IO1 – Report
School-based interventions to support student participation. A comparison of different programs. Results from the FRIEND-SHIP project

Citation suggestion: Hassani, S., Aroni, K., Toulia, A., Alves, S., Görel, G., Löper, M. F., Avramidis, E., Silveira-Maia, M., Sanches-Ferreira, M. M., Hellmich, F., Schwab, S., & Resch, K. (2020). School-based interventions to support student participation. A comparison of different programs. Results from the FRIEND-SHIP project. Vienna: University of Vienna. DOI: 10.25365/phaidra.147

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This communication reflects the views only of the author(s), the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Table of content

1. A short introduction to social inclusion and social participation

1.1 The aim of the report

Inclusive schooling affects all students and is not limited to a national perspective. All schools are legally compelled to move forward towards inclusive schooling. Schools in Europe and in most parts of the world are recognizing the importance of inclusive schooling more and more. In this regard, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (United Nations, 2007) has been ratified by most European countries. Inclusive education initiatives, although originally conceived for students with disabilities, now encompass a broad range of student diversities, including students from diverse socioeconomic, linguistic, cultural, and religious backgrounds, various gender identities and sexual orientations, and, more recently, refugee students. The diversity of students has increased in mainstream classrooms internationally, and thus the concept of inclusion is not only about giving students with various backgrounds a new placement, but also views social participation as a key element of inclusive education (see Bossaert, Colpin, Pijl, & Petry, 2013; Schwab, Nel, & Hellmich, 2018).

The purpose of the FRIEND-SHIP project is to identify crucial factors related to students' social participation and to foster social participation through an appropriate intervention approach. It contributes to the developing understanding of social participation of students and supports and promotes their social participation and inclusion in class in line with policy objectives. Within the present report, 17 school intervention programs concerning different aspects of children's social participation in inclusive education, such as promoting friendships, enhancing positive relations between students, evolving pleasant classroom climate, strengthening social skills and behaviors, or developing positive attitudes towards peers with special educational needs, have been reviewed. Hence, it is the aim of this report to serve as a reliable basis and to recount details of different programs on inclusion and social participation conducted in schools.

In line with its aims, the report is composed of four main parts. The introduction gives a brief overview on the state of previous research as well as a definition and discussion of social inclusion and participation. The second chapter offers a detailed discussion on the program 'Circle of Friends' and the results of eleven evaluation studies on the impact of the program. Furthermore, concise information on sixteen different intervention programs, along with one conducted evaluation per

intervention, will be presented in chapter three. In this chapter the key success factors of these school-based intervention programs (arising from the analysis of the respective evaluations) will also be discussed. These success factors form a basis for the upcoming intervention program which will be implemented in primary and secondary schools in Austria, Germany, Greece and Portugal. Finally, the last chapter consists of a summary of the results and discussion of the crucial topics which have to be taken into consideration for the future intervention program.

1.2 State of previous research and definition of terms

The literature on the social development of integrated students with SEN contains numerous studies investigating their 'social integration', 'social inclusion' and, more recently, their 'social participation'. These umbrella terms have been used by researchers interchangeably to denote similar social outcomes. Koster et al. (2009) conducted a literature review to clarify the meaning of these umbrella terms in studies focusing on the social dimension of inclusion in regular primary schools. Having considered 62 articles, Koster et al. (2009) concluded that the term 'social participation' is the most suitable one to capture the fullness of the social aspects of inclusion. This multi-dimensional construct consists of four key themes: (a) the presence of social contacts/interactions, (b) acceptance by others (c) social relationships and (d) self-perception of acceptance by classmates. Bossaert et al. (2013) subsequently conducted a literature review on secondary school literature and reached similar conclusions, thus confirming the four main themes of social participation. Additionally, Bossaert et al. (2013) identified another important subtheme (i.e. self-perception of social interaction) that has only been conducted in secondary settings. Taking these reviews together, and also considering the evidence of recent studies in the field, one could argue that the social participation of students with SEN in regular education settings is quite challenging. To sum up previous literature, students with SEN have consistently been found to score significantly lower than students without SEN in three out of the four themes of social participation (for self-perception the situation is a bit more complex), an indication that they run a greater risk of being socially marginalized within their classes than their classmates (Bossaert, de Boer, Frostad, Pijl, & Petry, 2015; Nepi, Facondini, Nucci, & Peru, 2013; Pijl & Frostad, 2010; Schwab, Huber, & Gebhardt, 2016).

Regarding the key theme of social interaction, students with SEN are more often recorded as being alone in the playground and as having fewer interactions during break time with their peers than their classmates without SEN (Avramidis, 2013; Koster, Pijl, Nakken & van Houten, 2010; Petry,

2018; Schwab, 2014; 2015a). The literature clearly shows that this lack of interaction between students with SEN and their peers is not only due to significantly fewer attempts from the students with SEN but also from their peers. This is particularly worrisome because the lack of social interaction cannot solely be attributed to the lack of pro-social behavior on the part of the students with SEN but possibly to the negative attitudes held by their peers without SEN.

Regarding social acceptance by classmates, the literature shows that students with SEN occupy a less favorable social position within their class network than their peers. Specifically, several studies in regular settings have found students with SEN being less accepted and more rejected than their peers without SEN (Bossaert, de Boer, Frostad, Pijl, & Petry, 2015; Koster, Pijl, Nakken & van Houten, 2010; Pijl & Frostad, 2010; Schwab, 2015; 2019). Regarding friendships, the literature shows that students with SEN have fewer friends in their class than their classmates without SEN (Koster, Pijl, Nakken, & van Houten, 2010; Pijl, Skaalvik, & Skaalvik, 2010; Schwab, 2015). Moreover, even when students with SEN manage to establish some friendships, these tend to be less stable (Frostad, Mjaavatn, & Pijl, 2011; Schwab, 2019; Wiener & Schneider, 2002). Regarding the students' social self-concept, the evidence from previous studies is rather mixed. For example, in a review of early studies in the field by Pijl, Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2010), all five identified studies including measurements of social self-concept showed lower perceptions among students with learning disabilities than among their peers without learning disabilities (Lackaye & Margalit, 2006; Núñez et al 2005; Polychroni, Koukoura & Anagnostou, 2006; Tabassam & Grainge,r 2002, Vaughn, Elbaum & Schumm, 1996). However, results from recent reviews (Bossaert et al., 2013; Koster et al., 2009; Schwab, 2018) indicated that for students' self-perception of their social inclusion the difference between students with and without SEN was often smaller or not even found. For instance, some studies failed to detect such a difference (Avramidis, 2013; Avramidis, Avgeri & Strogilos, 2018; Koster et al., 2010).

In conclusion, the literature on the social participation of students with SEN suggests that these students experience more social difficulties than their peers without SEN. However, a caveat needs to be pointed out here; students without SEN also run the risk of being socially marginalized within their class. For example, in a study by Avramidis (2013) the numbers of students with SEN and without SEN classified as socially isolated were remarkably similar. This finding suggests that having SEN is not a sole determining factor for social isolation; instead, any student displaying poor pro-social behavior could experience difficulties in their social interaction, and by extension, enjoy reduced social participation.

Indeed, the difficulties some students experience in building relationships with their classmates might reflect insufficient sets of age-group appropriate social skills (Frostad & Pijl, 2007). Although the literature contains numerous definitions of social skills, it is well-accepted that they constitute an essential set of competencies that allow an individual to establish and maintain positive social relationships. According to Gresham (1986), the various definitions that have been put forward can be distinguished into three categories, namely those that emphasize acceptance by others, those that emphasize actual behavior in social situations, and those that emphasize social validity. In the first set of definitions, a child is considered socially skilled if she or he is accepted or considered popular by her or his peers. However, these definitions do not specify the particular behaviors that render a child acceptable or likeable to their peers. In the second set of definitions, social skills are defined as skilled behaviors that are exhibited in specific circumstances. These skilled behaviors aim to increase the probability of positive reinforcement and decrease the probability of negative feedback. In the third set of definitions, social skills are behaviors that are performed in specific situations and generate important social outcomes for the individual, such as peer acceptance and enhanced self-esteem, or lead to positive judgments by significant others regarding the individual's social competence.

In their attempt to define social skills Caldarella and Merrell (1997 cited in Merrell, 2007) proposed five dimensions which are interwoven with each other: (a) peer relationships: this dimension involves the children who express themselves positively about others; appraise them, offer help, ask them to play together or engage in other meaningful activities (b) self-control: this dimension refers to children who effectively manage their feelings; can remain calm, can follow the rules and can handle criticism by others (c) academic: this dimension includes skills that render the children independent and productive; manifested in the successful completion of schoolwork, undertaking independent projects and following the instructions of the teacher (d) compliance: this dimension refers to children who get on well with others; they share their things with others, they respect the rules and generally can cooperate with others on various tasks (e) assertiveness: this dimension refers to extrovert children who can initiate conversations and are capable of acknowledging compliments from others. More recently, Merrell and Gimpel (2014) have proposed four broad categories of social skills namely: (a) behaviors that concern the self, such as accepting consequences, being responsible and expressing your own feelings (b) interpersonal behaviors such as dealing with conflict, helping others and attracting attention (c) environment-related behaviors such as dealing with unexpected events and showing interest in the social context (d) behaviors that

are related to particular tasks, such as concentrating on performing a task and completing an assignment. Finally, an interesting dichotomy has been highlighted by Garrote (2017) who, following Malti and Perren (2016), distinguished between social skills that satisfy one's needs and those considering the needs of others, thus naming and classifying them as 'self-oriented' and 'other-oriented' social skills. The first are important for the self since they enable the individual to successfully interact and ultimately bond with peers and include skills such as leadership, assertiveness and self-control. Other-oriented skills, such as helping, caring, cooperating and showing empathy are equally important, since they enable the individual to take into consideration interests and benefits of others in social interactions.

Based on the above theoretical understandings, various intervention programs have been developed aiming at strengthening the social skills of children with interpersonal problems who are at risk of future social isolation. For example, the literature contains studies evaluating the effectiveness of SST (Social Skills Training) interventions designed to support the students' socio-emotional development including behavioral social skills training (e.g. modelling, instructions, discussion), social perception skills training involving the interpretation of social cues, and social problem solving. While some of the implemented SST interventions have been designed specifically for students with behavioral difficulties and students with learning disabilities, several meta-analyzes have shown that these interventions have rather weak effects on the social skills of these students and on their social standing in the class (Kavale & Forness, 1996; Kavale & Mostert, 2004; Quinn, Kavale, Mathur, Rutherford, & Forness, 1999). The evidence seems to suggest that SST interventions do not produce significant effects when individual students are singled out, but instead are most effective when they are implemented at the whole school level and some key systemic factors, such as the whole school ethos, staff and peer attitudes are also altered (see Spence (2003) for a relevant review). Interestingly, this holds true for other school-based interventions designed to promote the social participation of traditionally marginalized students such as students with SEN. Indeed, in their review of school-based interventions in regular preschool and elementary classrooms, Garrote, Dessemontet and Opitz (2017) identified a range of whole-school interventions including teaching interaction strategies to students without SEN, setting up group activities in the academic context (cooperative learning and peer-tutoring), and formulating support groups for pupils with SEN. Importantly, these interventions seem to be able to have a positive impact on all children and not just those on with SEN.

To sum up, there is a need to shift the research focus from those individual students who stand out as marginalized towards implementing interventions that address the entire class. In line with this research priority, the presented report aims to explore the impact of the 'Circle of Friends' intervention program as well as other intervention programs fostering social participation of all students.

2. Circle of Friends

Short facts	
Name of program:	Circle of Friends
Responsible organization(s):	Inclusive Solutions
Duration of the intervention:	diverse
Program homepage:	https://inclusive-solutions.com/
Target group	
Students (age):	diverse
Diversity dimensions:	All diversity dimensions
School type:	All types of mainstream schools
Summary of the program	
Definition for inclusion / social participation:	There is no clear definition of social inclusion. The workbook authors mention the underlying values of Circle of Friends, which is among others "[..] *full inclusion for all* [..]." (Newton & Wilson, 2016, p. 6). Examples of full inclusion are given by mentioning Nisbet and Hagner (2000) as well as Jordan and Goodey (1996). Inclusion is further linked to human rights by citing the Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education (1998) "*Inclusive education is a human right, its good education and it makes social sense*" (as cited in Newton & Wilson, 2016, p. 13)
Aim of the program	The program wants to increase the inclusion of children in mainstream schools who are at risk of exclusion due to various reasons (Newton & Wilson, 2016).
Key stages:	The Circle of Friends workbook (Newton & Wilson, 2016) names different stages, which are essential for carrying out the program.
Preparation:	Before starting the Circle of Friends, it is important to gain the support of the parents, the so-called 'focus child' as well as the school principal. Furthermore, the staff involved in the program have to agree in spending around 30 to 40 minutes per week on the intervention.
Initial meeting with the 'focus child's' class	This meeting is the starting point. It is recommended that a person (social worker, psychologist, etc.) who is not involved in the class leads the meeting to demonstrate the importance of the program. A second teacher who writes the minutes can be supportive for the session. It is essential to discuss the positive, but also difficult, aspects of the so called 'focus child' with the class and tell them that their help is needed to overcome existing 'problems'. After this discussion the person in charge of the session gives an input on different kinds of relationships and friendships which should help the class to get a broader

		picture and sense of their networks. This content is followed by the effort to create empathy by asking the students to imagine how they would feel and how they would behave, if they did not have any friends. After collecting their answers, the next step is to collect and develop ideas on how to be supportive. Finally, six to eight students volunteer for the circle of friends. As the so called 'focus child' is not present during the initial meeting it is necessary to mention at the beginning, that s/he is aware of this meeting and has given permission for it.
	Initial circle of friends meeting	This meeting with the so called 'focus child' should be scheduled as soon as possible and will take around 45 to 60 minutes. The creation of a safe environment for the child is crucial, therefore preparation of the 'focus child' is recommended to let him/her know what will happen during this meeting so that there are no unpleasant surprises and the meeting is not overwhelming for her/him. The session starts with warm ups and agreements on how to deal with each other. The next part is the feedback from the volunteers, which has also already been carried out during the whole class meeting. It is important to create an open and candid discussion so that the 'focus child' feels safe. After naming positive and difficult aspects, the group comes up with support plans for the child (Newton & Wilson, 2016).
	Weekly circle meetings	In the following weeks, each meeting will last around 20 to 40 minutes. These meetings are thought to "[…] *offer encouragement and recognition for successes and progresses; to identify difficulties, set targets and devise strategies for achieving targets; and to help to put these ideas into practice.*" (Newton & Wilson, 2016, p. 73). It is also important to talk about the children's feelings as well as challenges and work together on new strategies to overcome obstacles. The circle facilitator can use different methods to have more in-depth or simple sessions.
Methods:		Circles taking place on a weekly basis build the main setting, nevertheless the facilitator can use different approaches and methods to design and organize them. The Circle of Friends workbook names the problem solving and the personal and social development approach. By going for the first option the review of positives and negatives, the work on specific problems, the specification of targets, as well as brainstorming of strategies to achieve set

targets can be useful. The latter approach uses activities like circle times which focus on relationships, identity and reaction to difficult experiences (Bliss & Tetley, 1993; Mosley, 1996; Sapon-Shevin, 1998). Besides psycho- and socio-dramatic processes, therapeutic group-work approaches (Hanko, 1999) and emotional literacy (Sharp & Herrick, 2000) are named in the workbook.

2.1 Design of data collection and summary of 'Circle of Friends' studies

For the 'Circle of Friends' studies the following inclusion criteria were found eligible for the report:

1. school-based intervention
2. with focus on the application of the 'Circle of Friends'
3. with focus on students' outcomes
4. with empirical research conducted and published since 1995, when the first session of 'Circle of Friends' took place.

Due to these inclusion criteria, eleven published evaluations in English were reviewed. The studies will be presented very briefly and discussed in this section in order to see if the intervention is successful and if it can be integrated in an adapted version to the 'FRIEND-SHIP Intervention Program'.

The first eligible study is by Newton, Taylor and Wilson (1996), the founders of 'Circle of Friends' in the UK. The paper gives insight into findings of twenty 'Circle of Friends' interventions conducted for different children in the original form. The interventions took place in several mainstream schools by focusing on students with emotional and behavioral problems. As the authors do not describe their methodology in data collection and/or evaluation in detail, it is quite difficult to analyze and assess the results. However, discussion excerpts from circles are used and it is mentioned that results derive from observations during the circles and from written feedback of educators. The authors describe in their results that the circles were beneficial for all students participating, as they enhanced their interpersonal skills (Newton et al., 1996). The progress made in skills, such as empathy and collective problem-solving, are specifically mentioned. Students improved their listening skills as well as the ability to recognize and voice feelings. In this respect the students also learned how feelings and behaviors are connected to each other and that it is possible to change one's behavior over time. The results for teachers reveal that the focus on positive aspects/changes can also affect their point of view. It was also mentioned that the circle meetings, which were similar to services

they already provided, had also raised the teachers' self-esteem. Teachers also reported feeling supported, as students took on responsibility for their peers which also led to a change for the whole class: it became prouder due to the achieved success.

Whitaker et al. (1998) describe in their paper the rationale and process of establishing 'Circle of Friends'. The sample consisted of seven 3rd to 10thgrade students with Autism Spectrum Disorder. Six attended mainstream schools and one attended a school for pupils with moderate learning difficulties. 'Circles of friends' involved the participation of six to eight volunteer students for each 'focus child' who were selected based on the class teacher's final decision (*N*=52 students). Circle meetings occurred during lunch times and ranged from 3 to 17 meetings when the evaluation was carried out. Data were collected through qualitative measures to evaluate how students view benefits as well as challenges of the intervention. Interviews were conducted with the school staff, the 'focus students' and their parents as well as with the circle members. However, the authors do not mention if these interviews were conducted at pre and/or post-intervention and presumably no control group existed.

The authors mention that it is not possible to state if and to what extent changes in behaviors can be directly linked to the 'Circle of Friends'. However, the results indicate a positive impact on the 'focus student' and the circle members. The facilitators of the circles reported an improved social integration, reduced anxiety and improved behavior for the 'focus student', as well as an increased level of empathy, understanding and self-esteem for the circle members. The circle members reported the intervention effects on their supportive behavior, personal development and satisfaction with achieving target goals. The parents reported their enthusiasm for the circles and improved sociability. There is no information about the focus students' perceptions of their experience in the circle of friends.

Shotton (1998) presents in her paper a modified version of the 'Circle of Friends' for a thirteen-year-old student, named Susan, who had poor relationships with her classmates. The intervention started with the whole class, where in contrast to the original version the so called 'focus child' was also present. The students were asked to fill in a sociometric questionnaire (Coie, Dodge, & Coppotelli, 1982) which gave information on the popularity of students, on existing friendships within the class as well as feedback as to whether students would like to be involved in the 'Circle of Friends' group. On the basis of this questionnaire five children were chosen to participate in the weekly group meetings for about half an hour during the following six weeks. Besides Susan, two further students who were identified as being at risk of being isolated where included in the circle.

After the intervention the group members gave the feedback that they felt happier and more included in school since they had built new relationships within the 'Circle of Friends'. With regard to Susan, her teachers as well as her mother observed that she had become more self-assured. The self-report of Susan revealed that although she had made some new friends, school was still not a place she enjoyed.

Smith and Cooke (2000) present a single case study of a five-year-old student, Mark, in a reception class who seemed to have a lack of friendships. His behavior is described as demanding and his mother reported that he did not show any interest in participating in joint activities during reception year. An adapted version of the approach was applied by combining it with the concept developed by LaVigina et al. (1989) addressing *environmental change, teaching new skills, reinforcement* and *reactive strategies.*

Seven weeks after the intervention the results were discussed with the classroom staff and positive feedback was given regarding the topic of friendship. It was reported that the Mark had made progress in bringing up his ideas as well as in interacting and playing with others. Furthermore, his antisocial behavior had been reduced considerably.

Bowen (2010) presents in her single case experimental study the evaluation of three strategic interventions implemented with four children (between 7 and 13 years) with visual impairment to enhance their self-esteem. The strategic intervention consisted of ‘circle time’, 'Circle of Friends' and ‘one-to-one mentoring’, and these were implemented in a single and combined way, over a period of approximately six months. Self-esteem was estimated through the B/G STEEM questionnaire (Maines & Robinson, 1993), used at the beginning and at two intervals after the intervention.

Overall, the four students demonstrated higher levels of self-esteem after the strategic interventions and younger students seemed to respond more quickly to intervention than secondary pupils. However, it was not possible to determine whether one strategic intervention or a combination of interventions was more successful at increasing self-esteem than any other. The author discusses that any positive intervention would contribute to raising self-esteem of students identified as vulnerable. The changes in self-esteem may have been due to a variety of factors, including the increased positive attention that the pupil received, or even the social desirability effect.

In a second single case experimental study O’Connor (2016) presents results from a ‘Circle of Friends’ intervention for a ten-year-old student with a diagnosis of Asperger Syndrome and other associated learning needs. The student is described as having difficulties in engaging in appropriate social interactions with his classmates. The ‘Circle of Friends’ implementation was aimed at increasing

the student's ability to respond appropriately to peer interactions and to initiate appropriate interactions. The intervention occurred once a week for 3 months, with a total of 12 sessions.

Students' behaviors in interactions were observed in the classroom and on the playground. Quantitative data were collected at baseline and post intervention through the use of the 'Belonging Scales' (adapted from Psychological Sense of School Membership Scale; Goodenow, 1993) to evaluate self-worth and acceptance level perceived by children; and the 'Social Inclusion Survey' (Frederickson & Graham, 1999), a sociometric measure to evaluate children's willingness to associate with classmates in work and social contexts in school. The author mentions an increase in the children's willingness to make social initiations and relationships with the focus child after the intervention, as well as a significant increase in self-esteem and ratings of social acceptance. Furthermore, O'Connor (2016) reports more frequent contacts of higher quality between the so called 'focus child' and the peer group. However, the paper does not exactly describe the measures used and the data obtained, making it difficult to verify the reported findings.

