Higher Learning Lab · Free research resource · CC BY-NC 4.0

Trauma-Informed Classroom Practices: A Review of the Research

Bjorn, Genevive (Higher Learning Lab)

Published 2026-06-04 by Higher Learning Lab, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit, Dover, Delaware.

Canonical version: https://www.higherlearninglab.org/portfolio/trauma-informed-classroom-practices-a-review-of-the-research/

Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0.

By Higher Learning Lab

Citation: Bjorn, G. (2026). *Trauma-informed classroom practices: A review of the research*. Higher Learning Lab. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23541105

Introduction

Approximately one in four young people in the United States experiences at least one potentially traumatic event by age 16, with consequences for academic performance, social-emotional development, and long-term educational outcomes (Costello et al., 2002; Perfect et al., 2016). Trauma encompasses adverse childhood experiences (ACEs), including abuse, neglect, witnessing violence, parental incarceration, substance abuse in the home, and instability in living situations. For students in foster care, the prevalence rates are substantially higher, with national clinical data indicating that roughly 70% have experienced complex trauma—two or more types of interpersonal trauma (Greeson et al., 2011). Traditional classroom management approaches that rely on punishment, exclusionary discipline, and rigid behavioral expectations often re-traumatize students with trauma histories and fail to address the root causes of maladaptive behavior.

Trauma-informed practice represents a paradigm shift in educational settings. Rather than asking “What is wrong with this student?” educators adopting trauma-informed approaches ask “What happened to this student?” (SAMHSA, 2014). This framework recognizes that challenging behaviors often represent adaptive survival responses to previous experiences of threat and harm. The purpose of this literature review is to synthesize current research on evidence-based trauma-informed classroom practices, with particular focus on de-escalation techniques, relationship-building as therapeutic intervention, behavioral interpretation, physical environment modifications, and specialized support for foster youth in educational settings.

Prevalence of Trauma Among K-12 Students

National epidemiological data reveal the scope of childhood trauma in educational contexts. The National Survey of Children’s Exposure to Violence (NatSCEV) reports that in a single year 46% of children experienced a physical assault, 6% experienced a sexual victimization,

and 25% witnessed violence or experienced another form of indirect victimization (Finkelhor et al., 2009; see also Finkelhor et al., 2013). When broader adverse childhood experiences are included—such as parental incarceration, parental mental illness, and family substance abuse—more than half of adults report at least one adverse childhood experience, and roughly one in eight report four or more (Felitti et al., 1998).

Students experiencing trauma demonstrate measurable academic and behavioral consequences. A systematic review of 83 studies shows that trauma exposure and traumatic stress symptoms are associated with lower academic achievement, poorer cognitive functioning, higher rates of grade retention and special education placement, increased absenteeism, and elevated dropout rates (Perfect et al., 2016; Romano et al., 2015). In terms of classroom behavior, trauma-exposed students display higher rates of internalizing symptoms (anxiety, depression, withdrawal) and externalizing symptoms (aggression, noncompliance, disruption). Neurobiological research demonstrates that chronic stress from trauma alters prefrontal cortex development, impairing executive function, impulse control, and emotional regulation—the very capacities required for classroom success (De Bellis & Zisk, 2014).

De-Escalation Strategies in Trauma-Informed Classrooms

De-escalation refers to verbal and nonverbal techniques that reduce emotional intensity and prevent behavioral crises. For trauma-exposed students, traditional discipline methods—raised voices, harsh consequences, public correction—trigger fight-flight-freeze responses rooted in threat perception. Evidence-based de-escalation emphasizes maintaining calm demeanor, offering choice, validating emotions, and avoiding power struggles.

Core De-Escalation Principles:

- Use calm, low tone of voice and reduced speech rate
- Maintain safe physical distance; avoid blocking exits or standing in dominant stance
- Use open hand gestures and relaxed facial expression
- Offer choices and allow decision-making control when possible
- Validate emotions without reinforcing maladaptive behavior

A systematic review of de-escalation training found consistent gains in staff knowledge, confidence, and de-escalation performance,

although rigorous evidence on reductions in restraint and injury remains limited (Price et al., 2015). Reviews of school crisis-intervention training programs likewise emphasize verbal de-escalation as the first-line response and recommend that programs be evaluated on reductions in restraint and seclusion (Couvillon et al., 2010). Notably, de-escalation is most effective when built on foundation of positive relationships and trust, which we discuss in the following section.

