using a small-sample correction (Tipton, 2015).

Outcomes are organized into four main categories: Academic Outcomes (Table 2), Problem Behaviors (Table 3), Social Relationships (Table 4), and Emotional Wellbeing (Table 5). Each set of outcomes is analyzed separately. Effect sizes for Problem Behaviors were reversed to indicate fewer problems.

Findings/Results

A total of 56 studies of 38 SEL programs met the inclusion criteria (Table 1). Overall, these studies exhibited a high level of methodological rigor, with 87.5% (n=49) of the studies randomized at either the student or cluster level and only 12.5% (n=7) using quasi-experimental methods. Studies with outcomes in each category are summarized in Tables 6-9.

Meta-analytic models for each category are summarized in Tables 2-5. In each case, first a null model was estimated, giving the mean effect size across all outcomes of that type. Then a meta-regression model was estimated, controlling for methodological factors (study level of assignment and research design), as well as outcome factors (sub-category of outcome and whether it was self-reported by students).

To assess the degree of heterogeneity in the effect sizes, a 95% prediction interval was calculated for each of the full meta-regressions. For academic outcomes, this was -.03 to .31. For problem behaviors it was -.10 to .15. For social relationship outcomes it was -.07 to .24, and it was .13 to .49 for emotional wellbeing outcomes. While the mean effect sizes of academic outcomes (ES=+0.14), social relationships (ES=+0.09), and emotional wellbeing (ES=+0.31) were practically meaningful, the mean effect size for problem behaviors was close to zero

(ES=+0.02). However, in all cases the degrees of freedom were small, so these results must be interpreted with caution.

Conclusions

There are several hundred SEL programs available in the field. Yet the effectiveness of those programs varies. Schools should be encouraged to choose the proven programs most appropriate to their contexts, to maximize intervention effects.

References

- *Barr, D. J., Boulay, B., Selman, R. L., McCormick, R., Lowenstein, E., Gamse, B., Fine, M., & Leonard, M. B. (2015). A randomized controlled trial of professional development for interdisciplinary civic education: Impacts on humanities teachers and their students. *Teachers College Record*, *117*, 1-52.
- *Battistich, V., Schaps, E., Watson, M., & Solomon, D. (2000). Effects of the Child Development Project on students' drug use and other problem behaviors. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, *21*(1), 75-99.
- *Bauer, N. S., Lozano, P., & Rivara, F. P. (2007). The effectiveness of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program in public middle schools: A controlled trial. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *40*(3), 266-274.
- *Bavarian, N., Lewis, K. M., DuBois, D. L., Acock, A., Vuchinich, S., Silverthorn, N., ... & Flay, B. R. (2013). Using social-emotional and character development to improve academic outcomes: A matched-pair, cluster-randomized controlled trial in low-income, urban schools. *Journal of School Health*, *83*(11), 771-779.
- *Blair, C., McKinnon, R. D. & Daneri, M. P. (2018). Effect of the Tools of the Mind Kindergarten Program on children's social and emotional development. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *43*, 52-61.
- *Blair, C., & Raver, C. C. (2014). Closing the achievement gap through modification of neurocognitive and neuroendocrine function: Results from a cluster randomized controlled trial of an innovative approach to the education of children in kindergarten. *PLOS One*, *9*(11), 1-13.
- Boncu, A., Costea, I., & Minulescu, M. (2017). A meta-analytic study investigating the efficiency of socio-emotional learning programs on the development of children and adolescents. *Romanian Journal of Applied Psychology*, *19*(2), 35-41.
- *Bos, J.M., Dhillon, S. & Borman, T. (2019). *Building Assets and Reducing Risks (BARR) Validation Study: Final Report*. American Institutes for Research.
- *Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., Reyes, M. R., & Salovey, P. (2012). Enhancing academic performance and social and emotional competence with the RULER feeling words curriculum. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *22*(2), 218-224.
- *Brown, E. C., Low, S., Smith, B. H., & Haggerty, K. P. (2011). Outcomes from a school-randomized controlled trial of steps to respect: A bullying prevention program. *School Psychology Review*, *40*(3), 423-43.
- *Caldarella, P., Larsen, R. A. A., Williams, L., Wills, H., Kamps, D., & Wehby, J. H. (2018). Effects of CW-FIT on teachers' ratings of elementary school students at risk for emotional and behavioral disorders. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *20*(2), 78-89.
- *Campbell, C. A., & Brigman, G. (2005). Closing the achievement gap: A structured approach to group counseling. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, *30*(1), 67-82.
- Cantone, E., Piras, A. P., Vellante, M., Preti, A., Danielsdottir, S., D'Aloja, E., ... Bhugra, D. (2015). Interventions on bullying and cyberbullying in schools: A systematic review. *Clinical Practice & Epidemiology in Mental Health*, *11*(S1:M4), 58-76.
- *Cappella, E., & Weinstein, R. (2006). The prevention of social aggression among girls. *Social Development*, *15*(3), 434-462.

- *Cheney, D. A., Stage, S. A., Hawken, L. S., Lynass, L., Mielenz, C., & Waugh, M. (2009). A 2-year outcome study of the check, connect, and expect intervention for students at risk for severe behavior problems. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 17*(4), 226-243.
- Chung, Y., Carter, E. W., & Sisco, L. G. (2012). A systematic review of interventions to increase peer interactions for students with complex communication challenges. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 37*(4), 271-287.
- *Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (Karen Bierman, John Coie, Kenneth Dodge, Mark Greenburg, John Lochman, Robert McMahon, and Ellen Pinderhughes). (1999). Initial Impact of the Fast Track prevention trial for conduct problems: I. The high-risk sample. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 67*, 631-647.
- Corcoran, R. P., Cheung, C. L., Kim, E., & Xie, C. (2018). Effective universal school-based social and emotional learning programs for improving academic achievement: A systematic review and meta-analysis of 50 years of research. *Educational Research Review, 25*, 56-72.
- *Corsello, M., & Sharma, A. (2015). *The Building Assets-Reducing Risks Program: Replication and Expansion of an Effective Strategy to Turn Around Low-Achieving Schools. i3 Development Grant. Final Report.* Grantee Submission.
- *Crean, H. F., & Johnson, D. B. (2013). Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS) and elementary school aged children's aggression: Results from a cluster randomized trial. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 52*(1-2), 56-72.
- de Boer, H., Donker, A. S., & Van der Werf, M. P. C. (2014). Effects of the attributes of educational interventions on students' academic performance: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 84*(4), 509-545.
- *DeRosier, M. E. (2004). Building relationships and combating bullying: Effectiveness of a school-based social skills group intervention. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 33*(1), 196-201.
- *DiPerna, J. C., Lei, P., Bellinger, J., & Cheng, W. (2016). Effects of a universal positive classroom behavior program on student learning. *Psychology in the Schools, 53*(2), 189-203
- *DiPerna, J. C., Lei, P., Cheng, W., Hart, S. C., & Bellinger, J. (2018). A cluster randomized trial of the Social Skills Improvement System Classwide Intervention Program in first grade. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 110*(1), 1-16
- *Domino, M. (2011). *The impact of take the lead on school bullying among middle school youth.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)Walden University.
- *Domino, M. (2013). Measuring the impact of an alternative approach to school bullying. *Journal of School Health, 83*(6), 430-437.
- 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.
- 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.
- *Espelage, D. L., Low, S., Van Ryzin, M. J., & Polanin, J. R. (2015). Clinical trial of Second Step middle school program: Impact on bullying, cyberbullying, homophobic teasing, and sexual harassment perpetration. *School Psychology Review, 44*(4), 464-479.