Frederickson and Turner (2003) present the findings of a two-phase small–scale evaluation of the Circle intervention approach. The sample consisted of twenty children aged 6 to 12 years with emotional and behavioral difficulties.

In phase one, ten children were randomly selected to participate in the 'Circle of Friends' intervention and ten students formed the comparison group. In phase two, the comparison group in phase one received the intervention and the results were compared across both phases. Between-groups and within-subjects designs were used, respectively. Intervention took place over a six-week period. The students were asked to fill in the *Sociometric Rating Scale* (Asher & Dodge, 1986) to evaluate their perceptions and judgments regarding the so called 'focus child'; *Self-Perception Profile for Children* (Harter, 1985) to evaluate students' perceptions about themselves; and the *My Class Inventory subscale* (Fraser, 1982; Fraser & Fisher, 1986) to analyze students' perceptions of their classroom environment. Teachers filled out the *Teacher's Rating Scale of Child's Actual Behavior* (Harter, 1985). All measures were obtained at pre- and post-intervention.

The findings revealed positive effects from both intervention phases on the social acceptance of the 'focus children' in their classroom. However, few changes were obtained on the 'focus children's' perception of their social acceptance or behavioral conduct, on teacher's ratings of children's behavioral conduct, or on the classroom climate.

In their second experimental study, Frederickson et al. (2005) explored the effects of the 'Circle of Friends' during six weeks across various aspects, as well as the sustainability of social

inclusion in the mid-term; by including a follow-up evaluation four months after phase one. The sample consisted of 14 children aged 6.8 years to 11.3 years with different special educational needs (emotional and behavioral difficulties, learning difficulties or autistic spectrum disorder). The *LITOP* questionnaire from the Social Inclusion Survey (SIS) (Frederickson & Graham, 1999) was used as a sociometric measure. Upon this Frederickson et al. (2005) calculated an index of acceptance as well as an index of rejection for each child. Additionally, an adapted version of the *Guess Who* peer assessment measure of Coie and Dodge (1988) was used for unlimited nominations and proportion scores (see Frederickson & Graham, 1999).

Frederickson et al. (2005) state that the whole-class session showed a positive impact on the social inclusion of the 'focus children'. The results show a greater acceptance of the children followed by a reduction of rejection. However, at the follow up point results show that acceptance decreased and rejection increased. A difference in behavior could be shown between children participating in the 'Circle of Friends' and those not participating in the 'Circle of Friends', as those being part of the circle were likely to accept and less likely to reject the 'focus child'. For the weekly sessions, with the exception of one child labelled with an autistic spectrum disorder, no significant improvements could be shown. At the follow up point acceptance ratings by circle members seemed to adjust back to baseline rates. Rejection ratings decreased but were slightly lower compared to baseline level.

Miller et al., (2003) present the effects of Friendship Circles on social interactions between three male students with mild disabilities and their classmates and the generalization of positive skills to other school settings and social behaviors. The so called 'focus students' were isolated, ignored, or were the target of taunting or unfavorable remarks by peers. Four peers of each 'focus student' were selected based on teachers' opinions of students' social competence and problem-solving skills and sociogram of the focus student.

A multiple probe design was used, with each 'focus child' initiating the Friendship Circle after the previous one has demonstrated an increase in appropriate interactions. Friendship Circles met once a week for 30 minutes and were facilitated by the experimenter in the special education classroom.

Data were gathered through the observation of social interactions at lunch and recess during baseline, intervention, generalization and maintenance phases; sociograms (Beninghoff, 1993) filled by all students prior and after the interventions; and anecdotal records from teachers. For social comparison purposes, appropriate social interactions of three groups of five fifth-grade students without disabilities were observed at lunch.

The results show a higher percentage of appropriate interactions at lunch for the three target students and their peers following the intervention, which were maintained after the withdrawal of intervention at levels similar to those of the social comparison group. The intervention also had a positive impact on the occurrence of friendly play at recess for two target students. Anecdotal records from teachers indicated improved social interactions for the two target students throughout the day and improved social behaviors in the general education classroom, with students from the Friendship Circle demonstrating an increase in supportive behaviors to the target student.

In their small scale study Kalyva and Avramidis (2005) present results on the effectiveness of the 'Circle of Friends' intervention with a focus on the enhancement of communication skills. The sample consisted of 30 pre-school children of which 5 were identified with autism (EG= 3, CG=2). The intervention was carried out once a week for 3 months and took place for approximately 30 minutes. Data was collected at baseline, intervention and at a 2 month follow-up by using classroom observations which documented the amount of responses and initiation attempts.

The results showed positive effects at post-intervention as well as at follow-up. Kalyva and Avramidis (2005) state that compared to the control group the rates of unsuccessful response and initiation had declined in the intervention group and successful response and initiation rates had increased at post-intervention as well as at follow-up time. The authors conclude that the 'Circle of Friends' can be a great intervention to advance the social skills of children with autism and foster their 'inclusion' in mainstream settings.

Finally, in their paper Barrett and Randall (2004) present the evaluation of two different models of the 'Circle of Friends' intervention regarding their direct, training and general effects. A mixed method approach was applied to gather data.

The first model focused on one child, which was in contrast to the original 'Circle of Friends' approach present at the whole class meeting. The intervention was applied for six weeks and six children took part in the weekly 'Circle of Friends' sessions. A sociometric questionnaire (Frederickson, 1991) was used at pre- and post-intervention to evaluate changes in peer acceptance. It was also used to decide on which children should join the weekly sessions. At post-intervention students, teachers, and parents had to complete a questionnaire in addition to a whole class discussion being conducted, so that those not participating in the 'Circle of Friends' could be interviewed. Barrett and Randall (2004) state that the first model showed limited effects on the 'focus child's' peer relationships. Regarding the other children participating in the circle, a marginal effect could be detected, as they showed interest in participating in an upcoming 'Circle of Friends'.

The second evaluation was used for a whole class 'Circle of Friends' model at a primary school which included more ‘focus children’ in the class. Three students were identified as at risk. The *My Class Inventory* (MCI) (Fraser, 1989) was filled out by all students to collect data on actual and preferred class cohesion.

Barrett and Randall (2004) state positive general effects noted by children self-reporting on an alteration in the quality of their social skills. Also, direct effects indicated a positive change as one focus child reported an enhancement in its social skills, and two focus children reported having more relationships. However, the authors mention that it was not possible to improve peer relationships of the most excluded child with the ‘Circle of Friends’.

2.2 Discussion of study results

Summarizing and interpreting the effects of the ‘Circle of Friends’ program based on the present literature review is a complex task. Although the program has already been used several times and although all of the mentioned studies showed positive effects on specific outcomes (such as the social participation of the ‘focus child’ or their social behavior as well as the behavior of other circle members), the interpretation is limited. One major concern – which can be stated for all intervention studies is the publication bias (Kien et al., 2014). Not a single study was included in the review which reported no (positive) intervention effects. Moreover, the comparison of the results is challenging due to several limitations. First of all, a lack of information seems to appear when comparing all of these studies. For instance, in some studies it was rather unclear whether the intervention was done exactly according to the recommendations in the program – some mentioned that they adapted the program regarding specific settings, target children etc. Secondly, some studies did not give sufficient information on the methodology which had been used to evaluate the intervention. A problem which can be pointed out is that all of the above-mentioned studies focused on the positive effects of the intervention program while possible negative effects were neglected. For instance, when entering into intensive interactions with peers, a possible outcome could also be that the peers become more aware of the ‘misbehavior’ of the ‘target child’ which could, for example, lead to a higher level of bullying etc. As a quotation says, ‘we see what we expect to see’. It is therefore recommended that future evaluations also consider possible negative effects. Moreover, based on research on social participation (e.g. Schwab, 2018) the methodology which is used might also influence the outcome. It has been recognized that qualitative methods (e.g. interviews) often

end up with more positive results than quantitative methods (e.g. sociometric networks or questionnaires using Likert scales) or more objective data (e.g. observations from external observers). In contrast to previous research the 'Circle of Friends' program evaluations lack objective data collection and mixed-method data. Moreover, against a recent trend in inclusive education research (see e.g. de Leeuw, de Boer, & Minnaert, 2018), hardly any of the studies included the voice of the 'target student'. If the social participation of the focus student is in the center of the intervention, the evaluation of the effects definitely needs to take the perception of these students into account. Moreover, the evaluation was mostly conducted directly before and after the intervention, and the long-term effects/the stability of short time effects was not investigated. Even more critical, based on the above-mentioned studies, is that it seems to still be unclear as to which part of the program the effects are due. For example, it might be that higher social participation results were due to the increased interaction between children (see literature about the intergroup-contact theory; Allport, 1954) and not due to specific aspects of the program. To get a more in-depth insight, it would therefore be necessary to include control groups which receive other interventions or which control for intergroup contacts.

Most of the presented studies had in common the fact that the 'focus child' was a child with social-emotional problems and/or had a very low level of social participation. Therefore, not much is known as to how the 'Circle of Friends' intervention works for children with other diversity dimensions and/or difficulties. Another interesting outcome of the review of studies evaluating the 'Circle of Friends' program was that there was still a wide variance in how long the intervention was carried out.

Keeping in mind the way the 'Circle of Friends' program works, namely that a specific child is in the focus of a circle, ethical aspects also need to be taken more strongly into consideration. These have not been addressed in the above-mentioned studies. Additionally, the knowledge about the usability of the program in different settings is still limited.

What has to be taken into account for the current FRIEND-SHIP project is that within the development of an intervention program it is helpful to provide detailed information on how to evaluate this intervention program. In the best case, a teacher diary (to note in detail how the intervention was implemented), an evaluation tool (including scales, interview guides) as well as information on how to conduct the evaluation are required to get comparable evidence on the intervention effects. This needs to be carefully taken into consideration in all future outputs of the current project.

3. Social inclusion programs – Reviews

3.1 Procedure and design of data collection

Participating countries in the FRIEND-SHIP project conducted a review of existing programs aimed at increasing children's social participation/social inclusion in mainstream schools. This review was conducted to: synthesize the common elements of former programs as well as analyze strengths and weaknesses; present empirical evidence available with respect to the implementation of each intervention program; and inform the development of the 'FRIEND-SHIP program'. For such aims, each partner selected four social participation/social inclusion programs.

The inclusion criteria were established attending to aims of the project and, therefore, involved

1. school-based interventions to increase social inclusion/participation
2. with focus on students' outcomes
3. with the majority of the target group aged 6-11 years
4. with empirical research conducted and published since the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN, 2006).

In line with the overall aim of this project to contribute to inclusive schooling and social participation of all students, the target of interventions was not limited to any defined group of children. These broad criteria allowed a wide variety of programs to be included in the review.

Data from the selected programs were extracted and compiled by each partner country using a structured template summarizing the key attributes in order to facilitate comparison between different programs. The template was agreed by all partners and intended to describe each program's aims, theoretical underpinnings, length, format, methods, and evaluation. The following section summarizes key attributes of reviewed programs, as well as data elements of empirical research conducted on their implementation in order to inform the developing of 'FRIEND-SHIP Intervention Program'.

3.2 Results of reviewed programs

A total of seventeen programs were reviewed for this report. However, the evaluation studies of the 'Circle of Friends' are presented separately in section two of the report. Table 1 provides an overview of the characteristics of the sixteen intervention programs presented below.

It becomes evident that the reviewed intervention programs to enhance primary and secondary school students' social participation mainly differ in their focal points. The majority of the

interventions are competence-oriented aiming at increasing social inclusion/social participation with direct focus on three components: 1) developing students' social competences and social understanding 2) teaching students about respecting and valuing diversity 3) improving students' skills to establish and maintain friendship relations. Fewer intervention programs can be defined as problem-oriented: (n=2) aimed at preventing anger and peer-directed aggression ('Psychoeducational program for reduction of anger') and dealing with social anxiety ('Psychoeducational program for social anxiety reduction').

The first component of developing social competences and social understanding consists of teaching students to identify emotions and focus on positive aspects in oneself and others in order to be inclusive. Contents address the development of basic (e.g., sadness, happiness, anger) and complex (e.g., assertiveness, compassion, empathy, self-regulation/control, interpersonal problem solving, coping) social-emotional skills (e.g., programs 1, 5, 6, 15). The programs 'PATHS', 'Positive Action', 'SSIS-CIP', 'Sanford Harmony' as well as 'Steps for life' include activities that foster social-emotional learning by providing competences of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and responsible decision-making.

The second component includes the provision of information about diversity, addressing fundamental values such as respecting and valuing individual differences (e.g., programs 2, 15), by teaching students to be aware of prejudices and biases (e.g., program 3), and encouraging them to recognize and appreciate each's similarities and differences. This is the case of the 'Collaboration, help, and solidarity: Three ways to have a better time together' program, which included didactic units approaching the following contents: 'We are all different'; 'Differences are many and they are useful'. In turn, 'The GREI model' program includes instructional content regarding children demonstrating kindness to others who are different.

The third component puts a focus on teaching students to establish supportive interactions and friendships with classmates (e.g., programs 2, 3, 11, 15), through activities fostering awareness of friendship qualities, acceptance of different views and opinions, and cooperation with others. For example, the 'Psychoeducational program for transition to secondary education' includes one session dedicated to 'making new friends and keeping the old ones'. These components are present in the programs reviewed in an isolated or combined way. The 'Character strength intervention' and 'Positive Action' programs, for example, aim to promote social participation focusing on teaching students social and emotional competences. In turn, the 'Sanford Harmony' is a multi-component intervention thought to contribute to interpersonal relationships in and outside the classroom,

consisting of five units that address: diversity and inclusion; empathy and critical thinking; communication; problem solving; and peer relationships. Regardless of the main focus adopted, all programs aim to promote social inclusion and participation by building a positive classroom climate and fostering peers' inclusiveness.

Concerning the diversity approach adopted, twelve intervention programs focus on diversity in general (programs 1, 3-10, 12, 15, 16) and four focus on disability (programs 2, 11, 13, 14). The four interventions focusing on disability address children with intensified or special needs due to intellectual disability (programs 2, 11, 14); physical disabilities (program 14) and learning difficulties (program 13). With respect to the target group, the majority of the programs have a universal approach and focus therefore on the entire class. Two programs combine universal and targeted interventions: 'The GREI model' and 'MOSAIC'. Target interventions are conducted with students 'disliked by their peers' and with 'high ADHD symptoms and peer problems', respectively.

The duration of interventions ranged in length from five 45-minute sessions to one school year. Six interventions lasted less than twelve weeks (programs 2, 7-9, 13, 14). From these, shorter interventions lasted four and five weeks and were implemented twice a week (programs 13, 14). The other ones were implemented weekly during five, eight and ten weeks (programs 2, 7, 8, 9). Five interventions lasted between 18 and 35 weeks (programs 1, 3, 6, 12, 15) and four interventions were implemented during the full school year (programs 4, 10, 11, 16).

Most of the interventions were implemented through weekly structured sessions. Three interventions (programs 2, 4, 16) also embedded the principles and activities of the program in the basic curriculum throughout all day-to-day activities (e.g., arrivals and departures, classroom meetings, instruction time, transitions). For example, the 'PATHS' intervention program consists in a script curriculum in social and emotional skills taught in a regular basis.

Multiple teaching techniques and methods are used by these programs, including the delivery of instructional content about the skills to teach (e.g., programs 3, 6, 7, 9, 14, 16), feedback (e.g., programs 1-4, 9), exploration of stories regarding the target situation/skill, modelling to show children how to implement the target skills and behaviors (e.g., Programs 2, 3, 5, 9, 14), role-play situations to train children (e.g., programs 2, 3, 5, 9, 15, 16), simulation activities for students to experience different realities (2, 14), homework assignments (1, 2), group discussions and reflection (1, 3, 5-7, 9, 14, 16).

Teachers are responsible for conducting the majority of interventions. Three programs involve parents in the intervention with specific activities: to increase positive communication between

school and parents, to share information about the contents being delivered by the program, and to count on their support to encourage students to display friendship skills in peer contexts (programs 3, 6, 14).

Empirical research about the implementation of intervention programs reviewed is also analyzed and described in this report. Most of the studies measuring the effects of social participation intervention programs, are experimental or quasi-experimental studies, involving a comparison between intervention and control group with a pre-post-test design (n=11). The remaining studies used a pre-post-test design without a control group (e.g., programs 6, 9). Four studies specified the inclusion of students with disabilities in the sample (programs 1, 4, 11, 13), described by students with SEN in general (program 1), ADHD (program 4), mild intellectual disability (program 11) and learning difficulties (program 13). The target population of the intervention was mainly students from primary school. Four studies also included children from kindergarten (programs 4, 5, 14, 15). The number of participants per study varied from 20 (program 11) to 11258 (program 10) children. Intervention effects were often estimated using more than one measurement instrument. The total number of measures used in interventions was 55. The majority of these measures consisted in self-report measures completed by students (*N*=34) and teachers (*N*=5).

Six of the measures included observation of interactions/social behaviors of students (*N*=4) and teachers' classroom strategies (*N*=2) and three measures included sociometric interviews to evaluate the social statues of students in social networks. Qualitative measures, such as interviews (with teachers, *N*=3; with students, *N*=1) and focus groups (with students, *N*=3), were also used. In regard to the effects of interventions, the majority of the studies showed significant improvements on various outcome measures. In our sample of interventions, students' socio-emotional skills and social participation were by far the most common student outcomes (*N*=10 and *N*=9, respectively). In few studies, students' academic outcomes and teachers' classroom practices were also reported (*N*=3).

In order to promote primary and secondary school students' social participation in the classroom, several studies such as the 'Character Strength Intervention', the 'SSIS-CIP', 'Positive action' or the 'Steps for Life' focus on students' personal and social skills and emotions. In this respect the evaluations reveal positive effects on skills such as empathy, emotion management, friendship skills ('Steps for Life'; Kourmousi et al., 2018), significant enhancement in likeability, adherence to social rules and the use of active coping strategies ('Psychoeducational program for transition to secondary education', Brouzos, Vassipoulos, Vlachioti & Baourda, 2019), greater decrease in aggressive behavior and hostile attributions as well as less perceived anger and more self-control

('Psychoeducation program for reduction of aggression', Vassilopoulos, Brouzos & Rentzios, 2014), less social anxiety, negative interpretation of ambiguity, and higher self-reported likeability in elementary school students at risk of social anxiety ('Psychoeducational program for social anxiety reduction', Vassilopoulos, Banerjee, & Prantzalou, 2009). Furthermore, students with learning difficulties who participated in the intervention group chose positive conflict strategies and showed less inappropriate behaviors compared to those children in the control group ('Social Stories', Kalyva & Agaliotis, 2009).

Social participation outcomes included the measurement of the four dimensions defined by Koster et al. (2009): acceptance by classmates and self-perception of acceptance evaluated by quantitative measures (e.g., programs 3, 5, 10, 14); social relationships and friendships evaluated through sociometric interviews (e.g., programs 2, 3, 4); social interactions evaluated through the observation of social contacts between students (e.g., programs 2, 11).

With regard to students' attitudes towards and acceptance of peers with special educational needs, the intervention program 'Special Friends' (De Boer, Pijl, Minnaert, & Post, 2014) aims to enhance the attitudes of kindergarten and elementary school students towards peers with (severe) intellectual and physical disabilities. To change their attitudes towards peers with disabilities, students received explanations and knowledge about intellectual and physical disabilities. Furthermore, students read stories about fictional characters with intellectual and physical disabilities. Short- and long-time effects of the intervention were evaluated in an experimental study (De Boer et al., 2014). Findings indicate significantly more positive attitudes of kindergarten students in the experimental group immediately after the intervention compared to those students in the control group. Long-term effects could not be found. In contrast, no intervention effects were found concerning elementary school students' attitudes towards peers with intellectual or physical disabilities. In order to further improve the intervention, it is suggested to involve children's parents (e.g., in terms of storytelling about disabilities at home).

To further promote primary and secondary students' social participation in the inclusive classroom, some of the reviewed intervention programs primarily focus on children's peer relationships and interactions. For example, the aim of the 'GREI Model' intervention program (García Bacete, Marande & Mikami, 2019) is to enhance social relationships in elementary school classrooms. The intervention program targets students' social-emotional skills, inclusive peer-climate, student-teacher relationships, and parent support over a period of two years, based on a multi-component approach. On the one hand, children are taught universal skills in social relationships and on the other

hand, the program can be used to specifically address children with peer problems. In this matter, results of an empirical study (García Bacete et al., 2019) reveal beneficial effects of the GREI intervention program on social relationships in elementary classrooms. Children in the experimental group expected and received less dislike from their classmates, had higher self-perceptions of peer acceptance and improved teacher-student relationships compared to students in the control group. Another example is the 'Social Co-Existence Programme' (Vasileiadis & Doikou-Avlidou, 2018) which has the main goal of enhancing the social participation in primary schools by fostering social interactions among students with intellectual disabilities with their peers without disabilities. Therefore, the program includes practices concerning the implementation of structured activities to promote emotion regulation, appropriate expression, self-confidence and cooperation, as well as participation of students with intellectual disabilities in social activities inside and outside the school setting. The results of the experimental study indicate significantly increased social interactions of students with intellectual disabilities with their peers without disabilities, and positive changes in students' attitudes towards peers with intellectual disabilities as a result of the intervention. Furthermore, the aim of the MOSAIC (Mikami, Ownes, Hudec, Kassab, & Evans, 2019) intervention is to create a positive peer climate and affect peer dynamics in elementary school classrooms through teachers' day-to-day practices. It is stated that children with ADHD especially benefit from teachers' classroom practices, as these children are usually socially excluded. Finally, the main goal of the intervention program 'Collaboration, help, and solidarity: Three ways to have better time together' (Nota, Ginevra & Soresi, 2018) is to promote the social participation of elementary school students with intellectual disabilities (ID). Findings from an experimental study (Nota et al., 2018) indicate positive effects of the intervention on the social acceptance of students with ID, their social behavior in the inclusive classroom, and their interactions with peers without disabilities.

