

Impact of Organizational Factors on Effective Integration of Social Emotional Learning in Pre-Service Teacher Training Programs

Alia Siraj ¹ Mehwish Jabeen ² Humair Akhtar ²

¹ PhD Scholar, Department of Education, University of Wah, Wah Cantt., Punjab, Pakistan.

✉ aliasiraj11@gmail.com |  <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-3701-5349>

² Assistant Professor, Department of Education, University of Wah, Wah Cantt., Punjab, Pakistan.

✉ drmehwish17@gmail.com |  <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-9002-7868>

³ M.Phil. Scholar, Department of Education, The University of Haripur, Haripur, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

✉ umairakhtar848@gmail.com |  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1127-427X>

This article may be cited as Siraj, A., Jabeen, M., & Akhtar, H. (2025). Impact of Organizational Factors on Effective Integration of Social Emotional Learning in Pre-Service Teacher Training Programs. *ProScholar Insights*, 4(4), 160-173.

<https://doi.org/10.55737/psi.2025d-44136>



Corresponding Author:

Humair Akhtar

M.Phil. Scholar, Department of Education, The University of Haripur, Haripur, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

✉ umairakhtar848@gmail.com

Abstract: Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) has been proposed as a very important part of holistic teacher preparation, but, its successful implementation into pre-service teacher training programs is still a problem especially in the developing educational settings. This paper discussed how the organizational variables, which include curriculum design, training resources and institutional support, influence the successful integration of SEL into pre-service teacher training programs. Quantitative survey research design was used guided by a positivist paradigm. Two questionnaires, which were self-developed, were used to collect data on 79 teacher educators working in seven public universities in Islamabad, Pakistan. The data were analysed using descriptive statistics, one-sample t-tests, Pearson correlation and multiple linear regression. The results proved that teacher educators tended to consider the organizational factors as significant in terms of SEL integration. There were great positive correlations among all organizational variables and SEL integration. Regression analysis also revealed that organizational factors were all significant predictors of effective SEL integration with institutional support and training resources being stronger than curriculum design as predictors of effective SEL integration. The paper ends by concluding that successful implementation of SEL in pre-service teacher education must be an organizational strategy that incorporates favourable policies, resources and aligned curricula. The results are results that are empirical in nature to use in institutional change and policy efforts to improve the integration of SEL in teacher education curriculum.

Keywords: Social Emotional Learning, CASEL, Pre-service Teacher Education, Curriculum Design, Training Resources, Institutional Support

Introduction

SEL is being seen as a pillar of holistic education contributing to improved emotional control of learners, their interpersonal, and academic engagement (Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning [CASEL], 2023; Social Emotional Learning, 2025). Within the framework of teacher preparation, SEL needs to be incorporated into pre-service teacher training, which is a pedagogical imperative and a systemic problem (Murano et al., 2019). Institutional support, access to training materials, and curriculum design, are organizational factors that are crucial in defining how successful the integration of SEL can be in teacher education programs (Ulla & Poom-Valickis, 2023; Oberle et al., 2020). Institutional support offers the policy assumptions and leadership that give SEL the upper hand and establishes the level of faculty capacity building based on training resources (Duane et al., 2025) and the organizational of SEL competencies within the framework of professional standards and coursework (Ltifi, 2024). These factors collectively affect the capacity of teacher educators to produce a competent pre-service teacher in his/her future classroom that advances SEL.

On the global scale, the study of SEL inclusion in the teacher education process reveals the ongoing problem with preparation courses. The systematic review of the implementation of SEL in tertiary and teacher education revealed that institutional support and educator preparedness were among the major factors of successful SEL programming (Wang & Ishak, 2025). Similarly, research on SEL professional development suggests that the lack of training opportunities and the shortage of resources are important obstacles to the implementation of comprehensive SEL training by teachers (Najjarpour, 2025). The previous literature in the U.S. has observed that, the traditional teacher preparation programs are characterized by a little formal consideration of SEL competencies, which there is structural and curriculum deficiency in the current models (Schonert-Reichl et al., 2014). Taken together, these results indicate that organizational conditions influence the way of translating the SEL principles into the teacher education practice on the international level.

Empirical work is limited and not well represented in the regional and Pakistani context but suggests similar systemic problems. Recent quantitative research involving teacher educators in Pakistan revealed inadequate levels of SEL awareness and understanding among teacher educators, which has been explained by the lack of pre-service training and in-service training, poor curricular integration, and poor institutional commitment (Siraj et al., 2025). In another study of SEL awareness among the locals, it was stated that though some of the identified skills such as self-awareness or social awareness are accepted, other important competencies such as self-management and responsible decision-making are not well represented in teacher education programs (Yasir & Mahmood, 2024). This research indicates that there are certain difficulties in developing a strong SEL focus on Pakistani pre-service teacher training, and organizational aspects, including training materials and curricula sets, prove to have become the significant bottlenecks.

Although these are some useful contributions, there are still gaps in the research about the quantitative study of the impacts of particular factors in an organization on the effectiveness of the SEL integration in the pre-service teacher training programs. The available literature tends to explain the level of awareness or perceptions but fails to quantify the predictive correlation of institutional support, training resources, curriculum design and SEL integration outcomes in a systematic way. More evidence on institutional and resource allocation mechanisms that support or restrict SEL practices in teacher education is being demanded by the international literature (Wang & Ishak, 2025; Najjarpour, 2025), but not yet addressed by empirical research in the Pakistani teacher education context. Specifically, the research that involves strong quantitative designs is necessary to determine how the combination of organizational predictors influences SEL integration as a way of informing specific policy and practical intervention in teacher training institutions.

