SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY:
From Science to Practice

Special Topic: SASP Mini-Convention Report

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY:
From Science to Practice

Editor

Tyler L. Renshaw
University of California, Santa Barbara
trenshaw@education.ucsb.edu

Periodical Description

Student Affiliates in School Psychology (SASP) is the student-led organization of the American Psychological Association's Division 16. *School Psychology: From Science to Practice (FSTP)* is the quarterly periodical of SASP. It serves as a multipurpose platform for promoting and disseminating graduate-student scholarship; sharing applied knowledge and valuable practicum experiences; exchanging information and perspectives on critical issues in school psychology; propagating scientific and applied insights from current faculty, practitioners, and interns; and informing the membership of relevant activities, opportunities, resources, and happenings within the organization.

Manuscript Guidelines

FSTP currently accepts articles for seven themed columns: Scholarship, Research Reviews, Lessons From the Field, Forum, Commentary, Chapter Spotlight, and Perspectives. All submissions should be submitted directly to the editor via email at *trenshaw@education.ucsb.edu*. Submissions are accepted on a rolling deadline, so articles may be accepted well in advance of publication. For word count, content, and formatting guidelines for each column, please reference the "Manuscript Guidelines" document located on the SASP website (*http://www.iu.edu/~sasp/*). All manuscripts should be submitted as Word documents and adhere to APA style.

SASP EXECUTIVE BOARD

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY:
From Science to Practice

Special Topic: SASP Mini-Convention Report

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Welcome to the Mini-Convention Special Report

Sara E. House

Oklahoma State University

On August 7, 2009, approximately 40 school psychology students met in a hotel suite in Toronto for the SASP Mini-Convention. Student research was presented, a panel of professors spoke about their experiences of becoming early career school psychologist, and students swapped stories about their own graduate school experiences. As I stood among the students from across the U.S. and Canada and talked with them about their research, I realized that I was standing in the middle of the future of School Psychology. The research presented covered a wide range of topics that are critical to our field, including IEP development and use, anti-violence curricula, educational inclusion, and strength-based assessments. These presenters are the people who will be shaping what school psychology will be 10, 20, and 30 plus years from now. Furthermore, this room full of future school psychologists had the opportunity to learn about the road ahead of us from Drs. Albers, Hazel, and Allen. They provided insight into the process of obtaining an internship, balancing family and career, and the common struggles that many early-career school psychologists experience.

The Mini-Convention was an experience that I wish every school psychology student could have experienced, although I realize that is not possible. Therefore, we chose to devote a whole issue of *School Psychology: From Science to Practice* to the Mini-Convention, so that you can experience —in at least a small way—the research and information that was presented in August. Although, unfortunately, we were not able to obtain reports for all of the presentations, we were able to obtain reports for most. I hope you enjoy the scholarship presented within these pages, and I also hope that you will consider sharing your work with us next year at the SASP Mini-Convention!

Finally, the Mini-Convention experience would not have been possible without the enormous amount of effort put forth by our Convention Chair, Kelly Barker. Thank you for all your hard work, Kelly. It was a wonderful success!

SASP MINI-CONVENTION REPORT

A Retrospective on the Panel of Professionals: A Conversation with Drs. Albers, Allen, and Hazel

Kelly Ann Barker

St. John's University

How important is it for me to complete my internship at an APA accredited site? What are the benefits of doing a postdoc? How do I prepare myself for a career in academia? These are questions that many of us have had as we pursue our degrees and think towards the future. In seeking answers and guidance, many students turn to their advisors, faculty mentors, and practitioners in the field. During the SASP Mini-Convention this August, the Student Affiliates in School Psychology provided the opportunity for graduate students to do just that.

Distinguished school psychologists, Drs. Craig Albers, Korrie Allen, and Cynthia Hazel, served on a Panel of Professionals during the SASP Mini-Convention, where they spoke openly and answered questions about their experiences and opinions on topics relevant to students. All panel members are Assistant Professors at their respective Universities, Dr. Albers at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Dr. Allen at Eastern Virginia Medical School, and Dr.

Hazel at the University of Denver. Though all work in academia, they represent the diversity of school psychology in their research interests, post graduate experiences, and even in their degrees (Drs. Albers and Hazel received a Ph.D. degree, while Dr. Allen received a Psy.D.). What follows is a brief summary of their remarks on key topics and issues.

Summary of Panel Discussion

A key topic of discussion was finding the balance between work and family life. How that balance is achieved and what it looks like is likely to be different for everyone and based on personal decisions. They encouraged graduate students to *not* act as though work is always your top priority, but to make your family a priority as well. Family may also include more than your spouse and children, maintaining relationships with friends and extended family is important as well. Give thought to what you want your

life to look like, and be sure you are making decisions and taking actions that will allow that to happen. For those with children, an important recommendation from the panel was to be sure and have reliable childcare, back-up childcare, and maybe even a back-up for your back-up!

Whether discussing the balance between work and family life, or graduate school and a personal life, the same anecdotes and advice apply. As Dr. Albers reminded us, don't put off until tomorrow what you can do today, and don't do today what you can do tomorrow. As I am sure we have all learned in graduate school, there is always more to be done! Use your time wisely, and be flexible in your plans. Do not make work any harder than it needs to be. It's ok to have some free time; busy does not necessarily mean productive. Work efficiently, and don't feel guilty about taking time for yourself or others, you will be a better worker because of it.

We know that children find greater success when they have support, and the same is true of graduate students and school psychologists. It is important to have a support system, both professionally and socially. Your colleagues from graduate school are an invaluable support during your time in school, and will continue to be your professional allies long after. Surrounding yourself with family and friends will help you to overcome challenges, make important decisions, as well as enjoy life and find time to relax!

Because Dr. Allen works for a Medical School, a more "non-traditional" role for a school psychologist, she spoke a bit about what it is like to work in this type of role and to "be a Psy.D. in a Ph.D. world". She noted that we should not ever feel limited in the scope of what we can achieve. If you are interested in working in a more non-traditional setting, become aware of how your specific training will be a unique advantage to that setting. For Dr. Allen, this came in the way of being able to provide a link between the hospital and the schools. Dr. Allen's knowledge of the school setting gave her the unique advantage of working as a liaison between the two and ensuring easier transitions for the children. Furthermore, another piece of advice for those interested in working in a more non-traditional setting is to seek mentorship. In fact, this advice applies to all who may be interested in working in a specialty area or with specific population of children. It's advantageous to have mentors in the various areas that interest you, as you will gain different perspectives and learn unique things from each of them. In general, don't be afraid to reach out, call, e-mail, and introduce yourself to professionals at conferences. They noted that the more you seek out mentorship and look to learn from others, the greater awareness you will gain of yourself, your interests and who/what you want to be.

Members of the panel also re-commended not to be nervous if you are unsure about what you want to do or the type of setting you want to work in. As Dr. Hazel pointed out, "Psychology is like a candy store with so much to choose from, and graduate school is your time to get a stomach ache."

Try different things; allow yourself to sample all that psychology has to offer; follow your interests. You will have plenty of time to narrow your focus, to be more selective, to develop a specialty. For now, give yourself the opportunity to experience every area of psychology that may interest you. These experiences will help you determine a specialty or learn which populations you work best with, but you won't know what you're good at if you don't extend yourself and at least try. By doing so, you may even learn something new about yourself or develop an interest in an area you never thought you would. Moreover, they recommended that even when it comes to choosing your dissertation, do what you are passionate about. Not only will following your passion help you to stay motivated, but it also will come across in your work and the way you present it later —perhaps at a job interview. When discussing types of research and methodologies, they also recommended that choices between quantitative and qualitative research should be engaged during graduate school, following wherever your interests lead.

The panel also noted that the same advice holds true when trying to choose a predoctoral internship site. There are several available options and by the time you are deciding on internship placement, you should have a better idea of some areas that are of particular interest to you. In general, choose a site that meets your needs; choose a site that will help you further your core competencies as a school psychologist and that will allow you to develop in a more specialized area of interest to you; and don't be afraid to ask for what you want. Members of the panel spoke of how they worked to create their own internship experiences to meet their needs. Internship is your time to develop into the psychologists that you wish to be.

While discussing internship experiences, the question arose about the importance of completing an APA accredited internship. Ultimately, the members of the panel felt that there is no easy answer to this question, though in their personal experiences they did not believe it was necessary when seeking an academic position. Depending upon where you are looking to be employed and who is conducting the applicant search, the weight placed upon an APA accredited internship is likely to vary. However, none of the panel felt that it was a severe detriment to ones career to have completed an internship at a non-APA accredited site. The only time they felt that it may become a problem is when seeking licensure as a psychologist. For those potentially seeking licensure who will be completing their internship at a non-APA accredited site, the panel advises that you familiarize yourself with what the licensure guidelines are, and speak with your internship supervisor to make sure that you get those experiences. Most importantly, be sure to document how you've met the licensure requirements, as this data will support your application by providing written records on exactly how you met their stated requirements.

Beyond internship, completing post-doctoral training after graduation is another

option available to school psychologists, and many students inquired as to the benefits of completing this additional training. According to our panel members, a postdoc is a time to further advance your career, gain experiences you may not have had the opportunity for in your training program, and develop in a specialized area. A benefit to completing a postdoc is that it provides the opportunity for you to further your research career, providing you with the opportunity to be involved in a greater number of research projects, and/or research on a larger scale than you may have been exposed to previously. It may also provide the opportunity for you to gain teaching experience if academia is an avenue you wish to pursue. Postdocs also allow for increased networking, mentorship and collaboration with other professions in your area of interest. Overall, postdoctoral training provides the opportunity to gain advanced and specialized training in your interested subfield of study, which will vary depending on individual interests and circumstance.

Whether you decide to pursue postdoctoral training or a job following graduation, the panel had a few tips for student to keep in mind when preparing for such interviews. First, be prepared for challenges and try to pre-formulate responses to address these challenges. If you feel you might be challenged about why you decided to do a more qualitative versus quantitative dissertation, be prepared to address this. Why did you choose this area of research? Why are you passionate about it? How did it make you a better psychologist? If you are a school psychologist applying to a more clinical position, you might be challenged on why you are qualified for that position. How does your training provide you with a unique perspective? How will that unique perspective benefit the children at this site? To prepare to answer such questions, they recommended that current faculty mentors might be helpful. Specifically, don't be afraid to ask for advice if you are unsure of how you might respond to a specifically challenging question, or seek out colleagues who may do mock-interview work with you. Furthermore, the help and support of your peers and mentors can be invaluable during this process, too.

Several students stated an interest in pursuing a career in academia, and asked our panel for any advice in pursuing a faculty position. The panel discussed several things students can do to help prepare themselves and their CVs for a life in academia. One panel member suggested to not to worry too much about what your CV looks like: if you are active in the field and in your program, and are pursuing your interests, your CV should write itself. They also recommended to be careful not to become consumed with trying to look good on paper. Doing so may lead to spreading yourself too thin and may hinder your ability to pursue your true passions. This will become evident to interviewers as you discuss your experiences and, more importantly, can lead to unhappiness during the graduate student years!

That being said, the panel did identify certain experiences that will be an asset to

those seeking a career in academia. Specifically, teaching experience, either as a teacher's assistant or guest lecturer, provides students with a greater understanding of the role of a faculty member and demonstrates a familiarity with lecturing to a class. Also, grant writing is often a large piece of academic positions, and any experience in grant writing would be helpful. Furthermore, being a part of a faculty search committee or other departmental/university committee allows you to become acquainted with how departments operate internally. Additionally, one of the most important pieces of advice for those seeking a career in academia is to seek out mentorship and make connections with other scholars in other locations. It is important to get to know people in the field that you are interested in, both within and outside of your university. To accomplish this, they suggest introducing yourself at conferences, making yourself and your interests known, and not being afraid to follow-up with contacts and invest time in networking activities. Although it may be time consuming now, they say it will serve you well during your post-graduate years.

Conclusion

In summary, attending the SASP Mini-Convention and hearing from Drs. Albers, Allen, and Hazel was an invaluable experience for developing and future school psychologists. The opportunity to ask questions and learn from professionals in the field was a clear example of one of the most emphasized points of advice: the importance and power of mentorship. Furthermore, the diversity among the panelists reminds us that you can create the psychologist you become— even within the subfield of school psychology. This doesn't happen by chance; rather, it happens by providing yourself with the opportunities to try different things, learn about your strengths and areas of interest, and work to tailor your experiences to develop in those areas. To conclude, all of the panelists seemed to tell us a similar story: get to work; work efficiently; develop and maintain personal and professional relationships; and enjoy the great candy store of psychology!