3.3 Key success factors of reviewed social inclusion programs

For a successful and sustainable promotion of students' social participation in the classroom some crucial factors concerning the appropriate practical implementation in primary and secondary schools should be considered. Besides the above-mentioned descriptive and analytic results important for the analysis, a closer look at these factors was, therefore, required.

One of the key success factors of social participation programs seems to be the duration of the intervention. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude (but not absolute) that long-term interventions with

regularity and comprehensiveness might be a central element in terms of a more sustainable development of social competencies (e.g., 'Collaboration, help and solidarity', 'The GREI Model', 'Social Stories', 'Special friends'). Another key success factor is linked to the age of the students. It is suggested that interventions should take place in early childhood or at an early stage in students' social development, as students are more sensitive to educational interventions in the developmental age (Vuorinen et al., 2019). Vassilopoulos, Banerjee, and Prantzalou (2009) for example state that students mostly benefit from cognitive training prior to their puberty.

Furthermore, it can be assumed that interventions to promote students' social participation are particularly successful if the activities can be integrated into regular lessons in small groups, thus it is important to provide teachers with a variety of opportunities to deal with students' social competencies, deliver specific feedback to every participant, and prompt and reinforce the development of new social competencies (Nota, Ginevra & Soresi, 2018). Small groups also provide students with the opportunity and space to actively work on a wider range of scenarios and reflect upon them (O'Hare, Stark, Orr, Biggart, & Bonnell, 2018). Equally Welch, Himonides, Saunders, Papageorgi, and Sarazin (2014) highlight the motivational effect for students when it comes to collaborative learning groups.

Moreover, an active engagement of students seems to be beneficial when lessons focus primarily on practical or art-based exercises rather than on answering questions after listening to a story (e.g., 'Positive action'). Accordingly, the active engagement of students and the use of a multi-component approach are highlighted as strengths of social participation interventions (e.g., García Bacete et al., 2019; Kourmousi et al., 2018). Intervening through multiple channels is related to higher positive outcomes and long-term effects on students' social participation, specifically on social acceptance and peer liking. In the GREI intervention model García Bacete et al. (2019) addressed children's socio-emotional skills, inclusive peer climate, positive teacher-student relationships and parent support through didactic instruction, role-play and modelling. Despite the adapted intervention conducted by de Boer, Pijl, Minnaert and Post (2014) which used only one component – the knowledge component – the original 'Special Friends' program (Favazza et al., 1999) combined this with structured play and home reading components with positive outcomes. In turn, the 'Collaboration, Help and Solidarity' intervention program combined social contact, simulations, classrooms exercises and stories about persons with disabilities (Nota et al., 2018). In addition, children's attitudes towards peers with special educational needs can be considered as a crucial factor to improve the social participation of students with special educational needs in inclusive education. Consequently,

intervention programs should aim to support the development of positive attitudes by initiating clearly structured possibilities for students with and without disabilities to successfully interact with each other. According to Bricker (1995) parents have a high impact on the development of children's attitudes towards peers with special educational needs. Therefore, it is recommended to include them in the intervention (de Boer et al., 2014). However, children must be given both sufficient time to internalize newly learned social competencies and real-life opportunities to apply those skills learned.

In order for teaching to be feasible, classroom practices should be universally applied to all students in the classroom instead of some target students. In this context it needs to be emphasized that complex intervention approaches over a long period of time require good organization and structure from the teachers involved, as well as elaborated learning materials. In this sense, Humphrey, Barlow and Lendrum (2018b) state that the quality of the intervention delivery is essential for achieving positive effects, and factors such as initial training, on-going technical support, as well as assistance to teachers can contribute to improve such quality of delivery ('PATHS' intervention program). To assure the implementation fidelity, the GREI intervention provided teachers training sessions and individual consultation moments. Furthermore, teachers received manuals for each intervention component.

Last but not least, it is noteworthy that some evaluations were based on students' self-reports. For a broad evaluation of the effects of intervention programs, both teachers' and students' reports as well as observations should be taken into account (O'Hare et al., 2018).

Table 1: Overview of intervention programs reviewed

	Name of Intervention	Overall aim(s)	Students	Intervention dosage	Study / Country	Sample	Measure(s)	Outcomes
1	Character strength intervention	○ social competences & understanding	10 – 13 years (with students with SEN)	16 weeks (45 min. weekly)	Vuorinen et al. (2019) / Finnland	Students (*N*=253; EG=175; CG=78) Teachers (*N*=7)	Student report Teacher report	<u>Mixed findings but:</u> ○ students with SEN profit ○ boys: show anti-aggressive behavior ○ girls: show empathy
2	Collaboration, help, and solidarity	○ respecting and valuing diversity ○ establish & maintain friendships	8 years (students with SEN)	10 weeks (120 min. weekly)	Nota et al. (2018) / Italy	Students (*N*=152; EG=76; CG=76)	Observation	<u>Positive impact</u> on day-to-day interactions
3	GREI	○ respecting and valuing diversity ○ establish & maintain friendships ○ increase peers' inclusiveness	6 years	18 weeks	García Bacete et al. (2019) / Spain	Students (*N*=214)	Student report	<u>Positive impact:</u> ○ less disliked by classmates ○ perceived themselves to be more peer-accepted
4	MOSAIC	○ increase peers' inclusiveness ○ improve children's behavior problems	6 – 9 years (students with ADHD)	1 school year	Mikami et al. (2019) / Canada and USA	Students (*N*=194) Teachers (*N*=12)	Student report Teacher report Observation	<u>Positive impact:</u> ○ improvement of children's classroom behaviors ○ peers were more inclusive
5	PATHS	○ social competences & understanding	4 – 11 years	2 school years (30-40 min. twice a week)	Humphrey et al. (2018a) / UK	Students (*N*=5218; EG=2294; CG=2106) Teachers (*N*=106)	Student report Teacher report Observation	<u>Small impact</u>
6	Positive Action	○ social competences & understanding	8 – 10 years	35 weeks (15 min. several times a week)	O'Hare et al. (2018) / UK	Students (*N*=423 post level) Teachers (*N*=19) Principals (*N*=15)	Student report Teacher report Observation	<u>Mixed findings:</u> ○ evidence for the 'Think-Act-Feel' cycle ○ decrease in aggression ○ no change in peer relations and prosocial behavior

7	Psychoeducational programme for transition to secondary education	○ Partially: establish & maintain friendships	11 – 12 years	5 weeks (45 min. weekly)	Brouzos et al. (2019) / Greece	Students (*N*=82; EG=56; CG=26)	Student report	<u>Positive impact:</u> ○ decrease in social anxiety ○ increase in self-esteem ○ increase in likeability ○ increase in adherence to social rules ○ increase in active coping strategies
8	Psychoeducational Programme for reduction of Aggression	○ social competences	9 – 10 years	5 weeks (45 min. weekly)	Vassilopoulos et al. (2014) / Greece	Students (*N*=86; EG=52; CG=34)	Student report	<u>Positive impact:</u> ○ less likely to endorse hostile attributions ○ more likely to endorse benign attributions ○ less peer aggressive behavior more self-control
9	Psychoeducational programme for social anxiety reduction	○ social competences	10 – 12 years	8 weeks (40 min. weekly)	Vassilopoulos et al. (2013) / Greece	Students (*N*=40)	Student report	<u>Mixed findings:</u> ○ more peer likeability ○ reduction of social anxiety symptoms ○ increasing benign interpretations ○ no reduction in depression
10	Sing up	○ increase sense of self ○ increase peers' inclusiveness	7 – 10 years	1 school year	Welch et al. (2014) / UK	Students (*N*=6087)	Student report Observation	<u>Positive impact:</u> Connection between singing ability/technique and ○ sense of social inclusion & integration ○ greater sense of self and of being socially involved.
11	Social Co-existence Programme	○ increase peers' inclusiveness ○ social competences & understanding ○ establish & maintain friendships	6 – 7 years (students with SEN)	1 school year	Vasileiadis et al. (2018) / Greece	Students (*N*=20)	Student report Observation	<u>Positive impact:</u> ○ increases in target students' social interactions with their peers ○ positive changes in general education pupils' attitudes
12	SSIS-CIP - Social Skills Improvement System	○ social competences & understanding	3 – 18 years	12 weeks (20-25 min. twice a week)	DiPerna et al. (2017) / US	Students (*N*=696; EG =341; CG=355) Teachers (*N*=59; EG=29; CG=30)	Student report Teacher report Observation	<u>Small positive impact on:</u> ○ students' social skills and behavior in the classroom ○ peer cooperation, empathy & engagement in social activities ○ approaches to learning no impact on academic skills

13	Social Stories	○ social competences ○ increase peers' inclusiveness	10 – 12 years (only students with LD)	1 month (twice a week)	Kalyva, & Agaliotis, (2009) / Greece	Students (*N*=63; EG=31; CG=32; N=63 with LD allocated in both groups) Teachers (*N*=17)	Student report Teacher report	Positive impact: ○ children chose largely positive conflict resolution strategies ○ children with LD were rated to be engaging in less inappropriate social behaviors
14	Special Friends	○ change attitudes ○ increase peers' inclusiveness	4 – 12 years (students with SEN)	3 weeks (45 min. twice a week)	De Boer et al. (2014) / Netherlands	Students (*N*=271; EG=113; CG=158)	Student report Teacher report (implementation)	Mixed findings: ○ positive attitudes more significant on the last measurement ○ positive immediate effects on attitudes of kindergarten students, but limited effects on elementary school students' attitudes. ○ elementary school boys hold significantly more negative attitudes than girls.
15	Sanford Harmony	○ social competences & understanding ○ establish & maintain friendships	3 – 12 years	26 weeks (45 min. weekly)	Miller et al. (2017) / USA	Students (*N*=627; EG=368; CG=259) Teachers (*N*=24; EG=10; CG=14)	Student report Teacher report	Small positive impact but: ○ significant lower aggressive behavior (however overall low aggressive behavior in EG & CG) ○ higher peer liking and acceptance of students ○ significantly more school liking ○ greater sense of belonging and inclusion in classroom. ○ higher academic achievements
16	Steps for Life	○ social competences & understanding	6 – 8 years (and older)	1 school year (120 min. weekly)	Kourmousi et al. (2018) / Greece	Students (*N*=2439; EG=1516; CG=923)	Student report Teacher report	Positive impact: ○ significant improvements on social participation, cooperation and friendship-skills (also in CG), ○ improvement in emotions' management, concentration of attention, and ability to control verbal and physical aggressiveness and victimization

1. Character strength intervention

Evaluation	
Vuorinen, K., Erikivi, A.& Uusitalo-Malmivaara, L. (2019). A character-strength intervention in 11 inclusive Finnish classrooms to promote social participation of students with special educational needs. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 19*(1), 45-57.	
Short facts	
Responsible organization(s):	University of Helsinki
Duration of the intervention:	16 weeks ("weekly 45-minute intervention lessons, the principles of the program were embedded in the basic curriculum" (p. 47))
Target group	
Students (age):	10 to 13 years (4th - 6th graders)
Diversity dimensions:	Students with SEN: "students with intensified or special needs due to learning and/or behavioral difficulties, and/or immigrant background" (p. 46)
Teacher:	Teachers from inclusive elementary school classes
School type:	Elementary school
Summary of the program	
Definition for inclusion / social participation:	In Finland, students are not categorized on the basis of diagnoses. Provision of support is pedagogical and school-driven. There is no unique definition or criteria for special needs.
Aim of the program	The intervention aims to promote social participation by teaching students to focus on positive aspects in themselves and others. Furthermore, the promotion of social skills, well-being as well as learning skills in inclusive classes where addressed by the intervention.
Key stages:	Vuorinen, Erikivi & Uusitalo-Malmivaara (2019) planned the intervention based on the *Strengths Gym* (Proctor et al., 2011) program and adapted it to fit the Finish school setting. The intervention consists of three main stages. The first step is to teach students the meaning of character as well as how to make progress in strengthening it. Compassion, kindness, love, self-regulation and grit are therefore in the center of attention. The second step is teaching happiness by giving an understanding of positive emotions, appreciation and mutual support. The third and final stage is familiarization with the concept of a growth mind-set and its ability to support learning skills. For this reason, the authors used the positive framework from Linkins, Niemiec, Gillham, et al. (2015).
Methods:	Methods included in the program such as introducing, exploring, reflecting, group activities, homework, strength card activity, different

activities like Iceberg exercise, Bounce back activity etc. Taken from table 2 Vuorinen et al. (2019, pp. 48-49)

Lesson	Lessonplan
1. Introduction to character strengths	VIA survey, introduction to strength vocabulary. Viacharacter.org.
2. My personal character strengths	Exploring and reflecting the VIA-IS-inventory results. *My top five strengths* posters. Finding ways to use and develop character strengths. Group activity: *Strengths wall*. Creating a shared language for strength spotting. Homework: *My signature strengths introduction*.
3. Other people matter	Exploring signature strengths in others. A strength card activity *We are different but everyone is unique.* Group activity: *Strengths lenses*. Positive feedback. Homework: Strength spotting at home, *A family tree of strengths*.
4. Self-control	Exploring ways to develop and use self-control Reflecting where self-control is needed and what happens when we run out of it. Marshmallow test (Mischel, 2014), video and activity. Homework: Spot and write *Successful self-control usage*
5. Growth mindset	Understanding the theory of fixed and growth mindset (Dweck, 2006). Introducing the *Self-talk bird* (Boniwell, 2013). Self-talk cartoon activity. Group activity: *What went well* tree. Homework: *What went well* diary.
6. Grit	Understanding *the Grit formula*, passion for long-term goals (Duckworth, 2016). Iceberg exercise, practicing long-term goal setting. Group activity: *Gritty puppy* video, reflecting on the importance of grit in learning and in life, in general. Homework: Grit goal setting at home and in hobbies.
7. Resilience	How to foster resilience, tools and activities. Exploring stories on resilience. Bounce back activity: *Elastic band*.

	Homework: Reflecting on your resilience and how it is strengthened.
8. Gratitude	Exploring how gratitude is linked to happiness and well-being. Expressing gratitude, *Gratitude letter*. Gratitude activity: a joint *Gratitude wall*. Homework: Gratitude photo journal.
9. Love	What is love and how to integrate it in our everyday lives. Understanding the micromoments of love and positive resonance (Fredrickson, 2013). Group activity: *Smile circle*. Homework: *Essays on Micromoments of love*.
10. Positive emotions	Understanding emotions and finding out the healthy balance on positive and negative emotions. Introducing the broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions (Fredrickson, 2001). Homework: Labelling different emotions.
11. Curiosity	Finding out the connection between curiosity and learning. Group activity: *The Curiosity game*. Homework: Designing the best way to stimulate curiosity in others.
12. Kindness	Understanding the connection between kindness, empathy and compassion. Kindness is contagious. Links to well-being. Group activity: *Secret friend*, strengths spotting in others. Homework: *Random act of kindness* week.
13. Hope	Introducing the essential skills for creating a hopeful mindset. Exploring thoughts and acts of hope. Group activity: *Hope lenses*, letter to the future me. Homework: *My dream day*.
14. Social intelligence	Understanding the skills needed in social encounters. Mindmap: The qualities of a good friend. Group activity: Active listening to others with empathy. Homework: Recognize your emotions – be aware of yourself in social situations.

	15. Zest	The importance of finding true passions and its' effects on well-being. Understanding intrinsic motivation. Group activity: *Zest agents* (Be aware, zest is contagious!). Homework: My favorite childhood activities.
	16. Compassion	Exploring the importance of compassion to all people. Group activity: Sharing stories about compassion. Reflecting on the need for compassion: *The story of a bullied boy.* Homework: Compassion spotting in the media (Ahlvik et al., 2015).
Further comments on program:		The intervention is developed by researchers of the University of Finland and is based on a positive education approach. This approach emphasizes focusing on the positive aspects as well as on the strengths of students, regardless of any other learning barriers and/or developmental challenges they may have. The purpose of the program is to increase social participation of all students.
Evaluation of the program		
Type (Process and/or output)		Process - Pre-post-design with EG and CG (mixed methods)
Method 1:		Quantitative measures
Measurement points:		Data were collected with 7 self-report scales (before and after the intervention)
Sample:		Students (N=253; 11 intervention classes with $N_{intervention}$=175; 4 control classes with $N_{control}$=78), 17 students with SEN in the intervention classes
Measurement:		Social competence, strength usage, grit, global happiness, school-related happiness, schoolwork engagement, mindset, and background variables like gender, number of close friends, age & class level
	Multi-Assessment of Social Competence (MASC) (Kaukiainen, Junttila, Kinnunen, et al., 2005).	Empathy and aggressive behavior
	Grit-S (Duckworth & Quinn, 2009)	Consistency of interest and perseverance of effort
	Strengths Use Scale (SUS) (Govindji & Linley, 2007)	Individual strengths use

	Subjective Happiness Scale (SHS) (Lyubomirsky & Lepper, 1999)	Global happiness
	School Children's Happiness Inventory (SCHI) (Ivens, 2007)	Context-related questionnaire
	Schoolwork Engagement Inventory (EDA) (Salmela-Aro & Upadaya, 2012)	Evaluated how learning can be affected by a positive growth mindset.
	Mindset (Dweck, 2006)	Evaluated how learning can be affected by a positive growth mindset.
Method 2:	Qualitative methods: Teacher interviews	
Measurement points:	Post intervention (Shortly after the intervention)	
Sample:	Teachers (*N*=7)	
Indicators:	The main question is related to "*what kind of accounts teachers formed about the effects of the intervention in their instruction?*" (p.50) (e.g. "*what kind of changes in your students' social behaviour did you notice during the intervention?*" (p. 50)).	
Results:	The evaluation showed mixed findings. After the intervention, the intervention group of students with SEN displayed higher consistency of interest and engagement in schoolwork. Thus, the students with SEN (EG) seemed to profit from the intervention. Vuorinen et al. (2019) argue that boys made progress in anti-aggressive behavior and that girls showed increased empathy and perseverance of effort after the intervention. The Strengths Use Scale did not show changes to either the global happiness or school-related happiness. The authors argue that in global happiness, changes are slow. The measure of Schoolwork Engagement did not show any statistical differences at post-intervention although teachers mentioned that boys were willing to learn more and that peer support had increased. The evaluation shows that teachers provided positive feedback and experience with regard to the intervention. Further, an improved social cohesion was stated. Vuorinen et al. (2019) remarked that a limitation may be that those teachers who were excited about the approach were among those who agreed to be interviewed.	

2. Collaboration, help, and solidarity: Three ways to have a better time together

Evaluation	
Nota, L., Ginevra, M. C., & Soresi, S. (2018). School inclusion of children with intellectual disability: An intervention program. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability.*	
Short facts	
Responsible organization(s):	University of Padova
Duration of the intervention:	10 weekly 2-hour didactic units (DU)
Target group	
Students (age):	8 years (elementary school students)
Diversity dimensions:	Children with intellectual disability
Teacher:	Elementary school teachers – proposes to be implemented in future by trained teachers in their classes
School type:	Elementary school
Summary of the program	
Definition for inclusion / social participation:	No definition provided
Aim of the program	The program aims to highlight diversity within the class, and favor school inclusion of classmates with Intellectual Disabilities, and of all the diversities of the classroom context
Key stages:	The program provides children with correct knowledge of the impairments of their classmates with intellectual disability (ID) that affect restrictions in activities and in participation, and also of their strengths and weaknesses; improving children's abilities to identify ways to enhance capacities and participation of classmates with ID; establishing and supporting friendly relationships with classmates with ID while carrying out regular play and study activities during school hours and using social and supportive abilities in the class.
1st DU:	'We are all different'
2nd DU:	'Differences are many and they are useful'
3rd DU:	'Differences due to impairments'
4th DU:	'Being classmates to children with a hearing or vision impairment'
5th DU:	'Being classmates to children with motor impairment'
6th DU:	'Being classmates to children with intellectual disability'
7th DU:	'Diversity in my class'
8th DU:	'How to be sensitive to diversity in class'

	9th DU:	'How to increase 'OK' behaviours in class'
	10th DU:	'On the side of classmates'
Methods:	Multiple teaching techniques and methods were used, including social reinforcements, informational feedback, and modelling to show students how to implement the target skills and behaviors. Presentation of real-life stories of two children Role play situations to train children to help and encourage the participation of peers with disability in school activities and at break times Simulations of impairments Homework assignments	
Further comments on program:	Providing the definitions of impairment, activity, participation and giving clear indications on the impairments of a classmate with disability may have increased the knowledge that children had of their classmate with ID and produced more positive beliefs about disability in general. The strengthening of positive social behaviors and of social relationships with classmates with ID was facilitated by providing a DU (didactic units – sessions) of generalization centered on the implementation of socially adequate behaviors towards classmates with ID during school periods and at break times. The emphasis was placed on the emotional advantages of supportive and friendly behaviors and the presentation of positive examples of interactions with children with ID which highlight positive emotional components may have stimulated positive feelings towards classmates with ID.	
Evaluation of the program		
Type (Process and/or output)	Experimental study with two repeated measures taken in an experimental group (EG) and a control group (CG). The evaluation of the program implementation expected that at post-test students with ID included in the classes randomly assigned to the EG would receive more positive and fewer negative behaviors, more positive and fewer negative peer sociometric nominations from their classmates, and also that they themselves would adopt more positive and fewer negative behaviors towards peers. The intervention effects were evaluated through direct observation of the social behaviors of students with ID received from and made to peers; and through peer sociometric nominations.	