Literature Review

SEL is a pedagogical paradigm which focuses more on the growth of intrapersonal and interpersonal skills in learning as well as the traditional cognitive abilities. According to CASEL, SEL is an evidence-based process that enables learners to gain five core competencies self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making that facilitate academic learning, emotional regulation, and positive behaviour (CASEL, 2020). The framework provided by CASEL highlights that SEL is not only associated with the add-on activities, but core competencies that may be incorporated at the curricula and educational practices levels to achieve the holistic development of students. The incorporation of SEL in teacher training involves not only the instructional approaches but also organizational frameworks, which will offer an institutional back up, training materials and curriculum development in compliance with SEL concepts. Such organizational factors as strong administrative policies, the provision of sufficient training resources and coherence of the curriculum have been identified to become decisive factors in the effective implementation of SEL into pre-service teacher preparation programs (Wang et al., 2025; Siraj et al., 2025). Extensive integration means that teacher educators themselves are expected to be SEL literate, assisted by institutional forms of organization that help teacher educators to develop, align their curriculum, and engage in self-reflection.

In the global scale, SEL studies in teacher education have focused on the significance of entrenched supports as well as structural arrangements that allow teachers to tap into SEL pedagogies in a productive manner. Wang and Ishak (2025) highlight in a systematic review that institutional support and educator preparedness are the key initiators



of a successful SEL integration in a tertiary and a teacher education environment and summarize the results of 26 peer-reviewed papers. This review indicated that most members of the teaching fraternity do not receive sufficient professional learning opportunities and institutional support usually determines the extent to which SEL can be integrated into the teacher training programs. The results indicate that the professional development, availability of resources and organizational culture have direct effect on the SEL outcomes and sustainability in educational institutions. On the same note, the literature discussing the application of SEL to schools cites systemic barriers to the implementation of comprehensive application of SEL including time allocation, resources, and lack of training facilities as obstructions to the wider application of SEL, which means that these constraints do not exist in school settings but cut right across the teacher education courses at the universities (Lindsay, 2013). Intergovernmental and practitioner reports also argue that teacher training institutions should not be limited to voluntary workshops but instead to institutional policies supported by institutional resources to the SEL integration on large scale.

Research works on pre-service professional learning in the field of SEL are justified by the research studies conducted in the early childhood and K-12 systems that highlight the ability of educators to enhance SEL competencies in students (Blandford, 2025). The research conducted in the pre-service early childhood education proved that the SEL competencies of the teacher trainees depend on the exposure to the curriculum and the training experiences (Schonert-Reichl et al., 2015), which supports the premise that curricular design and teaching exposure during teacher education heavily influence the willingness of the educators to adopt the SEL strategies (Waajid et al., 2013). Moreover, available research on teacher preparation shows that pre-service teachers demonstrate better levels of SEL knowledge and instructional self-efficacy in case of SEL inclusion into primary coursework and practicum experiences, which has positive effects on classroom climate and student achievement (Cochran & Peters, 2023; Akhtar et al., 2019). Such foreign studies also present some facts that the institutional level of organizational factors is critical in setting SEL adoption in teacher education.

In neighbouring environments like India, professional development models have shown that SEL pedagogical skills are boosted greatly when teacher training integrates the long-term programmes such as the ones that do not constitute of workshops. In studying the models that can be utilized in the professional development of teachers in giving them the SEL skills, Bhardwaj explains that systematic follow-up, reflective practice, and culturally responsive content programs are more effective than training events (Bhardwaj, 2025). Although these studies are not specifically dedicated to the pre-service teacher education, the obtained findings highlight the universality of the organizational factors, including the quality of the training resources and the format of the professional development, as predictors of the successful implementation of SEL in both pre-service and in-service settings. These suggestions indicate that teacher training programs that invest in carefully designed SEL training modules, and are institutionally supported, can have increased the ability to develop SEL skills in future teacher trainees.

On the national level in the context of Pakistan, the integration of SEL in education has recently begun to be explored, yet the empirical research is still scarce (when compared to the international literature). Siraj et al. (2025) explored the knowledge and awareness levels of teacher educators regarding SEL in Islamabad and Rawalpindi universities and found out that the levels of SEL literacy are usually rather low among the participants. As the main obstacles to effective SEL implementation in teacher training programs, the study determined institutional support gaps, insufficient professional development, and the insignificance of curriculum integration. Notably, the regression analysis in this paper indicated that the perceptions of the significance of SEL were a significant predictor of instructional practices awareness, with the institutional priorities being the factors that impacted the involvement of the educators with SEL content. The other quantitative study that was conducted by Yasir and Mahmood (2025) also examined awareness of teacher educators about SEL skills integrated in teacher education programs and concluded that self-awareness and social awareness were highly emphasized, whereas other important skills such as responsible decision-making and relationship skills were under-represented. The researchers urged a prompt change in the curricula of teacher education so that the SEL competencies and professional pedagogical training were equally covered. These national results are significant because they indicate that such organizational issues as curriculum design and training access are not merely global issues but also relevant to the Pakistani teacher education system.



Additional Pakistani studies in school context supports the notion that teachers can be constrained in structural aspects to incorporate SEL principles into practice. The study by Hussain et al. (2025) focuses on the concept of SEL in the perceptions of teachers working in a secondary school, stating moderate levels of knowledge and identifying lack of proper training, institutional support, and the inflexible curriculum as the main issues. Another point that was highlighted in this study was that better teacher knowledge is associated with a lower perceived barrier to SEL implementation. These outcomes are indicative of the general challenges facing the educational ecosystem in institutionalizing SEL, in which the meso-level supports of the organizational level and the macro-level level of policy interact to produce changes in the pedagogical practices, which further depict how these issues can indirectly impact pre-service teacher education contexts. Though this research is at the classroom level, they affect the discourse on teacher preparation by indicating that issues encountered by the in-service teachers lie in the preparation offered to the teachers during the pre-service training, which might not be SEL-focused.

