

Developing A Leadership-Driven Framework for Integrating Socio-Emotional Learning in The Curriculum of Primary School

Ethel L. Matugas

Cebu Technological University-Main Campus

Abstract:

This study examined school leadership practices and teachers' integration of socio-emotional learning (SEL) in the curriculum at Einstein School Cebu, Lapu-Lapu City, Philippines, focusing on their relationship to the socio-emotional learning outcomes of primary pupils during the School Year 2025–2026. The research aimed to assess the level of school leadership practices supporting SEL integration, the extent to which teachers integrate SEL in instructional processes, and the level of socio-emotional learning outcomes among pupils, as well as to propose a leadership-driven framework for strengthening SEL implementation based on the findings. A quantitative descriptive–correlational research design was employed, involving administrators and teachers from the elementary department selected through total enumeration. Data were gathered using a researcher-made survey questionnaire composed of three parts: school leadership practices in support of SEL, teachers' integration of SEL in the curriculum, and perceived socio-emotional learning outcomes among primary pupils. Statistical tools such as frequency and percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient were used to analyze the data. Findings revealed that school leadership practices supporting SEL integration were generally rated as less practiced, particularly in teacher training, resource allocation, and monitoring and evaluation. Teachers' integration of SEL in the curriculum was rated as sometimes practiced, with higher integration observed in classroom implementation than in lesson planning, assessment practices, and collaboration with peers and parents. The socio-emotional learning outcomes of pupils were generally rated as moderate, with responsible decision-making identified as the weakest competency. Results further showed a weak and non-significant relationship ($r = 0.323$, $p = 0.100$) between school leadership practices and socio-emotional learning outcomes. The study concludes that while teachers demonstrate emerging SEL practices, the absence of strong, institutionalized leadership support limits the depth and consistency of SEL integration. Consequently, a leadership-driven framework is proposed to strengthen policy alignment, teacher capacity-building, stakeholder collaboration, and systematic monitoring to enhance socio-emotional learning outcomes among primary pupils.

Keywords: Early Childhood Education, Socio-Emotional Learning, Leadership-Driven Framework, Descriptive–Correlational Study, Cebu, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

Education in the twenty-first century is no longer confined to the development of academic competencies alone; it is equally expected to nurture the holistic growth and well-being of learners. In contemporary educational discourse, socio-emotional learning (SEL) has emerged as a critical dimension of quality education because it equips children with essential life skills such as self-awareness, empathy, emotional regulation, relationship-building, and responsible decision-making (CASEL, 2020; Cabello & Fernandez-Berrocal, 2022). These competencies are increasingly recognized as indispensable in helping learners navigate personal, academic, and social challenges within rapidly changing educational and societal environments. International educational organizations and contemporary studies emphasize that socio-emotional competencies are strongly associated with improved academic performance, positive behavior, mental well-being, and long-term success in life (OECD, 2021; Greenberg, 2023). Consequently, integrating SEL into the curriculum has become a global priority in fostering resilient, compassionate, and socially responsible learners.

In the Philippine educational context, the Department of Education continues to advocate for learner-centered and values-oriented education that develops not only intellectual competence but also emotional resilience, social responsibility, and ethical character among learners. Educational reforms under the K to 12 Curriculum and related educational initiatives emphasize the importance of producing well-rounded Filipino learners capable of adapting to complex social realities and future challenges (Malapitan, 2023). Despite these initiatives, the integration of socio-emotional learning in preschool, primary, and grade school education remains limited and fragmented. Although teachers may incorporate values formation, empathy, cooperation, and emotional understanding into classroom discussions and activities, these practices are often informal, inconsistent, and not grounded in a structured framework for socio-emotional development (Haugstad, 2020). In many schools, socio-emotional competencies are still treated as supplementary rather than integral components of teaching and learning, resulting in varying implementation practices across classrooms and grade levels.

Research underscores the importance of systematically embedding socio-emotional learning into curriculum design, instructional delivery, and assessment practices to ensure that learners develop essential socio-emotional competencies alongside academic skills. Studies have shown that schools implementing structured SEL programs experience improvements in classroom climate, student engagement, interpersonal relationships, and behavioral outcomes (Durlak et al., 2020; Cipriano et al., 2024). Furthermore, socio-emotional competencies have been associated with enhanced academic motivation, improved self-regulation, collaborative skills, and stronger learner engagement (Jones & Doolittle, 2020; Bergin et al., 2024). In early childhood and primary education, SEL integration also contributes significantly to emotional competence, classroom participation, and school readiness among young learners (Domitrovich & Jones, 2017; Denham et al., 2021). However, the success of SEL integration largely depends on institutional support, teacher preparedness, and effective leadership practices within schools. Without clear policies, sustained professional development, and consistent

monitoring systems, the implementation of SEL initiatives may remain superficial and unsustainable (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020).

Equally significant is the role of school leadership in advancing socio-emotional learning integration within the curriculum. School leaders serve as instructional and organizational catalysts who shape school culture, establish educational priorities, allocate resources, and provide strategic direction for program implementation (Leithwood & Sun, 2018). Leadership practices that prioritize socio-emotional learning can significantly influence teachers' readiness to integrate SEL into instruction by fostering supportive professional environments, promoting collaborative practices, and ensuring access to relevant training and instructional resources (Ibrahim et al., 2021). Effective leadership also contributes to the establishment of inclusive and emotionally supportive learning environments where learners' well-being is recognized as central to educational success (Mahfouz et al., 2021). Moreover, transformational and instructional leadership practices have been found to positively influence teacher engagement, resilience, and commitment toward educational innovation and change (Alves et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2021). Nonetheless, leadership practices in many schools continue to focus predominantly on academic performance indicators and standardized assessment outcomes, often leaving socio-emotional learning initiatives underdeveloped and insufficiently institutionalized. The absence of a clear leadership-driven framework that systematically guides SEL integration therefore represents a critical gap in educational practice and policy implementation.

Teachers likewise play a vital role in fostering socio-emotional learning within classroom environments. Classroom interactions, teacher modeling, and emotionally responsive instruction significantly shape learners' socio-emotional competencies and behavior (Chen & Lee, 2021; Zhang et al., 2021). Research further indicates that positive teacher-student relationships and collaborative classroom engagement contribute to improved socio-emotional outcomes among learners (Arora & Mishra, 2024). Teachers who are equipped with socio-emotional competencies themselves are more capable of creating supportive, inclusive, and emotionally safe learning environments that enhance student participation and well-being (Cipriano & Brackett, 2020; Kaspar, 2022). However, teachers often face challenges in integrating SEL due to limited professional training, insufficient resources, and the absence of systematic institutional support. These concerns highlight the importance of leadership in strengthening teachers' capacity to effectively embed socio-emotional learning into classroom instruction and assessment practices.

This study is anchored on the need to address these existing gaps by examining the relationship among school leadership practices, teachers' integration of socio-emotional learning, and socio-emotional learning outcomes among learners. Specifically, the study investigates leadership practices related to vision-setting, policy support, teacher professional development, resource allocation, and monitoring mechanisms to determine how leadership influences the successful integration of socio-emotional learning into classroom instruction and assessment. Likewise, it explores the extent to which teachers integrate

SEL through lesson planning, classroom implementation, assessment strategies, and collaboration with peers and parents, as well as how these practices contribute to learners' socio-emotional development.