Dimensions of social participation (Koster et al., 2009) addressed by the program (outcomes): friendships/relationships, contacts/interactions, student's social self-perception, acceptance by classmates	Friendships/Relationships Contacts/Interactions	
Method 1:	Observation of social interactions between TD peers and their classmates with ID	
Measurement points:	Social behaviors were observed in natural class settings in three 20-minute sessions in math lessons, three 20-minute sessions in Italian lessons, and three 15-minute sessions during break time. Overall, each child with ID was observed for 330 minutes (165 minutes at pre-test and 165 minutes at post-test).	
Sample:	Students (*N*=152; EG=76; CG=76))	
	Direct observations 'School inclusion facilitation' coding system (Soresi & Nota, 2007)	Social behaviors observed were coded according the following categories: ○ Positive behaviors adopted ○ Negative behaviors adopted ○ Positive behaviors received ○ Negative behaviors received For the scoring, the frequency of positive and negative social behaviors adopted and received was calculated for each child with ID
	Sociometric status of students with ID	Participants were asked to nominate classmates they would be most likely to invite to their party (positive nominations), and those they would be most likely not to invite to their party (negative nominations) prior and after the intervention. Unlimited nominations. Scores were calculated for each participant considering the number of positive and negative nominations that he or she made for the classmates with ID
Method 2:	Sociometric status of students with ID	
Measurement points:	Participants were asked to nominate classmates they would be most	

	likely to invite to their party (positive nominations), and those they would be most likely not to invite to their party (negative nominations) prior and after the intervention.
Sample:	*N*=152 students without disabilities – 76 in the EG, 76 in the CG. 10 students with ID
Measurement:	Tables which represent statistical data
Results:	The intervention was found to positively impact day-to-day interactions between the students and their classmates with ID included in the classes randomly assigned to the EG. The latter received more positive social behaviors aimed at starting or maintaining positive social interactions from their classmates, such as showing eye contact during verbal communications, smiling, and hugging. The peer nomination technique showed that the intervention positively influenced the level of social acceptance of peers with ID.
Key success factors:	A combined approach on the aspects of attitudes may have improved the attitudes of elementary school children towards peers with ID and positive attitudes might have promoted greater acceptance of peers with ID. The intervention used elements such as social contact with peers with ID, multi-methods (e.g., simulations, classroom exercises, stories, etc.), and several sessions over a longer period of time
Further comments:	The variables focused on in the intervention are indeed sensitive to educational actions and can be increased in developmental age.

3. The GREI Model

Evaluation	
García Bacete, F., Marande, G. & Mikami, A. (2019). Evaluation of a multi-component and multi-agent intervention to improve classroom social relationships among early elementary school-age children. *Journal of School Psychology.* 77, 124-138.	
Short facts	
Responsible organization(s):	Department of Developmental, Educational, and Social Psychology and Methodology, Jaume I University, Castellón, Spain; Department of Psychology, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada
Duration of the intervention:	18 weeks
Target group	
Students (age):	6 years
Teacher:	Elementary school teachers with an average of 15.2 years of teaching in the comparison sample and 15.0 in the intervention group. Teachers differ between phases.
School type:	4 mainstream public schools; urban areas; middle socio-economic status
Summary of the program	
Definition for inclusion / social participation:	No definition provided
Aim of the program	Intervention sought to help peers be inclusive toward children with behavioral differences.
Key stages:	Teachers received training and ongoing support throughout the implementation. 1st grade year, six 40-min sessions were delivered; 2nd grade year, seven 120-min were delivered; biweekly individual 1h consultation with each teacher during school year. All the students received a universal intervention, and the targeted children (who were disliked by their peers) received additional components containing higher doses of the intervention. Universal components – contribute to a positive classroom social relationship. Targeted components – provide higher intervention dose to these target children than they were already receiving from the universal components. Both components address four key areas that contribute to classroom relationships Area 1 | child social-emotional skills Area 2 | inclusive peer climate Area 3 | positive teacher-student relationships

	Area 4	parent support

Methods: The GREI intervention is a multi-component and multi-agent intervention. It contains components addressing each of the areas thought to contribute to classroom social relationships and involves teachers, parents, peers, and children as agents of change.

Universal components: contained content to address each of the four areas thought to contribute to positive classroom social relationships.

Area 1: Child socio-emotional skills	Lessons approached prosocial behavior, assertiveness, emotion recognition and regulation, and interpersonal problem solving; lessons included didactic content combined with skills practice including role-playing and modelling. In day-to-day interactions teachers set social norms to encourage students to identify and label their emotions (and emotions of peers) and call positive attention to children's displays of social-emotional skills
Area 2: Inclusive peer climate	Instructional content regarding children demonstrating kindness to others who are different (e.g., by reading and discussing a story about a child who does not fit in), and had children practice inclusive, empathetic behavior by saying 'I put myself in your shoes'; children are taught to be aware of their prejudices and biases; teacher conducted Positive Peer Reporting, a technique containing structured sessions during which peers had the opportunity to recognize positive characteristics in classmates. In day-to-day interaction, teachers introduced social norms in the classroom such as 'you can't say you can't play' and conducted at least two cooperative learning activities per week.
Area 3: Positive teacher-student relationships	Training plan with teachers working on two of the good teacher-student relationships: warmth (characterized by emotional support) and organization (characterized by structure and proactive behavior management (Korpershoek, Harms, de Boer, van Kuijk, & Doolaard, 2016); Teachers are encouraged to give positive feedback publicly and negative feedback discreetly to students

Area 4: Parent support	Implementation of Family-School Cooperation training program (Forest & García Bacete, 2006) to help teachers to increase their positive communication with parents. Teachers are encouraged to send information home about the social emotional skills curriculum being delivered.
Target components	
Area 1: Child socio-emotional skills	Application of the Pair Counselling in the school context (García Bacete, Rubio, Milián, & Marande, 2013; Karcher, 2007). Children receive six to eight 45-minute sessions of the program approaching perspective taking, negotiation strategies, and reduction of negative behaviors. Each session is delivered to a pair of a target child and a peer the same age and sex.
Area 2: Inclusive peer climate	Classroom seating is arranged by placing each target child with peers sociometrically preferred, and who had not negatively nominated the target child in the sociometric interview; teachers strategically ensure that target children are chosen to receive compliments from peers.
Area 3: teacher-student relationship	Consultation sessions with teachers as part of the universal component to improve teacher- child relationships contain designated activities to generate better relationships with target children (e.g., identify positive attributes in target children, brainstorm about when the teacher might notice these attributes, and track when the teacher pointed out positive attributes.
Area 4: Parent support	Parental Friendship Coaching program (Mikami et al., 2010): eight, 90-min workshops held weekly focusing on helping parents improve communication with their children, coaching children to display friendship skills in peer settings (such as how to be a good sport), and arranging supervised playdates. Teachers also offered parents of target children up to four additional parent-teacher consultation meetings to facilitate a collaborative plan to address the child's social and behavioral needs.

Evaluation of the program		
Type	Quasi-experimental, staggered implementation design.	
(Process and/or output)	It was expected that in the GREI intervention group (compared to the control group), children would receive more peer liking and less peer disliking.	
Dimensions of social participation (Koster et al., 2009) addressed by the program (outcomes): friendships/relationships, contacts/interactions, student's social self-perception, acceptance by classmates	Students social self-perception Acceptance by classmates Friendship/Relationship	
Method 1:	Sociometric interviews; self-perception of children regarding the extent to which peers liked and disliked them; children's perceptions about their teachers as warm and organized	
Measurement points:	Beginning of the 1st grade (pre-test) and the end of the 2nd grade (post-test)	
Sample:	Universal component: *N*=443 1st-grade students (229 = comparison group; 214 = intervention group). Targeted intervention: *N*=91 target children (considered disliked by the peers) – 44= comparison; 47= intervention	
Measurement:	Outcome measures: peer sociometric nominations received; peer sociometric nominations expected; self-perceptions of peer acceptance; teacher-child relationships.	
	Peer sociometric nominations received (Coie, Dodge, & Coppotelli, 1982)	Children nominated classmates whom they liked, and then whom they disliked (unlimited number of nominations)
	Peer sociometric nominations expected	Children named the peers they thought liked them and which ones did not
	Peer Acceptance subscale of the Pictorial Scale of Perceived Competence and Social Acceptance for Young Children (Harter & Pike, 1984)	Children's overall self-perceptions of peer acceptance
	Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction-Early Primary (Zijlstra, Wubbels,	Children's perceptions of teacher (Teacher-child relationships)

	Brekelmans, & Koomen, 2013)
Results:	The GREI intervention had beneficial effects. Children who received the intervention were less disliked by classmates, expected to be less disliked by classmates, perceived themselves to be more peer-accepted, and reported their teachers to have more warmth and organization relative to those in the comparison condition. Further, the association between the intervention and less peer disliking as well as more teacher warmth was accentuated among the at-risk group of target children with peer problems. However, children who received the intervention also received less peer liking from classmates and expected to receive less peer liking.
Key success factors:	The intervention contained multiple components to comprehensively address peer dislike over a period of 2 years. The creation of a training procedure and manuals for each intervention component given to the participating schools, supported educators during such a long intervention.
Further comments:	The GREI intervention had beneficial effects. Children who received the intervention were less disliked by classmates, expected to be less disliked by classmates, perceived themselves to be more peer-accepted, and reported their teachers to have more warmth and organization, relative to those in the comparison condition. Further, the association between the intervention and less peer dislike as well as more teacher warmth was accentuated among the at-risk group of target children with peer problems. However, children who received the intervention also received less peer liking from classmates and expected to receive less peer liking.

4. MOSAIC - Making Socially Accepting Inclusive Classrooms

Evaluation	
Mikami, A. Y., Owens, J. S., Hudec, K. L., Kassab, H. & Evans, S. W. (2019). Classroom Strategies Designed to Reduce Child Problem Behavior and Increase Peer Inclusiveness: Does Teacher Use Predict Students' Sociometric Ratings? *School Mental Health*.	
Short facts	
Responsible organization(s):	Department of Psychology, University of British Columbia
Duration of the intervention:	1 school year
Program homepage:	https://peerlab.psych.ubc.ca/research/
Target group	
Students (age):	Approx. 3–10 years (no specific information) Kindergarten to fourth grade; Full sample – *M*=6.5(1.4); ADHD students – *M*=6.5(1.4)
Diversity dimensions:	Children with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) problems or peer problems
Teacher:	12 general education teachers
School type:	Elementary
Summary of the program	
Definition for inclusion / social participation:	No definition provided
Aim of the program	The MOSAIC program was developed to harness teacher influence on creating a positive peer climate in the classroom. MOSAIC consists of a set of strategies for teachers to enact that not only improve children's behavior problems, but also increase peers' inclusiveness, with the end goal of helping teachers shape classroom peer dynamics.
Key stages:	Teachers receive training and ongoing support throughout the implementation: 2 hours orientation to study procedures and an intervention manual, before the beginning of the school year. Consultants observe teachers during classroom and provide feedback via e-mail. Teachers deliver all MOSAIC strategies to the whole class (universal) and provide an accentuated dose to the target children selected for high ADHD symptoms and peer problems. Teachers were helped by consultants, in 45-min individual meetings approximately twice per month. MOSAIC strategies included:

	Strategies for **children's behavior problems**: reviewing and reinforcing expectations for behavior; Strategies for **peers' inclusiveness**: reviewing and reinforcing expectations for inclusiveness, highlighting positive attributes, CARE time minutes where the teacher spends time alone with the children, boding and showing the peers that he/she is likable, and discreet corrections.
Methods:	Teachers infuse the strategies throughout all day-to-day activities (e.g., arrivals and departures, classroom meetings, instruction time, transitions). MOSAIC strategies included: Strategies for children's behavior problems: 1. Reviewing expectations for behavior 2. Reinforcing expectations for behavior Strategies for peers' inclusiveness: 3. Reviewing expectations for inclusiveness 4. Reinforcing expectations for inclusiveness 5. Highlighting positive attributes 6. CARE time minutes where the teacher spends time alone with the children, boding and showing the peers that he/she is likable 7. Discreet corrections
Evaluation of the program	
Type (Process and/or output)	Intervention implemented by teachers across an academic year. Outputs for children: improvement in peer sociometric ratings
Dimensions of social participation (Koster et al., 2009) addressed by the program (outcomes): friendships/relationships, contacts/interactions, student's social self-perception, acceptance by classmates	Friendships/Relationships
Method 1:	Intervention implemented by teachers across an academic year – measured at several points. Teacher strategies that address children's behaviors and/or encourage peers' inclusiveness, use of MOSAIC strategies, teacher influences on children's sociometric judgements
Measurement points:	**Observed teacher practices**: each teacher was observed an average of 29 times across the academic year **Self-reported teacher practices**: teachers completed nine mini surveys to assess the use of MOSAIC strategies; (approx. 1-2 times per month)

	Sociometric ratings: Once at beginning of the school year and once at the end; children were asked to give a sociometric rating to each classmate	
Sample:	*N*=194 children, in which 51 are targeted as having ADHD problems or peer problems; Teachers (*N*=12)	
Measurement:	Teacher practices, self-reported teacher practices and sociometric ratings of the students	
	Direct observation of teacher practices	
	Key strategies observed: (key strategies and their associated practices)	1. Reviewing expectations for behavior (teacher states expectations of the positive behavior that the teacher wants children to demonstrate) 2. Reinforcing expectations for behavior (each time the teacher reinforced any positive behavior) 3. Reviewing expectations for inclusiveness; (The teacher reviews expectations for inclusive behavior in advance of an activity or problems occurring) 4. Reinforcing expectations for inclusiveness; (the teacher calls positive attention to a child's display of inclusive behavior after the behavior has occurred) 5. Highlighting positive attributes; (number of times the teacher calls attention to a child's positive personal qualities unrelated to behavioral compliance, in front of peers.) 6. CARE Time (one-on-one time, e.g., 3–5 min) between the teacher and child that is separate from instruction, during which the teacher is focused on bonding with the child.) 7. Discreet corrections (each time the teacher engaged in a discreet correction)

	Self-reported teacher practices	Teachers completed nine surveys, distributed over the academic year, to assess their self-reported use of MOSAIC Strategies. On each survey, teachers reported whether they engaged in a practice during the last full school day; thus, in contrast to the observed variables, teachers' reports of strategy use on the surveys reflect a binary outcome (used/ did not use) across a time period of a whole day
	Sociometric Ratings procedure (Coie, Dodge, & Coppotelli, 1982)	Children were asked to give sociometric ratings of each consenting classmate on a scale of 1–5 (1 = really do not like; 5 = really like) and were provided a visual of a face that ranged from frowning to smiling.
Results:	Results indicated that teacher practices designed to improve children's classroom behaviors, as well as practices that encouraged peers to be more inclusive, each predicted child receiving better sociometric ratings at the end of the year after accounting for ratings at the beginning of the year. Some practices appeared uniquely efficacious for children with elevated ADHD symptoms.	
Key success factors:	It may be important to reduce negative behavior in children first before teacher practices which promote inclusive peer behavior towards those children will work, that is, children with ADHD symptoms display disruptive behaviors that are extremely off-putting to peers, so without reducing these behaviors, the subtle effects of teachers showing that they like these children may not be enough to override their classmates' negative impressions.	

5. PATHS - Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies

Evaluation	
Humphrey, N., Hennessey, A., Lendrum, A., Wigelsworth,M., Turner, A., Panayiotou, M., … Calam, R. (2018a). The PATHS curriculum for promoting social and emotional well-being among children aged 7–9 years: a cluster RCT. *Public Health Research, 6*(10). Humphrey, N., Barlow, A., & Lendrum, A. (2018b). Quality Matters: Implementation Moderates Student Outcomes in the PATHS Curriculum. *Prevention Science, 19*(2), 197-208.	
Short facts	
Responsible organization(s):	PATHS was developed by Mark Greenberg and Carol Kusche in the USA and adapted by Barnardo's, a children's charity organization in the UK
Duration of the intervention:	2 years
Program homepage:	http://www.pathseducation.co.uk/
Target group	
Students (age):	4 – 11 years (in the study 7-9 years)
Diversity dimensions:	All children socio-economic dimension was considered in the study
Teacher:	Class teacher deliver intervention
School type:	All school types (in the study primary schools)
Summary of the program	
Definition for inclusion / social participation:	No definition provided.
Aim of the program	PATHS is a social and emotional learning (SEL) intervention program which aims to improve the social competence and social understanding of children.
Key stages:	On the official homepage PATHS lists 4 units as the key stages of the intervention program. Different lessons within these units take around 30 to 40 minutes and are supposed to be delivered twice a week. The number of lessons varies depending on the age of the children.
Unit 1: Emotional understanding	The activities within this unit deal with about 25 different emotional conditions starting with more basic emotions (happy, sad, angry, etc.) and proceeding later with more complex emotional conditions. By first learning to name these emotions children should learn later on how effectively practice self-control and optimal problem solution. Children learn for example to recognize their emotions as well as those of others
Unit 2: Self-control	This unit lays the foundation for further work on the topic of effective problem solving. Children learn the

		difference between feelings and behaviors. They learn how to develop strategies to control for example anger and calm down
	Unit 3: Social problem solving	This unit focuses on interpersonal problem solving. Children learn to develop skills in emotional awareness and self-control. Step by step they learn what is necessary to solve social problems. Starting with identifying the problem, thinking of goals and possible solutions and proceeding with the evaluation of the behavior and outcome.
	Unit 4: Peer relations and self-esteem	The topic of friendships is part of all units but will also be covered at this stage. Children learn for example how relationships can affect their self-esteem
Methods:	Unit 1:	Group discussions, role-play, art activities, biographies, stories and educational games
	Unit 2:	Modelling and role-play, as well as Turtle Technique, Three Steps for Calming Down and the Control Signals Poster (CSP).
	Unit 3:	Control Signals Poster, Stop - What is Happening?
	Unit 4:	Giving compliments (Student of the Day).
Evaluation of the program		
Type (Process and/or output)	Output as well as implementation and process evaluation. Humphrey, Barlow and Lendrum (2018b) published an additional paper where the evaluation of the relationship between levels of implementation and intervention outcomes in the SEL program PATHS are presented. In this paper, they put great emphasis on pointing out the difference between fidelity and quality in implementation (Humphrey, 2018b)1.	
Dimensions of social participation (Koster et al., 2009) addressed by the program (outcomes): friendships/relationships, contacts/interactions, student's social self-perception, acceptance by classmates	Friendships/Relationships Student's social self-perception	

[1] Humphrey et al. (2018b, p. 197-198) describe by referring to Lendrum et al. (2016), that implementation of school based programmes "[…] is typically conceptualized in terms of constructs such as *fidelity* (what is delivered and how closely does this adhere to intervention guidance materials?), *dosage* (how much of the intervention is delivered?), *quality* (how well is the intervention delivered?), *reach* (was the intervention delivered to all intended recipients?), and *participant responsiveness* (did recipients engage with the intervention?)."

Sample:	The study (Humphrey et al., 2018a) was designed as a cluster randomized controlled trial with primary schools (*N*=45, *N*=5218). 23 schools (*N*=2294) implemented the intervention program PATH and 22 schools (*N*=2106) continued their usual academic year. Humphrey et al. (2018a) list six objectives of which four were interesting for this report. Hence, different sample sizes were used depending on the respective objective. The first objective aimed to evaluate the on outcomes for children, the second focused on the sustainability regarding the impact of PATHS, the third on children's psychosocial adjustment to secondary school, the fourth objective is the evaluation of the role of implementation variability in moderating the impact of PATHS on outcomes for children. objectives 2, 3: (*N*=1631) of the main trial cohort with children aged 9–10; at follow-up (24 month) objective 4: schools (*N*=23) and children (*N*=2676)	
Method 1:	For the teacher informant-report the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) was used to collect data of *children's internalizing symptoms, externalizing problems, and pro-social behaviour* (Humphrey et al, 2018a).	
Measurement points:	Baseline data collected from May to July 2012 Follow-up data collected from May to July 2013	
Measurement	The Social and Emotional Competence Change Index (SECCI) was used which is part of the PATHS program evaluation tools Humphrey et al., 2018b). The change, which has been observed in the students, is specified on a scale (much worse, a little worse, no change, a little improved, much improved).	
Method 2:	Child –self report	
Measurement points:	baseline (May – July 2012) interim (12 months: May – July 2013) and post intervention (24 months: May – July 2014)	
Measurement	Social Skills Improvement System (SSIS) (Gresham & Elliot, 2008).	
	Kidscreen-27 (Ravens-Sieberer et al., 2007)	psychological well-being, perceptions of peer and social support, and school environment
	Social Skills Improvement System (SSIS) (Gresham & Elliot, 2008).	Children's social skills
Method 3:	Structured Observations	
Sample:	One observation per teacher/classroom (*N*=69)	

Measurement:	One factual indicator for 'dosage' and one for 'reach' with 10 observed indicators designed to evaluate fidelity, quality, and participant responsiveness.
Method 4:	Qualitative data: Interviews and focus groups
Sample:	Class teacher interviews (*N*=106) Participants for student focus groups (*N*=11) PATHS coordinator interviews (*N*=11) Parent interviews (*N*=9)
Measurement points:	Class teacher interviews (*N*=106) (*N*=38) November to December 2012 (*N*=29) March to April 2013 (*N*=20) November to December 2013 (*N*=19) March to April 2014 PATHS coordinator interviews May to June 2013 Student focus groups July 2013 to April 2014 Parent interviews December 2013 to May 2014
Results:	Humphrey et al., (2018a) showed in their evaluation that PATHS had a very small impact on children's social skills, perceptions of peer and social support, and reductions in exclusions directly after implementation. Furthermore, a very small improvement in children's psychological well-being [d = 0.12, 95% confidence interval (CI) –0.02 to 0.25; p < 0.05) was found. There were also no sustainable improvements at post intervention (12 and 24 month). Humphrey et al. (2018a) outline that the low effects of PATH can have several reasons. One could be due to the circumstance that all participating schools used different SEL interventions, furthermore that the recommended 100 minutes of PATHS lessons per week had not been applied in the examined schools. This lack of intensity may also be responsible for the limited outcome. In this context they also mention that it is unrealistic to expect that an intervention can repeal school culture and education policies, which have been established over a long period. Other reasons mentioned included the cultural transferability of the intervention as well as the different school systems. Regarding the implementation, the evaluation shows that higher levels of dosage led to significantly lower scores of students' pro-social behavior and social-emotional skills. Humphrey et al. (2018a) assume that the quality of the lessons may have suffered due to the high dosage, that this result is due to lower functioning classes, or that there was no/less time for other effective activities. Furthermore, the

	analysis of the intervention program shows that higher implementation quality and participant responsiveness was linked with lower ratings of students' externalizing problems at the time of follow-up (Humphrey et al., 2018b)
Key success factors:	Humphrey et al. (2018b) refer to Durlak's (2015) statement that sometimes the quality of the delivery of the intervention may have a stronger beneficial impact than other factors. A training before starting the intervention as well as constant support are named as some examples on how to foster positive outcome.
Further comments:	Regarding the evaluation of intervention programs Humphrey et al. (2018b) describe that levels of implementation dimensions as moderators of intervention effects play an important role concerning internal and external validity in program evaluation.

