

Feasibility of Evidence-Based Social and Emotional Learning in Prairie Canadian Schools

by

Kayla Kilborn

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
The University of Manitoba
in partial fulfilment of the requirements of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg

Copyright © 2021 by Kayla Kilborn

Abstract

This study examined the opportunities and barriers for implementing evidence-based Social and Emotional Learning programs in Prairie Canadian Schools. Teachers from Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta were recruited via e-mail and social media to fill out a survey on SEL feasibility. This survey consisted of five feasibility related domains: 1) attitudes about SEL, 2) knowledge about SEL, 3) job stress 4) resources for implementing SEL and 5) SEL practices. Results indicated that Prairie Canadian educators were already implementing SEL informally in their classroom through diverse instructional techniques. Linear Regression analysis indicated that participant's positive attitudes about SEL significantly predicted increased perceived feasibility for evidence-based SEL implementation. Additionally, Binomial Logistic Regression indicated that both increased knowledge and access to resources predicted increased SEL practice by Prairie Canadian educators. Content analysis and constant comparison method (from Grounded theory) was used to evaluate open-ended responses by participants. This analysis paralleled the quantitative results and indicated that Canadian educators had positive views about SEL programming but required better access to SEL training, and resources (e.g., more time to plan and teach SEL, funding and program materials). A unique finding from this study was that some Prairie Canadian educators indicated requiring French materials for SEL programs. In order to effectively implement evidence-based SEL in Prairie Canadian schools, policy makers must address the indicated barriers for Canadian educators, such as increased SEL training and SEL resources and appropriate French materials.

Keywords: Social and Emotional Learning, Feasibility, SEL resources, SEL attitudes, SEL training

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my advisor Dr. Janine Montgomery and my committee members, Dr. Johnson Li and Dr. Shahin Shooshtari for their assistance and continued support in completing this research. Additionally, I would like to thank MA students Rachel Roy and Breanna Cheri for their help with qualitative analyses and manuscript editing.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my grandmother, Pearl Marchant, for her unwavering support in all realms of my life. Without her, my education would not have been possible. I would also like to dedicate my thesis to my siblings Michael Kingshott and Shelby Kilborn, their partners (Elesia, Nathaniel and Danny), my partner Breanna Cheri and my best friend Teghan Wright. Thank you all for being there throughout my academic journey and thank you for being patient with me when I couldn't 'hang out' because I was too busy with school.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Dedication.....	iv
List of Tables.....	vi
List of Figures.....	vii
Introduction.....	1
The Need for SEL in Schools.....	1
The Benefits of SEL.....	3
Evidence-based SEL Programs and Benefits.....	4
Results from Non-Canadian SEL Feasibility Studies.....	6
The Current Study.....	8
Pre-study Anticipated Findings.....	9
Methodology.....	10
Study Design.....	10
Participants.....	10
Survey Measure.....	11
Procedure.....	13
Analyses.....	14
Results.....	19
Quantitative Results.....	20
Qualitative Results.....	22
Discussion.....	23

Current SEL Climate in Prairie Canadian Schools.....	23
Predictors of SEL Being Taught in the Classroom.....	25
A Unique Finding of the Current Study.....	26
Limitations.....	27
Future Research.....	27
Conclusion.....	28
References.....	29
Social and Emotional Learning Questionnaire.....	62

List of Tables

Table 2. Participant Demographic.....	36
Table 3. Subjects and Grade Taught.....	38
Table 4. Frequencies of Responses to Teacher/ Principal Job Stress Items.....	39
Table 5. Frequencies of Responses to Knowledge of SEL Items.....	41
Table 6. Frequencies of Responses to Attitudes of SEL Items.....	43
Table 7. Frequencies of Responses to Current SEL Practices Items.....	45
Table 8. Frequencies of Responses to Personnel Resources Items.....	46
Table 9. Frequencies of Responses to Other Resources Items.....	47
Table 10. Correlations Between Domains.....	49
Table 11. Supports and Resources that Would Make SEL Programming More Practical...	50
Table 12. Additional Thoughts or Concerns about SEL Programming.....	51

Introduction

Evidence-based Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) programs have been implemented in many non-Canadian schools (Caldarella, Christensen & Kramer, 2009; Merrel, Juskelis, & Tran, 2008; Durlark, Weissberg & Dymnicki, 2011; Payton, Weissberg & Durlack, 2008; Bierman, Coie & Dodge 2010; Kramer & Caldarella, 2009; Kendziora & Yoder, 2016). This type of programming has been implemented as an effective way to help students improve their behaviour, academic outcomes and emotional functioning (as detailed below) (Caldarella, Christensen & Kramer, 2009; Merrel, Juskelis, & Tran, 2008; Durlark, Weissberg & Dymnicki, 2011; Payton, Weissberg & Durlack, 2008; Bierman, Coie & Dodge 2010; Kramer & Caldarella, 2009; Kendziora & Yoder, 2016). While some information from other countries is available (e.g., Frydenberg & Martin, 2017; Freeman, 2017; Humphrey, Lendrum & Wigelsworth, 2010). to date, there is currently no study that evaluates the feasibility (opportunities and barriers) for implementing SEL programs across Canadian Schools. Due to the elevated need of this type of programming (e.g., increased student challenging behaviour and psychological distress) (e.g., Gilliam & Sahar, 2006; Raver & Knitzer, 2002; Rimm- Kaufman, Pianta & Cox, 2009; Jerome, Hamre & Pianta, 2009) it is imperative that we explore the feasibility of its implementation in a Canadian context.

The Need for SEL in Schools

Teachers are expected to prepare their students academically and foster positive learning outcomes. However, it is no secret that teachers take on many roles in a student's life as students spend a great deal of their time in school settings (McKay, Sutherland & Pochini, 2013). They act as parents, social workers, guidance counselors and more (McKay, Sutherland & Pochini, 2013). They are there for students as role models, emotional and social supports, guidance and inspiration. All of these roles are, in and of themselves, are extremely straining and, as highlighted below, teachers are finding it more difficult to effectively fill these roles and keep their students safe and well (McKay, Sutherland & Pochini, 2013).

Reports of student challenging behaviour, bullying, and psychological distress (including trauma) are increasingly common. For example, 25.1% of Canadian youth have reported experiencing at least one type of bullying at their school (Attar-Schwartz et al, 2017). A study done by Attar-Schwartz et al. (2017) demonstrated that this bullying was a significant predictor

of externalizing behaviours (e.g., aggression and conduct problems). High rates of externalizing behaviours have also been shown among Canadian youth living under the poverty line (Volta & Farrell, 2009). A study conducted by Tonmyr, et al. (2011) indicated high rates (approximately 25%) of diagnosed depression and anxiety among Canadian children and adolescents who have experienced trauma such as childhood maltreatment. Specifically, this study further shows that Canadian children and adolescents have been exposed to domestic violence (11%), neglect (7%), emotional maltreatment (6%) as well as physical (5%) and sexual (1%) abuse (Tonmyr, et al. 2011). Issues of bullying, externalizing behaviour and psychological distress have highlighted the need for evidence based SEL in schools (Gilliam & Sahar, 2006; Raver & Knitzer, 2002; Rimm-Kaufman, Pianta & Cox, 2009; Jerome, Hamre & Pianta, 2009; Reinke, Herman & Petras, 2013; Samara, Marlow & Wolke, 2008; Seeley, Tombari & Bennett, 2011; Tishelman, Haney & Greenwald-O'Brien, 2010) as SEL has been found to be an effective intervention for these issues (Durlak, Weissberg & Dymnicki, 2011; Bierman, Coie & Dodge, 2010). For example, in Bierman et al. (2010), SEL demonstrated to have a significant impact on the reduction of aggression in students, especially in those who had the highest baseline levels of aggression. Additionally, LaBelle's (2019) study found that SEL improved student mental health and increased student resiliency.

Canadian schools are expressing keen interest in SEL and many may already be providing some programming to support this area (Schonert-Reichl & Hymel, 2007). For example, Schonert-Reichl & Hymel (2007) indicated that SEL programming has been incorporated into British Columbian schools and has yielded many benefits. Overall, there is little information available on Canadian school educators (e.g., teachers, principals, guidance counselors, etc.) perspectives on SEL or information on previous training, knowledge and resources for incorporating SEL in the Canadian context. These aspects are crucial to explore when evaluating the feasibility of implementing SEL programming in schools (a description of previous Non-Canadian findings on these aspects are found below). While there may be similarities with countries where research on SEL has been conducted, there is no evidence to suggest that these results would completely generalize to a Canadian context. For example, the Canadian education system is provincially mandated while the U.S. is centralized and therefore, their rigid application and implementation of SEL programming may not be cohesive in a Canadian context (Collie, Martin & Frydenberg, 2017). Furthermore, Canada is a bi-lingual

(French and English) country and educators here might emphasize the need for bi-lingual SEL materials. SEL studies from Hong Kong, Korea, China, New Zealand, the Pacific Islands and Singapore might also not fit the Canadian context as they are collectivist nations which emphasize the group while Canada, an individualist nation, emphasizes the individual (Collie, Martin & Frydenberg, 2017). Educators from these collectivist countries may emphasize barriers and opportunities for SEL that differ from Canadian educators. The literature demonstrates that there is a strong relationship between SEL instruction and context (Collie, Shapka & Perry, 2012). As a result, it may be unlikely that applying non- Canadian SEL feasibility studies to Canada will entirely capture views held by Canadian educators on the feasibility of SEL implementation.

The Benefits of SEL

According to the Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL) Model, Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) facilitates the development of attitudes, knowledge and skills required to 1) understand and manage emotions, 2) set and achieve goals, 3) feel and show empathy for others, 4) establish and maintain positive relationships and 5) make responsible decisions (Elbertson, Bracket & Weissberg, 2009). CASEL was created in order to promote and foster evidence- based SEL integration into education (CASEL, 2019). It consists of a group of researchers who summarize the knowledge gathered from quality SEL studies and provide this knowledge to educators and policy makers (CASEL, 2019). CASEL has also provided a model for SEL which consists of five core domains. These domains consist of social and emotional competencies that are involved in developing the skills and benefits described above. Below are detailed descriptions of all domains:

Self-Awareness. This domain describes the ability to identify emotions in oneself and adequately manage them. Additionally, it is awareness of one's strength's and limitations as well as self-confidence and self-efficacy (CASEL, 2019). Developing self-awareness has been linked to a number of benefits. For example, Hippe (2004) has shown that an increase in self-awareness has been linked to an increase in resiliency. Dishon, et al. (2018) has shown that increased self-awareness leads to an increase in meaningful decision-making skills. Self-awareness also decreases "lie-telling behaviours" in children (Bender, O'Connor & Evans, 2018) and increases self-regulation of impulsive actions (Payton, Wardlaw & Graczyk, 2000).

Self-Management. This domain describes one's ability to engage in impulse control,

self-management, self-discipline, motivation, goal setting and organizational skills (CASEL, 2019). The literature indicates various benefits of building self-management skills. For instance, Kern-Koegel, et al. (1992) demonstrated that improved social skills and reduced disruptive behaviours in children can occur through self-management. A study by Mooney et al. (2005) showed that self-management also improved targeted academic outcomes for children who struggle with emotional and behavioural disorders.

Responsible Decision Making. Responsible decision making has been linked to self-awareness, another extremely important domain of SEL (as described above) (Van Huynh, 2018). This domain includes the ability to identify, analyze, evaluate and reflect in order to solve social issues, emotional issues and daily problems (CASEL, 2019). Payton et al. (2000) indicated that improved responsible decision-making skills enhanced the health of young people and decreased risky behaviours (e.g., violent behaviour, drug use, risky sexual behaviours and school drop-out).

Relationship Skills. This domain involves the ability to communicate, engage others socially, build positive and healthy relationships and engage in teamwork (CASEL, 2019). Helker & Ray (2009) demonstrated that effectively building relationship skills will work to reduce externalizing behaviours of students who show borderline/clinically high levels of externalizing behaviours. Additionally, Littlefield et al. (2017) indicated that positive relationships lead to a sense of belonging and connectedness which are foundational elements to positive mental health.

Social Awareness. This domain describes the ability to take on different perspectives (i.e., the perspective of others), appreciate diversity and have respect for others (CASEL, 2019). There are many benefits associated with good social awareness skills such as an increase in ethical growth. Galil et al. (2019) demonstrates that increased social awareness works to decrease cheating behaviours in children as they are more aware of the impact that cheating may have on others.