- *Espelage, D. L., Low, S., Polanin, J. R., & Brown, E. C. (2015). Clinical trial of Second Step middle-school program: Impact on aggression & victimization. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 27*, 52-63.
- *Frey, K. S., Hirschstein, M. K., Snell, J. L., Van Schoiack-Edstrom, L., MacKenzie, E. P., & Broderick, C. J. (2005). Reducing Playground bullying and supporting beliefs: An experimental trial of the Steps to Respect. *Developmental Psychology, 41*(3), 479-91.
- *Gillham, J. E., Reivich, K. J., Brunwasser, S. M., Freres, D. R., Chajon, N. D., Kash-MacDonald, V. M., ... & Seligman, M. E. (2012). Evaluation of a group cognitive-behavioral depression prevention program for young adolescents: A randomized effectiveness trial. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 41*(5), 621-639.
- *Gillham, J. E., Reivich, K. J., Freres, D. R., Chaplin, T. M., Shatté, A. J., Samuels, B., ... & Seligman, M. E. (2007). School-based prevention of depressive symptoms: A randomized controlled study of the effectiveness and specificity of the Penn Resiliency Program. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 75*(1), 9-19.
- Goldberg, J. M., Sklad, M., Elfrink, T. R., Schreurs, K. M. G., Bohlmeijer, E., & Clarke, A. M. (2019). Effectiveness of interventions adopting a whole school approach to enhancing social and emotional development: A meta-analysis. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 34*, 755-782.
- Grant, S., Hamilton, L. S., Wrabel, S. L., Gomez, C. J., Whitaker, A., Leschitz, J. T., Unlu, F., Chavez-Herrerias, Baker, G. Barrett, M., Harris, M., & Ramos, A. (2017). *Social and emotional learning interventions under the Every Student Succeeds Act: Evidence review*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- *Graves, S. L., Herndon-Sobalvarro, A., Nichols, K., Aston, C., Ryan, A., Blefari, A., Schutte, K., Schachner, A., Vicoria, L., & Prier, D. (2017). Examining the effectiveness of a culturally adapted social emotional intervention for African American males in an urban setting. *School Psychology Quarterly, 32*(1), 62-74.
- *Grossman, D. C., Neckerman, H. J., Koepsell, T. D., Liu, P. Y., Asher, K. N., Beland, K., ... & Rivara, F. P. (1997). Effectiveness of a violence prevention curriculum among children in elementary school: A randomized controlled trial. *JAMA, 277*(20), 1605-1611.
- *Harlacher, J. E. & Merrell, K. W. (2010). Social and emotional learning as a universal level of student support: Evaluating the follow-up effect of Strong Kids on social and emotional outcomes. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 26*(3), 212-29.
- Hedges, L. V. (2007). Effect sizes in cluster-randomized designs. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics, 32*(4), 341-370. <https://doi.org/10.3102/1076998606298043>.
- Hedges, L. V., Tipton, E., & Johnson, M. C. (2010). Robust variance estimation in meta-regression with dependent effect size estimates. *Research synthesis methods, 1*(1), 39-65.
- *Heller, S. B., Shah, A. K., Guryan, J., Ludwig, J., Mullainathan, S., & Pollack, H. A. (2017). Thinking, fast and slow? Some field experiments to reduce crime and dropout in Chicago. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 132*(1), 1-54.
- *Heller, S., Pollack, H. A., Ander, R., & Ludwig, J. (2013). Preventing youth violence and dropout: A randomized field experiment (No. w19014). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- *Herrera, C., Grossman, J. B., Kauh, T. J., Feldman, A. F., McMaken, J., & Zucovy, L. Z. (2007). *Making a difference in schools: The Big Brothers Big Sisters school-based mentoring impact study*. Public/Private Ventures.

- *Herrera, C., Grossman, J. B., Kauh, T. J., & McMaken, J. (2011). Mentoring in schools: An impact study of Big Brothers Big Sisters school-based mentoring. *Child development*, 82(1), 346-361.
- *Holloway, K. A. (2004). *The effects of a school-based mentoring program on middle school students at-risk for school failure*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation.) The Pennsylvania State University.
- *Jacob, R., Jones, S., Morrison, F. (2012). *Evaluating the impact of a self-regulation impact (SECURE) on self-regulation and achievement*. University of Michigan.
- *Jenson, J. M. & Dieterich, W. A. (2007). Effects of a skills-based prevention program on bullying and bully victimization among elementary school children. *Prevention Science*, 8(8), 285-296.
- *Jones, S. M., Brown, J. L. & Aber, J. L. (2011). Two-year impacts of a universal school-based social-emotional and literacy intervention: An experiment in translational developmental research. *Child Development*, 82(2), 533-554.
- *Kumpfer, K. L., Alvarado, R., Tait, C., & Turner, C. (2002). Effectiveness of school-based family and children's skills training for substance abuse prevention among 6-8-year-old rural children. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 16(4S), S65-71.
- *Lemberger, M. E. Selig, J. P., Bowers, H., & Rogers, J. E. (2015). Effects of the Student Success Skills program on executive functioning skills, feelings of connectedness, and academic achievement in a predominantly Hispanic, low-income middle school district. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 93(1), 25-37.
- Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (2001). *Practical meta-analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- *Lochman, J. E. Boxmeyer, C. L., Jones, S., Qu, L., Ewoldsen, D., & Nelson, W. M. III. (2017). Testing the feasibility of a briefer school-based preventive intervention with aggressive children: A hybrid intervention with face-to-face and internet components. *Journal of School Psychology*, 62, 33-50.
- *Lochman, J. E., Boxmeyer, C., Powell, N., Qu, L., Wells, K., & Windle, M. (2009). Dissemination of the Coping Power Program: Importance of intensity of counselor training. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 77(3), 397-409.
- *Lochman, J. E., Boxmeyer, C., Powell, N., Qu, L., Wells, K., & Windle, M. (2012). Coping Power dissemination study: Intervention and special education effects on academic outcomes. *Behavior Disorders*, 37(3), 192-205.
- *Lochman, J. E., & Wells, K. C. (2002). The Coping Power Program at the middle-school transition: Universal and indicated prevention effects. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 15(4S), S40-S54.
- *Low, S., Cook, C. R., Smolkowski, K., & Buntain-Ricklefs, J. (2015). Promoting social-emotional competence: An evaluation of the elementary version of Second Step®. *Journal of School Psychology*, 53(6), 463-477.
- *Low, S., Frey, K. S., & Brockman, C. J. (2010). Gossip on the playground: Changes associated with universal intervention, retaliation beliefs, and supportive friends. *School Psychology Review*, 39(4), 536-51.
- *Mariani, M. A. (2011). *The Effect of Student Participation in Student Success Skills on Pro-social and Bullying Behavior*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida Atlantic University.

- *Maynard, B. R., Kjellstrand, E. K., & Thompson, A. M. (2014). Effects of Check and Connect on attendance, behavior, and academics: A randomized effectiveness trial. *Research on Social Work Practice, 24*(3), 296-309.
- *McCormick, M. P., Cappella, E., O'Connor, E., Hill, J. L., & McClowry, S. (2016). Do effects of social-emotional learning programs vary by level of parent participation? Evidence from the randomized trial of INSIGHTS. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 9*(3), 364-394.
- *Neace, W. P., & Munoz, M. A. (2012). Pushing the boundaries of education: Evaluating the impact of Second Step®: A violence prevention curriculum with psychosocial and non-cognitive measures. *Child & Youth Services, 33*(1), 46-69.
- Polanin, J. R., Tanner-Smith, E. E., & Hennessy, E. A. (2016). Estimating the difference between published and unpublished effect sizes: A meta-review. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(1), 207-236.
- *Reid, M. J., Webster-Stratton, C., & Hammond, M. (2007). Enhancing a classroom social competence and problem-solving curriculum by offering parent training to families of moderate- to high-risk elementary school children. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 36*(40), 605-620.
- *Reinke, W. M., Herman, K. C., & Dong (2018). The Incredible Years Teacher Classroom Management Program: Outcomes from a group randomized trial. *Prevention Science, 19*, 1043-54.
- *Schultz, L. H., Barr, D. J., & Selman, R. L. (2001). The value of a developmental approach to evaluating character development programmes: An outcome study of Facing History and Ourselves. *Journal of Moral Education, 30*(1), 3-27.
- Slavin, R. E. (1986). Best-evidence synthesis: An alternative to meta-analytic and traditional reviews. *Educational Researcher, 15*(9), 5-11.
- *Snyder, F., Flay, B., Vuchinich, S., Acock, A., Washburn, I., Beets, M., & Li, K. K. (2010). Impact of a social-emotional and character development program on school-level indicators of academic achievement, absenteeism, and disciplinary outcomes: A matched-pair, cluster-randomized, controlled trial. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 3*(1), 26-55.
- *Social and Character Development Research Consortium (2010). *Efficacy of Schoolwide Programs to Promote Social and Character Development and Reduce Problem Behavior in Elementary School Children (NCER 2011-2012)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Research, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- *Sullivan, T. N., Sutherland, K. S., Farrell, A. D., & Taylor, K. A. (2015). An evaluation of Second Step: What are the benefits for youth with and without disabilities? *Remedial and Special Education, 36*(5), 286-298.
- Tipton, E. (2015). Small sample adjustments for robust variance estimation with meta-regression. *Psychological Methods, 20*(3), 375-393.
- *Webb, L. D., Brigman, G. A., & Campbell, C. (2005). Linking school counselors and student success: A replication of the Student Success Skills approach targeting the academic and social competence of students. *Professional School Counseling, 8*(5), 407-413.
- Wigelsworth, M., Lendrum, A., Oldfield, J., Scott, A., ten Bokkel, I., Tate, K., & Emery, C. (2016). The impact of trial stage, developer, involvement and international transferability on universal social and emotional learning programme outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 46*(3), 347-76.

