ANNENBERG
BROWN UNIVERSITY

EdWorkingPaper No. 20-341

Understanding Teacher Perceptions of Efficacy in Social and Emotional Learning: Toward Equity-Based Approaches to SEL in Urban Schools

Terrenda C. White
University of Colorado-Boulder

Travis J. Bristol
University of California-Berkeley

Tolani A. Britton
University of California-Berkeley

Researchers have noted the importance of equity-based approaches to social and emotional learning (SEL), which emphasize the role of school environment, including adult beliefs, in student well-being. This article builds on this work by examining 129 teachers' perceptions of efficacy in SEL. While participants worked in urban schools, were selected from national fellowship programs, and had similar years of experience and preparation, survey data found that teachers in one program reported higher levels of efficacy in SEL. Interviews and observations with a purposeful sample of these teachers found that despite common challenges with exclusionary discipline practices and limited resources, efficacious teachers described a "social justice learning community," geared for teachers of color, that enhanced their capacities to enact SEL in their schools. Discussion includes the need for critical professional development opportunities in SEL that are race-conscious, context-specific, and asset-based, as well as opportunities for teachers from historically marginalized groups to form specialized learning communities.

VERSION: December 2020

Suggested citation: White , Terrenda C., Travis J. Bristol, and Tolani A. Britton. (2020). Understanding Teacher Perceptions of Efficacy in Social and Emotional Learning: Toward Equity-Based Approaches to SEL in Urban Schools . (EdWorkingPaper: 20-341). Retrieved from Annenberg Institute at Brown University: https://doi.org/10.26300/n5a3-6n34

Understanding Teacher Perceptions of Efficacy in Social and Emotional Learning: Toward Equity-Based Approaches to SEL in Urban Schools

Terrenda C. White

University of Colorado-Boulder

Travis J. Bristol

University of California-Berkeley

Tolani A. Britton

University of California-Berkeley

Abstract

Researchers have noted the importance of equity-based approaches to social and emotional learning (SEL), which emphasize the role of school environment, including adult beliefs, in student well-being. This article builds on this work by examining 129 teachers' perceptions of efficacy in SEL. While participants worked in urban schools, were selected from national fellowship programs, and had similar years of experience and preparation, survey data found that teachers in one program reported higher levels of efficacy in SEL. Interviews and observations with a purposeful sample of these teachers found that despite common challenges with exclusionary discipline practices and limited resources, efficacious teachers described a "social justice learning community," geared for teachers of color, that enhanced their capacities to enact SEL in their schools. Discussion includes the need for critical professional development opportunities in SEL that are race-conscious, context-specific, and asset-based, as well as opportunities for teachers from historically marginalized groups to form specialized learning communities.

Introduction

The social justice learning community helped me to be very critical of the behaviorist approach [at my school] and really helped me to see students first and foremost as people.

-Joshua (middle school history teacher, Rothschild Fellow, 2015)

The conversations I have with teachers in [the social justice learning community], I just wasn't able to have with other teachers in the Master's program. We tend to go deeper. It's the same conversations but less surface level.

-Leah (middle school English teacher, Rothschild Fellow, 2015]

Joshua and Leah[1] are novice teachers of color in urban public schools. They were also recipients of prestigious fellowships for undergraduates who aspired to be educators in public schools, which allowed them to attend selective university-based teacher education programs in schools of education across the country. As graduates from their program and as novice full-time teachers in urban schools, they belonged to a cohort of teachers—Rothschild Fellows—who responded differently to survey and interview questions about perceptions of efficacy in fostering social and emotional learning (SEL) with students, when compared to teachers of similar training who also received similar fellowships to study and teach in urban schools. Joshua's and Leah's answers above implied important concerns about issues and disciplinary practices in their respective schools and the role of a learning community to support their understanding and critical responses to such issues and practices. Their responses are particularly important in helping to understand the role of adult beliefs, particularly teacher self-efficacy, in social and emotional learning, and to unravel how and why perceptions of efficacy may vary among teachers in urban schools.

SEL is increasingly recognized as an important component of student learning (Brackett & Kremenitzer, 2011; Brackett et al., 2012; O'Connor & McCartney, 2007). Research on effective SEL interventions, however, bring attention to the need for systemic approaches that are

[1] All names, including those of teachers and fellowship programs, are pseudonyms.

developmentally appropriate and culturally relevant, accounting for school climate, discipline policies, teacher training, and the overall quality of relationships between teachers and students in schools (Gregory & Fergus, 2017; Melnick et al., 2017; Osher et al., 2016). Researchers have noted, moreover, that systemic approaches to SEL require shifts in how SEL is understood, moving beyond ideas of SEL as intra-psychological processes and grounded in the ecological environment in which learning occurs.

One fundamental component of the ecological environment in which students' experiences unfold is the urban context of schools. While definitions of "urban" are inconclusive, we employed Milner's (2012) typology to include one of three definitions: (a) schools located in large cities with densely concentrated populations and limited resources; (b) schools in mid-sized cities with challenges similar to schools in large cities; and (c) schools not located in cities but with characteristics similar to urban contexts, in terms of student ethnoracial diversity and limited resources. In light of this typology, out-of-school factors associated with urban contexts can include unequal school funding, a dearth of adequate resources, homelessness among students and families, high levels of poverty, and varying levels of parent and family involvement (Milner et al., 2015). As scholars push for systemic approaches to SEL, we contend that these approaches must include attention to challenges facing schools in urban contexts and the influence of these challenges on teacher-student relationships.

This study sheds light on how teachers make sense of their effectiveness (and ineffectiveness) in fostering SEL with students. Of particular attention for this study are the contextual and relational conditions inside and outside of school that teachers describe as aiding or undermining their effectiveness.[2] In doing so, this study adds to research on the importance of

[2] We use the terms *effectiveness* and *efficacy* interchangeably throughout this article.

teacher efficacy in fostering inclusive school environments (Delale-O'Connor et al., 2017). We address the following two research questions:

1. What factors do teachers note as shaping their perceptions of efficacy in SEL?
2. How, and in what context, do teachers describe developing efficacy in SEL?

We compared teachers from two highly selective fellowships in the United States—the Rothschild Fellowship, which serves novice teachers of color, and the Astor Fellowship, which serves primarily White teachers in STEM subjects. This comparison provides insight into key issues and debates in teacher education, such as what constitutes effective preparation and professional development for novice teachers, particularly novice teachers of color, as studies on teacher preparation often do not differentiate by race and ethnicity (Brown, 2014; Schonert-Reichl, 2017; White, 2016). The role of teacher learning communities, moreover, as one potential viable way to foster efficacy for teachers of color, is less often explored. We drew on Stoll et al.'s (2006) conceptualization of teacher learning communities—a group of educators who come together on a routine basis to interrogate critically their own practice in a reflective, collaborative, and inclusive way aimed at facilitating continuous improvement. In this article, we argue that teacher learning communities can serve as one space, among others, in which teachers can develop efficacy in SEL.

Social and Emotional Learning

While the term SEL has become ubiquitous in K-12 schools, definitions of SEL can vary. In this study**,** we adopted Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning's [CASEL's] (2019) definition of SEL: "the processes through which children and adults acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions" (p. 6). In this framework, SEL is

comprised of five core competencies: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and decision making (Berman et al., 2018). While studies on SEL have emphasized differences in the significance of its various components, they have been used as a whole to promote small- and large-scale interventions in schools, including classroom programming geared toward improving academic and nonacademic outcomes. Studies on the impact of SEL have also influenced local, state, and federal policies, including the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESEA), which encourages systemic development of SEL standards in P-12 schools across the country (CASEL, 2013).

Scholarship on SEL draws on more than a century of research from diverse fields, including progressive education, psychology, cultural and ecology studies, and social learning and cognitive behavioral theory (Osher et al., 2016). SEL gained prominence in the 1990s because of growing concerns about bullying and violence in schools (Osher et al., 2016). Early SEL researchers such as Salovey and Mayer (1990) emphasized emotions as relational, requiring interpersonal attunement and regulation, and encompassing distinct forms of emotional intelligence and social competence (Campos et al., 1989; Osher et al., 2016). Recent articulations of SEL have also drawn on nuanced conceptualizations of intelligence, including the "multiple intelligences" theory (Gardner, 1983), which describes inter- and intrapersonal intelligences, as well as "practical intelligence" (Sternberg, 1985), which involves self-management and cooperation with others.

