Strengthening Teacher Self-Efficacy Through Targeted Training: Integrating Parents' Perspectives on Primary Students' Social-Emotional Skills

Dr. Helena R. Vázquez

School of Education, University of Barcelona, Spain

Abstract: Primary education increasingly demands that teachers cultivate not only academic learning but also students' social-emotional competencies, which shape classroom climate, engagement, behavior, and long-term wellbeing (Durlak et al., 2011; Elias & Moceri, 2012; Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning, 2022). Yet the effectiveness of school-based social-emotional learning depends substantially on teachers' sense of capability to implement practices consistently, adaptively, and in partnership with families (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Easton, 2008; Epstein & Salinas, 1993). This article develops a publication-oriented conceptual-empirical framework that links teacher self-efficacy to targeted professional learning and to systematic integration of parents' perspectives on children's social-emotional skills. The study positions self-efficacy as a practical driver of instructional quality, classroom management competence, and sustained implementation of social-emotional approaches (Alghulayqah, 2021; Chang & Chien, 2015; Akdeniz, 2016). Using a qualitative-dominant mixed design in principle—grounded in semi-structured interviews, parent perspective elicitation, and interpretive synthesis—the article demonstrates how needs-aligned training can strengthen teacher self-efficacy by connecting pedagogical routines to observable social-emotional behaviors at home and school (Brinkmann, 2014; Çayak & Ergi, 2015). Findings are presented as a descriptive analytic model, strictly derived from the provided evidence base, detailing (a) the training features associated with improved instructional practice and teacher confidence, (b) how parental observations can refine teachers' understanding of children's social-emotional strengths and vulnerabilities, and (c) how school–family partnership structures can stabilize social-emotional skill development across settings (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Gore et al., 2017; Cefai & Cavioni, 2014). The article concludes with an implementation pathway for primary schools that aligns professional development systems, classroom management skill-building, and parent-informed social-emotional supports while acknowledging contextual constraints in reforming education systems and sustaining teacher learning (Alyami, 2014; Alqahtani & Albidewi, 2022; Abdul Salam, 2019).

Keywords: Teacher self-efficacy; professional development; primary education; social-emotional learning; parent perspectives; school–family partnership; training effectiveness.

Introduction: Primary schools operate at the intersection of instruction, development, and care. Teachers are expected to deliver subject learning while also shaping classroom environments in which children learn to cooperate, regulate emotion, resolve conflicts, persist through difficulty, and form constructive relationships (Cefai & Cavioni, 2014; Elias & Moceri, 2012). Social-emotional learning has therefore moved from an "extra" to an organizing principle for how schools understand readiness to learn, classroom climate, and prevention of undesirable behaviors (Durlak et al., 2011; Çayak & Ergi, 2015). At the same time, teacher quality—how teachers plan, teach, manage classrooms, and respond to learners—remains one of the strongest school-level influences on student outcomes, making teacher professional learning a persistent policy and institutional priority (Darling-

Hammond et al., 2017; Gore et al., 2017).

Yet teacher professional learning is not merely a matter of exposure to new ideas. Teachers must believe they can enact those ideas in real classrooms with real constraints. For this reason, self-efficacy is pivotal: it is the perceived capability to organize and execute actions required to achieve desired outcomes. In education research, self-efficacy is repeatedly associated with persistence, willingness to adopt innovations, and resilience under stress (Chang & Chien, 2015; Alghulayqah, 2021). Importantly, self-efficacy is not only psychological; it is operational. If a teacher does not feel capable of facilitating social-emotional learning, coordinating with parents, or managing classroom behavior constructively, implementation is likely to be inconsistent, superficial, or avoided altogether (Cefai & Cavioni, 2014; Çayak & Ergi, 2015).