Theoretical Foundations of SEL

The conceptual basis of this research is based on the SEL theory as defined by CASEL and accompanied with the Social Cognitive Theory (SCT). The model created by CASEL assumes that SEL competencies are interconnected groups of skills that can be taught and incorporated into educational environments to promote organizational and personal well-being and learning results (CASEL, 2020). This framework highlights that an environment that offers conducive policies, educator readiness as well as thoughtful practices is more favourable to acquisition and maintenance of SEL competencies. When applied to teacher education, the SEL theory implies that pre-service teachers will better internalize and apply SEL competencies in case organizational conditions, including institutional support, training resources access, and coherent curriculum design, are relevant to SEL objectives. Therefore, organizational conditions are facilitating factors, which influence the attitudes, knowledge and instructional practice of pre-service teachers.

SCT, which was theorised by Bandura, comes into play to fill the gap of SEL theory in that human behaviour is conditioned in reciprocal interactions between personal factors, behaviours, and environmental determinants (Bandura, 1986). Suggesting that cognitive beliefs, social influences, and the supports that pre-service teachers are exposed to in their training institutions affect their interactions with SEL content, this theory can be applied to teacher education. All three institutional support and curriculum design influence the environmental conditions, and training resources have an impact on cognitive and behavioural elements in the integration of SEL among teachers. Therefore, the introduction of SEL in teacher education may be seen as the process where personal values and behaviour are influenced by the organizational settings, which consequently perpetuate and cement SEL practices.

Conceptual Framework

According to the theoretical premise of CASEL's SEL framework and SCT, the conceptual framework of the study postulates that organizational aspects that include institutional support, training materials, and curriculum design all play a role in effective implementation of SEL in pre-service teacher training. In this model, institutional facilitation involves leadership approval, policy requirements and strategic planning in which SEL is emphasized as a teacher training process. Training materials include professional development opportunities, instructional resources and continuous capacity-building processes to model and teach SEL competencies by the teacher educator. The curriculum design entails the integration of explicit SEL material and practices into the practice of core courses and practicum. It is hoped that such organizational predictors will have a beneficial influence on SEL integration outcomes, which are assessed by destination indicators of instructional practices, SEL mastery in pre-service teachers, and a desire to apply it. The framework suggests that, under the conditions of strong organizational factors and their alignment with the SEL principles, the pre-service teacher training programs will become more effective in equipping the future educators with the ability to develop SEL competencies in their work with the learners. The conceptualization will be used in the quantitative investigation of the conditions and structures of particular institutions and their impact on the process of SEL integration and provide empirically supported information on the issue to inform policymaking and educational transformation.



Research Gap

Although this body of research is increasing, there is still a significant gap in the quantitative research which systematically examines the effect of particular organizational variables on the outcome of the SEL integration in the pre-service teacher training program. The majority of the available research either dwells on in-service teacher training or descriptive reports of SEL levels of awareness without attempting to empirically address the role of organizational variables in predicting SEL integration success, including institutional support, training funds, training curriculum design, etc. Existing studies on international studies have shed more light on the general barriers and enablers to SEL implementation, but few have quantified these aspects in the context of pre-service teacher education. On the same note, although awareness and attitude problems have been initiated by national research in Pakistan, the relationships between predictive variables of organizational variables and integration effectiveness have not been well-modelled. Moreover, studies that apply any of the established frameworks of SEL, like CASEL, to teacher education assessment in the Pakistani setting are limited, which limits cross-cultural comparisons and evidence-based policymaking. The literature thus indicates a gap in quantitative studies that find out the collective contribution of the organizational factors in effective SEL integration in pre-service teacher training programs to provide an empirical evidence in the change of institutional policy.

Research Objectives

The following objectives were formulated;

- i. To know level of organizational factors (curriculum design, training resources and institutional support) for implementation of social emotional learning
- ii. To examine the relationship between curriculum design, training resources and institutional support for effective implementation of social emotional learning
- iii. To identify the predictive role of organizational factors on effective integration of social emotional learning in pre-service training.

Methodology

The following research methodology used to solve the research problem.

Research Design and Rationale

The current research is founded on positivist research paradigm which presupposes that social phenomena can be measured, quantified, and studied objectively with the help of empirical research. Positivism focuses on observable facts and numerical data and statistical analysis to explain the interrelationship between variables (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Consistent with this paradigm, the present study aims to study how organizational variables affect effective implementation of SEL in pre-service teacher training programs through the use of quantifiable variables and statistical methodologies. A positivist paradigm would be suitable in the current research because it would allow the researcher to test the relationship between organizational predictors and SEL integration outcomes through objectivism, adding generalizability, and replicability of the results to the study (Bryman, 2016; Cohen et al., 2002).

This study used the quantitative survey research design. Survey research is common in social sciences where a specific population is surveyed to gather information aimed at describing attributes, attitudes, perceptions and practices and also to analyse the relationship among variables (Fraenkel & Wallen 1990). The rationale in selecting a survey design is due to the fact that the study will be used to quantify the perception of teacher educators toward organizational issues associated with the implementation of SEL and the perceived practices of teacher educators in terms of integrating SEL in teacher training programs. Additionally, due to the quantitative design, the quantitative researcher can utilize descriptive and inferential statistics to identify the strength and direction of the correlation between continuous variables through the use of one-sample t-tests and correlation and linear regression analysis (Field, 2024). The design will be well appropriate to meet study objectives which include finding patterns, testing, and predicting outcomes about the SEL integration in institutional setting.