Kelly Ann Barker, M.S., is a doctoral student in the School Psychology Program at St. John's University and the current Convention Chair for the SASP Executive Board.

SASP MINI-CONVENTION REPORT

An Analysis of Elementary and Secondary IEPs: Differences for Students with Learning Disabilities

Erika Miller, William McKee, Sarah Husain, and Kellie-Anne Browne-Campbell

University of British Columbia

Abstract. This study explored differences in IEPs for Elementary and Secondary students identified with a Learning Disability (LD) in British Columbia, Canada. A stratified random sample of 109 IEPs of elementary (K-7) and secondary (8-12) students from 32 school districts were analyzed. Current results indicate a remarkable number of Secondary student IEP goals (42%) were "non-instructional", meaning they were not related to changes in instruction, while for Elementary student IEPs only 22% were identified as "non-instructional". Over 39% of Secondary and 16% of Elementary IEPs lacked evidence of parental and/or student involvement in IEP planning. Results of this study help inform school professionals about current practices and use of data in instructional program planning for Elementary and Secondary School systems.

Educational law requires that students with learning disabilities have an Individualized Education Plan (IEP). Individual IEP planning meets legal requirements, but also contributes to the quality of education for these students by differentiating instruction and setting instructionally relevant goals. This study is an exploration of the differences in IEPs for Elementary and Secondary students identified with a Learning Disability (LD) in British Columbia, Canada. IEPs were analyzed to examine the required elements of each IEP goal using a checklist (Campbell, McKee, Husain, & Miller, 2009) based on a systematic review of the literature and requirements in the BC legislation.

Instructional goals are a critical feature of IEPs for students with learning disabilities and must be directly relevant to planning instruction that will meet their unique needs. Also, research suggests the importance of parental and student involvement in IEP planning (Simpson & Fiedler, 1989; Turnbull, Turnbull, & Wheat, 1982). Differences in parent and student involvement in the IEP planning and implementation process, at different developmental levels, need to be documented. Similarly, students who are involved in the IEP planning process have more positive views of IEPs (Lovitt & Cushing, 1994), and those students trained to

lead IEP goal setting show increased self-confidence and self-advocacy (Mason, Kovac, Johnson, & Stillerman, 2002). This study focuses on identifying differences in how explicitly goals are stated and if evidence of parental and/or student involvement in IEPs for Elementary and Secondary students with learning disabilities is present.

Literature supports the importance of the involvement of students with LD and their parents in the IEP process (Martin, Van Dycke, Christensen, Greene, Gardner, & Lovett, 2006; Mason, Kovac, & Johnson, 2004; Rock, 2000). Despite the obvious differences in grade level instructional demands and participation of students and parents in IEP planning at each level, little attention has been paid to this issue in the literature. The purpose of this study is to examine how instructional planning (goals) differs for Elementary and Secondary IEPs and how parents and/or students are involved in IEP planning at the two levels.

Procedures

The researchers examined 109 IEPs (55 elementary, 54 secondary) from 32 school districts across British Columbia, Canada. The IEPs analyzed for each student were developed over two academic years (2006-07 and 2007-08). All of the IEPs used in the study were written for students designated under the Ministry of Education category of Learning Disabilities (1701 Code Q). The distribution of students across grades was varied for both Elementary and Secondary groups (Figure 1).

Measure

A checklist was developed based on a systematic review of the literature and requirements in BC legislation. The General Elements Checklist (GEC) consisted of 8 items which examined key structural and instructional elements integral to all students' IEPs, regardless of the students' level of instruction. The checklist was in a Likert format, with response options of "evident", "somewhat evident", and "not stated". This checklist was originally developed for a larger study that assessed the structural and instructional elements of IEPs. Select items were also analyzed from an additional checklist used in a previous study to examine the instructional elements of goals presented for each IEP (Instructional Elements Checklist) with some items adapted from the Instructional Environment Scale (second edition; Ysseldyke & Christenson, 1996).

Results

Using the previously described measures, the researchers examined how instructional planning (goals) differed for Elementary and Secondary IEPs. Overall, goals were explicitly stated in the majority of IEPs of students with Learning Disabilities. More specifically, goals were stated explicitly

or somewhat explicitly for Elementary students more frequently than for Secondary students (Figure 2). When divided into groups, 98% of Elementary IEPs contained either evidence or some evidence of strengths and weaknesses. However, 7% of Secondary IEPs did not contain any evidence of a statement regarding strengths and weaknesses (Figure 3). Furthermore, researchers examined whether specific goals in the IEPs were instructional in nature as opposed to including adaptations only. Nearly half of the goals at the secondary level were non-instructional (i.e., behavioral, adaptations, accommodations), compared to a quarter at the elementary level (Figures 4 and 5).

The second research question addressed how parents and/or students are involved in IEP planning and implementation at the Elementary and Secondary levels. Overall, parent or student involvement in the IEP planning process was clearly evident for 67% of all IEPs examined. Nonetheless, parent or student involvement was not evident for 28% of IEPs (Figure 6). Researchers found differences were present in parent or student involvement in the planning process. Of note, for 16% of Elementary IEPs and 40% of Secondary IEPs, the presence of this involvement was not documented. Parent or student contribution to the implementation of the IEP was not documented for 60% of Elementary IEPs and 57% of Secondary IEPs (Figure 7). The Parent and Student awareness of the IEP was analyzed separately, using the checklist, to determine evidence of their awareness on each IEP. Parental awareness of

the IEP was clearly or somewhat evident for 80% of the IEPs, while student awareness was clearly or somewhat evident for 21% of IEPs. Student awareness of the IEP was low, with 86% of Elementary and 72% of Secondary IEPs not demonstrating evidence of the student being aware of the document (Figures 8 and 9).

Discussion

Results indicate that goals regarding instructional planning, as demonstrated on the IEP document, were present in almost half of goals stated in IEPs for Secondary students. Additionally, many Secondary students were likely unaware of the IEP document and not involved in the planning and implementation process, as indicated on the IEP document. Since a large number of the goals examined at the secondary level were non-instructional, this suggests that IEPs may serve a different function at the elementary and secondary levels. However, "best practices" in the literature have not differentiated between the utility of IEPs at the elementary and secondary levels. Considering this, it is possible that the transition to multiple classes and multiple core teachers at the Secondary level could inhibit communication among teachers regarding student-learning needs. Thus, to ameliorate this situation, it may be useful for policies to reflect the necessity of including instructional components during the IEP development process as well as communicating these to the student of

interest. This may heighten the value of secondary students having this information and being able to advocate for their own instructional needs.

In conclusion, we recommend that future studies in this line of research investigate the function of IEPs at Elementary and Secondary levels, given the dearth of literature in this area. Furthermore, systematic efforts implemented in schools to include students in IEP planning processes may empower them take action in both current and future planning regarding their educational future. Moreover, the findings herein suggest that it may be beneficial for school personnel across school districts to use a common structure for the development and im-plementation of IEPs in the future, as this may help establish consistency across school districts in the development of IEPs as well as adherence to best practice standards. Finally, given that this study is limited by geographic location—unable to be generalized beyond students British Columbia—we suggest that replications be pursued with a larger and broader sample.

References

Campbell, K. A. B., McKee, W., Husain, S., & Miller, E. (2009, February). *Elements of effective IEPs for students with learning disabilities*. Poster session presented at the annual convention of the National Association of School Psychologists, Boston, MA.

Lovitt, T. C. & Cushing, S. S. (1994). High school students rate their IEPs: Low opinions and lack of ownership. *Intervention in School & Clinic, 30*, 34-38.

Martin, J. E., Van Dycke, J. L., Christensen, W. R., Greene, B. A., Gardner, J. E., & Lovett, D. L. (2006). Increasing student participation in IEP meetings: Establishing the self-directed IEP as an evidenced based practice. *Exceptional Children, 72*, 299-316.

Mason, C.Y., Kovac, M., & Johnson, L. (2004). How to help students lead their IEP meetings. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 36*, 18-25.

Mason, C.Y., Kovac, M., Johnson, L. & Stillerman, S. (2002). Implementing student-led IEPs: Student participation and student and teacher reactions. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 25*, 171-192.

Rock, M. L. (2000). Parents as equal partners. *Teacher Exceptional Children, 32*, 30-37.

Simpson, R. L. & Fiedler, C. R. (1989). Parent Participation in Individualized Educational Program (IEP) Conferences: A Cased for Individualization. In M. J. Fine (Ed.), *The Second Handbook on Parent Education: Contemporary Perspectives* (pp. 145-171). San Diego: Academic Press, Inc.

Turnbull, H. R., Turnbull, A. P. & Wheat, M. J. (1982). Assumptions of parental participation: A legislative history. *Exceptional Education Quarterly, 3*, 1-8.

Ysseldyke, J., & Christenson, S. (1996). The instructional environment system (2nd ed.). Longmont, CO: Sopris West.

SASP MINI-CONVENTION REPORT

"He Says, She Says": Examining Parent and Teacher Ratings Among Preschool Youth

D'Andrea Jacobs and Laurie Benson

Michigan State University

How do we achieve success within the educational system? Certainly there is the traditional orientation towards academic achievement as the most highly regarded outcome of educational systems. Yet theoretical and empirical evidence suggest that there is also an underlying set of social skills and behaviors that are not only beneficial to child development in and of themselves, but acquisition of such social competency may also bolster development in the academic domain. With elementary enrollment burgeoning to a projected 34.9 million for the fall of 2008 (Hussar & Bailey, 2008), attending to social competency development as an additional avenue toward the promotion and support of academic achievement has never been so promising. Social and political circles have devoted much attention to the task of increasing academic ability (or academic achievement) among students. With national mandates such as the No Child Left Behind Act calling for assess- ments and monitoring of teachers, students, and administrators, the need to increase academic achievement is evident throughout the educational system. As such, research involving factors that contribute to academic achievement is not uncommon. A multitude of efforts involving teacher relationships, curriculum development, and support programs are continually examined as means of developing students, with the ultimate goal of increasing academic achievement in students.

Social Competence and Academic Achievement

While attention to quality instruction and core curriculum is imperative to academic success, it is also important to examine social competence skills when looking to bolster student achievement. Skills such as the ability to work effectively as a member of a group, to appropriately communicate one's wants and needs, and to resolve personal conflicts have been found to have significant effects that reach beyond the

social domain. For example, extant research indicates a relationship between social competence and academic readiness (Malecki and Elliot, 2004; McClelland, Acock, & Morrison, 2006; Hennessey, 2007; Brock, Nishida, Chiong, Grimm, & Riff-Kaufman, 2008). Given such a relationship, social competence skills (e.g., cooperation, responsibility, and independence) comprise a significant portion of "learning-related skills," highlighting their association with academic achievement (McClelland et al., 2006). This is particularly evident in early childhood education. In a study assessing the relationship between learning-related skills and math and reading scores, McClelland et al. found that children lacking learning-related skills were found to have lower math and reading scores compared to children who possessed such skills. Furthermore, among children lacking learning related skills between kindergarten through second grade, the gap in math and reading scores increased over time, as opposed to children in third through sixth grade, in which the discrepancy persisted but did not increase. These and other findings suggest that social competence skills support a strong foundation for academic readiness and future learning.

Discrepancies in Conceptualizing Social Competency

The development of social competence skills has been increasingly emphasized in academic settings, particularly within the early childhood classroom (Hennessey, 2007; Brock, Nishida, Chiong, Grimm, & Riff-Kaufman, 2008). Although there appears to be agreement that social competence skills are important and beneficial to child outcomes and development, there may be some discrepancy as to the way in which such competencies are conceptualized and defined among key stakeholders in early education. For example, a study comparing the social skills ratings of Native American and white parents and teachers found discrepant results. While there was moderate agreement between teachers and Native American parents, there was low agreement between teachers and white parents (Powless & Elliot, 1993). While studies have found that these differences may vary as a result of parent and teacher ethnicity, other studies have found that these discrepant ratings result when racial differences are not present (Alston, 1982; Zimmerman, Khoury, Vega, Gil, & Warheit, 1995).