Evidence-Based SEL Programs and Benefits

Currently, there are a number of international evidence-based SEL programs available (Dusenbury, Zadrazil, & Mart, 2011; Durlak, Weissberg & Dymnicki, 2011). International research on SEL has found that the implementation in schools fosters the improvement and development of positive social and emotional skills, positive behaviour, about self and others and

improved academic performance (Caldarella, Christensen & Kramer, 2009; Merrel, Juskelis, & Tran, 2008; Durlark, Weissberg & Dymnicki, 2011; Payton, Weissberg & Durlack, 2008; Bierman, Coie & Dodge 2010; Kramer & Caldarella, 2009; Kendziora & Yoder, 2016). Furthermore, SEL has been shown to reduce conduct problems and emotional distress in students (Durlak, Weissberg & Dymnicki, 2011; Bierman, Coie & Dodge, 2010). Below is a non-exhaustive list of examples of evidence-based Social and Emotional Learning programs and their associated benefits:

4Rs (Reading, Writing, Respect and Resolution). This program is for pre-kindergarten to 8th grade students and has been primarily implemented in the U.S. (Jones et al., 2010). The 4Rs program includes: a) teachers reading students a story about a conflict (e.g., bullying), b) engaging students in books talks (e.g., discussion, writing and roleplaying) about the story to assist in better understanding of the content (e.g., how the characters in the story felt) and c) the applied learning lesson (e.g., understanding the negativity of putting others down) (CASEL, 2019). This program is divided into seven units and is delivered in approximately 35 lessons per year (CASEL, 2019). Jones et al. (2010) used a cluster randomized controlled trial design to evaluate the 4R's and demonstrated that the program improved academic outcomes, increased social behaviour, decreased conduct problems and reduced emotional distress.

Michigan Model for Health. This program is for kindergarten to 12th grade students and has been primarily implemented in the U.S (O'Neill, et al. 2011). This program is a prevention-based approach that provides students with lessons that help build skills for positive lifestyle behaviours (e.g., physical activity, safety lessons, alcohol and tobacco awareness, etc.) (CASEL, 2019). The Michigan Model for Health is delivered in 8-14 lessons per year. This program has been evaluated by O'Neill et al. (2011) using a randomized control trial and was demonstrated to increase positive social behaviour and decrease conduct problems.

Positive Action. This program is for kindergarten to 12th grade students and is also implemented primarily in the U.S. (Duncan, Washburn & Lewis, 2017). This program is delivered in lessons (a step-by-step script based around a theme, e.g., bullying, conflict resolution, etc.) that promote a healthy self-concept and teach positive actions for body and mind (CASEL, 2019). Positive Action is delivered in approximately 140 lessons per year for each grade level. Duncan et al. (2017) evaluated the effects of this program using a cluster-randomized trial that involved grade 3 to 8 students across 14 schools. This study demonstrated

that Positive Action improved academic outcomes as well as reduced conduct problems (Duncan, Washburn & Lewis, 2017).

Promotional Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS). This program is for kindergarten to 6th grade students and is primarily used in the U.S. (Domitrovich, et al. 2007). The PATHS program consists of lessons that promote conflict resolution, how to regulate one's emotions, empathy and responsible decision making (CASEL, 2019). PATHS is delivered in approximately 40-52 lessons a year per grade. Domitrovich et al. (2007) evaluated this program using a randomized control trial. This study demonstrated that PATHS improved academic outcomes, increased positive social behaviour, reduced conduct problems and reduced emotional distress in students (Domitrovich, Cortes & Greenberg, 2007).

Results from Non-Canadian SEL Feasibility Studies

Previous non-Canadian studies have evaluated the feasibility of implementing evidence-based SEL programming. These studies included the evaluation of teacher attitudes about SEL (e.g., Bridgeland, Bruce & Hariharan, 2013), resources needed for SEL (e.g., Kendziora & Yoder, 2016), educator knowledge about SEL (e.g., Buchanan, Guldner & Tran 2009), job stress (Buchanan, Guldner & Tran 2009) and current SEL practices (Schonert- Reichl & Hymel, 2007). Detailed below are how the results from non-Canadian studies implicated these domains in the feasibility of SEL implementation.

Attitudes about SEL. Bracket et al. (2011) indicated that understanding educator's attitudes about SEL are crucial for assessing program implementation as positive attitudes are associated with increased teacher buy-in. Non-Canadian research (e.g., U.S., Chinese, U.K., etc.) has shown that teachers see the value of implementing SEL in the classroom (Bridgeland, Bruce & Hariharan, 2013; Kam, Wong & Fung, 2011; Buchanan, Guldner & Tran, 2009; Humphrey, Lendrum & Wigelsworth, 2010). For example, Buchanan et al. (2009), demonstrated that 98.9% of educators from the U.S. endorsed SEL as an important contributor to success in school and life, 96.2% believe SEL enhances academic outcomes and 68.9% believe SEL should be taught in schools. Qualitative results from a U.K. study demonstrate that poorer attitudes regarding SEL will lead to a decrease in implementation (Humphrey, Lendrum & Wigelsworth, 2010). While many teachers do identify the need and recognize the importance of SEL (Bridgeland, Bruce & Hariharan, 2013; Kam, Wong & Fung, 2011; Buchanan, Guldner & Tran, 2009), challenges to its incorporation have been voiced (Kendziora & Yoder, 2016; Buchanan, Guldner & Tran, 2009).

These challenges included the need for SEL resources, knowledge about SEL (e.g., access to training), and job stress (Buchanan, Guldner & Trann, 2009).

Resources Needed for SEL. Concerns regarding general resources for implementing SEL have been raised in many non-Canadian studies (e.g., Humphrey, Lendrum & Wigerlsworth, 2010; Buchanan & Guldner, 2009). For example, some U.S. educators indicated that they are already struggling to cover academic curriculum due to time constraints which would prohibit additional instruction (Kendziora & Yoder, 2016; Buchanan, Guldner & Tran 2009). Furthermore, half of these educators identified a lack of time as significant barrier and many found it difficult to make time for SEL lesson preparation and teaching (Buchanan, Guldner & Tran, 2009). Additionally, Kendziora et al. (2016) found that there are school districts in the U.S. who receive funds for SEL, but educators indicated that the funds they receive are not sufficient enough to cover all the costs of programming. A U.K. study indicated that both national and local funding for SEL programming must allocated in order to foster effective implementation of SEL in schools (Humphrey, Lendrum & Wigerlsworth, 2010). As indicated in Humphrey, et al. (2010), without access to general resources (e.g., funding time, SEL supplies, etc.), it is evident that the feasibility of implementing Social and Emotional Learning in schools may significantly decrease.

Knowledge about SEL. An Australian review of SEL studies indicated that educator knowledge about SEL was paramount for effective feasibility of SEL implementation (Freeman, 2017). Freeman et al. (2017) indicates that varied forms of training exist for the development of SEL knowledge. Training might include self-help, short-duration piecemeal professional development, comprehensive professional development and program manuals from various SEL programs (Freeman, 2017). Unfortunately, Freeman et al. (2017) indicated that short-duration training and SEL program manuals may not be effective for SEL knowledge building in educators as they have failed to foster change in teacher SEL practice. In the U.S., the majority of teachers indicated knowing the term SEL but indicated a lack of SEL training as a major issue (Buchanan, Guldner & Tran, 2009). Specifically, they endorse a lack of SEL training as a barrier for SEL implementation (Buchanan, Guldner & Tran 2009). Additionally, some U.S. teachers find the challenge of student mental health concerns an area that they are unprepared for as they lack knowledge in this area (Buchanan, Guldner & Tran 2009). Without opportunities to build knowledge in SEL (e.g., training programs), there may be a decrease in the feasibility of

implementing SEL programming in Canadian Schools.

Job Stress. An Australian and Asian-Pacific review and a U.S. study of SEL demonstrated that teacher stress decreases the ability to effectively implement SEL programming in classrooms (Frydenberg, Martin & Collie, 2017; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009). For example, U.S. teachers identify large class sizes as a major stressor and approximately half of them indicated that this makes it difficult to implement SEL (Buchanan & Guldner, 2009). Frydenberg, et al. (2017) also identified time constraints as a source of stress for Australian and Asian-Pacific educators. Time constraints were largely linked to other teacher stressors such as curriculum and administrative demands (Frydenberg, Martin & Collie, 2017). Without remediation of this issue, we may find that the feasibility of implementing SEL will be decreased in Canadian schools.

Current SEL Practices. Studies from the U.S., Australia, Asia-Pacific, China and U.K., demonstrated that educators are already making efforts to implement SEL in their classroom some way (Frydenberg & Martin, 2017; Freeman, 2017; Humphrey, Lendrum & Wigelsworth, 2010). For example, in Australia, SEL is delivered through mental health initiatives called KidsMatter and MindsMatter (Frydenberg & Martin, 2017). In Asia-Pacific, SEL is embedded within citizenship and values education curricula. This demonstrates that many systems and educators acknowledge the importance and value of implementing Social and Emotional Learning in classrooms. In a U.S. study, 67% of educators indicated that evidence-based SEL curriculum was being implemented in their classes while 54.5% reported implementing SEL on their own and 12.9% reported that another individual implements SEL in their classroom. It appears that SEL incorporation is valued and implemented to some degree across a number of diverse countries and cultures.

Despite research indicating benefit for social, emotional and academic outcomes, Non-Canadian studies (as demonstrated above) indicated challenges and barriers that will impact teacher readiness and willingness to implement evidence based SEL programming. It is important to understand these impacts on SEL implementation in a Canadian context in order to fully understand the feasibility of implementing evidence-based SEL programming in Canada.

The Current Study

SEL holds potential to reduce behavioural and emotional problems while enhancing social and emotional competence, academic performance and overall well-being. The need for

SEL has been widely acknowledged by teachers worldwide (Bridgeland, Bruce & Hariharan, 2013; Kam, Wong & Fung, 2011; Buchanan, Guldner & Tran, 2009). However, previous research has not focused on SEL instruction in a Canadian context and therefore, we do not understand the perspectives of SEL from educators who work in this context, leaving a gap in the literature. We need to ensure that programming, training and policy for SEL fits Canadian needs. To do so, it is essential to directly examine Canadian teacher's SEL perspectives, knowledge and current practices to inform evidence-based SEL practice. This study evaluated Canadian educators 1) perceived SEL knowledge, 2) current SEL practices 3) access to resources, 4) job stress and 5) perceived contributors to the feasibility of SEL implementation. These topics were chosen from previous non-Canadian feasibility studies on SEL implementation (as discussed above).

Pre-study Anticipated Findings

We anticipated that Canadian school educators would identify issues for the implementation of SEL that are similar to issues identified in non-Canadian SEL feasibility research. However, given the different context of Canadian schools, we thought we may find that teachers identify other issues or emphasize issues more than non-Canadian populations. As a result, previous literature on other educator's perspectives of SEL implementation may not be completely generalizable to Canadian schools. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to collect information on Canadian school educator's perspectives for the incorporation of SEL programming. This information was collected via survey and can be used to inform policy, training and to contribute to future programming development of SEL in Canadian schools.

As shown in previous non-Canadian studies, we expected that Canadian school educators have some knowledge about SEL and are already incorporating some aspects of SEL into their classrooms (e.g., Schonert-Reichl & Hymel, 2007). However, paralleling previous research (e.g., Buchanan, Guldner & Tran 2009) we anticipated many teachers will endorse various barriers that effect the feasibility of SEL incorporation, including resources, teacher/principal stress, knowledge about SEL, and attitudes about SEL. We expected that composite scores for teacher/principal stress would be negatively correlated with the feasibility of implementing SEL and resources. We expected that composite scores for knowledge about SEL would be positively correlated with feasibility of implementing SEL and resources. Further, we also expected that positive attitudes of SEL and resources would be positively correlated with

feasibility of implementing SEL. Finally, we anticipated that specific resources might contribute more to the feasibility of SEL than others (e.g., support from school personnel such as principal, time, money, materials and guidance).