Population of the Study

Teacher educators in seven Pakistani public universities in twin cities were the population of the study (N = 79). These Universities were; Allama Iqbal open University (AIOU), International Islamic University Islamabad (IIUI), National



University of Modern Languages (NUML), Fatima Jinnah Women University (FJWU), Women University, and Pir Mehr Ali Shah Arid Agriculture University (ARID). The population of interest was the teacher educators, as they are at the forefront in curriculum design, instruction and training pre-service teachers to classroom practice which involves integrating SEL competencies. The investigation of this population gives valuable information on institutional and pedagogical issues that have an impact on the pre-service level of the integration of SEL.

Sample of Study

All the 79 teacher educators of the seven universities (19 male and 60 female) were included in the sample of the study. Participants were selected by a purposive sampling method. Purposive sampling is a non-probability sampling method whereby the research participants are chosen according to the respective traits that pertain to the purpose of the research (Etikan et al., 2016). The method was considered suitable as the teacher educators involved in pre-service teacher training programs and curriculum delivery only could offer informed response about the issues faced by the organization and the practices of SEL integration. The inclusion of the whole available population also enhanced the representativeness of the sample in the specified environment of the public universities of twin cities of Pakistan.

Research Instrument

Two self-designed surveys developed specifically to gather data concerning teacher educators were used as the means of data collection. The implementation of SEL presented challenges measured in the first questionnaire with special attention to organizational factors, namely, an institutional support, training resources and curriculum design. This tool utilized a four-point Likert scale, containing strongly disagree to strongly agree, as the measure of perception of the respondents about organizational factors of implementation of SEL. The second questionnaire evaluated the integration of SEL in teacher training programs and was measured with the help of a five-point Likert-scale, where the first item was "I do not implement this practice", and the last one was "I implement this practice extremely well". It is well-known that Likert-type scales are useful in the measurement of attitudes, perceptions, and self-reported practices in the educational research (Likert, 1932; Boone & Boone, 2012). The two instruments applied allowed the researcher to treat both organizational factors and SEL integration as continuous variables that can be analysed using parametric statistics.

Validity of Research

The questionnaires were also checked by the experts in teacher education and educational psychology who checked the relevance, clarity and correspondence of the items with the objectives and constructs of SEL. One of the most popular procedures of determining the content validity of the self-developed instruments is expert validation (Taherdoost, 2016). Based on feedbacks by experts, required changes were done so that the item wording can be improved and conceptual alignment can be done.

Reliability of Study

The trustworthiness of the instruments was determined by utilizing the internal consistency analysis involving the use of Cronbach alpha coefficient. The coefficient of reliability of 0.70 or above is considered to be acceptable in research (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Pilot testing has been done before the actual data collection so that, the instruments yielded consistent and stable responses. The determination of reliability made sure that the scales were administered to different respondents to measure the desired constructs. The following table showed reliability of research instruments

Table 1

Reliability test for Subscales

| S. No. | Subscale | Number of Items | Cronbach's Alpha |
|--------|-----------------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| 1 | Curriculum Design (I.V) | 4 | .810 |
| 2 | Training Resources (I.V) | 4 | .769 |
| 3 | Institutional Support (I.V) | 4 | .783 |
| 4 | Integration of SEL (D.V) | 8 | .871 |



The table 1 confirmed reliability of each subscale which exceeded .70 showing that constructs of questionnaires are reliable, which is also considered as excellent reliability in social sciences research. The reliability for curriculum design ($\alpha = .810$), training resources ($\alpha = .769$), institutional support ($\alpha = .783$), and integration of SEL ($\alpha = .871$), indicating that each subscale is highly reliable because all values exceed acceptable threshold of .70.

Data Collection Procedure

The researcher approached teacher educators in the chosen universities personally after gaining official permission of the respective university authorities. The participants were made aware of the aim of the study, and questionnaires were conducted face to face so as to ensure improved response rate as well as clarifying ambiguity associated with the items. Participants were given sufficient time to fill the questionnaires and all the filled forms were gathered by the researcher. This process guaranteed consistency in administration and reduced the non-response bias, which is crucial in the integrity of the survey research (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Data Analysis

The statistical analysis and coding of data were performed using statistical software. The perceptions of the teacher educators on organizational challenges and SEL integration percentages were summarized using descriptive statistics such as means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages. A one-sample t-test was used to investigate the possibility of organizational challenges and SEL integration levels having a significant difference with the hypothesized benchmarks. One-sample t -tests are used to compare sample means with a test value when the variables are continuous and normally distributed (Field, 2018).

Moreover, the effects of organizational factors on effective integration of SEL in pre-service teacher training programs were estimated by means of linear regression analysis. Both SEL integration and organizational factors were the continuous variables. Linear regression is an effective statistical method to analyse the cause-and-effect relationships and forecast the results in the education research (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2019). This discussion allowed the researcher to evaluate the degree to which organizational characteristics played a role in differences in the practices of SEL integration among teacher educators.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical values were also held in high regard during the research. All the participants were under voluntary participation in the study and informed consent was signed before the collection of data. All the participants would have been guaranteed the confidentiality and anonymity of their answers and no personal information would have been used in the presentation of results. Data were utilized in terms of academic and research. Educational research requires ethical research practices that serve to safeguard the rights of participants, provide trustworthiness, and academic integrity (Cohen et al., 2018).