- *Wills, H., Kamps, D., Caldarella, P., Wehby, J., & Romine, R. S. (2018). Class-wide function-related intervention teams (CW-FIT): Student and teacher outcomes from a multisite randomized replication trial. *The Elementary School Journal*, *119*(1), 29-51.
- *Wills, H., Kamps, D., Fleming, K., & Hansen, B. (2016). Student and teacher outcomes of the Class Wide Function Related Intervention Team efficacy trial. *Exceptional Children*, *83*(1), 58-76.

*Included in the review

Table 1. Summary of included studies

	All	Academic Outcomes	Problem Behaviors	Social Relationships	Emotional Wellbeing
Programs	38	26	33	29	17
Studies	56	36	44	34	19
ES	455	99	170	149	37

Table 2. Meta-Regression Results: Academic Outcomes

Coefficients	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Null Model</i>					
Intercept	0.094	0.016	5.980	11.818	0.000
<i>Meta-Regression</i>					
Intercept	0.137	0.090	1.531	1.638	0.291
Randomized	-0.033	0.090	-0.367	1.618	0.756
Clustered	-0.030	0.037	-0.810	16.229	0.430
Self-report	0.006	0.032	0.187	4.524	0.860
Academic Outcomes Subcategories ⁺					
Academic Performance	-0.000	0.026	-0.002	8.966	0.999

Note. ⁺Academic Engagement is the reference group.

Table 3. Meta-Regression Results: Problem Behaviors

Coefficients	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Null Model</i>					
Intercept	0.067	0.014	4.746	24.634	0.000
<i>Meta-Regression</i>					
Intercept	0.024	0.038	0.640	5.143	0.550
Randomized	0.031	0.034	0.904	3.934	0.418
Clustered	0.019	0.030	0.640	14.461	0.532
Self-report	-0.021	0.021	-1.006	12.218	0.334
Problem Behaviors Subcategories ⁺					
Bullying	0.022	0.026	0.840	12.205	0.417
Disruptive behavior	0.029	0.018	1.611	16.102	0.127
Drug/alcohol abuse	-0.046	0.069	-0.661	3.799	0.547
Sexual/racial harassment or aggression	-0.038	0.019	-1.987	5.089	0.103

Note. All effect sizes were reversed to indicate *fewer* problem behaviors. ⁺Aggression/conduct problems is the reference group.

Table 4. Meta-Regression Results: Social Relationships

Coefficients	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Null Model</i>					
Intercept	0.111	0.019	5.775	14.539	0.000
<i>Meta-Regression</i>					
Intercept	0.088	0.093	0.941	3.146	0.413
Randomized	0.041	0.053	0.778	2.146	0.513
Clustered	0.009	0.052	0.171	10.190	0.868
Self report	-0.009	0.039	-0.217	10.564	0.832
<i>Social Relationships Subcategories⁺</i>					
Interpersonal Relationships	-0.021	0.047	-0.454	10.352	0.659
Prosocial behavior	-0.002	0.040	-0.049	10.123	0.962
School climate	-0.014	0.034	-0.409	10.794	0.691
Social skills	-0.023	0.033	-0.697	9.077	0.503

Note. ⁺Empathy is the reference group.

Table 5. Meta-Regression Results: Emotional Wellbeing

Coefficients	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Null Model</i>					
Intercept	0.111	0.029	3.827	12.720	0.002
<i>Meta-Regression</i>					
Intercept	0.313	0.356	0.879	1.426	0.502
Randomized	0.047	0.058	0.808	3.347	0.473
Clustered	-0.183	0.357	-0.512	1.441	0.676
Self report	-0.240	0.360	-0.668	1.721	0.583
<i>Emotional Wellbeing Subcategories⁺</i>					
Emotional Regulation	-0.012	0.062	-0.192	4.188	0.857
Reduced anxiety/ depression	-0.070	0.009	-8.210	2.359	0.009
Self-esteem/ self-efficacy	0.072	0.082	0.876	3.208	0.442

Note. ⁺Coping skills/stress management is the reference group.

Table 6. Study Details: Academic Outcomes

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
4Rs	Jones et al. (2011)	CR	3	1 year	18 schools	18 schools in NYC 46% H, 41% AA, 4% W, 9% Other, 62% below federal poverty level	Attendance	+0.03
							Academic skills	-0.10
4Rs	Social and Character Development Research Consortium (2010)	CR	3	1 year	14 schools	14 schools in NYC; 46% H, 41% AA, 5% W	Engagement with learning	-0.08
Academic and Behavioral Competencies Program (ABC)	Social and Character Development Research Consortium (2010)	CR	3	1 year	12 schools	12 schools in 3 districts in upstate NY; 33% W, 41% AA, 17% H.	Engagement with learning	0.00
BARR	Corsello & Sharma (2015)	SR	9	1 year	495 students	1 suburban school in southern CA; 52% W, 37% H, 68% FRL, 17% ELL.	Reading	+0.14*
							Cumulative GPA in core courses	+0.24*
							Math	+0.34*
							Number of credits earned in core courses	+0.19*
BARR	Bos et al. (2019)	SR	9	1 year	2683 students	11 high schools in ME, CA, KY, MN, TX	Grit	0.00
							Student academic engagement	+0.11*

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
BBBS	Herrera et al (2007)	SR	4-9	2 years	1139 students	serving urban, suburban, and rural areas; 55% H, 25% W, 8% AA, 32% ELL, 77% FRL (approximates)	Students' belief on teacher expectations	+0.25*
							Persistence to grade 10	+0.08
							Chronic absence	+0.04
							Reading	+0.01
							GPA	+0.11*
							Math	+0.01
							Course failure	+0.31*
							College expectations	+0.05
							Academic self-esteem	+0.04
							Absence without excuse	+0.26*
							Classroom effort	+0.07
							Scholastic efficacy	+0.11*
							Number of assignments completed	+0.14*
							Start to skip school	+0.25*
							Task orientation	+0.06
							Academic performance	+0.09*
Quality of classwork	+0.12*							
GPA	+0.04							

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
Becoming a Man	Heller et al (2013)	SR	7-10	1 year	2740 students	18 Chicago Public Schools in some of the city's most disadvantaged and dangerous neighborhoods; 70% AA, 30% H	School preparedness	+0.03
							Academic engagement (GPA, days present, and enrollment status at end of year)	+0.06*
							Enrollment in school at the end of the year	+0.05
							Days present	+0.05
							Grit/persistence	+0.07
							GPA	+0.06
Heller et al (2017)	SR	9-10	2 years	2064 students	9 high schools in Chicago; 69% AA, 29% H	Academic engagement (GPA, days present, and enrollment status at end of year)	+0.05*	
Check & Connect (C&C)	Maynard et al. (2014)	SR	6-12	1 year	189 students	14 CIS schools	Attendance	+0.01
							Academic performance	+0.07
Check, Connect, and Expect	Cheney et al. (2009)	CR	1-5	2 years	18 schools	Students at risk of emotional or behavior disorders in 3 school districts in western WA; 53% FRL	Reading	+0.28