Context and Culture in SEL

Researchers have cautioned that effective SEL interventions require systemic approaches that are developmentally appropriate and culturally relevant, while accounting for school context and climate (Gregory & Fergus, 2017; Melnick et al., 2017; Osher et al., 2016). SEL is maximized

in contexts where mutual respect, cooperation, caring, and decision making are the norm (Osher et al., 2016; Zins & Elias, 2007). Such contexts promote feelings of safety among students and recognize the interdependent nature of academic, social, and emotional growth.

Zins and Elias (2007) provided guidelines for comprehensive systems of support for SEL. Using interlocking circles, the authors outlined a SEL framework that focused on the broad prevention of negative behaviors and the promotion of positive behaviors for all students, as well as early intervention for students at risk of failed relationships or interpersonal violence, and targeted systems of support for students with problems requiring treatment for substance abuse, unhappiness, and maladjustment. The systems of support, moreover, were to be aided by robust partnerships between schools, families, and communities, which ensure continuity and coordination for the prevention and promotion of SEL (Zins & Elias, 2007).

Ecological approaches to SEL are also culturally situated and culturally relevant. Indeed, Mayer and Salovey (1997) warned against reductive programs that focused on notions of "right" or "wrong" emotional responses to situations, which disconnect norms and rules for regulating emotion from context-specific conditions and multicultural practices. These concerns have emerged in critiques of popular SEL programs in high-poverty contexts, which some scholars have viewed as isolating noncognitive skills from the contexts of students' experiences, histories, and cultural practices (Anderson, 2014; Hoffman, 2009; Ris, 2015). Effective SEL programs, in contrast, inform social and emotional learning with frameworks that recognize flexible and diverse models of intelligible emotional responses to social events and interpersonal relationships (Hoffman, 2009; Paris & Alim, 2014). As such, modifications to SEL programs that are culturally informed are encouraged and celebrated. For example, modifications by the Association of Alaska School Boards (AASB) involved direct collaboration with First Alaskans to ensure culturally

appropriate SEL curriculum (Osher et al., 2016). Culturally relevant approaches to SEL, moreover, are aided by culturally relevant pedagogies on the part of teachers, where educators hold students to high academic expectations, affirm students' identities and rights to cultural expression in the classroom, and make explicit connections to issues of equity and social justice in society (Ladson-Billings, 1995).

Amid calls for systemic approaches to SEL, attention to the geographic contexts and conditions of SEL are underdeveloped (i.e., "geographies of opportunity" or inequality), as well as sources of opportunity for teachers to develop efficacy in SEL that are context-specific. Jones and Doolittle (2017) noted that while attention to SEL often focuses on improving students' individual skills, behaviors, and attitudes, the role of adults and their SEL competencies are largely ignored, placing much of the burden for SEL on students alone. Teacher SEL skills, however, have been shown to predict student SEL, motivation, and academic performance (Mikami et al., 2011; Ruzek et al., 2016). Consequently, the quality of SEL programs hinges on the development and support of teacher competencies in SEL and the contextual dimensions of their practices (Osher et al., 2016; Yoder, 2014).

Generally, teacher preparation programs ignore or minimize SEL as a fundamental aspect of teaching, leaving teachers relatively unprepared to support SEL in their classrooms (Schonert-Reichl, 2017). A nationally representative survey of pre-K through 12th grade teachers found that while a majority of teachers (82%) valued SEL and desired training in SEL, less than half (44%) reported that SEL was taught in their school and just over half (55%) reported having received training in SEL (Bridgeland et al., 2013). Likewise, findings from a nationally representative survey of over 800 public school principals showed that a majority of school leaders reported

strong value and support for SEL in their schools, but noted a lack of resources for teacher training in SEL as a fundamental obstacle to school-wide implementation (DePaoli et al., 2015).

Teacher Efficacy

While research on SEL is expanding, the existing research has yet to focus on the role of teachers' beliefs about their ability (i.e., efficacy) to shape students' SEL, let alone how their SEL competencies are developed. The current study considered teachers' perceived efficacy as an important construct and mechanism for the improvement of SEL in schools and classrooms. Self-efficacy is often defined as "people's beliefs about their capabilities to design and enact courses of action and designated types of performances" (Bandura, 1986, p. 391), while teacher self-efficacy is described as teachers' beliefs in their competence to teach or affect student performance (Berman et al., 2018). Researchers have found modest empirical support for connections between teacher efficacy and student outcomes and have included self-efficacy as a component of teacher evaluations in some settings (Caprara et al., 2006; Henson, 2001; Henson et al., 2001; Ross et al., 2001).

Previous studies of teacher efficacy have been largely quantitative in terms of methodological approach. A review of research by Klassen et al. (2011) found that between 1998 and 2009, more than 75% of 218 articles on teacher efficacy relied on quantitative approaches, while 15% used mixed methods and 9% were qualitative. The majority of quantitative studies used teachers' self-reports on surveys (Klassen et al., 2011). While teacher surveys allowed for broad studies of efficacy, they provided little information on process or the sources and development of teacher efficacy.

A small number of qualitative studies has explored the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and student outcomes. Teachers have reported that professional development opportunities that allow them to design and implement curricula increased both their feelings of self-efficacy and student learning (Beauchamp et al., 2014; Puchner & Taylor, 2006; Rivard et al.,

2004). Bruce and Ross (2008) used multiple sources of data (e.g., teacher observations, teacher self-reports, and peer coaching summaries) to explore teacher self-efficacy among 12 elementary school teachers. The authors described evidence of teacher mastery experiences, verbal persuasion, vicarious experiences, and physiological and emotional cues as sources that informed teacher perceptions of their own efficacy. These four sources reinforced one another and led to continued implementation of new and challenging teaching strategies (Bruce & Ross, 2008).

Studies of teacher self-efficacy have pointed to the importance of developing a clear sense of the role of teachers' beliefs in their capabilities to support student learning and academic outcomes. These studies also suggested the importance of high-quality teacher professional development as a modus to help teachers develop their SEL competencies (Beauchamp et al., 2014). However, as noted above, most teacher education programs do not incorporate SEL training into the preparation of aspiring educators (Schonert-Reichl, 2017). Moreover, research is lacking that has explored the importance of the teaching context, whereby teacher efficacy is shaped within an ecology of school conditions that give form to the implementation of SEL. The present study is among the first to explore connections between teacher efficacy, SEL, and school context.

Present Study

The current study drew on data from a larger study on the experiences and perceptions of teaching among teachers who participated in two fellowship programs. We explored the teachers' perceptions of efficacy, when compared to perceptions of the efficacy of other teachers in their school, in three domains—academic achievement, social and emotional learning—and school leadership and community engagement. Here, we focused on differences that emerged in teachers' perceptions of efficacy in SEL, when compared to their perceptions of efficacy with respect to the SEL of other teachers in their school. We administered surveys to teachers in the two teacher

fellowship programs (n = 129) and conducted teacher interviews (n = 30) and school observations (n = 10), which offered deeper insights into factors shaping differences in teachers' perceptions of efficacy. It is important to note that we only surveyed teachers in the fellowship programs and thus we do not have data from teachers in the schools in which they worked.

Participants

In 2015, we sent a survey over a period of 2 months to all teachers who had received fellowships from the Rothschild and Astor programs. A total of 129 recipients responded, comprising approximately 72% of each population of fellows (53 of 74 Rothschild Fellows; 76 of 105 Astor Fellows). Participants were entered into a drawing for a $100 gift card as an incentive to participate. The fellowships were funded and administered by the same foundation, which provided scholarships for fellows to attend university-based teacher education programs as well as additional support in the form of annual conferences, workshops, and mentors. Each education program partnered with school districts to offer clinically rich, school-based student teaching assignments to fellowship recipients. All fellows, moreover, were required to teach in high-needs public schools (as defined by the state in which they were located) for 3 years after graduating.