Analysis and Findings

The following tables showed analysis of the data in the light of objectives of the study.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics Regarding Perception of Teacher Educators about Organizational Factors for Integration of SEL into Teacher Training Programs (N = 79)

| | Min | Max | Mean | SE Mean | SD |
|-----------------------|------|------|--------|---------|--------|
| Curriculum Design | 1.00 | 4.00 | 3.0000 | .08057 | .71611 |
| Training Resources | 1.00 | 4.00 | 1.9873 | .07748 | .68862 |
| Institutional Support | 1.00 | 4.00 | 1.9367 | .08323 | .73975 |
| Valid N (listwise) | | | | | |

The table 2 showed descriptive statistics regarding organizational factors for integration of SEL into teacher training programs. Curriculum design (Min = 1.00, Max = 4.00, Mean = 3.0000, SE Mean = .08057 and SD = .71611) depicting



agreement that curriculum is well designed about SEL implementation. On the other hand, training resources (Min = 1.00, Max = 4.00, Mean = 1.9873, SE Mean = .07748 and SD = .68862) displaying disagreement that there are inadequate training resources for prospective teachers. Lastly, institutional support (Min = 1.00, Max = 4.00, Mean = 1.9367, SE Mean = .08323 and SD = .73975) also exhibited disagreement that there is limited institutional support for implementation SEL into teacher training programs.

Table 3

One-Sample t-test Comparing Mean Score about Organizational Factors for Implementation of SEL to Neutral Point (2.5)

| | Mean | t | df | Sig. | 95% CI |
|-----------------------|--------|------|----|------|--------------|
| Curriculum Design | 3.0000 | 6.20 | 78 | .000 | [2.84, 3.16] |
| Training Resources | 2.9873 | 6.61 | 78 | .000 | [2.83, 3.14] |
| Institutional Support | 3.9367 | 6.76 | 78 | .000 | [3.92, 3.96] |
| Overall Score | 3.308 | 6.52 | 78 | .000 | [3.29, 3.33] |

In table 3, a one-sample t-test was utilised to measure if the mean scores for each construct of organizational factors were significantly different from the scale's theoretical neutral point (2.5). The analysis revealed highly significant scores for Curriculum design ($M = 3.0000$, $t = 6.20$, $p < 0.05$), 95% CI [2.84 – 3.16], Training resources ($M = 2.9873$, $t = -6.61$, $p < 0.05$), 95% CI [2.83 – 3.14] and Institutional support ($M = 3.9367$, $t = 6.76$, $p < 0.05$), 95% CI [3.92 – 3.96]. Mean scores of all organizational factors (lies within 3.0) fall significantly above the neutral midpoint, with the 95% confidence intervals encompassing 2.5. This statistical test reinforces the conclusion from descriptive statistics: perception of teacher educators skewed towards agreement for all constructs. This analysis objectively validates that sample high level of perception regarding organizational factors significantly contribute towards SEL implementation are not due to chance but represent a valid result.

Table 4

Correlation Analysis Among Constructs of the Study

| | Curriculum Design | Training Resources | Institutional Support |
|-----------------------|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Training Resources | Pearson Correlation .408 Sig. (2-tailed) .005** N 79 | | |
| Institutional Support | Pearson Correlation .569 Sig. (2-tailed) .000** N 79 | .424 .002** 79 | |
| Integration of SEL | Pearson Correlation .616** Sig. (2-tailed) .005 N 79 | .697** .000 79 | .692** .000 79 |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

A Pearson correlation was performed to explore the correlation among constructs of the study. The results depicted strong positive and statistically significant correlation between four variables. The correlation between curriculum design and training resources ($r = .408$, $p < .05$) indicating that curriculum design provides training resources for implementation of SEL. In addition, the relationship between curriculum design and institutional support ($r = .569$, $p < .05$) showing that curriculum design provides pedagogical map for SEL, that influence to create such environment and resources enabling teachers to get institutional support. Furthermore, curriculum design is significantly correlated with integration of SEL ($r = .616$, $p < .05$) revealing that curriculum design for SEL helps to integrate it into teacher training program. Moreover, training resources and institutional support also correlated as ($r = .424$, $p < .05$), training resources with integration of SEL ($r = .697$, $p < .05$), and institutional support with integration of SEL as ($r = .692$, $p < .05$) showing that organizational factors significantly contribute towards the integration of SEL.



Table 5

Regression Analysis: Predicting effective integration of SEL from Organizational Factors

| Predictors | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | Sig. |
|-----------------------|-------|------------|------|-------|------|
| (Constant) | 1.552 | .181 | | 8.592 | .000 |
| 1 Curriculum Design | .121 | .061 | .196 | 1.978 | .042 |
| Training Resources | .204 | .063 | .317 | 3.227 | .002 |
| Institutional Support | .191 | .058 | .320 | 3.278 | .002 |

a. Dependent Variable: Int_SEL

b. Predictors: (Constant), IS, TR, CD

R = .560, R² = .313, Adjusted R² = .286, F (3, 75) = 11.400, p < .05

The table 5 revealed that organizational factors accounting for 56% of the variance. A standard multiple regression was performed to assess whether organizational factors could predict effective integration of SEL into teaching training programs. The model is statistically found significant ($F(3, 75) = 11.400, p < .05$) and elucidates a substantial 29% of the variance in effective integration of SEL ($R^2 = .560$). All three predictors are significant: institutional support is stronger predictors ($\beta = .320, p < .05$), training resources also depicted a strong effect ($\beta = .317, p < .05$), and curriculum design showed a weaker but significant effect ($\beta = .196, p < .05$). The results highlight significant dynamics: institutional support is crucial for effective integration of SEL, while training resources also supports teacher educators for effective implementation, and curriculum design also support because pedagogy helps to model SEL using lived experiences.