The significance of this study lies in its potential contributions to educational research, leadership practice, and curriculum development. First, the study contributes empirical evidence to the growing body of literature on socio-emotional learning integration within the Philippine educational setting, where local studies on SEL implementation and leadership support remain relatively limited. Second, it highlights the pivotal role of school leadership in promoting sustainable socio-emotional learning practices, thereby emphasizing leadership as a critical determinant in the success of educational innovations and learner-centered reforms (Akinnusi, 2021). Third, the study provides insights that may assist educational institutions in strengthening socio-emotional learning integration across different grade levels and learning environments.

Ultimately, while socio-emotional learning has been widely acknowledged as essential in developing well-rounded and future-ready learners, its implementation in basic education continues to face challenges related to leadership support, teacher preparedness, and institutional structures. Teachers often lack systematic training in socio-emotional learning integration, and leadership practices have yet to fully institutionalize SEL as a core educational priority. In response to these concerns, this study seeks to examine the interplay among leadership practices, teachers' integration of socio-emotional learning, and learner outcomes through a quantitative research approach. Through this, the study aspires to support schools in fostering emotionally resilient, socially responsible, and academically competent learners who are better prepared to succeed in both school and life.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Social and Emotional Learning in Education

Social and emotional learning (SEL) has become a significant pillar in modern education, extending beyond the traditional goals of academic instruction to support learners' holistic development and long-term success. Contemporary educational systems increasingly recognize that emotional resilience, empathy, self-regulation, and social competence are as important as cognitive and academic abilities in preparing learners for the demands of the twenty-first century. Pitlik (2021) explained that the concept of SEL originated in 1994 with the establishment of the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL), a multidisciplinary organization composed of educators, researchers, and child advocates who emphasized the importance of educating the "whole child." CASEL advocated that academic achievement and socio-emotional competencies are interconnected, and schools should intentionally cultivate both domains to promote lifelong success among learners.

Research demonstrates that emotions and social interactions significantly influence students' academic engagement, motivation, and learning outcomes. According to Durlak et al. (2021), emotions may either encourage or hinder children's academic participation, work ethic, commitment, and school success. The researchers further emphasized that relationships and emotional processes directly affect how learners

acquire and process knowledge. Consequently, schools and families must address socio-emotional dimensions of learning to support children's overall development effectively. These findings are supported by theoretical perspectives such as Vygotsky's Social Development Theory and Goleman's Emotional Intelligence Theory, both of which highlight the importance of self-awareness, self-regulation, empathy, and ethical decision-making in fostering both academic achievement and personal well-being.

Despite the recognized benefits of SEL, integrating socio-emotional learning into early childhood and primary education curricula continues to present several challenges. Resource limitations, inadequate teacher preparation, insufficient institutional support, and cultural responsiveness remain persistent concerns in the implementation of SEL programs. Nevertheless, studies continue to affirm the transformative potential of SEL in promoting emotionally intelligent, socially responsible, and academically competent learners. By bridging theory and practice, SEL initiatives provide opportunities for children to acquire the socio-emotional competencies necessary to navigate complex educational and social environments successfully.

Vygotsky's Social Development Theory and Socio-Emotional Learning

Vygotsky's Social Development Theory provides one of the strongest theoretical foundations for socio-emotional learning. Lev Vygotsky emphasized that human development is fundamentally shaped by social interactions and cultural experiences. According to Chatterjee, Singh, and Duraiappah (2020), Vygotsky believed that learning occurs through interaction with more knowledgeable individuals, such as teachers, peers, and adults, within supportive social environments. Central to his theory is the concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which refers to the gap between what learners can accomplish independently and what they can achieve with guidance and collaboration. Through scaffolding and mediated interactions, children gradually internalize cognitive, emotional, and social competencies necessary for effective functioning in society.

The principles of Vygotsky's theory strongly align with the goals of socio-emotional learning because emotional regulation, empathy, communication, and relationship-building emerge primarily through supportive social interactions. Research further indicates that SEL competencies are best developed in environments where collaboration, guided participation, and meaningful dialogue are encouraged. Howe (2014) demonstrated that values education programs grounded in Vygotskian principles foster socio-emotional growth by promoting emotional safety and peer collaboration in classrooms. Similarly, Fler (2025) found that preschool children developed socio-emotional competencies through teacher-mediated play-based interactions, emphasizing the importance of social dialogue in emotional understanding and self-regulation. Zhang et al. (2022) likewise confirmed that scaffolding strategies enhanced learners' confidence, communication skills, and socio-emotional engagement, reinforcing the connection between guided support and socio-emotional development. Furthermore, participatory and collaborative teaching approaches strengthen trust, emotional connection, and classroom engagement among learners. Arora and Mishra (2024) highlighted that positive teacher-student relationships and collaborative classroom practices improve learners' socio-emotional competencies while reducing disruptive behaviors. These findings indicate that SEL is most effective when learners are actively engaged in supportive social environments where emotional and cognitive growth occur simultaneously.

Emotional Intelligence Theory and Socio-Emotional Competencies

Daniel Goleman's Emotional Intelligence Theory also provides substantial support for socio-emotional learning by emphasizing the importance of emotional awareness and interpersonal competence in human development. According to Todorova (2024), Goleman identified five core components of emotional intelligence: self-awareness, self-regulation, social skills, empathy, and motivation. These competencies closely parallel the core domains of socio-emotional learning and are essential in helping learners manage emotions, interact effectively with others, and engage in responsible decision-making.

Emotional intelligence contributes significantly to learners' ability to navigate social interactions and pursue self-directed growth. Self-awareness enables learners to recognize and understand their emotions, while self-regulation allows them to control emotional responses and adapt appropriately to changing situations. Social skills and empathy facilitate effective communication, collaboration, and understanding of others' perspectives, particularly in complex interpersonal situations. Motivation, particularly intrinsic motivation, supports goal-setting, initiative, and perseverance in learning tasks. These competencies collectively strengthen learners' emotional resilience and social functioning, making emotional intelligence a foundational component of socio-emotional learning.

Integration of Socio-Emotional Learning in the Curriculum

The integration of socio-emotional learning into primary education curricula has gained increasing attention due to its positive impact on learners' academic performance, emotional regulation, and social competence. Dumbuya (2023) emphasized that integrating SEL into academic content allows children to develop socio-emotional skills alongside traditional subject competencies. Through instructional activities such as collaborative projects, classroom discussions, and character analysis, learners develop empathy, cooperation, and perspective-taking abilities within meaningful learning experiences.

Similarly, Aksoy and Gresham (2020) asserted that SEL is particularly crucial during early childhood because it establishes the foundation for lifelong social, emotional, cognitive, and academic development. The researchers emphasized that all developmental domains are interconnected; therefore, difficulties in one area may significantly affect the others. SEL programs help learners develop competencies such as self-regulation, attention, and emotional understanding, which directly support academic achievement and positive classroom behavior. Furthermore, Durlak et al. (2021) found that learners participating in SEL-integrated programs demonstrated improved academic performance, stronger peer relationships, and better emotional management skills.

Recent literature also identifies various effective approaches for integrating SEL into primary education. Haugstad (2020) explained that SEL integration is most effective when embedded into curriculum content, daily routines, project-based learning, classroom environments, and teacher-student relationships. Morning meetings, collaborative activities, arts integration, and play-based learning opportunities all contribute to the development of socio-emotional competencies among young learners. In addition, supportive classroom climates and positive teacher-student relationships were found to significantly influence learners' motivation, emotional well-being, and engagement in school activities. Project-based learning, collaborative instruction, and emotionally supportive environments were likewise identified as effective strategies for strengthening socio-emotional competencies among primary learners.