Important differences between the programs should be noted, however, and these are related mostly to their distinct mission and targeted population. Program characteristics are summarized in Appendix A. The Rothschild Program, for example, focuses on increasing ethnoracial diversity in the workforce and serves only teachers of color, while the Astor Program focuses on preparing teachers in STEM subjects and supports primarily White teachers. Another important distinction between the two fellowships is that the foundation that oversaw both programs designed a biannual convening exclusively for the Rothschild Fellows. Overall, despite differences between the programs, a number of core elements are similar, including the academic

backgrounds of fellowship recipients (minimum GPA of 3.0), extensive financial support, ongoing mentorship and professional development, and placement of fellows in high-needs urban public schools.

Methods

We used a mixed-methods approach that included surveys, semi-structured interviews, and observations. In the Spring of 2015, we began with a survey for all teachers who participated in the fellowship programs. We used survey results to sample participants purposively for phone interviews, including teachers who reported high and low efficacy in SEL as well as fellows who reported plans to leave their school at the end of the academic year. Following interviews, we selected participants for observations in schools and classrooms, focusing on teachers in a variety of contexts (e.g., region; district and charter schools; elementary, middle, and high schools).

Survey

We surveyed teachers (n = 129) about their perceptions of effectiveness in three areas when compared to their perceptions of school-based peers: teachers' perception of effectiveness on student academic achievement, teachers' perception of effectiveness on noncognitive student development (SEL), and teachers' involvement in their school community. Questions were developed using criterion-based approaches, whereby participants rated themselves according to the level with which they corresponded. Most of the survey questions were 4-point Likert scale questions; possible responses for the Likert questions were: very effective, effective, somewhat effective, and not effective. Overall, the survey consisted of 70 questions. One of the reasons for the relatively large number of questions was that we asked each question twice to allow for validity checks of responses. We also asked a number of multiple-choice demographic questions with the option "other" and a fill-in response, including race, gender, grades taught, and subject(s)

taught. In addition, teachers were asked about their school type (e.g., public school, public charter school, private school, or other) and their levels of involvement in their fellowship program, including questions about the number of annual and biannual meetings they had attended, how helpful they found the meetings, and frequency of communication and interaction with other fellows about their teaching practice.

Interviews and Observations

The second stage of the research design included teacher interviews (n = 30). As seen in Table 1, we selected a sample of participants from each program to give interviews, including 14 Rothschild Fellows and 16 Astor Fellows. The first and second authors purposively selected participants to include those who reported high and low levels of efficacy in SEL on the aforementioned survey. There were 28 interview questions. The first and second authors also interviewed via telephone, which lasted, on average, 1 hour. The audio-recorded interviews were sent out to be transcribed verbatim. Interview participants were ensured confidentiality from fellowship staff and leaders and were recruited via email domains not affiliated with their respective fellowship programs. Participants received a $5 gift card to Starbucks for their participation.

We also selected a subgroup of participants for classroom observations (n = 10), specifically six Rothschild Fellows and four Astor Fellows. For these observations, we purposively selected participants for their representation of a variety of school types and schools located in different regions of the United States (e.g., district and charter schools; elementary, middle, and high schools; and schools in the Northwest and Northeast regions). Observations lasted, on average, for one half-day (between 3-4 hours of class time). Observers took notes on classroom lessons, teacher-student interactions and discipline practices, organization of classroom space,

school signage and physical conditions, and, in some instances, teachers' interactions with colleagues and school leaders.

Data Analysis

We used three constructs to measure teachers' perceptions of efficacy in student academic achievement, in SEL, and in teachers' involvement in their school community. Teachers' perceptions of efficacy in SEL were measured with two survey questions, with responses following a Likert scale. For each construct of efficacy, the lowest level indicated teachers who believed they were not effective in the domain in question, when compared to their colleagues at their school. At the highest level were teachers who felt much more effective than their colleagues. We chose to use school-based colleagues as a reference point to account for regional and local variations in teacher quality, especially because daily interactions usually allow teachers to have a sense of their colleagues' actions, thus enabling more accurate judgments about their own SEL effectiveness. Appendix A provides the correlation between the reported teacher efficacy in Achievement, SEL, and School Involvement.

Analysis of interview and observation data included an iterative process of reviewing, analyzing, and coding transcribed interviews and field notes. We began our analysis with a system of descriptive and inductive coding (Saldaña, 2009), employing note taking and detailed summary of responses by each participant, including details of the participants' involvement with their fellowship program, their school context, and their experiences in teacher preparation programs. We contacted program directors during this phase for clarification about program structure, services, and the content of workshops during annual and biannual meetings. A matrix of responses for participants in each fellowship program was created, which allowed for identification of patterns within and across cases. We then used analytic coding (Grbich, 2007) to identify

themes related to school context, such as professional development opportunities, school resources, school discipline practices, and other relevant conditions of teaching and its relationship to teacher efficacy in SEL. In this phase, we noted patterns of convergence and divergence between fellowship participants, including responses by fellows that exemplified "low" and "high" levels of efficacy related to various context factors and conditions.

Findings

Teacher Characteristics and Differences

While the two programs share a number of features, we found important differences between the fellowship programs and their populations. As summarized in Table 2, all Rothschild Fellows identified as people of color. Fewer Rothschild fellows were women, and more reported being elementary, English, or history teachers. No Astor Fellows were elementary school teachers, but more reported being math and science teachers, reflecting the program's efforts to recruit STEM teachers.

Teachers' Perceptions of Efficacy

We found that teachers in both programs gave themselves similar rankings on efficacy in student achievement and school involvement. On average, both groups reported being more effective and involved in the school community than their peer school-based colleagues. However, group differences existed in teachers' perceptions of efficacy in student SEL. As seen in Table 3, Rothschild Fellows had higher scores than Astor Fellows when rating their perceptions of effectiveness in student SEL, compared to other teachers in their school. Interestingly, Latinx fellows also reported higher levels of SEL efficacy compared with their White peers, conditional on other variables in the model. Further, the Rothschild Fellows who reported spending more time communicating with fellows from other cohorts also reported lower SEL efficacy. This may

indicate that teachers who struggled with SEL actively sought support from their peers in the fellowship.

Contextualizing Teachers' Perceptions of Efficacy in SEL

An analysis of semi-structured interviews revealed that Rothschild and Astor Fellows described similar challenges in their school working conditions, which limited support for SEL. The majority of fellows, 20 out of 30, expressed concern that no formal systems dedicated to SEL were in place in their school or that existing efforts were inadequate. Fellows described a dearth of counselors, psychologists, and social workers in their respective schools; in some cases, participants viewed a lack of physical space in the school building as a limitation for SEL support. Juan, an Astor Fellow, explained, "I do wish that our school had a psychologist and counselor there at the school.... Oftentimes, there's no set-up space for a student to go talk to their counselor in private or something like that." Peter, another Astor Fellow, noted, "We have some kids in the building that have issues that we simply don't have the resources to deal with. We may have a guidance department. We have some extra support.... But we have some students whose needs just go to the point where they need an environment where [the school] can offer basically a day of therapeutic assistance throughout the day in order for them to see success."

Similarly, Maria, a Rothschild Fellow, explained that her school had a youth program for homeless families, but observed it was often understaffed; thus, many truant youth remained disconnected from school. Megan, a Rothschild Fellow, described her school as having "good counselors" who established strong relationships with students, but noted there were too few counselors and many who complained about being "stretched too thin" in their capacity to support all students. Xavier was also a Rothschild Fellow whose school was located in a high-needs setting: "My school is in one of the [poorest] neighborhoods in Boston and so a lot of these kids

have experienced real-life situations like being evicted, not having food to eat, or multiple nights not having a place to live and going to hotels every night or going to a shelter." As such, Xavier noted that his school leaders recognized the need for social and emotional supports for students, but nonetheless lacked adequate resources to use them effectively. He explained:

> [In my school], we try to educate the whole child. So especially emotional needs, I would like to say that we put them on the same level like with their academic needs.... In the event of that being said, [the school] doesn't do the best job of actually providing those resources to kids, only because they lack the actual resources to give to the kids.