Discussion

The current research focused on the connection between organizational and the successful implementation of Social Emotional Learning in pre-service teacher training syllabuses. The results of the descriptive analysis showed that the teacher educators tended to agree on the significance of curriculum design, training materials, and institutional support in bringing SEL integration. This general tendency speaks to the increased realization by teacher educators of the institutional and structural conditions that are required to integrate SEL into teacher preparation programs. These results are aligned with the current literature that underlines the importance of the organizational preparedness and the systemic correspondence to the successful implementation of SEL (Durlak et al., 2011; Jones, et al., 2013). The identification of the organizational aspects as the prerequisites implies that teacher educators do not view SEL as a pedagogical supplement, but as an institutionalized and pedagogically grounded framework.

The correlation analysis revealed a statistically significant correlation between the design of a curriculum and the effective implementation of SEL. The mentioned finding implies that teacher educators can be more successful by adopting SEL practices in case curricula explicitly address SEL competencies, learning outcomes, and pedagogical strategies. Evidence of this interpretation is provided by previous research in other countries, which suggests that curriculum alignment is a key factor in transferring the SEL theory to classroom practice (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; CASEL, 2020; Ahmed & Khan, 2024). Programs of teacher education (that incorporate SEL outcomes into the objectives of courses and assessment systems) are more likely to encourage a consistent and long-term implementation. In the Pakistani setting, some new sources of information also indicate the rigidity of curricula and the overload of content as obstacles to innovative pedagogies, such as SEL thus, supporting the relevance of deliberate curriculum design changes (Hussain et al., 2025).

The second research question investigated the correlation of organizational factors and SEL integration. The outcomes demonstrated the positive and significant correlation, which is why the ability to get the chances of professional development, instructional materials, and guidance during the work is important. This result is consistent with the previous studies that note that teacher readiness and resource access are key to successful SEL implementation (Schonert-Reichl, 2017; Darling-Hammond et al., 2019). Teacher educators might not be able to adapt SEL frameworks into practice instruction strategies without proper training and resource provision. These findings are also supported by regional studies carried out in South Asia that have proposed that a lack of professional learning opportunities is a major limitation to the ability of teachers to embrace practices based on SEL (Siddiqui & Gorard,



2017). The current research builds on this evidence and indicates that the same predicament can be found at pre-service teacher education level in Pakistan.

With respect to the third research objective, the results found that there was a strong correlation between the institutional support and an effective integration of SEL. Institutional support, such as leadership devotion, policy fit, and administrative support, was found to be a decisive forecaster of the SEL integration. This outcome aligns with ecological and organizational theories of educational change, which hypothesize that the leadership of institutions and the systemic facilitation of the process are the most important factors in the maintenance of instructional innovations (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Fullan, 2016). The evidence of other countries shows that institutions that have a supportive system of leadership and policy guidelines are more effective in integrating SEL in teacher education programs (Jones & Bouffard, 2012; Oberle et al., 2020). The absence of institutional approval in Pakistan could be a barrier to SEL integration since institutions of higher education generally focus on mastery of the material and performance on exams, so the institutional approval is a decisive factor.

The regression model also indicated that the organizational factors have a strong predictive effect in the successful integration of SEL in pre-service teacher training programs. This observation proves that such factors as curriculum design, training materials, and institutional support do not work independently but act in synergy. These findings are in line with those of systems-based approaches to educational reform, which note how interdependent organizational elements are in influencing teaching practices (Kezar, 2018; Domitrovich et al., 2017). The foreseeability of the role of organizational factors that are witnessed in this study supports the suggestion that sustainable integration of SEL must be an extensive institutional approach and not a one man show by individual educators.

Combined, the results of this research add to the increasing number of studies which underscore the significance of organizational conditions in the implementation of SEL. Although the current literature mainly addresses the implementation at the school level, this paper further explores the topic on the pre-service teacher education, especially in the Pakistani higher education system. The findings indicate that enhanced organizational frameworks in teacher training institutions can be crucial in equipping the future teachers to succeed in the application of SEL. The results herein justify the proposal to reform the system of teacher education and to make sure that SEL competencies can be incorporated into the framework of institutional policies, curricula, and professional development (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; CASEL, 2020).

Conclusion

The current paper has explored the effect of the organizational factors on the successful incorporation of Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) within the pre-service teacher training programs with particular attention to curriculum design, training materials, and institutional support. According to the data analysis and the discussion, it is possible to state that the organizational factors have a crucial influence on determining the level of successful implementation of SEL into teacher education programs. The descriptive results indicated that teacher educators tended to appreciate the role of these organizational dimensions suggesting an ongoing process of institutionalization of SEL as a core element of teacher preparation and not as a fringe or peripheral aspect of instruction.

The correlational analysis also provided that all three organizational factors had a significant and positive relationship with the successful integration of SEL. Curriculum design proved to be one of the pillars and it implied that once SEL competencies are systematically embedded in course objectives, pedagogies and assessments, teachers' educators stand in a better position to adopt SEL on a regular basis. The training resources showed a high correlation with SEL integration, which highlights the need to develop into more confident and competent educators by means of constant professional growth, educational resources, and capacity-building opportunities. The institutional support also demonstrated to be significantly related to the SEL integration, and as such, leadership commitment, supportive policies, and administrative encouragement played a great role in maintaining SEL practices in teacher training institutions.