School Leadership and Socio-Emotional Learning Integration

School leadership plays a critical role in the successful implementation of socio-emotional learning initiatives. Dakeasian (2024) emphasized that effective school leaders establish clear expectations, provide professional development opportunities, and ensure that SEL remains a school-wide priority alongside academic achievement. Leadership commitment is therefore essential in sustaining SEL initiatives and creating environments where socio-emotional learning can flourish.

Transformational leadership practices have also been strongly associated with successful SEL integration. Arar and Nasra (2020) found that transformational school leadership improved teachers' organizational commitment and job satisfaction, indirectly contributing to better student outcomes. Likewise, Alves et al. (2021) revealed that transformational leadership enhanced teacher engagement and resilience, both of which are necessary for sustaining socio-emotional learning practices. Ibrahim et al. (2021) similarly reported that transformational leadership strengthened teachers' readiness to implement innovative educational approaches such as SEL.

Systemic and whole-school approaches to SEL further highlight the importance of leadership. The New York State Education Department (2019) emphasized that SEL implementation becomes more effective when aligned with school policies, curricula, and community partnerships. CASEL (2023) also identified leadership support as a critical factor in ensuring consistent SEL implementation across schools. School leaders therefore serve as catalysts who shape school culture, coordinate initiatives, and support teachers in embedding SEL into curriculum and instruction. Research further indicates that leadership practices influence teacher motivation, school climate, and organizational support systems that are necessary for sustaining socio-emotional learning initiatives. These findings affirm that leadership-driven approaches are essential in institutionalizing SEL within educational settings.

CASEL Framework and Whole-School SEL Implementation

The CASEL Framework remains one of the most widely recognized models for socio-emotional learning implementation. CASEL identifies five core competencies: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making (CASEL, 2020). These competencies are considered essential in preparing learners to succeed academically, socially, and emotionally within diverse educational settings.

Studies consistently affirm the effectiveness of CASEL-based programs in improving learners' academic and socio-emotional outcomes. Taylor et al. (2017) found that SEL programs aligned with the CASEL framework resulted in improvements in academic achievement, emotional well-being, and prosocial behavior. Cipriano et al. (2023) further reported that schools implementing CASEL's whole-school approach experienced reductions in behavioral problems and increases in student resilience and engagement. Jagers et al. (2019) also proposed culturally responsive SEL models grounded in CASEL competencies, emphasizing the importance of adapting SEL programs to learners' cultural and community contexts.

Whole-school approaches to SEL additionally emphasize the role of families, communities, and collaborative partnerships in strengthening socio-emotional learning. The New York City Department of Education (2022) highlighted that parental and community involvement broadens learners' social support

systems and reinforces SEL competencies beyond classroom settings. Such collaborative efforts strengthen the sustainability and effectiveness of SEL initiatives in schools. Moreover, culturally responsive and equity-focused approaches to SEL ensure that learners from diverse backgrounds benefit from emotionally supportive and inclusive educational environments. These findings reinforce the importance of adopting comprehensive and systemic approaches to socio-emotional learning implementation.

Legal Bases Supporting Socio-Emotional Learning Integration

Republic Act No. 10533, otherwise known as the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013, provides a legal foundation for holistic and learner-centered education in the Philippines. The law emphasizes the development of well-rounded learners equipped not only with academic competencies but also with life skills, values, and social responsibility. The principles of RA 10533 align closely with socio-emotional learning because both emphasize the development of self-awareness, empathy, responsible decision-making, and interpersonal competence among learners.

Similarly, Republic Act No. 9155, or the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, highlights the role of school leadership and school-based management in improving educational quality. The law empowers school heads to exercise instructional leadership, support teachers, and create school environments responsive to learners' developmental needs. These governance principles support leadership-driven approaches to SEL integration, where school leaders serve as facilitators of socio-emotional learning initiatives.

DepEd Order No. 21, s. 2019 further reinforces the importance of holistic, inclusive, and learner-centered education under the K to 12 curriculum. The policy emphasizes that schools should nurture learners' cognitive, social, emotional, and ethical development through responsive and developmentally appropriate educational practices. These mandates provide institutional support for integrating socio-emotional learning into curriculum planning, instruction, and assessment practices within Philippine schools.

Although numerous studies have established the importance of socio-emotional learning in improving learners' academic achievement, emotional regulation, social competence, and overall well-being, significant gaps remain in the existing body of literature. Most international and local studies primarily focus on the effectiveness of SEL programs, classroom strategies, and student outcomes, while limited attention has been given to the critical role of school leadership in systematically driving SEL integration within the curriculum. Existing research often examines socio-emotional learning from the perspective of teacher practices or student development alone, leaving leadership-driven implementation insufficiently explored, particularly in preschool, primary, and grade school settings within the Philippine educational context. Furthermore, while legal frameworks such as Republic Act No. 10533, Republic Act No. 9155, and DepEd Order No. 21, s. 2019 emphasize holistic and learner-centered education, there remains a noticeable gap between policy aspirations and actual classroom implementation of SEL initiatives. Studies also reveal that many schools continue to prioritize academic performance and standardized assessments over socio-emotional development, resulting in fragmented and inconsistent SEL practices. In addition, there is a scarcity of contextualized frameworks that examine the interplay among school leadership practices, teachers' integration of SEL, and socio-emotional learning outcomes among learners. Hence,

this study addresses these gaps by investigating the relationships among leadership practices, teachers' integration of socio-emotional learning, and learners' socio-emotional outcomes, with the goal of providing empirical evidence that may strengthen the systematic integration of SEL in Philippine basic education.

METHODOLOGY

Research Method

This study employed a quantitative descriptive–correlational research design to examine the relationship between school leadership practices, teachers' integration of socio-emotional learning (SEL), and socio-emotional learning outcomes among learners in preschool, primary, and grade school education. This design was deemed appropriate because it enables the identification and analysis of relationships among variables without manipulating the natural educational environment of the participants (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Through this approach, the study sought to determine how school leadership practices and teachers' integration of SEL influence learners' socio-emotional competencies, thereby providing empirical evidence regarding the role of leadership and classroom practices in promoting socio-emotional learning. The descriptive component allowed the researcher to determine the current status of leadership practices, SEL integration, and learner outcomes, while the correlational component enabled the determination of the strength and direction of the relationships among the study variables.

Participants

The participants of this study consisted of four (4) school administrators and twenty-one (21) teachers from the elementary department of a selected private school in Cebu, Philippines during the School Year 2025–2026. The respondents were considered the most appropriate participants because they are directly involved in the planning, implementation, supervision, and delivery of socio-emotional learning within the curriculum. Specifically, the administrators included the school principal and three coordinators representing the preschool, primary, and intermediate levels, while the teacher respondents were organic teachers assigned across the elementary department. Complete enumeration was utilized in the study to ensure that all administrators and teachers directly involved in SEL integration were represented. This method allowed the researcher to obtain comprehensive and reliable information regarding leadership practices, classroom implementation of socio-emotional learning, and perceptions of learner socio-emotional outcomes.