Methodology

Study Design

The design of this study was non-experimental as we were not manipulating any of the IV's. Specifically, it was observational and cross-sectional as we asked participants to provide information via questionnaire for our review and were not using follow-up questionnaires. We analyzed the numerical information provided to us on the questionnaire using quantitative analyses and qualitative analyses were used to evaluate open ended questions. Due to the utilization of both quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis, this study was considered to be mixed-methods.

Participants

Participant's (teachers, principals and other educators that may take part in teaching SEL) were recruited across Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. In addition, since Canada is heterogenous in terms of regions and curricula, we aimed to include a relatively homogenous population, and thus 'Prairie' teachers and school staff were recruited. Prairie provinces may be more similar to each other than other locations for demographic reasons, and also because they tend to use the same instructional curricula (Wester and Northern Canadian Protocol, 2016). The inclusion criteria for these participants included: 1) employment with a school division or private school in one of the provinces indicated above and 2) the ability to independently read and write in English to complete the consent form and measures. Recruitment was done through e-mails sent to teacher's associations and relevant social media postings (e.g., Twitter and Facebook). The e-mail and social media postings briefly described the study, how long it takes and the contact information of the researchers. A link to the study questionnaire was provided in the e-mail and social media postings so that if the individual wished to participate, they could click on this link.

Once the participant clicked on the link, they would be taken to the consent form. This form described the study in detail: the purpose of the study, how long it will take to complete, the contact information of the researchers and other ethical considerations. If the participant chose to

participate, they were instructed to click “I agree to participate in the research study” at the bottom of the consent form and informed consent was considered to be endorsed. They were then taken to the study questionnaire which asked participants about their views on SEL, current practices and barriers to SEL implementation. If the participant did not wish to participate, they clicked “I do not agree to participate in this research study” and the survey was closed.

Survey Measure

Survey construction. This survey was developed by our research team using measures from previous research (Lambert & McCarthy, 2001; Fisher, Lamber & McCarthy 2009; Lambert & McCarthy, 2009; Buchanan, Guldner & Tran, 2009; Shea, Jacobs & Esserman 2014; Bracket, Reyes & Rivers, 2012) and was modified with more regionally applicable questions based on expert input from teachers focus groups from Manitoba. Once a survey was created, it was pilot tested to ensure quality (relevance and understandability) by pre-service teachers (pilot survey test). The modification and testing phases of this survey are described:

- 1) Focus groups: A group of Manitoban teachers (elementary school, middle school and high school teachers and one special education teacher) participated in focus groups and gave their input regarding their perspectives, attitudes and beliefs about SEL. These teachers identified the importance of SEL, but also expressed concern for barriers for implementation including time constraints, incompatibility of students needs with available programs and the belief that SEL was not a priority.
- 2) Pilot test: The survey was taken by pre-service teachers who are undergraduates in the Bachelor of Education program at the University of Manitoba. They looked over the questionnaire and rated each question in terms of relevance and understandability. If the question was rated as very low in terms of relevance and understandability by three or more out of twenty participants, it was modified for improvement by a panel of three University of Manitoba researchers. For example, one Likert-scale item asked how demanding their “Class size” was. This item was modified with added detail for clarity and changed to “Managing class size (e.g., a large number of students).”

The questionnaire was administered using the data collection software Qualtrics (Qualtrics_LLC, 2016). The majority of the questionnaire items were structured (close- ended) as these are often quicker for participants to complete. Responses for structured questions were

given in categorical or Likert scale form. Participants responded to Likert- scale questions in terms of how demanding a situation is (1- Very demanding – 6- Not at all demanding), how familiar they were with certain aspects of SEL (1- Not at all familiar– 6- Very familiar), how true statements are (1- Not at all true– 6- Very true), agreement (1- Strongly disagree– 6- Strongly agree) and how supportive resources are (1- Not at all – 6- Very). Some questions were open-ended to allow participants to provide more rich information about their responses.

Survey description. The survey consists of 9 sections. The goal of this survey is to assess Prairie Canadian teachers for their demographic information, teaching background, teacher related stress, knowledge about SEL, attitudes about SEL, current SEL practices, resources and how feasible it is to implement SEL. Objectives of the survey and examples of the survey questions are described below.

Section 1: Demographic Information. Participants self-reported their demographic information including the province they currently live in to indicate the province of employment, gender, age and details about their education.

Section 2: Teaching Background. Participants indicated their teaching background including current position in their school, how long they have been teaching and which subjects and grades they teach.

Section 3: Teacher/Principal Stress. Participants indicated their general work-related stress. Items from this section asked how demanding certain aspects of their job are and how helpful their resources are. These items were adapted and modified from a previous study evaluating school demands and job stress (Lambert & McCarthy, 2001; Fisher, Lambert & McCarthy 2009; Lambert & McCarthy, 2009).

Section 4: Knowledge about SEL. Participants shared their understanding and views of their schools understanding of SEL and mental health. The items in this section are similar to those used in a previous study evaluating teachers understanding of SEL (Buchanan, Guldner & Tran, 2009). Some items were modified from those found in a study assessing organizational readiness for implementation and change (Shea, Jacobs & Esserman 2014).

Section 5: Attitudes about SEL. Participants indicated their beliefs about SEL. These items are similar to those used in a previous study evaluating teachers' beliefs about SEL (Bracket, Reyes & Rivers, 2012).

Section 6: Current SEL Practices in Schools. Participants indicated whether SEL is

being incorporated into their classroom, how they teach SEL and who implements SEL in their school/building. These items are similar to those found in a previous study on teacher's beliefs (Bracket, Reyes & Rivers, 2012) and understanding of SEL (Buchanan, Guldner & Tran, 2009). Some items were modified from those found in a study assessing organizational readiness for implementation and change (Shea, Jacobs & Esserman 2014).

Section 7: Resources. Participant's reported access to resources in their school in terms of how supportive particular school personnel are and what resources they have for implementing SEL. These items are similar to those in previous studies evaluating teacher resources, demands (Lambert & McCarthy, 2001; Lambert & McCarthy, 2009) and views of SEL (Buchanan, Guldner & Tran 2009). Some items were heavily modified from those found in a study assessing organizational readiness for implementation and change (Shea, Jacobs & Esserman 2014).

Section 8: Feasibility in Implementing SEL. Teachers reported how feasible they feel implementing SEL is. These questions were based on those asked in a previous study on teachers' perspectives of SEL (Buchanan, Guldner & Tran 2009).

Section 9: Open ended questions. Participants indicated how much time they need to prepare material to teach an SEL program, what supports, and resources would make SEL programming more practical, and additional thoughts or concerns about SEL programming.

Procedure

Participants were recruited via e-mail through their teacher's associations, or by posters on social media platforms. The e-mail/ poster: 1) introduced the questionnaire, 2) provided an estimate of the time required to complete the questionnaire, 3) ensured confidentiality of the participant, 4), provided contact information for questions about the study and 5) provided a link to the questionnaire. By clicking on the survey, the participants were taken to the online questionnaire and were first presented with the consent form. Clicking "I agree to participate in this research study" took participants to the questionnaire. Participants were permitted to stop and resume their session at any time.

Analyses

Data was exported from Qualtrics into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. It was then cleaned and missing values were managed by coding them as 888 and dealt with using pairwise deletion. This method was chosen because it preserves the most information within a data set. Specifically, pairwise deletion will filter out missing data points while maintaining all other data points within a case. After cleaning and managing missing values, the data was then uploaded to Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for statistical analysis.

Descriptive statistics including frequencies, means and standard deviations were calculated and reported for each relative domain of the questionnaire. Table 1 describes the analyses done for each domain within the questionnaire.

Assumption Testing for Multiple Regression Analyses. The data was evaluated to ensure that assumptions for running multiple regression analyses were met. A Scatterplot was produced for each of the IV's (knowledge about SEL, attitudes about SEL, teacher stress and resources) and the DV (feasibility of implementing SEL). These scatterplots demonstrated a relatively linear relationship between each of the IV's and the DV. Collinearity Statistics were run for each IV which resulted in VIF's (knowledge about SEL= 1.19, attitudes toward SEL= 1.21, teacher stress= 1.13 and resources= 1.09) below 10 for each, showing no multicollinearity in the data. The Durbin-Watson Statistic of 1.76 demonstrated that there is little autocorrelation in the data and that residuals are relatively independent. Furthermore, a Probability-Plot (P-P) demonstrated that residuals were normally distributed. The assumption of homoscedasticity was evaluated by plotting standardized predicted values against standardized residuals using a scatter plot. Data points demonstrated close alignment indicating that this assumption had been met. Finally, a Cook's Distance of .014 (less than 1) indicated no outliers influencing the data set. All of the assumptions discussed above were met and determined that this data set is normal. As a result, multiple regression analyses can be used to analyze the data.

Table 1. Planned analyses for each questionnaire domain.

Domain	Item Type(s)	Analysis
Demographic Information	Multiple choice	Frequencies were calculated for province, gender, age and completed degrees. An average was calculated for age across participants.
Teaching Background	Multiple choice Fill in the blank	Frequencies were calculated for job title, subjects taught, and grade level taught. An average for length of time teacher has taught was calculated across participants .
Teacher/ Principal Stress	Multiple choice	Responses to items were coded (e.g., 1- Not at all demanding, 2- Mostly not demanding, 3- Mildly not demanding, 4- Mildly demanding, 5- Mostly demanding, 6- Very demanding). After being coded, each participants scores were added up to produce a composite score. Higher scores indicated high levels of participant stress.

Knowledge about SEL

Multiple choice

An average was then calculated across participants.

Responses to items were coded (e.g., 1- Not at all, 2- Mostly unfamiliar, 3- Mildly unfamiliar, 4- Mildly familiar, 5- Mostly familiar, 6- Very familiar). After being coded, each participants scores were added up to produce a composite score. Higher scores indicated better knowledge about SEL. Overall average across participants was calculated

Attitudes about SEL

Multiple choice

Responses to items were coded (e.g., 1- Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3- Slightly disagree, 4- Slightly agree, 5- Agree, 6- Strongly agree). After being coded, each participants scores were added up to produce a composite score. Higher scores indicated more positive attitudes toward SEL. Overall average across participants is calculated.

Current SEL Practices	Multiple choice Multiple choice (check all that apply)	<p>Frequencies were calculated for how often and how the participant teaches SEL in their classroom (if applicable) and who the individuals are that are currently implementing SEL in the participants classroom/ building.</p> <p>Participants were asked how often they incorporated SEL into their classroom (1- never, 2- monthly, 3- weekly, 4- daily). These responses were recoded into 1- practices SEL (from 2- monthly, 3-weekly and 4- daily) and 0- does not practice SEL (from 1- never). Binomial Logistic Regression Analysis was used to determine how the IVs (teacher/ principal stress, knowledge about SEL, attitudes about SEL and resources) predict whether teachers incorporate SEL in the classroom.</p>
Resources	Multiple choice	<p>Response to items were coded (e.g., 1- Not at all, 2- Mostly not, 3- Mildly not, 4- Mildly, 5- Mostly, 6- Very). After</p>

being coded, each participants scores were added up to produce a composite score. Higher scores indicated better resources for implementing SEL. Overall average across participants is calculated. Averages are calculated across participants for each item and then Multiple Regression Analysis is used to determine how each resource effects feasibility

Feasibility

Multiple choice

Responses to items were coded (e.g., 1- Not at all, 2- Mostly not, 3- Mildly not, 4- Mildly, 5- Mostly, 6- Very). After being coded, individual participant scores were added up to produce a composite score. Higher scores indicated better feasibility for implementing SEL. Overall average across participants was calculated. Multiple Regression was used to determine how teacher/ principal stress, knowledge about SEL, attitudes about SEL and resources

contributed to the feasibility of implementing SEL.

Open Ended Questions

Long answer

Long answer questions were evaluated using content analysis which entailed coding and categorizing data. Additionally, constant comparison method from Grounded theory (as used in Ngulube 2015) was utilized. Content analysis involves two researchers independently analyzing open ended responses to identify subthemes and themes. After independently coding open-ended responses, constant comparison method, was used where researchers collaborated to review and compare their emergent subthemes and themes until a consensus on subthemes and themes was reached (as in Fischer, 2015).

Note: For full items see Appendix C.

Results

Demographics

This study consisted of 91 participants from the Prairie Canadian Provinces with an

average age of 39.3 (SD= 9.25). During the study, some attrition occurred partway through completion, and as a result, 84 completed the full questionnaire. Table 2 and 3 describes participant demographic information, occupation, education and grades and subjects taught.

