**Supplementary Material**

**Definition of Self-Regulation**

Underlying and supporting the development of pre-academic skills is the development of self-regulation skills (Blair & Razza, 2007). Self-regulation has been studied using various terms (Zhou et al., 2012). Executive function (EF) skills, for example, include interlinked cognitive capacities that facilitate focusing and regulating attention and following-through on goal-driven behaviors (Zelazo & Carlson, 2012). EF skills include the ability to hold and update information in mind over short periods of time (working memory), suppress dominant or learned responses (inhibitory control), and shift attention between different stimulus–response rules (cognitive flexibility) (Best & Miller, 2010; Carlson, 2005; Garon et al., 2008). Self-regulation skills allow children to pay attention, navigate changing environments and tasks, avoid distractions, and regulate their emotions (McClelland et al., 2018; Montroy et al., 2016).

**Getting Ready for School (GRS) Classroom Component**

The GRS classroom curriculum provides supplemental activities promoting emergent literacy, math, and self-regulation skills organized into nine units following a developmentally appropriate sequence (Marti, Melvin, et al., 2018). GRS literacy activities include a daily *Morning Message* activity that grows in complexity each unit to target conventions of print and that is integrated in the circle time routine, and stand-alone literacy activities that foster children’s acquisition of vocabulary, narrative-building skills, phonological awareness, and print knowledge. To support the acquisition of math skills, GRS includes activities involving one-to-one correspondence, counting, sorting and comparison, pattern identification, and measurement that grow in complexity. To support the development of self-regulation, a set of activities, routines and strategies from the Social Emotional Cognitive Understanding and Regulation (SECURe) curriculum (Jones et al., 2014) was integrated into the GRS curriculum. The preparatory unit of the GRS curriculum includes 6 strategies designed to promote positive interactions between teachers and children and among children. The activities are: *Focus binoculars* (a strategy to focus attention), *I Message* (a strategy to express emotions), *Taking Turns Bag* (a strategy to encourage turn taking), *Shake Break Cool Down* (a movement routine to use before starting group activities), the *Thinking Spot* (a quiet area to calm down or have a quiet moment), and *This Is the Way We Ask to Play song*.  These activities are meant to be introduced across the first 3-4 weeks of the intervention and then used throughout the intervention. The curriculum also included nine *Brain Games*: fun, engaging, often-familiar games designed to build EF skills and increasing in complexity over time. Each Brain Game has three versions that increase in difficulty and incorporate literacy or math concepts (such as a modified “Freeze Dance” where children had to stop and find a letter, shape, or number). The games were designed based on research suggesting that activities with a focus on EF may foster generalized regulation of attention and behavior in the classroom (Rueda et al., 2005). In addition, the curriculum included one activity per unit that promotes emotional knowledge, expression, management, and cooperation by using books available in the classroom. These activities integrate some of the strategies implemented in the preparation unit. Some of these skills are also integrated in the literacy and math activities. For example, doing a rhyming activity with feelings words and then discussing how it is okay to feel different ways and how we can manage such emotions.

Each GRS activity has a description of materials required, vocabulary to use, core concept being targeted (e.g., rhyming, one-to-one correspondence, working memory), recommended group size, and step-by-step lesson plan with teaching practice tips. All materials required are either present in the class (i.e., blocks, paper, markers) or are provided by the GRS team. For example, GRS includes 29 posters to use in circle time or small group that target specific literacy and math activities. To support implementation of the GRS intervention, teachers receive a full-day introductory training, mid-year booster training, and weekly individualized meetings with a classroom coach.

The GRS intervention implemented a “kernel” approach, similar to the SECURe intervention (Jones et al., 2014). Rather than a standard curriculum, GRS offers a selection of literacy, math, and self-regulation activities organized by difficulty level. Teachers can choose which activities to use and determine the pace at which to progress through them. This approach sets GRS apart from traditional curriculum-based interventions that follow a fixed set of lessons. Kernel-based approaches provide teachers with greater flexibility to tailor interventions to their teaching style and the specific needs of their students (Colagrossi et al., 2024). This adaptability could potentially make them more cost-effective than standard curriculum-based methods.