In addition, the regression analysis established that effective SEL integration in pre-service teacher training program is a significant predictor, which is collectively predicted by organizational factors. Institutional support and training resources were the most influential predictors, whereas curriculum design also produced significant effects



to predictive model. This observation implies that SEL integration is not the result of the independent activity of single teachers but rather the outcome of interdependent organizational circumstances that allow or inhibit action in concert. The findings support the perception that a conducive institutional background with sufficient resources and properly aligned curricula is vital towards promoting sustainable SEL practices in teacher education.

In conclusion, the findings of the study provide empirical evidence that it is important to strengthen the organizational structures in the institutions of teacher training to enhance the effective implementation of SEL. The research addresses the gap in quantitative studies of the SEL in pre-service teacher education in Pakistani setting and provides valuable information to the policymakers, institutional leaders, and curriculum developers. By focusing on the whole and the organizational factors, the teacher education programs will be able to equip the future teachers with the means to foster the development of social and emotional competencies in their students, thus, leading to holistic educational achievements and the overall well-being of the society.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made based on conclusions of research;

1. SEL may be formally integrated in teacher training institutions through institutional policies, vision statements, and strategic plans in order to maintain continued dedication and institutional leadership to SEL integration.
2. The curriculum of pre-service teacher education may be reformed in a systematic manner to demonstrate SEL competencies clearly by incorporating them into the course objectives, learning outcomes, instructional methods, and assessment schemes of all applicable courses.
3. The teacher educators may be provided with the continuous and systematic professional development programs aimed at improving their knowledge, skills and pedagogical competence concerning SEL instead of depending on the training workshops which are isolated and short-term.
4. Universities may allocate enough financial, material, and technological resources to assist SEL teaching, such as availability of teaching materials, teaching aids, online platforms, and research-backed SEL models.
5. The institutional leaders and academic administrators may be instrumental in encouraging and overseeing SEL initiatives, offering incentives on innovative approaches to teaching, and establishing conducive learning environments that would motivate teacher educators to incorporate SEL in their classroom practices.
6. Field experiences and pre-service teaching practicum may incorporate formal experiences that allow student teachers to observe, practice and reflect on the practice of the implementation of SEL in real classroom contexts.
7. An institution may initiate systematic, monitoring, and evaluation systems to determine the efficacy of the SEL integration in the teacher education program and base the results on the subsequent improvement.

Limitations of the Study

Although this study offers some meaningful insights on the role of the organizational factors in the integration of the SEL in the pre-service teacher training programs, there are some limitations that can be identified. To begin with, the focus of the research was very narrow, due to which the sample of teacher educators included in the study was only seven public universities situated in the Islamabad and Rawalpindi regions, and this can restrict the externalization of the research results onto other regions, private institutions, and various educational settings in Pakistan. Second, purposive sampling is suitable in terms of choosing information-rich subjects, but limits the possibility of making inferences on a larger scale, such as the population. Third, the self-reported questionnaires were used to collect data, which can be subjected to the social desirability bias and are not capable of representing the true SEL integration practices in the instructional settings. Fourth, the cross-sectional type of the study does not permit tracing further changes in organizational factors and SEL integration with time passing or creating the cause and effect relationships between variables. Also, although the paper concentrated on the specifics of the organization, such as curriculum design, training materials and institutional support, other variables that might have impacted the results were not analysed, including personal SEL competencies and beliefs of teacher educators, past training experiences, and institutional culture. Such constraints provide evidence that the results are to be viewed cautiously and in the contextual parameters of the research.



Future Directions

In the light of study's limitations, it may be suggested that some future directions. Future research may expand the area of the study by incorporating teacher educators from private universities, teacher training colleges and institutions from other provinces of Pakistan to increase the representativeness and generalizability of results. The use of probability sampling and larger sample sizes may also enhance the effectiveness of subsequent research.

It is also recommended that longitudinal research designs are also appropriate to study the changes in organization factors and SEL integration over time and also to establish causal relationships more accurately. In addition, a mixed or qualitative methodology, including interviews and classroom observations, may provide additional information to the survey findings, which may help to understand the real SEL practices and institutional processes in more depth.

Future studies can also be done to determine the mediating or moderating influence of individual-level variables, e.g., the SEL competencies, self-efficacy, and professional belief of teacher educators in the organizational-factor-SEL-integration relationship. Lastly, investigation or intervention-based research studies of how specific organizational changes or professional development initiatives are effective might provide viable evidence to guide policy and practice in pre-service teacher education.



References

Ahmed, R. S., & Khan, N. (2024). Exploring teachers' perception and practices about the provision of Social-Emotional Learning at primary grades in Karachi, Pakistan. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(2), 119–130. <https://doi.org/10.55737/qjss.813513390>

Akhtar, H., Khan, M. S., & Ayub, S. (2019). Peer tutoring: An effective technique to enhance students English writing skills. *Global Social Sciences Review*, IV(III), 299–305. [https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2019\(iv-iii\).39](https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2019(iv-iii).39)

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

Bhardwaj, S. (2025). Professional development models for equipping teachers with SEL pedagogical skills in Indian contexts. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation*, 12(7), 1657-1666. <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJSI.2025.120700169>

Blandford, A. (2025). *Exploring Social-Emotional Learning for Adults: A Qualitative Inquiry into Early Childhood Teachers' Experiences in Pre-Service Education Programs* (Doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne).

Boone, H., & Boone, D. (2012). Analyzing Likert data. *Journal of Extension*, 50(2). <https://doi.org/10.34068/joe.50.02.48>

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods*. Oxford university press.

Cochran, L. M., & Parker Peters, M. (2023). Mindful preparation: An exploration of the effects of mindfulness and SEL training on pre-service teacher efficacy and empathy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 123, 103986. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103986>

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2002). *Research methods in education*. Routledge.