Quantitative Results

Teacher/principal stress. The majority of participants (62.7%) did not endorse school responsibilities (e.g., supervising recess, coaching sports, etc.) as demanding (see Table 4). However, most participants rated paperwork or administrative responsibilities (e.g., report card writing, attendance, etc.) (73.7%), finding instructional resources (e.g., guides, professional development workshops, etc.) (57.2%), managing class size (e.g., a large number of students) (69.3%), managing student behaviours (78.1%) and student mental health issues (90.2%) as being mildly to very demanding.

Knowledge about SEL. Some participants, 19 (21.3%), reported that they have received no SEL training (see Table 5). The majority of participants who have received SEL training, indicated receiving this training through professional development workshops (33.7%) and self-study (23.6%). Most participants reported being mildly to very familiar with the term SEL (78.7%) and knowledgeable about SEL (65.2%). Additionally, more than half of participants indicated feeling mildly to very confident teaching SEL programming in their classroom (59.5%).

Attitudes of SEL. Most participants agree that SEL is important to be successful in life and school (97.7%) (see Table 6). Similarly, the majority of participants believe SEL programming should be implemented school-wide (94.3%) and that all teachers should receive training/support on how to teach SEL skills (96.7%). The majority of participants also believe that SEL should be integrated into daily instruction (92%) and that it is their job to teach SEL (92.1%).

Current SEL Practices. Of 87 participants who responded to current SEL practices items, only 4 (4.6%) reported not incorporating SEL at all into their classroom (see Table 7). The majority of participants who reported teaching SEL in their classroom indicated they did so by incorporating it into informal lessons (81.6%). Approximately half of participants incorporate SEL into lessons (52.9%) and some incorporate it into games (37.9%), curriculum (28.7%) and

in other ways (e.g., teachable moments which are teaching opportunities that may arise in everyday life such as play ground conflicts) (25.3%).

Resources: Accessing school personnel for any type of support. The majority of participants (72.1%) reported accessing team leaders (e.g., principals and vice principals) for support (see Table 8). Of these participants, approximately half (53.5%) found team leaders to be mildly to very helpful. The majority of participants (74.7%) reported accessing school counselors for support. Of these participants, approximately half (48.2%) found school counselors to be mildly to very helpful. Most participants (90.4%) reported accessing other teachers (their peers) for support. Of these participants, the majority (60.2%) found teachers (their peers) to be mildly to very helpful).

Resources: Other. Most participants (61.9%) reported that they do not have the time needed to teach SEL in their school (see Table 9). Similarly, the majority of participants (69%) indicated that they do not have funds (69%), materials (e.g., lessons) (71.5%) or access SEL guidance and coaching (78.6%) in order to teach SEL.

Predictors of Feasibility of Implementing SEL. A significant positive correlation was only demonstrated between ratings of attitudes about SEL and the ratings of feasibility of implementing SEL, $r(79) = .38, p < .001$ (see Table 10). Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was used to determine how much of the variance in the DV (feasibility of implementing SEL) was accounted for by the IV's (knowledge about SEL, attitudes about SEL, resources and teacher stress). The analysis indicated that attitudes toward SEL ($\beta = .97, p < .001$) and resources ($\beta = .36, p < .01$) contributed significantly to the feasibility of implementing SEL. Multiple linear regression analysis was also run to determine which types of resources (time, funding, material and access to guidance and coaching) for implementing SEL contributed significantly to SEL feasibility. Results indicated that having time to teach SEL in the classroom predicted higher feasibility rates for implementing SEL ($\beta = 1.69, p < .05$).

Predictors of SEL being Taught in the Classroom. Binomial Logistic Regression was run to determine which of the IV's (knowledge about SEL, attitudes about SEL, resources and teacher stress) significantly predicted whether or not Prairie Canadian educators incorporated SEL into their classroom. This analysis showed that resources ($\chi^2(4) = 6.40, p < .05$) and knowledge about SEL ($\chi^2(4) = 14.90, p < .001$) contributed significantly to SEL classroom

incorporation. The odds of incorporating SEL into the classroom were 1.28 times higher for participants with more resources than participants with less resources, $b = .25$, $p < .05$, $OR = 1.28$ (95% CI: 1.01, 1.62). Similarly, the odds of incorporating SEL into the classroom were 1.69 times higher for participants with greater knowledge of SEL than for those with less knowledge of SEL, $b = .52$, $p < .001$, $OR = 1.69$ (95% CI: 1.17, 2.45).

Qualitative Results

As described in the methods section, content analysis and constant comparison method within a Grounded Theory Framework (as described in Table 1) was used to analyze each of the open-ended question responses (see Table 1). Participants ideas were often assigned to more than one theme as the content of many of their responses could reflect multiple, overlapping themes.

Supports and resources needed to make SEL implementation more practical.

Responses to this item were split into 7 subthemes: Access to 1) Program material, 2) Formal training, 3) Diverse programming, 4) Personnel support, as well as 5) Identification of barriers for implementing SEL, 6) Unspecified resources and 7) Current SEL Practices (see Table 11). Most participant responses subscribe to the Access to program material theme, specifically, participants discuss the need for access to SEL lesson plans and lesson plan material (57.6%). For example, when responding to this item, one participant indicated needing specific types of materials including, “task booklets, discussion topics for activities, and curriculum on what to teach” to make SEL implementation more feasible. The second most subscribed to theme is Access to formal training. Most participants whose responses subscribe to this theme indicated wanting access to professional development (18.2%) and general training (18.2%) regarding SEL. For example, one participant indicated needing “School wide systems PD [*professional development*]” and another indicated needing “More training for teachers” in order to make SEL implementation more feasible.

Another commonly occurring and clearly important theme highlighted by participants was Access to diverse programming, specifically the Applicable to French Immersion sub-theme (6.1%). For example, one participant indicated requiring French resources in order to increase the feasibility of implementing SEL programming in French Immersion schools. This emerging sub-theme speaks to the unique bi-lingual school system that exists in Canada. Clearly, access to various support for effective SEL implementation was an issue for many of our participants.

Additional thoughts and/or concerns about SEL programming. Responses to this item were split into 3 main themes: 1) Recognizing SEL is needed, 2) Barriers for implementing SEL and 3) Suggestions for SEL incorporation. The majority of participant responses subscribed to the Barriers for implementing SEL theme. Those whose responses subscribed to this theme mostly discussed time constraints (31%) and attitudes (20.7%) as barriers. For example, one participant stated “How much more can teachers take on? There are other curriculum demands that are not going away” implying that there is not enough time to meet all academic and SEL goals. Another participant indicated that “Teacher buy in” is important for increased feasibility of implementing SEL programming, implying that there are teachers who do not believe in SEL approaches. Many participant responses also subscribed to the Recognizing SEL is needed theme. The majority of those whose responses subscribed to this theme discussed the importance of SEL (62.1%) and the increasing mental health needs of students (17.2%). For example, one participant stated, “Social-emotional learning is imperative in education.” Another participant said, “With all the talk/ focus on mental health issues, etc., I would say that SEL programming would be quite beneficial to our students in helping them be successful in their schooling and lives!” It is evident that, despite challenges, educators see incorporating SEL as a worth while endeavour.

Discussion

Student challenging behaviour, bullying and psychological distress are increasingly common in schools (e.g., Gilliam & Sahar, 2006; Raver & Knitzer, 2002; Rimm- Kaufman, Pianta & Cox, 2009; Jerome, Hamre & Pianta, 2009; Reinke, Herman & Petras, 2013; Samara, Marlow & Wolke, 2008; Seeley, Tombari & Bennett, 2011; Tishelman, Haney & Greenwald-O’Brien, 2010) and has highlighted the need for evidence-based SEL intervention. The aim of this study was to understand educator’s perspectives and practices related to the feasibility of implementing SEL programming in Prairie Canadian schools to help inform, and potentially shape policy, guidelines and training. This was done by examining current SEL practices, challenges and barriers and opportunities for SEL implementation. Survey findings from both multiple choice and open-ended questions are presented below.

Current SEL Climate in Prairie Canadian Schools

Paralleling other non-Canadian studies (e.g., Schonert-Reichl & Hymel, 2007; Buchnan,

Guldner & Tran, 2009, Freeman, 2017), the current study demonstrated that 95.4% of Prairie Canadian educators indicated regularly incorporating SEL into their classroom. Much like the review of SEL programs in Australia and Pacific Asia, Prairie Canadian educators are implementing SEL programming in various forms (Frydenberg, Martin & Collie, 2017). Specifically, our study demonstrated that educators reported incorporating SEL regularly into formal curriculum (28.7 %), lessons (52.9 %), informal lessons (81.6%), games (37.9 %) and through other methods (25.3%) (e.g., teachable moments). These results fell in contrast with Buchanan et al.'s study where 45.5% of U.S. educators were implementing actual evidence-based SEL programs in their classrooms. As found with U.S. educators (Bracket, Reyes & Rivers, 2012), the current study indicated that positive attitudes about SEL increased SEL practice for Prairie Canadian educators. For example, Bracket, et al. (2012), found that positive attitudes increased educator SEL buy-in which led to an increase in program incorporation for U.S. teachers. Therefore, increased positive attitudes about SEL may explain why many Prairie Canadian educators are regularly incorporating SEL in their classroom.

Similar to U.S. and Chinese educators (Buchanan, Guldner & Tran, 2009; 2013; Kam, Wong & Fung, 2011), the majority of Prairie Canadian educators in this study indicated positive attitudes toward SEL. For example, in Buchanan, et al. (2009), 98.9% of U.S. educators indicated that SEL was important for success in school and life and 96.9% believed it to be important for academic outcomes. This is similar to the 92% of Prairie Canadians in this study who also indicated believing in the benefits of SEL. However, it appears that more Prairie Canadians feel positively about implementing SEL programming in the classroom compared to their U.S. and Chinese counterparts. Only 68.9% of U.S. educators and 65% of Chinese educators indicated believing SEL should be taught in the classroom (Kam, Wong & Fung, 2011; Buchanan, Guldner & Tran, 2009). This is compared to 92% of Prairie Canadian educators who believe SEL should be integrated into daily instruction and the 92.1% that believe it is their job to teach SEL programming. Overall, 95.4% of Prairie Canadian educators from this study indicated incorporating SEL in their classroom while only 67.4% of U.S. educators in Buchanan et al. (2009) indicated SEL classroom incorporation. A U.K. study by Humphrey et al. (2010) demonstrated that poorer attitudes regarding SEL will lead to a decrease in SEL classroom incorporation. This may explain the discrepancy in levels of SEL classroom incorporation between U.S. and Prairie Canadian educators, as it appears that research indicates fewer U.S.

educators believe SEL should be taught in the classroom.

Our study showed that Prairie Canadian educators indicated that they have had varied levels of SEL training; approximately a quarter did not have any training while most have acquired some training through self-study (23.6%) or professional development workshops (33.7%) (i.e., one day presentation sessions). These results are similar to those found in a U.S. study done by Buchanan et al. (2009) where the need for more formal SEL training opportunities is identified by educators. For example, few U.S. educators indicated attending full or half-day SEL in-service programs (12.9 %-15.5%), post-secondary SEL training (15.2%), workshops (29.5%) and on-site coaching (12.1%) or having prior SEL work experience (13.6%), reading SEL books (18.6%), watching SEL videos (10.6%) and other types of training (3.4%) (Buchanan, Gulder & Tran, 2009). Despite a lack of formal training for Prairie Canadian educators, as found in the U.S. (e.g., Buchanan, Guldner & Tran, 2009), most participants (80.9 %) in the current study indicated having adequate knowledge about SEL. Furthermore, over half express confidence in teaching it in their classroom. Knowledge about SEL programming significantly increases SEL implementation effectiveness (e.g., more positive student outcomes) and reduces barriers to implementation (Reyes, Bracket & Rivers, 2019; Buchanan, Guldner & Tran, 2009). While this information demonstrated that Prairie Canadian educators reported confidence in understanding SEL, it did not indicate any formal training.