6. Positive Action

Evaluation	
O'Hare, L., Stark, P., Orr, K. Biggart, A., Bonnell C. (2018). Positive Action. Pilot report and executive summary.	
Short facts	
Responsible organization(s):	Positive Action, Inc.
Duration of the intervention:	35 weeks
Program homepage:	https://www.positiveaction.net
Target group	
Students (age):	8-10 years
Diversity dimensions:	All children
Teacher:	Teachers delivered the intervention and were trained at the beginning of the year
School type:	Primary school
Summary of the program	
Definition for inclusion / social participation:	No definition provided
Aim of the program	Positive Action is a social and emotional learning program (SEL). The content of the modules varies depending of the target group's age. The program seeks to improve self-control, self-confidence, respect, self-honesty, continuous self-improvement as well as self-management of children, but also strives to reduce their depression, anxiety, dissatisfaction, negative behavior, and develop the quality of the school and the students themselves. (O'Hare et al., 2018)
Key stages:	Positive Action is built as a cycle focusing on the topics of 'self-regulation (or 'Think')', 'prosocial behavior and levels of aggressive behavior (or 'Act')' and 'levels of worrying and feelings about self and life (or 'Feel')' (O'Hare et al., 2018). The program comprises seven different modules, which can be described as the different stages. On the official homepage[2] the modules/unites are described as followed:
Unit 1: Self – Concept	The starting point is the assessment of the student's self-concept. Students learn that their way of thinking and feeling regarding themselves, as well as other people like family members and friends, have an impact on their self-concepts.

[2] https://www.positiveaction.net/introduction [08.01.2020]

Unit 2: Positive actions for your body and mind	Students learn that they are in charge of caring for their bodies and acquire knowledge on the physical and intellectual characteristics of self-concept. They learn that is important to take good care of their bodies and minds. The main focus of the sessions is on positive activities for physical health and positive activities for intellectual health
Unit 3: Managing yourself responsibly	Students learn to manage their resources (time, energy, belongings, thoughts, actions, and feelings) as well as their feelings. The sessions therefore focus on specific feelings like love, anger, worry, jealousy, pride, fear, etc.
Unit 4: Treating others the way you like to be treated	After working on the self during the last units this unit deals with social interactions were students are supposed to learn to practice respect, empathy, kindness, and cooperation.
Unit 5: Telling yourself the truth	Students learn to deal with realities and seeing themselves as they are. The unit therefore includes topics such as knowing oneself, not blaming others, admitting mistakes etc.
Unit 6: Improving yourself Continually	This unit is designed to teach students to be able to define their individual goals. Main focus of this unit is to develop personal goals and to have confidence in their potential, to see opportunities and not problems, and to work toward improvement.
Unit 7: Review	The last unit sums up the principles learned so far so that the students recall the positive actions learned and to practice them again. It also allows them to see the changes that have happened within the last year and see their improvements.

The units implemented in the UK have slightly different names (O'Hare et al., 2018)[3] but the content remains the same. Nevertheless, the evaluation report only names units 1 to 6. It is not clear if the last unit has been excluded due to modifications to fit the UK needs.

[3] *Unit 1—Philosophy and Thoughts - Actions-Feelings about Self Circle*
Unit 2—Positive actions for the physical and intellectual areas
Unit 3—Positive actions for the social/emotional area of self-management
Unit 4—Positive actions for the social/emotional area of social skills
Unit 5—Positive actions for the social/emotional area of self-honesty
Unit 6— Positive actions for the social/emotional area of self-improvement

Methods	The program includes 140 lessons (100 core lessons) across the different units. The lessons last around 15 minutes and take place several times a week in the classroom. Lessons include activities that may be part of games, posters, puzzles, worksheets, stories, songs, or discussions among children and which differ in structure and content in each lesson. Assemblies to promote different topics, actions, and feelings, as well as posters, are part of the whole-school activities. Furthermore, newsletters and communication with parents are included in the whole-school elements. (O'Hare et al., 2018)
Evaluation of the program	
Type (Process and/or output)	Process and output. The program was implemented in 15 U.K. primary school settings during a full school year (October 2016 to June 2017) with no control group. The evaluation has a mixed methods design. It combined a student survey on outcome measures, a survey on program outputs and implementation factors completed by teachers at the end of each unit of the program, a school climate survey completed by head teachers, and a student satisfaction questionnaire measuring engagement and student-teacher relationships. Furthermore, classroom observations, student focus groups and teacher interviews were conducted to collect qualitative data (O'Hare, L., et al., 2018).
Dimensions of social participation (Koster et al., 2009) addressed by the program (outcomes): friendships/relationships, contacts/interactions, student's social self-perception, acceptance by classmates	Friendships/Relationships
Method 1:	Survey for student outcome related data in the three main areas of the program: self-regulation, behavior, and feelings. Research question: *Did project data support the pathways in the programme logic model (that is, the programme theory of outcome change)*?
Measurement points:	Two measurement points for the survey: pre-test (October 2016) and post-test (June 2017)
Sample:	Children (*N*=473) – pre-test Children (*N*= 423) – post-test
Child Self-Control Rating Scale (Rorhbeck et al., 1991)	Think (self-regulation)

	The Aggression Scale: a selfreport measure of aggressive behaviour for young adolescents (Orpinas & Frankowski, 2001)	Act (aggressive behaviors)
	Peer relations and prosocial behaviour questionnaire (Rigby & Slee, 1993)	Act (prosocial behavior)
	Penn State Worry Questionnaire for Children4 (Chorpita et al.,1997)	Feel (worry and anxiety)
Method 2:	Survey	
Measurement points:	Post level	
Sample:	Children (*N*=358) (year 5 children)	
Measurement:	Adaption of the Client Satisfaction Questionnaire (Larsen et al., 1979) and Facilitator Disposition Checklist (O'Hare, Kerr & Biggart, 2010).	engagement and relationship questionnaire for students
	KIDSCREEN psychological wellbeing (Ravens-Sieberer et al., 2003)	Feel (feelings about self and life)
Method 3:	Teacher end of unit survey	
Measurement points:	At the end of each unit	
Sample:	Teachers (*N*=19)	
Method 4:	Adaption of questionnaire for School Survey, the Positive Action Visitor Perception Form, and Positive Action resources detailing climate or whole school activity	School climate questionnaire for principals
Measurement points:	Post level	
Sample:	Principals (*N*=15)	
Measurement	Five aspects were scored by the observer in accordance with an	Classroom observations

[4] The authors (O'Hare, L., et al., 2018) suggest not using the questionnaire for further evaluations of this program as it did not correlate with all the other outcomes

	observation schedule. Sum of max. 25 served as an overall implementation fidelity score.
Measurement points:	Post level - May to June 2017
Sample:	One observation was carried out in 13 schools. Two schools did not participate.
Method 6	Interviews with teachers and head teachers
Measurement points:	Post level - May to June 2017
Sample:	Teachers (*N*=5)
Method 7	Focus groups with students
Measurement points:	Post level
Sample	Focus groups (*N*=5)
Results:	For research question 1: *Did project data support the pathways in the programme logic model (that is, the programme theory of outcome change)?* The evaluation shows evidence for the 'Think-Act-Feel' cycle through outcomes correlating significantly with each other at post-test. Of the three main outcomes, a positive change was evident in the Aggression Scale (Act), which showed a significant decrease in aggression (p = 0.024). Furthermore, the evaluation shows a significant decrease in student's feelings about self and life (Feel) from pre-test to post-test (p = 0.019). At this point, it is important to point out that there was no control group, therefore a cause and effect relationship cannot be determined. Peer relations and prosocial behavior (Act) and Penn State Worry Questionnaire (Feel) showed no significant change from pre-test to post-test. (O'Hare et al., 2018). For research question 2: *Is there a differential relationship between the programme outputs (whole-school activities and classroom activities) and outcome change (that is, the programme theory of intervention)?* The results showed that there was no significant change between outputs and outcome, except for the relationship between increased whole-school activities and decreased Feel outcome. The authors mention that this result shows some problems with the whole-school component and the way it was realized. They recommend either to remove them or reduce them (O'Hare et al., 2018). For research question 3: *Which implementation factors had a significant association with outcome change?* The evaluation gives evidence that enhanced student engagement with the lessons was related to improvements in all outcome variables at post-test.

	The results of the questionnaires completed by the students vary, some lessons have a positive impact on school activities, while others do not motivate them to work and be engaged because of their content. One of qualitative results presented was that the length of lessons had a negative impact on activity in the classroom (Cf. O'Hare et al., 2018)
Key success factors:	Student engagement may have a positive effect. O'Hare et al. (2018) mention that practical or art-based lessons showed a high engagement in contrast to lessons were children had to answer questions after listening to a story.
Further comments:	Evaluation tools for Positive Action http://www.episcenter.psu.edu/EvaluationToolsPositiveAction (03.02.2020)

7. Psychoeducational programme for transition to secondary education

Evaluation	
Brouzos, A., Vassilopoulos, S. P., Vlachioti, A., & Baourda, V. (2019). A coping-oriented group intervention for students waiting to undergo secondary school transition: Effects on coping strategies, self-esteem, and social anxiety symptoms. *Psychology in the Schools*, *57*(1), 31-43	
Short facts	
Responsible organization(s):	University of Patras & University of Ioannina, GR
Duration of the intervention:	5 weeks, one session every week implemented in the third school trimester
Target group	
Students (age):	11-12 years old (year 6 students)
Diversity dimensions:	All children (no learning disabilities or mental health problems)
School type:	General primary school
Summary of the program	
Definition for inclusion / social participation:	No definition provided, focus on school adjustment
Aim of the program	Overall, the intervention aims to facilitate the students' transition to secondary education (e.g., the need to manage multiple teacher relationships, increased conflict with parents as well as increased pressure from peers). Moreover, it aims to develop coping skills: for example, the ability to learn about teachers' expectations and respond to them in an appropriate way. This quasi-experimental study sought to examine the outcomes of a coping-oriented group intervention for children waiting to undergo secondary school transition. The content topics of the intervention include providing information about the impending school transition and the new school environment as well as imparting problem-solving skills and adaptive coping strategies. The researchers predicted that compared to the non-intervention group, children in the coping-oriented group would: (a) be more likely to report engaging in active coping and less likely to report engaging in passive/avoidant coping after the intervention, (b) report fewer social anxiety symptoms, (c) report higher self-esteem, and (d) be more likely to report engaging in prosocial behavior. Finally, on the basis of previous evidence showing that social anxiety is associated with maladaptive coping, it was also investigated whether positive changes in coping style predict fewer social anxiety symptoms in adolescents waiting to undergo school transition.
Key stages:	The intervention consists of 5 sessions

	Session 1	Let's make our group
	Session 2	Getting ready for secondary school
	Session 3	Making new friends and keeping the old ones
	Session 4	Solving problems at schools
	Session 5	The progress of our group
Methods:	Experiential activities (games to get to know each other, behavior contract, information acquisition and discussion etc.) aiming at facilitating social skills development and coping strategies development.	
Further comments on program:	The intervention aims at improving the students' social skills and, by extension, their coping strategies. However, the program is worth examining as it involves common and important group activities to enhance group bonding.	

Evaluation of the program

Type (Process and/or output)	Group experiment – output evaluation Participation in the study was completely voluntary and took place during the third school trimester (April–May 2015). Adolescents - after being informed of the research objectives in class—were asked to provide their consent verbally, whereas their parents gave informed written consent. Study participants completed the SASC-R, the CS4, the RSE, and SCSI 1 week before the commencement of the program. In both the intervention and control condition, the leaders administered the questionnaires to class groups. Post-assessment questionnaires were administered 1 week after the termination of the intervention. The three intervention groups were led by the same leaders on the same day (but at different times) for 45min per week for 5 consecutive weeks. All sessions were held in the adolescents' classroom within the normal hours of the school day. Control groups did not receive any intervention at all during the course of this study (test–retest group)
Dimensions of social participation (Koster et al., 2009) addressed by the program (outcomes): friendships/relationships, contacts/interactions, student's social self-perception, acceptance by classmates	Self-esteem
Method 1:	Administration of psychometric instruments (self-report measures))
Measurement points:	2 measurement points pre- and post- intervention (1 week before the commencement of the program and 1 week after the implementation of the program)

Sample:	*N*=82 participants (6th grade Greek students enrolled in two elementary schools in north-western Greece) (no learning disabilities or mental health problems). *N*=56 students in the intervention group (27 males and 29 females) and *N*=26 in the non-intervention control group (12 males and 14 females).	
Measurement:	Social anxiety assessment - Social Anxiety Scale for Children-Revised (SASC-R; La Greca & Stone, 1993)	social anxiety
	Self-esteem assessment - Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE; Rosenberg, 1965)	self-esteem
	Social skills assessment- Greek version of the Children's Self-report Social Skills Scale (CS4; Danielson & Phelps, 1981)	social skills
Results:	Results indicate that completion of the intervention led to: ○ Significant decrease in social anxiety levels after intervention ○ Significant increase in reported self-esteem ○ Significant increase in likeability ○ Significant increase in adherence to social rules after intervention ○ Significant increase in active coping strategies	
Key success factors:	Group members in the current study were encouraged by the group facilitators to actively participate in mixed-gender small group discussions and collaboratively decide which way would be best to resolve the hypothetical problem situation, which might have resulted in a more self-empowering group experience. It is therefore of critical importance to create the above circumstances.	

8. Psychoeducational Programme for reduction of Aggression

Evaluation	
Vassilopoulos, S. P., Brouzos, A., & Rentzios, C. (2014). Evaluation of a universal social information-processing group program aimed at preventing anger and aggressive behaviour in primary school children. *Hellenic Journal of Psychology, 11*, 208-222.	
Short facts	
Responsible organization(s):	University of Ioannina, GR
Duration of the intervention:	5 weeks, 1 session per week (á 45 minutes)
Target group	
Students (age):	9 to 11 years (fifth and sixth grades)
School type:	General primary school
Summary of the program	
Definition for inclusion / social participation:	No definition of provided, focus on aggression and social skills
Aim of the program	Promoting social skills in order to prevent anger and peer-directed aggression in primary school children.
Key stages:	The intervention program consists of 5 sessions. Session 1: Signing the 'social contract' Session 2: Detecting other people's intentions Session 3: Putting ourselves in other people's shoes Session 4: Why do my parents get angry? Session 5: Towards the end of the journey
Methods:	Universal program which includes an introduction, the three core content areas (attribution retraining, empathy, parental anger) sessions, and a termination session.
Further comments on program:	This is a universal program which is delivered to all children in a classroom or school without any prior screening for individual risk factors or behavior problems. Based on previous meta-analytic data, the authors claim that shorter universal models appear to be more effective than longer universal models.
Evaluation of the program	
Type (Process and/or output)	Group experiment – output evaluation
Method 1:	Administration of psychometric (self-report) instruments
Measurement points:	2 measurement points pre- and post- intervention (1 day before the commencement of the program and 2 days after the completion of the program)

Sample: Greek elementary children (*N*= 52) attending three public schools in western Greece. Eighteen child participants were in the experimental group (9 males, 9 females), and *N*=34 in the control group (20 males, 14 females), all of whom were Caucasian. Age ranged from 9 to 11 years.

Measurement: An ambiguous vignette paradigm (adapted from Vassilopoulos et al., 2008) was used to measure children's attributional bias and emotional reaction estimates. In total there were 18 vignettes. Half of the children (within each group) received vignettes 1-9 at pre-assessment and vignettes 10-18 at post-assessment, whereas this order was reversed for the other half of the children. All vignettes described a negative outcome (e.g., damaged personal property, physical harm, social ridicule) for the student and most of them involved an unnamed peer (or group of peers) in either accidental or ambiguous (i.e., the intent of the interacting person is not clear) social situations.

Procedure: Children completed the AS, the self-control subscale of the SSRS-C, and the ambiguous vignette paradigm over one session the day before the commencement of the program. Post-test scores were delayed for two days after the completion of the program

Aggression Scale (AS) (Orpinas & Frankowski, 2001)	Aggression
Social Skills Rating System Child version (SSRS-C) (Gresham & Elliot, 1990)	Self-control
Ambiguous vignette paradigm (constructed for the purpose of the study)	Attributional bias and emotional reaction

Results: Compared to a test-retest control group (n = 34), children receiving group intervention (n = 18) were less likely to endorse hostile attributions and more likely to endorse benign attributions in response to a set of ambiguous social situations. Furthermore, peer-directed aggressive behavior scores reduced more in the experimental group than in the control group. Children who received social information processing group intervention also reported less perceived anger and showed a trend to report more self-control than those in the control group. Finally, a regression analysis showed that children who evidenced greater reductions in aggressive behavior tended to be those who also reported greater decreases in hostile attributional style.

Key success factors:	Although it is unclear which components of the group contributed to its efficacy and in what capacity these components impacted the results, the authors speculated that the use of a problem-focused group intervention was a critical factor that affected the success of the program. Thus, giving participants the opportunity to work actively in small groups on several hypothetical social scenarios and trying to evaluate alternative (negative and more benign) interpretations by examining the evidence for and against each of them and/or generate their own explanations might have enhanced the effects of reattribution training.
Further comments:	The activities contained in the 5 sessions of this program might form a small part of a larger intervention program aimed at enhancing social participation.

9. Psychoeducational programme for social anxiety reduction

Evaluation	
Vassilopoulos, S. P., Brouzos, A., Damer, D. E., Mellou, A., & Mitropoulou, A. (2013). A psychoeducational school-based group intervention for socially anxious children. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 38*(4), 307-329.	
Short facts	
Responsible organization(s):	University of Patras
Duration of the intervention:	8 weeks (one session per week, á 40 minutes)
Target group	
Students (age):	10 to 12 years old (Grade 4 to 6)
Diversity dimensions:	Students with medium to high levels of social anxiety
School type:	General primary school
Summary of the program	
Definition for inclusion / social participation:	No definition provided, focus on social anxiety and detailed discussion of its causes and consequences
Aim of the program	By working actively on specific hypothetical scenarios, socially anxious children have the opportunity to identify and evaluate negative cognitions by examining the evidence for and against and searching for alternative explanations.
Key stages:	The intervention consists of 8 sessions. Session 1: Breaking the Ice Session 2: A Cube Full of Feelings Session 3: Making and Keeping Friends Session 4: The ‘‘Mystery’’ of My Stress Session 5: The Stress Shield Sessions 6 & 7: Looking at the Bright Side Session 8: Saying Goodbye
Methods:	The content topics of the program include anxiety management, cognitive restructuring, and social competence. Person-cantered counselling (e.g., active listening, reflection, empathy) and active teaching techniques (e.g., psychoeducation, feedback, modelling role play, and problem solving).
Further comments on program:	This program aims at reducing social anxiety. As such it does not directly promote social participation. However, most of the activities contained in the 8 sessions of the program focus on enhancing social competence which is a prerequisite to social inclusion.

Evaluation of the program	
Type	Group experiment – output evaluation
(Process and/or output)	The main purpose of this study was to evaluate an eight-week school-based intervention program designed to reduce childhood social anxiety, relatively short in session length and overall time. The intervention was delivered in a group format and its evaluation was accomplished through the utilization of a one-group pre- and post-test design. It was hypothesized that pre–post intervention results would indicate a decrease in social anxiety, comorbid depressive symptoms and negative cognitions, as well as an increase in social skills
Method 1:	Child self-report Administration of psychometric instruments First, 87 children from 5 classrooms in the same school completed the standardized measures during class hour (pre-assessment). Then, students who scored at and above the average on the SASC–R were approached by the group leaders and asked to participate in the program. The first group meeting took place two weeks after the administration of the standardized measures. The three groups were led by the same co-leaders on the same day (but at different times) for 40min per week for eight consecutive weeks. The re-administration of the measures (post assessment) took place one week after the completion of the program. Identification of appropriate children for intervention was accomplished through administering children's self-reports which are considered more advantageous compared to other methods (e.g., parent or teacher nomination) because it allows greater access to internal processes (Lau & Rapee, 2011). Therefore, to include students with medium to high levels of social anxiety, only children scoring at or above the mean on the Social Anxiety Scale for Children–Revised (SASC–R; La Greca & Stone, 1993), a self-report measure of child social anxiety, were selected for participation.
Measurement points:	2 measurement points: pre- and post- intervention (2 weeks before the commencement of the program and 1 week after the implementation of the program)
Sample:	Greek elementary children (*N*=40) enrolled in the fourth through sixth grades in a suburban, public school in north-western Greece. There were 13 male and 27 female participants. There were 18 participants in the fourth grade, 13 participants in the fifth grade and 9 participants in the sixth grade. Ages ranged from 9 years to 11 years. The

	participants were randomly assigned to three groups, each consisting of 9 to 16 members.	
Measurement:	Greek version of the SASC–R (La Greca & Stone, 1993)	Social anxiety
	Greek version of the Children's Depression Inventory–Short Form (CDI) (Kovacs, 1992)	Participants' depression
	Measure of interpretation biases developed by Vassilopoulos and colleagues (2009). A series of 18ambiguous social scenarios	Bias
	Greek version of the Children's Self-Report Social Skills Scale (CS4) Danielson & Phelps, 2003)	Perceived social skills
Results:	The results of this study indicated that participation in a psychoeducational group for elementary school students may contribute to reducing social anxiety symptoms and negative interpretations for ambiguous events and increasing benign interpretations and self-reported likeability. In addition, comorbid symptoms like self-reported depression were not reduced as much as core symptoms by the intervention, suggesting that the intervention program was specific to the disorder of social anxiety.	
Key success factors:	This intervention program is most effective when implemented with young children (primary school-aged) because they benefit from the cognitive aspects of the intervention program and there is evidence that negative cognitive style is malleable prior to puberty.	
Further comments:	Some of the activities contained in the sessions of this program might form a small part of a larger intervention program aimed at enhancing social participation.	