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
Competence Support Program (CSP)	Social and Character Development Research Consortium (2010)	CR	3	1 year	10 schools	10 schools from 2 districts in 2 counties in NC; 47% W, 35% B, 10% H	Engagement with learning	+0.04
	Lochman & Wells (2002)	SR	5-6	16 months	213 students	17 elementary schools in a small-sized city in the southeastern US	Academic competence	+0.24
Coping Power	Lochman et al. (2012)	CR	4-5	18 months	49 Counselors	57 public schools in north central AL; 84% AA	Math grades	+0.24
							Language arts grades	+0.19
Coping with the Middle School Transitions	Lochman & Wells (2002)	CR	5-6	16 months	60 Classrooms	17 elementary schools in a small-sized city in the southeastern US	Academic competence	+0.09
CW-FIT	Wills et al. (2016)	CR	K-6	18 weeks	159 classes	17 schools in urban and culturally diverse communities in the US	Student on-task behavior	+0.47*
	Caldarella et al. (2018)	CR	K-6	4 months	160 classes	19 culturally diverse schools from MO, TN, UT; 43% W, 15% H, 39% AA	Academic behavior	+0.41
	Wills et al. (2018)						Academic competence	-0.01
						Student on-task behavior	+0.49*	

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
Facing History and Ourselves	Barr et al. (2015)	CR	9-10	1 year	62 schools	62 schools in Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, LA, Memphis/ Nashville, New England, NY/NJ, and San Francisco; 36% H, 32% W, 13% AA, 13% A	Historical Understanding	+0.14*
Fast Track (Selective)	Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (1999)	CR	1	1 year	54 schools	54 schools in high risk neighborhood in NC, TN, WA, PA; 51% AA, 47% W, 35% low SES	Woodcock Letter Attack	+0.01
							Spache Word Attach	+0.17*
							Language arts grades	-0.01*
GAT	Jacob et al. (2012)	CR	K-3	39 weeks	6 schools	6 schools in Phoenix, AZ; 92% FRL, 30% EL, 80% H	Attentive/impulse control	+0.13
							Literacy	+0.08
Incredible Years Teacher Classroom Management Program	Reinke et al. (2018)	CR	K-3	1 year	104 classes	9 urban schools in a school district in the Midwestern US. 76% AA, 22% W, 61% FRL, 9% SPED	Concentration prob.	-0.07
							Academic comp.	+0.08*
							Reading	-0.15
							Math	-0.03
INSIGHT	McCormick et al. (2016)	CR	K-1	1 year	22 schools	22 schools from 3 urban low-income districts; 75% AA, 16% H, 83% FRL	Off-task behaviors	-0.30
							Math skills	+0.01
							Critical thinking	-0.15
							Math achievement	-0.08
							Reading skills	+0.06

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
Love in a Big World (LIBW)	Social and Character Development Research Consortium (2010)	CR	3	1 year	12 schools	12 schools in 2 school districts in 2 counties in TN; 65% W, 21% AA, 8% H	Engagement with learning	+0.01
PATHS	Social and Character Development Research Consortium (2010)	CR	3	1 year	10 schools	10 schools from 1 district in MN and 2 districts in NY; 56% W, 22% AA, 12% H.	Engagement with learning	+0.05
Positive Action	Snyder et al. (2010)	CR	1-5	4 years	20 schools	20 schools in e Hawai'ian islands; 26% Hawaiian, 9% W, 2% AA, 25% A, at least 25% FRL	Attendance	+0.20
							Reading	+0.12
							Reading	+0.20*
Positive Action	Social and Character Development Research Consortium (2010)	CR	3	1 year	14 schools	14 schools in an urban school district in Chicago; 46% AA, 27% H, 7% W, 3% A	Engagement with learning	-0.25*
							Attendance	+0.20
							Math	+0.17
Positive Action	Bavarian et al. (2013)	CR	3-8	6 years	14 schools	14 low-income, urban public schools in Chicago; 48% AA, 27% H	Reading	+0.10

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
Reaching Academic Potential	Holloway (2004)	SR	6-8	18 weeks	75 students	1 middle school in Northern Virginia; 44% AA, 19% H, 32% W, 4% A, 66% male	Academic self-concept	+0.46
							Attendance	-0.10
							Learning behaviors	+0.08
							GPA	-0.01
RULER	Brackett et al. (2012)	CQE	5-6	7 months	6 schools	3 schools in Long Island, NY	School problems (e.g. attention, learning problems)	-0.27
Second Step	Low et al. (2015)	CR	K-2	1 year	61 schools	61 schools in Washington and AZ; 50-78% FRL, 40-46% W, 6-8% AA, 15-475 H, 0-18% A	Skills for learning	+0.11*
	Social and Character Development Research Consortium (2010)	CR	3	1 year	12 schools	12 schools in MD; 83% W, 7% B, 5% H, 8% O	Engagement with learning	-0.03
							Academic competence and motivation	-0.06
	Neace & Munoz (2012)	CQE	1	2 years	24 schools	54% racial minority; 53% low SES	Absence without excuse - Cohort 2	+0.09
Social Skills Improvement System Classwide	DiPerna et al. (2016)	CR	2	12 weeks	38 classes	6 schools in the Mid-Atlantic region. Four urban two rural schools.	Reading	-0.14
							Math	-0.07

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
Intervention Program (SSIS-CIP)	DiPerna et al. (2018)	CR	1	12 weeks	57 classes	6 elementary schools in the Mid-Atlantic US; 70% W, 24% AA, 5% A, 9% H, 6% SPED	Math	+0.04
							Reading	+0.07
Steps to Respect	Brown et al. (2011)	CR	3-5	1 year	33 schools	33 schools in north-central CA	Academic performance	-0.01
							Academic competence	+0.02
Student Success Skills	Lemberger et al. (2015)	CR	7	1 year	11 classes	11 classrooms in rural suburban middle school in southwestern US; 66% H, 38% W, 8% O	Ability to hold information for task completion	+0.08
							Organization of materials	+0.29*
							Pacing and completion rates for a given activity	+0.40*
							Awareness of strengths, weaknesses, and related behaviors	+0.34
							Impulse control	+0.17
							Ability to anticipate and react to future events or consequences	+0.49*

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
							Ability to cognitively move from one activity to another	+0.29*
	Campbell & Brigman (2005)	QE	5-6	1 year	308 students	20 schools in FL; 82% W, 8% AA, 5% H, 60% FRL	Reading	+0.24*
	Webb et al. (2005)	SR	5-6	1 year	418 students	20 schools in FL; 85% W, 4% AA, 9% H, 45% FRL	Reading	+0.14
Tools of the Mind	Blair et al. (2018)				29	29 schools in 12 districts; 73% W, 2% AA, 7% H, 4% A	Academic competence	+0.04
	Blair & Ravor (2014)	CR	K	1 year	schools		Vocabulary	+0.01
							Math	+0.06*
							Reading	+0.06

Note. CR=Cluster randomized, SR=Student randomized, CQE=Cluster quasi-experimental, SQE=Student quasi-experimental, A=Asian American, AA=African American, H=Hispanic, W=White, not Hispanic, O=Other, EL=English learner, FRL=Free and reduced lunch, SPED=Special Education.