This article argues that strengthening teacher self-efficacy through targeted training is most effective when professional learning is explicitly connected to the social-emotional skill realities that children display across contexts, including the home setting as seen "through parental eyes" (Epstein & Salinas, 1993; Aunola & Nurmi, 2005). Parents and caregivers observe children's emotion regulation, empathy, conflict patterns, and behavioral responses outside school routines, providing contextual information that can help teachers interpret classroom behavior more accurately and design supports more precisely (Aunola & Nurmi, 2005; Aktas Özkafaci, 2012). Family perspectives are not automatically aligned with school interpretations, and such differences can become sources of tension. However, when structured properly, parent perspectives can enhance the teacher's understanding of the child as a whole learner and strengthen collaboration around consistent skill-building (Epstein & Salinas, 1993; Çayak & Ergi, 2015).

Professional development scholarship emphasizes that "effective" teacher learning is sustained, coherent, active, and closely tied to practice rather than delivered as disconnected workshops (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Easton, 2008). Randomized trial evidence suggests that well-designed professional development can improve teaching quality, but these effects depend on the design features and the school conditions that enable implementation (Gore et al., 2017). In contexts that are undergoing national reforms or sustainability-oriented education initiatives, professional development systems must also align with broader policy goals and licensing requirements (Alyami, 2014; Alghtani, 2022; Abdul Salam, 2019). The question, then, is how to design targeted training that increases teacher self-efficacy specifically for social-emotional learning in primary classrooms, while simultaneously integrating family perspectives in a way that supports rather than burdens teachers.

The present work addresses three intertwined gaps suggested by the reference base. First, professional development discussions often focus on instructional performance and program design but do not always specify how training strengthens self-efficacy for social-emotional facilitation and classroom climate work (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Catalano & Popiţan, 2020). Second, social-emotional learning literature demonstrates broad student benefits, yet schools frequently struggle to implement SEL consistently due to limited teacher readiness and weak home–school coordination (Durlak et al., 2011; Elias & Moceri, 2012; Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning, 2022). Third, family partnership research underscores the value of parent perspectives, but operational integration into teacher learning programs remains under-specified, particularly in ways that are feasible for teachers and respectful of cultural diversity (Epstein & Salinas, 1993; Çayak & Ergi, 2015).

Accordingly, this article develops a comprehensive, practice-facing framework: targeted professional learning to strengthen teacher self-efficacy, designed explicitly to incorporate parent-provided insight into children's social-emotional skills, and implemented through partnership structures that support consistency across home and school (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Epstein & Salinas, 1993). Although the field often treats these as separate domains—teacher training on one side and parent engagement on the other—this article argues that integrating them is essential because social-emotional skill development is inherently contextual and relational (Cefai & Cavioni, 2014; Aunola & Nurmi, 2005).

METHODOLOGY

This article is developed as a publication-ready research framework grounded strictly in the provided references. It specifies a feasible empirical approach that aligns with qualitative research standards and professional development evaluation traditions, while presenting results in descriptive analytical form to reflect the reference-based nature of the work (Brinkmann, 2014; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017).

Research design and rationale. A robust approach for studying teacher self-efficacy improvement through targeted training, while integrating parents' perspectives, is a qualitative-dominant design with complementary interpretive synthesis. Qualitative methods are particularly suitable because (a) self-efficacy is experienced and expressed through

teachers' interpretations of classroom events, (b) social-emotional skill perceptions are context-sensitive and may differ across teachers and parents, and (c) partnership quality is shaped by trust, communication patterns, and local norms (Brinkmann, 2014; Epstein & Salinas, 1993). At the same time, the design can be strengthened by systematic program documentation (e.g., training modules, coaching notes) consistent with evidence-based professional development evaluation (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Gore et al., 2017).

Participants and context. The recommended empirical setting is a cluster of primary schools implementing or strengthening SEL approaches, possibly within a broader reform agenda. System-level reform contexts are relevant because they shape professional development infrastructure and teacher expectations (Alyami, 2014; Abdul Salam, 2019). Teacher participants would be primary classroom teachers who engage in a targeted training program focused on classroom management competence, social-emotional facilitation, and parent partnership routines (Alshihri & Qotb, 2020; Cefai & Cavioni, 2014). Parent participants would be caregivers of children in those classrooms, invited to provide structured perspectives on their children's social-emotional behaviors and strengths at home (Aunola & Nurmi, 2005; Aktas Özkafaci, 2012).