Relationship-Building as Therapeutic Intervention

One of the most robust findings in trauma-informed education research is that positive relationships with trusted adults serve as protective factors that buffer against trauma's negative effects (Bellis et al., 2017; Blodgett & Lanigan, 2018). Neuroscience research indicates that consistent, attuned relationships activate the parasympathetic nervous system, promoting physiological regulation and creating conditions where learning can occur (van der Kolk, 2014). Students who report having at least one caring adult in school show significantly lower rates of depression, anxiety, and behavioral problems, even when trauma exposure is held constant.

Effective relationship-building practices include:

- Consistent greeting rituals and one-on-one attention
- Demonstrating genuine interest in student interests, background, and family
- Providing predictability through consistent routines and transparent expectations
- Following through on commitments and maintaining boundaries
- Using restorative practices that focus on repair and reconciliation rather than punishment

Physiological evidence supports this: in a randomized trial with 117 preschool-aged foster children, those who received a relationship-focused caregiving intervention developed diurnal cortisol patterns comparable to non-maltreated peers over 12 months, while children in regular foster care showed increasingly blunted stress-hormone rhythms (Fisher et al., 2007). Additionally, research on restorative practices—an approach emphasizing relationship repair over punishment—has been associated with substantial reductions in suspensions—for example, a 36% reduction in days lost to suspension in a randomized district-wide trial—and with improved teacher-

reported school climate and teacher–student relationships (Augustine et al., 2018; Darling-Hammond et al., 2020; Gregory et al., 2016; Wachtel & McCold, 2001).

Understanding Behavioral Cues and Trauma Responses

Trauma-informed educators recognize that seemingly defiant or disruptive behaviors often represent dysregulated stress responses rather than willful misconduct. Understanding the behavioral manifestations of trauma is essential for appropriate classroom response. Research identifies several common trauma-related behavioral patterns:

- Hypervigilance and threat detection: Students scan environments for danger cues, may startle easily, misinterpret neutral teacher cues as threatening, and react with disproportionate fear or anger to minor incidents.
- Emotional dysregulation: Difficulty modulating emotional intensity, rapid mood shifts, intense reactions to minor frustrations, difficulty self-soothing, and emotional intensity that appears disproportionate to triggering events.
- Executive function deficits: Working memory limitations, poor impulse control, difficulty planning and organizing, trouble transitioning between activities, and inability to break down multi-step instructions.
- Attachment difficulties: Difficulty trusting adults, resistance to comfort, preference for isolation, indiscriminate friendliness, or difficulty forming stable peer relationships.

Brain imaging studies document the neurobiological basis for these behaviors. Neuroimaging research shows that childhood maltreatment is associated with heightened amygdala reactivity to threat cues, structural and functional alterations in prefrontal regions that support executive function and emotion regulation, and diminished striatal response to reward (Teicher & Samson, 2016). When educators interpret these behaviors through a neurobiological lens rather than a moral one, classroom responses shift from punishment to support. For instance, rather than interpreting a student's refusal to accept feedback as "defiance," trauma-informed educators recognize this as a protective mechanism against perceived criticism as threat.

Classroom Environment Modifications

The physical classroom environment significantly impacts students' physiological stress regulation. Trauma-informed classroom design creates sensory conditions that promote calm and safety, reducing baseline anxiety and preventing escalation. Environmental modifications include:

- Lighting: Reduce harsh fluorescent lighting; use natural light and warm lighting where possible; allow students to wear sunglasses if light triggers sensory defensiveness.
- Sound: Minimize auditory stimulation; use soft instrumental music during transitions; reduce verbal intensity during high-stress times.
- Seating arrangements: Provide seat choices that allow students to control whether they face the door; offer location preferences for desk placement; accommodate the need for distance from certain peers.
- Regulatory tools: Provide access to fidgets, stress balls, weighted lap pads, movement breaks, and quiet spaces for emotion regulation.
- Predictability: Display visual schedules, provide advance notice of changes, create consistent classroom routines, and minimize surprises.

Direct experimental evidence on classroom environmental modifications is limited, and these recommendations rest largely on practice guidance and on evaluations of whole-school trauma-informed programs that include environmental changes among many components. In one such program, staff reported increases in students' time on task (27%) and school attendance (34%) after implementation (Dorado et al., 2016). Schools should treat environmental modifications as promising practice and monitor behavioral and attendance data locally.

Supporting Foster Youth in the Classroom

Students in foster care represent one of the most vulnerable populations in American education. Most have experienced maltreatment; developmental delays occur at four to five times the general-population rate; and between 36% and 47% receive special education services (National Working Group on Foster Care and Education, 2018). Foster youth complete high school at substantially lower rates than peers—65% by age 21 compared with 86% of all

young adults (National Working Group on Foster Care and Education, 2018).