Data Collection Tools

The primary data-gathering tool used in this study was a researcher-made survey questionnaire adopted and adapted from validated instruments on socio-emotional learning and educational leadership, including measures guided by the CASEL Framework and previous studies related to leadership-driven SEL implementation. The questionnaire was specifically designed to gather quantitative data aligned with the study's Statement of the Problem and consisted of three main sections.

School Leadership Practices

This section measured the level of school leadership practices in supporting socio-emotional learning integration in terms of vision-setting and policy support, teacher training and professional development,

resource allocation, and monitoring and evaluation. The items assessed how school administrators support and promote SEL implementation within the curriculum.

Teachers' Integration of Socio-Emotional Learning

This section measured the extent to which teachers integrate socio-emotional learning into lesson planning, classroom implementation, assessment practices, and collaboration with peers and parents. The indicators were aligned with the CASEL competencies, including self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making.

Socio-Emotional Learning Outcomes

This section assessed the perceived socio-emotional learning outcomes among learners in terms of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making.

All items in the questionnaire were rated using a five-point Likert scale interpreted as follows: 5 – Strongly Agree, 4 – Agree, 3 – Neutral, 2 – Disagree, and 1 – Strongly Disagree. The instrument underwent expert validation to ensure content validity, clarity, and alignment with the study objectives. Moreover, pilot testing was conducted among teachers and administrators outside the actual study site who possessed similar characteristics to the intended respondents. The reliability of the instrument was measured using Cronbach's Alpha, and items with low reliability were revised or removed to ensure strong internal consistency and reliability of the questionnaire.

Data Collection Procedure

A face-to-face data collection method was employed through the administration of the structured survey questionnaire to the administrator and teacher respondents. Prior to the actual data collection, formal approval was secured from the appropriate school authorities and administrators. The researcher coordinated with the school principal and department coordinators to discuss the objectives, procedures, and ethical considerations of the study. Respondents were informed about the purpose of the research, the voluntary nature of their participation, and their right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

During the preliminary stage, pilot testing of the questionnaire was conducted among respondents outside the actual study site to ensure the clarity, reliability, and appropriateness of the instrument. Feedback gathered during the pilot test was utilized to revise ambiguous or unclear statements. Following this, the finalized questionnaires were personally distributed to all identified respondents. Clear instructions regarding the completion of the questionnaire were provided, and respondents were given adequate time to answer the instrument at their convenience.

After the retrieval of the completed questionnaires, responses were checked for completeness and accuracy. The collected data were then encoded, organized, and prepared for statistical analysis. Throughout the entire data collection process, respondents' anonymity and confidentiality were strictly

observed in compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173), ensuring ethical standards in the collection, storage, and handling of data.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical methods. Descriptive statistics, including frequency count, percentage, weighted mean, and standard deviation, were utilized to summarize the demographic profile of respondents and determine the levels of school leadership practices, teachers' integration of socio-emotional learning, and socio-emotional learning outcomes among learners. To determine the significant relationships between school leadership practices and learner socio-emotional outcomes, as well as between teachers' integration of SEL and learner socio-emotional outcomes, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson's r) was employed. In addition, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether significant differences existed in the perceptions of respondents across different groups. All statistical analyses were conducted using a 0.05 level of significance to ensure the validity and reliability of the results. A licensed statistician was consulted to verify the accuracy of all computations and interpretations, thereby strengthening the credibility and reliability of the study findings.

RESULTS

Table 1-Summary on the Level of School Leadership Practices in Support of Socio Emotional Learning Integration in the Curriculum

Components	WM	SD	Verbal Description
Vision-setting and policy support	2.53	0.85	Less Practiced
Teacher training and professional development	2.18	0.73	Less Practiced
Resource allocation	2.15	0.70	Less Practiced
Monitoring and evaluation	2.16	0.73	Less Practiced
Grand Mean	2.26		
Grand Standard Deviation		0.75	Less Practiced

As reflected in Table 6, all components of school leadership practices were verbally interpreted as Less Practiced, with weighted means ranging from 2.15 to 2.53. Among the four indicators, vision-setting and policy support obtained the highest weighted mean of 2.53 with a standard deviation of 0.85, indicating that school leaders demonstrate relatively greater efforts in establishing school goals, directions, and policies related to socio-emotional learning compared to the other leadership dimensions. However, despite being the highest-rated component, the result still falls within the "Less Practiced" category, suggesting that SEL-related vision and policy initiatives remain insufficiently institutionalized within the school setting. On the other hand, resource allocation received the lowest weighted mean of 2.15 with a standard deviation of 0.70, implying that the provision of instructional materials, financial support, and

learning resources necessary for effective SEL implementation remains limited. Similarly, monitoring and evaluation (WM = 2.16, SD = 0.73) and teacher training and professional development (WM = 2.18, SD = 0.73) were also interpreted as Less Practiced, indicating minimal leadership efforts in conducting systematic supervision, evaluating SEL implementation, and providing teachers with professional development opportunities related to socio-emotional learning. The computed grand mean of 2.26 and grand standard deviation of 0.75 revealed that school leadership practices supporting socio-emotional learning integration are generally weak and inconsistently implemented across all identified dimensions.

Table 2-Summary on the Extent to Which the Teachers' Integration of Socio-emotional Learning in the Curriculum

Components	WM	SD	Verbal Description
Lesson planning	2.76	0.76	Sometimes
Classroom implementation	2.91	0.78	Sometimes
Assessment practices	2.63	0.76	Sometimes
Collaboration with peers and parents	2.22	0.89	Rarely
Grand Mean	2.63		
Grand Standard Deviation		0.80	Sometimes

Table 2 presents the summary on the extent to which teachers integrate socio-emotional learning (SEL) in the curriculum in terms of lesson planning, classroom implementation, assessment practices, and collaboration with peers and parents. As reflected in the table, teachers' integration of socio-emotional learning was generally interpreted as Sometimes, with weighted means ranging from 2.22 to 2.91. Among the identified components, classroom implementation obtained the highest weighted mean of 2.91 with a standard deviation of 0.78, indicating that teachers demonstrate socio-emotional learning most frequently through classroom interactions, learner engagement activities, and behavior management practices. This suggests that teachers are moderately capable of incorporating socio-emotional competencies into daily instructional activities and classroom environments. Meanwhile, lesson planning registered a weighted mean of 2.76 with a standard deviation of 0.76, verbally interpreted as Sometimes, implying that socio-emotional learning competencies are moderately integrated into instructional planning and classroom objectives. Similarly, assessment practices obtained a weighted mean of 2.63 with a standard deviation of 0.76, also interpreted as Sometimes, indicating that teachers occasionally incorporate socio-emotional competencies into learner assessment and evaluation activities. On the other hand, collaboration with peers and parents recorded the lowest weighted mean of 2.22 with a standard deviation of 0.89, verbally interpreted as Rarely. This finding indicates limited collaboration and partnership among teachers, parents, and colleagues in supporting socio-emotional learning initiatives within and beyond the classroom setting. The computed grand mean of 2.63 and grand standard deviation of 0.80 revealed that teachers' integration

of socio-emotional learning in the curriculum is moderately practiced but remains inconsistent across the identified dimensions.