10. Sing up

Evaluation	
Welch, G. F., Himonides, E., Saunders, J., Papageorgi, I., & Sarazin, M. (2014). Singing and social inclusion. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, 803-814.	
Short facts	
Responsible organization(s):	UK government, Institute of Education
Duration of the intervention:	Full school year
Program homepage:	https://www.singup.org
Target group	
Students (age):	7 - 10 years
Diversity dimensions:	All children included
Teacher:	
School type:	Primary schools
Summary of the program	
Definition for inclusion / social participation:	For this study, social inclusion is defined as a model depending on sense of self and of being socially integrated.
Aim of the program	The aim of the Sing Up Program is to teach children to sing and enjoy singing, as well as to develop and enhance their musical abilities. At the same time, through singing they increase their sense of self in conjunction with being socially integrated and included. Singing also promotes improved learning, children's self-esteem, confidence and their social development (Welch et al., 2014)
Key stages:	No key stages/phases described.
Methods:	Singing (individual or in choirs) Music Curriculum
Further comments on program:	The intervention is developed by researches of the University of London, University of Nicosia and University of Oxford and is based on a positive outcome.
Evaluation of the program	
Type (Process and/or output)	Process
Dimensions of social participation (Koster et al., 2009) addressed by the program (outcomes): friendships/relationships, contacts/interactions, student's social self-perception, acceptance by classmates	Friendships/Relationships Student's social self-perception

Method 1:	Assessment of children's singing behavior as well as their singing development. The protocol includes vocal abilities such as voice range and children's spoken pitch, as well as child's performance of two well-known songs (use of 2 skill rating scales) (Rutkowski, 1997; Welch, 1998).
Measurement points:	During implementation
Sample:	Children (*N*=11258)
Method 2:	Student self-report questionnaire with 60 questions, of which 45 include children's perspective on singing and the other 15 on their social inclusion. Seven-point Likert-type smiley face scale is used for the answers and children's agreement. The 6 topics covered by the questionnaire are as followed (taken from Table 1 Welch, G. F., et al. (2014)): 1. Identity as a singer (emotional connection with singing) 2. Identity as a singer (self) 3. Singing at home 4. Singing at school 5. Singing in informal settings Social inclusion
Measurement points:	Pre and post test
Sample:	Children (*N*=6087) of which had No-Sing Up (*N*=1505) and Sing up (*N*=4582) experience.
Measurement:	children's self-concept and sense of being socially included
Results:	The results of this study show a positive outcome. There is a clear parallel and connection between children's sense of social inclusion and integration as well as their singing ability. According to Welch et al. (2014), there is also a positive link between increased singing technique and a greater sense of self and of being socially involved. There was also no difference whether or not the children had experience with the Sing Up program or not, as this did not affect the change in results.
Key success factors:	Welch et al. (2014) consider that collaborative learning, group motivational processes (collective goals) as well as feeling successful about performing together support the sense of being socially included.

11. Social Co-existence Programme

Evaluation	
Vasileiadis, I., & Doikou-Avlidou, M. (2018). Enhancing social interaction of students with intellectual disabilities with their general education peers: the outcomes of an intervention programme. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 18*(4), 267-277.	
Short facts	
Responsible organization(s):	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
Duration of the intervention:	One academic year (November to May)
Target group	
Students (age):	6 to 7 years (1st and 2nd grade of primary school)
Diversity dimensions:	Mild intellectual disabilities
Teacher:	General education teacher assisted by school psychologist
School type:	General and special school (co-located)
Summary of the program	
Definition for inclusion / social participation:	In this study social inclusion is synonymous with social participation and refers to full access to community resources, involvement in community activities, maintenance of relationships with family, friends and members of the community, and development of 'a sense of belonging to a group' (Cobigo, Ouellette-Kuntz, Lysaght, et al., 2012: 76).
Aim of the program	The intervention program aimed at increasing social acceptance and social interaction of students with intellectual disabilities (target students) with their peers The objectives of this action were for the students (1) to feel better with themselves and develop a positive self-image and self-confidence; (2) to learn to regulate the emotions they experience during their interaction with others without the coordinators' intervention, to get used to clearly stating their wishes and limits and to expressing their emotions and thoughts freely but appropriately; (3) to learn to accept different views and opinions; and (4) to easily participate and cooperate with others
Key stages:	The intervention comprised three main phases. Phase one: initial assessment Phase two: creation of a 'coexistence and self-regulation group' and implementation of the program (14 meetings) along with some activities in the neighborhood Phase three: post-intervention assessment

Methods:	At the beginning of the school year, the target students and the first-grade students of the co-located general school formed the 'coexistence and self-regulation group' which met fourteen times in total, on predetermined days. During these meetings, experiential exercises in which the participants addressed issues of communication, personal relations, as well as school and social everyday life, were implemented. The meetings of the 'coexistence and self-regulation group' lasted two hours each and took place in the 'self-regulation room', an adapted room in the special school. The group was coordinated by the special school psychologist accompanied by the general education teacher. Michel Lobrot's Non-Directive Intervention was the approach adopted during group meetings and all other actions as well (Lobrot, 1989).
Further comments on program:	Additionally, an individualized program was created for every target student involving activities in the neighborhood (shopping, free play in the park or the playground) designed to enhance social skills and promote neighborhood inclusion. Teachers and students would meet twice a week for about two hours, for a 6-month period (from October to May). Although the program was implemented with young school students, it is suitable for older students as well.
Evaluation of the program	
Type (Process and/or output)	Single-group experimental study with pre- and post- measurements. Process (qualitative involving interviews with teachers and students throughout the intervention) and output evaluation (pre- and post-measurement of contacts/interactions.
Dimensions of social participation (Koster et al., 2009) addressed by the program (outcomes): friendships/relationships, contacts/interactions, student's social self-perception, acceptance by classmates	Contacts/Interactions. Social acceptance is mentioned in the paper but no data provided for this dimension.
Method 1:	Observation of social interactions between students without and students with intellectual disabilities (ID) Direct observation was conducted with the use of the time sampling method, before and after the completion of the program. Observations took place at the room where the 'coexistence and self-regulation group' met during the implementation of the main activities, and in the schoolyard during the long (first) morning break.

	During Phase 1, observation was carried out 3 weeks after the program had started so that students were familiar with the school environment and circumstances that might influence observation could be checked. During Phase 3, observation in the schoolyard was conducted 1 week before the end of the program, whereas observation in the 'self-regulation room' was held during the last month of the program's implementation. In each of the two above-mentioned phases, observations in the schoolyard were performed over a 4-day period, 1 day for each student. Observation in the 'self-regulation room' was randomized and was carried out within a 4-week period. Observation would start 10 minutes after the beginning of the main exercise and would be completed 10 minutes before its completion. Every day, three target students were observed, each time at a different point of the exercise. During each phase, each target student was observed for 40 minutes (3 ten-minute periods in the self-regulation room and one ten-minute period in the schoolyard). The observational schedule included the following types of behavior: (1) occurrence of interaction (2) initiated/ received interaction (3) solitary activity and (4) non-engagement. With regard to occurrence of interaction, recording involved whether the interaction was (1) verbal or nonverbal, and (2) positive, neutral or negative.
Measurement points:	Pre- (November) and Post- (May) systematic observations during lessons and free time.
Sample:	Four students (three males and one female) with mild intellectual disability attending a special school, as well as 16 students without disabilities attending the co-located general school.
Measurement:	Systematic Recording of (1) occurrence of interaction (2) initiated/received interaction, (3) solitary activity and (4) non-engagement. Time sampling method applied. For details see paper.
Method 2:	Individual semi-structured interviews during the first and the last 2 weeks of the implementation of the program were conducted with the school staff members who participated both in the program and the study, as well as with the target students. Staff members also kept a

	diary for the whole duration of the project. In addition, group interviews were conducted with the general education students
Measurement points:	During the first and the last 2 weeks of the implementation of the program.
Sample:	*N*=20 Interviews with the 4 target students with LD and with the 16 students without LD. Interviews with the teaches involved (unspecified number)
Results:	Findings revealed significant increases in target students' social interactions with their peers inside and outside the school setting, as well as positive changes in general education students' attitudes, both during and upon the completion of the program. Positive attitudinal changes were recorded in the teachers' diaries and positive perceptions were elicited in the staff and student interviews.

12. SSIS-CIP - Social Skills Improvement System

Evaluation	
DiPerna, J. C., Lei, P., Cheng, W., Hart, S. C., & Bellinger, J. (2017). A cluster randomized trial of the Social Skills Improvement System-Classwide Intervention Program (SSIS-CIP) in first grade. *Journal of Educational Psychology. 110*(1), 1–16.	
Short facts	
Responsible organization(s):	Arizona State University and University of South Carolina
Duration of the intervention:	12 weeks
Program homepage	https://www.pearsonassessments.com/
Target group	
Students (age):	The regular SSIS-CIP targets students from 3–18 years. SSIS-CIP early elementary level curriculum was developed for use in grades 1–3.
Diversity dimensions:	
Teacher:	Assessment of social-emotional skills by teacher ratings and observations of students' classroom behavior
School type:	Primary and secondary schools
Summary of the program	
Definition for inclusion / social participation:	By promoting young children's social-emotional skills, they will be able to develop constructive relationships with peers, learning-related attitudes and become engaged in school activities.
Aim of the program	The aim of the SSIS-CIP is to promote social-emotional skills of elementary school students (1–3 grade). In detail, the program primarily targets cooperation skills, self-control skills, assertiveness, responsibility, and empathy.
Key stages:	The SSIS-CIP contains 10 instructional units on key classroom social skills:
Unit 1–3: receptive skills	e.g., listening to others, following the rules
Unit 4: selective input	e.g., paying attention to your work
Unit 5: productive skills	e.g., asking a question
Unit 6–10: interactive skills	e.g., cooperation, communication
	The units include the following social skills:

	Communication, engagement, cooperation, assertiveness, responsibility, empathy, and self-control.
Methods:	Each unit consists of scripted lessons, video vignettes (30–90 seconds) and practice exercises (student booklets). Every lesson relies on instructional strategies. In order for students to learn targeted skills in each lesson, they have to do the following activities: 1) describe 2) model 3) role-play 4) do 5) practice 6) monitor progress 7) generalize
Further comments on program:	Before applying the SSIS-CIP in the classroom, teachers completed 1-day workshops with the author. Furthermore, they could find additional information on the program in the Instructor's Handbook (Elliott & Gresham, 2007).
Evaluation of the program	
Type (Process and/or output)	Output orientated pre- and post-measurements concerning students' social-emotional skill-development due to the SSIS-CIP intervention.
Dimensions of social participation (Koster et al., 2009) addressed by the program (outcomes): friendships/relationships, contacts/interactions, student's social self-perception, acceptance by classmates	Relationships with peers Contact/Interactions Students' social self-perception
Method 1:	In order to evaluate the effects of the SSIS-CIP intervention program to improve primary school students' social skills in the classroom, the study is built on a pre- and post-measurement design. To evaluate and ensure the fidelity of implemented SSIS-CIS lessons, teachers were observed by independent observers. Therefore, independent observers provided monitoring reports on the completeness of activities and accuracy of provided lesson by means of a 4-point scale ranging from 'not implemented' (1) to 'fully implemented' (4). In addition, teachers filled in self-reports on their implementation fidelity of the SSIS-CIP. Overall, due to the monitoring efforts and well

	scripted lessons the SSIS-CIP was fully implemented in all classrooms (teachers: M=3.92; SD=0.16; independent observers: M=3.97; SD=0.08).	
Measurement points:	Two measurement points: Pre- and post-evaluation	
Sample:	Students Experimental group: *N*=341 (M=6.29 years) Control group: *N*=355 (M=6.30 years) Teachers ((*N*=59; $N_{intervention}$=29; $N_{control}$=30)	
Measurement:	The SSIS-RST (Gresham & Elliott, 2008)	Teachers' perspective of their students' social skills and problem behaviors in the classroom. It contains seven subscales on students' communication, cooperation, assertiveness, responsibility, engagement, empathy and self-control (4-point Likert-scale).
	CLOCK monitoring protocol (Volpe & DiPerna, 2010)	Students' social behaviors in the classroom
Results:	Overall, the results of the study indicate small positive effects of the SSIS-CIP on first grade primary school students' social skills and behavior in the classroom. Notably, students' cooperation with peers, their empathy, and their engagement in social activities were particularly affected by the SSIS-CIP intervention. Students in the experimental group indicated higher increases in social skills than their students in the control group. Students with lower levels of initial social skills demonstrated higher increases due to the intervention than students with higher initial social skills.	

13.Social Stories

Evaluation	
Kalyva, E., & Agaliotis, I. (2009). Can social stories enhance the interpersonal conflict resolution skills of children with LD? *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 30*(1), 192-202.	
Short facts	
Responsible organization(s):	City Liberal Studies
Duration of the intervention:	1 month, 8 meetings twice a week
Target group	
Students (age):	10 to 12 years, grades 4 to 6
Diversity dimensions:	Children with LD
Teacher:	Intervention was applied by a school psychologist with the collaboration of the teachers
School type:	General primary schools
Summary of the program	
Definition for inclusion / social participation:	No definition provided.
Aim of the program	Enhancement of social skills to enable children to resolve interpersonal conflict effectively. The intervention aimed at improving the students' social skills with a view of rendering them capable of effectively resolving conflicts. As such, the program indirectly supports the social participation of students with LD.
Key stages:	Baseline, intervention, and follow-up phases of the study over a period of 3 months.
1. Baseline	Baseline assessment was carried out on week 1 before the intervention program began and involved reading aloud to the children the story ''for one chocolate'' and recording their answers to the three accompanying questions. The teachers completed the T-MESSY.
2. Intervention	The social stories intervention was implemented twice a week for a period of 1 month, adding up to a total of eight sessions. Each session lasted approximately 10 min and took place on the same 2 days (Tuesday and Friday) of each week at the beginning of inclusion class. The social story was recorded so that all children were exposed to

		exactly the same stimulus (e.g., speed of reading, clarity and tone of voice). The teachers were asked to make sure that the child with LD sat quietly at the chair and listened to the story.
	3. Follow-up	The follow-up phase was carried out 2 months after the collection of the post-intervention data. All the children were interviewed once more for 20 min using a different interpersonal conflict story from the ones used at baseline and at post-intervention, and their selection of strategies to resolve interpersonal conflicts were recorded. The teachers again completed the T-MESSY.
Methods:		Social stories representing interpersonal conflict scenarios were narrated to children with LD and discussed All data during the baseline, intervention, and follow-up phases of the study were recorded live and were collected at three time points over a period of 3 months, through interviews with the children with LD. Interpersonal conflicts were assessed by the measure devised by Agaliotis and Goudiras (2004), which involves the reading of a short description of an interpersonal problem to the participant who is then asked three questions about how the story's main character might respond to the particular problem. The teachers were asked to complete the Matson Evaluation of Social Skills with Youngsters – Teacher Form (Matson, 1990), which consists of 64 items that the teacher has to rate on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much).
Evaluation of the program		
Type (Process and/or output)		Group experiment with pre-, post-, and follow-up measurements (Output evaluation)
Method 1:		Systematic interviewing conducted by the researchers. The children's oral answers were recorded and rated by three independent raters – two researchers and one inclusion teacher – in accordance to four of the social interaction strategies proposed by Carlson (1987, p. 308): ○ Accommodating: Indirect, pleasant, and polite ways of responding but respondent does not seek to gain his or her way, ○ Avoidance: Non-social reactions of descriptions of unpleasant emotions about the situation ○ Hostile: Threatening, verbally rebuking, or punishing other children ○ Compromise: Efforts to maintain a sociable relationship, but also to maximize the ability of one or both persons to get what they want.
Measurement points:		3 time points (pre- post- and follow-up)

Sample:

Participants in this study were primary schoolchildren (*N*=63) diagnosed with LD and primary teachers (*N*=17) of inclusion classes. The sample comprised initially of 100 children with diagnosed LD (*N*=73 boys and *N*=27 girls) between 10 and 12 years old attending Grades 4–6 in regular schools (*N*=20) in the broader area of Thessaloniki, Greece. The researchers contacted the local educational authority and asked the psychologists who work there to identify the children in the community who were diagnosed with LD by their agency. All the children with LD who were selected for the present study met the following criteria: (a) they attended primary inclusion schools, (b) they did not experience any kind of sensory problems or impairments, mental retardation, or psychiatric or conduct disorder and (c) they had a full-scale IQ of higher than 80 (M = 102.7, S.D. = 13.5) according to Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC-3, 1991).

The next step was to contact the schools of the 100 children with LD who met the above-mentioned criteria and to verify with their teachers that they were behind their peers in terms of reading, writing, or mathematics and that they received low grades. The teachers had administered widely used Greek curriculum-based tests to assess the students' reading, writing, and mathematic skills, where the children with LD performed inadequately.

Out of the 100 children with LD who were initially selected for the present study, 63 were found to face interpersonal conflict resolution problems – using the test developed by Agaliotis and Goudiras (2004) – and were included in this study as participants. The mean age of these children was 10 years and 7 months and there were in total 41 boys and 22 girls. The 17 primary schoolteachers who contributed to the implementation of the intervention had been teaching in inclusion classes for between 1 and 6 years, and they all had some kind of training in special needs education. These children with LD who had difficulty in resolving interpersonal conflicts were randomly allocated to the experimental group (31 children—19 boys and 12 girls) and to the control group (32 children—22 boys and 10 girls).

Measurement:

Recording of conflict resolution strategy (avoidance, compromise, accommodating, hostile). Specifically, interpersonal conflicts were assessed by the measure devised by Agaliotis and Goudiras (2004), which involves the reading of a short description of an interpersonal problem to the participant who is then asked three questions about

how the story's main character might respond to the particular problem. The three different stories that were read to the participants – one at each phase of the intervention – were the following: (a) 'for one chocolate': two girls fight over a piece of chocolate, (b) 'at the playroom': two children divide the room in half and isolate the third child in the room who wants to play with them, and (c) 'out for food': one child is annoyed by the behavior of a friend who acts silly while sitting at a fast-food diner. For a more detailed description please refer to Agaliotis and Goudiras (2004). After the researchers read each story, they asked the children to imagine the situation and then to answer the following three questions that were devised by Carlson (1987): (1) ''What strategy would you employ in this situation?'', (2) ''Which other strategy might you use?'', which assesses generation of alternatives and problem-solving skills, and (3) ''Which strategy was best to use?'', which assesses their social knowledge

Profile for Interpersonal Conflict Resolution (PICR; Agaliotis and Goudiras, 2004)	conflict resolution strategy (avoidance, compromise, accommodating, hostile).

Method 2: Systematic evaluation of social skills.

Measurement points: 3 time points (pre- post- and follow-up)

Sample: Experimental group: 31 students with LD aged 10-12

Control group: 32 students with LD aged 10-12

Measurement: T-Messy rating scale consists of 64 items that the teacher has to rate on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much). And provides standardized information about the frequency of a child's appropriate and inappropriate social behaviors.

T-MESSY rating scale completed by the teachers (Matson, J. L. (1990)	Social skills (appropriate social skills and inappropriate assertiveness)

Results: All children chose mainly avoidance and hostile strategies before the intervention, but children in the experimental group chose predominantly positive strategies both after the intervention and at follow-up in comparison to control children.

Children with LD who received the intervention were rated by their teachers as engaging in significantly less inappropriate social behaviors after the intervention and at follow-up in comparison to control children.

The recorded changes in the choice of interpersonal conflict resolution strategies and the more positive teacher ratings for the experimental group indicated that social stories constitute a powerful intervention for the enhancement of the social competence of children with LD.