Predictors of SEL being taught in the Classroom

While the vast majority of Prairie Canadian educators recognize the importance of SEL and reported that they are informally incorporating it into their classroom, many barriers for the implementation of evidence-based SEL programs were identified. Prairie Canadian educators in this study indicated a lack of access to resources and training as the largest barriers for SEL classroom incorporation. Specifically, educators in this study indicated a lack of time (61.9%), funding (69 %), SEL materials (71.5 %) and SEL guidance and coaching (78.6 %). This is supported by educator responses to open-ended questions where educators indicated requiring more time for SEL instruction (31 %), SEL lesson plan material (57.6 %), SEL professional development (18.2 %) and general SEL training (18.2 %). These results are similar to those found in Buchanan et al. (2009) where educators from the U.S. identified a lack of time for SEL lesson planning (88.3 %) and teaching (90.6%) and funding to pay for SEL material (78%). A study by Kendziora et al. also demonstrated that U.S. educators believed that they did not have

adequate funding to support SEL programming (2016). Additionally, U.S. educators also indicated their level of training (67.9 %) as a barrier to the implementation of SEL programming, implying that they do not feel that their training is sufficient (Buchanan, Guldner & Tran 2009) and more SEL training is required (Kendziora & Yoder, 2016).

SEL studies from our U.S., U.K. and Australian counterparts have also demonstrated the importance of access to resources and training for effective SEL implementation (e.g., Humphrey, Lendrum & Wigerlsworth, 2010; Buchanan & Guldner, 2009; Freeman, 2017). For example, time constraints due to the planning and teaching of regular curriculum as well as administrative demands leave little room for the incorporation of SEL in the classroom. (Frydenberg, Matin & Collie, 2017). Furthermore, if teachers are not granted appropriate funding for programming costs they will not have access to evidence-based SEL materials and therefore be unable to implement it. Similarly, Freeman et al. (2017) shows that educators from Australia indicated that without effective training to build upon SEL knowledge and skills, implementation of evidence-based SEL decreases. Additionally, the short-duration SEL training programs, which the majority of educators receive (as noted earlier), does not foster changes in the SEL practice of educators (Freeman, 2017). It is evident that in order to increase the effectiveness of SEL implementation, policy makers need to provide Prairie Canadian teachers with SEL training and resources, specifically by finding ways to reduce time restraints and increasing access to funding and SEL program material.

A Unique Finding of the Current Study

A finding unique to the current study, is that 6% of Prairie Canadian educators identified the need for French-translated SEL materials. To our knowledge, no other SEL study examining feasibility of implementation has highlighted the need for SEL to be translated into French. While Canada is primarily an English-speaking country, French is the official second language and as a result French Immersion schooling is offered across the country. Currently, within the provinces examined in this study, there are approximately 26 301 students enrolled in French Immersion Schools in Manitoba, 43 797 in Alberta and 16 704 in Saskatchewan (Statistics Canada, 2021). French Immersion is for non-Francophones to develop their French speaking skills to become functionally bilingual (Government of Manitoba, 2009). To do this, the majority of their education is in French. As a result, if Prairie Canadian French Immersion educators are

to implement SEL programming, this programming must be translated into French in order to maintain the integrity of French Immersion schooling.

Limitations

A major limitation of this study is that the data was retrieved from only 3 Canadian provinces: Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan. As a result, the findings from this study may not be generalizable to other Canadian provinces, especially since each province's education system is provincially mandated and therefore differs from province to province. Another limitation of this study is that results may not be entirely generalizable to the individual provinces in which we examined (Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan) due to each province having their own regulations on how education is conducted. In this study, data from the three Prairie Canadian provinces are summarized rather than presented on their own. Future studies may want to explore the feasibility of SEL implementation in specific/ other provinces to gain a more accurate picture of their feasibility barriers and opportunities. Qualitative analyses, specifically content analysis and constant comparison method was used to evaluate open-ended questions. Due to the subjective nature of qualitative analyses, despite using two coders, interpretations may be subject to the bias of the coder's perspectives and experiences. As a result, participants' open-ended responses may have been misinterpreted. Additionally, the responses to open-ended questions were minimal and lacked depth. Therefore, it may not have provided much insight into Prairie Canadian educators' perspectives on SEL implementation. Additionally, only 91 educators participated in this study. While this sample size was effective enough to run our indicated analyses, increasing our sample would lead to increased reliability and decreased variability of results. Furthermore, an increase in sample size would allow results from this study to be more generalizable to Prairie Canadian Provinces.

Future Research

Future research could assess the reliability and validity of the Social and Emotional Learning Questionnaire (SELQ) that was created in this study. As previously noted, future studies can utilize the SELQ to determine the feasibility of implementing evidence-based SEL in other provinces, cities and school divisions. Many Prairie Canadian educators indicate incorporating SEL practices informally into their classroom. Future research may wish to explore the type of informal practices they are using and whether they yield the same benefits as evidence-based SEL programming and to directly examine French Immersion contexts.

Conclusion

As previously noted, past studies have shown us the increasing need for evidence-based SEL intervention in schools (e.g., increased rates of bullying and teacher distress). This study has demonstrated that the majority of Prairie Canadian educators see value in implementing this type of programming. Currently, many of them are attempting to implement SEL largely on their own and informally. However, in order to effectively implement evidence-based SEL programs in Prairie Canadian Schools, policy makers and stakeholders must address barriers regarding the lack of access to SEL training and resources for educators. Further, policy initiatives recognizing teacher time and demands and providing resources to allow time for training, planning and implementation could increase opportunity for effective SEL implementation. Likewise, funding geared toward SEL programming and materials would enhance the likelihood of effective SEL implementation. Without proper development of SEL knowledge and better access to SEL resources and support for implementation, the feasibility of implementation SEL will be much less effective. As a result, Prairie Canadian schools will not reap SEL benefits (described in this study) as their non-Canadian counterparts have.

References

- Bender, J., O'Connor, A. M., & Evans, A. D. (2018). Mirror, Mirror on the wall: Increasing young children's honest through inducing self-awareness. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 167, 414-422.
- Bierman, K.L., Coie, J.D., Dodge, K.A., Greenberg, M.T., Lochman, J.E., McMahon, R.J., Pinderhughes, E. (2010). The Effects of a Multiyear Universal Social-Emotional Learning Program: The Role of Student and School Characteristics. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 78(2), 156-168.
- Brackett, M. A., Reyes, M. R., Rivers, S. E., Elbertson, N. A. & Salovey, P. (2012). Assessing Teachers' Beliefs About Social and Emotional Learning. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 30 (3), 219- 236.
- Bridgeland, J., Bruce, M., & Hariharan, A. (2013). The Missing Piece: A National Teacher Survey on How Social and Emotional Learning Can Empower Children and Transform Schools. Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning. Chicago: Author.
- Buchanan, R., Guldner, B.A., Tran, O.K., & Merrel, K.W. (2009). Social and Emotional Learning in Classrooms: A Survey of Teachers' Knowledge, Perceptions, and Practices. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 25, 187-203.
- CASEL (2019), Evidence of Effectiveness. Retrieved from:
<https://casel.org/guide/ratings/elementary/>
- Caldarella, P., Christensen, L., Kramer, T.J., & Kronmiller, K. (2009). Promoting Social and Emotional Learning in Second Grade Students: A Study of the Strong Start Curriculum. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 37, 51-56.
- Collie, R. J., Shapka, J. D., & Perry, N. E. (2012). School climate and social-emotional learning: Predicting teacher stress, job satisfaction, and teaching efficacy. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104(4), 1189–1204.
- Colle, R. J., Martin, A.J. & Frydenberg, E. (2017). Social and Emotional Learning: A brief overview and issues relevant to Australia and the Asia-Pacific. *Social and Emotional*

Learning in Australia and the Asian Pacific.

- Dishon, N., Oldmeadow, J. A. & Kaufman, J. (2018). Trait self-awareness predicts perceptions of choice meaningfulness in decision-making task. *BMC Research Notes*, 11 (75).
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-018-3191-2>
- Duncan, R., Washburn, I. J., Lewis, K. M., Bavarian, N., DuBois, D. L., Acock, A. C., Vuchinich, S. & Flay, B. R. (2017). Can Universal SEL Programs Benefit Universally? Effects of the Positive Action Program on Multiple Trajectories of Social- Emotional and Misconduct Behaviors. *Prevention Science*, 18, 214- 224.
- Dusenbury, L., Zadzrazil, J., Mart, A., & Weissberg, R. (2011). State learning standards to advance social and emotional learning: The state scan of social and emotional learning standards, preschool through high school. Retrieved from CASEL website:
<http://casel.org/wpcontent/uploads/2011/04/Brief-on-theState-Scan-4-18-2011.pdf>.
- Elbertson, N.A., Bracket, M.A., & Weissberg, R.P. (2009). School- based Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Programming: Current Perspectives. *The Second International Handbook of Educational Change*, 2, 1017-1032.
- Fischer, E. P., Sherman, M. D., McSweeney, J. C., Pyne, J. M., Owen, R. R. & Dixon, L. B. (2015). Perspectives of Family and Veterans on Family Programs to Support Integration of Returning Veterans with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. *Psychological Services*, 12 (3), 187- 198.
- Fisher, M., Lambert, R., & McCarthy, C. (2009). Plans to leave current job. Charlotte, NC: The Center for Educational Measurement and Evaluation.
- Freeman, E. (2017). Building teacher capacity to promote Social and Emotional Learning in Australia. *Social and Emotional Learning in Australia and the Asian-Pacific*, 413- 435.
- Frydenberg, E., Martin, A. J. & Collie, R.J. (2017). *Social and Emotional Learning in Australia and the Asia-Pacific*, Sydney, Australia: Springer Nature Singapore Pte Limited.

- Galil, A., Yarmolovsky, J., Gidron, M. & Geva, R. (2019). Cheating behaviour in children: Integrating gaze allocation and social awareness. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 178, 405-416.
- Gilliam, W. S., & Shahar, G. (2006). Preschool and child care expulsion and suspension: Rates and predictors in one state. *Infants & Young Children*, 19(3), 228-245.
- Government of Manitoba (2009). A Guide to French Immersion in Schools. *Education*.
https://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/k12/schools/fr_imm.html
- Guo, Y. (2011). Perspectives of immigrant Muslim parents: Advocating for religious diversity in Canadian Schools. *Multicultural Education*, (18) 2, 55- 60.
- Helker, W. P. & Ray, D. C. (2009). Impact of child teacher relationship training on teachers' and aides' use of relationship-building skills and the effects on student classroom behavior. *International Journal of Play Therapy*, 18(2), 70–83.
- Hippe, J. (2004). Self-Awareness: A Precursor to Resiliency. *Reclaiming Children & Youth*, 12 (4), 240-242.
- Humphrey, N., Lendrum, A. & Wigelsworth, M. (2010). *Social and emotional aspects of learning (SEAL) in secondary schools: National evaluation*. Research Report DFE RR049. UK: Department for Education.
- Jennings, P. A. & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. Review of Education Research, <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308325693>.
- Jerome, E.M., Hamre, B.K., Pianta, R.C. (2009). Teacher- Child Relationships from Kindergarten to Grade Six: Early Childhood Predictors of Teacher-Perceived Conflict and Closeness. *Social Development*, 18, 915-945.
- Jones, S. M., Brown, J. L., Aber, J. & Lawrence, A. J. (2010). Three cumulative impacts of the 4Rs program on children's social-emotional, behavioural and academic outcomes. *Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness*, Washington, D. C.