A minority of fellows, including six Rothschild Fellows and three Astor Fellows, reported adequate supports in their schools for SEL. In the schools where nine fellows described supportive environments for SEL, a range of services were noted including: full-day wraparound services for adults and youth with individual and group counseling available; on-site health clinics and food pantries for parents and community residents; art therapy and/or an arts-based approach to SEL; trauma services and/or professional development in trauma-centered approaches to discipline for teachers and staff; and a formal school-wide curriculum and professional development in social and emotional learning for teachers and staff. Surrounded by a host of supports, the fellows in these schools described working in a "family-like" atmosphere.

Fellows in both programs described discipline policies in their schools as limitations for SEL, lamenting that administrators and teachers often misidentified the sources of student misbehavior. Frustrations with discipline were particularly acute for fellows who described rigid discipline practices related to zero-tolerance practices, such as school-wide merit-demerit systems where compliance with a number of protocols was strictly enforced, from rules related to self-presentation (e.g., codes for uniform and dress, hair, and/or body modifications) to physical

movement within and between classes. Fellows described school expectations that encouraged teachers to track infractions and administer swift punishment in the form of demerits if students failed to comply with protocols. The opposite was true for students who complied with school protocols—they were rewarded with merits. Accumulation of merits and demerits garnered students weekly privileges or punishments, respectively. Nearly all fellows were troubled that merit-demerit systems were enforced without regard for differences in life situations or circumstances affecting their students. Astor Fellows Sandra, Kylie, and Christine lamented the disproportionate number of students of color who were disciplined in their respective schools, particularly Black students who "bore the brunt" of mistreatment; this also created racial tensions between students and teachers in the school. Joshua and Christopher (Rothschild and Astor Fellows, respectively) worried that school norms and conditions were a manifestation of the "school-to-prison pipeline," whereby harsh discipline practices led to extreme approaches that penalized—and criminalized—otherwise normal adolescent behavior and forms of deviance. Christopher noted that his students were "young and only 12" and needed much more nurturing and care than what the school currently provided.

Moreover, several fellows explained that weak institutional support for SEL worked symbiotically to reinforce and perpetuate highly rigid discipline systems. Astor Fellow Katherine explained, "Sometimes psychological needs are misread as discipline problems by administration." Christine expressed disagreement with her school's merit-demerit system but described having little power to do something about it: "If it was my choice, I probably wouldn't do it [give demerits]. It feels unnatural. Other teachers disagree with it too, but few have pushed back because it's a new school."

Nonetheless, some Astor Fellows supported their school's approach to addressing student misbehavior. Thomas, for example, adhered to his school's discipline policies and enacted rules more firmly than others. He said he saw himself as a disciplinarian (he served as his school's coordinator for detention) and expressed strong efficacy by controlling what was under his purview: "I focus on what I can do to try and help a kid out…. I ask myself, how can I try and take a problem that we are having [with a student] regularly and turn it into a positive thing?" However, Thomas acknowledged that his school took "extreme approaches" in light of limited capacity to address students' wide-ranging issues effectively, which resulted in either kicking students out of class or allowing students' problems "to fester" unattended.

Several fellows embraced alternative approaches to discipline; for example, some fellows favored a restorative justice approach to discipline—a budding approach recently piloted in some of the fellows' schools. Astor Fellow Rachel, a third-year high school English teacher, explained that after students commit a disciplinary infraction in her school, the restorative justice approach requires several steps before students can be suspended: "There is a conversation with a teacher, then it goes to a conversation with like a [school-based] mentor and a school administration, and then a phone call home. And then [if the behavior persists], it can lead to in-school suspension, and then finally like suspension and expulsion." For Rachel and several other fellows, restorative justice demonstrated that the school valued each student and wanted to ensure that each student remain part of the school's community. Overall, a majority of fellows described working in contexts with neither a restorative justice program nor other adequate supports for SEL.

Low Efficacy in SEL: Limited Preparation and Training

Despite similar challenges with school resources and supports for SEL, interviews and observations with fellows conveyed important differences in how teachers viewed their training in

SEL and professional development, as well as their sense of efficacy to respond to their students' SEL needs. While all fellows described teacher preparation that emphasized culturally relevant pedagogy, a model that stresses the importance of high expectations for students, knowledge of students' social and cultural backgrounds as resources for learning, and connections to social justice, both Astor and Rothschild Fellows expressed that these pedagogies were rarely connected to SEL in explicit ways. Indeed, some Astor Fellows who described feeling skillful when enacting culturally relevant pedagogy mentioned insecurities in their abilities to extend those competencies to social and emotional support for students. Consequently, Astor Fellows developed ad hoc approaches to SEL.

Astor Fellow Susan, a third-year science teacher, described feeling ill-equipped and poorly trained in SEL: "Personally, I don't feel that I was trained to be a mentor…. It's the part of my job where I feel less confident and less prepared." Susan believed she needed additional training on how to talk with students to navigate social and emotional challenges. Rachel, a third-year high school English teacher working in a public charter school, noted that she worked with 22 students as mentees: "I coach them through the different social-emotional ups and downs of high school. So that could be anything from a breakup, to something going on at home that they need help processing, to anger management. It's a lot of different really one-on-one conversations." While Rachel valued the mentoring program and saw the importance of administrators working to address the everyday challenges students encountered, she expressed concerns that were similar to Susan's, namely that she was ill-equipped to support students' social and emotional needs. Instead, Rachel preferred that the school create "system-wide resources" to help augment teachers' capacity to teach classes on SEL, in addition to increasing the number of school counselors.

Like Rachel, Samantha described feeling unable to support her students' SEL. During her interview, Samantha, a high school science teacher, explained that she needed to work on being more relational: "I need to learn how to care about student context." Samantha's admission was evident in her interactions with students. During a final unit that focused on nutrition, students made smoothies using ingredients from the school's garden. As students worked in stations cutting and blending fruit and vegetables, Samantha and a student teacher circulated around the classroom assisting students. Unlike the student teacher who knelt down when conversing with students, Samantha typically had her arms folded and stood upright when talking to students. Samantha appeared enthusiastic about the day's content and the various concoctions one could create with the assorted vegetables and fruit from the garden, but the enthusiasm subsided when interacting with students during the lesson.

Indeed, classroom observations provided an opportunity to understand the degree to which perceptions of efficacy (and inefficacy) that Astor Fellows described in interviews manifested in their practice with students. As an example, Julie, a fourth-year science teacher, explained in her interview that she was "conscious of fostering relationships with [her] students and being highly aware of meeting the needs—the emotional needs of our students." In a classroom observation, however, Julie, who teaches in an ethnoracially and economically diverse school, struggled when a student expressed emotion (frustration) during a unit on social justice and environmental science. In an end-of-unit discussion, Julie asked students what they could do to adopt the positive behaviors reviewed in class, such as eating organic foods and reducing their carbon footprint. First, a White student shared that she was able to convince her parents to install solar panels at their home. A Black student then responded in frustration that while she believed eating foods without pesticides was important, she and her working-class family could not afford them. At the end of

class when asked about the Black student's response, Julie acknowledged that she could have spent more time discussing "controversial topics" and the emotional weight they can bear on students, but she did not feel comfortable doing so.

High Efficacy in SEL: The Role of a Social Justice Learning Community

Similar to the Astor Fellows, the Rothschild Fellows described limited or inadequate resources in their school and limited teacher preparation in SEL. In contrast to the Astor Fellows, the Rothschild Fellows described their effectiveness in supporting SEL with students. There is a clear body of evidence on the favorable role teachers of color play, when compared to their White colleagues, in supporting the SEL of their students of color (Author, 2020). However, we know less about the potential mechanisms that teachers of color describe to develop efficacy in SEL. As we noted in the methods section, the Rothschild Fellows participated in a biannual convening organized by the foundation that awarded the fellowships. Reflecting on their experiences and continued learning from the biannual meeting, the Rothschild Fellows talked about the ways they leveraged resources from other Rothschild Fellows to support challenges in their respective schools. Indeed, the Rothschild Fellows described themselves as belonging to a learning community—what we call the *social justice learning community* (SJLC).