Connecting the Home and School Environments

In conclusion, the combined interactions between the home and school environments appear to intertwine in their ability to affect academic outcomes. For example, Parcel and Menaghan (1995) found that the resources acquired within the familial relationship (e.g. safety, cleanliness, cognitive stimulation) are related to lower rate of

problem behaviors. Parental attitudes toward school, which can be expressed covertly and overtly to the child, also contribute to shared attitudes between parents and children in relation to education, which can aid in academic achievement (Johnson, 2007; Voydanoff, 2004). Students who can smoothly transition from home and school cultures are found to be more readily able to succeed in the academic climate, as opposed to those who view the two cultures as opposing or different (Phelan, Davidson, & Cao, 1991).

Understanding the importance of family and school cohesion of ideals, schools are increasingly making efforts to establish a relationship between the two environments. Research that seeks to better understand parent and teacher similarities and differences in their perceptions of socially competent behavior has the potential to inform the development and evaluation of programs aimed at bridging the divide between home and school. This has several implications for practice, as there are some very practical ways to enhance such understanding, including maintaining consistent comm- unication with parents via a multitude of media (i.e., newsletters, school website, home/school blogs) and frequent invitations to school functions such as parent-teacher conferences and open houses. These efforts may assist in the communication of school- based values and ideals that may not be discussed in the home environment.

D'Andrea L. Jacobs, M.A., is a student in the School Psych-ology Program at Michigan State University.

References

Alston, L. (1982). Parent vs. teacher reactions to problematic behavior of head start children. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 3*, 155-165.

Brock, L. L. Nishida, C. K., Chiong, C., Grimm, K. J., & Riff-Kaufman, S. E. (2008). Children's perceptions of the classroom environment and social and academic performance: A longitudinal analysis of the contribution of the Responsive Classroom approach. *Journal of School Psychology, 46*, 129–149.

Hennessey, B. A. (2007). Promoting social competence in school-aged children: The effects of the open circle program. *Journal of School Psychology, 45,* 349–360.

Hussar, W. J., and Bailey, T. M. (2008). *Projections of Education Statistics to 2017* (NCES 2008-078). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Malecki, C. K. & Elliot, S. N. (2002). Children's social behaviors as predictors of academic achievement: A longitudinal analysis. *School Psychology Quarterly, 7*, 1-23.

McClelland, M. M., Acock, A. C., & Morrison, F. J. (2006). The impact of kindergarten learning-related skills on academic trajectories at the end of elementary school. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 21*, 471–490.

Parcel, T. L. & Menaghan, E. G. (1995). Social sources of change in children's environments: The effects of parental occupation and family conditions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57*, 69-84.

Powless, D. L. & Elliot, S. N. (1993). Assessment of social skills of native American preschoolers: Teachers' and parents' ratings. *Journal of School Psychology, 31*, 293-307.

Zimmerman, R. S., Khoury, E. L., Vega, W. A., Gil, A. G. & Warheit, G. J. (1995). Teacher and Parent Perceptions of Behavior Problems Among a Sample of African American, Hispanic, and Non-Hispanic White Students. *American Journal of Community Psychology 23,* 181-197.

Laurie Benson, M.A., is a student in the School Psychology Program at Michigan State University.

SASP MINI-COVENTION REPORT

Development of Executive Function in Adolescents

Alycia Dadd
Fordham University

Abstract. Executive function (EF) is an umbrella term that refers to several higher order cognitive processes required to engage in goal directed behavior. Within the large body of research involving EF there is a paucity of information on the typically developing individual, particularly in the adolescent years. The primary purpose of this paper is to explore any developmental trends that emerge in adolescence. The second purpose of this paper is to distinguish EF as a construct unique from general measured intelligence, as suggested by Delis (2007). A small scale study was conducted and extant data was collected on a total of 11 high school students. Findings from both their general cognitive assessment and specific assessment of executive functioning suggest a developmental trend in the ability to utilize motor planning and self-monitoring between the ages of 14 and 16.5. Evidence also suggested that EF is a construct that is not synonymous with IQ and should be studied independently. A discussion of these findings, including implications for practice, is included herein.

Executive Function (EF) processes occur in a coordinated effort to direct perception, emotion, cognition and motor functions; however, they do not represent a single construct (McCloskey, 2007). The prefrontal cortex and the anterior cingulate cortex of the brain are strongly associated with executive function. The prefrontal cortex is critical in goal directed behavior and provides a neuroanatomical connection between the limbic and the reticular activating systems, which regulate motivation and arousal. These are vital systems necessary to regulate attention, selectively attend to salient information, and monitor one's performance (Spreen, Risser, Edgell, 1995). During early childhood the volume of gray and white matter of the frontal lobes grow substantially (Hongwanishkul, Happaney, Lee, & Zelazo, 2005). Much research has been conducted studying the development of executive function in early childhood, as was reviewed in Carlson's meta-analysis (2005). Another large body of EF research involves the study of individuals who have experienced some insult to their prefrontal cortex and utilizes

assessment methods that are downward extensions of adult models with little regard to a developmental perspective (Meltzer, 2007). Considering this, there is a lack of research on the typically developing individual, particularly in the adolescent years. Thus, the primary purpose of this paper is to explore any developmental trends that may emerge in adolescence. Although developmental differences may not be pronounced across groups, it is believed that a general trend will emerge that will reveal some differences across ages. Specifically, it is hypothesized that there will be a significant difference on one or more of the tasks measuring executive function across age groups. Furthermore, it is hypothesized that the younger group will perform less successfully on one or more of the EF tasks than the older group.

The lack of a consensual definition of EF has lead some researchers to question whether or not EF is a construct separate from one's general cognitive functioning or measured intelligence. In light of the variability of the definition of EF, there are several models currently cited in the relevant literature, all of which include different discrete processes that relate to goal directed behaviors (Barkley, 1997; Brown, 2006; Dawson & Guare , 2004; McCloskey, 2007; Zelazo, Carter, Reznick, & Frye, 1997). Given this, the second purpose of this paper is to distinguish EF as a construct unique from general measured intelligence, as suggested by Delis (2007). The expectation is that correlations between measured IQ and EF

will fall somewhere between 0.1 and .5, indicating moderate to small correlations. Specifically, correlations will be calculated to examine two additional hypotheses. One, Verbal Fluency, as measured on the Delis-Kaplan Executive Function System (D-KEFS) Category Switching Accuracy, will be more highly correlated with a participants Verbal Comprehension Index (VCI) than their Perceptual Reasoning Index (PRI)/Perceptual Organization Index (POI). Two, a measure of nonverbal fluency and response inhibition (D-KEFS Design Fluency Switching) will correlate more highly with PRI/POI than VCI. Three, Visual Motor sequencing (D-KEFS Trail making Test) will correlate more highly with PRI/POI than VCI. Four, Inhibition of over learned verbal responses (D-KEFS Color-Word Interference) will be more highly correlated with VCI than PRI/POI. And six, Sort Recognition Description on the D-KEFS will be more comparably correlated with both PRI/POI and VCI, as the task requires sorting based on both visual and verbal mediated relationships. Furthermore, as a caveat, it is anticipated that the small sample size in the present study will contribute to findings that are less robust than Delis' original results.

Method

Participants. Data were collected from 11 high school students, ranging in age from 14.25 years to 17.6 years. Only those students who obtained Full Scale IQ (FSIQ) scores in the average range or above were

included. All assessments were conducted as part of the students' initial or triennial evaluations, carried out via the Committee on Special Education (CSE). All students attended a public high school in a middle- to upper-class suburb of New York City. Local demographic data suggest that the ethnic makeup of the school is as follows: 90% Caucasian, 5% Hispanic, 4% Asian, <1% Black, <1% Native American. Moreover, in this particular district, only 1% of students qualified for free or reduced price lunch, compared to 44% statewide. Overall, three females and eight males were assessed.

Measures. Six students received the WISC-IV and four were administered the WAIS-III. For the purposes of this study, the VCI and PRI/POI will be used for correlational analysis. The D-KEFS was used to assess specific areas of executive function. The D-KEFS consists of nine distinct tests; however, not all participants were administered the full battery.

Procedures. Despite the small sample size, statistical analyses were conducted to examine the data. To analyze the first hypothesis, students were assigned to one of four groups based on their ages (six-month interval groupings were used). One-way Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were conducted for each measure of executive function to explore any significant differences between the age groupings. Additionally, the correlation between D-KEFS tests and the Wechsler PRI/POI and VCI were calculated to evaluate all of the remaining hypotheses.

Results

As previously described, the first hypothesis was investigated via multiple ANOVAs, examining the group mean differences on all the measures of EF that were administered (Table 1). A significant difference on performance of the D-KEFS Design Fluency Switching Test, $F(30.8, 3.9) = 7.83$, $p = .25$, was found. This finding indicates that there were significant differences in participants' performance on this task related to group membership. Furthermore, post hoc analyses were conducted using Tukey's HSD test, with $p = .05$. Results from these analyses revealed significant differences between Groups 1, 2, and 3, but not group 4. The remainder of the analyses, however, revealed results that were not significant, which was anticipated in light of the small sample size.

To analyze the remainder of the hypotheses, correlational analyses were conducted (Table 2). Unlike Delis' study, all groups were collapsed due of the small number of participants. Correlations ranged from .05 to .71, which is a range of small to large, based on Cohen's criteria. Specifically, results from these analyses indicated that Verbal Fluency on the DKEFS was more highly correlated with participants VCI ($r = .596$) than with their PRI/POI ($r = .312$); D-KEFS Design Fluency Switching correlated more highly with PRI/POI ($r = .473$) than with VCI ($r = -.471$); Visual Motor Sequencing (D-KEFS Trail Making Test) correlated more highly with PRI/POI

Table 1. *ANOVA Results Regarding Age-Group Differences in Executive Function*

Source	SS	df	MS (*s2*)	F	*p*
Design Fluency Switching					
Between Groups	92.3	3	30.8	7.83	.025*
Within Groups	19.7	5	3.9		
Total	112	8			
Design Fluency – Filled					
Between Groups	19.1	3	6.4	4.43	.071
Within Groups	7.2	5	1.4		
Total	26.2	8			
Trial Making – Motor Speed					
Between Groups	88.5.	3	29.5	4.4	.094
Within Groups	27.0.	4	6.75		
Total	115.5	7			
Verbal Fluency – Letter					
Between Groups	49.13	3	16.4	2.9	.140
Within Groups	28.5	5	5.7		
Total	77.6	8			
Trial Making – Number Letter Switch					
Between Groups	33.5	3	11.2	2.18	.233
Within Groups	20.5	4	5.1		
Total	54	7			
Tower – Move Accuracy					
Between Groups	36.8	3	12.3	2.9	.268
Within Groups	8.5	2	4.3		
Total	45.3	5			
Tower – Mean Time to first move					
Between Groups	10.3	3	3.4	2.8	.277
Within Groups	2.5	2	1.25		
Total	12.8	5			
Tower – Time per move					
Between Groups	8.8	3	2.9	2.4	.312
Within Groups	2.5	2	1.2		
Total	11.3	5			
Design Fluency - Empty					
Between Groups	23.2	3	7.7	1.5	.32
Within Groups	25.7	5	5.1		
Total	48.9	8			

*p<.05

(r = .707) than VCI (r =.135). Examination of further hypotheses indicated that the D-KEFS Color-Word Interference scores were not more highly correlated with VCI (r = -.053) than PRI/POI (r = .326), and the final hypothesis (testing the relationship between Sort Recognition Description on the D-KEFS and IQ) was un-examinable—given that not enough participants received the particular subtest of interest.