**GRS Parent/Home Component**

The GRS parent/home component consists of a series of activities following a developmentally appropriate sequence aligned with the sequence of the classroom activities (Marti, Merz, et al., 2018). The activities can be easily completed using simple household materials and are designed to be integrated into daily family routines and be done at home or in the neighborhood. For example, when children go for a walk in their neighborhood, they are encouraged to play “hunt for letters” and practice letter and sound recognition by ﬁnding the letters of their names in signs. Children can also practice counting, sorting, and adding by playing “What belongs? What does not?” where they take different objects they have at home and sort them following different rules. Children and parents can also practice self-regulation skills playing “Let’s play freeze” as they dance to their favorite song or talk about different feelings as they engage in “Make a feelings bookmark” using pictures from newspapers and magazines. To do these activities, parents are provided with a color printed book and a set of printed materials to follow the activities from the GRS book. To support parent involvement and implementation of GRS activities, parents are offered in-person events at their center. Throughout the year, parents are invited to participate in one kick-off event to introduce GRS to the families, eight parent workshops, and two classroom parties. Each one-hour parent workshop included didactics, modeling, role-plays, and small group work. During the one-hour classroom parties at dismissal time, parents engage in GRS activities with their children while receiving support from GRS staff and teachers as needed. In addition, parents can watch videos showing real parents doing the learning activities with their children and a voice-over giving tips on how to do the activity. The videos are available on a classroom tablet and online. Videos are available in Spanish and English and were designed for culturally diverse parents and parents with low levels of literacy.

**English and Spanish Test Versions**

English and Spanish assessments were collapsed for analysis so that children administered fall assessments in Spanish and spring assessments in English (*n* = 42) were retained for analysis.Spanish versions of the assessments used in this study were created and intended to be parallel to the English versions, as noted. For example, studies have equated the English and Spanish Woodcock-Johnson-III measures, indicating that they assessed the same competencies (Hindman et al., 2010; Munoz-Sandoval et al., 2005; Schmitt et al., 2015; Woodcock et al., 2001); scores on the Woodcock-Johnson and Woodcock-Muñoz measures have been combined for analyses before (Bustamante & Hindman, 2020; Schmitt et al., 2015, 2017). In addition, data from the Expressive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test (EOWPVT) and EOWPVT-Spanish Bilingual Edition (EOWPVT-SBE) have been combined in previous studies (Bustamante & Hindman, 2020; Choi et al., 2018). The Research-based Early Math Assessment-Short Form (REMA-SF)-Spanish is a translation of the REMA-SF, and there are no differences in item content between Spanish and English versions, with the REMA-SF items demonstrating little to no evidence of differential item functioning across subgroups (Weiland et al., 2012). Multiple previous studies have administered the self-regulation tasks used in this study in the child’s preferred language—English or Spanish—and analyzed the data for English and Spanish administrations together (Landry et al., 2017; Merz et al., 2017; Sulik et al., 2009; Williford et al., 2013).

**Table S1. Intraclass correlations (ICCs) indicating proportion of between-classroom and between-school variance for school readiness outcome variables in unconditional models**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Classroom-level** | |  | **School-level** | | |
|  | **ICC** | ***p*** |  | ***N* schools** | **ICC** | ***p*** |
| **Language/literacy** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EOWPVT | .10 | .04 |  | 4 | .11 | .18 |
| WJ Letter-Word Identification | .07 | .02 |  | 7 | .05 | .11 |
| CELF Phonological awareness | .13 | .005 |  | 7 | .03 | .11 |
| **Early math** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WJ Applied Problems | .16 | .002 |  | 7 | .07 | .07 |
| REMA-SF | .13 | .02 |  | 4 | .07 | .15 |
| **Self-regulation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HTKS | .06 | .04 |  | 7 | .05 | .12 |
| PSRA toy wrap | .00 | -- |  | 7 | .00 | -- |
| PSRA attention/impulse control | .02 | .19 |  | 7 | .00 | -- |

EOWPVT, Expressive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test; WJ, Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement; CELF, Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals; REMA-SF, Research-based Early Math Assessment-Short Form; HTKS, Head-Toes-Knees-Shoulders task; PSRA, Preschool Self-Regulation Assessment.