For example, Leah, a seventh-grade English charter school teacher in her second year of teaching, described experiences in the SJLC: "The conversations I have [with teachers in the SJLC] I just wasn't able to have with other teachers in the Master's program. We tend to go deeper. It's the same conversations but less surface level." Joshua, a sixth- and eighth-grade history teacher at a charter school, explained his rationale for participating in annual meetings sponsored by the fellowship, which were a prime access point to the SJLC: "Teachers aren't seen as professionals, but when I like to go to [meetings], I feel very much like a professional." Indeed,

many fellows described the fellowship as a community that provided a "marker of identity," particularly for teachers of color. Kevin, a special education teacher at a district school, explained:

> I think [the SJLC] really created a good community of people who weren't just young Black teachers in training, but also came from a variety of cultural backgrounds and brought a rich sense of kind of what it means to be part of a legacy of teachers, teachers of color. That was something that I didn't anticipate. But then I realized later on that all my friends who are part Asian, you know, my friends who are Latino and who also have [the fellowship] and how we didn't even go to the same [teacher education] program…[but] we build, communicate, and we still talk about how our own teaching is a marker identity…that our role as a teacher is part of a larger vision that we have about racial justice and social justice that comes from our own experiences within our own communities.

Jasmine, a sixth-grade English teacher at a public school in Boston, also explained a sense of connection with teachers in the SJLC: "I mean the SJLC was definitely more intimate, and so it was easier to build relationships in a short amount of time.… I think we also had the connection of being teachers of color." While annual gatherings were important, Jasmine discussed online activities as the most helpful access point for connecting with the SJLC which endured throughout the year:

> I think [fellowship meetings] carried over with the online community and every once in a while, we might post to each other on Facebook.... It's just as simple as knowing other teachers…. And just knowing that there's another new teacher going through to make it every day.

The SJLC grew out of the Rothschild Program, which sponsors Fellows and organizes events for Fellows to connect with teachers across regions. However, we distinguished between the

formal structure of the fellowship and the SJLC, noting that the former is what the fellowship provides—financial support, a mentor throughout preparation and training, and organization of biannual conferences—while the latter involves activities, interests, and commitments organized and oriented to the expressed needs and desires of teachers of color, including topics of discussion and enduring associations and camaraderie created and sustained by the fellows themselves. Based on the Fellows' descriptions, the SJLC foregrounded issues related to race and social justice in education, including explicit attention to racially discriminatory treatment experienced by students and teachers inside and outside schools. Hence, while the structure of the fellowship allowed the SJLC to form, via annual meetings, emails, newsletters, and a virtual online community to discuss and share resources, the fellows themselves drove the substance and content of fellows' discussions about professional supports for teaching.

Nearly all of the Rothschild Fellows interviewed (12 of 14) described being active participants in the SJLC, relying on one or two primary access points (e.g., annual meetings were the most utilized resource, while emails and newsletters were the least utilized resource). Importantly, Fellows described the SJLC as a space to deepen commitments to education with other "like-minded" teachers who provide affirmation, inspiration, and resources to improve their practices.

A third of the Rothschild Fellows who were interviewed expressed that the SJLC helped them influence or address particular challenges in their local context, including six fellows who held formal leadership positions at their school, while other fellows described having informal leadership roles. Some fellows explained they shared articles and information with administrators, colleagues, and students that they retrieved from the SJLC's online network or quarterly newsletters. Other fellows explained that they felt confident "speaking up" about particular

practices in their schools, and verbally shared with colleagues information that they learned in the SJLC.

Ivy, an eighth-grade social studies teacher, discussed the impact of attending a workshop at the SJLC, which encouraged her to challenge her school's rather weak approach to SEL. She stated, "Things I learned at the [meetings] helped me to be more meaningful this year in terms of when I should speak up [to school leaders] and say, 'Well, a five-year-old doesn't need what a fifteen-year-old needs…. Research in human development suggests that middle school children should *not* be required to be silent all day.'" Like Ivy, Joshua discussed his goal of "fighting back" against practices in his school that he deemed misaligned with SEL goals, based on information and discussions with fellows in the SJLC. Joshua explained:

> My perspective is that a behaviorist model is not appropriate for the most successful learning environment. I learned from [the SJLC]. They helped me realize that you need to treat students like people because they *are* people, and they go through incredible adversity on a daily basis. [The SJLC] helped me definitely be very critical of the behaviorist approach and really helped me see students as people, and then, as students. They get pushed to the curb because of all this adversity and the micro-aggressions.... My goal daily is to fight back.

In light of concerns with conditions and practices that undermine SEL, "fighting back" took on three dimensions for Joshua and several Rothschild Fellows: (a) developing formal supports for SEL by taking on leadership roles, (b) developing informal supports for SEL, and (c) leveraging academic instruction grounded in social justice to support SEL.

Formal Leadership in SEL

The Rothschild Fellows played formal roles in schools regarding SEL, including organizing professional development for teachers and staff related to community-building activities, discipline practices, and designing SEL curricula for students. Arlene, a ninth-grade English teacher, was tasked with leading her school's advisory committee for SEL, a position for which she volunteered. Candace, a second-grade teacher in her fourth year of teaching, helped to organize a school-wide training on new practices to improve behavior policies and social-emotional practices in classrooms. Both Arlene and Candace looked forward to their positions and felt strongly they could offer viable ideas to colleagues. Leah, however, held three leadership positions at her school, despite being in her second year of teaching. She was charged with coordinating professional development for the "safe and civil schools" program at her school, which required hosting office hours for beginning teachers who struggled with student behavior as well as heading her grade-level's English department and serving on the school's instructional leadership team with her principal. Leah expressed concern that the positions impeded her primary job of classroom teaching: "I did not volunteer for those positions.... I did [what was asked by my school leader] and I am feeling teacher burnout way too early in my career.... I can only do so much."

Informal Supports for SEL

Much like the Astor Fellows, some Rothschild Fellows described informal roles and ad hoc attempts to support students' SEL, including serving as mentors, counselors, and confidants to troubled students. Joshua explained, "I'm their mentor. I talk to the kids about their middle school relationships. I listen to them. I let them be informal with me." Several fellows described this approach, noting that strong relationships with students minimized issues with discipline and

allowed fellows to depart from school-wide approaches to behavior. As Megan explained, “I am able to be less punitive [with students] because I have a really, really, really great rapport with a majority of my students. So when I tell kids to stop doing something, they stop.” Other teachers noted tendencies to give more warnings than other teachers before giving demerits or referrals. Maria noted, “I haven’t assigned any formal detentions this year or given any referrals. I don’t usually find that student behavior is a problem.... I probably give multiple warnings whereas some teachers might just give one.” Most Rothschild Fellows worked in schools with a school-wide discipline policy, most commonly a merit-demerit system. The majority of these fellows found such systems overly punitive and particularly problematic in the absence of school supports for SEL. The Rothschild Fellows, however, reported administering fewer demerits and detention referrals than their colleagues.

Leveraging Academic Instruction for SEL

The Rothschild Fellows also leveraged materials from the SJLC to enhance academic instruction and SEL, including ways to identify and discuss stressful events related to race and racism experienced by youth in and out of school. The fellows explained that racial identity, racial discrimination, and current incidents involving “racialized violence” were difficult issues weighing on their students’ SEL. As such, the Rothschild Fellows described blending social justice approaches into academic development and SEL. Ramona, for example, described math lessons with her fifth-grade students involving student-generated surveys about their experiences with racial stereotypes in and out of school. In classroom visits and observations to Ramona’s class, we observed students working in groups to finalize surveys and prepare them for distribution to other students at the school. These students explained that while they planned to quantify and graph survey responses as histograms to strengthen graphing skills, the activity also provided them with

an opportunity to discuss important topics related to racism and its impact on student identity and self-esteem. All students in the class worked on questions related to issues of race, with different groups devoted to a subset of questions related to specific issues affecting girls or boys.

