The Perceptions of Kansas Debate and Forensics Teachers Regarding Factors that Affect Instruction in their Classrooms

Megan L. Hagaman
B.A., Kansas Wesleyan University, 2007
M.S., Fort Hays State University, 2016

Submitted to the Graduate Department and Faculty of the School of Education of Baker University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

Susan K. Rogers
Susan K. Rogers, Ph.D.
Major Advisor

James Robins
James Robins, Ed.D.

Justin Hawpe
Justin Hawpe, Ed.D.

Date Defended: August 7, 2020

Abstract

This study was a quantitative, cross-sectional descriptive survey of Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics coaches. The purposes of this study were to determine the extent Kansas debate and forensics teachers perceive that they have Social-emotional learning (SEL) professional development opportunities available, have SEL classroom resources available, are confident in promoting student growth and development related to SEL, are ready to address issues of diversity, and have integrated SEL into their classroom. Teacher perceptions of SEL were examined first individually, second by comparing large school and small school classifications, third by examining perceptions of teachers who taught both debate and forensics and those who teach only debate or forensics, and finally by comparing the perceptions of teacher type by school classification. The sample consisted of 142 debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers from across the state of Kansas. The survey was conducted via Google forms and involved the use of components of the Panorama Teacher and Staff SEL Surveys (Gehlbach, 2018). The results of the 144 hypothesis tests were complex and mixed. Comparisons between school classifications and teacher types, for the most part, were mixed or indicated no differences in teacher perceptions. Results from individual teacher perceptions were of interest and indicated that no matter the size of the school, or content taught, Kansas debate and forensics teachers might need additional SEL professional development opportunities and additional access to SEL classroom resources. Results on student growth and development and readiness to address issues of diversity were also mixed. Kansas debate and forensics teachers do not integrate SEL into their classrooms. Further research is warranted.

Dedication

"We have to teach our girls that they can reach as high as humanly possible."
~Beyonce

I have been incredibly fortunate to know many strong women in my lifetime and to have had their influences in my life. This dissertation is dedicated to my mother, Deena Hagaman, who has shown me what true strength, caring, passion, and perseverance is. I am lucky to have her support in all of my endeavors and to have a fantastic role model as a mother. She has taught me so much about what great parenting is and has helped me become a successful parent too. This dissertation is also dedicated to my daughter Tiana, who is proving to be every bit as strong and successful as her grandmother and the other powerful women in our family who came before her. The world is yours, Tia, and you can achieve whatever you set your mind to and work for, no matter how long and winding the path is. Set your goals as high as humanly possible and do not stop until you smash them out of the ballpark, the arena, or the board room. The world is your stage, and you have the tools to achieve great things.

Acknowledgements

A successful dissertation takes a team to complete, and I was fortunate to have a tremendous team supporting me in my efforts. First and foremost, I would like to recognize and thank my major advisor, Dr. Susan K. Rogers, without her support and guidance, this process would have been daunting. Dr. Rogers has given me many new opportunities to learn and grow as a student and as an educator. I am truly thankful for her encouragement, support, and guidance. Second, I would like to acknowledge and thank Dr. Margaret A. Waterman for her invaluable insight into the world of statistics, and her keen problem-solving skills. I am blessed to have had the opportunity to work with her and have her guidance throughout this process. I would also like to thank Dr. James Robins and Dr. Justin Hawpe for serving on my dissertation defense committee. Finally, I would like to acknowledge my Wichita cohort crew, Jeremy Scheufller and Theresa Basadre, for their support, guidance, listening, and conversation throughout this process. I am thankful to have had the opportunity to learn together with both of you, and to have the chance to call you colleagues and friends.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

Goleman (1995) popularized the notion of emotional intelligence in the mid-1990s writing, "In a very real sense we have two minds, one that thinks and one that feels. These two fundamentally different ways of knowing interact to construct our mental life" (p. 8). To Goleman (1995), an individual's ability to regulate his or her emotional state is vitally important, and because individuals can learn to control their responses, a greater predictor of success in life than unchangeable characteristics like intelligence. Across the United States, there is a renewed emphasis on teaching the whole child, more specifically meeting the emotional and social needs of learners through social-emotional learning (SEL). Instruction, training, and development of SEL programming has become a critical segment of pedagogy in a school's curricula.

Teaching SEL has become a staple in educational curricula because the implementation of SEL creates an opportunity for a wide array of educational benefits. Evans, Scourfield, and Murphy (2015) reported that modern youth are associated with poor academic and educational outcomes, health, and involvement with society. SEL programming offers the potential to address concerns about educational success, health, and social involvement both in school settings, at home, and in the community. Fully implemented SEL programs have shown demonstrable improvements in social behavior, academic achievement, and behavioral problems (Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning [CASEL], 2013; Gillespie, 2008; Madueke, 2014; Mantz, 2017). Gillespie (2008), in a study of 274 grade school through high school educators, determined that students who had received SEL intensive education scored 11 percentile

points higher on standardized tests than did their peers who did not have SEL instruction. Darling-Hammond (2019) noted that well-implemented SEL programs increase positive outcomes for social behavior because students understand how to relate to others and resolve conflicts. Furthermore, Darling-Hammond (2019) noted that schools with effective SEL programming had fewer disruptive behavioral issues, and students were better able to ask for help when needed.