Conclusions

Analyses of the results found differences on specific measures of executive function by age among the subjects in this study. In particular, the ability to use cognitive flexibility, visual attention, motor speed, visual-perceptual and constructional skills to complete unique designs appears to vary as a function of age. Moreover, significant differences on the Design Fluency switching subtest suggest a developmental trend in the ability to utilize motor planning and self-monitoring between the ages of 14 and 16.5 years. Further support for this trend is shown in Table 1, where both the D-KEFS Filled Dots and Trail Making Motor Speed tasks, although not significant, indicate a greater difference for age than for the remaining measures. Thus, motor planning may be an area that is rapidly developing within adolescence and should be evaluated further. Trends were also observed that suggest areas for further research, including Verbal Fluency by letter categorization. This trend may be

attributed to the development of one's ability to organize and retrieve verbal information on demand, and it may be impacted by difficulties with reading or awareness of initial letter sounds. Furthermore, scores on the Tower test (mean time per move, the time until the first move, and move accuracy) suggest that while students may be able to accurately recreate a model and monitor designs, the ability to comply with task rules is variable. Differences were indicative of difficulties initiating and suggested that some students have greater difficulty planning. Considering this, the Tower test may be a useful tool for further evaluation of EF development, particularly detailed analysis of the descriptive scores.

Results also provided evidence to support Delis' claim that EF is a construct that, while related, is not synonymous with IQ. In this study, the correlations were not as robust as Delis', but the majority of correlations fell in the medium range and ranged from -.05 to .71, following the hypothesized pattern. Generally, those tasks that were more reliant on visual processing correlated more highly with the PRI, while those with more verbal demands correlated more highly with the VCI. Thus, while there is some relationship between IQ and EF, the data suggest that they are not the same construct and can therefore be studied independently.

Considering research design, there were several impediments to achieving statistical significance throughout this study. First, a small sample of convenience was

Table 2. *Correlations between D-KEFS and WISC-IV/WAIS-III Performance Indices*

Variable	N=11 POI/PRI	VCI
Verbal Category Switching: Accuracy	.312	.596
Design Fluency: Switching	.473	-.47
Trail Making Test: Switching	.707*	.135
Color-Word Interference Test: Inhibition/Switching	.326	-.053
Sort Recognition: Description	n/a	n/a

Note: D-KEFS = Delis-Kaplan Executive Function System
VCI = Verbal Comprehension Index; POI = Perceptual Organization Index
PRI = Perceptual Reasoning Index
*p<.05

utilized. The small number of participants made the attainment of statistically significant data difficult. Additionally, extant data was used and there was some variation in the exact battery administered to each participant. Thus, certain hypotheses could not be evaluated, as previously described. Furthermore, while the target of this research was to identify "typical" development, all of these students had been referred to the Committee on Special Education because of difficulties with learning or behavior. As such, they did exhibit some aberrant behavior and would therefore not usually be classified as representatives of "typical" development. However, given that

the students' needs were not comparable to those in the clinical population, they were used for the purposes of this study. It is important to remember, however, that the intent of the present study was exploratory in nature, seeking to generate anecdotal information that may guide further research in this area. Future large-scale studies that examine test results from a population with no history of learning difficulties are recommended. Indeed, the undertaking of this research is vitally important to academic success. There are a growing number of high school age students struggling with executive dysfunction and few research-based inter-

ventions have been identified that emerge from a developmental perspective. Thus, the main goal of this line of research should be to create efficacious and developmentally appropriate interventions that can be implemented in the context of school-based intervention services.

Author's Note

References

Barkley, R. A. (1997). *ADHD and the nature of self-control*. New York: The Guilford Press

Brown, T. E. (2006). Executive functions and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: Implications of two conflicting viewpoints. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, *53*, 35-46.

Carlson, S. M. (2005). Developmentally sensitive measures of executive function in preschool children. *Developmental Neuropsychology, 28*, 595-616.

Dawson, P. & Guare, R. (2004). Executive skills in children and adolescents. New York: The Guilford Press.

Delis, D., Lansing, A., Houston, W. S., Wetter, S., Duke Han, S., Jacobson, M., Holdnack, J., & Kramer J. (2007). Creativity lost: The importance of testing higher-level executive functions in school-age children and adolescents. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 25*, 29-40.

Hongwanishkul, D., Happaney, K. R., Lee, W., & Zelazo, P. D. (2005). Hot and cool executive function: Age-related changes and individual differences. *Developmental Neuropsychology, 28,* 617-644.

McCloskey, G. (2007, November). *Executive functions overview.* Presentation at the Learning and Brain Conference, Cambridge, MA.

Spreen, O., Risser A. H., & Edgell, D. (1995). *Developmental neuropsychology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Zelazo, P. D., Carter, A. S., Reznick, J. S., & Frye, D. (1997). Early development of executive function: A problem solving approach. *Review of General Psychology, 1*, 198-226.

Alycia Dadd, M.Ed., is a doctoral student in the School Psychology Program at Fordham University.

SASP MINI-CONVENTION REPORT

A Question of Empirical Support: Inclusive Education and Student Outcomes

Alisha M. B. Brown

Michigan State University

Inclusive education is a key policy objective in numerous countries, including the United States. Wide reaching pieces of American legislation including the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA), and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act have brought inclusion to the forefront of educational news and public awareness. A major force behind these changes in public policy is a moral concern for human rights and social justice; however, there is, to date, lacking empirical support for this moral quest. Thus, it is reasonable to question the level of empirical support for inclusive education.

This literature review theoretically frames social justice and empirical evidence as two pillars supporting the rationale underlying inclusive education. Specifically, the intent of this review is to explore the existing support for both pillars, as it is important for school psychologists to be aware of these multiple sources of information when making special education placement decisions for students with disabilities. For the purposes of this review, *inclusive education* is defined as the creation of access to and full participation in rich learning for all students without prejudice (McPhail & Freeman, 2005). Given that school psychologists play a critical role in determining the extent to which a child with a disability is included in the general education classroom, they are encouraged to weigh both social justice and empirical evidence when making such decisions.

A review of the extant literature revealed that inclusive education is largely justified on social justice grounds. Theoretical work, educational policy, and the introduction and discussion sections of research papers collectively show that inclusion is widely accepted as a fundamental human right. Thus, the social justice pillar of inclusion stands tall. Justification on empirical grounds is not as clear, however, and is the primary focus of this literature review. To evaluate the strength of the empirical evidence pillar of inclusion, the general research question was posed: Is

inclusive education empirically supported? Support was measured in terms of student academic and social-emotional outcomes. To answer the research question, eleven research papers studying the empirical effectiveness of inclusion in terms of academic and social-emotional student outcomes were reviewed. Two of these articles examined academic student outcomes only (Idol, 2006; Rea, McLaughlin, & Walter-Thomas, 2002), five examined social-emotional outcomes only (Blair, Umbreit, Dunlap, & Jung, 2007; Bouck, 2006; Frederickson, Simmonds, Evans, & Soulsby, 2007; Jordan & Stanovich, 2001; Wiener & Tardif, 2004), and four examined both academic and social-emotional student outcomes (Carter, Cushing, Clark, & Kennedy, 2005; Kalambouka, Farrell, Dyson, & Kaplan, 2007; LeRoy & Simpson, 1996; Lindsay, 2007). It is important to note that these articles are by no means an exhaustive list of studies carried out in this subject area; rather, a small sample of such studies was selected with the intent of obtaining a snapshot of current empirical research findings in this area.

Of the two articles examining academic student outcomes only, one revealed positive effects of inclusion (Rea, McLaughlin, & Walter-Thomas, 2002) and one revealed mixed effects (Idol, 2006). Of the five articles examining social-emotional student outcomes only, two revealed positive effects of inclusion (Blair et al., 2007; Wiener & Tardiff, 2004), two revealed mixed effects (Frederickson et al., 2007; Jordan & Stanovich, 2001), and one revealed negative

effects (Bouck, 2006). Furthermore, of the four articles examining both academic and social-emotional student outcomes, two revealed positive effects of inclusion (Carter et al., 2005; LeRoy & Simpson, 1996), one revealed mixed effects (Kalambouka et al., 2007), and one revealed negative effects (Lindsay, 2007).

Contrary to popular belief, the present small-scale analysis of the research reveals the lack of a firm research base for inclusion. Despite the fact that a proportion of the studies produced positive results, more produced either mixed or negative results, suggesting that inclusion may actually *not* be beneficial for all students with disabilities. For future research, we recommend that scholars increase the quality, quantity, and specificity (i.e., targeting particular groups of students with particular types of disabilities) of studies examining the impact of inclusive education to shed further light on the varied findings reviewed here. In conclusion, although we believe that research in this area has the potential to compliment the social justice rationale for inclusive education, it appears, at this point, that the empirical evidence pillar is far less substantiated and therefore less sturdy than the social justice pillar in supporting inclusive education.

References

Blair, K. S., Umbreit, J., Dunlap, G., & Jung, G. (2007). Promoting inclusion and peer participation through assessment-based intervention. *Top Early Child Special Education, 27*, 134-147.

Bouck, E. C. (2006). How educational placements impact classroom interactions: Experiences of six secondary students with mild mental impairment. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 41*, 4-14.

Carter, E. W., Cushing, L. S., Clark, N. M., & Kennedy, C. H. (2005). Effects of peer support interventions on students' access to the general curriculum and social interactions. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 30,* 15-25.

Frederickson, N., Simmonds, E., Evans, L., & Soulsby, C. (2007). Assessing the social and affective outcomes of inclusion. *British Journal of Special Education, 34,* 105-115.

Idol, L. (2006). Toward inclusion of special education students in general education: A program evaluation of eight schools. *Remedial and Special Education, 27*, 77-94.

Jordan, A., & Stanovich, P. (2001). Patterns of teacher-student interaction in inclusive elementary classrooms and correlates with student self-concept. *International Journal of Disability, Development, and Education, 48*, 33-52.

Kalambouka, A., Farrell, P., Dyson, A., & Kaplan, I. (2007). The impact of placing pupils with special education needs in mainstream schools on the achievement of their peers. *Educational Research, 49*, 365-382.

LeRoy, B., & Simpson, C. (1996). Improving student outcomes through inclusive education. *Support for Learning, 11,* 32-36.

Lindsay, G. (2007). Educational psychology and the effectiveness of inclusive education/ mainstreaming. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 77,* 1-24.

McPhail, J. C., & Freeman, J. G. (2005). Beyond prejudice: Thinking towards genuine inclusion. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 20*, 254-267.

Rea, P. J., McLaughlin, V. L., & Walter-Thomas, C. (2002). Outcomes for students with learning disabilities in inclusive and pullout programs. *Exceptional Children, 68*, 203-222.

Wiener, J., & Tardif, C. Y. (2004). Social and emotional functioning of children with learning disabilities: Does special education placement make a difference? *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 19*, 20-32.

Alisha M. B. Brown, B.A., is a second-year doctoral student in the School Psychology Program at Michigan State University.

SASP MINI-CONVENTION REPORT

Does Gender Affect Internalizing vs. Externalizing Behaviors in Alternative Schools?

Jessica Blasik, Janice Decker, Dana Keener, and Ryan Lenz

Duquense University

Abstract. The purpose of this study was to examine the difference between the social and emotional functioning of male and female students, as it relates to executive functioning, at two Alternative Education programs. Although the results were not significant, the interaction between gender and program as it relates to social-emotional and executive functioning approached significance. Results from 36 participating students are presented herein. Some guidance on how to interpret the assessment tools and how the results apply to male and female students within these alternative education environments is also provided herein. Using such information, school teams may be able to more effectively target younger students in hopes of preventing the need for Alternative Education programming.

Executive functioning involves skills such as goal-oriented planning, strategy building, self-monitoring of behavior, and organization of information (Clark, Prior, & Kinsella, 2002). Executive functioning has a dramatic impact on learning new information and, therefore, has implications for success in school. Past research has indicated that both externalizing and internalizing behaviors have been associated with executive functioning deficits. In recent years, internalizing and externalizing problems have been studied as well as the adverse affects they have on a student's ability to benefit from an education (Friedman et al, 2007; Herman & Ostrander, 2007; McCandless & O'Laughlin, 2007). Executive functions are highly related to one's ability to learn and retain information (Clark, Prior, & Kinsella, 2002). For example, when distracted or unable to attend to what is being presented, students have a difficult time interacting with their environment in positive and meaningful ways. Given that research indicates that females are more likely to experience internalizing symptoms while males are more likely to exhibit the externalizing behaviors, it is possible that gender differences may be

associated with different levels of executive functioning deficits (Friedman et al., 2007).