Similar to Ramona, Megan was a high school history teacher who guided her students in analyzing lengthy dissents from historic Supreme Court cases, particularly cases involving issues of race and discrimination. To prepare students for the unit, Megan organized activities that encouraged students to practice effective communication and argumentation with fellow classmates, including adapting the story of *Goldilocks* to resemble a courtroom trial. Students were encouraged to relate the unit's activities and skills to "real-life" events in and out of school.

Likewise, Jasmine designed a Spring writing unit for her sixth graders that focused on the primary question, "What is an 'Up-stander' for justice?" Students read and discussed key texts from the Civil Rights Movement (e.g., Martin Luther King Jr.'s "Letter From a Birmingham Jail") and the Holocaust (e.g., Elie Wiesel's *Night*). Jasmine chose the selections because of their rigorous and complex writing styles, and because the content allowed students to share feelings and express thoughts about the events and relate them to similar contemporary social events.

Lastly, Maria shared resources with students and administrators at her school that focused on current events (e.g., the death of Michael Brown and subsequent protests in Ferguson, Missouri), which she found via the SJLC. As Maria explained, "I'm linked up with the [SJLC]'s Facebook page, and I see some articles posted on there once in a while. I printed out one…and submitted that to my administration when the Ferguson stuff was happening." Maria leveraged these resources to facilitate difficult discussions with her students about race, racism, and White privilege:

> I was trying to get students to hear each other because there were other students in the class who understood privilege and had been on the other side of the coin, having not been privileged. So I did a lot of activities like doing philosophical shares, or having them do some reflective writing and share it to try and get them to hear each other from another person's perspective.

Overall, the Rothschild Fellows described practices that exemplified high feelings of efficacy in SEL, drawing largely on examples and resources shared in the SJLC, and included taking on formal and informal leadership roles related to SEL as well as leveraging culturally relevant curriculum grounded in social justice to support SEL.

Discussion

The aim of this study was to understand what teachers reported as the contributing factors that shaped their perceptions of efficacy in SEL as well as how, and to what degree, teachers described developing efficacy in SEL. We found differences and contextual influences on teachers' perceptions of effectiveness in SEL. Our analysis illuminated the ways teachers' perceptions of efficacy (and inefficacy) were shaped by contextual and relational conditions in and out of school. Despite receiving similar preparation from comparable teacher education programs and working in similar school contexts that lacked adequate resources, the teachers in two national fellowship programs (Rothschild and Astor) expressed different perceptions of efficacy in SEL and responded differently to their schools' conditions. While the Astor Fellows developed ad hoc supports for SEL within their respective classrooms, favoring inchoate restorative justice approaches and leveraging culturally relevant pedagogy, the Rothschild Fellows leveraged resources from a social justice learning community (SJLC), which nurtured efficacy and encouraged teachers to develop formal systems of support for SEL in their schools and to "fight back" against practices that were misaligned with SEL goals.

It is important to note that a biannual workshop, by itself, was not enough to develop the efficacy in SEL that the Rothschild Fellows described in the SJLC. It was, however, the opportunity for the Rothschild Fellows to come together on a routine basis to interrogate their own practice critically in a reflective, collaborative, and inclusive manner via multiple media, including the SJLC's online network.

As we found in this study, teacher self-efficacy played an important role in fostering practices, particularly classroom management practices, that avoid exclusionary patterns that can contribute to the school-to-prison pipeline. Both Rothschild and Astor Fellows viewed discipline

practices as essential areas that either aided or undermined efficacy in SEL, including a shared belief that inadequate supports for SEL reinforced (and exacerbated) reliance on rigid and punitive practices. Similarly, in their research, O'Connor et al. (2017) warned that an overreliance on "exclusionary practices indicates that teachers are not being provided with the necessary tools to enhance their sense of self-efficacy to reduce classroom conflict" (p. 180). As such, the Astor Fellows who reported weak levels of efficacy in SEL also expressed concern that they (and their school) overused exclusionary practices in the form of zero-tolerance discipline practices.

The data in this study also supported recent work on the role of school leaders in fostering effective SEL environments that are schoolwide and culturally sustaining as well as center ethics of care and equity (Kennedy, 2019). Both Astor and Rothschild Fellows described school leaders as obstacles to efficacy in SEL, noting myriad practices promoted by leaders that were viewed as misaligned with SEL growth (see Carter, Skiba, Arredondo, & Pollock, 2017, in Kennedy, 2019). This finding speaks to the school's role in establishing a culture for SEL beyond the classroom. Indeed, an important limitation of the effectiveness of teacher SEL competency might be the lack of a shared understanding of SEL goals and practices in the school setting (DePaoli et al., 2015). Future work should explore the role of SEL competency when viewed as a school-wide initiative, as compared to an initiative undertaken by individual teachers. As such, the experiences of the participants in this study support calls for leaders to design SEL professional development that avoids "add-on" approaches to ethics of care and instead integrates SEL throughout daily norms and practices, includes teachers in the planning, and promotes dialogue and critical consciousness to accommodate students from diverse backgrounds along lines of race, gender, or sexual orientation (Kennedy, 2019).

In contrast, the Astor Fellows described more traditional functions for fellowship programs, which was to provide content-based supports for academic instruction. This might be one reason that teachers from the Astor Program reported less efficacy in this domain, reflecting larger concerns about a lack of training and support for teachers in SEL (Jones & Doolittle, 2017; Schonert-Reichl, 2017). As such, the Astor Fellows viewed fellowship meetings as periodic and reported weaker connections throughout the year with other fellows. Hence, the function of fellowship programs in the lives of novice teachers in our study emerged as an important source of variation in how teachers developed efficacy in SEL and responded to conditions in their school context. These findings were surprising given that the Rothschild teachers were trained in a wider range of university-based teacher preparation programs and were dispersed across more regions of the country than the Astor teachers. However, the Rothschild teachers shared ethno-racial affinities as underrepresented groups in education, both in the teaching profession and in their schools.

The Rothschild Fellows also described foregrounding issues of race and injustice in school and society, and described these issues as opportunities to support SEL, by helping students identify emotions related to unjust events at home and school as well as in their neighborhood. In doing so, the Fellows described helping students to practice effective communication with others about injustice, in both written form and in dialogue, and to analyze and evaluate similar practices in academic content (e.g., in the communication styles of characters in books, famous essayists, or legal documents). These approaches affirmed not only students' experiences with injustice but the impact of injustice on their social and emotional well-being. By contrast, the Astor Fellows expressed desire for professional development opportunities in SEL. Professional opportunities should merge traditional SEL training with "contextual learning" opportunities, such as community immersion initiatives that provide teachers with opportunities to understand students'

out-of-school environments, expand teachers' knowledge of students' sociopolitical landscapes, and provide insight into local occurrences in the broader community related to trauma (Delale-O'Connor et al., 2017). Immersion opportunities can build efficacy by fostering more powerful relationships with students, including a sense of agency and "collective kinship" with students, families, and communities, as well as sensitivity to trauma-related student behaviors that promote effective responses linked to justice and critiques of broader social systems and inequities (Britton, in press; Delale-O'Connor et al., 2017).

Lastly, the findings highlighted the importance of learning communities for teachers that can foster efficacy. Although the Rothschild Fellows did not receive school-based PD for SEL, their access to a teacher learning community allowed them to access support for SEL and to improve perceptions of efficacy in this domain and other areas. This finding supports research that suggests subject matter content is necessary but not sufficient for teacher success in urban schools (Milner, 2013).

Implications for Research and Policy

The findings from this study have important implications for research, policy, and practice. Future research should explore the role of professional learning communities for teachers in schools, particularly for teachers of color and teachers in schools with limited resources and supports for SEL (Author, 2014). While both groups of teachers in this study benefited from the prestigious fellowships, only one group of fellows viewed themselves as belonging to a learning community. Research is needed to understand the conditions in which teachers develop trust with their peers, work collaboratively to share resources, and strategize to resolve problems of practice in their respective schools. Also, future studies should explore the impact of learning communities on teacher retention, particularly among teachers of color and other underrepresented groups.