Training intervention structure. The training program is conceptualized using evidence-based characteristics of effective professional development: content focus, active learning, coherence with school goals, duration, and collective participation (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). It integrates classroom management competence development for new or developing teachers (Alshihri & Qotb, 2020), instructional process improvement principles (Akdeniz, 2016), and explicit SEL pedagogy aligned with established frameworks (Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning, 2022; Cefai & Cavioni, 2014). The training also embeds partnership routines grounded in school–family collaboration logic, such as structured communication channels and feedback cycles (Epstein & Salinas, 1993; Çayak & Ergi, 2015).

Data collection. The study design centers on three data sources:

1. Teacher interviews conducted at multiple points: before training, mid-program, and after implementation. Semi-structured interviewing is appropriate to elicit teachers' perceived capabilities, challenges, and interpretation of changes in their practice (Brinkmann, 2014).

2. Parent perspective elicitation using structured prompts that ask caregivers to describe children's emotion regulation, empathy, peer interaction, and behavior patterns at home. Parenting style and home climate are relevant background influences on children's problem behaviors and social development (Aunola & Nurmi, 2005; Bilir & Dabanlı, 1981).

3. Program and classroom documentation including training content, reflective teacher notes, and descriptions of observed practice changes. This supports alignment with professional development evaluation standards and helps establish coherence between training and enacted practice (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Easton, 2008).

Analytic logic. Analysis would proceed through interpretive coding of teacher and parent data to identify themes related to (a) self-efficacy growth, (b) perceived effectiveness of training elements, (c) parent–teacher alignment or misalignment on children's SEL skills, and (d) changes in classroom behaviors and climate. The goal is not to quantify effects but to build a rigorous descriptive account of how targeted training and parent insights interact to strengthen teachers' capacity and confidence (Brinkmann, 2014; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Evidence from training research highlights that design quality matters; therefore, analysis specifically links perceived teacher changes to particular training components and partnership routines (Catalano & Popițan, 2020; Gore et al., 2017).

Validity and ethics. Trustworthiness in qualitative research is supported by triangulation across teacher interviews, parent narratives, and program documents, as well as by iterative member-checking of interpretation where appropriate (Brinkmann, 2014). Ethics are central because parent perspectives involve sensitive information about children's behavior and family life. Partnership work must be framed as supportive rather than evaluative, consistent with respect-based collaboration principles (Epstein & Salinas, 1993; Çayak & Ergi, 2015).

RESULTS

Because this article is grounded strictly in the provided reference set, the results are presented as a comprehensive descriptive synthesis of the patterns a needs-aligned training plus parent-perspective integration approach is expected to reveal, based on the cited evidence about professional development effectiveness, self-efficacy, classroom management, parenting influences, and SEL implementation. These results are organized as findings about mechanisms: how and why targeted training and parent perspectives strengthen teacher self-efficacy and improve SEL support in primary classrooms (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Durlak et al., 2011).

Training design features most likely to strengthen

teacher self-efficacy. Evidence-based professional development is repeatedly described as effective when it is sustained, coherent, content-focused, and active—meaning teachers practice strategies, receive feedback, and connect learning to classroom realities (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Easton, 2008). From a self-efficacy perspective, these features matter because they supply teachers with mastery experiences and reduce uncertainty about "what to do Monday morning." When training includes guided rehearsal of classroom routines, reflective analysis of classroom situations, and opportunities to observe or discuss peer practice, teachers are more likely to feel capable of enacting new approaches (Akdeniz, 2016; Gore et al., 2017).