**Table S2. Zero-order correlations for school readiness scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| 1 | Pretest EOWPVT | -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Pretest WJ Letter-Word Identification | .43\*\*\* | -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Pretest CELF Phonological Awareness | .33\*\*\* | .36\*\*\* | -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Pretest WJ Applied Problems | .62\*\*\* | .52\*\*\* | .48\*\*\* | -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Pretest REMA-SF | .48\*\*\* | .43\*\*\* | .43\*\*\* | .63\*\*\* | -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Pretest HTKS | .33\*\*\* | .23\*\*\* | .38\*\*\* | .45\*\*\* | .33\*\*\* | -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Pretest PSRA Toy Wrap | .20\*\* | .05 | .21\*\*\* | .17\*\*\* | .13\* | .17\*\*\* | -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Pretest PSRA Attention/Impulse Control | .21\*\*\* | .19\*\*\* | .26\*\*\* | .33\*\*\* | .29\*\*\* | .19\*\*\* | .40\*\*\* | -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Posttest EOWPVT | .82\*\*\* | .42\*\*\* | .39\*\*\* | .59\*\*\* | .47\*\*\* | .31\*\*\* | .16\* | .16\*\* | -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Posttest WJ Letter-Word Identification | .48\*\*\* | .87\*\*\* | .34\*\*\* | .50\*\*\* | .45\*\*\* | .18\*\* | .04 | .20\*\*\* | .46\*\*\* | -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Posttest CELF Phonological Awareness | .44\*\*\* | .36\*\*\* | .42\*\*\* | .47\*\*\* | .35\*\*\* | .33\*\*\* | .20\*\*\* | .22\*\*\* | .44\*\*\* | .40\*\*\* | -- |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Posttest WJ Applied Problems | .65\*\*\* | .50\*\*\* | .41\*\*\* | .70\*\*\* | .57\*\*\* | .41\*\*\* | .19\*\*\* | .27\*\*\* | .63\*\*\* | .55\*\*\* | .55\*\*\* | -- |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Posttest REMA-SF | .51\*\*\* | .39\*\*\* | .29\*\*\* | .58\*\*\* | .50\*\*\* | .30\*\*\* | .14\* | .27\*\*\* | .51\*\*\* | .42\*\*\* | .41\*\*\* | .60\*\*\* | -- |  |  |  |
| 14 | Posttest HTKS | .43\*\*\* | .30\*\*\* | .45\*\*\* | .51\*\*\* | .50\*\*\* | .54\*\*\* | .23\*\*\* | .29\*\*\* | .42\*\*\* | .31\*\*\* | .48\*\*\* | .52\*\*\* | .41\*\*\* | -- |  |  |
| 15 | Posttest PSRA Toy Wrap | .05 | -.003 | .13\* | .13\*\* | .01 | .22\*\*\* | .33\*\*\* | .28\*\*\* | .05 | .03 | .12\* | .11\* | .04 | .20\*\*\* | -- |  |
| 16 | Posttest PSRA Attention/Impulse Control | .12\* | .08 | .21\*\*\* | .17\*\*\* | .12\* | .13\* | .29\*\*\* | .52\*\*\* | .16\*\* | .12\* | .19\*\*\* | .19\*\*\* | .11+ | .21\*\*\* | .41\*\*\* | **--** |

\* *p* < .05; \*\* *p* < .01; \*\*\* *p* < .001

EOWPVT, Expressive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test; WJ, Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement; CELF, Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals; REMA-SF, Research-based Early Math Assessment-Short Form; HTKS, Head-Toes-Knees-Shoulders task; PSRA, Preschool Self-Regulation Assessment

**Table S3. Multilevel model results for intervention effects on language/literacy**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **EOWPVT**  **(*n* = 268)** | | |  | **WJ Letter-Word Identification**  **(*n* = 452)** | | |  | **CELF Phonological Awareness**  **(*n* = 442)** | | |
| **Predictors** | ***b*** | ***SE*** | ***p*** |  | ***b*** | ***SE*** | ***p*** |  | ***b*** | ***SE*** | ***p*** |
| Intercept | 38.64 | 1.87 | <.001 |  | .76 | .03 | <.001 |  | 4.84 | .41 | <.001 |
| Age | 13.05 | 2.28 | <.001 |  | .16 | .03 | <.001 |  | 2.96 | .38 | <.001 |
| Sex | .73 | 1.53 | .63 |  | -.01 | .02 | .71 |  | .19 | .25 | .44 |
| Race/ethnicity (African American vs. Hispanic/Latine) | 7.37 | 2.47 | .003 |  | .19 | .04 | <.001 |  | 1.11 | .41 | .01 |
| Race/ethnicity (all others vs. Hispanic/Latine) | 3.27 | 3.04 | .28 |  | .13 | .03 | .001 |  | .58 | .44 | .19 |
| Cohort 3 vs. 2 | -1.72 | 1.83 | .36 |  | .03 | .03 | .37 |  | 1.12 | .44 | .02 |
| Cohort 1 vs. 2 | -- | -- | -- |  | .08 | .03 | .02 |  | -.06 | .42 | .88 |
| Condition | 1.86 | 1.89 | .34 |  | -.04 | .03 | .22 |  | -.62 | .41 | .14 |
| Time | 9.01 | .94 | <.001 |  | .12 | .01 | <.001 |  | 2.17 | .28 | <.001 |
| Condition x time | 3.02 | 1.18 | .01 |  | .05 | .02 | .01 |  | .51 | .36 | .15 |