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. [CASEL]. (2023). *What is SEL?* CASEL. <https://casel.org/what-is-sel/>

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. [CASEL]. (2020). *What is the CASEL framework?* CASEL. Retrieved from <https://casel.org/fundamentals-of-sel/what-is-the-casel-framework>

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. Sage publications.

Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2019). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(2), 97-140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791>

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.

Domitrovich, C. E., Durlak, J. A., Staley, K. C., & Weissberg, R. P. (2017). Social-emotional competence: An essential factor for promoting positive adjustment and reducing risk in school children. *Child Development*, 88(2), 408–416. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12739>

Duane, A. M., Caouette, J. D., Morris, K. S., Metzger, A. N., CalHOPE Research Committee, & Shapiro, V. B. (2025). Securing the foundation: Providing supports and building teacher capacity for SEL implementation through a university-based continuing education course. *Social and Emotional Learning: Research, Practice, and Policy*, 5(100082), 100082. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sel.2025.100082>

Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: a meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions: Social and emotional learning. *Child Development*, 82(1), 405–432. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x>

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1–4.

Field, A. (2024). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Sage publications limited.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (1990). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. Order Department, McGraw Hill Publishing Co., Princeton Rd, Hightstown, NJ 08520.

Fullan, M. (2016). *The new meaning of educational change* (5th ed.). Teachers College Press.

Hussain, A., Ahmad, N., Khan, F. N., Hussain, S., Muhammad, W., Kamal, A. A., & Nazli, F. (2025). Social Emotional Learning in Schools: Perceptions of Secondary School Teachers in Swat, Pakistan. *ACADEMIA International Journal for Social Sciences*, 4(2), 745-759. <https://doi.org/10.63056/ACAD.004.02.0212>



Jennings, P. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(1), 491-525. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308325693>

Jones, S. M., & Bouffard, S. M. (2012). Social and emotional learning in schools: From programs to strategies and commentaries. *Social Policy Report*, 26(4), 1-33. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2379-3988.2012.tb00073.x>

Jones, S. M., Bouffard, S. M., & Weissbourd, R. (2013). Educators' social and emotional skills vital to learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 94(8), 62-65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171309400815>

Kezar, A. (2018). *How colleges change: Understanding, leading, and enacting change*. Routledge.

Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 140, 1-55.

Lindsay, M. (2013). Integrating social emotional learning into secondary curriculum. *Online Submission*, 2(2), 451-465.

Ltfi, S. (2024). *Factors influencing principals' selection of social-emotional learning (SEL) programs in elementary schools* [Unpublished Doctoral dissertation]. Marymount University, Virginia, United States.

Murano, D., Way, J. D., Martin, J. E., Walton, K. E., Anguiano-Carrasco, C., & Burrus, J. (2019). The need for high-quality pre-service and inservice teacher training in social and emotional learning. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, 12(2), 111-113. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jrit-02-2019-0028>

Najjarpour, M. (2025). Teachers' perceptions of challenges to integrating social emotional learning professional development into EFL teacher training programs. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 9, 100501. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2025.100501>

Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, I. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill, New York.

Oberle, E., Domitrovich, C. E., Meyers, D. C., & Weissberg, R. P. (2020). Establishing systemic social and emotional learning approaches in schools: A framework for schoolwide implementation. In *Social and emotional learning* (pp. 6-26). Routledge.

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

Schonert-Reichl, K. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2014). Social and emotional learning: Children. In *Encyclopedia of primary prevention and health promotion* (pp. 936-949). Springer, Boston, MA.

Schonert-Reichl, K. A., Hanson-Peterson, J. L., & Hymel, S. (2015). SEL and preservice teacher education. *Handbook of social and emotional learning: Research and Practice*, 4, 406-421.

Siddiqui, N., & Gorard, S. (2017). Comparing government and private schools in Pakistan: The way forward for universal education. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 82, 159-169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2017.01.007>

Siraj, A., Jabeen, D. M., & Akhtar, H. (2025). Social emotional learning: A contemporary analysis of teacher educators' understanding and awareness in Pakistan. *Inverge Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(4), 368-381. <https://doi.org/10.63544/ijss.v4i4.206>

Social Emotional Learning. (2025, October 2). *Social-emotional learning*. Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. Retrieved November 27, 2025, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social%20emotional_learning

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2019). *Using multivariate statistics* (7th ed.). Pearson.

Taherdoost, H. (2016). Validity and reliability of the research instrument; How to test the validation of a questionnaire/survey in a research. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3205040>

Tahir, M. B., Moin, M., Arif, M., & Jabeen, M. (2025). Exploring teachers' perceptions, instructional practices, and challenges in supporting students with learning difficulties in special education. *The Knowledge*, 4(3), 73-84. <https://doi.org/10.55737/tk2k25c.43085>

Ulla, T., & Poom-Valickis, K. (2023, January). Program support matters: A systematic review on teacher-and school related contextual factors facilitating the implementation of social-emotional learning programs. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 7, p. 965538). Frontiers Media SA.

Waajid, B., Garner, P. W., & Owen, J. E. (2013). Infusing Social Emotional Learning into the Teacher Education Curriculum. *International Journal of Emotional Education*, 5(2), 31-48.

Wang, D., & Ishak, Z. (2025). Unveiling the implementation of social- Emotional learning among college students: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 24(5), 376-399. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.24.5.20>

Yasir, S., & Mahmood, M. (2024). A Study to Explore the Awareness of Teacher Educators about Social and Emotional Learning Skills. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(4), 339-349. <https://doi.org/10.55737/qjss.v-iv.24268>