- Kam, C., Wong, L.W., & Fung, K.M. Promoting social emotional learning in Chinese schools: a feasibility study of PATHS implementation in Hong Kong. *The International Journal of Emotional Education*, 3, 30-47.
- Kendziora, K. & Yoder, N. (2016). When Districts Support and Integrate Social and Emotional Learning (SEL): Findings from an Ongoing Evaluation of Districtwide Implementation of SEL. *American Institute for Research*, 1-17.
- Kramer, T.J., & Caldarella, P. (2009). Social and Emotional Learning in the Kindergarten Classroom: Evaluation of the Strong Start Curriculum. *Early Childhood Education journal*, 37, 303.
- LaBelle, B. (2019). Positive Outcomes of a Social-Emotional Learning Program to Promote Student Resiliency and Address Mental Health. *Contemporary School Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-019-00263-y>
- Lambert, R. G., McCarthy, C. J., & Abbott-Shim, M. (2001). Classroom Appraisal of Resources and Demands, school-aged version. Charlotte, NC: The Center for Educational Evaluation and Measurement.
- Lambert, R. G., McCarthy, C., O' Donnel, M., & Wang, C. (2009). Measuring elementary teacher stress and coping in the classroom: Validity evidence for the Classroom Appraisal of Resources and Demands, *Psychology in the Schools*, 46 (10), 973- 988.
- Kern-Koegel, L., Koegel, R., Hurley, C. & Frea, W. D. (1992). Improving social skills and disruptive behaviour in children with Autism through self-management. *Journal of Applied Behaviour Analysis*, 25 (2), 341-353.
- Littlefield, L., Cavanagh, S. & Knapp, R. (2017). KidsMatter: Building the capacity of Australian Primary Schools and Early Childhood Services to Foster Children's Social and Emotional Skills and Promote Children's Mental Health. *Social and Emotional Learning in Australia and the Asia-Pacific*, 293-311.
- McKay, A. W., Sutherland, L. & Pochini, K. D. (2013). *Teachers and the Law*, Ontario, Canada: Emond Montgomery Publications Limited.

- Merrel, K.W., Juskelis, M.P., Tran, O., & Shepard Buchanan, R. (2008). Social and Emotional Learning in the Classroom: Evaluation of Strong Kids and Strong Teens on Students' Social-Emotional Knowledge and Symptoms, 24 (2), 209- 224.
- Mooney, P., Ryan, J. B., Uhing, B. M., Reid, R. & Epstein, M. H. (2005). A review of self management interventions targeting academic outcomes for students with emotional behavioural disorders. *Journal of Behavioural Education*, 14 (3), 203-221.
- Ngulube, P. (2015). Qualitative Data Analysis and Interpretation: Systematic Search for Meaning. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.1.1375.7608
- O'Neill, J. M., Clark, J. K., Jones, J. A. (2011). Promoting mental health and preventing substance abuse and violence in elementary students: a randomized control study of the Michigan Model for Health. *Journal of School Health*, 81(6), 320-330.
- Payton, J., Weissberg, R.P., Durlak J.A., Dymnicki, A.B., Taylor, R.D., Schellinger, K.B., & Pachan, M. (2008). The Positive Impact of Social and Emotional Learning for Kindergarten to Eighth-grade Students. *Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning*
- . Payton, J. W., Wardlaw, D. M., Graczyk, P. A., Bloodworth, M. R., Tompsett, C. J. & Weissberg, R. P. (2000). Social and Emotional Learning: A framework for promoting mental health and reducing risk behaviour in Children and Youth. *Journal of School Health*, 70 (5).
- Qualtrics LLC [Computer Software]. Provo, UT: Qualtrics.
- Raver, C. C., & Knitzer, J. (2002). Ready to enter: What research tells policymakers about strategies to promote social and emotional school readiness among three- and four-year old children (Promoting the Emotional Well-being of Children and Families Policy Paper No.3). New York, NY: National Center for Children in Poverty.
- Reinke, W.M., Herman, K.C., Petras, H., & Lalongo, N.S. (2013). Empirically Derived Subtypes of Child Academic and Behaviour Problems: Co-Occurrence and Distal Outcomes. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 36, 759-770.

- Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., Pianta, R. C., & Cox, M. J. (2000). Teachers' judgments of problems in the transition to kindergarten. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 15, 147-166.
- Samara, M., Marlow, N., & Wolke, D. (2008). Pervasive Behaviour Problems at 6 Years of Age in a Total-Population Sample of Child Born at ≤ 25 Weeks of Gestation. *Pediatrics*, 122.
- Schonert- Reichl, K.A., & Hymel, S. (2007) Educating the Heart as well as the Mind: Social and Emotional Learning for School and Life Success. *Education Canada*, 20-24.
- Attar-Schwartz, S. Mishna, F. & Khouy-Kassabri, M. (2019). The role of classmates social support, peer victimization and gender externalizing and internalizing behaviours among Canadian Youth. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 28, 2335-2346.
- Seeley, K., Tombari, M., Bennett, L., & Dunkle, J. (2011, December). Bullying in schools: An overview (Juvenile Justice Bulletin). Retrieved from U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention website:
<http://www.ojjdp.gov/pubs/234205.pdf>
- Shea, C. M., Jacobs, S. R. Esserman, D. A., Bruce, K., Weiner, B. J. (2014). Organizational readiness for implementing change: a psychometric assessment of a new measure. *Implementation Science*.
- Statistics Canada, The Daily. 2019. *Canada's population estimates: Age and sex, July 1, 2019*. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 11-627-M. Ottawa, Ontario.
- Statistics Canada. (2021). Table 37-10-0009-01 Number of students in official languages programs, public elementary and secondary schools, by program type, grade and sex
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25318/3710000901-eng>
- Tishelman, A.C., Haney, P., Greenwald O'Brien, & J. Blaustein, M.E. (2010). A Framework for School-Based Psychological Evaluations: Utilizing a 'Trauma Lens.' *Journal of Child & Adolescent Trauma*, 3, 279-302.

- Tonmyr, L., Williams, G., Hovdestad, W. E., & Draca, J. (2011). Anxiety and/or Depression in 10-15 year old's investigated by child welfare in Canada. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 48* (5), 493-498.
- Van Huynh, S.(2018). Social awareness and responsible decision making of students in grade 4 and 5 in Vietnam. *Journal of Education and Human Development, 7* (4), 7-15.
- Votta, E. & Farrel, S. (2009). Predictors of psychological adjustment among homeless and housed female youth. *Journal of the Canadian Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 18*, 2, 126- 132.
- “Welcome”. *Western and Northern Canadian Protocol*. Retrieved July 16, 2016.

Table 2. Participant Demographic

Factor	N	%
Gender		
	N	91
Female	85	93.4
Male	6	6.6
Province of Employment		
	N	91
Manitoba	47	51.6
Saskatchewan	25	27.5
Alberta	19	20.9
Country of Birth		
	N	91
Canada	87	95.6
England	1	1.1
Portugal	1	1.1
India	1	1.1
Undisclosed	1	1.1
Education		
	N	91
Technical School	3	3.3
Associates Degree	2	2.2
Bachelor's Degree	87	95.6
Master's Degree	15	16.5
Doctoral Degree	1	1.1
Postbaccalaureate	4	4.4
Certificate of Commerce	1	1.1
Special Education Certificate	1	1.1
Occupation		
	N	91

Principal	4	4.5
Teacher	71	79.8
Special Education Teacher	15	16.9
Early Childhood Educator	3	3.4
Guidance Counselor	3	3.4
Librarian	1	1.1
Learning Support	1	1.1
Number of Years Teaching		
N	91	
Less than a year	2	2.2
1-5 years	21	23.1
6-9 years	18	25.3
10-20 years	34	37.4
More than 20 years	16	17.6

Table 3. Subjects and Grade Taught

	Language Arts	Math	Social Studies	Science	Physical Education	Other
Kindergarten	9 (9.9%)	9 (9.9%)	8 (8.8%)	8 (8.8%)	6 (6.6%)	1 (1.1%)
Grade 1	5 (5.5%)	5 (5.5%)	4 (4.4%)	5 (5.5%)	6 (6.6%)	3 (3.3%)
Grade 2	4 (4.4%)	3 (3.3%)	2 (2.2%)	2 (2.2%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)
Grade 3	9 (9.9%)	9 (9.9%)	9 (9.9%)	11 (12.1%)	4 (4.4%)	16 (17.6%)
Grade 4	5 (5.5%)	6 (9.9%)	4 (4.4%)	6 (6.6%)	2 (2.2%)	8 (8.8%)
Grade 5	8 (8.8%)	8 (8.8%)	6 (6.6 %)	7 (7.7%)	3 (3.3%)	10 (11%)
Grade 6	7 (7.7%)	6 (6.6%)	6 (6.6%)	5 (5.5%)	1 (1.1%)	4 (4.4%)
Grade 7	6 (6.6%)	3 (3.3%)	3 (3.3%)	2 (2.2%)	2 (2.2%)	2 (2.2%)
Grade 8	2 (2.2%)	2 (2.2%)	2 (2.2%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	6 (6.6%)
Grade 9	4 (4.4%)	2 (2.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)	3 (3.3%)
Grade 10	4 (4.4 %)	1 (1.1%)	3 (3.3%)	3 (3.3%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)
Grade 11	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.1%)
Grade 12	6 (6.6%)	0 (0%)	2 (2.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (3.3%)
Split Grade Classroom*	0 (0%)	4 (4.4%)	4 (4.4%)	4 (4.4%)	1 (1.1%)	7 (7.7%)
Undisclosed	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (3.3%)

Note: Percentages are based off N= 91. *Split Grade Classroom's refer to classes that have multiple grades (e.g., grade 4/5 split class).

Table 4. Frequencies of responses to teacher/principal job stress items.

Factor	N	%
How demanding are school responsibilities (e.g., supervising recess, coaching sports, etc.)?		
N	91	
Not at all	8	8.8
Mostly not	18	19.8
Mildly not	31	34.1
Mildly	18	19.8
Mostly	12	13.2
Very	4	4.4
How demanding is paperwork or administrative responsibilities (e.g., report cards, attendance, etc.)?		
N	91	
Not at all	2	2.2
Mostly not	5	5.5
Mildly not	17	18.7
Mildly	23	25.3
Mostly	30	33
Very	14	15.4
How demanding is finding instructional resources (e.g., guides, professional development workshops, etc.)?		
N	91	
Not at all	3	3.3
Mostly not	17	18.7
Mildly not	19	20.9
Mildly	29	31.9
Mostly	16	17.6
Very	7	7.7

How demanding is managing class size (e.g., a large number of students)?

N	91	
Not at all	4	4.4
Mostly not	9	9.9
Mildly not	15	16.5
Mildly	18	19.8
Mostly	24	26.4
Very	21	23.1

How demanding is it managing student behaviours?

N	91	
Not at all	1	1.1
Mostly not	5	5.5
Mildly not	14	15.4
Mildly	16	17.6
Mostly	28	30.8
Very	27	29.7

How demanding are student mental health issues?

N	91	
Not at all	2	2.2
Mostly not	3	3.3
Mildly not	4	4.4
Mildly	19	20.9
Mostly	23	25.3
Very	40	44

Note. n(%) represents the number of participants that subscribed to each response

Table 5. Frequencies of responses to Knowledge of SEL items

Factor	N	%
Type of SEL training		
	N	89
None	19	21.3
Post-secondary	15	16.9
Professional development workshops	30	33.7
Online training	4	4.5
Self-study	21	23.6
Familiar with the term SEL		
	N	89
Not at all	4	4.5
Mostly not	8	9
Mildly not	7	7.9
Mildly	20	22.5
Mostly	25	28.1
Very	25	28.1
Feel knowledgeable about SEL		
	N	89
Not at all	3	3.4
Mostly not	15	16.9
Mildly not	13	14.6
Mildly	22	24.7
Mostly	28	31.5
Very	8	9
Feel confident with knowledge to teach SEL		
	N	89
Not at all	8	9
Mostly not	17	19.1
Mildly not	11	12.4

Mildly	26	29.2
Mostly	19	21.3
Very	8	9

Note. n(%) represents the number of participants that subscribed to each response

Table 6. Frequencies of responses to attitudes of SEL items.