Table 7. Study Details: Problem Behaviors

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
4Rs	Jones et al. (2011)	CR	3	1 year	18 schools	18 schools in NYC; 46% H, 41% AA, 4% W, 9% Other, 62% below federal poverty level	Aggression and conduct problems – Teacher report	+0.03
							Aggressive fantasies	-0.17
							Aggressive interpersonal negotiation strategies	-0.01
							ADHD related behavior	+0.03
Social and Character Development Research Consortium (2010)	CR	3	1 year	14 schools	14 schools in NYC; 46% H, 41% AA, 5% W	Aggression and delinquent behaviors – Student report	+0.04	
						Aggression and conduct problems – Parent report	-0.11	
						Victimization at school	+0.08	
Academic and Behavioral Competencies Program (ABC)	Social and Character Development Research Consortium (2010)	CR	3	1 year	12 schools	12 schools in 3 districts in upstate NY; 33% W, 41% AA, 17% H.	Aggression and delinquent behaviors – Student report	-0.04
							Aggression and conduct problems – Teacher report	-0.03
							Aggression and conduct problems – Parent report	0.00

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
							Victimization at school	+0.08
							ADHD related behavior	+0.01
BARR	Bos et al. (2019)	SR	9	1 year	2863 students	11 high schools in ME, CA, KY, MN, TX serving urban, suburban, and rural areas; 55% H, 25% W, 8% AA, 32% ELL, 77% FRL	Suspensions	+0.02
BBBS	Herrera et al (2007)	SR	4-9	2 years	1139 students	71 schools, 10 BBBS agencies, 1140 students; 37% W, 23% H, 18% AA, 6% Native American, 13% multiracial, 1% A, 3% Other	Difficulty in class	+0.04
							Misconduct outside of school	-0.07
							School misconduct	+0.24*
							Substance use	-0.11
Becoming a Man	Heller et al (2013)	SR	7-10	1 year	2740 students	18 Chicago Public Schools in some of the city's most disadvantaged and dangerous neighborhoods; 70% AA, 30% H	Arrests	+0.08
	Heller et al (2017)	SR	9-10	2 years	2064 students	9 high schools in Chicago; 69% AA, 29% H	Arrests	+0.08*

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
Caring School Community	Battistich et al. (2000)	CQE	3-5	3 years	24 schools	24 elementary schools from six districts; 21% AA, 19% H	Status offenses and delinquent behaviors	+0.05
							Victimization at school	-0.04
							Drug Use	-0.03
Check & Connect (C&C)	Maynard et al. (2014)	SR	6-12	1 year	189 students	14 CIS schools	Office referrals	+0.27
Check, Connect, and Expect	Cheney et al. (2009)	CR	1-5	2 years	18 schools	Students at risk of emotional or behavior disorders in 3 school districts in western WA; 53% FRL	Externalizing behavior	+0.11
							Problem behavior	+0.29
Competence Support Program (CSP)	Social and Character Development Research Consortium (2010)	CR	3	1 year	10 schools	10 schools from 2 districts in 2 counties in NC; 47% W, 35% B, 10% H	Aggression and conduct problems – Teacher report	-0.09
							Aggression and conduct problems – Parent report	+0.11
							Aggression and delinquent behaviors – Student report	-0.04
							Victimization at school	-0.08
							ADHD related behavior	+0.03

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size						
Coping Power	Lochman & Wells (2002)	SR	5-6	16 months	213 students	17 elementary schools in a small-sized city in the southeastern US	Proactive Aggression – Parent report	+0.24						
							Expectation that aggressive behavior would lead to positive outcomes	+0.20						
							Reactive Aggression – Teacher report	+0.09						
							Reactive Aggression – Parent report	-0.04						
							Aggression	-0.05						
							Proactive Aggression – Teacher report	+0.11						
							Behavioral improvement	+0.3*						
							Dysregulation	+0.09						
							Peer substance uses	-0.11						
							Substance use	+0.06						
							Lochman et al. (2009)	CR	4-5	18 months	49 counselors	57 public schools in north central AL; 84% AA	Positive impression about aggression	0.00
													Hitting or threatening	+0.04
Lochman et al. (2017)	CR	5	8 months	8 schools	8 schools from 1 school system in AL; 93% AA	Aggression	+0.21							
						Conduct problems	+0.27							

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
Coping with the Middle School Transitions	Lochman & Wells (2002)	CR	5-6	16 months	60 classes	17 elementary schools in a small-sized city in the southeastern US	Expectation that aggressive behavior would lead to positive outcomes	+0.05
							Reactive Aggression – Teacher report	+0.08
							Reactive Aggression – Parent report	-0.02
							Improvement in aggressive behaviors	-0.12
							Proactive Aggression – Parent report	+0.03
							Proactive Aggression – Teacher report	+0.24
							Dysregulation	-0.03
							Peer substance uses	+0.13
							Substance use	+0.18
CW-FIT	Wills et al. (2016)	CR	K-6	18 weeks	159 classes	17 schools in urban and culturally diverse communities in the US	Disruptive behavior	+0.38*
							Antisocial behavior	+0.16
							Externalizing behavior	+0.18
	Caldarella et al. (2018)	CR	K-6	4 months	160 classes	19 culturally diverse schools from MO, TN, UT; 43% W, 15% H, 39% AA	Bullying	+0.04

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
							Hyperactivity/inattention	+0.32
							problem behaviors total	+0.20
							Autistic symptoms	+0.12
Facing History and Ourselves	Schultz et al. (2001)	CQE	8	12 weeks	9 teachers	Public schools in northeastern US	Fighting	+0.16
							Aggressive and oppositional behaviors – Teacher report	+0.04
							Aggressive and oppositional behaviors – Parent report	-0.20
Fast Track (Selective)	Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (1999)	CR	1	1 year	54 schools	54 schools in high risk neighborhood in NC, TN, WA, PA; 51% AA, 47% W, 35% low SES	Externalizing behavior – Parent report	-0.05
							Aggressive and oppositional behaviors – Observer report	-0.18*
							Externalizing behavior – Teacher report	0.00
							Aggression	+0.10

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
Incredible Years - Child + Parent Training	Reid et al. (2007)	CR	K-1	2 years	14 schools	14 high FRL schools in Seattle	Externalizing behavior – Parent report	+0.18
							Externalizing behavior – Teacher report	+0.24
Incredible Years - Dinosaur Social Skills	Reid et al. (2007)	CR	K-1	2 years	14 schools	14 high FRL schools in Seattle	Externalizing behavior – Parent report	+0.29
							Externalizing behavior – Teacher report	+0.33
							Child negative behavior	+0.05
Incredible Years Teacher Classroom Management Program (IY TCM)	Reinke et al. (2018)	CR	K-3	1 year	104 classes	9 urban schools in a school district in the Midwestern US; 76% AA, 22% W, 61% FRL, 9% SPED	Disruptive behavior	-0.04
INSIGHT	McCormick et al. (2016)	CR	K-1	1 year	22 schools	22 schools from 3 urban low-income districts; 75% AA, 16% H, 83% FRL	Behavior problems	-0.18
							Behavioral engagement	+0.18
Love in a Big World (LIBW)	Social and Character Development	CR	3	1 year	12 schools	12 schools in 2 school districts in 2 counties;	Aggression and conduct problems – Teacher report	-0.08

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
	Research Consortium (2010)					in TN; 65% W, 21% AA, 8% H	Aggression and delinquent behaviors – Student report	-0.05
							Aggression and conduct problems – Parent report	-0.06
							Victimization at school	+0.07
							ADHD related behavior	-0.12
							Feelings towards bullying	-0.04
Olweus	Bauer et al. (2007)	CQE	6-8	1 year	10 schools	10 schools in Seattle; 35% W, 24% A, 16% AA, 7% H	Relational victimization	0.00
							Physical victimization	+0.01
							Aggression and conduct problems – Teacher report	-0.03
PATHS	Social and Character Development Research Consortium (2010)	CR	3	1 year	10 schools	10 schools from 1 district in MN and 2 districts in NY; 56% W, 22% AA, 12% H.	Aggression and delinquent behaviors – Student report	+0.10
							Aggression and conduct problems – Parent report	-0.10
							Victimization at school	-0.04

