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Introduction

Difficulties with executive function (EF) are frequently observed in people with autism spectrum disorders (ASD). Adult outcome in ASD is generally poor in relation to education, independence, friendship, and mental health. Regulation and modulation of the demands of community settings, problems with planning, organizing, executing goal-directed activities, and a general lack of self-advocacy skills have been identified as primary challenges to adult outcome. These areas all point to problems with self-regulation (SR) that could best be addressed during childhood. SR research has yielded positive results for typically-developing children during childhood.

The Self-Regulation Program for Awareness and Resilience in Kids (spark*) is an innovative approach to improving behavioral, cognitive and emotional self-regulation in children with ASD. spark* is informed by positive psychology, neuropsychology, meditative learning, and mindfulness.

**OBJECTIVES:** To evaluate the feasibility, acceptability, and effectiveness of spark* in improving EF (behavioural regulation, metacognition, global EF) and social competence in children with ASD by examining preliminary data collected during pilot testing.

Method

**PARTICIPANTS:** Six 6-8-year-olds and seven 9-10-year-olds with high functioning ASD and Asperger’s Disorder (AD) participated in spark* over ten 1-hour sessions.

**PROCEDURE:** spark* was administered by graduate students in school psychology who were trained in the spark* philosophy and methods and supervised by experienced therapists. Intervention involved teaching skills across four main phases:

- Awareness of the ability to use the skill,
- Awareness of the need to use the skill,
- Resilience in its use, and
- Self-advocacy to increase its use.

Skills addressed during sessions included:

- Behavioral SR of hands, breathing, feet, voice, and whole body; and
- Cognitive SR, focusing and sustaining attention, determining and retaining the most important/relevant information, determining expectations, and constructing meaning.

**RESULTS**

Qualitative feedback on spark* indicated it is:

- Feasible in group settings (graduate student facilitators completed weekly reflections and ratings and endorsed this), and
- Acceptable (no children dropped out or refused to attend).

Pre- and post-treatment data were collected from parents on measures of EF [i.e., Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function (BRIEF)] and social interaction [i.e., Children’s Communication Checklist (CCC-2)]. The data were analyzed with a series of paired-samples t-tests (See Table 1).

**CONCLUSIONS**

- The spark* program is feasible in group settings and it can be conducted by graduate students in school psychology.
- The spark* program is acceptable for elementary school-aged children with high functioning ASD and AD.
- Even with relatively brief intervention (10 hours), we observed significant improvement in behavioral regulation.
- Parents reported generalization of SR skills in their children.
- Future Research: To evaluate effectiveness relative to controls; use performance measures of EF.
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![Figure 1. Improvement Scores for the BRIEF BRI, MI, and GEC. The red lines indicate the group mean for each index and individual improvement scores are indicated with bars.](image)

**Table 1. Summary of Means and Standard Deviations for Scores on the BRIEF, MI, GEC, and SIDI.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Pre-Intervention M (SD)</th>
<th>Post-Intervention M (SD)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRIEF indices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Regulation Index (BRI)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>76.38 (5.10)</td>
<td>70.83 (6.23)</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognition Index (MI)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71.13 (5.77)</td>
<td>67.25 (11.30)</td>
<td>&gt; .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Executive Composite (GEC)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75.00 (3.21)</td>
<td>70.00 (9.83)</td>
<td>&lt; .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCC-2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction Difference Index (SIDI)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-13.83 (4.94)</td>
<td>-11.17 (3.84)</td>
<td>&gt; .60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to make straightforward comparisons on the magnitude of EF improvement, we calculated improvement scores for the BRIEF, MI, and GEC. These scores are shown in Figure 1 for individual participants and the group as a whole.