Factor	N	%
I believe SEL is important to be successful in life and school		
	N	88
Strongly disagree	1	1.1
Disagree	1	1.1
Slightly disagree	0	0
Slightly agree	8	9.1
Agree	9	10.2
Strongly agree	69	78.4
I believe SEL programming should be school wide		
	N	88
Strongly disagree	1	1.1
Disagree	1	1.1
Slightly disagree	3	3.4
Slightly agree	5	5.7
Agree	11	12.5
Strongly agree	67	76.1
I believe that all teachers should receive training/support on how to teach SEL skills		
	N	88
Strongly disagree	1	1.1
Disagree	1	1.1
Slightly disagree	1	1.1
Slightly agree	5	5.7
Agree	10	11.5
Strongly agree	70	79.5
I believe SEL should be integrated into daily instruction		
	N	88
Strongly disagree	2	2.3

	Disagree	2	2.3
	Slightly disagree	3	3.4
	Slightly agree	5	5.7
	Agree	12	13.6
	Strongly agree	64	72.7
I believe that teaching SEL is my job			
	N	88	
	Strongly disagree	2	2.3
	Disagree	2	2.3
	Slightly disagree	3	3.4
	Slightly agree	10	11.4
	Agree	17	19.3
	Strongly agree	54	61.4

Note. n(%) represents the number of participants that subscribed to each response

Table 7. Frequencies of responses to current SEL practices items

Factor	N	%
Incorporation of SEL at all		
N	87	
Yes	83	95.4
No	4	4.6%
Incorporate SEL into curriculum		
N	87	
Yes	25	28.7
No	58	66.7
Incorporate SEL into lessons		
N	87	
Yes	46	52.9
No	37	42.5
Incorporate SEL into informal lessons		
N	87	
Yes	71	81.6
No	12	13.8
Incorporate SEL into games		
N	87	
Yes	33	37.9
No	50	57.5
Incorporate SEL in other ways		
N	87	
Yes	22	25.3
No	61	70.1

Note. n(%) represents the number of participants that subscribed to each response

Table 8. Frequencies of responses to personnel resources items

Factor	N	%
Support of leader teams (e.g., principals and vice principals)		
	N	86
Have not accessed	24	27.9
Not at all helpful	4	4.7
Mostly not helpful	7	8.1
Mildly not helpful	5	5.8
Mildly helpful	24	27.9
Mostly helpful	9	10.5
Very helpful	13	15.1
Support of school counselors		
	N	83
Have not accessed	21	25.3
Not at all helpful	6	31.3
Mostly not helpful	8	9.6
Mildly not helpful	9	10.8
Mildly helpful	17	20.5
Mostly helpful	9	10.8
Very helpful	14	16.9
Support of teachers (peers)		
	N	83
Have not accessed	8	9.6
Not at all helpful	6	7.2
Mostly not helpful	6	7.2
Mildly not helpful	13	15.7
Mildly helpful	28	33.7
Mostly helpful	14	16.9
Very helpful	8	9.6

Note. n(%) represents the number of participants that subscribed to each respons

Table 9. Frequencies of responses to other resources items

Factor	N	%
We have the time needed to teach SEL in our school		
	N	84
Not at all true	9	10.7
Mostly not true	24	28.6
Mildly not true	19	22.6
Mildly true	16	19
Mostly true	11	13.1
Very true	5	6
We have the money to teach SEL in our school		
	N	84
Not at all true	17	20.2
Mostly not true	20	23.8
Mildly not true	21	25
Mildly true	18	21.4
Mostly true	6	7.1
Very true	2	2.4
We have the materials we need to teach SEL in our school (e.g., lessons, games, etc.)		
	N	84
Not at all true	13	15.5
Mostly not true	22	26.2
Mildly not true	25	29.8
Mildly true	16	19
Mostly true	5	6
Very true	3	3.6
We have access to SEL guidance and coaching		
	N	84
Not at all true	22	26.2

Mostly not true	23	27.4
Mildly not true	21	25
Mildly true	9	10.7
Mostly true	6	7.1
Very true	3	3.6

Note. n(%) represents the number of participants that subscribed to each response

Table 10. Correlations Between Domains

Domains	Teacher Stress	SEL Knowledge	SEL Attitudes	Resources
Teacher Stress				
SEL Knowledge	.22*			
SEL Attitudes	.31**	.36***		
Resources	.21*	.22*	.13	
Feasibility	.10	.20	.38***	19

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 11. Supports and Resources that would Make SEL programming more practical

Theme & Subtheme	Participants (<i>n</i> = 33)	
	<i>n</i>	%
Access to program material		
Lesson plans/material	19	57.6
Evidence-based curriculums	2	6.1
Access to formal training		
Professional development	6	18.2
Workshops	2	6.1
General training	6	18.2
Access to diverse programming		
Applicable across all ages/grades	3	9.1
Applicable to French Immersion	2	6.1
Applicable across cultures	1	3
Personnel support		
Team leaders (Administration)	1	3
School division	1	3
Outside of school	1	3
Additional staffing	1	3
School Counselor	1	3
SEL Knowledgeable personnel	1	3
Identification of barriers for SEL implementation		
Funding	1	3
Large classrooms	1	3
Access to unspecified resources		
General resources	1	3
Current SEL Practices		
Current SEL practices	1	3

Note. n(%) represents the number of participants within each subtheme

Table 12. Additional thoughts or concerns about SEL programming

Theme & Subtheme	Participants (n= 29)	
	<i>n</i>	%
SEL is needed		
Recognizes importance of SEL	18	62.1
Increasing mental health needs of students	5	17.2
Barriers for SEL implementation		
Time	9	31
Attitudes	6	20.7
Lack of Unspecified Resources	2	6.9
Funding	3	10.3
Student Challenges	2	6.9
Lack of training	2	6.9
Sustainability of SEL programming	2	6.9
Access to programs	1	3.4
Suggestion for SEL incorporation		
Teachable moments	2	6.9
Involvement of community	1	3.4
Mandated for all teachers	1	3.4
Trauma-informed programming	1	3.4
Integrate into classes	2	6.9
Led by guidance counselors	1	3.4

Note. n(%) represents the number of participants within each subtheme

Appendix H: (Formal) Survey: First contact email with invitation to participate

**Principle Investigator:**

Kayla Kilborn, B.A. (Hons.), M.A. Student (School Psychology)

University of Manitoba, Department of Psychology

Email: kilborn1@myumanitoba.ca, Lab Phone: (204)474-9629

Research Supervisor:

Dr. Janine Montgomery, Associate Professor, Psychology

Email: Janine.Montgomery@umanitoba.ca

Research Project Title: Social Emotional Learning in Prairie Canadian Schools

Dear potential participant,

Under the supervision of Dr. Janine Montgomery of the Department of Psychology at the University of Manitoba, I am collecting information about Prairie Canadian teachers, principals and other education staff's perspectives on Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) and its implementation in schools. I will be collecting this information via survey. The data collected will be summarized in my Master's thesis

The purpose of this study is to gather information on Canadian teacher, principal and other education staff's readiness to implement SEL. In addition, this project will also gather information on current SEL practices and will identify current challenges and opportunities for effective implementation. The results from this study will be used to inform training and professional development programming and may contribute to future programming development. We believe gathering information is important because SEL has been shown to improve both social and academic student performance as well as addressing challenging student behavior,

psychological distress and bullying. To our knowledge, no study in Canada has examined teacher, principal and/or educational staff readiness to implement evidence based SEL instruction.

You are being invited to participate in this study because you are a Canadian teacher, principal or other personnel related to the education system. If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a survey including questions regarding your knowledge and attitude about SEL, SEL practices, SEL resources, feasibility implementing SEL, and your job stress. The survey comprises of 40 questions and in total will take 20 minutes to complete. Your responses will be confidential. The link to the survey will not be connected to your e-mail in any way. As a participant in the survey, you are eligible to receive a summary of the results. Upon completion of the survey, a link will be available which will open a new web browser where you may provide your e-mail address. You may also provide us with your email address so that we can enter you for a chance to win a \$100 gift card as an appreciation for your participation. Your email and mailing address, therefore, will not be linked to your responses on the survey in any way.

While there are no anticipated risks, participants may benefit from participating by learning about and contributing to research. For the actual formal part, they may also benefit by providing information that will be shared with decision makers, researchers, and other educators that may inform and/or improve research and practice.

If you have any questions at any time, you may contact Kayla Kilborn via e-mail at kilborn1@myumanitoba.ca or contact the research supervisor at Janine.montgomery@umantoba.ca.

Thank you for considering participation in my research project. Your assistance and time are greatly appreciated!


Sincerely,

Kayla Kilborn, B.A. (Hons.), M.A. Student (School Psychology)

University of Manitoba, Department of Psychology


If you are interested in participating, please use the link below to complete the survey by October 2020.

Appendix I: Survey group recruitment poster



**UNIVERSITY
OF MANITOBA**

Heart and Mind Project: Social and Emotional Learning in Canadian Schools




Social
Cognition
Laboratory
Dr. Janine Montgomery

What are we researching?

There is growing interest in teaching Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) to support mental health, academics and promote positive behavior. There is little knowledge about Canadian teacher perspectives about SEL.

This study is designed to identify opportunities to facilitate SEL programs and determine program development and needs.



Social & Emotional Learning

Who can participate?

Teachers who teach in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta who are willing to do a 20 minute survey in order to give input on current practices, challenges and opportunities to facilitate SEL in Canadian Schools. Additionally they must read and write in English.

Compensation

As a thank you for your time, you will be entered into a draw for a chance to win a \$100 gift card.

Aims of this study

- ❖ Inform evidence-based interventions and future program development in Canadian schools.
- ❖ Address policy, practice, and training needs.

Risks and benefits of this study

- ❖ There are no risks in participating in this study. All responses are confidential.
- ❖ Benefit: it will be used to inform future SEL programs in Canadian schools.

Contact Information

If you would like to participate or want more information please contact:

Kayla Kilborn BA (Hons), Masters Student:
kilborn1@myumanitoba.ca
 OR
 Dr. Janine Montgomery, PhD:
Janine.Montgomery@umanitoba.ca

Appendix J: Survey group consent form (Formal Group)

**Study Information and Consent Form**

Study Title: Social Emotional Learning in Prairie Canadian Schools

Principal Researchers: Kayla Kilborn, MA student, Department of Psychology, University of Manitoba; Phone: (204) 802-0659; E-mail: kilborn1@myumanitoba.ca

Research Supervisor: Dr. Janine Montgomery, Associate Professor, Psychology, University of Manitoba; E-mail: janine.montgomery@umanitoba.ca

This consent form, which you may print for your records and reference, is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.

You are invited to participate in a research study titled “Social Emotional Learning (SEL) in Prairie Canadian Schools”. This study is being conducted for the completion of a graduate master’s thesis under the supervision of Dr. Janine Montgomery. **The purpose of this study is to gather information on teachers’, principals and relevant education personnel on their perspectives on SEL programming in schools. Furthermore, we aim to understand current practices, challenges (including gaps in programming) and opportunities to facilitate evidenced based interventions which will be important for determining future SEL programming development and training needs.**

This study is only open to teachers, principals and relevant decision makers/ administrators. You will be asked to complete surveys with questions aimed to understand your perspective, training knowledge, and resources for implementing SEL. Additionally, surveys will ask questions about SEL practices already in your classroom/building and ask about challenges you may have

implementing SEL. The survey comprises of 40 questions and in total will take 20 minutes to complete. Upon completion of the study you will be entered into a draw for a chance to win a \$100 gift card.

Participating in this study is voluntary. After deciding to participate in this study, you have the right to discontinue your participation without penalty. You may withdraw your data at anytime up to the point of anticipated publication in September 2021. You will not be penalized for exercising your right to not answer any questions that you feel uncomfortable answering. There are no known risks associated with participating in this study. The survey is presented using the American website Qualtrics and data storage is subject to American laws. The risks associated with data storage in the U.S. are similar to those associated with many e-mail and social media websites such as Gmail and Facebook.

While there are no anticipated risks, participants may benefit from participating by learning about and contributing to research. For the actual formal part, they may also benefit by providing information that will be shared with decision makers, researchers, and other educators that may inform and/or improve research and practice.

If you choose to participate in this study, you will be asked to provide some demographics; none of which are personally identifying. Your survey will be coded with a number to ensure confidentiality. Any information you provide will be kept confidential to ensure your responses are not identified. Your name will not be placed on the questionnaire. Only a Qualtrics experimenter number will be listed on the data file. Data will be stored in a secure location, on password protected computers and viewed only by the researchers. Data from this survey will be saved on the computer for an indefinite period, as the study data may be useful for future analyses.

We hope to discuss our findings at conferences and to publish them in a professional journal. Summaries of more than 15 respondents from one school division/region will be shared with relevant education personnel (school divisions, etc.). None of your individual responses will be revealed as the data will be presented in summary form only.

If you have any questions about the survey at any time, you may contact Kayla Kilborn via e-mail at kilborn1@myumanitoba.ca or Dr. Janine Montgomery at Janine.Montgomery@umanitoba.ca

The University of Manitoba may look at the research records to see that the research is being done in a safe and proper way.