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
							ADHD related behavior	+0.07
	Crean & Johnson (2013)	CR	3	1 year	14 schools	14 schools in northeastern and midwestern US; 51% W, 38% AA, 43% Federal Poverty	Acting out	+0.07
	Snyder et al. (2010)	CR	1-5	4 years	20 schools	20 schools in e Hawai'ian islands; 26% Hawaiian, 9% W, 2% AA, 25% A, at least 25% FRL	Suspension	+0.04
							Aggression and delinquent behaviors – Student report	-0.07
Positive Action	Social and Character Development Research Consortium (2010)	CR	3	1 year	14 schools	14 schools in an urban school district in Chicago; 46% AA, 27% H, 7% W, 3% A	Aggression, conduct problems, and responsibilities – Parent report	+0.10
							Aggression, conduct problems, and responsibilities – Teacher report	+0.08
							Victimization at school	-0.10
							ADHD related behavior	+0.08

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
Reaching Academic Potential	Holloway (2004)	SR	6-8	18 weeks	78 students	1 middle school in Northern VA; 44% AA, 19% H, 32% W, 4% A, 66% male	Disciplinary referrals	-0.03
							Externalizing behavior	-0.19
RULER	Brackett et al. (2012)	CQE	5-6	7 months	6 schools	3 schools in Long Island, NY	Externalizing behavior	-0.07
							Physical aggression	+0.13
Second Step	Espelage, Low, Polanin, & Brown (2015)	CR	6-7	2 years	36 schools	36 schools in IL and KS.	Victimization from peers	+0.09
							Homophobic victimization	+0.06
							Sexual harassment victimization	+0.05
							Bullying	+0.08
	Espelage, Low, Van Ryzin, & Polanin (2015)	CR	6-8	3 years	36 schools	36 schools in IL and KS, 3651 students, 22% W, 31% B, 33% H, 11% biracial	Cyberbullying perpetration	+0.10
							Homophobic name-calling	+0.03
							Sexual harassment perpetration	+0.02
Low et al. (2015)	CR	K-2	1 year	61 schools	61 schools in WA and AZ; 50-78% FRL, 40-46% W, 6-8% AA, 15-47% H, 0-18% A	Conduct problems	+0.04	
						Hyperactivity	+0.11*	
		CR	6	1 year			Overt aggression	+0.17

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
							Aggression	0.00
							Overt aggression	-0.12
							Relational aggression - TR	+0.17
	Sullivan et al. (2015)				28 classes	3 middle schools in southeastern US. 28 classrooms, 63% B, 22% W, 1% H, 11% MR, 3% O, 23% SPED	Relational victimization - TR	+0.13
							Overt victimization	-0.09
							Overt victimization	-0.03
							Relational aggression - SR	+0.37
							Relational victimization - SR	+0.01
							Aggression and delinquent behaviors - SR	+0.04
	Social and Character Development Research Consortium (2010)	CR	3	1 years	12 schools	12 schools in MD, 83% W, 7% B, 5% H, 8% O	Aggression, conduct problems, and responsibilities - TR	+0.02
							Aggression, conduct problems, and responsibilities - PR	-0.03
							Victimization at school	+0.09
							ADHD related behavior	-0.07

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
	Neace & Munoz (2012)	CQE	1	2 years	24 schools	12 schools; 53% low SES; 54% racial minority; 48% female, 2 cohorts of students	Days suspended – Cohort 1	+0.05
Days suspended – Cohort 2							+0.01	
Suspension – Cohort 2							0.00	
Suspension – Cohort 1							+0.07	
	Grossman et al. (1997)	CR	2-3	16-20 weeks	12 schools	12 schools in WA, 79-80% W, 5-9% AA, 6-11% A, 3-4% H	Aggression	+0.01
Antisocial-aggressive							+0.02	
Aggression							+0.03	
Delinquent behavior							+0.03	
Delinquent behavior							+0.06	
Demanding/ disruptive behavior							0.00	
Acting out	0.00							
	Social Aggression Prevention Program (SAPP)	SR	4-6	12-14 weeks	134 students	6 schools in Northern CA	Hostile/irritable	+0.01
Physical/verbal aggression – Teacher report							-0.08	
Physical/verbal aggression – Parent report							-0.02	
							Social aggression – Parent report	0.00

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
							Social aggression – Teacher report	-0.08
Social Skills Group Intervention (SSGRIN)	DeRosier (2004)	SR	3	12 weeks	381 students	11 public elementary schools in Wake County Public School System. 73% W, 20% AA	Fighting	+0.10
							Bullying victimization	+0.01
Steps to Respect	Frey et al. (2005)	CR	3-6	2 years	6 schools	6 schools from 2 suburban districts in the Pacific Northwest US	Indirect aggression	-0.01
							Observed aggression	+0.09
							Aggression – Student report	+0.05
							Intention for upstanding	+0.10
							Bullying	+0.20
							Bystanding	+0.03
							Victimization	+0.13
							Victimization	+0.06
							Acceptance of bullying/aggression	+0.11
							Argumentative attitude	+0.18
Low et al. (2010)	CR	3-6	1 year	6 schools	6 schools from 2 suburban districts in the Pacific Northwest US	Gossip perpetration	+0.16	
						Gossip victimization	+0.11	

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
							Intervene in bullying	+0.14
							Nonphysical bullying	0.00
							Attitudes toward intervening in bullying	-0.01
							Physical bullying	+0.07
							Bullying	-0.03
	Brown et al. (2011)	CR	3-5	1 year	33 schools	33 schools in north-central CA	Bullying problems in school	-0.10
							Teacher/staff bullying prevention	+0.14
							Teacher/staff intervention in bullying	+0.12
							Bullying victimization	-0.07
							Bystanding	+0.09
Strong Kids (culturally adapted)	Graves et al. (2017)	SR	K-2	4 months	61 students	A predominately African American elementary school in an urban city in the Mid-Atlantic region of the US. 100% AA, 100% FRL	Externalizing behavior	+0.28

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
Student Success Skills	Mariani (2011)	CQE	5	6 months	5 schools	5 public elementary schools in central FL; 2% A, 15% AA, 66% W, 13% H, 28% FRL	Bullying	+0.30
Take the Lead	Domino (2013)	CR	7	1 semester	32 classes	One suburban public middle school in southwestern CT; 93% W, 1% AA, 2% H, 3% A	Bullying	+0.51*
Tools of the Mind	Blair et al. (2018)	CR	K	1 year	29 schools	29 schools in 12 districts; 73% W, 2% AA, 7% H, 4% A	Aggression and conduct problems	+0.19*
							Behavioral problems	+0.19*
Youth Matters	Jenson & Dieterich (2007)	CR	4-5	2 years	28 schools	28 urban schools in CO; 60% H, 15% AA, 9% W.	Bullying	+0.09
							Bullying victimization	+0.27

Note. CR=Cluster randomized, SR=Student randomized, CQE=Cluster quasi-experimental, SQE=Student quasi-experimental, A=Asian American, AA=African American, H=Hispanic, W=White, not Hispanic, O=Other, EL=English learner, FRL=Free and reduced lunch, SPED=Special Education.