**Table 3-Summary on the Level of Socio-Emotional Learning Outcomes
among Primary Pupils as Perceived by Teachers**

Components	WM	SD	Verbal Description
Self-awareness	2.72	0.76	Moderate
Self-management	2.67	0.66	Moderate
Social awareness	2.70	0.68	Moderate
Relationship skills	2.74	0.72	Moderate
Responsible decision-making	2.57	0.66	Low
Grand Mean	2.68		Moderate
Grand Standard Deviation		0.70	

Table 3 presents the summary on the level of socio-emotional learning outcomes among primary pupils as perceived by teachers in terms of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making. As reflected in the table, four of the five socio-emotional learning competencies were verbally interpreted as Moderate, with weighted means ranging from 2.67 to 2.74. Among the identified components, relationship skills obtained the highest weighted mean of 2.74 with a standard deviation of 0.72, indicating that pupils moderately demonstrate the ability to establish positive relationships, cooperate with peers, and interact appropriately within classroom settings. This was followed closely by self-awareness (WM = 2.72, SD = 0.76), suggesting that pupils moderately recognize and understand their emotions, behaviors, and personal responses in different situations. Likewise, social awareness obtained a weighted mean of 2.70 with a standard deviation of 0.68, while self-management recorded a weighted mean of 2.67 with a standard deviation of 0.66, both verbally interpreted as Moderate. These findings indicate that pupils moderately demonstrate empathy, respect for others, emotional control, and the ability to adjust behaviors according to classroom expectations and social situations. In contrast, responsible decision-making received the lowest weighted mean of 2.57 with a standard deviation of 0.66, verbally interpreted as Low. This result implies that pupils experience greater difficulty in demonstrating ethical judgment, evaluating consequences, solving problems independently, and making responsible behavioral decisions in different situations. The computed grand mean of 2.68 and grand standard deviation of 0.70 revealed that pupils' socio-emotional learning outcomes are generally developing at a moderate level but remain insufficiently strengthened across all competency areas.

Table 4- Test of Relationship between the School Leadership Practices and Socio-Emotional Learning Outcomes

Variables	r-value	Strength of Correlation	p - value	Decision	Remarks
School Leadership Practices and Socio-Emotional Learning Outcomes	0.323	Weak Positive	0.100	Do not reject Ho	Not Significant

*significant at $p < 0.05$ (two-tailed)

Table 4 presents the test of relationship between school leadership practices and socio-emotional learning outcomes among pupils. The analysis yielded an r-value of 0.323, indicating a weak positive correlation between the two variables. This suggests that as school leadership practices increase, socio-emotional learning outcomes also tend to increase slightly; however, the relationship is relatively weak. Furthermore, the computed p-value of 0.100 is greater than the 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected, indicating that there is no statistically significant relationship between school leadership practices and socio-emotional learning outcomes among pupils. The findings imply that variations in socio-emotional learning outcomes cannot be significantly attributed to school leadership practices alone.

DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that socio-emotional learning integration within the curriculum is not yet strongly institutionalized through leadership practices. Although school leaders appear to demonstrate some level of commitment through vision-setting and policy support, the low ratings across all components suggest that SEL implementation remains largely limited at the operational level. This implies that while school administrators may recognize the importance of socio-emotional learning conceptually, such recognition has not yet been fully translated into sustained practices involving professional development, resource provision, instructional support, and systematic monitoring mechanisms. This finding supports the assertions of Mahfouz et al. (2021) and Greenberg (2023), who emphasized that leadership commitment is essential in creating school environments where socio-emotional learning is systematically integrated and sustained. The relatively higher rating of vision-setting and policy support suggests that leadership efforts are more visible in establishing broad educational directions and goals aligned with holistic learner development. This finding supports the view that school leaders play a critical role in shaping school culture, organizational priorities, and instructional direction (Leithwood & Sun, 2018). However, the persistence of a “Less Practiced” rating indicates that policies alone are insufficient to ensure successful SEL integration without concrete implementation structures. Leadership support becomes meaningful only when accompanied by strategic actions that empower teachers and sustain classroom implementation. This observation aligns with the findings of Dakessian (2024), who stressed that effective SEL

implementation requires leadership practices that extend beyond policy formulation toward active instructional support and school-wide coordination. The low ratings in teacher training and professional development further imply that teachers may not be receiving adequate preparation and capacity-building opportunities related to socio-emotional learning integration. This situation may affect teachers' confidence, instructional readiness, and ability to effectively incorporate SEL competencies into classroom practices. Existing literature emphasizes that sustained professional development is essential in helping teachers understand and apply socio-emotional learning strategies in meaningful and developmentally appropriate ways (Ibrahim et al., 2021; Kaspar, 2022). Without continuous training and instructional support, SEL practices may remain inconsistent, fragmented, and dependent on individual teacher initiative rather than becoming part of a systematic educational approach. Similarly, Cipriano and Brackett (2020) emphasized that teachers who possess strong socio-emotional competencies themselves are more capable of creating emotionally supportive and learner-centered classroom environments. Likewise, the low rating in resource allocation suggests insufficient institutional support in terms of instructional materials, funding, and learner-centered resources necessary for effective SEL implementation. The absence of adequate resources may hinder teachers from integrating socio-emotional learning activities consistently within classroom instruction. This finding supports the observations of Haugstad (2020), who emphasized that successful SEL integration requires supportive classroom environments, structured routines, and appropriate learning resources to reinforce socio-emotional competencies among learners. In the same manner, CASEL (2023) stressed that whole-school SEL implementation requires equitable resource provision and administrative support to sustain instructional practices and learner engagement. The low rating in monitoring and evaluation further indicates that schools may lack systematic mechanisms for assessing and sustaining socio-emotional learning initiatives. Monitoring and evaluation are necessary to determine whether SEL objectives are being effectively implemented and achieved within classroom settings. Without structured supervision and data-informed evaluation systems, socio-emotional learning initiatives may become inconsistent and unsustainable over time. This finding aligns with Jones and Bouffard (2012), who emphasized that effective SEL implementation requires ongoing assessment, collaborative reflection, and leadership-driven accountability systems to ensure program quality and long-term sustainability. The findings also suggest that schools may continue to prioritize academic-oriented programs and standardized assessment outcomes over socio-emotional development initiatives. This condition reflects the concerns raised by Malapitan (2023) and Violón-Agudo and Violón (2024), who argued that despite the holistic vision promoted by Philippine educational policies, classroom practices often remain heavily centered on cognitive and academic competencies. Consequently, socio-emotional learning tends to receive limited institutional attention and is frequently treated as supplementary rather than integral to the curriculum. Moreover, the results reinforce the importance of transformational and instructional leadership in strengthening socio-emotional learning integration. Research by Alves et al. (2021) and Liu et al. (2021) demonstrated that transformational leadership practices positively influence teacher engagement, collective efficacy, and readiness for educational innovation. Similarly, Arar and Nasra (2020) found that supportive leadership practices enhance teachers' organizational commitment and willingness to adopt

new educational approaches. These studies imply that leadership-driven support systems are critical in creating school cultures where socio-emotional learning becomes embedded in daily instructional practices rather than remaining isolated initiatives. The findings underscore the necessity of strengthening leadership practices to support the institutionalization of socio-emotional learning within the curriculum. The weak and inconsistent implementation across all leadership dimensions demonstrates the need for a more comprehensive and systematic leadership approach that prioritizes socio-emotional development alongside academic achievement. Sustainable SEL integration requires leadership commitment translated into concrete practices involving teacher capacity-building, collaborative school culture, equitable resource allocation, and continuous monitoring and evaluation systems (CASEL, 2023; Mahfouz et al., 2020; Esguerra & Quinito, 2025). Strengthening these leadership mechanisms may significantly contribute to the successful integration and sustainability of socio-emotional learning practices within the school environment.