This study examined the differences in social-emotional and executive functioning skills between students in specialized instruction programs at two different schools. One program, called "Road Less Traveled," is a voluntary alternative education program designed for students at-risk for not graduating who do *not* exhibit chronic behavior problems. The other alternative education program, known as "CrossRoads," is an involuntary program comprised of students who may have had chronic behavior problems, truancy, or or have been expelled because of drug or weapon violations. We hypothesized that students in the involuntary group would exhibit higher levels of externalizing behaviors, such as acting out, defiance, and verbal aggression. Conversely, we hypothesized that students in the voluntary group would exhibit higher levels of internalizing behaviors, such as depressive feelings and/or anxious thoughts (Tobin & Sprague, 2002; Walker & Sprague, 1999). The differences highlighted between these two groups of students is noteworthy, as differences in problem behaviors may have implications for both educational planning and intervention.

Methods

This study examined forty-two 15- to 18-year old adolescents at two different alternative education programs in a single school district in Pennsylvania. Once the adolescents with missing data were removed, the sample size was reduced to 36 students, 17 males and 19 females. The Road Less Traveled group had 19 students, 13 females and 6 males, while the CrossRoads group had 17 students, 11 males and 6 females.

The data were collected during the 2008-2009 school year and were part of the behavioral assessments required for alternative education grant funding. The current study used de-identified data to conduct the analysis with the permission of the school and university IRB approval. The data analysis included the composite T-scores on the Internalizing Problems, Externalizing Problems, and Executive Functioning scales of the Teacher Rating Scale of the Behavioral Assessment Scale for Children-Second Edition (BASC-2; Reynolds & Kamphaus, 2004), as well as the Global Executive Composite on the Behavior Rating Inventory for Executive Function (BRIEF; Gioia, Isquith, Guy, & Kenworthy, 2000). The Global Executive Composite score from the BRIEF is an overall estimate of a student's executive function level and takes into consideration all areas contained within the BRIEF. Differences between program and gender were examined at the two alternative schools.

Data Analysis and Results

A MANOVA was conducted to test the previously described hypotheses. Results

Table 1. *Outcome Means and Standard Deviations by Program Type and Gender*

	BASC-2 Externalizing	BASC-2 Internalizing	BASC-2 Executive Functioning	BRIEF Global Executive Function
CrossRoads (overall)	54.94 (9.05)	54.88 (16.45)	52.06 (10.46)	71.24** (15.26)
Males	54.45 (9.59)	51.91 (13.54)	51.82 (11.83)	73.55** (12.45)
Females	55.83 (8.77)	60.33* (21.07)	52.50 (8.36)	67.00** (20.04)
Road Less Traveled (overall)	54.32 (8.81)	58.58 (11.41)	54.68 (8.75)	66.37** (20.12)
Males	58.50 (8.60)	61.17* (13.01)	59.00 (8.90)	73.33** (28.33)
Females	52.38 (53.47)	57.38 (10.95)	52.69 (8.26)	63.15* (15.41)
Males (overall)	55.88 (9.19)	55.18 (13.72)	54.35 (11.17)	73.47** (18.65)
Females (overall)	53.47 (8.52)	58.32 (14.33)	52.63 (8.06)	64.37* (16.53)
Total	54.61 (8.80)	56.83 (13.93)	53.44 (9.55)	68.67** (17.91)

indicated no significant main effects for gender (F (3, 32) = .961, p = .444) or the type of program (F (3, 32) = .836, p = .513), nor interaction effects between gender and the type of program (F (3, 32) = .470, p = .061) on any of the other associated variables (i.e., internalizing behaviors, externalizing behaviors, and executive functioning; see Table 1 for means and standard deviations). However, given a bigger sample size, the interaction effect may be significant, given that it approached significance in this small sample.

For BASC-2 results, scores from 41-59 are considered to be average, while scores from 60-69 are considered at-risk and scores of 70 and above are considered clinically significant for problems within the area of interest. For the BRIEF results, scores from 41-59 are considered to be average, while scores from 60-64 are at-risk and

scores of 65 or higher are considered clinically significant. It is important to note the differences in the qualitative categorization of at-risk verses clinically significant for the BASC and BRIEF. Of equal importance is the difference between having a score in the at-risk range versus a clinically significant range, as this is a factor in the interpretation of the results.

All student scores for the Externalizing Problems and Executive Functioning scales fall within the normal range. However, it is interesting to note that males in the Road Less Traveled group had an average of 59 on the BASC Executive Functioning Scale, which is just below the at-risk range. Furthermore, the difference between the genders in the CrossRoads group was less than one point, while the difference between males ($M = 59$) and females ($M = 52.69$) in the Road Less Traveled group was more than a six points.

Results from the Internalizing Problems scale indicate a nine point difference between males in the Road Less Traveled group ($M = 61.17$) and the males in the CrossRoads group ($M = 51.91$). This is not statistically significant; never-theless, it seems to have clinical relevance because the CrossRoads group shows typical levels of internalizing symptoms while the Road Less Traveled group shows an at-risk level of internalizing problems. Unlike the males, the females in the Road Less Traveled group scored lower ($M = 57.38$) than the females in the CrossRoads group ($M = 60.33$). Although the interaction for gender and program was not significant ($F(1, 32) = 1.501$, $p = .229$), on average, the BASC-2 Internalizing Problems scale scores for females in the CrossRoads group and males in the Road Less Traveled group were in the at-risk range. On the other hand, the females in the Road Less Traveled group and the males in the CrossRoads group had average scores on the Internalizing Problems scale.

For the Global Executive Function composite of the BRIEF, the females had an overall score that fell in the at-risk range ($M = 63.15$), while the males' mean score fell in the clinically significant range ($M = 73.47$). Although the discrepancy between the groups is not statistically significant ($F = (1, 36)$ 1.714, $p = .200$), on average, males reportedly exhibited executive functioning deficits at a rate observably higher than females. Group means indicate that males in both groups (CrossRoads $M = 73.5$ and Road Less Traveled $M = 73.3$) had similar scores, with both exhibiting clinically significant ex-ecutive functioning deficits. For females, the executive function composite score for the CrossRoads group falls in the clinically significant range ($M = 67$), while the mean score of the females in the Road Less Traveled group fell in the at-risk range ($M = 63.15$). Although there was no significant differences between these groups, there may be some meaningful clinical, observable differences recognized between the groups.

Discussion

The focus of this study was to examine social and emotional functioning as it differed for male and female students at two Alternative Education programs. In general, differences between male and female social-emotional profiles and their relation to executive functioning were explored, with no statistically significant differences found. However, although the results were not significant, the interaction between gender and program, as it relates to social-emotional and executive functioning, approached significance. In addition, there were qualitative and possibly clinical differences found between the groups of males and females at each of the two schools.

Given the small sample size and limited data resources, obtaining statistically non-significant results was not surprising. Although these results are suggestive of tendencies within specific populations within alternative education settings, the general-izability of these results are nevertheless limited within the scope of this study. However, the results are still meaningful, as they begin to highlight some initial differences within a group of students that was previously perceived as homo-geneous. In conclusion, we suggest that considering results such as these and therefore ack-nowledging the uniqueness of students along these dimensions may allow school psychologists to better tailor interventions to meet student needs.

References

Clark, C., Prior, M., & Kinsella, G. (2002). The relationship between executive function abilities, adaptive behavior and academic achievement in children with externalizing behavior problems. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 43*, 785-796.

Friedman, N. P., Haberstick, B. C., Willcutt, E. G., Miyake, A., Young, S. E., Corley, R. P. et al.(2007). Greater attention problems during childhood predict poorer executive functioning in late adolescence. *Psychological Science, 18*, 893-900.

Gioia, G. A., Isquith, P. K., Guy, S. C., & Kenworthy, L. (2000). *Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Herman, K. C., & Ostrander, R. (2007). The effects of attention problems on depression: Developmental, academic, and cognitive pathways. *School Psychology Quarterly, 22*, 483-510.

McCandless, S., & O'Laughlin, L. (2007). The clinical utility of the Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function (BRIEF) in the diagnosis of ADHD. *Journal of Attention Disorders, 10,* 381-389.

Reynolds, C. R., & Kamphaus, R. W. (2004). *Behavior assessment system for children, second edition.* Bloomington, MN: Pearson Assessments.

Tobin, T. J., & Sprague, J. R. (2002). Alternative educational programs: Accommodating tertiary level, at-risk students. In M. R. Shinn, H. M. Walker, & G. Stoner (Eds.), *Interventions for academic and behavior problems II: Preventive and remedial approaches* (pp. 961-992). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Walker, & Sprague, H. M. (1999). The path to school failure, delinquency, and violence: Causal factors and some potential solutions. *Intervention in School & Clinic, 35*, 67-73.

Jessica Blasik, M.S.Ed., Janice Decker, M.Ed., Dana Keener, M.S.Ed., and Ryan Lenz, M.Ed., are doctoral students in the School Psychology Program at Duquense University.

SASP MINI-CONVENTION REPORT

Implementing an Anti-Violence Curriculum in a Culturally Diverse School District

Robyn Bratica, Genevieve Verdi, Anthony Swentosky, Drew Wood,
Elisabeth O'Bryon, and Paul Bueno de Mesquita
University of Rhode Island

A growing body of research has demonstrated the effectiveness of Second Step: A Violence Prevention Curriculum (Committee for Children, 2002) in increasing students' knowledge and use of prosocial behaviors (Cook et al., 2007) and decreasing the use of antisocial behaviors (McMahon, Washburn, Felix, Yakin, & Childrey, 2000). For example, Taub (2001) found that in a sample of third to sixth grade poor, white students from a rural school district, teacher ratings indicated that students who received Second Step demonstrated significant improvements in social competence and antisocial behavior as compared to a control group of students who did not receive the intervention. Behavioral observation results from this study also indicated improvements in prosocial behaviors.

Additionally, in a pre-posttest randomized controlled study design, Grossman and colleagues (1997) found that the Second Step intervention, implemented with second and third graders from suburban schools, yielded significant increases for the intervention group in prosocial behavior and decreases in antisocial behavior, when compared to the control group. Moreover, in an urban sample of preschool and kindergarten students, McMahon and colleagues (2000) found that Second Step facilitated significant gains in children's knowledge of identifying feelings and facial cues, in thinking about how and why children might respond in conflict situations, and in predicting the consequences of their responses. Significant decreases in behavioral observations of verbal aggression, physical aggression, and disruptive behaviors were also demonstrated in this study. The studies mentioned above, as well as others (Frey, Nolen, Edstrom, & Hirschstein, 2005; Sprague et al., 2001), have demonstrated the effectiveness of Second Step in improving students' knowledge and behaviors across a

wide range of school characteristics and contexts. However, to date, most studies investigating this program have yet to focus on implementation details. Specifically, most evaluations of Second Step have not assessed the fidelity of program implementation, although it is likely that the manner in which the program is implemented affects the programs' overall effectiveness.

Participants and Second Step Implementation

In the present study, a team of graduate students implemented Second Step in 15 different classrooms within two schools in the same district, from October 2008 through May 2009. The lessons were administered weekly and each lasted approximately 20 to 30 minutes. Although the standardized procedures of the Second Step curriculum were followed, certain aspects of the program were emphasized depending upon the grade level. For example, among the younger grades, there was greater interest among students in role-playing and therefore this aspect of the curriculum was emphasized. In contrast, students in the older age levels appeared less interested in role-plays and more interested in group discussion, and therefore this aspect of the program received more emphasis.

The students who participated in this study ranged from kindergarten to sixth grade. Within the school district that Second Step was implemented, 70% of students identified

as Hispanic or Latino and 22% of total students were classified as English Language Learners. Furthermore, 40.9% of children in the surrounding community lived in families with an income below the federal poverty threshold and 75% of students within the district were eligible for free or reduced lunch.

Perceptions of Second Step Implementation

Administrator, teacher, and student perceptions of Second Step were gathered during and after implementation of the program in the kindergarten, first, second, third, fourth, and sixth grade classes. The research team was in constant communication with school administrators during the year. After providing the principals and assistant principals at both the elementary and middle school with an overview of Second Step, the administrators were eager to utilize the program. Prior to implementation, administrators reported that empathy, problem solving, and anger management skills taught via the Second Step curriculum were important to develop and promote in their schools, noting that they would be happy to facilitate the implementation process. Following implementation, the elementary and middle school teachers reported positive feedback about the program, noting that their students benefited from the weekly lessons.