*Note*. Continuous predictors were grand mean centered. Vocabulary was assessed using the Expressive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test (EOWPVT) in cohorts 2 and 3. Sex was coded as 0 = male and 1 = female. All analyses included random intercepts at the child and classroom level. --, zero variance. Print knowledge was measured using the Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement (WJ) Letter-Word Identification subtest. Phonological awareness was measured using the Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals (CELF) Phonological Awareness subtest.

**Table S4. Multilevel model results for intervention effects on early math skills**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WJ Applied Problems**  **(*n* = 452)** | | |  | **REMA-SF**  **(*n* = 278)** | | |
| **Predictors** | ***b*** | ***SE*** | ***p*** |  | ***b*** | ***SE*** | ***p*** |
| Intercept | 8.11 | .57 | <.001 |  | 7.90 | .53 | <.001 |
| Age | 3.65 | .51 | <.001 |  | 3.63 | .55 | <.001 |
| Sex (1 = female) | .63 | .33 | .05 |  | .90 | .36 | .01 |
| Race/ethnicity (African American vs. Hispanic/Latine) | 1.27 | .55 | .02 |  | .12 | .59 | .84 |
| Race/ethnicity (all others vs. Hispanic/Latine) | .87 | .59 | .14 |  | .21 | .73 | .77 |
| Cohort 3 vs. 2 | .06 | .66 | .92 |  | .28 | .52 | .59 |
| Cohort 1 vs. 2 | 1.25 | .63 | .06 |  | -- | -- | -- |
| Condition | -.41 | .56 | .47 |  | -.36 | .56 | .53 |
| Time | 3.44 | .25 | <.001 |  | 2.90 | .40 | <.001 |
| Condition x time | .93 | .32 | .004 |  | 1.07 | .50 | .03 |

*Note*. Continuous predictors were grand mean centered. Early math was assessed using the Research-based Early Math Assessment-Short Form (REMA-SF) in cohorts 2 and 3. All analyses included random intercepts at the child and classroom level. --, zero variance. WJ, Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement.

**Table S5. Multilevel model results for intervention effects on self-regulation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **HTKS**  **(*n* = 450)** | | |  | **PSRA Toy Wrap**  **(*n* = 422)** | | |  | **PSRA Attention/Impulse Control**  **(*n* = 452)** | | |
| **Predictors** | ***b*** | ***SE*** | ***p*** |  | ***b*** | ***SE*** | ***p*** |  | ***b*** | ***SE*** | ***p*** |
| Intercept | .36 | .06 | <.001 |  | 32.56 | 2.33 | <.001 |  | 23.23 | .53 | <.001 |
| Age | .43 | .07 | <.001 |  | 8.55 | 2.66 | .001 |  | 1.86 | .60 | .002 |
| Sex (1 = female) | .07 | .05 | .14 |  | 8.43 | 1.80 | <.001 |  | 2.07 | .40 | <.001 |
| Race/ethnicity (African American vs. Hispanic/Latine) | .10 | .08 | .18 |  | 1.45 | 2.98 | .63 |  | -.39 | .67 | .55 |
| Race/ethnicity (all others vs. Hispanic/Latine) | .09 | .08 | .24 |  | -2.76 | 3.14 | .38 |  | .39 | .69 | .57 |
| Cohort 3 vs. 2 | .07 | .06 | .24 |  | .44 | 2.25 | .85 |  | -.76 | .54 | .17 |
| Cohort 1 vs. 2 | .12 | .05 | .02 |  | -2.19 | 2.10 | .30 |  | -.71 | .50 | .16 |
| Condition | -.10 | .05 | .05 |  | -2.44 | 2.29 | .29 |  | -.96 | .52 | .07 |
| Time | .45 | .05 | <.001 |  | 7.70 | 2.15 | <.001 |  | .36 | .37 | .34 |
| Condition x time | .03 | .06 | .68 |  | -1.77 | 2.75 | .53 |  | .31 | .48 | .52 |

*Note*. Continuous predictors were grand mean centered. All analyses included random intercepts at the child and classroom level. HTKS, Head-Toes-Knees-Shoulders task; PSRA, Preschool Self-Regulation Assessment.
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