The findings indicate that socio-emotional learning is present within classroom practices; however, its integration remains moderate and inconsistent across instructional areas. The relatively higher rating in classroom implementation suggests that teachers are more likely to integrate socio-emotional learning informally through classroom interactions, learner engagement strategies, behavior management, and daily communication with students. This implies that teachers recognize the importance of fostering supportive and emotionally responsive classroom environments, even in the absence of highly structured SEL systems. The result supports the findings of Haugstad (2020), who emphasized that socio-emotional learning is often most visible through classroom routines, teacher-student relationships, collaborative activities, and emotionally supportive instructional practices. Similarly, Denham et al. (2021) stressed that emotionally supportive classroom interactions contribute significantly to learners' emotional competence, self-regulation, and positive social behavior in early education settings. The moderate rating in lesson planning further suggests that teachers occasionally incorporate socio-emotional competencies into instructional objectives, classroom activities, and learning experiences. However, the findings also imply that SEL integration may not yet be systematically embedded into curriculum planning across all subject areas and grade levels. This observation aligns with Dumbuya (2023), who stressed that socio-emotional learning becomes more effective when intentionally integrated into curriculum content rather than treated as a separate or supplementary component of instruction. Likewise, Aksoy and Gresham (2020) emphasized that integrating SEL into early childhood and primary education is essential because socio-emotional competencies significantly influence learners' academic performance, emotional regulation, and social development. In the same manner, Domitrovich and Jones (2017) noted that integrating socio-emotional learning into instructional content and school routines strengthens learners' school readiness and long-term developmental outcomes. Similarly, the results on assessment practices indicate that socio-emotional learning competencies are only moderately reflected in learner evaluation and classroom assessment activities. This finding suggests that teachers may still focus more heavily on cognitive and academic performance indicators than on socio-emotional development outcomes. Existing literature highlights that effective SEL implementation requires assessment approaches that evaluate learners' emotional growth, self-regulation, collaboration, and interpersonal competencies alongside academic

achievement (CASEL, 2023; Jones & Doolittle, 2020). Without systematic assessment mechanisms, socio-emotional learning may remain difficult to monitor, reinforce, and sustain within classroom instruction. Cipriano et al. (2024) further emphasized that effective universal SEL programs require consistent implementation and evaluation processes to ensure sustainable learner outcomes and school-wide impact. The lowest rating in collaboration with peers and parents reveals limited stakeholder engagement in socio-emotional learning integration. This finding suggests that SEL initiatives remain largely classroom-centered and may not yet be supported through strong collaborative partnerships among teachers, families, and school communities. The result is significant because socio-emotional development is strengthened when schools, families, and communities work together in reinforcing socio-emotional competencies among learners. The New York City Department of Education (2022) emphasized that parental and community involvement broadens learners' support systems and strengthens SEL implementation beyond the classroom setting. Likewise, Zha et al. (2025) found that parents play essential roles in modeling, guiding, and reinforcing collaborative and socio-emotional behaviors among children. Furthermore, Bergin et al. (2024) highlighted that school-wide SEL programs become more effective when teachers, families, and school leaders collectively support socio-emotional learning initiatives. The findings also indicate that teachers may require stronger institutional support, professional development opportunities, and collaborative structures to integrate socio-emotional learning more consistently across planning, instruction, assessment, and stakeholder engagement. This observation aligns with the assertions of Valenzuela (2023), who emphasized that SEL integration becomes more sustainable when supported by systemic and school-wide implementation approaches. Similarly, CASEL (2023) highlighted that effective socio-emotional learning programs require leadership support, collaborative practices, and ongoing professional development to ensure consistency and sustainability. Greenberg (2023) further explained that evidence-based SEL implementation requires schools to institutionalize socio-emotional learning through leadership-driven initiatives, teacher preparation, and organizational support systems. Furthermore, the results reinforce the importance of supportive school leadership in strengthening teachers' capacity to integrate socio-emotional learning into daily instructional practices. Studies by Ibrahim et al. (2021) and Alves et al. (2021) revealed that leadership practices significantly influence teachers' readiness, engagement, and commitment toward implementing innovative educational approaches such as SEL. Similarly, Mahfouz et al. (2021) stressed that leadership support contributes to the successful implementation of SEL initiatives by fostering positive school climates, teacher collaboration, and emotionally supportive learning environments. In the absence of strong leadership support systems, teachers may struggle to institutionalize socio-emotional learning practices consistently within the curriculum. The findings suggest that while teachers demonstrate moderate efforts to integrate socio-emotional learning into classroom instruction, implementation remains inconsistent and heavily dependent on individual practices rather than systematic school-wide structures. Strengthening collaboration, assessment practices, teacher preparation, and leadership support mechanisms may significantly enhance the consistent and sustainable integration of socio-emotional learning across all dimensions of the curriculum. These findings support the assertions of CASEL (2023), Jones and Bouffard (2012), and Esguerra and Quinito (2025), who emphasized that sustainable socio-emotional learning

integration requires collaborative leadership, continuous professional development, supportive policies, and comprehensive implementation systems that prioritize learners' holistic development alongside academic achievement.

The findings indicate that although school leadership practices demonstrate a weak positive association with socio-emotional learning outcomes, the relationship is not statistically significant. This suggests that while leadership practices may contribute to socio-emotional development to some extent, their influence alone may not be sufficient to produce substantial improvements in pupils' socio-emotional competencies. The result further implies that socio-emotional learning outcomes are likely shaped by multiple interacting factors beyond leadership practices, including classroom instruction, teacher-student relationships, family involvement, peer interaction, and the broader school environment. The weak positive correlation nevertheless suggests that leadership practices still play an indirect and supportive role in fostering environments conducive to socio-emotional learning. This finding aligns with Leithwood and Sun (2018), who emphasized that school leadership often influences learner outcomes indirectly through its impact on school climate, teacher motivation, instructional quality, and organizational culture. Similarly, Mahfouz et al. (2021) explained that leadership support contributes to SEL implementation primarily by establishing emotionally supportive school environments, encouraging collaboration, and strengthening teacher engagement rather than directly affecting learner competencies. The absence of a statistically significant relationship may also reflect the generally low level of leadership practices observed in the earlier findings of the study. Since leadership practices related to teacher training, monitoring, evaluation, and resource allocation were rated as less practiced, their limited implementation may have reduced their capacity to significantly influence learners' socio-emotional outcomes. Existing literature emphasizes that leadership becomes effective in supporting socio-emotional learning only when translated into consistent professional development, systematic implementation structures, and sustainable institutional support mechanisms (Dakessian, 2024; CASEL, 2023). Moreover, socio-emotional learning outcomes among pupils may depend more heavily on direct classroom experiences and instructional interactions than on broader administrative practices. Research by Chen and Lee (2021) highlighted that teacher modeling, peer interaction, and emotionally responsive classroom practices significantly influence learners' socio-emotional competencies. Likewise, Cipriano and Brackett (2020) emphasized that learners develop socio-emotional skills more effectively when exposed to emotionally supportive teacher-student relationships and positive classroom climates. This may explain why leadership practices alone did not demonstrate a significant relationship with socio-emotional learning outcomes in the present study. The findings further support the assertions of Haugstad (2020) and Durlak et al. (2020), who emphasized that sustainable socio-emotional development requires consistent and integrated efforts across multiple educational dimensions, including curriculum integration, classroom implementation, family engagement, and school-wide support systems. Leadership may therefore function more as an enabling and facilitative factor rather than a direct determinant of learners' socio-emotional competencies. Additionally, the findings may indicate that the effects of leadership practices on socio-emotional learning outcomes require longer periods of implementation before measurable learner changes become evident. SEL competencies such as emotional regulation, empathy, relationship-building, and responsible decision-making often develop gradually