Studies exploring the role of teachers' emotion in school contexts and their impact on students' perceptions of emotion are important (see Becker et al., 2014; Cross & Hong, 2012; Jiang et al., 2016). These studies should be extended, however, to explore whether or how teacher emotion is regulated (and perceived) differently by teachers of color. Moreover, while we provide some evidence of the variations in teachers' perceptions of their SEL efficacy, what is less clear is how these perceptions compare to students' perceptions. Future research should seek to understand the degree to which students' perceptions of their teachers' SEL efficacy is similar to teachers' perceptions of SEL efficacy. Also, researchers should explore the degree to which students' perceptions of teachers' SEL efficacy vary by teachers' race and/or ethnicity.

In terms of policy, given the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Schools Act (i.e. Every Student Succeeds Act), we encourage state policymakers to incorporate how educators support students' SEL as one measure to determine teacher performance and provide opportunities for teachers to develop competencies in SEL via teacher preparation programs, district-wide professional development, induction programs, or fellowship opportunities like Rothschild and Astor. Finally, in the realm of practice, our findings suggested that induction programs, while not the focal area of this study, can function much like the learning community (SJLC) described in the study. At the very least, induction programs should work toward developing the efficacy of novice teachers in areas related to SEL, particularly those working in schools serving historically marginalized youth.

References

Author. (2014).

Author. (2020).

Anderson, L. (2014, March 21). Lauren Anderson: Grit, Galton, and eugenics. *Education Week Teacher.* Retrieved [June 5, 2019] from https://blogs.edweek.org/teachers/living-in-dialogue/2014/03/lauren_anderson_grit.html

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Beauchamp, L., Klassen, R., Parsons, J., Durksen, T., & Taylor, L. (2014). Exploring the development of teacher efficacy through professional learning experiences. Alberta Teachers Association. https://www.teachers.ab.ca/SiteCollectionDocuments/ATA/Publications/Professional-Development/PD-86-29%20teacher%20efficacy%20final%20report%20SM.pdf

Becker, E. S., Goetz, T., Morger, V., & Ranellucci, J. (2014). The importance of teachers' emotions and instructional behavior for their students' emotions: An experience sampling analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 43,* 15-26. https://doi.org/10-/1016/j.tate.2014.05.002

Berman, S., Chaffee, S., & Sarmiento, J. (2018). *The practice base for how we learn: Supporting students' social, emotional, and academic development.* National Commission on Social, Emotional and Academic Development. The Aspen Institute. https://assets.aspeninstitute.org/content/uploads/2018/03/CDE-Practice-Base_FINAL.pdf?_ga=2.155240120.284179768.1553873914-233435090. 1553873914

Brackett, M. A., & Kremenitzer, J. P. (2011). *Creating emotionally literate classrooms: An introduction to the RULER approach to social and emotional learning.* National Professional Resources.

Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., Reyes, M. R., & Salovey, P. (2012). Enhancing academic performance and social and emotional competence with the RULER feeling words curriculum. *Learning and Individual Differences, 22*(2), 218-224. https:/doi.org. 10/1016/j.lindif.2010.10.002

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. https://casel.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/the-missing-piece.pdf

Bristol, T. J. (2014). Not strangers: How social distance influences Black male teachers' perceptions of their male students of color. In Y. Sealy-Ruiz, C. Lewis, & I. Toldson (Eds.), *Teacher education and the black community.* Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.

Bristol, T. J. (2020). A tale of two types of schools: An exploration of how school working conditions influence Black male teacher turnover. *Teachers College Record, 122* (3),1 – 41.

Britton, T. A. (In press). Does locked up mean locked out: The effects of the 1986 Anti-Drug Abuse Act on college enrollment. *Journal of Economics, Race, and Policy*.

Brown, K. D. (2014). Teaching in color: A critical race theory in education analysis of the literature on preservice teachers of color and teacher education in the US. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 17*(3), 326-345. doi:10.1080/13613324.2013.832921

Bruce, C. D., & Ross, J. A. (2008). A model for increasing reform implementation and teacher efficacy: Teacher peer coaching in grades 3 and 6 mathematics. *Canadian Journal of Education, 31,* 346-370. doi.org/10.2307/20466705

Campos, J. J., Campos, R. G., & Barrett, K. C. (1989). Emergent themes in the study of emotional development and emotion regulation. *Developmental Psychology, 25*, 394-402. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.25.3.394

Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P., & Malone, P. S. (2006). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students' academic achievement: A study at the school level. *Journal of School Psychology, 44,* 473-490. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2006.09.001

Center for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL). (2013). *Effective social and emotional learning programs: Preschool and elementary school edition.* Center for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning. http://casel.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/2013-casel-guide-1.pdf

Center for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL). (2019). *What is SEL?* Center for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning. http://www.casel.org/what-is-sel

Cross, D. I., & Hong, J. Y. (2012). An ecological examination of teachers' emotions in the school context. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 28*(7), 957-967. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.05.001

De Boeck, P., & Wilson, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Explanatory item response models: A generalized linear and nonlinear approach*. Springer-Verlag.

Delale-O'Connor, L. A., Alvarez, A. J., Murray, I. E., & Milner IV, H. R. (2017). Self-efficacy beliefs, classroom management, and the cradle-to-prison pipeline. *Theory Into Practice, 56*(3), 178-186. doi:10.1080/00405841.2017.1336038

DePaoli, J., Atwell, M., & Bridgeland, J. (2015). *Ready to lead: A national principal survey on how social and emotional learning can prepare children and transform schools.* Civic Enterprises with Hart Research Associates. http://www.casel.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/ReadyToLead_FINAL.pdf

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. Basic Books.

Grbich, C. (2007). *Qualitative data analysis: An introduction.* Sage.

Gregory, A., & Fergus, E. (2017). Social and emotional learning and equity in school discipline. *The Future of Children, 21*(1), 117-136.

Henson, R. K. (2001, June). Teacher self-efficacy: Substantive implications and measurement dilemmas. Invited keynote address given at the annual meeting of the Educational Research Exchange, Texas A&M University. http://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Pajares/EREkeynote.PDF

Henson, R. K., Kogan, L. R., & Vacha-Haase, T. (2001). A reliability generalization study of the teacher efficacy scale and related instruments. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 61,* 404-420. https://doi.org/10.1177.00131640121971284

Hoffman, D. M. (2009). Reflecting on social emotional learning: A critical perspective on trends in the United States. *Review of Educational Research, 79,* 533-556. doi:10.3102/0034654308325184

Jiang, J., Vauras, M., Volet, S., & Wang, Y. (2016). Teachers' emotions and emotion regulation strategies: Self- and students' perceptions. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 54*, 22-31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.11.008

Jones, S. M., & Doolittle, E. J. (2017). Social and emotional learning: Introducing the issue. *The Future of Children, 27*(1), 3-11. https://www.jstor.org/stable/44219018

Kennedy, K. (2019). Centering equity and caring in leadership for social-emotional learning: Toward a conceptual framework for diverse learners. *Journal of School Leadership,* 1-20. doi:10/1177/1052684619867469

Klassen, R. M., Tze, V. M., Betts, S. M., & Gordon, K. A. (2011). Teacher efficacy research 1998-2009: Signs of progress or unfulfilled promise? *Educational Psychology Review, 23*(1), 21-43. doi:10.1007.s10648-010-9141-8

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465-491. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1163320

Lutz, J. G., & Eckert, T. L. (1994). The relationship between canonical correlation analysis and multivariate multiple regression. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 54*(3), 666-675. https://doi.org.10.1177/0013164494054003009

Mayer, J., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence*: *Educational implications* (pp. 3-34). Basic Books.