Programs that explicitly build classroom management competencies—particularly for newer teachers—are especially relevant because classroom management serves as the enabling condition for SEL instruction. Without predictable routines and a safe climate, social-emotional lessons can deteriorate into behavioral control episodes (Alshihri & Qotb, 2020; Cefai & Cavioni, 2014). Teachers who gain concrete management tools often report improved confidence and calmer instructional flow, which is consistent with the idea that capability perceptions are shaped by practical control of key classroom variables (Alghulayqah, 2021; Akdeniz, 2016).

Research on professional centers and licensing-focused development programs also suggests that professional learning systems can standardize expectations and provide structured pathways for teacher growth, which may indirectly support efficacy by clarifying what "good practice" looks like (Abu Mudaigm et al., 2018; Abdul Salam, 2019). In settings where reform initiatives shape teacher roles, such clarity can be particularly important because uncertainty and policy churn can erode confidence (Alyami, 2014).

How targeted training translates into observable changes in teaching practice. The literature indicates that teacher professional development can influence classroom performance when it is tied to concrete instructional moves and reinforced through cycles of feedback and shared professional learning (Giraldo, 2014; Gore et al., 2017). In the context of SEL and classroom climate, targeted training is expected to influence three observable domains of practice.

First, teachers become more intentional about embedding social-emotional skills into everyday instruction—using cooperative structures, emotion vocabulary, perspective-taking prompts, and reflective closure routines. This is aligned with practical interpretations of SEL as integrated pedagogy rather than isolated lessons (Cefai & Cavioni, 2014; Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning, 2022). Second, teachers become more skilled in recognizing the difference between skill deficits and willful misbehavior. This distinction matters because SEL-oriented behavior support treats many disruptions as opportunities for skill-building rather than punishment, consistent with prevention-focused approaches highlighted in SEL research (Durlak et al., 2011; Elias & Moceri, 2012). Third, teachers demonstrate greater consistency in responses to undesirable behaviors, which is commonly associated with improved classroom climate and reduced escalation (Çayak & Ergi, 2015; Alshihri & Qotb, 2020).

As teachers experience these changes, they are likely to report increased self-efficacy because they can see cause-and-effect relationships between their actions and student responses. This aligns with the principle that efficacy is strengthened when individuals experience mastery and interpret outcomes as linked to their efforts (Chang & Chien, 2015; Alghulayqah, 2021).

What parents uniquely contribute to understanding children's social-emotional skills. Parents provide longitudinal observation across contexts—home routines, sibling dynamics, neighborhood interactions, and unstructured time—where children may display different emotional triggers and coping strategies than they show in school (Aunola & Nurmi, 2005; Aktas Özkafaci, 2012). This matters because social-emotional skills are not fixed traits; they are context-sensitive capacities influenced by expectations, relationships, and environmental stability (Bilir & Dabanlı, 1981; Cefai & Cavioni, 2014).

Parenting styles have been associated with children's problem behavior, indicating that home practices shape how children regulate emotion and respond to authority (Aunola & Nurmi, 2005). While schools should not pathologize families, awareness of home dynamics can help teachers interpret a child's classroom behavior with greater empathy and precision. For example, a child who appears oppositional at school may be experiencing inconsistent boundaries at home, or conversely may be experiencing high pressure and emotional suppression that manifests as dysregulation in peer contexts (Aunola & Nurmi, 2005; Bilir & Dabanlı, 1981).

Parent perspectives also expand the teacher's view of strengths. A child who is quiet and withdrawn at school may be socially engaged at home; another child labeled impulsive at school may show persistence and responsibility in family tasks. Recognizing strengths is important because SEL is not only intervention for

problems; it is development of competencies and positive identities (Elias & Moceri, 2012; Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning, 2022). When teachers can name and leverage strengths, they can design support strategies that build on what children already do well.

Mechanisms through which parent perspectives strengthen teacher self-efficacy. Integrating parents' observations into teacher training is expected to strengthen self-efficacy through at least four mechanisms grounded in the partnership and SEL literature.

First, parent insight increases diagnostic confidence. Teachers often experience uncertainty about the causes of behavior—whether a behavior is situational, developmental, relational, or skill-based. Parent data adds context, reducing ambiguity and supporting more targeted responses (Epstein & Salinas, 1993; Aunola & Nurmi, 2005). When teachers feel more accurate in their interpretation, they feel more capable.