through repeated experiences, guided reflection, and continuous reinforcement across school and home environments (Jones & Doolittle, 2020; CASEL, 2023). Consequently, limited or emerging leadership practices may not yet have produced sufficient long-term effects on pupils' socio-emotional outcomes. The findings suggest that school leadership practices alone do not significantly determine socio-emotional learning outcomes among pupils. While leadership remains important in establishing supportive school structures and promoting SEL initiatives, stronger and more comprehensive implementation mechanisms involving teachers, families, classroom practices, and collaborative learning environments are necessary to produce meaningful improvements in learners' socio-emotional competencies. These findings reinforce the importance of adopting a holistic and school-wide approach to socio-emotional learning integration that extends beyond administrative leadership and emphasizes sustained instructional and environmental support systems.

The study concluded that socio-emotional learning integration within the curriculum remains moderately and inconsistently implemented due to limited leadership support, insufficient professional development opportunities, inadequate resource allocation, weak monitoring systems, and minimal collaborative engagement among stakeholders. Although teachers demonstrated moderate efforts in integrating socio-emotional learning through classroom implementation, lesson planning, and assessment practices, these practices were not yet systematically institutionalized across all instructional areas. Likewise, pupils demonstrated developing socio-emotional competencies, particularly in relationship skills, self-awareness, social awareness, and self-management; however, responsible decision-making remained underdeveloped, indicating the need for more explicit and sustained socio-emotional learning interventions. Furthermore, the findings revealed that school leadership practices demonstrated only a weak and non-significant relationship with socio-emotional learning outcomes, suggesting that leadership alone is insufficient to directly influence pupils' socio-emotional development without strong classroom implementation, family involvement, teacher preparedness, and collaborative school-wide support systems. The study affirms that effective and sustainable socio-emotional learning integration requires a holistic, collaborative, and leadership-supported approach that strengthens instructional practices, professional capacity-building, stakeholder engagement, and supportive learning environments to promote learners' holistic development and socio-emotional well-being.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of the study reveal that socio-emotional learning integration within the curriculum remains insufficiently institutionalized due to limited and inconsistent leadership support systems. Although school leaders demonstrate recognition of the importance of socio-emotional learning through vision-setting and policy support, these efforts have not yet been fully translated into sustained implementation practices involving professional development, resource allocation, collaborative engagement, and systematic monitoring mechanisms. Consequently, socio-emotional learning continues to function more as a supplementary instructional practice rather than as an integral and fully embedded component of the curriculum. The study further establishes that teachers demonstrate moderate integration of socio-emotional learning, particularly through classroom implementation and daily learner interactions.

However, the integration of socio-emotional competencies into lesson planning, assessment practices, and collaboration with parents and peers remains inconsistent. This indicates that teachers' implementation of socio-emotional learning is still largely dependent on individual initiative rather than supported through comprehensive and school-wide systems. The limited collaboration with parents and professional learning communities further weakens the continuity and reinforcement of socio-emotional learning beyond classroom instruction. Moreover, the findings indicate that primary pupils possess developing socio-emotional competencies, particularly in self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship skills. Nevertheless, responsible decision-making emerged as the weakest competency, suggesting that pupils continue to experience difficulties in ethical reasoning, accountability, problem-solving, and evaluating the consequences of their actions. These findings underscore the need for more intentional, explicit, and sustained socio-emotional learning experiences that provide learners with meaningful opportunities to develop higher-order socio-emotional competencies. The study also concludes that school leadership practices alone do not significantly determine socio-emotional learning outcomes among pupils. Although leadership practices demonstrated a weak positive relationship with learner outcomes, the relationship was not statistically significant, implying that socio-emotional development is influenced by multiple interconnected factors such as classroom instruction, teacher-student relationships, family engagement, peer interaction, and school climate. Leadership therefore functions more as an enabling and facilitative mechanism that supports the conditions necessary for effective socio-emotional learning implementation rather than serving as a direct determinant of learner outcomes. The findings affirm that sustainable and effective socio-emotional learning integration requires a holistic, collaborative, and school-wide approach that aligns leadership practices, instructional implementation, stakeholder engagement, supportive learning environments, and continuous capacity-building initiatives. Strengthening these interconnected systems may significantly contribute to the development of emotionally resilient, socially responsible, ethically grounded, and academically competent learners prepared to navigate the complexities of contemporary society.

In light of the findings and conclusions of the study, it is strongly recommended that educational leaders institutionalize socio-emotional learning as a core component of the curriculum by embedding SEL goals, competencies, and implementation strategies into school policies, improvement plans, instructional frameworks, and leadership priorities. School administrators should establish clear and consistent leadership-driven systems that promote socio-emotional learning across all grade levels and subject areas to ensure that learners' holistic development receives equal emphasis alongside academic achievement.

It is likewise recommended that schools implement structured, continuous, and research-based professional development programs focusing on socio-emotional learning pedagogy, emotionally responsive teaching strategies, learner-centered assessment approaches, and culturally responsive classroom practices. Such initiatives may strengthen teachers' competence, confidence, and instructional readiness in systematically integrating socio-emotional learning into lesson planning, classroom instruction, learner assessment, and daily educational interactions. Enhancing teachers' socio-emotional competencies may further contribute to the creation of more inclusive, emotionally supportive, and learner-centered classroom environments.

Furthermore, schools should allocate sufficient instructional resources, learning materials, budgetary support, and dedicated instructional time to ensure the sustainability and effectiveness of socio-emotional learning initiatives. Appropriate instructional tools, intervention materials, learner-centered activities, and SEL-based assessment instruments should be made accessible to support teachers in implementing socio-emotional learning consistently and effectively across all educational levels.

The establishment of a systematic monitoring and evaluation mechanism for socio-emotional learning implementation is also highly recommended. School leaders and instructional supervisors should integrate socio-emotional learning indicators into classroom observation tools, instructional supervision processes, school evaluation systems, and professional feedback mechanisms. Consistent monitoring, reflective evaluation, and evidence-based decision-making may help identify implementation gaps, strengthen accountability, and improve the quality and sustainability of socio-emotional learning initiatives.

In addition, stronger collaboration among teachers, parents, professional learning communities, and community stakeholders should be encouraged to reinforce socio-emotional learning beyond classroom settings. Schools should develop meaningful home-school partnerships, parent engagement programs, and collaborative activities that actively involve families and communities in promoting learners' emotional regulation, ethical behavior, interpersonal competence, and social responsibility. Strengthening these collaborative relationships may provide learners with more consistent socio-emotional support across different learning environments.

Finally, future researchers are encouraged to conduct broader and more comprehensive investigations on socio-emotional learning integration using larger populations, multiple educational settings, and additional variables related to school climate, teacher competencies, family involvement, learner behavior, and organizational leadership. Future studies utilizing qualitative and mixed-method approaches may also provide deeper insights into the lived experiences, implementation challenges, and contextual factors influencing socio-emotional learning in Philippine basic education. Such studies may contribute significantly to the development of evidence-based policies, contextualized frameworks, and sustainable educational interventions that advance holistic and inclusive learner development.