High school competitive debate and forensics programs offer tremendous benefits to those students who participate in the activities. Arbenz and Beltran (2001) noted:

> The benefits of debate in high school are evident. Students who participate in this extra-curricular activity boast a plethora of skills that are considered positive in our society. Debate sharpens the critical thinking skills of students, guides them towards professional careers and colleges, teaches them about social issues, improves their interactions with others, improves communication skills and even helps out the home-life of many participants. (p. 6)

However, for students to achieve positive outcomes from participation, these activities require teachers to be responsive to the social and emotional needs of students. Timmons (2016) noted, "While the National Speech and Debate Association appropriately wants to empower all of our country's youth, the diverse communities we embrace mean that we need to also consider the varied needs of students" (p. 33). Incorporating SEL curricula into coaching debate and forensics is a way to address the needs of all learners and to be responsive to the diverse populations engaging in these activities.

Background

SEL is a broadly defined term that encompasses skills a person should possess to be considered a well-rounded individual. CASEL (2013) defined social and emotional learning as:

> the process through which children and adults acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions. (p. 4)

While there has been some debate as to whether social and emotional characteristics should be defined together, most researchers have defined the two terms broadly and accepted the combining of these competencies (Gillespie, 2008). SEL connects five interrelated areas, including relationships, self-awareness, responsible decision making, social awareness, and self-management (CASEL, 2015; Evans et al., 2015; Gillespie, 2008; Mantz, 2017). While researchers have agreed on most components of SEL, teacher's perceptions of what SEL encompasses have differed. Madueke (2014) determined that teacher's perceptions of SEL are that social skills (voice tone, helping others, participation with peers, and eye contact) are distinct from emotional skills (expressing emotion, recognition of emotion, determining-intensity of emotion). Teachers also rated emotional skills as more important than social skills development (Madueke, 2014). Despite the differing opinions of teachers on the definition of SEL reported by Gillespie (2008), Madueke (2014) found 95% of teachers indicated that SEL is a vital concern in education and teaching.

Understanding the way competitive high school debate and forensics work in Kansas is important for understanding the sample groups. According to the Kansas State High School Activities Association (KSHSAA, 2019a), high school debate, also referred to as policy debate, occurs during the fall semester and for roughly two weeks in January at the start of the spring semester in the state of Kansas. If teams qualify to compete at national tournaments, they may continue to participate in debate competitions during the spring semester. High school forensics competition, also referred to as speech, occurs in the spring semester and concludes at the beginning of May, unless students qualify for national-level competition (KSHSAA, 2018). Because KSHSAA has adopted a split season, teachers can coach only debate, only forensics, or both activities.

The governing body for high school debate and forensics in Kansas is the KSHSAA. The 355 KSHSAA member schools are divided into classifications based on the size of the student population of each school during the current academic year:

> Member schools voted to change classification of schools in all activities as follows: beginning in 2018-19, class 6A will have 36 schools (previously 32), class 5A 36 schools (previously 32), class 4A 36 schools (previously 64), class 3A and 2A will still have 64 schools, and class 1A will be comprised of the remaining schools. (KSHSAA, 2018, p. 4)

The classification system allows schools of a particular size to compete against like schools at state competitions. However, in debate and forensics, it is common to compete across classifications at invitational tournaments throughout each season.

In Kansas, 121 schools registered for participation in policy debate during the fall of 2018 (KSHSAA, 2019b). According to the KSHSAA (2019b), 2,067 boys, and 1,960

girls participated in debate with a total participation of 4,027 students in 2018. See Table 1 for a breakdown of participation by grade level and by gender.

Table 1

Debate Participants in Kansas by Grade and Gender 2018

Grade	Boys	Girls
Grade 9	848	817
Grade 10	571	568
Grade 11	351	343
Grade 12	297	232
Total	2,067	1,960

Note. Adapted from the KSHSAA 2019 Fall Senior High School Student Activity Participation Survey, 2018, *KSHSAA November Journal*, *81*, p. 9.

Forensics has a higher participation rate in Kansas with 236 schools that participated in 2019 (KSHSAA, 2019a). According to the KSHSAA (2019a), 2,676 boys and 3,800 girls were active in forensics for a total of 6,476 competitors. See Table 2 for a breakdown of forensics participants by gender and by grade level.

Table 2

Forensics Participants in Kansas by Grade and Gender 2019

Grade	Boys	Girls
Grade 9	708	1,045
Grade 10	728	1,044
Grade 11	637	949
Grade 12	603	726
Total	2,676	3,800

Note: Adapted from the 2018-19 Spring High School Student Activity Participation Survey, 2019, *KSHSAA May Journal, 81*, p. 29.

This section included a discussion of the background and structure of debate and forensics activities in Kansas high schools set forth by the KSHSAA and introductory information about the use of SEL curriculum in schools. Additionally, the number of participants in debate and forensics activities was discussed. The next section includes an examination and statement of the problem for the study.