Second, parent perspectives support continuity of expectations across home and school. A classic barrier in SEL implementation is inconsistency: children receive different messages about emotion and behavior in different settings. When parents and teachers share language and goals, children practice the same skills across contexts, increasing the likelihood of observable improvement (Çayak & Ergi, 2015; Epstein & Salinas, 1993). Observable improvement, in turn, strengthens teachers' belief that their strategies work and are worth sustaining (Alghulayqah, 2021; Durlak et al., 2011).

Third, parent perspectives can reduce teacher isolation. Teachers facing persistent behavioral challenges may feel personally responsible or professionally inadequate. Partnership structures distribute responsibility in constructive ways, framing the child's development as a shared project rather than a teacher-only problem (Epstein & Salinas, 1993). This relational support can stabilize efficacy beliefs, especially under stress.

Fourth, parent integration can improve classroom climate indirectly by strengthening teacher–parent trust, which reduces conflict and improves communication when difficulties arise. Teacher confidence often declines when parent–teacher relationships are adversarial or ambiguous. Structured partnership routines, when tied to SEL goals, can prevent miscommunication and build cooperative problem-solving norms (Çayak & Ergi, 2015; Epstein & Salinas, 1993).

Expected improvements in students' social-emotional skills and behavior. Meta-analytic evidence indicates that SEL interventions can produce positive effects on students' social-emotional competencies, attitudes, behaviors, and academic performance (Durlak et al., 2011). However, those effects are conditioned by implementation quality. Teachers' readiness and confidence influence whether SEL practices are delivered consistently, and whether they are integrated into daily classroom life rather than treated as separate lessons (Cefai & Cavioni, 2014; Elias & Moceri, 2012).

When teachers' self-efficacy strengthens through targeted training, they are more likely to persist with SEL routines, respond calmly to behavioral disruptions, and provide structured opportunities for students to practice skills such as emotion labeling, empathy, and cooperative problem-solving (Cefai & Cavioni, 2014; Akdeniz, 2016). Family partnership further supports these outcomes by reinforcing similar expectations at home and by enabling early identification of stressors that might affect school behavior (Aunola & Nurmi, 2005; Epstein & Salinas, 1993).

DISCUSSION

The integrated model proposed here suggests that teacher self-efficacy, professional development quality, and parent perspectives form a mutually reinforcing system. Rather than treating teacher training as an internal school process and parent insight as external "engagement," the framework positions parents as contributors to the teacher's pedagogical understanding and to the child's continuity of learning environments (Epstein & Salinas, 1993; Çayak & Ergi, 2015). This section interprets the results through theoretical and practical lenses and addresses counter-arguments, limitations, and future directions grounded in the provided sources.

Why self-efficacy is a central hinge in SEL implementation. Self-efficacy is often discussed as an individual belief, but in school practice it functions as a hinge variable: it shapes whether teachers attempt new strategies, how they interpret setbacks, and whether they sustain practices long enough to see impact (Chang & Chien, 2015; Alghulayqah, 2021). SEL implementation demands consistency, patience, and relational skill. Teachers must facilitate emotions, mediate peer conflicts, and manage time pressures. Without efficacy, SEL is often reduced to surface-level "kindness rules" or short isolated activities that do not reshape classroom culture (Cefai & Cavioni, 2014; Elias & Moceri, 2012).

Professional development research clarifies what strengthens efficacy in practice: learning opportunities that are coherent with teachers' contexts, extend over time, include active learning, and provide feedback and

collaboration (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Easton, 2008). Evidence from randomized approaches to improving teaching quality further supports the importance of structured, collaborative professional learning models rather than ad hoc workshops (Gore et al., 2017). When applied to SEL, this implies that a one-time seminar on social-emotional skills will not be sufficient; teachers need iterative practice and a shared professional language for SEL pedagogy.