This research has been approved by the Psychology Research Ethics Board. If you have any concerns or complaints about this project, you may contact the Human Ethics Coordinator at 204-474-7122 or by e-mail at humanethics@umanitoba.ca We encourage you to print a copy of this consent form for your records.

☐ I agree to participate in this research study

☐ I do not agree to participate in this research study

Appendix K: Social and Emotional Learning Questionnaire (Formal Group)

Formal Social and Emotional Learning Questionnaire

Start of Block: Default Question Block**Study Information and Consent Form**

Study Title: Social Emotional Learning in Prairie Canadian Schools

Principal Researchers:

Kayla Kilborn, MA student, Department of Psychology, University of Manitoba; Phone: (204) 802-0659; E-mail: kilborn1@myumanitoba.ca

Research Supervisor:

Dr. Janine Newton Montgomery, Associate Professor, Psychology, University of Manitoba; E-mail: janine.montgomery@umanitoba.ca

This consent form, which you may print for your records and reference, is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.

You are invited to participate in a research study titled “Social Emotional Learning (SEL) in Prairie Canadian Schools”. This study is being conducted for the completion of a graduate master’s thesis under the supervision of Dr. Janine Newton Montgomery. **The purpose of this study is to gather information on teachers’, principals and relevant education personnel on their perspectives on SEL programming in schools. Furthermore, we aim to understand current practices, challenges (including gaps in programming) and opportunities to**

facilitate evidenced based interventions which will be important for determining future SEL programming development and training needs.

This study is only open to teachers, principals and relevant decision makers/ administrators. You will be asked to complete surveys with questions aimed to understand your perspective, training knowledge, and resources for implementing SEL. Additionally, surveys will ask questions about SEL practices already in your classroom/building and ask about challenges you may have implementing SEL. The survey comprises of 40 questions and in total will take 15 minutes to complete. Upon completion of the study you will be entered into a draw for a chance to win a \$100 gift card.

Participating in this study is voluntary. After deciding to participate in this study, you have the right to discontinue your participation without penalty. You may withdraw your data at anytime up to the point of anticipated publication in September 2021. You will not be penalized for exercising your right to not answer any questions that you feel uncomfortable answering. There are no known risks associated with participating in this study. The survey is presented using the American website Qualtrics and data storage is subject to American laws. The risks associated with data storage in the U.S. are similar to those associated with many e-mail and social media websites such as Gmail and Facebook.

While there are no anticipated risks, participants may benefit from participating by learning about and contributing to research. You may also benefit by providing information that will be shared with decision makers, researchers, and other educators that may inform and/or improve research and practice.

If you choose to participate in this study, you will be asked to provide some demographics; none of which are personally identifying. Your survey will be coded with a number to ensure confidentiality. Any information you provide will be kept confidential to ensure your responses are not identified. Your name will not be placed on the questionnaire. Only a Qualtrics experimenter number will be listed on the data file. Data will be stored in a secure location, on password protected computers and viewed only by the researchers. Data from this survey will be

saved on the computer for an indefinite period, as the study data may be useful for future analyses.

We hope to discuss our findings at conferences and to publish them in a professional journal. Summaries of more than 15 respondents from one school division/region will be shared with relevant education personnel (school divisions, etc.). None of your individual responses will be revealed as the data will be presented in summary form only.

If you have any questions about the survey at any time, you may contact Kayla Kilborn via e-mail at kilborn1@myumanitoba.ca or Dr. Janine Newton Montgomery at Janine.Montgomery@umanitoba.ca

The University of Manitoba may look at the research records to see that the research is being done in a safe and proper way.

This research has been approved by the Psychology Research Ethics Board. If you have any concerns or complaints about this project, you may contact the Human Ethics Coordinator at 204-474-7122 or by e-mail at humanethics@umanitoba.ca We encourage you to print a copy of this consent form for your records.

☐ I agree to participate in this research study (1)

☐ I do not agree to participate in this research study (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If Study Information and Consent Form Study Title: Social Emotional Learning in Prairie Canadian S... = I do not agree to participate in this research study

Page Break

Desc_1 Social and Emotional Learning Questionnaire (SELQ)

Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) allows for the development of attitudes, knowledge, and skills that are required to 1) understand and manage emotions, 2) set and achieve positive goals, 3) feel and show empathy for others, 4) establish and maintain positive relationships and 5) make responsible decisions. The following survey was designed to identify current SEL practices in your school/classroom, challenges/barriers to implementation SEL and opportunities to facilitate evidence-based interventions which will be important for determining the future programming and training needs.

Page Break

dem_1 1. Were you born in Canada?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

Display This Question:

If 1. Were you born in Canada? = No

dem_1no 2. Where were you born?

dem_2 3. Which province do you currently live in?

- ☐ Manitoba (1)
- ☐ Saskatchewan (2)
- ☐ Alberta (3)
- ☐ Other: (4) _____

dem_3 4. Which gender do you identify with?

- ☐ Female (1)
- ☐ Male (2)
- ☐ Preferred term: (3) _____
- ☐ Prefer not to share (4)
-

dem_4 5. What is your age?

dem_5 6. What degrees have you completed?

- ☐ Technical School (1)
 - ☐ Associates Degree (2)
 - ☐ Bachelor's Degree (3)
 - ☐ Master's Degree (4)
 - ☐ Doctoral Degree (5)
 - ☐ Other: (6) _____
-

Page Break

backg_1 1. What is your primary role? Please check all that apply.

- ☐ Principal (1)
 - ☐ Teacher (2)
 - ☐ Special Education Teacher (3)
 - ☐ Other: (4) _____
-

backg_2 2. How long have you been teaching?

- ☐ Less than a year (1)
- ☐ 1-5 years (2)
- ☐ 6-9 years (3)
- ☐ 10-20 years (4)
- ☐ More than 20 years (5)

backg_3 3. What subjects and grade levels do you teach?

	Kindergarten	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Language Arts (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Math (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Social Studies (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Science (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Physical Education (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other: (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other: (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other: (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

desc_chal We would like to ask you questions regarding your general work-related challenges.

desc_chal2 **How challenging/concerning are each of the following:**

1- Not at all 2- Mostly not 3- Mildly not 4- Mildly 5- Mostly 6- Very

chal_1 1. School responsibilities (e.g., supervising recess, coaching sports, etc.).

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

chal_2 2. Paperwork or administrative responsibilities (e.g., report cards, attendance, etc.).

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

chal_3 3. Finding instructional resources (e.g., guides, professional development workshops, etc.).

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

chal_4 4. Managing class size (e.g., a large number of students).

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

chal_5 5. Managing student behaviours.

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

chal_6 6. Student mental health issues.

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

Page Break

know_1 1. What kind of Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) training have you received?

- ☐ None (1)
- ☐ Post-secondary training (2)
- ☐ Professional development workshops (3)
- ☐ Online training (4)
- ☐ Self-study (5)
-

Desc1_know **How familiar are you with the following:**

1- Not at all 2- Mostly not 3- Mildly not 4- Mildly 5- Mostly 6- Very

know_2 2. The term Social and Emotional Learning (SEL).

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

desc_2know **How much do you agree with the following statements?**

1- Strongly disagree

2- Disagree

3- Slightly disagree

4- Slightly agree

5- Agree

6- Strongly agree

know_3 3. I feel knowledgeable about SEL.

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

know_4 4. I feel confident with my knowledge to teach SEL.

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

Page Break

desc_att **How much do you agree with the following statements?**

1- Strongly disagree

2- Disagree

3- Slightly disagree

4- Slightly agree

5- Agree

6- Strongly agree

att_1 1. I believe SEL is important to be successful in life and school.

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

att_2 2. I believe SEL programming should be school-wide.

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

att_3 3. I believe that all teachers should receive training/support on how to teach SEL skills.

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

att_4 4. I believe SEL should be integrated into daily instruction.

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

att_5 5. Do you feel that teaching SEL is your job?

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

Display This Question:

If 5. Do you feel that teaching SEL is your job? = 1

And 5. Do you feel that teaching SEL is your job? = 2

And 5. Do you feel that teaching SEL is your job? = 3

att_6 Who do you think should be teaching SEL?

Page Break

prac_1 1. Approximately, how often do you incorporate SEL content in your classroom?

- ☐ Never (1)
 - ☐ Monthly (2)
 - ☐ Weekly (3)
 - ☐ Daily (4)
-

prac_2 2. How do you teach SEL in your classroom? Please check all that apply.

☐

Curriculum (1)

☐

Integrated into lessons (across subjects) (2)

☐

Informal lessons (e.g., teachable moments) (3)

☐

Games (4)

☐

Other (5)

Display This Question:

If 2. How do you teach SEL in your classroom? Please check all that apply. = Other

prac_3 3. Give an example of other ways you teach SEL in your classroom:

prac_4 4. To your knowledge, which individual(s) currently implement SEL in your classroom/building? Please check all that apply.

- ☐ No one (1)
- ☐ Classroom Teacher (peer) (2)
- ☐ School Psychologist (3)
- ☐ School Counselor (4)
- ☐ School Social Worker (5)
- ☐ Administrator (6)
- ☐ Educational Assistant (7)
- ☐ Health/ Physical Education Teacher (8)
- ☐ University Researcher (9)
- ☐ Outside agency: (10) _____
- ☐ Other: (11) _____

desc_1res

If you have accessed support from other members in your school, how helpful were they?

Check a 0 if you have not accessed them.

0- Have not accessed

1- Not at all

2- Mostly not

3- Mildly not

4- Mildly

5- Mostly

6- Very

res_1 1. Leader teams (e.g., principal and vice principal).

☐ 0 (1)

☐ 1 (2)

☐ 2 (3)

☐ 3 (4)

☐ 4 (5)

☐ 5 (6)

☐ 6 (7)

Display This Question:

If 1. Leader teams (e.g., principal and vice principal). = 0

Why did you not access this support?

res_2 2. School Counselors.

☐ 0 (1)

☐ 1 (2)

☐ 2 (3)

☐ 3 (4)

☐ 4 (5)

☐ 5 (6)

☐ 6 (7)

Display This Question:

If 2. School Counselors. = 0

Q45 Why did you not access this support?

res_3 3. Teachers

☐ 0 (1)

☐ 1 (2)

☐ 2 (3)

☐ 3 (4)

☐ 4 (5)

☐ 5 (6)

☐ 6 (7)

Display This Question:

If 3. Teachers = 0

Q46 Why did you not access this support?

res_4 4. Other:

Display This Question:

If If 4. Other: Text Response Is Not Empty

res_4con Was this other support helpful?

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

desc2_res **How true is each statement:**

1- Not at all true

2- Mostly not true

3- Mildly not true

4- Mildly true

5- Mostly true

6- Very true

res_5 5. We have the time we need to teach SEL in our school.

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

res_6 6. We have the money to teach SEL in our school.

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

res_7 7. We have the materials we need to teach SEL in our school (e.g., for lessons, games, etc.).

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

res_8 8. We have access to SEL guidance and coaching.

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

Page Break

desc_feas **How feasible are the following:**

1- Not at all 2- Mostly not 3- Mildly not 4- Mildly 5- Mostly 6- Very

feas_1 1. Devoting time **once everyday** to brief (10-15 minutes) SEL instruction.

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

feas_2 2. Devoting time **once a week** to brief (10-15 minutes) SEL instruction.

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

feas_3 3. Devoting time **once a month** to brief (10-15 minutes) SEL instruction.

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

feas_4 4. Devoting an entire instructional period to SEL **once a day**.

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

feas_5 5. Devoting an entire instructional period to SEL **once a week**.

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

feas_6 6. Devoting an entire instructional period to SEL **once a month**.

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

feas_7 7. Integrating SEL content into multiple subjects.

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

feas_8 8. Addressing SEL in teachable moments.

☐ 1 (1)

☐ 2 (2)

☐ 3 (3)

☐ 4 (4)

☐ 5 (5)

☐ 6 (6)

Page Break

open_1 1. How much time do you currently need or think is needed to prepare material to teach SEL?

Open_2 2. What supports and resources would make SEL programming more practical?

open_3 3. What are your additional thoughts or concerns about SEL programming?

Link Thank you for participating in our study. Your time is greatly appreciated! To be entered into the draw for a chance to win a \$100 gift card, please click on the link below:

https://umanitobapsych.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_6tAyhIeHeJfEBSJ

End of Block: Default Question Block