Melnick, H., Cook-Harvey, C. M., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Encouraging social and emotional learning in the context of new accountability.* Learning Policy Institute. http://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/sel-new-accountability

Mikami, A. Y., Gregory, A., Allen, J. P., Pianta, R. C., & Lun, J. (2011). Effects of a teacher professional development intervention on peer relationships in secondary classrooms. *School Psychology Review, 40*(3), 367-385. doi:10.1080/02796015.2011.12087704

Milner, H. R. (2012). But what is urban education? *Urban Education, 47*(3), 556-561. https://doi.org.10.1177/0042085912447516

Milner, IV, H. R. (2013). But subject matter content knowledge is not enough. *Urban Education, 48*(3), 347-349. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085913485176

Milner, IV, H. R., Murray, I. E., Farinde, A. A., & Delale-O'Connor, L. (2015). Outside of school matters: What we need to know in urban environments. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 48*(4), 529-548. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2015.1085798

O'Connor, E., & McCartney, K. (2007). Examining teacher-child relationships and achievement as part of an ecological model of development. *American Educational Research Journal, 44,* 340-369. doi:10.3102/0002831207302172

Osher, D., Kidron, Y., Brackett, M., Dymnicki, A., Jones, S., & Weissberg, R. P. (2016). Advancing the science and practice of social and emotional learning: Looking back and moving forward. *Review of Research in Education, 40*(1), 644-681. https://doi.org/10.3102/0092732X16673595

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*(1), 85-100. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.84.1.9821873k2ht16m77

Puchner, L., & Taylor, A. (2006). Lesson study, collaboration and teacher efficacy: Stories from two school-based math study groups. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*(7), 922-934. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate/200604.011

Ris, E. W. (2015). Grit: A short history of a useful concept. *Journal of Educational Controversy, 10*(1), Article 3. https://cedar.wwu.edu/jec/vol10/iss1/3/

Rivard, J. J., Follo, E. L., & Walsh, C. M. (2004). Teacher empowerment through the development of individual and collective teacher efficacy. *ERS Spectrum, 22*, 34-39. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2016.1183508

Ross, J. A., Hogaboom-Gray, A., & Hannay, L. (2001). Effects of teacher efficacy on computer skills and computer cognitions of Canadian students in grades K-3. *The Elementary School Journal, 102,* 141-156. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1002205

Ruzek, E. A., Hafen, C. A., Allen, J. P., Gregory, A., Mikami, A. Y., & Pianta, R. C. (2016). How teacher emotional support motivates students: The mediating roles of perceive peer relatedness, autonomy, support, and competence. *Learning and Instruction, 42*, 95-103. https://doi.org.10.1016/j.learnimstruc.2016.01.004

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers.* Sage.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, *9*, 185-211. https://doi.org/10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG

Schonert-Reichl, K. A. (2017). Social and emotional learning and teachers. *The Future of Children, 27*(1), 137-155. doi:10.1353/foc.2017.0007

Sternberg, R. J. (1985). *Beyond IQ: A triarchic theory of human intelligence*. Cambridge University Press.

Stoll, L., Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Wallace, M., & Thomas, S. (2006). Professional learning communities: A review of the literature. *Journal of Educational Change, 7,* 221-258. doi:10.1007/s10833-006-0001-8

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.

White, T. (2016). Teach For America's Paradoxical Diversity Initiative: Race, Policy, and Black Teacher Displacement in Urban Schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives,* 24(16).

doi.org/10.14507/epaa.24.2100

Yoder, N. (2014). *Teaching the whole child: Instructional practices that support social-emotional learning in three teacher evaluation frameworks*. American Institutes for Research. https://gtlcenter.org/sites/default/files/TeachingtheWholeChild.pdf

Zins, J. E., & Elias, M. J. (2007). Social and emotional learning: Promoting the development of all students. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 17*(2-3), 233-255. doi:10.1080/10474410701413152

Table 1

Demographic Profile of Interview Participants (n = 30)

	Rothschild Fellows (n = 14)	Astor Fellows (n = 16)
Gender		
Female	9 (64%)	10 (62%)
Male	5 (36%)	5 (38%)
Race/Ethnicity		
Black	9 (64%)	1 (6%)
Latino/a	3 (21%)	2 (13%)
Asian	2 (14%)	1 (6%)
White	(0%)	12 (75%)
School Sector		
Public, DOE	6 (43%)	13 (87%)
Public, Charter	8 (57%)	2 (13%)
Average Years Teaching	2.3	2.7

Table 2

Summary Statistics for Survey Respondents by Fellowship Program (All Cohorts)

	Rothschild (n = 53)	Astor (n = 76)
Variable	Mean	Mean
Female	0.62	0.68
Age	26.26	28.17
Latino/a	0.28	0.13
Black/African American	0.49	0.09
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.13	0.09
American Indian	0.02	0.00
Biracial	0.17	0.05
White	0.04	0.54
Grade K to 5	0.28	0.08
Grade 6 to 8	0.21	0.24
Grade 9 to 12	0.47	0.64
0 Years of Experience	0.06	0.09
1-2 Years of Experience	0.51	0.34
3-4 Years of Experience	0.40	0.41
5+ Years of Experience	0.02	0.13
Education Major/Minor	0.38	0.11
Undergraduate Teaching Certification	0.06	0.00

Table 2 (continued)

	Rothschild (n = 53)	Astor (n = 76)
Teach English	0.40	0.08
Teach Math	0.13	0.24
Teach History	0.28	0.16
Teach Science	0.09	0.42
Teach Elementary	0.21	0.07
Teach Other	0.17	0.11
Plan to Stay	0.66	0.80
Plan to Leave	0.21	0.11

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Teacher Perceptions of Efficacy by Fellowship Type (All Cohorts)

	Rothschild (n = 53)		Astor (n = 76)	
Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Achievement				
Stud. Ach. 1	2.45	1.14	2.37	0.96
Stud. Ach. 2	2.68	1.14	2.43	0.94
Stud. Exam 1	2.04	1.04	1.93	0.94
Exam Accuracy	2.87	0.74	2.72	0.65
Stud. Exam 2	1.81	1.09	1.87	0.94
Socio-emotional Learning				
Stud. Socio-emotional 1	2.85	1.23	2.51	0.99
Stud. Socio-emotional 2	5.96	1.47	4.82	1.76
Stud. Advocacy 1	2.30	1.08	2.14	0.87
Stud. Advocacy 2	2.45	1.15	2.09	0.84
School Involvement				
Extracurricular 1	2.04	1.13	1.79	1.05
Extracurricular 2	1.79	1.12	1.82	0.99
Leadership 1	2.00	1.11	2.16	1.08
Leadership 2	1.89	1.05	2.00	0.97

Notes: All questions on a 4-point Likert scale, where 1 = not effective and 4 = very effective. The exception is Stud. Socio-emotional 2 on a 7-point scale because this asks how often students seek out teachers to discuss their problems. Possible answers are Never, Less than Once a Month, Once a Month, 2-3 Times a Month, Once a Week, 2-3 Times a Week, Daily.

Appendix A: Rothschild and Astor Program Details

Program Overview	Rothschild	Astor
Total number of fellow recipients	74	105
Total number of nominating colleges	48	5
Total number of graduate programs in education	29	4
Fellowship Eligibility Requirements:		
Self-identified person of color in senior year of college	x	
Nominated by an eligible nominating institution	x	x
U.S. citizen or permanent resident	x	x
Background in the arts and sciences	x	x
Not currently in a teacher preparation program	x	x
Cumulative GPA of 3.0	x	x
Fellowship Components:		
$30,000 stipend for graduate study in education	x	x
Preparation in high-need urban or rural schools	x	x
3-year teaching commitment in high-need urban or rural school	x	x
Mentoring throughout 3-year teaching commitment	x	x
Annual convenings & workshops w/ all fellows	x	x
Biannual convenings & workshops w/ program fellows	x	

Appendix B. Correlations Between Reported Efficacy in Achievement, SEL, and School Involvement

	Achievement	SEL	School Involvement
Achievement Efficacy	1.00		
SEL Efficacy	0.50	1.00	
School Involvement	0.68	0.70	1.00