The significance of parent perspectives as data—not judgment. A frequent concern in schools is that parent input can become confrontational, judgmental, or logistically overwhelming. The framework here addresses that concern by positioning parent perspectives as structured data that enhances interpretive accuracy and continuity, not as a mechanism for evaluating teacher performance (Epstein & Salinas, 1993). Parent–teacher partnership work is most productive when it is designed as collaborative inquiry around the child's needs and strengths, using respectful communication structures and shared goals (Çayak & Ergi, 2015).

From a developmental standpoint, the home environment is a major context for social-emotional learning. Parenting styles and family attitudes are associated with children's problem behavior and social development, suggesting that home routines influence emotion regulation and behavior patterns (Aunola & Nurmi, 2005; Bilir & Dabanlı, 1981). Therefore, excluding parent perspectives can lead to partial understanding and reduced intervention fit. At the same time, including parent perspectives without teacher training can create confusion. Teachers need training not only to facilitate student SEL but also to interpret parent input without defensiveness and to communicate plans clearly. Such capacity is itself part of teacher efficacy for partnership work (Abu Mudaigm et al., 2018; Abdul Salam, 2019).

The role of classroom management as the bridge between teaching quality and SEL. Classroom management competency is often separated from SEL, but the reference base implies that management is a core enabling condition. New teacher competency frameworks emphasize classroom management as a foundational capability (Alshihri & Qotb, 2020). Instructional process principles also emphasize that teaching effectiveness depends on structuring learning environments, routines, and interactions (Akdeniz, 2016).

Integrating SEL with management means shifting from purely reactive discipline toward proactive, skill-based supports: teaching emotional vocabulary, establishing routines for peer interaction, and creating predictable structures for transitions and conflict resolution (Cefai & Cavioni, 2014; Durlak et al., 2011). When teachers can manage classrooms in this way, they experience greater control and lower stress, which strengthens efficacy beliefs. Conversely, teachers who lack management tools often experience repeated disruptions that undermine their confidence and willingness to attempt SEL approaches. Therefore, targeted training must include management skill-building as well as SEL pedagogy (Alshihri & Qotb, 2020; Akdeniz, 2016).

Counter-arguments and nuances. One counter-argument is that focusing on teacher self-efficacy might individualize responsibility for systemic problems. Teacher confidence can be undermined by large class sizes, limited resources, and policy overload. Reform contexts show that system-level changes require institutional support and coherent infrastructure (Alyami, 2014; Abdul Salam, 2019). The integrated framework recognizes this by emphasizing professional development systems and centers, not just individual teacher effort (Abu Mudaigm et al., 2018). Effective professional development requires time, leadership support, and alignment with school priorities (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Easton, 2008).

A second counter-argument concerns parent involvement: not all families have equal capacity to participate, and partnership approaches can unintentionally privilege certain social groups. This concern underscores the need for equitable partnership design—multiple communication formats, respect for diverse family structures, and avoidance of deficit assumptions about families (Epstein & Salinas, 1993). Teachers should be trained to interpret limited participation as often structural (time, work, language) rather than as lack of care.

A third nuance concerns measuring SEL and interpreting parent reports. Several references point to psychometric work on SEL-related scales and teachers' perceptions, indicating that perceptions can be shaped by context and bias (Aydın, 2023; Esen Aygün & Şahin Taşkın, 2017a; Esen Aygün & Şahin Taşkın, 2017b). Therefore, parent and teacher perspectives should be triangulated rather than treated as objective truths. The value lies in dialogue and pattern recognition across settings.

Limitations. This article presents a reference-grounded research framework and descriptive synthesis rather than reporting newly collected empirical results. The limitation is that real-world implementation will vary, and specific outcomes depend on local context, training duration, leadership support, and partnership feasibility (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Gore et al.,

2017). Another limitation is that some references are context-specific (e.g., national visions, reforms), so transferability requires careful adaptation (Alghtani, 2022; Alqahtani & Albidewi, 2022; Alyami, 2014).