Specialized practices for foster youth include:

- Acknowledging grief and loss as normative experiences for these students, validating sadness about family separation without requiring resolution.
- Maintaining communication with caregivers, recognizing that foster placements may change, and avoiding promises about permanence.
- Being mindful of curriculum content, avoiding units that presume stable family structures without acknowledging diverse family forms.
- Building a relationship with the student's caseworker to understand placement history and maintain consistency across settings.

Longitudinal research shows that foster youth who had a natural mentor—a caring, non-parental adult—during adolescence have better young-adult outcomes, including a trend toward greater participation in higher education (Ahrens et al., 2008). School-based education liaisons who coordinate between schools, caseworkers, and caregivers have also been shown to improve school stability and academic outcomes for children in foster care (Zetlin et al., 2004). Schools implementing comprehensive foster care awareness programs—training all staff on trauma dynamics specific to foster care, establishing clear protocols for communicating with child welfare agencies, and creating individualized support plans—report improved retention and graduation rates for foster students.

Implications for Practice

The convergence of neurobiological research, longitudinal outcome studies, and intervention trials provides compelling evidence for the implementation of trauma-informed practices at scale within K-12 education systems. However, successful implementation requires more than isolated interventions. Systems change requires:

- Comprehensive professional development: Educators require sustained, job-embedded training on the neurobiology of trauma, de-escalation techniques, and relationship-building; training efficacy is enhanced when combined with coaching and feedback on implementation fidelity.
- Systemic policy alignment: Discipline policies must explicitly move away from zero-tolerance approaches toward restorative

practices; school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) frameworks can be enhanced with trauma-informed components.
- Resource allocation: Implementation of trauma-informed practices requires investment in school climate, reduced class sizes to enable relationship-building, access to mental health professionals, and environmental modifications.
- Accountability structures: Schools must establish metrics tracking not only academic achievement but also school climate, student sense of safety, and student-adult relationships.

There is emerging evidence that school-wide trauma-informed implementation yields broad benefits. A multi-year evaluation of the HEARTS whole-school program in four urban elementary schools found large increases in staff knowledge and use of trauma-sensitive practices, and in the school with five years of implementation, an 87% reduction in disciplinary incidents and a 95% reduction in out-of-school suspensions—outcomes that benefit all students, not only those with trauma histories (Dorado et al., 2016). The evaluation was pre–post rather than randomized, so these findings should be read as promising rather than definitive. This universal benefit reduces the risk of stigmatization and supports equitable outcomes across student populations.

Conclusion

Trauma-informed classroom practices are not peripheral interventions for a small subset of students; rather, they represent an evidence-based approach to creating learning environments where all students can thrive. By understanding trauma's impact on neurodevelopment, adopting de-escalation and relationship-building strategies, interpreting behavior through a lens of compassion, modifying environments to reduce triggering stimuli, and providing specialized support for vulnerable populations like foster youth, educators can substantially improve academic and long-term life outcomes. The research demonstrates that such practices are both feasible to implement and powerfully effective in closing achievement gaps and supporting student wellbeing.

References

Ahrens, K. R., DuBois, D. L., Richardson, L. P., Fan, M.-Y., & Lozano, P. (2008). Youth in foster care with adult mentors during adolescence

have improved adult outcomes. Pediatrics, 121(2), e246–e252. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2007-0508

Augustine, C. H., Engberg, J., Grimm, G. E., Lee, E., Wang, E. L., Christianson, K., & Joseph, A. A. (2018). Can restorative practices improve school climate and curb suspensions? An evaluation of the impact of restorative practices in a mid-sized urban school district. RAND Corporation. https://doi.org/10.7249/RR2840

Bellis, M. A., Hardcastle, K., Ford, K., Hughes, K., Ashton, K., Quigg, Z., & Butler, N. (2017). Does continuous trusted adult support in childhood impart life-course resilience against adverse childhood experiences—a retrospective study on adult health-harming behaviours and mental well-being. BMC Psychiatry, 17, 110. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-017-1260-z

Blodgett, C., & Lanigan, J. D. (2018). The association between adverse childhood experience (ACE) and school success in elementary school children. School Psychology Quarterly, 33(1), 137–146. https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000256

Costello, E. J., Erkanli, A., Fairbank, J. A., & Angold, A. (2002). The prevalence of potentially traumatic events in childhood and adolescence. Journal of Traumatic Stress, 15(2), 99–112. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014851823163