Overall, teacher reports indicated that they perceived the program to be valuable for

students, reporting that students displayed increased empathy towards others, improved impulse control, improved anger management skills, increased problem solving skills, and increased decision making skills as a result of the programming. Teachers also commented that they were pleased the program provided students with opportunities to practice exhibiting prosocial behaviors through the various role plays associated with the lessons. Furthermore, they noted that the lessons addressed authentic issues that their students faced daily and thus they recommended that students could have benefited from multiple implementations per week.

Beyond teacher reports, students reported that they acquired a variety of skills throughout the duration of the Second Step program. Specifically, younger children reported learning important relaxation techniques (e.g., taking three deep breaths and counting backwards) and prosocial behaviors (e.g., sharing with peers, appropriately joining groups, and apologizing). Older children reported that the program helped them deal with peer issues more effectively, such as handling peer pressure and appropriately dealing with gossip among friends.

Challenges, Limitations, and Implications

Various challenges and opportunities associated with implementing an evidence-based program in two different schools in the same district were encountered. Collaboration with school administrators and personnel (principals, school psychologists, social workers) at both sites gave the opportunity to promote the use of this program in a number of classrooms. Administrators at both schools were open and supportive, although teachers initially demonstrated varying levels of enthusiasm and acceptance. Having the support of both building principals helped in the gaining of teacher support and approval for classroom implementation of Second Step, and the post-intervention data indicates that overall, teachers were very satisfied with the program. The degree to which teachers participated in weekly lessons varied as some teachers actively participated in lessons and activities, while other teachers used the time to pursue other activities.

Student participation also fluctuated across classrooms and lessons. For example, in some classrooms students were vocal, enthusiastic, and readily volunteered participation, whereas in other classrooms students were more reticent. These discrepancies may have been due to a number of factors, including personality differences, unique classroom dynamics, and time of day. As would be expected, interactions with students at the elementary school differed greatly from those at the middle school. As such, issues regarding the logistics of program implementation had to be addressed throughout the course of the year to ensure the lessons were developmentally appropriate. For example, while elementary-level children were eager to participate in role-plays, the older students seemed more comfortable

exploring new ideas through small-group activities. Additionally, language barriers were less of an issue in the middle school, allowing more time to focus on the content of individual lessons. Also, the different physical layout and schedule of each classroom impacted the delivery of the program. While elementary-level classroom generally included large open space to work as a group, older students focus more on individual seated work, and consequently classrooms were not as well-suited to whole-group activities.

Furthermore, linguistic diversity, one facet of the cultural diversity in the district, presented some predictable challenges in implementing Second Step, particularly at the lower grade levels. Although the Second Step program is available in both English and Spanish, most classrooms included students who speak only English, only Spanish, both English and Spanish, or only another language (e.g., Creole or Portuguese). Even if all of the students spoke either English or Spanish, each lesson could not be implemented simultaneously in both languages or in tandem within a feasible time frame. Additionally, not all teachers in the school, nor all Second Step instructors, were proficient in Spanish. Thus, linguistic complications seemed most problematic at the lower grade levels, where ELL students sometimes struggled to follow the overarching aim of the lessons when vocabulary comprehension made it difficult for them to engage in the instruction. Instructors seemed to fare best when they broke from the standard script to "check in" with students periodically, inviting one or several class members to summarize what had taken place so far. This allowed them to clarify any misunderstandings and go back to earlier points in the script as necessary. When an instructor who was fluent in Spanish was present, it was easier to engage all students as key concepts could be interpreted into the students' native language when necessary. Moreover, role-plays were carried out in both English and Spanish, and students who understood English but were unwilling to verbally participate were assigned non-verbal roles that still allowed them to participate.

Another challenge to successful program implementation of Second Step in this district was student mobility. Many students in the district were recent immigrants to the country and/or state and, as such, had mobile families. Several parents enrolled students in the district immediately upon arrival in their new location, but then moved out of the district boundaries for the purpose of obtaining affordable or fitting housing. It was also not uncommon for parents in the district (or grandparents, aunts, or uncles—whomever was acting as guardian for the student) to remove children from the school for weeks or months at a time as they returned to their home country. Specifically, the student mobility rate (calculated by accounting for each time a student enrolls in or leaves a school) in the district for 2009 was 40%, which is more than double the state average of 17%. Since Second Step is a program in which each lesson builds on ideas

discussed and skills acquired in previous lessons, students who are not present for the entire set of lessons (or at least the majority of the lessons) are at a disadvantage and are unlikely to benefit as much as peers who are exposed to the full curriculum. We propose that future scholarship in this area seek to account for and remedy such challenges and limitations as experienced in this study. Nevertheless, despite these shortcomings, we suggest that the data herein indicate that Second Step may be a valuable and socially valid tool for promoting students social-emotional competence and reducing violence at school.

References

Committee for Children. (2002). *Second Step: A violence prevention program, preschool/ kindergarten—grade 5* (3rd ed.). Seattle, WA: Author.

Cook, M. B., Ford, J., Levine, J., Bourke, C., Newell, L. & Lapidus, G. (2007). The effects of citywide implementation of "second step" on elementary school students' prosocial and aggressive behavior. *The Journal of Primary Prevention, 28*, 93-115.

Frey, K. S., Nolen, S. B., Edstrom, L. V. & Hirschstein, M. K. (2005). Effects of a school-based social-emotional competence program: Linking children's goals, attributions, and behavior. *Applied Developmental Psychology, 26*, 171-200.

Grossman, D. C., Neckerman, H. J., Koepsell, T. D., Liu, P., Asher, K. N., Beland, K., Frey, K., Rivara, F. P. (1997). Effectiveness of a violence prevention curriculum among children in elementary school. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 277,* 1605-1611.

Larsen, T. & Samdal, O. (2007). Implementing Second Step: Balancing Fidelity and Program Adaptation. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 17*(1), 1-29.

McMahon, S. D., Washburn, J., Felix, E. D., Yakin, J. & Childrey, G. (2000). Violence Prevention: Program effects on urban preschool and kindergarten children. *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 9*, 271 – 281.

Sprague, J., Walker, H., Golly, A, White, K., Myers, D. R. & Shannon, T. (2001). Translating research into effective practice: The effects of a universal staff and student intervention on indicators of discipline and school safety. *Education and Treatment of Children, 24*, 495-511.

Taub, J. (2001). Evaluation of the Second Step Violence Prevention Program at a Rural Elementary School. *School Psychology Review, 31*, 186-200.

Robyn Bratica, B.A., Genevieve Verdi, M.Ed., Anthony Swentosky, M.S., Drew Wood, M.S., and Elisabeth O'Bryon, B.A., are students in the School Psychology Program at the University of Rhode Island.

Paul Bueno de Mesquina, Ph.D., is a faculty member in the School Psychology Program at the University of Rhode Island.

RESEARCH REVIEW

Childhood-Onset Schizophrenia: A Primer for School Psychologists

Kaitlyn Stewart and Tyler L. Renshaw
University of California, Santa Barbara

Abstract. Childhood-onset schizophrenia is a complex but rare psychiatric disorder that is characterized by symptoms that severely hamper students school functioning. The intent of this manuscript is to serve as a primer on this topic for school psychologists, by reviewing the epidemiology and etiology of the disorder as well as contemporary, best-practice approaches to assessment and intervention.

Schizophrenia is a complex psychiatric disorder, which has had and continues to have a dynamic aspect that results in uncertainties regarding etiology, life course, and treatment. Childhood-onset schizophrenia (COS) is a relatively rare disorder that is hard to diagnose. Most persons who are identified as having schizophrenia are first recognized in adolescence or adulthood. It is hard to classify children who display symptoms of schizophrenia because of issues regarding symptomology and comorbidity. The complexities of schizophrenia as a disorder—and particularly COS—make it an intriguing area of study, and scholars are still far from obtaining a complete understanding of the multiple and complex variables influencing this disorder. As practitioners in the school system, it is important to be educated about all possible disorders that may affect a child's education as well as how to differentiate between such disorders. Furthermore, it is requisite to understand the nature and course of a disorder, so that it can be assessed and treated effectively. Given this understanding, and given that COS can have a serious impact on a child's academic and social development (Asarnow & Asarnow, 2003), the purpose of this work is to serve as a brief primer on COS for school psychologists. To accomplish this, we will review and highlight some epidemiological, etiological, assessment, and treatment issues. But first, to set this disorder within context, we will briefly discuss the developmental perspective toward psychopathology (e.g., Mash & Dozois, 2003).

Developmental Perspective

The developmental perspective addresses a person's growth and change as development is carried out from neonate to adult. This process is gradual and continual and happens in specific contexts. Although there are certain general stages everyone passes through, no one person has the same outcomes as another individual. A developmental approach emphasizes changes over time in an individual; thus, this approach helps to understand an individual at a more in depth level. As such, a developmental approach serves as a comprehensive model of human development, focusing on the dynamic interplay between dynamic individuals and dynamic contexts over time (Mash & Dozois, 2003).

A developmental perspective is important in understanding COS because of the complexities related to the etiology, life course, symptoms, and treatments. A comprehensive understanding of an individual's early development in the womb and infancy play a large role in understanding symptomatology and onset. This stresses the importance for parental input in order to correctly identify a child's problems. Also, understanding a child's development level is imperative in designing and planning for treatment options, as it will help to prevent against ill-fitted programming. Moreover, the developmental perspective is also crucial given that the two major etiological models are developmental in nature: the *stress-vulnerability model* and the *neurodevelop-*

mental model. Both models take into account changes over time in relation to the onset of schizophrenia. Lastly, when conceptualizing COS in students, understanding typical development will necessarily enhance the understanding of atypical developmental symptoms and the effects that the may have on youth (Mash & Dozois, 2003). I this way, COS can be primarily conceptualized as an impairment—or maladaptation—in typical child development.

Epidemiological Information

Little is currently known about COS, as it is a relatively rare disorder, affecting approximately 1 in 40,000 children. Mueser and McGurk (2004) report a lifetime prevalence of 1%, and approximately 2.5 million people are estimated to be living with the disorder. Research is inconsistent on sex differences, with some studies indicating a ratio of 2:1 (males to females; Green, Padron-Gayol, Hardesty, & Bassiri, 1992) and others reporting ratios as large as 5:1 (Hafner, Hambrecht, Loffler, Munk-Jorgenson, & Reichler-Rossier, 1998). Indeed, it is hard to find research regarding this population because of the low prevalence.

Research has also found prevalence differences between groups varying by socioeconomic status and marital status. Although schizophrenia appears across SES groups, it has been found to be more frequent in populations with lower SES (Munk & Mortensen, 1992). This relationship can be

explained in two directions: either the stress of poverty is conceptualized as a risk-factor for manifesting schizophrenic symptoms or the lower SES status is viewed as a direct or indirect results of the disorder itself. For example, a person with schizophrenia could have a hard time keeping a job, therefore contributing to a low SES status. Scholasrhip also suggests that prevalence rates vary among other groups, with rates indicating prevalence of 1%, 2%, and 3% among married, single, and divorced groups, respectively (Keith, Regier, & Rae, 1991). Additonally, Keith and colleagues (1991) found that schizophrenia is more prevalent in African American populations—although there is no extant rationale for why this may be so.

Despite prevalence differences, there is evidence suggesting that COS is very similar to, yet more severe than, the adult form of schizophrenia (Asarnow, Thompson, & McGrath, 2004). Given that COS is defined by the onset of psychosis prior to the age of 12, the symptomatology required for diagnosis is generally considered to be the same as that for adults. On average, the age of onset of both types of schizophrenia (childhood-onset and adult) is between 16 and 35 years old (Asarnow et al., 2004).

Understanding of Etiology

As a psychiatric disorder, schizophrenia is well known for having a strong genetic component. For example, it has been found that 50% of children with schizophrenia have a first degree relative with a schizophrenic spectrum disorder (Gonthier & Lyon, 2004). Furthermore, familial studies have found that the prevalence of schizophrenia rises to 3% among second-degree relatives with the disorder (Gottesman & Reilly, 2003). The familial component is also connected to biological etiologies of schizophrenia. Asarnow and Asarnow (2003) discuss two biological hypotheses, the *neurodevelopmental model* and *dopamine hypothesis*. The first of these hypotheses, the neurodevelopmental model, suggests that schizophrenia is primarily caused by a malformation in the limbic system and prefrontal cortex that happens in early development. It is thought that the atypical development of these brain structures results in an abnormal stress responses that can cause schizophrenic symptoms. On the other hand, the dopamine hypothesis suggests that management problems regarding dopamine transmission, resulting in the overproduction of dopamine, causes increases in the intensification of psychotic disorders.