Table 8. Study Details: Social Relationships

Sample	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Outcome	Effect Size	
4Rs	Jones et al. (2011)	CR	3	1 year	18 schools	18 schools in NYC; 46% H, 41% AA, 4% W, 9% Other, 62% FRL	Prosocial fantasies	+0.02
						Social competence	+0.03	
						Altruism – Parent report	0.00	
	Social and Character Development Research Consortium (2010)	CR	3	1 year	14 schools	14 schools in NYC 46% H, 41% AA, 5% W	Altruism – Teacher report	-0.17
							Altruism – Student report	-0.13
							Empathy	-0.07
							Negative School Orientation	+0.06
							Positive school orientation	+0.08
							Self-efficacy for peer interaction	-0.13
							Empathy	+0.02
Academic and Behavioral Competencies Program (ABC)	Social and Character Development Research	CR	3	1 year	12 schools	12 schools in 3 districts in upstate NY. 33% W, 41% AA, 17% H.	Altruism – Parent report	+0.15
						Altruism – Teacher report	+0.39	

Sample	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Outcome	Effect Size	
	Consortium (2010)					Altruism – Student report	-0.07	
						Negative school orientation	-0.16	
						Positive school orientation	-0.17	
						Self-efficacy for peer interaction	+0.06	
BARR	Bos et al. (2019)	SR	9	1 year	2690 students	11 high schools in ME, CA, KY, MN, TX serving urban, suburban, and rural areas; 55% H, 25% W, 8% AA, 32% ELL, 77% FRL	Sense of belonging to classroom Supportive student-teacher relationships Classmates' social emotional capacities	+0.04 +0.29* +0.02
BBBS	Herrera et al (2011)	SR	4-9	2 years	1139 students	71 schools, 10 BBBS agencies, 1140 students; 37% W, 23% H, 18% AA, 6% Native American, 13% multiracial, 1% A, 3% Other	Presence of a special adult who they can spend time with	+0.18*
						Sense of emotional support from peers	+0.08	
	Herrera et al (2007)	SR	4-9	15 months	1140 students	71 schools, 1139 students, 69% FRL, 63% ethnic minority	Social acceptance Teacher-student relationship – Teacher report	+0.06 +0.04

Sample	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Outcome	Effect Size	
						Teacher-student relationship – Student report	0.00	
						Relationship with parent	+0.05	
						Prosocial behavior	+0.06	
						Connectedness to school	+0.02	
						Positive classroom affect	0.00	
						Assertiveness	-0.02	
Becoming a Man	Heller et al (2013)	SR	7-10	1 year	1074 students	18 Chicago Public Schools in some of the city's most disadvantaged and dangerous neighborhoods; 70% AA, 30% H	Emotional health	+0.07
Check, Connect, and Expect	Cheney et al. (2009)	CR	1-5	2 years	18 schools	Students at risk of emotional or behavior disorders in 3 school districts in western Washington 53% FRL	Social skills	+0.05

Sample	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N		Outcome	Effect Size
Competence Support Program (CSP)	Social and Character Development Research Consortium (2010)	CR	3	1 year	10 schools	10 schools from 2 districts in 2 counties in North CA; 47% W, 35% B, 10% H	Empathy	+0.17
							Altruism – Student report	-0.11
							Altruism – Teacher report	+0.04
							Altruism – Parent report	+0.04
							Positive school orientation	+0.15
							Negative School Orientation	+0.11
							Self-efficacy for peer interaction	+0.12
Coping Power	Lochman & Wells (2002)	SR	5-6	16 months	124 students	17 elementary schools in a small-sized city in the southeastern US	Problems in social relations	+0.07
							School bonding	+0.13
							Social competence in peer relations	+0.23
							Social skills improvement	+0.40*
							Problem solving skills improvement	+0.30*
Coping with the Middle	Lochman & Wells (2002)	CR	5-6	16 months	60 classes	17 elementary schools in a small-sized city	Problems in social relations	-0.45*
							School bonding	+0.12

Sample	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N		Outcome	Effect Size
School Transitions						in the southeastern US	Social skills improvement	-0.07
							Problem solving skills improvement	-0.12
							Social competence in peer relations	-0.08
CW-FIT	Caldarella et al. (2018)	CR	K-6	4 months	160 classes	19 culturally diverse schools from MO, TN, UT; 43% W, 15% H, 39% AA	Empathy	+0.26
							Peer relations	+0.37
							Communication skills	+0.17
							Responsibility	+0.24
							social skills total	+0.28
							Cooperation	+0.46
							Social competence	+0.44
							Engagement	+0.21
							Assertiveness	+0.16
							Self-management/compliance	+0.32
Facing History and Ourselves	Schultz et al. (2001)	CQE	8	12 weeks	9 teachers	public schools in northeastern US	Moral reasoning (percentage of principled moral reasoning)	-0.10
							Civic attitudes and participation	+0.15

Sample	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Outcome	Effect Size	
						Moral reasoning (composite moral reasoning score)	-0.05	
						Students' practice for open climate	+0.09	
						Teachers' practice for open climate	+0.17*	
						Political tolerance	+0.18*	
						Justice oriented citizenship	+0.15	
						Racism/Tolerance	+0.02	
						Civic Discourse	+0.17	
						Relationship maturity (response rating)	-0.05	
						Relationship maturity (best response)	-0.04	
						Engaging with civic matters	+0.23*	
						Civic Self-Efficacy	+0.20*	
						Deliberation Convictions	+0.07	
Fast Track (Selective)	Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (1999)	CR	1	1 year	54 schools	54 schools in high risk neighborhood in NC, TN, WA, PA. 51% AA, 47% W, 35% low SES	Positive peer interaction	+0.21*

Sample	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N		Outcome	Effect Size
I Can Problem Solve	Kumpfer et al. (2002)	CR	1	1 year	12 schools	12 schools from 2 Rocky Mountain school districts	School bonding	+0.44*
							Social competence	-0.04
Incredible Years - Child + Parent Training	Reid et al. (2007)	CR	K-1	2 years	14 schools	14 high FRL schools in Seattle	Prosocial behaviors (Communication)	+0.35
							Social competence	+0.03
Incredible Years - Dinosaur Social Skills	Reid et al. (2007)	CR	K-1	2 years	14 schools	14 high FRL schools in Seattle	Prosocial behaviors (Communication)	+0.17
							Social competence	+0.3
Incredible Years Teacher Classroom Management Program (IY TCM)	Reinke et al. (2018)	CR	K-3	1 year	104 classes	9 urban schools in a school district in the Midwestern US. 76% AA, 22% W, 61% FRL, 9% SPED	Prosocial behavior	+0.13*
							Social competence	+0.13*
INSIGHT	McCormick et al. (2016)	CR	K-1	1 year	22 schools	22 schools from 3 urban low-income districts; 75% AA, 16% H, 83% FRL	Teacher-student closeness	-0.21
							Teacher-student conflict	-0.07
Love in a Big World (LIBW)	Social and Character Development Research Consortium (2010)	CR	3	1 year	12 schools	12 schools in 2 school districts in 2 counties in TN; 65% W, 21% AA, 8% H	Empathy	-0.02
							Altruism – Student report	-0.15
							Altruism – Parent report	+0.31*
							Altruism – Teacher report	+0.04

Sample	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Outcome	Effect Size	
						Negative School Orientation	+0.17	
						Positive school orientation	+0.05	
						Self-efficacy for peer interaction	-0.01	
Olweus	Bauer et al. (2007)	CQE	6-8	1 year	10 schools	10 schools in Seattle; 35% W, 24% A, 16% AA, 7% H	Teachers' readiness to intervene bullying	+0.01
						Students' readiness to intervene in bullying	+0.11	
						Empathy	+0.10	
						Altruism – Parent report	+0.03	
						Altruism – Student report	+0.15	
PATHS	Social and Character Development Research Consortium (2010)	CR	3	1 year	10 schools	10 schools from 1 district in MN and 2 districts in NY; 56% W, 22% AA, 12% H.	Altruism – Teacher report	+0.02
						Negative School Orientation	+0.08	
						Positive school orientation	-0.03	
						Self-efficacy for peer interaction	+0.01	
Positive Action	Social and Character Development	CR	3	1 year	14 schools	14 schools in an urban school district	Empathy	+0.21
						Altruism – Parent report	+0.01	

Sample	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Outcome	Effect Size	
	Research Consortium (2010)					in Chicago. 46% AA, 27% H, 7% W, 3% A	Altruism – Student report	-0.09
						Altruism – Teacher report	+0.27	
						Negative School Orientation	+0.02	
						Positive school orientation	+0.11	
						Self-efficacy for peer interaction	-0.24	
	Low et al. (2015)	CR	K-2	1 year	61 schools	61 schools in Washington and AZ; 50-78% FRL, 40-46% W, 6-8% AA, 15-475 H, 0-18% A	Empathy	+0.12
							Peer problems	+0.07
							Prosocial behavior	+0.02
							Problem solving	+0.11
							Empathy	+0.04
Second Step	Social and Character Development Research Consortium (2010)	CR	3	1 year	12 schools	12 schools in MD; 83% W, 7% B, 5% H, 8% O	Altruism – Parent report	-0.03
							Altruism – Student report	-0.09
							Altruism – Teacher report	-0.08
							Negative School Orientation	+0.06
							Student afraid at school	+0.08