Future scope. Future studies can implement the described design as a school-based program evaluation: tracking teacher self-efficacy trajectories before and after targeted training, analyzing how parent perspectives influence teacher planning, and observing changes in classroom climate and undesirable behaviors (Çayak & Ergi, 2015; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Research can also compare different professional development delivery models—professional centers, school-based learning communities, coaching cycles—to determine which best supports sustained SEL practice (Abu Mudaigm et al., 2018; Easton, 2008). Finally, future work could explore how teacher wellbeing and quality of life interact with self-efficacy and sustained implementation, drawing conceptual links from self-efficacy studies in other populations (Al Mawadieh et al., 2021).

CONCLUSION

Strengthening teacher self-efficacy is central to improving teaching quality and sustaining meaningful social-emotional learning in primary classrooms. Evidence on effective professional development indicates that teacher learning must be sustained, coherent, and embedded in practice, enabling teachers to acquire mastery experiences that build confidence and persistence (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Easton, 2008; Gore et al., 2017). In primary education, where classroom climate and behavior shape daily learning opportunities, targeted training that integrates classroom management competence with SEL pedagogy can stabilize teachers' instructional practice and enhance perceived capability (Akdeniz, 2016; Alshihri & Qotb, 2020; Cefai & Cavioni, 2014).

Integrating parents' perspectives adds critical contextual knowledge about children's social-emotional behaviors and strengths across home settings, enabling teachers to interpret classroom behavior more accurately and design supports that are consistent and respectful (Aunola & Nurmi, 2005; Aktas Özkafaci, 2012). When partnership structures are established through collaborative routines and communication systems, home–school consistency becomes a mechanism for strengthening children's social-emotional skill development and for reinforcing teachers' belief that their efforts lead to meaningful change (Epstein & Salinas, 1993; Çayak & Ergi, 2015).

Ultimately, the proposed framework reframes teacher self-efficacy as both an outcome of effective professional learning systems and a driver of sustainable SEL implementation. It suggests that the most practical pathway to improved social-emotional outcomes in primary education is not isolated programs but integrated capacity-building: professional development that equips teachers, partnership structures that include parents as informants and collaborators, and school systems that provide coherence, support, and time for professional learning to translate into practice (Abdul Salam, 2019; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Durlak et al., 2011).

REFERENCES

1. Abdul Salam, A. M. (2019). A proposed perspective for developing professional development programs at the Professional Academy for the Teacher to meet licensing requirements in light of the experience of some countries. Journal of Faculty of Education, 35(2), 1–72.

2. Abu Mudaigm, K., Kayid, S., & Jauarnh, T. (2018). The role of professional centers in developing teachers' performance from the perspective of the principals in the Beersheba area. Journal of Educational and Psychology Sciences, 26(4), 432–462.

3. Akdeniz, C. (2016). Instructional process and concepts in theory and practice: Improving the teaching process. Springer Singapore.

4. Aktas Özkafaci, A. (2012). Analyzing the relationship between mothers' attitude towards growing up children and social skill level of the children (Publication No. 449765) [Master's thesis, Istanbul Arel University]. Council of Higher Education Thesis Center.

5. Al Mawadieh, R., Adheisa, M., Alomyan, H., & Al-Badri, A. (2021). The relationship between self-efficacy and quality of life among university students. An-Najah University Journal for Research - B (Humanities), 39(9), 1–23.

6. Alghtani, O. (2022). Suggested proposal for sustainable alternative of the professional development of teachers in the light of the national vision 2030 of K.S.A. Educational & Science Journal, 1(20), 53–88.

7. Alghulayqah, A. (2021). Professional performance development of educational supervisor and its relationship with perceived self-efficacy. Journal of Education Studies, 1(27), 275–326.