Although etiological theories primarily implicate biological factors, there are several environmental risk factors for COS, including (but not limited to) pregnancy and birth complications, psychosocial stress (Asarnow & Asarnow, 2003), low SES (Munk & Mortensen, 1992), exposure to viral infections (e.g. influenza), and cannabis use. Family and other environmental stressors may include sudden or chronic stressors, which have been shown to increase risk of having a psychotic episode leading to a diagnosis of schizophrenia (Cannon & Clarke, 2005). Even with so many possible risk factors, the role of

environmental stress plays an important role in the prominent model of etiology for schizophrenia: the *stress-vulnerability model.*

The stress-vulnerability model suggests that there is a genetic or biological predisposition for a specific disorder (i.e., COS), but that this vulnerability alone is not enough for the disorder to manifest itself. Rather, a stressor, internal or external, serves as a trigger initiates a series of interrelated processes and symptomatology that then result in the manifestation of the disorder. Examples of stressors could include drug use, low SES, death in the family, or moving schools or homes. The amount of stress needed to trigger symptoms of psychosis is different for different individuals (Vancouver, 2009). The model is helpful in explaining the course of the disorder by showing how established underlying biological vulner-ability is determined by interactions between genetic and early environmental influences and then the large role that environment play in the process.

Assessment

The optimal and most comprehensive strategy for assessing COS is to follow the multimethod approach outlined by the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (AACAP; 2001). Although this approach was outlined almost a decade ago, it has continued to be endorsed by con-temporary scholars (e.g., Asarnow, Tompson, & McGrath, 2004; Gonthier & Lyon, 2004) as the best practice for assessing this complex disorder. Instead of delineating the exact measures that must be used, this approach recommends that three general types of testing be employed: psychiatric, physical (medical), and psychological assessment. And ultimately, this method recommends that a diagnosis of COS be given only after all other possible DSM-IV-TR symptoms and causes are ruled out.

Psychiatric assessment includes the use of structured interviews, symptom scales, and diagnostic decision trees—similar to those presented in the DSM-IV-TR (American Psychiatric Association [APA], 2000). Extensive interviews should be conducted with the child, parents, teachers, and other significant caregivers. And, if desired, siblings and peers can also be interviewed. Mostly importantly, such interviews should address the family's history of mental illness as well as the nature and history of the symptoms the child is experiencing. Because children may have been experiencing psychotic symptoms for prolonged periods of time, they may tend to view them as normal. Such interviews should also consider and rule out the effects of cultural factors on a child's behavior as well as the difference between thought disorder and creative, childlike thinking. Moreover, symptom scales—such as the Positive Negative Syndrome Scale for Children (Kiddie-PANSS), the Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia for School-Aged Children (K-SADS) and the Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale for Children (BPRS-C)—can all be used to provide information regarding a

child's psychiatric functioning. According to the extant scholarship, one of these scales is not recommended above the other; rather, all are viewed as viable (yet under-researched) measures for detecting possible psychotic and schizophrenic symptoms in children (Gonthier & Lyon, 2004).

Following psychiatric assessment, a *physical* assessment should be conducted by a general physician and other health professionals (e.g., neurologist) to rule out possible medical causes for schizophrenic symptoms. Such causes include but are not limited to substance abuse (intoxication), delirium, lesions in the central nervous system, brain tumors, various infections, and metabolic and seizure disorders (AACAP, 2001). Depending on the results of the psychiatric interviews and this initial physical assessment, further medical assessment may be necessary. For example, various forms of neuroimaging (e.g., MRI, fMRI, PET, CT), toxicology screening, and other biochemical testing may prove useful in providing further information regarding possible causes underlying a child's psychotic symptoms (Clark & Lewis, 1998). Ultimately, such screening should be extensive enough to rule out all other possible medical causes.

Unlike the psychiatric and physical assessments, *psychological* testing is strongly recommended but not required (AACAP, 2001). Given that the extant literature indicates that personality and projective tests are not effective instruments for diagnosing COS, and that cognitive/intellectual testing is unnecessary unless there is some evidence of

developmental delays, psychological testing is thus conceptualized as supplementary but not mandatory for diagnosing COS. However, because it is necessary to rule out every possible disorder (e.g., psychotic mood disorders, autism, other pervasive developmental disorders, post-traumatic stress disorder) prior to diagnosing a child with COS, practitioners are encouraged to include cognitive or other psychological testing as part of their standard assessment battery. Moreover, given that COS can be comorbid with several other disorders (e.g., attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder, depression, and oppositional defiant disorder), psychological testing may also help inform practitioners of other problems that may be co-occurring with or imitating schizophrenia (Gonthier & Lyon, 2004).

Intervention

Similar to the assessment recommendations, the optimal strategy for intervening with COS is to follow the multimethod approach originally outlined by the AACAP (2001) and subsequently endorsed by contemporary scholars (e.g., Asarnow et al., 2004; Gonthier & Lyon, 2004). This approach suggests that practitioners intervening with this complex disorder should seek to employ and coordinate five general types of intervention: psychopharmacological, cognitive-behavioral, family, educational, and other environmental strategies. Given the rare nature of this disorder, it is noteworthy some

of these recommended strategies are derived more from clinical experience and logic models and less from empirical research.

After a diagnosis of COS is obtained through the previously described methodology, the immediate first-line of recommended treatment is psychopharmacological therapy. Within this therapy, it is recommended that the first-line of treatment be neuroleptics (traditional antipsychotics), risperidone or olanzapine. These two medications are preferred over other neuroleptics (e.g., haloperidol) because research indicates that they are less likely to cause Parkinsonian symptoms in children (Arsarnow et al., 2004). Although prescribed less than neuroleptics, research indicates that atypical antipsychotics are also an effective first-line treatment, as they appear to be at least as effective for positive symptoms (e.g., hallucinations and delusions) and possibly more effective for negative symptoms (e.g., flat affect and paucity of speech). Nevertheless, clozapine (an atypical antipsychotic) is not recommended as a first-line treatment due to its adverse effects. If a child has not responded to two trials of at least two first-line treatments for 6-8 weeks each, second-line medications, such as clozapine, are then prescribed. However, given that many of these second-line treatments can reduce children's white blood cell count, these levels should be monitored carefully on a weekly basis to ensure stability (AACAP, 2001).

After the child is started on psychopharmacological therapy, cognitive-behavioral strategies should then be implemented. Specifically, such strategies should include psychoeducation about schizophrenia, social skills training, relapse prevention, and problem-solving skills and strategies (AACAP, 2001). Specific skills such as assertiveness and self-advocacy training, basic self-care skills, and coping strategies can be targeted in educational settings or integrated into the child's curriculum (Dulmus & Smyth, 2000). Ultimately, the purpose of these strategies is help the child learn how to successfully navigate their environments as well as understand the implications of their diagnosis. Although this is recommended for all children with such diagnoses, there is little empirical evidence to support it. Nevertheless, generalizing from the effectiveness of cognitive-behavioral strategies with children with various other disorders, it is still recommended as essential element to include in treatment (Gonthier & Lyon, 2004).

It is also recommended that such children receive systems-level intervention in their families, schools, and other environments (AACAP, 2001). Within the family, such intervention could include psychoeducation about the disorder, development of coping strategies, and basic communication skills. Within the school, such intervention could include various special education services—specialized academic instruction, curricular modifications, and designated psychological services. And intervention within other environments could include a host of permanent or semi-permanent alterations, such as placement in a day or

residential treatment facility, if warranted. Although, ultimately, all of these systemic interventions are aimed at improving the child's functioning, it is important to remember that the most desirable setting should always be as least restrictive as possible (Gonthier & Lyon, 2004). Furthermore, although such systemic interventions are theoretically sound and consistent with a developmental psycho-pathology model (e.g., Mash & Dozois, 2003), it is noteworthy that they are, to date, unsubstantiated by empirical research. However, this is not because such studies have been conducted and produced null findings; rather, such studies have yet to be conducted.

Conclusions

The purpose of this work was to serve as a primer on COS for school psychologists, by briefly reviewing and highlighting some epidemiological, etiological, assessment, and treatment issues. From the information presented herein, five important conclusions can be drawn. First, COS is a complex, rare disorder that has detrimental effects on youth's social and academic functioning. Indeed, out of all the various childhood psychopathologies, COS may have the most deleterious effects on and the least promising prognosis for the individual child and their associated ecological system. Second, although it appears that COS is determined by a host of interactive and dynamic factors, its developmental trajectory can be best understood through three complementary paradigms: the neurodevelopmental model, the dopamine hypothesis, and the diathesis-stress-vulnerabilities model. Taken together, these paradigms account for many of the developmental, biochemical, and environmental variables, which all broadly influence the development of COS. Third, the optimal strategy for assessing and treating COS is to follow the multimethod approaches as originally outlined by the AACAP (2001). Specifically, assessment should include psychiatric, physical (medical), and (possibly) psychological measures—making sure to rule out all possible causes as well as to identify all possible comorbidities. Fourth, practitioners should employ five general types of intervention: psychopharmacological, cognitive-behavioral, family, educational, and other environmental strategies. However, of these, it is important to remember that only the psychopharmacological therapies have a contemporary evidence base. And, lastly, although it has yet to be empirically established, an ecological approach to assessment and treatment for COS is theoretically in line with a developmental systems and developmental psychopathology perspective. By being aware of and mindful of these key issues, school psychologists will be better prepared to work with students diagnosed with COS as well as the multi-layered support and treatment systems that surround these students.

References

American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed. text revision). Washington, DC: Author.

Asarnow, J.R. & Asarnow, R.F. (2003). Childhood-onset schizophrenia. In Mash, E. J., & Barkley, R. A. (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology* (2nd ed., pp. 455-485). New York: Guilford Press.

Asarnow, J. R., Thompson, M. C., & McGrath, E. P. (2004). Childhood-onset schizophrenia: clinical and treatment issues. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 45*, 180-194.

Cannon, M. & Clarke, M. C. (2005). Risk for schizophrenia—Broadening the concepts, pushing back the boundaries. *Schizophrenia Research, 79*, 5-13.

Clark, A. F., & Lewis, S. W. (1998). Practitioner review: Treatment of schizophrenia in childhood and adolescence. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 39,* 1071-1081.

Dulmus, C. N., & Syth, N. J. (2000). Early-onset schizophrenia: A literature review of empirically based interventions. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 17,* 679-694.

Gottesmen I. I., & Reilly, J. L., (2003). Strengthening the evidence for genetic factors in schizophrenia (without abetting genetic discrimination). In M. F. Lezenweger & J. M. Hooley (Eds.), *Principles of experimental psychopathology: Essays in honor of Brendan A Maher* (pp. 31-44). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.

Green, W., Padron-Gayol, M., Hardesty, A. S., & Bassiri, M. (1992). Schizophrenia with childhood onset: A phenomenological study of 38 cases. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 35*, 968-976.

Gonthier, M., & Lyon, M. A. (2004). Childhood-onset schizophrenia: An overview. *Psychology in the Schools, 41,* 803-811.

Hafner, H., Hambrecht, M., Loffler, W., Munk-Jorgenson, P., & Reichler-Rossier, A. (1998). Causes and consequences of the gender difference in age of onset of schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Bulletin, 24*, 99-113.

Keith, S. J., Regier, D. A., & Rae, D. S. (1991). Schizophrenic Disorders. In L. N. Robins & D.S. Regier (Eds.), *Psychiatric disorders in America: the Epidemiological Catchment Area Study.* New York: Free Press.

Mash, E. J., & Dozois, D. J. A. (2003). Child psychopathology: A developmental-systems perspective. In E. J. Mash & R. A. Barkley (Eds.), *Child psychopathology* (2nd ed., pp. 3-71). New York: Guilford Press.

Mueser, K. T., & McGurk, S. R., (2004). Schizophrenia. *The Lancet, 363*, 2063-72.

Munk, J. P., Mortensen, P. B. (1992). Social outcome in schizophrenia: A 13-year follow-up. *Social Psychiatry and Epidemiology, 27*, 129-134.