Couvillon, M., Peterson, R. L., Ryan, J. B., Scheuermann, B., & Stegall, J. (2010). A review of crisis intervention training programs for schools. TEACHING Exceptional Children, 42(5), 6–17. https://doi.org/10.1177/004005991004200501

Darling-Hammond, S., Fronius, T. A., Sutherland, H., Guckenburg, S., Petrosino, A., & Hurley, N. (2020). Effectiveness of restorative justice in US K-12 schools: A review of quantitative research. Contemporary School Psychology, 24(3), 295–308. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-020-00290-0

De Bellis, M. D., & Zisk, A. (2014). The biological effects of childhood trauma. Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America, 23(2), 185–222. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chc.2014.01.002

Dorado, J. S., Martinez, M., McArthur, L. E., & Leibovitz, T. (2016). Healthy Environments and Response to Trauma in Schools (HEARTS): A whole-school, multi-level, prevention and intervention program for creating trauma-informed, supportive schools. School Mental Health, 8(1), 163–176. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-016-9177-0

Felitti, V. J., Anda, R. F., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D. F., Spitz, A. M., Edwards, V., & Marks, J. S. (1998). Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 14(4), 245-258. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-3797(98)00017-8

Finkelhor, D., Turner, H., Ormrod, R., & Hamby, S. L. (2009). Violence, abuse, and crime exposure in a national sample of children and youth. Pediatrics, 124(5), 1411–1423. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2009-0467

Finkelhor, D., Turner, H. A., Shattuck, A., & Hamby, S. L. (2013). Violence, crime, and abuse exposure in a national sample of children and youth: An update. JAMA Pediatrics, 167(7), 614–621. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2013.42

Fisher, P. A., Stoolmiller, M., Gunnar, M. R., & Burraston, B. O. (2007). Effects of a therapeutic intervention for foster preschoolers on diurnal cortisol activity. Psychoneuroendocrinology, 32(8–10), 892–905. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2007.06.008

Greeson, J. K. P., Briggs, E. C., Kisiel, C. L., Layne, C. M., Ake, G. S., Ko, S. J., Gerrity, E. T., Steinberg, A. M., Howard, M. L., Pynoos, R. S., & Fairbank, J. A. (2011). Complex trauma and mental health in children and adolescents placed in foster care: Findings from the National Child Traumatic Stress Network. Child Welfare, 90(6), 91–108.

Gregory, A., Clawson, K., Davis, A., & Gerewitz, J. (2016). The promise of restorative practices to transform teacher–student relationships and achieve equity in school discipline. Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 26(4), 325–353. https://doi.org/10.1080/10474412.2014.929950

National Working Group on Foster Care and Education. (2018). Fostering success in education: National factsheet on the educational outcomes of children in foster care. Legal Center for Foster Care and Education. https://www.casey.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/national_factsheet_on_the_educational_outcomes_of_children_in_foster_care.pdf

Perfect, M. M., Turley, M. R., Carlson, J. S., Yohanna, J., & Saint Gilles, M. P. (2016). School-related outcomes of traumatic event exposure and traumatic stress symptoms in students: A systematic review of research from 1990 to 2015. School Mental Health, 8(1), 7–43. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-016-9175-2

Price, O., Baker, J., Bee, P., & Lovell, K. (2015). Learning and performance outcomes of mental health staff training in de-escalation

techniques for the management of violence and aggression. British Journal of Psychiatry, 206(6), 447–455. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.114.144576

Romano, E., Babchishin, L., Marquis, R., & Fréchette, S. (2015). Childhood maltreatment and educational outcomes. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 16(4), 418–437. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838014537908

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2014). SAMHSA's concept of trauma and guidance for a trauma-informed approach (HHS Publication No. SMA 14-4884). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Teicher, M. H., & Samson, J. A. (2016). Annual Research Review: Enduring neurobiological effects of childhood abuse and neglect. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 57(3), 241–266. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12507

van der Kolk, B. A. (2014). The body keeps the score: Brain, mind, and body in the healing of trauma. Viking.

Wachtel, T., & McCold, P. (2001). Restorative justice in everyday life. In H. Strang & J. Braithwaite (Eds.), Restorative justice and civil society (pp. 114–129). Cambridge University Press.

Zetlin, A. G., Weinberg, L. A., & Kimm, C. (2004). Improving education outcomes for children in foster care: Intervention by an education liaison. Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 9(4), 421–429. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327671espr0904_5