REFERENCES:

1. Akinnusi, M. (2021). Understanding principals' perceptions of leadership for social and emotional learning in primary schools. Walden University.
<https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=11744&context=dissertations>
2. Aksoy, P., & Gresham, F. M. (2020). Theoretical bases of “social-emotional learning intervention programs” for preschool children. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 7(4), 1517–1531. <http://iojet.org/index.php/IOJET/article/view/1010>
3. Alimboyong, A. D. (2019). Implementation of RA 9155: Basis for educational planning. *Ascendens Asia Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(2M).
4. Alves, J., Sousa, C., Moreira, S., & Cunha, R. (2021). Transformational leadership and teacher engagement: The mediating role of psychological resilience. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(5), 732–749. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220907324>

5. Arar, K., & Nasra, M. A. (2020). Leadership style, organizational learning, and teachers' organizational commitment. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(1), 186–204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218781066>
6. Arora, A., & Mishra, R. (2024). Teacher–student relationships and socio-emotional learning: A participative approach to classroom engagement. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 14(2), 88–102.
7. Aspen Institute. (2019). The positive school climate framework. <https://www.aspeninstitute.org/publications/positive-school-climate-framework/>
8. Australian Early Development Census (AEDC). (2025). AEDC National Report 2024. Australian Government Department of Education. https://www.aedc.gov.au/docs/default-source/default-document-library/aedc_national-report-2024_da7-409a37b9d-95ce-43e7-af00-51aa604cf0b3.pdf
9. Bergin, C., & Bergin, D. (2024). Effectiveness of a social-emotional learning program for both students and teachers. ERIC. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1455183.pdf>
10. Bergin, C., Prewett, S., Jones, E. A., & Murphy, B. (2024). Effectiveness of a social-emotional learning program for both teachers and students. *SAGE Open*, 14(2), 21582440241281284. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241281284>
11. Cabello, R., & Fernandez-Berrocal, P. (2022). Social and emotional learning in education: Theory, practice, and future directions. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34(2), 855–879. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-021-09633-0>
12. Chen, L., & Lee, H. (2021). Peer and teacher modeling in the development of socio-emotional skills in elementary education. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 113(5), 872–885. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000521>
13. Cipriano, C., & Brackett, M. A. (2020). How educators' emotion skills influence students' social and emotional learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 55(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2019.1700238>
14. Cipriano, C., Dymnicki, A., & Taylor, R. (2024). A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effects of universal school-based social and emotional learning programs. *ScienceDirect*. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2773233924000032>
15. Cipriano, C., Jones, D., & Smith, G. (2023). Towards an inclusive social and emotional learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 115(4), 789–804. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000623>
16. Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL). (2020). CASEL framework: Core competencies of social and emotional learning. <https://casel.org/fundamentals-of-sel/>
17. Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
18. Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). 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>

19. Denham, S. A., Bassett, H. H., & Wyatt, T. M. (2021). The socialization of emotional competence in early childhood classrooms. *Early Education and Development*, 32(7), 967–984. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2020.1845491>
20. Domitrovich, C., & Jones, D. (2017). Social and emotional learning and school readiness. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 34, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2015.09.001>
21. Durlak, J. A., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Weissberg, R. P. (2011). A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development*, 82(1), 405–432. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x>
22. Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2020). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning. *Child Development*, 91(2), 405–432. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12864>
23. Elbertson, N. A., & Jones, S. M. (2025). The role of educators in school-based social and emotional learning. *ScienceDirect*. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2773233925000580>
24. Esguerra, R. A., & Quinito, D. I. (2025). Teachers' professional development and school leadership management. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation*, 12(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2025.12010001>
25. Flee, M. (2025). Preschool children's play and socio-emotional development: A Vygotskian perspective. *Frontiers in Education*, 10, 1569322. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2025.1569322>
26. Goforth, A. N., & Jones, S. M. (2022). Cultural adaptation of an educator social-emotional learning program. *PubMed Central*. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11293464/>
27. Greenberg, M. T. (2023). Evidence for social and emotional learning in schools. *Learning Policy Institute*. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/evidence-social-emotional-learning-schools-report>
28. Haugstad, M. (2020). Early childhood social-emotional learning. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 48(5), 563–571. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-020-01101-2>
29. Haugstad, R. E. (2020). Integrating social emotional learning into curriculum content, routines, and relationships in a primary classroom (Master's thesis). *Bethel University*. <https://spark.bethel.edu/etd/275>
30. Howe, E. R. (2014). Value education for global citizenship. *Curriculum and Teaching*, 29(2), 5–21. <https://doi.org/10.7459/ct/29.2.02>
31. Ibrahim, M. S., Ghavifekr, S., Ling, S., & Afshari, M. (2021). Transformational leadership and teachers' readiness for educational change. *Educational Studies*, 47(6), 645–664. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2019.1686203>
32. Jagers, R. J., & Rivas-Drake, D. (2019). Equity and social and emotional learning. *CASEL*.
33. Johnson, R., Smith, T., & Allen, P. (2022). Teacher behavior and students' socio-emotional learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 115, 101–114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.101614>

34. Jones, S. M., & Bouffard, S. M. (2012). Social and emotional learning in schools. *Social Policy Report*, 26(4), 1–33.
35. Jones, S. M., & Doolittle, E. J. (2020). Social and emotional learning: Introducing the issue. *The Future of Children*, 30(1), 3–11.
36. Jones, S. M., Bailey, R., Brush, K., Nelson, B., & Barnes, S. (2021). What works in SEL? Harvard Graduate School of Education.
37. Kaspar, V. (2022). Teacher well-being and social-emotional learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 114(3), 423–435.
38. Kwan, P. (2020). Emotional aspects of principal leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(5), 847–865.
39. Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2018). Transformational school leadership effects. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 54(3), 384–423.
40. Liu, Y., Bellibaş, M. Ş., & Gümüş, S. (2021). Instructional and transformational leadership effects. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(3), 430–452.
41. Mahfouz, J., Greenberg, M. T., & Rodway, J. (2021). School leadership and SEL implementation. *Review of Education*, 9(3), e3315.
42. Mahfouz, J., Greenberg, M. T., & Rodway, J. (2024). Enhancing teachers' socio-emotional skills. *Review of Education*, 12(1), e3315.
43. Mahfouz, J., Greenberg, M., & Rodriguez, A. (2020). Principals' social and emotional competence. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(1), 135–155.
44. Malapitan, J. C. (2023). Values education in Philippine K–12. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 6(2), 45–57.
45. OECD. (2021). *Beyond academic learning*. OECD Publishing.
46. UNESCO & UNICEF. (2021). *Reimagining education*. UNESCO.
47. Zhang, X., Li, J., & Wang, Y. (2021). Classroom interactions and teacher modeling. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 678123.
48. Zhang, W., Li, Y., & Chen, H. (2022). Scaffolding and socio-emotional engagement. *Education Research International*, 3514892.
49. Zha, Z., & Zhang, Y. (2025). Collaborative learning and social-emotional development. *Journal of Educational Research*, 118(1), 45–58.



**Advanced International Journal of Multidisciplinary
Research**

E-ISSN: 2584-0487
editor@aijmr.com

Volume 4, Issue 3, May-June 2026

CrossRef DOI: 10.62127/aijmr.2026.v04i03.1370