Key success factors:	Children who receive the social stories intervention need some time to internalize and apply the information they get from the intervention to real life situations. Consequently, the authors suggest that the intervention is applied for a lengthy period of time as its effects might take some time to become visible.
Further comments:	The social stories intervention might form a small part of a larger intervention program aimed at enhancing social participation

14. Special Friends

Evaluation	
De Boer, A.,Pijl, S., Minnaert, A. & Post, W. (2014). Evaluating the Effectiveness of an Intervention Program to Influence Attitudes of Students Towards Peers with Disabilities. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders.* 44. 572-583.	
Short facts	
Responsible organization(s):	Department of Special Education of University of Groningen, The Netherlands
Duration of the intervention:	Three weeks, six lessons á 45 minutes
Target group	
Students (age):	4 to 12 years
Diversity dimensions:	Children with physical and intellectual disabilities
School type:	2 regular elementary schools; rural context
Summary of the program	
Definition for inclusion / social participation:	No definition provided
Aim of the program	Study the short- and long-term effects of an intervention that provides knowledge about disability and on changing the attitudes of students without disabilities towards their peers with physical and intellectual disabilities.
Key stages:	Providing knowledge about disability and changing attitudes of students without disabilities towards their peers with physical and intellectual disabilities. Six lessons per grade (1/2, 3/4, 5/6, 7/8) focusing on The first lesson was particularly aimed at explaining the specific types of disability. 3 X physical disability 2 X intellectual disability 2 X severe physical and intellectual disability
	Background information about the disabilities for teachers Description of each lesson Teaching aids/materials Information letter for parents <u>Lesson 1:</u> physical disability Description of the situation: the students did not receive any information about people with disabilities and the extent to which disability affects people's daily lives. The existing knowledge comes from

	experiences in students' own lives, like family members Aim of the lesson: at the end of the lesson students know what a physical disability is; can explain what kind of activities/plays a peer in a wheelchair can and cannot do Teaching aids/material: storybook 'Slompie, a spider with five legs'; presentation of the storybook; materials like puzzles, pencils, games, building bricks; drawings of games/activities
Methods:	Structured storytelling: books for the younger grades and movies or real-life stories for the older grades. For example, a story about a character/ child with a physical disability was either read (book) or shown (video) by the teacher, followed by a group discussion. For the second lesson, an activity was designed showing the impact of a physical disability in daily life (i.e., a sport activity in which the students use a wheelchair). Teachers received a detailed lesson plan to follow for each lesson and background information about the three disability types. Parents of the children in the experimental group had also received an information package including: background information on the program, a timetable and details about the three types of disability
Further comments on program:	Parents of the children participating in the study received an information package including background information on the program, a timetable and details about the three type of disability.
Evaluation of the program	
Type (Process and/or output)	Quasi-experimental study The authors explored the possibilities of promoting more positive attitudes of kindergarten and elementary school students towards children with physical, intellectual and severe physical intellectual disabilities though an intervention based on acquired knowledge
Dimensions of social participation (Koster et al., 2009) addressed by the program (outcomes): friendships/relationships, contacts/interactions, student's social self-perception, acceptance by classmates	Acceptance

Method 1:	Quasi-experimental study - multilevel analysis
Measurement points:	Three moments of measurement: prior to the start of the intervention (pre); after the intervention (post), and 1 year later (follow-up)
Sample:	*N*=271 students: *N*=53 Kindergarten students (EG=22; CG=31); *N*=218 elementary school students (EG=91; CG=127)
Measurement:	Attitudes of kindergarten and elementary children towards children with physical, intellectual, and severe physical and intellectual disabilities; Independent variables: age, gender, type of vignette, condition and measurement;

Acceptance Scale for Kindergarten-revised (ASK-R) (Favazza and Odom 1996)	Acceptance
Attitude Survey Towards Inclusive Education (ASIE) (age 8–12) (De Boer et al., 2012)	Attitude

Results:	The outcomes of the multilevel analysis showed positive, immediate effects on attitudes of kindergarten students, but limited effects on elementary school students' attitudes. Nevertheless, attitudes were more significant on the last measurement in both conditions; Elementary school boys hold significantly more negative attitudes than girls.
Key success factors:	One improvement of interventions might be to include parents in the intervention (e.g., by reading storybooks at home about disability). Another improvement could be to have the intervention over a longer period or repeat it at different time intervals
Further comments:	This study indicates the importance of interventions to influence attitudes positively, particularly at the kindergarten stage.

15. Sanford Harmony

Evaluation	
Miller, C. F., Kochel, K. P., Wheeler, L. A., Updegraff, K. A., Fabes, R. A., Martin, C. L. et al. (2017). The efficacy of a relationship building intervention in 5th grade. *Journal of School Psychology, 61*, 75–88. The relationship building interventions (RBIs) mentioned in the study by Miller et al. (2017) are equivalent to the Sandford Harmony units (see https://www.sanfordharmony.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Sanford-Harmony-Research-FAQ.pdf).	
Short facts	
Responsible organization(s):	National University System: National University, JFK University, City University of Seattle, National University Virtual High School, National University Academy
Duration of the intervention:	Depends on grade (in fifth grade the intervention was implemented over 26 weeks; 45 min/week; see Miller et al., 2017)
Program homepage:	https://www.sanfordharmony.org/
Target group	
Students (age):	Approx. 3–12 years (no specific information) Pre-K/K, Grades 1 & 2, Grade 3, Grade 4, Grades 5 & 6
Diversity dimensions:	All children can participate
Teacher:	Teachers implement the RBI curriculum in everyday classroom practice and evaluate students' social behaviors and academic achievements.
School type:	PreK6 (elementary school)
Summary of the program	
Definition for inclusion / social participation:	No definition provided
Aim of the program	Sanford Harmony is a social emotional learning (SEL) program to promote children's interpersonal relationships and communication in and outside the classroom.
Key stages:	The RBI consists of five relationship building units:
Unit 1: Diversity and inclusion	The overall aim is 'to promote an inclusive environment and a common classroom identity'. Therefore, 'students are provided with opportunities to get to know each other and are taught to recognize and appreciate each other's similarities and differences. Students develop a common classroom identity by working together to develop a classroom name and motto' (Miller et al., 2017, p. 78)

	Unit 2: Empathy and critical thinking	The goal is 'to facilitate an awareness of the connection between thoughts, feelings, and behaviors; to promote empathy and incremental thinking; to reduce stereotyped thinking' (Miller et al., 2017, p. 78). This is done by interactive classroom activities and games.
	Unit 3: Communication	The main aim of this unit is 'to foster the use of effective communication skills during social interactions and cooperative working groups' (Miller et al., 2017, p. 78). Therefore, students observe and practice effective communication skills.
	Unit 4: Problem solving	Students learn 'to cultivate the ability to solve interpersonal problems effectively' (Miller et al., 2017, p. 78). Thus, students are confronted with different conflict situations and learn 'step by step' how to solve such situations and to effectively use those problem-solving strategies in future conflicts.
	Unit 5: Peer relationships	The aim of this unit is 'to encourage supportive interactions and friendships among classmates' (Miller et al., 2017, p. 78). This unit contains activities on the awareness of friendship qualities, dealing with bullying and supporting peers.
Methods:	School- and class-wide applicable curriculum which contains activities and games to provide successful interpersonal relationships, social skills (e.g., problem solving or communication skills) and therefore foster classroom connection and community. The online learning platform for students and teachers includes brief descriptions of classroom activities, on demand training videos, role-playing games etc. E.g., ○ 'Meet Up': Build a classroom community (embrace diversity, understand other's perspectives, …) ○ 'Buddy Up': Foster social-emotional learning by providing competences of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making	
Evaluation of the program		
Type (Process and/or output)	Output evaluation; Intervention study with pre and post design.	
Dimensions of social participation (Koster et al., 2009) addressed by the program (outcomes):	Peer relationships and friendships Contacts/Interactions Acceptance by classmates	

friendships/relationships, contacts/interactions, student's social self-perception, acceptance by classmates	
Method 1:	Relationship building intervention (experimental vs. control group) with pre and post measurements by means of a questionnaire (teacher and student ratings)
Measurement points:	Pre and post measurement point
Sample:	*N*=627 fifth-grade students from six elementary schools and their classroom teachers participated in the study. At the time of the investigation students average age was 10.02 years (SD=0.40). *N*=368 students attended RBI activities (experimental group; cohort 1=139; cohort 2=229), whereas *N*=259 students did not (control group; cohort 1=60; cohort 2=199). 51.4% of the students were female. Teachers (*N*=24; EG=10; CG=14)
Measurement:	Social behaviors (teacher rating) School connectedness (student rating)
	Subscales of the 'Child Behaviour Scale' (CBS) (Ladd, Herald-Brown, & Andrews, 2009; Ladd & Profilet, 1996) — Students' social behaviors (prosocial behavior/aggressive behavior)
	Subscale of the School Liking and Avoidance Questionnaire (SLAQ) (Ladd & Price, 1987; 5-point scale) — Students' school connectedness (school liking and classroom identification/inclusion)
	Subscale of the 'Psychological Sense of School Membership Scale' (PSSM) (Goodenow, 1993). The original subscale was extended with self-developed items. Confirmatory factor analyzes indicate a good fit for the adapted scale with self-developed items. — Students' classroom identification/participation
	Rated with report cards: 0=unsatisfactory (F), 1=having difficulty (D), 2=satisfactory — Students' academic achievement

	(C), 3=very good (B), 4=outstanding (A) concerning language, writing, math, science and social competencies.	

Results: The intervention results overall indicate significant lower aggressive behavior, higher peer liking and acceptance of students attending the RBI compared to the children in the control group. Nevertheless, the reported differences between control and experimental group are small. According to the authors, this result is due to students' overall low aggressive behavior in both pre-test groups.

Furthermore, in comparison to students from the control group students from the RBI reported significantly more school liking, a greater sense of belonging and inclusion in their classroom.

Finally, students from the RBI had higher academic achievements than their peers from the control group.

Key success factors:

<u>Social behavior</u>

The authors expect that less aggressive behavior and more peer-liking and acceptance of RBI-students can be traced back to implemented non-aggressive behavior strategies, positive communication and problem-solving skills in challenging situations. Thus, it is reasonable that promoting an inclusion classroom norm in the RBI leads to positive interpersonal behaviors between popular children and their peers with characteristics such as behavioral problems, which normally may lead to social conflicts.

<u>School connectedness</u>

'Intergroup contact' (Allport, 1954) is mentioned as a factor central to the success of encouraging students' school connectedness and belonging. Thus, students attending the RBI have the opportunity to know each other and to develop a common class identity by experiencing learning activities together, which finally can lead to a greater sense of belonging and connectedness to their classroom. Furthermore, in the RBI crucial relationship skills are taught (e.g., problem solving in challenging situations). So, students from the RBI have the skills for successful peer interactions.

16. Steps for Life

Evaluation	
Kourmousi, N., Markogiannakis, G., Tzavara, C., Kounenou, K., Mandrikas, A., Christopoulou, E., & Koutras, V. (2018). Students' psychosocial empowerment with the 'Steps for Life' personal and social skills Greek elementary programme. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 10*(5), 535–549.	
Short facts	
Responsible organization(s):	School of Pedagogical & Technological Education (ASPETE), Athens, Greece University of Ionnina, Ionnina, Greece University of Athens, Athens, Greece and other
Duration of the intervention:	School years 2013–2014
Target group	
Students (age):	6–7 years/7–8 years or older
Diversity dimensions:	Socio-economic background (mother's/father's educational level, parents' income: high, middle and low income areas, family composition: parents living together/number of siblings), attendance of full-time/classic course, special education structures (e.g., attendance of an integration class/parallel support), re-attendance of the same class
Teacher:	Teachers are responsible for the integration of the »Steps for Life« intervention program in regular school lessons.
School type:	Elementary/primary school
Summary of the program	
Definition for inclusion / social participation:	No definition provided
Aim of the program	The aim of the program is to improve first and second grade students' self-esteem, empathy, as well as personal and social skills (in particular emotion management and problem solving). It is not intended to tell the students »what to do« and »how to behave«. Students should rather be encouraged to evaluate their own and others emotional states, make their own decisions in social interactions and solve their »everyday problems« (Kourmousi et. al, 2018)
Key stages:	»Steps for life« consists of nine steps (with different questions per step
Unit 1: Naming the emotion	e.g., How do you think the child in this picture feels? What is the name of the emotion?
Unit 2: External recognition	e.g., How can you tell what he/she feels?

	Unit 3: Internal recognition	e.g., Do you remember a time when you also felt … (emotion's name)?
	Unit 4:Stages of emotion	e.g., How do we say it when we feel just a little bit of that emotion?
	Unit 5: Causes of emotion	e.g., What things usually make you feel … (emotion's name)?
	Unit 6: Causes of emotion in other people	e.g., What things do you think would make a mom feel … (emotion's name)? How about a teacher?
	Unit 7: Usual ways to reacting / expressing the emotion	e.g., What do you usually do when you feel … (emotion's name)?
	Unit 8: Estimation of the consequences of the reported behaviours	e.g., What would possibly happen if you choose to do the first thing that you mentioned?
	Unit 9: Choosing the best ideas	e.g., So, which behaviors do you think would be good ideas in order to express and handle our emotion?
Methods:	Question-based procedure in order to encourage students to explore their emotions in a safe and guided way (see key stages). Annual universal elementary curriculum (27 lessons per week; two hours; four modules): (1) rule-setting and establishing of a good classroom climate (2) instruction of basic concepts (3) empathy and emotions' identification (4) problem solving and target-setting) Lessons include: o Introduction of a new concept o Lesson goals o Teaching instructions o Needed materials o Introduction of concept by puppets or pictures o Discussion/ask questions (see key-stages) o Role-play scenarios o Coursework activities etc.	
Further comments on program:	For the successful realization, the program includes a »Teachers' Manual«, »Lesson Guide«, different materials (e.g., hand-puppets,	

	pictures) and »Letters to the Family« (development report, supportive activities at home).
Evaluation of the program	
Type (Process and/or output)	Output evaluation – change in questionnaire dimensions after the implementation of the intervention program (comparison between intervention and control group)
Dimensions of social participation (Koster et al., 2009) addressed by the program (outcomes): friendships/relationships, contacts/interactions, student's social self-perception, acceptance by classmates	Participation/Cooperation Friendships Self-esteem
Method 1:	Intervention study by means of a questionnaire
Measurement points:	pre- and post-measurement
Sample:	In total *N*=2439 first and second grade students participated in the study, with *N*=1516 students in the experimental group and *N*=923 in the control group.
	Personal and Social Skills Scale for Elementary Students aged 7–9 (Kourmousi et al., 2017); 7-point Likert-scale: 1 = »never or almost never« to 7 = »always or almost always«
	Concentration of attention Participation/cooperation in class Identification and expression of emotions Emotion management Ability to control verbal and physical aggressiveness Ability to control victimization Empathy Friendship skills Problem-solving ability Ability to take responsibility Use of spoken and written ability
	Behavioural Academic Self-Esteem Scale (BASE) (Coopersmith & Gilberts, 1982); teacher-rated; 5-point Likert-scale: 1 = »always« to 5 = »never«;
	Self-esteem by frequency of behaviors (student initiative, social attention, success / failure, social attraction, and self-confidence)
Results:	In comparison with the pre-results, students from the experimental group showed significant improvements on all surveyed dimensions (e.g., friendship-skills, social participation and cooperation) in the post

	evaluation. In contrast, students from the control group did not significantly improve their concentration of attention, their management of emotions, or their ability to control verbal and physical aggressiveness and victimization with regard to their pre-results. Additionally, students from the experimental group had significantly higher improvements on all targeted dimensions than students from the control group.
Key success factors:	The authors report in their discussion section that friendship skills especially improved when implemented with specific activities such as story reading and club-founding, appropriate games like »secret friend« or »wheel of friendship« and active role-playing

4. Conclusion

The main goal of this report is to give an overview of existing programs to foster students' social participation in the context of inclusive education. First, it needs to be stressed that compared to the huge number of studies which have analyzed the social participation of students and state the status quo, little effort has been made to improve their social participation. While nearly all of the studies (see e.g. reviews from Bossaert at al., 2013; Koster et al., 2009; Schwab, 2018) highlighted the fact that students with SEN especially are at risk of low social participation, not as much research was conducted using intervention designs or trying to change the 'at risk' situation of specific students. Therefore, there is still a gap in research for identifying evidence-based intervention programs. What can be pointed out in this report is that most studies which dealt with social participation did not (sufficiently) define their understanding of inclusion, but rather used a normative definition.

Summarizing the results of the literature review, it can be concluded that fostering social participation in school-aged students is a challenging task which cannot easily be done within a single intervention focus. The described studies used different approaches (e.g. social-cognitive approaches, behavior approaches or social-emotional learning approaches) and found effects on different outcomes (such as sub-aspects of social participation, students' attitudes, students' behavior). The review showed that activities where students are highly involved can build the pedestal of the intervention. Multiple sessions over a long period might help students to internalize the main aims of the intervention as students need to transfer what they have learned to daily school life (and also to spare time activities). In this context it seems essential not to simply focus on specific target students but rather the enhancement of the 'WE' (we-feelings, community learning, common objectives, group empowerment) seems to be particular successful.

Summing up, a single intervention which fully addresses all possible complex requirements and which is suitable as an all-in-one solution does not exist. Therefore, for the current FRIEND-SHIP project the intervention program should rather be a box of different tools which can be used in a flexible way depending on the different contexts (e.g. primary or secondary grades, focus on disability or heterogeneity). Moreover, programs which are implemented in the everyday school life seem to be more effective, thus addressing teachers' behaviors with the program might be key. For long-term stable effects it is recommended that the program also includes booster sessions, which can be used flexibly later. If possible, students' voices should also be included in the development process of the intervention program (de Leeuw, de Boer, Beckmann, van Exel, & Minnaert, 2019) as some of the

previously outlined interventions were described as rather time-consuming and were not really user-friendly – neither for teachers nor students. Moreover, the role of other important semi-involved stakeholders (e.g. parents and school principals) needs to be taken into consideration.

Regarding the evaluation and implementation of the intervention, the record of different activities and their frequency (e.g. in form of a diary for teachers) could help to get more in-depth information on what is really happening in schools. Teachers need to be prepared on how to conduct the intervention and also need to be supported while carrying out the intervention. Therefore, not only presenting the materials but also giving recommendations on how to implement the intervention in class (e.g. via a teacher handbook) is of high importance.

For the evaluation itself, it can be stressed that it seems to be important that different perspectives (e.g. students' voices, facilitators' ratings and external observations) need to be included to get a broader picture of the situation. Last but not least, several ethical considerations need to be clearly discussed within the FRIEND-SHIP project. For instance, it needs to be addressed that an intervention can have negative effects too (e.g. on stigmatization) and that there might be students who do not want to be a 'focus child' or do not want to participate in the intervention at all. As social relations are based on voluntary decisions, the students' rights always need to be acknowledged.

Acknowledgement

We would like to express our sincere thanks and considerable appreciation to Nathalie Leblond for her valuable and helpful work regarding the proofreading and linguistic revision of the presented report.

5. Resources

Adair, B., Ullenhag, A., Keen, D., Granlund, M., & Imms, C. (2015). The effect of interventions aimed at improving participation outcomes for children with disabilities: A systematic review. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology, 57*, 1093-1104.

Agaliotis, I., & Goudiras, D. (2004). A profile of interpersonal conflict resolution of children with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal, 2*, 15–29.

Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. MA, Cambridge: Perseus Books.Addison-Wesley.

Asher, S. R., & Dodge, K. A. (1986). Identifiying children who are rejected by their peers. *Developmental Psychology, 22*, 444-449.

Avramidis, E. (2013). Self-concept, social position and social participation of pupils with SEN in mainstream primary schools. *Research Papers in Education, 28*, 421-442.

Avramidis, E., Avgeri, G., & Strogilos, V. (2018). Social participation and friendship quality of students with special educational needs in regular Greek primary schools. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 33*, 221-234.

Barrett, W., & Randall, L. (2004). Investigating the circle of friends approach: Adaptations and implications for practice. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 20(4), 353-368.

Beninghoff, A. (1993). *Ideas for inclusion: The teacher's guide to integrating students with severe disabilities.* Longmont: Sopris West.

Bliss, T., & Tetley, J. (1993). *Circle Time*. Bristol: Lucky Duck Publishing.

Boniwell, I. (2013) Educating For Happiness and Resilience. TEDx Hull. Independently organized TED event. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DbC18wFkHNI. Retrieved January 24, 2020

Bossaert, G.., Colpin, H.., Pijl, S. J., & Petry, K. (2013). Truly included? A literature study focusing on the social dimension of inclusion in education. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 17, 60-79.

Bossaert, G., de Boer, A. A., Frostad, P., Pijl, S. J., & Petry, K. (2015). Social participation of students with special educational needs in different educational systems. *Irish Educational Studies, 34*, 43-54.

Bowen, J. (2010). Visual impairment and self-esteem: What makes a difference?. *British journal of visual impairment, 28*(3), 235-243.

Bricker, D. (1995). The challenge of inclusion. *Journal of Early Intervention, 19*(3), 179–194.

Brouzos, A., Vassilopoulos, S. P., Vlachioti, A., & Baourda, V. A (2019). A coping-oriented group intervention for students waiting to undergo secondary school transition: Effects on coping strategies, self-esteem, and social anxiety symptoms. *Psychology in the Schools*, *57*(1), 31-43.

Carlson, C. (1987). Social interaction goals and strategies of children with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 20*, 306–311.

Chorpita, B. F., Tracey, S. A., Brown, T. A., Collica, T. J., & Barlow, D. H. (1997). Assessment of worry in children and adolescents: An adaptation of the Penn State Worry Questionnaire, *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 35*(6), 569–581.

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

Coie, J. D., & Dodge, K. A. (1988). Multiple sources of data on social behaviour and social status in the school: A cross age comparison. *Child Development, 59*, 815–829.

De Boer, A., Pijl, S., Minnaert, A., & Post, W. (2014). Evaluating the Effectiveness of an Intervention Program to Influence Attitudes of Students Towards Peers with Disabilities. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 44*, 572-583.

De Boer, A. A., Timmerman, M. E., Pijl, S. J., & Minnaert, A. E. M. G. (2012). The psychometric evaluation of a questionnaire to measure attitudes towards inclusive education. European Journal of Psychology of Education.

Coopersmith, S., & Gilberts, R. (1982). *Behavioral academic self-esteem. Professional manual.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press, Inc.

Cobigo, V., Ouellette-Kuntz, H., Lysaght, R., & Martin,L. (2012). Shifting our conceptualization of socialinclusion*. Stigma Research and Action, 2*(2), 75–84.

Danielson, C. K., & Phelps, C. R. (1981). The assessment of children's social skills. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 19*, 120–133.

De Leeuw, R. R., de Boer, A. A., & Minnaert, A. E. M. G. (2018). Student voices on social exclusion in general primary schools. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 33*, 166-186.

De Leeuw, R.R., de Boer, A.A., Beckmann, E.J., van Exel, N.J.A, & Minnaert, A.E.M.G. (2019). Young children's perspectives on resolving social exclusion within inclusive classrooms*. International Journal of Educational Research, 98*, 324–335.

DiPerna, J. C., Lei, P., Cheng, W., Hart, S. C., & Bellinger, J. (2017). A cluster randomized trial of the Social Skills Improvement System-Classwide Intervention Program (SSIS-CIP) in first grade. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 110*(1), 1–16.