8. Alqahtani, M., & Albidewi, I. (2022). Teachers' English language training programmes in Saudi Arabia for achieving sustainability in education. Sustainability, 14(22), 15323. https://doi.org/10.3390/su142215323

9. Alshihri, K., & Qotb, I. (2020). A proposed concept to develop the competencies of classroom management for new teachers in private schools from educational supervisors and school leaders' perspectives in Makkah. Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences, 4(10), 86–118. https://doi.org/10.26389/AJSRP.K171019

10. Alyami, R. (2014). Educational reform in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: Tatweer Schools as a unit of development. Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal, 5(2), 1515–1524. https://doi.org/10.20533/licej.2040.2589.2014.0202

11. Amodia-Bidakowska, A., Laverty, C., & Ramchandani, P. G. (2020). Father-child play: A systematic review of its frequency, characteristics and potential impact on children's development. Developmental Review, 57, 100924. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2020.100924

12. Aunola, K., & Nurmi, J. E. (2005). The role of parenting styles in children's problem behavior. Child Development, 76(6), 1144–1159. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00840.x-i1

13. Aydın, F. (2023). Developing the teacher perception of children's social emotional learning skills scale (Publication No. 806467) [Master's thesis, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University]. Council of Higher Education Thesis Center.

14. Baydan, Y. (2010). Developing the scale of perceived social-emotional skills and the effectiveness of social-emotional skills program (Publication No. 265235) [Master's thesis, Hacettepe University]. Council of Higher Education Thesis Center.

15. Bilir, Ş., & Dabanlı, D. (1981). Ergenlik çağındakinin sosyal gelişimine aile tutumlarının etkisinin araştırılması [Investigating the effect of family attitudes on the social development of adolescents]. Journal of Health, 4(12), 213–229.

16. Brinkmann, S. (2014). Unstructured and semi-structured interviewing. In P. Leavy (Ed.), The Oxford handbook of qualitative research (pp. 277–299). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199811755.013.030

17. Catalano, H., & Popiţan, A. (2020). The impact of training programs in professional development of teachers: Ascertaning study. European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences, 6, 84–89. https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2020.06.9

18. Cefai, C., & Cavioni, V. (2014). Social and emotional education in primary school: Integrating theory and research into practice. New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-8752-4

19. Chang, D., & Chien, W. (2015). Determining the relationship between academic self-efficacy and student engagement by meta-analysis. In P. Shaw (Ed.), 2015 International Conference on Education Reform and Modern Management (pp. 142–145). Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/ermm-15.2015.37

20. Cherry, K. (2021). Preoperational stage of cognitive development in young children. Verywell Mind.

21. Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (2022). Fundamentals of SEL. Author.

22. Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (2023). What is the CASEL framework? Author.

23. Çayak, S., & Ergi, D. Y. (2015). Relationship between teacher parent cooperation and primary school students' undesirable behaviors in the classroom. Journal of Education and Humanities: Theory and Practice, 6(11), 59–77.

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

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

26. Easton, L. B. (2008). From professional development to professional learning. Phi Delta Kappan, 89(10), 755–761. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170808901014

27. Elias, M. J., & Moceri, D. C. (2012). Developing social and emotional aspects of learning: The American experience. Research Papers in Education, 27(4), 423–434. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2012.690243

28. Epstein, J. L., & Salinas, K. C. (1993). School and family partnerships: Surveys and summaries. The Johns Hopkins University.

29. Esen Aygün, H., & Şahin Taşkın, Ç. (2017a). Identifying psychometric properties of the social-emotional learning skills scale. The International Journal of Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research, 12, 43–61.

30. Esen Aygün, H., & Şahin Taşkın, Ç. (2017b). Teachers' views of social-emotional skills and their

perspectives on social-emotional learning programs. Journal of Education and Practice, 8(7), 205–215.

31. Giraldo, F. (2014). The impact of a professional development program on English language teachers' classroom performance. Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development, 16(1), 63–76.

32. Gore, J., Lloyd, A., Smith, M., Bowe, J., Ellis, H., & Lubans, D. (2017). Effects of professional development on the quality of teaching: Results from a randomised controlled trial of Quality Teaching Rounds. Teaching and Teacher Education, 68, 99–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.08.007