Kaitlyn Stewart, M.Ed., is a third-year doctoral student in the Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology Program at the University of California, Santa Barbara and is currently the Membership Chair of the SASP Executive Board.

Tyler L. Renshaw, M.Ed., is a third-year doctoral student in the Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology Program at the University of California, Santa Barbara and is currently the Communications Chair of the SASP Executive Board.

CHAPTER SPOTLIGHT

Michigan State University Chapter of the Student Affiliates in School Psychology

Nathan von der Embse and Anisa N. Goforth
Michigan State University

The local SASP chapter at Michigan State University (MSU) is now in its fifth year. While we are a relatively young organization, we have nearly 30 members and are growing. The MSU SASP chapter has an active executive board, which meets regularly and along with its members, plans community outreach activities, professional development, and social functions.

What makes our organization unique is our involvement with many different organizations of school psychologists. Our chapter has representatives to the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), the Michigan Association of School Psychologists (MASP), Michigan Psychological Association (MPA), American Psychological Association of Graduate Students Advocacy Network (APAGS-ACT), national Student Affiliates of School Psychology, and a social justice student ambassador program (NASP). With so many representatives in different organizations, our

members stay current with the recent happenings in school psychology in multiple contexts. This aim fits well within the overarching themes of the school psychology program at MSU.

The MSU SASP chapter has several exciting initiatives for the current school year. For example, we are part of the new Student Ambassadors of Social Justice program, administered through the NASP Social Justice Interest Group. Our student representative will keep us informed of issues related to social justice and how we can take action. This ambassador will also help to establish positions at our universities across the nation. Also, our members will be involved with MASP as a student representative of the Executive Board. A first of its kind, this position will allow graduate students in our program to have access to policy and legislations relating to school psychological services across the state. The MASP president is working with our chapter in order to

increase student involvement and open up new opportunities for networking and learning from current school psychologists across the state.

In addition to these initiatives, the SASP membership includes multiple committees that focus on professional development, student recruitment, community outreach, and social activities. Last year, for example, we invited a local school psychologist to provide a professional development workshop on Autism Spectrum Disorder. Also, graduate students who were leaving on internship provided a general informational session about the internship application process. Community outreach activities included adopting a family during the holiday season and painting a local elementary school. We also raised $1800 for the Susan G. Komen Race for the Cure in memory of Dr. Jean Baker and all breast cancer survivors. Finally, given that we feel strongly about developing a sense of community across our student cohorts, we have developed a progressive dinner in which each cohort hosts one course.

As co-chairs this SASP chapter, we are excited about the new school year. Our chapter looks forward to offering exciting new initiatives, continuing past traditions, and growing as an organization of future school psychologists.

Nathan van der Embse is a student in the School Psychology Program at Michigan State University.

Anisa N. Goforth is a student in the School Psychology Program at Michigan State University and is the current Diversity Chair on the SASP Executive Board.

SASP Diversity Scholarship Winners

The Student Affiliates in School Psychology are pleased to announce the winners of the 2009-2010 Diversity Scholarship. This purpose of this award is to support students from under-represented cultural backgrounds as they endeavor to become a part of the inspiring profession of School Psychology. One annual award of $1000 is given to an incoming student and an advanced student.

Congratulations to Ya Zhang!

Ya Zhang is an incoming student to Michigan State University. She received her B.S. in Biological Science and her M.Ed in Developmental and Educational Psychology at East China Normal University. As an ethnic minority in China, Ya grew up in a remote mountain area which lacked appropriate educational facilities. With the support of her parents, she managed to become highly educated. She now wants to make a contribution to the development of school psychological services in China. Her research interests include child/adolescent mental health, the impact of school and family on social functioning, and neuropsychology. She hopes to become a consultant to both practitioners and scholars who are committed to school-based practice.

Congratulations to Lillie Huddleston!

Lillie is an advanced student at Georgia State University. She received her Bachelor of Music Education at Mississippi University for Women and her M.Ed in Music Education from Georgia State University. She worked as an elementary music teacher in the Atlanta Public School System for 10 years before she entered the MS/EDS Program in School Psychology at GSU in 2004 and entered the doctoral program in 2008. At Georgia State, she served as a member of a research team that examined the perceptions of African American School Psychologists related to their training experiences. She is currently collaborating on book chapters related to the impact of Gay Straight Alliances on school climate and on counseling interventions for students identified as bullies. After completion of her doctoral studies, she plans to pursue a faculty position to continue her research efforts with underserved populations.

Call for Student Nominations for the 2010 SASP Executive Board

Greetings SASP Members! Please consider nominating a graduate student in school psychology for election to the 2010 SASP Executive Board. Serving on the Executive SASP Board is an excellent opportunity to work collaboratively with other faculty and graduate students in school psychology across the nation and help shape the future of our field. Executive board members develop programs, publish student research, and produce materials that have a far-reaching impact on the field of school psychology.

CURRENT POSITIONS*

President-Elect

APAGS Liaison Chair

Membership Chair

Communications Chair

Convention Chair

Diversity Affairs Chair

Technology Chair

(*For a brief description of each position, please visit the SASP website: http://www.iu.edu/~sasp/*)*

To nominate a student (self-nominations are accepted) for a SASP Executive Board position, please send the following information about the nominee to SASPweb@gmail.com: (1) Name, (2) email address, (3) graduate program and degree, and (4) 250-word candidate statement from the nominee.

IMPORTANT DATES

November 1, 2009: Nominations Close

November 8, 2009: Candidate Statements Posted on http://www.indiana.edu/~sasp/ and Voting Period Opens

December 2, 2009: Voting Period Closes

December 4, 2009: Election Results Announced

Become a SASP Member!
(It's free *and* beneficial.)

To become a member of SASP please complete this form and mail it to the address listed below. Members are also eligible for travel expenses to APA, scholarship awards, and other financial rewards by taking part in activities designed to promote SASP. SASP membership is FREE to all school psychology students. In addition, please consider joining the SASP listserv. This listserv will provide you with access to our newsletter, information on how to apply for various awards and travel grants, and other resources important to students in our field. SASP encourages members to also join APA's Division 16 (School Psychology). Information regarding this will be included in your welcome packet.

SASP Membership Committee
Attn: Kaitlyn Stewart
380 Ellwood Beach Dr #7
Goleta, CA 93117

STUDENT AFFILIATE IN SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY (SASP)
MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

Renewal: Please circle   **yes   or   no**

NAME: _____

MAILING ADDRESS: _____

                                                  _____

EMAIL ADDRESS: _____

UNIVERSITY AFFILIATION: _____

STUDENT STATUS :   _____
                                                  (i.e., year in program and part- or full-time)

FACULTY SPONSOR   _____

Would you like to be added to the SASP Listserv ?   **yes   or   no**

Please indicate committees in which you may have interest:
___Communications
___Membership
___Diversity Affairs
___Nominations/Elections

Science. Practice. Policy.

Division 16 is an exciting division with many activities and services to benefit you. Members:

- ❖ Engage in the national and international conversation on school psychology. Division 16 is active in advocating for the interests of school psychologists on issues both within the broader field of psychology as well as with constituent school psychology organizations.
- ❖ Receive cutting edge publications such as *School Psychology Quarterly* the Division's APA journal and the high quality peer-reviewed newsletter *The School Psychologist*.
- ❖ Network with colleagues and leaders in the field who share your interest in School Psychology.
- ❖ Contribute to the Science *for* Policy and Practice in School Psychology during Division 16 programming at the APA annual convention via round table discussions, symposia, poster sessions, workshops, and the superlative Division 16 Hospitality Suite and Social Hour.
- ❖ Join the Division 16 listserv to keep up to date with current trends, professional opportunities and the on-going dialogue on School Psychology Matters.
- ❖ Recognize outstanding achievements. Division 16 honors Students (e.g., Paul Henkin travel awards, minority scholarships, AGS outstanding scholarship awards) Early Career Scholars (e.g., Lightner Witmer Award), and substantial contributors to the field (e.g., Fellow, Senior Scientist, Jack Bardon Distinguished Service Award, Lifetime Achievement Award).
- ❖ Become involved in Division 16 governance. There are many opportunities to join committees and run for executive office in the Division.
- ❖ Visit our web site for more information: http://www.indiana.edu/~div16/index.html

Science. Practice. Policy.

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION
Please print or type:

_____
Last Name   First Name   M.
Address_____
_____
City_____State_____Zip_____
Phone(_____)_____ E-mail _____
APA Membership Number *(if applicable)*:_____

Please check status:
____Member $45
____**First time Member (free membership for 2009)**
____Fellow $45
____Professional Affiliate $55
____**First time Professional Affiliate (free membership for 2009)**
____Life Status, no fee *(Division 16 members, 65 years of age or older and have been a member of APA for at least 25 years)*
____Life Status $30 *(with Division 16 Publications)*
____Student Affiliate $30 *(Complete Below)*
____**First time Student Affiliate Member (free membership for 2009; Complete Below)**

_____ _____ _____
Faculty Endorsement   Institution   Expected Yr. of Graduation

*Please join online (*http://memforms.apa.org/apa/cli/divapp/*) or mail this application with your check payable to APA Division 16 to:*
Attn: Division 16 Membership
         APA Division Services Office
         750 First Street, NE
         Washington, DC 20002-4242

**FREE MEMBERSHIP FOR ONE YEAR Individuals who have never been a member of Division 16 in the "member," "professional affiliate," or "student affiliate" categories may join at no expense for 2009. Individuals who have been student affiliate members in the past, have never joined as a member, and are now eligible to do so may also join at no expense for 2009. New members who take advantage of the free membership offer will receive *School Psychology Quarterly* as part of this promotion, *The School Psychologist* is available free of charge on-line at the Division web site (http://www.indiana.edu/~div16/index.html).

Links to Grant & Scholarship Opportunities

http://www.apa.org/apags/members/schawrds.html

http://www.apa.org/apf/scholarships.html

http://www.apa.org/pi/wpo/financialaiddirectory.pdf

http://www.apa.org/science/dissinfo.html

http://www.apa.org/science/travinfo.html

http://www.ed.gov/programs/iegpsddrap/index.html

http://www.aera.net/grantsprogram/

http://www.nasponline.org/students/student_ scholarships. aspxs

Award for Distinguished Graduate Student in Professional Psychology

The Board of Professional Affairs (BPA) and the American Psychological Association of Graduate Students (APAGS) awards the APA/APAGS Award for Distinguished Graduate Student in Professional Psychology, a $1000 award and travel expenses to and from the APA Annual Convention, to a graduate student who has demon-strated outstanding practice and application of psychology. This award is administered by the staff liaison for the Board of Professional Affairs, thus all correspondence, arrangements and notifications about this award will come from the Board of Professional Affairs, not APAGS.

A qualified candidate must demonstrate exemplary performance in working with an underserved population in an applied setting OR have developed an innovative method for delivering health services to an underserved population. Eligible candidates are encouraged to apply from all psychology sub-specialties (e.g. clinical, counseling, organization, school, health, etc.) and can be self-nominated or nominated by a member of the American Psychological Association (APA). All self-nominations must be endorsed by a member of APA (i.e. faculty, supervisor) who serves the function of a nominator.

Required Materials: (a) 1000-word or less summ-ary of work with an underserved population. That must include: a description of the student's work with an underserved population, an explanation of why said population is underserved, the status of the underserved population and number served, the nature of psychological services/work done, and its impact on addressing the needs of the identified population; and (b) a curriculum vitae and a letter of support from a member of APA, and in the instance of a self-nomination, verification that the endorser will serve the role and complete the functions of a nominator.

Upon receipt of the award, the nominator/ endorser will be expected to prepare the text for the award citation, attend the APA Convention, serve as chair of the winners award address, introduce the award recipient, and prepare the written introduction for any publication wishing to publicize the award.

For deadlines and application materials, please contact Ayo Bello at *abello@apa.org.*

Student Affiliates in
School Psychology

Website

http://www.iu.edu/~sasp/

Facebook Group

http://www.facebook.com/group.
php?gid=106370490645

Email

saspweb@gmail.com

Listserv

http://lists.apa.org/cgi-bin/
wa.exe?A0=SASP-D16

Student Affiliates in School Psychology