Duckworth, A. L., & Seligman, M. E. (2005). Selfdiscipline outdoes IQ in predicting academic performance of adolescents. *Psychological Science, 16*(12), 939–944.

Durlak, J. A. (2015). Studying program implementation is not easy but it is essential. *Prevention Science, 16*(8), 1123–1127.

Dweck, C. S. (2006). Mindset: *The New Psychology of Success*. New York: Random House Digital Inc.

Elliot, S. N. & Gresham, F. M. (2007). *Social skills improvement system: Classwide intervention program.* Minneapolis, MN: Pearson Assessments.

Favazza, P. C., & Odom, S. L. (1996). Use of the acceptance scale to measure attitudes of kindergarten-age children. Journal of Early Intervention, 20(3), 232–248.

Favazza, P. C., LaRoe, J., & Odom, S. L. (1999). *Special Friends: A manual for creating accepting environments*. Colorado: Roots & Wings.

Forest, C., & Garcia Bacete, F. J. (2006). *Comunicacion cooperativa entre la familia y la escuela.* Valencia: Edicions Culturals Valencianes, S.A.

Fraser, B. J. (1982). Development of short forms of several classroom environment scales. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 19*, 221-227

Fraser, B. J. (1989). *Assessing and improving classroom environments*. (What Research says to the science and mathematics teacher, No. 2). Perth: Curtin University

Fraser, B. J., & Fisher, D. L. (1986). Using short forms of classroom environment scales. *Journal of Research in Science teaching, 23*, 387-413.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American psychologist, 56*(3), 218-226

Fredrickson, B. L. (2013). *Love 2.0: Finding happiness and health in moments of connection*. New York: Penguin

Frederickson, N. (1991). Children can be so cruel - Helping the rejected child. In Lindsay, G., & Miller, A. (Eds.), *Psychological services for primary schools*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.

Frederickson, N., & Graham, B. (1999). Social skills and emotional intelligence. In N. Frederickson, & R. J. Cameron (Eds.), *Psychology in education portfolio*. Windsor: NFER-Nelson.

Frederickson, N. L., & Furnham, A. F. (2001). The long-term stability of sociometric status classification: A longitudinal study of included pupils who have moderate learning difficulties and their mainstream peers. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *42*, 581-592.

Frederickson, N. L., & Furnham, A. F. (2004). Peer-assessed behavioural characteristics and sociometric rejection: differences between pupils who have moderate learning difficulties and their mainstream peers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 74*, 391-410.

Frederickson, N., & Turner, J. (2003). Utilizing the classroom peer group to address children's social needs: An evaluation of the Circle of Friends intervention approach. *The Journal of Special Education, 36*(4), 234-245.

Frederickson, N., Warren, L., & Turner, J. (2005). "Circle of Friends"—An Exploration of Impact Over Time. *Educational psychology in practice*, *21*(3), 197-217.

Frostad, P., & Pijl, S. J. (2007). Does being friendly help in making friends? The relation between the social position and social skills of pupils with special needs in mainstream education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *22*, 15-30.

Frostad, P., Mjaavatn, P.E., & Pijl, S.J. (2011). The stability of social relations among adolescents with special educational needs (SEN) in regular schools in Norway. *London Review of Education*, *9*, 83-94.

García Bacete, F. J., Rubio, A., Milian, I., & Marande, G. (2013). El aprendizaje de la amistad en la educacion primaria. Un procedimiento intensivo para ayudar a los ninos rechazados a hacer amigos. *Apuntes de Psicologia, 31*, 155–163.

García Bacete, F., Marande, G., & Mikami, A. (2019). Evaluation of a multi-component and multi-agent intervention to improve classroom social relationships among early elementary school-age children. *Journal of School Psychology, 77*, 124-138.

Garrote, A. (2017). The Relationship between Social Participation and Social Skills of Pupils with an Intellectual Disability: A Study in Inclusive Classrooms. *Frontline Learning Research, 5*, 1-15.

Garrote, A., Dessemontet, R. S., & Opitz, E. M. (2017). Facilitating the social participation of pupils with special educational needs in mainstream schools: A review of school-based interventions. *Educational Research Review*, *20*, 12-23.

Goodenow, C. (1993). The psychological sense of school membership among adolescents: Scale development and educational correlates. *Psychology in the Schools, 30,* 79–90.

Goodman R. (1997). The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: a research note. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 38(*5), 581–586.

Govindji, R., & Linley, P. A. (2007). Strengths use, selfconcordance and well-being: implications for strengths coaching and coaching psychologists. *International Coaching Psychology Review, 2(*2), 143–153.

Gresham, F. M. (1986). Conceptual and definitional issues in the assessment of children's social skills: Implications for classifications and training. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 15*(1), 3-15.

Gresham, F. M., & Elliot, S. (1990). *The Social Skills Rating System*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.

Gresham, F. M., & Elliot, S. N. (2008). Social skills improvement system: Rating scales manual. Minneapolis, MN: NCS Pearson

Harter, S. (1985). *Manual for the Self-Perception Profile for Children*. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Huber, C. (2006). Soziale Integration in der Schule?!. Eine empirische Untersuchung zur sozialen Integration von Schülern mit sonderpädagogischem Förderbedarf im gemeinsamen Unterricht. Marburg: Tectum.

Humphrey, N., Hennessey, A., Lendrum, A., Wigelsworth, M., Turner, A., Panayiotou, M., … Calam, R. (2018a). The PATHS curriculum for promoting social and emotional well-being among children aged 7–9 years: a cluster RCT. *Public Health Research, 6*(10).

Humphrey, N., Barlow, A., & Lendrum, A. (2018b). Quality Matters: Implementation Moderates Student Outcomes in the PATHS Curriculum. *Prevention Science, 19*(2), 197-208.

Ivens, J. (2007). The development of a happiness measure for schoolchildren. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 23*(3), 221–239.

Jones, A. P., & Frederickson, N. (2010). Multi-informant predictors of social inclusion for students with autism spectrum disorders attending mainstream school. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 40*, 1094-1103.

Jordan, L., & Goodey, C. (1996). *Human Rights and School Change: The Newham Story*. Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.

Kalyva, E., & Agaliotis, I. (2009). Can social stories enhance the interpersonal conflict resolution skills of children with LD? *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 30*(1), 192-202.

Kalyva, E., & Avramidis, E. (2005). Improving communication between children with autism and their peers through the 'Circle of Friends': a small-scale intervention study. *Journal of applied research in intellectual disabilities, 18*(3), 253-261.

Karcher, M. (2007). *Pair counseling: A developmental intervention for counseling children in dyads.* Unpublished manual, University of Texas at San Antonio.

Kien, C., Nussbaumer-Streit, B., Thaler, K., Griebler, U., Van Noord, M., Wagner, P., & Gartlehner, G. (2014). Barriers to and facilitators of interventions to counterpublication bias: Thematic analysis of scholarly articles and stakeholderinterviews*. BMC health services research, 14*, 551.

Korpershoek, H., Harms, T., de Boer, H., van Kuijk, M., & Doolaard, S. (2016). A meta-analysis of the effects of classroom management strategies and classroom management programs on students' academic, behavioral, emotional, and motivational outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, *86*, 643–680.

Kaukiainen, A., Junttila, N., Kinnunen, R., & Vauras, M. (2005). *MASC. Multiassessment of Social Competence*. Finland: Centre for Learning Research, University of Turku.

Koster, M., Nakken, H., Pijl, S. J., & Van Houten, E. (2009). Being part of the peer group: A literature study focusing on the social dimension of inclusion in education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *13*(2), 117-140.

Koster, M., Pijl, S. J., Nakken, H., & Van Houten, E. J. (2010). Social participation of students with special needs in regular primary education in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 57*, 59-75.

Kourmousi, N., Markogiannakis, G., Tzavara, C., Kounenou, K., Mandrikas, A., Christopoulou, E., & Koutras, V. (2018). Students' psychosocial empowerment with the 'Steps for Life' personal and social skills Greek elementary programme. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 10*(5), 535–549.

Kourmousi, N., Salagianni, M., Merakou, K., Tzavara, C., & Koutras, V. (2017). Evaluation of the 'Steps for Life' personal and social skills Greek K-curriculum. *Creative Education, 8,* 1912–1940

Kovacs, M. K. (1992). *Children's depression inventory—short form (CDI)*. New York, NY: Multi-Health Systems Inc.

Kuhne, M., & Wiener, J. (2000). Stability of social status of children with and without learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 23*(1), 64-75.

La Greca, A. M., & Stone, W. L. (1993). The Social Anxiety Scale for Children-Revised: Factor structure and concurrent validity. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, *22*, 17 – 27.

Lackaye, T., & Margalit, M. (2006). Comparisons of achievement, effort, and self-perceptions among students with learning disabilities and their peers from different achievement groups. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 39,* 432-446.

Ladd, G. W., & Profilet, S. M. (1996). The Child Behavior Scale: A teacher-report measure of young children's aggressive, withdrawn, and prosocial behaviors. *Developmental Psychology, 32,* 1008–1024.

Ladd, G. W., Herald-Brown, S. L., & Andrews, R. K. (2009). The Child Behavior Scale (CBS) revisited: A longitudinal evaluation of CBS subscales with children, preadolescents, and adolescents. *Psychological Assessment, 21,* 325–339.

Larsen, D. L., Attkisson, C. C., Hargreaves, W. A., & Nguyen, T. D. (1979). Assessment of client/patient satisfaction: development of a general scale, *Evaluation and Program Planning, 2*(3), 197–207.

Lau, E. X., & Rapee, R. M. (2011). Prevention of anxiety disorders. *Current Psychiatry Reports*, *13*, 258 – 266.

LaVigna, G. W., Willis, T. J., & Donnellan, A. M. (1989). The role of positive programming in behavioral treatment. In E. Cipani (Ed.), *The treatment of severe behavior disorders* (pp. 59–83). Washington, DC: American Association on Mental Retardation.

Linkins, M., Niemiec, R. M., Gillham, J., & Mayerson, D. (2015). Through the lens of strength: a framework for educating the heart. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 10*(1), 64–68.

Lobrot, M. (1989). *L'ecoute du desir*. Paris,France: Retz.

Lyubomirsky, S., & Lepper, H. S. (1999). A measure of subjective happiness: preliminary reliability and construct validation. *Social Indicators Research, 46*(2), 137–155.

Maines, B., & Robinson, G. (1993). *B/G-STEEM: A Self-esteem Scale with Locus of Control Items*. Avon: Lame Duck Enterprises.

Malti, T., & Perren, S. (Eds.). (2016). *Soziale Kompetenz bei Kindern und Jugendlichen: Entwicklungsprozesse und Förderungsmöglichkeiten* (2nd ed.). Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Matson, J. L. (1990). *Matson Evaluation of Social Skills With Youngsters: Manual*. Worthington, OR: International Diagnostic Systems.

Merrell, K. W., & Gimpel, P. G. (2014). *Social skills of children and adolescents: Conceptualization, assessment, treatment*. Mahwah, N.J: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Merrell, K., W. (2007). *Behavioral, Social, and Emotional Assessment of Children and Adolescents* (3rd ed.). Manwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Mikami, A. Y., Lerner, M. D., Griggs, M. S., McGrath, A., & Calhoun, C. D. (2010). Parental influence on children with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: II. Results of a pilot intervention training parents as friendship coaches for children. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 38*, 737–749.

Mikami, A. Y., Owens, J. S., Hudec, K. L., Kassab, H., & Evans, S. W. (2019). Classroom Strategies Designed to Reduce Child Problem Behavior and Increase Peer Inclusiveness: Does Teacher Use Predict Students' Sociometric Ratings? *School Mental Health*.

Miller, C. F., Kochel, K. P., Wheeler, L. A., Updegraff, K. A., Fabes, R. A., & Martin, C. L. et al. (2017). The efficacy of a relationship building intervention in 5th grade. *Journal of School Psychology, 61*, 75–88.

Miller, M. C., Cooke, N. L., Test, D. W., & White, R. (2003). Effects of friendship circles on the social interactions of elementary age students with mild disabilities. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, *12*(3), 167-184.

Mischel, W. (2014). *The marshmallow test: understanding self-control and how to master it*. New York: Random House.

Matson, J. L. (1990). Matson Evaluation of Social Skills With Youngsters: Manual. Worthington.

Mosely, J. (1996). Quality Circle Time in the Primary Classroom. Wisbech: LDA.

Nabuzoka, D., & Smith, P. K. (1983). Sociometric status and social behaviour of children with and without learning difficulties. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 34*, 1435-1448.

Nepi L.D., Fioravanti J., Nannini P., & Peru A. (2015). Social acceptance and the choosing of favourite classmates: a comparison between students with special education-al needs and typically developing students in a context of full inclusion. *British Journal of Special Education, 42*, 319-337.

Nepi, L.D., Facondini, Nucci, R.F., & Peru, A. (2013). Evidence from full-inclusion model: the social position and sense of belonging of students with special educational needs and their peers in Italian primary school. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 28*(3), 319-332.

Newton, C., Taylor, G., & Wilson, D. (1996). Circles of friends: an inclusive approach to meeting emotional and behavioural needs. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 11*(4), 41-48.

Newton, C., & Wilson, D. (2016). *Creating Circles of Friends. A Peer Support and Inclusion Workbook*. (3rd ed.). Nottingham: Russell Press Ltd.

Nisbet, J. & Hagner, D. (Eds.), (2000). Part of the Community – strategies for Including Everyone. Baltimore: Paul Brookes

Nota, L., Ginevra, M. C., & Soresi, S. (2018). School inclusion of children with intellectual disability: An intervention program. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability.*

Núñez, J. C., González-Pienda, J. A., González-Pumariega, S., Roces, C., Alvarez, L., González, P., & Rodríguez, S. (2005). Subgroups of attributional profiles in students with learning difficulties and their relation to self-concept and academic goals. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *20*(2), 86-97.

O'Connor, E. (2016). The use of 'Circle of Friends' strategy to improve social interactions and social acceptance: a case study of a child with Asperger's Syndrome and other associated needs*. Support for Learning*, *31*(2), 138-147.

O'Hare, L., Stark, P., Orr, K. Biggart, A., & Bonnell C. (2018). Positive Action. Pilot report and executive summary.

O'Hare, L., Kerr, K., & Biggart, A. (2010). *Checklist for child ratings of facilitator dispositions in intervention and prevention programs*, Belfast: Centre for Effective Education, Queen's University Belfast.

Orpinas, P., & Frankowski, R. (2001). The Aggression Scale: A self-report measure of aggressive behavior for young adolescents, *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 21*(1), 50–67.

Petry K. (2018). The relationship between class attitudes toward peers with a disability and peer acceptance, friendships and peer interactions of students with a disability in regular secondary schools. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 33*, 254-268.

Pijl, S. J., & Frostad, P. (2010). Peer Acceptance and Self-Concept of Students with Disabilities in Regular Education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 25*, 93-105.

Pijl, S.J., Skaalvik, E.M., & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Students with Special needs and the Composition of Their Peer Group. *Irish Educational Studies, 29*, 57-70.

Polychroni, F., Koukoura, K., & Anagnostou, I. (2006). Academic self-concept, reading attitudes and approaches to learning of children with dyslexia: Do they differ from their peers? *European Journal of Special Needs Education 21*, 415-430.

Proctor, C., Tsukayama, E., Wood, A. M., Maltby, J., Eades, J. F., & Linley, P. A. (2011). Strengths Gym: The impact of a character strengths-based intervention on the life satisfaction and well-being of adolescents. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 6*(5), 377–388.

Ravens-Sieberer, U., Auquier, P., Erhart, M., Gosch, A., Rajmil, L., Bruil, J., ... Kilroe, J. (2007). The KIDSCREEN-27 quality of life measure for children and adolescents: psychometric results from a cross-cultural survey in 13 European countries. Quality of Life Research, 16, 1347–1356.

Rigby, K., & Slee, P. T. (1993). Dimensions of interpersonal relation among Australian children and implications for psychological well-being, *The Journal of Social Psychology, 133*(1), 33–42.

Rorhbeck, C. A., Azar, S. T., & Wagner, P. E. (1991). Child Self-Control Rating Scale: Validation of a child self-report measure, *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, *20*(2), 179–183.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rubin, K. H., Coplan, R. Chen, X., Bowker, J.C., McDonald, K., & Heverly-Fitt, S. (2015). Peer relationships in childhood. In M. H. Bornstein & M. E. Lamb (Eds.), *Developmental Science: An Advanced Textbook* (pp. 591-649). New York: Psychology Press.

Salmela-Aro, K., & Upadaya, K. (2012). The schoolwork Engagement Inventory: energy, dedication, and absorption (EDA). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 28(1), 60-67.

Ravens-Sieberer, U., Erhart, M., Power, M., Auquier, P., Cloetta, B., Hagquist, C. & Rajmil, L. (2003). 1793-C/Item-Response-Theory Analyses of Child and Adolescent Self-Report Quality of Life Data: The European Cross Cultural Research Instrument Kidscreen, *Quality of Life Research*, 722–722.

Rutkowski, J. (1997). The nature of children's singing voices: characteristics and assessment. The Phenomenon of Singing. In Roberts, B. A. (Ed.), *The Phenomenon of Singing* (pp. 201-209). St. John's Newfoundland: University Press

Sapon-Shevin, M. (1998). Because We Can Change the World – A Practical Guide to Building Cooperative, Inclusive Classroom Communities. New York: Allyn & Bacon.

Schwab, S. (2014). Schulische Integration, soziale Partizipation und emotionales Wohlbefinden in der Schule - Ergebnisse einer empirischen Längsschnittstudie. Wien: Lit. Verlag.

Schwab, S. (2015a). Social dimensions of inclusion in education of 4th and 7th grade pupils in inclusive and regular classes: outcomes from Austria. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 43-44*, 72-79.

Schwab, S. (2019). Friendship stability among students with and without special educational needs. *Educational* Studies,*45*(3), 390-401

Schwab, S., Gebhardt, M., & Gasteiger-Klicpera, B. (2013a). Facing the challenges of inclusion - A Survey of social integration and social behavior of students with and without SEN in an integrative school system. *International Journal Disability, Community and Rehabilitation*, *12*(1).

Schwab, S., Gebhardt, M., & Gasteiger-Klicpera, B. (2013b). Sozialverhalten von SchülerInnen mit und ohne sonderpädagogischen Förderbedarf in der Sekundarstufe I. *Heilpädagogische Forschung, 3*, 140-147.

Schwab, S., Huber, C., & Gebhardt, M. (2016). Social acceptance of students with Down syndrome and students without disability. *Educational Psychology 36*(8), 1501–1515.

Schwab, S., Nel, M., & Hellmich, F. (2018). Social participation of students with special educational needs in general education. Special Issue*. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 33*(2), 163-165.

Sharp, P., & Herrick, E. (2000). Promoting Emotional Literacy: Anger Management Groups. In Barwick, N. (Ed.), Clinical counselling in schools (pp.124-141). London: Routledge.

Shotton, G. (1998). A circles of friends approach with socially neglected children. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 14*(1), 22-25.

Smith, C., & Cooke, T. (2000). Collaboratively managing the behaviour of a reception class pupil. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *16*(2), 235-242.

Soresi, S., & Nota, L. (2007). *ASTRID Portfolio for the assessment, the treatment, and the inclusion of disabilities*. Firenze: Giunti-Organizzazioni Speciali.

Spence, S. (2003). Social Skills Training with Children and Young People: Theory, Evidence and Practice. *Child And Adolescent Mental Health*, *8*(2), 84-96.

Tabassam, W., & Grainger, J. (2002). Self-concept, attributional style and self-efficacy beliefs of students with learning disabilities with and without attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, *Learning Disability Quarterly 25*,141-151.

United Nations (2007). Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and Optional Protocol. New York, NY: UN.

Vassilopoulos, S. P., Banerjee, R., & Prantzalou, C. (2009). Experimental modification of interpretation bias in socially anxious children: Changes in interpretation, anticipated interpersonal anxiety, and social anxiety symptoms. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 47*, 1085–1089.

Vassilopoulos, S. P., Brouzos, A., Damer, D. E., Mellou, A., & Mitropoulou, A. (2013). A psychoeducational school-based group intervention for socially anxious children. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 38*(4), 307-329.

Vassilopoulos, S. P., Brouzos, A., & Rentzios, C. (2014). Evaluation of a universal social information-processing group program aimed at preventing anger and aggressive behaviour in primary school children. *Hellenic Journal of Psychology, 11*, 208-222.

Vasileiadis, I., & Doikou-Avlidou, M. (2018). Enhancing social interaction of pupils with intellectual disabilities with their general education peers: the outcomes of an intervention programme. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 18*(4), 267-277.

Vaughn, S., Elbaum, B. E. & Schumm, J. S. (1996). The effects of inclusion on the social functioning of students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities 29*, 598-608.

Volpe, R. J., & DiPerna, J. C. (2010). *Cooperative learning observation code for kids*. Unpublished observation code.

Vuorinen, K., Erikivi, A., & Uusitalo-Malmivaara, L. (2019). A character-strength intervention in 11 inclusive Finnish classrooms to promote social participation of students with special educational needs. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 19*(1), 45-57.

Welch, G. F. (1998). Early childhood musical development. *Research Studies in Music Education, 11*(1), 27-41.

Welch, G. F., Himonides, E., Saunders, J., Papageorgi, I., & Sarazin, M. (2014). Singing and social inclusion. *Frontiers in Psychology, 5*, 803-814.

Wiener, J. & Schneider, B. H. (2002). A multisource exploration of the friendship patterns of children with and without learning disabilities. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *30*, 127-141.

Whitaker, P., Barratt, P., Joy, H., Potter, M., & Thomas, G. (1998). Children with autism and peer group support: using 'circles of friends'. *British journal of special education*, *25*(2), 60-64.

6. Abbreviations

ADHD	Attention-deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder
CG	Control Group
EG	Experimental Group
ID	Intellectual Disability
LD	Learning Disabilities