Sample	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N		Outcome	Effect Size
							Positive school orientation	+0.09
							Self-efficacy for peer interaction	+0.09
	Grossman et al. (1997)	CR	2-3	16-20 weeks	12 schools	12 schools in WA; 79-80% W, 5-9% AA, 6-11% A, 3-4% H	Interpersonal skills	0.00
							Peer social skills	+0.05
							Assertiveness	0.00
							Self-management skills among peers	0.00
Social Aggression Prevention Program (SAPP)	Cappella & Weinstein (2006)	SR	4-6	12-14 weeks	134 students	6 schools in Northern CA	Empathy – Teacher report	+0.01
							Prosocial behaviors – Parent report	+0.07
							Prosocial behaviors – Teacher report	+0.16
Social Skills Group Intervention (SSGRIN)	DeRosier (2004)	SR	3	12 weeks	381 students	11 public elementary schools in Wake County Public School System; 73% W, 20% AA	Liked the least by peers	+0.13
							Liked the most by peers	+0.23*
							Outcome expectancy	+0.04
Steps to Respect	Frey et al. (2005)	CR	3-6	2 years	6 schools	6 schools from 2 suburban districts in the Pacific Northwest US	In-school adults' responsiveness to bullying	+0.13
							Peer interaction skill	0.00
							Agreeable attitude	+0.11

Sample	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Outcome	Effect Size	
Student Success Skills	Brown et al. (2011)	CR	3-5	1 year	33 schools	33 schools in north- central CA	Difficulty of assertion	+0.10
							Peer social support	+0.07
							School connectedness	+0.04
							Climate among students	+0.16
							Teacher/staff-student climate	-0.05
							Social competence	+0.10
	Mariani (2011)	CQE	5	6 months	5 schools	5 public elementary schools in central FL; 2% A, 15% AA, 66% W, 13% H, 28% FRL	Prosocial behavior	+0.36
							Competitive classroom climate	+0.02
							Satisfying classroom climate	+0.36
							Cohesive classroom climate	-0.02
							Social support from close friends	+0.14
							Social support from people in school	+0.22
Lemberger et al. (2015)	CR	7	1 year	11 classes	11 classrooms in rural suburban middle school in southwestern US. 66% H, 38% W, 8% O	Social support from teachers	+0.05	

Sample	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N		Outcome	Effect Size
Take the Lead	Domino (2011)	CR	7	1 semester	32 classes	One suburban public middle school in southwestern CT; 93% W, 1% AA, 2% H, 3% A	Prosocial behavior	+0.88*
Tools of the Mind	Blair et al. (2018)	CR	K	1 year	29 schools	29 schools in 12 districts; 73% W, 2% AA, 7% H, 4% A	Teacher-student relationship	+0.15*
							Self-regulation	+0.18*

Note. CR=Cluster randomized, SR=Student randomized, CQE=Cluster quasi-experimental, SQE=Student quasi-experimental, A=Asian American, AA=African American, H=Hispanic, W=White, not Hispanic, O=Other, EL=English learner, FRL=Free and reduced lunch, SPED=Special Education.

Table 9. Study Details: Emotional Wellbeing

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
4Rs	Jones et al. (2011)	CR	3	1 year	18 schools	18 schools in NYC 46% H, 41% AA, 4% W, 9% Other, 62% below federal poverty level	Depressive symptoms	+0.23
BBBS	Herrera et al (2007)	SR	4-9	2 years	1139 students	71 schools, 10 BBBS agencies, 1140 students; 37% W, 23% H, 18% AA, 6% Native American, 13% multiracial, 1% A, 3% Other	Self-worth	+0.03
Check, Connect, and Expect	Cheney et al. (2009)	CR	1-5	2 years	18 schools	Students at risk of developing further emotional or behavior disorders in three school districts in western Washington 53% FRL	Internalizing behavior	+0.51*
Coping Power	Lochman & Wells (2002)	SR	5-6	16 months	213 students	17 elementary schools in a small-sized city in the southeastern US	Fear	+0.09
Coping with the Middle School Transitions	Lochman & Wells (2002)	CR	5-6	16 months	60 Classes	17 elementary schools in a small-sized city in the southeastern US	Fear	-0.48*

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
CW-FIT	Caldarella et al. (2018)	CR	K-6	4 months	160 classes	19 culturally diverse schools from MO, TN, UT; 43% W, 15% H, 39% AA	Self-control	+0.11
							Internalizing behavior	+0.01
I Can Problem Solve	Kumpfer et al. (2002)	CR	1	1 year	12 schools	12 schools from 2 Rocky Mountain school districts	Self-regulation	+0.17
Incredible Years - Child + Parent Training	Reid et al. (2007)	CR	K-1	2 years	14 schools	14 high FRL schools in Seattle	Emotional regulation	+0.57*
							Internalizing behavior	+0.15
Incredible Years - Dinosaur Social Skills	Reid et al. (2007)	CR	K-1	2 years	14 schools	14 high FRL schools in Seattle	Emotional regulation	+0.14
							Internalizing behavior	+0.12
Incredible Years Teacher Classroom Management Program (IY TCM)	Reinke et al. (2018)	CR	K-3	1 year	104 classes	9 urban schools in a school district in the Midwestern US. 76% AA, 22% W, 61% FRL, 9% SPED	Emotional regulation	+0.14*
Penn Resiliency Program	Gillham et al. (2007)	SR	Middle school	12 weeks	290 students	290 students from 3 suburban middle schools, 77% W, middle class	Depressive symptoms - School A&B	+0.19
							Depressive symptoms - School C	-0.16
	Gillham et al. (2012)	SR	6-8	1 year	349 students	5 middle schools in two school districts in	Causal attributions for negative events	+0.13

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
						suburban metropolitan area in northeastern US; 77% W, 12% B, 4% O, 4% A, 3% H	Coping skills	+0.11
							Depressive symptoms	0.00
							Hopelessness	+0.09
							Depressive symptoms	+0.08
							Anxiety symptoms	+0.03
Reaching Academic Potential	Holloway (2004)	SR	6-8	18 weeks	79 students	1 middle school in Northern VA; 44% AA, 19% H, 32% W, 4% A, 66% male	Internalizing behavior	+0.03
							Affect self-concept	+0.47
							Family self-concept	+0.31
							Social self-concept	+0.41
							Physical self-concept	+0.62
RULER	Brackett et al. (2012)	CQE	5-6	7 months	6 schools	3 schools in Long Island, NY	Internalizing behavior	+0.06
Second Step	Low et al. (2015)	CR	K-2	1 year	61 schools	61 schools in Washington and AZ; 50-78% FRL, 40-46% W, 6-8% AA, 15-475 H, 0-18% A	Emotional management	+0.13
							Emotional problems	+0.10*
	Sullivan et al. (2015)	CR	6	1 year	28 classes	3 middle schools in southeastern US. 28 classes, 63% B, 22% W, 1% H, 11% MR, 3% O, 23% SPED	Emotional regulation	+0.04

Program	Cite	Design	Grade	Duration	N	Sample	Outcome	Effect Size
Social Skills Group Intervention (SSGRIN)	DeRosier (2004)	SR	3	12 weeks	381 students	11 public elementary schools in Wake County Public School System. 73% W, 20% AA	Depressive symptoms	+0.01
							Social anxiety	+0.21*
							Self-efficacy	+0.21*
							Self-esteem	+0.21*
Tools of the Mind	Blair et al. (2018)	CR	K	1 year	29 schools	29 schools in 12 districts; 73% W, 2% AA, 7% H, 4% A	Emotional regulation	+0.16*

Note. CR=Cluster randomized, SR=Student randomized, CQE=Cluster quasi-experimental, SQE=Student quasi-experimental, A=Asian American, AA=African American, H=Hispanic, W=White, not Hispanic, O=Other, EL=English learner, FRL=Free and reduced lunch, SPED=Special Education.