Statement of the Problem

Few studies have been conducted to examine teacher's perceptions of SEL. Gillespie (2008) determined that the majority of teachers ranked the need for SEL instruction as an important factor in education and their classrooms. Mantz (2017) found that teachers nearly 10 years later expressed the opinion that social-emotional competencies are a crucial factor in education. Despite the importance of these programs, only half of the teachers surveyed stated that they implemented SEL into their instruction.

Implementation alone is insufficient to ensure that the social-emotional needs of students are being met. Madueke (2014) noted that teachers have a mixed understanding of SEL, making it challenging to implement systemic reform without consistent branding of SEL curriculum and components. Equally important is the language and how teachers engage with SEL implementation. Evans et al. (2015) determined that teacher discourse and the ethos of the system play an essential role in the success of SEL programs. Teacher training programs also lack cohesive educational components and professional development mechanics for SEL program implementation. Of the educators surveyed by Gillespie (2008), 81% felt that their teacher training program failed to prepare them for meeting the social and emotional needs of students.

Competitive debate and forensics have undergone a significant transformation in participant population, diversity of literature, and style of argumentation. In traditional policy debate, students switch sides and debate each side of the resolution from round to round. Traditional policy debate roles may have the unintended consequence of marginalizing students who feel that alternating sides forces them to debate against their beliefs (Young, 2011). Traditional policy debate can result in pressure to discuss and promote ideas that the student may not fully believe or support. Young (2011) further explained that the desire to talk about personal experiences and power imbalances in society led to an increase in critical debate in both collegiate and high school policy realms. In critical debate, participants may use performance or critical literature to talk about beliefs that they hold deeply despite the limitations laid out by the debate topic. In practice, critical debate should allow the sincerity of argumentation and students to use their voices to speak their truths. The transformation of argument style has slowly spread

into high school debate and forensics communities. The Kansas Speech Communication Association president explained that technology has had an enormous effect on changing argumentation and literature and noted:

> Simultaneously high school debate camps began teaching students a more critical style of argumentation that was popular at the college level, and high school students brought these arguments back into the classrooms. Demographics indicate that public schools in the United States during this era have become increasingly diverse, with an explosion of minority populations in classrooms across the United States. A combination of progressive politics, a shaky economic situation, and an increase in academic literature exploring the root causes of these issues led speech and debate to become a natural breeding ground for a diverse student population to have a voice. Speech and debate have grown in their ability to foster a civic education that focuses on advocacy and effective political engagement to redress the issues that affect these children's everyday lives. (M. Harris, personal communication, August 16, 2018)

As a result, new challenges confront teachers of debate and forensics at the high school level. In policy debate, the rise of diversity in the student population, coupled with the increase in critical argumentation, including identity politics, has increased the need for teachers to implement social-emotional responsiveness and awareness. Likewise, competitors in forensics are increasingly utilizing literature and scripts to address power imbalances and to expose traumatic incidents occurring in our society. Students commonly select mature literature focusing on serious issues such as abusive relationships, rape culture, racism, sexism, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and

questioning (LGBTQ) rights, and other timely and sensitive topics (M. Harris, personal communication, August 16, 2018). Therefore, teachers must be equipped to discuss mature themes and diversity while meeting the needs of their students and ensuring a safe and supportive environment is in place for their students. Moreover, despite the changes in content and style, little research into SEL instruction needs of debate and forensics teachers exists.

SEL has become a teaching strategy to help schools support the needs of the whole student (Berman, 2018). Since SEL has gained national attention as an effective instructional tool, implementing SEL into instruction and coaching may be an important first step in helping debate and forensics teachers address the needs of an increasingly diverse population of learners. Yeager (2017) noted, "SEL programs try to help adolescents cope with their difficulties more successfully by improving skills and mindsets, and they try to create respectful school environments that young people want to be a part of by changing the school's climate" (p. 74). In academic co-curricular activities such as debate and forensics, students are confronted with mature themes and sensitive argumentation, making the need for SEL responsive teachers more important than ever. SEL instruction is needed in the debate and forensics classroom, but it is unclear to what extent SEL is being integrated into the classrooms of Kansas debate and forensics teachers. Additionally, it is unclear the extent to which Kansas debate and forensics teachers perceive that they have SEL professional development opportunities available, have SEL classroom resources available, are confident in promoting student growth and development related to SEL, are ready to address issues of diversity, and have

integrated SEL into their classrooms, and if school classification or the type of teacher affects those perceptions.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which Kansas debate and forensics teachers perceive that they have SEL classroom resources available to them, have SEL professional development opportunities available to them, are confident in promoting student growth and development related to SEL, are ready to address issues of diversity, and have integrated SEL instruction into their classroom. The next purpose of this study was to determine the effects of school classification on Kansas debate and forensics teachers' perceptions that they have SEL professional development opportunities available to them, have SEL classroom resources available to them, are confident in promoting student growth and development related to SEL, are ready to address issues of diversity, and have integrated SEL into their classroom. A further purpose of this study was to determine the extent of the differences in Kansas debate and forensics teachers' perceptions that they have SEL professional development opportunities available to them, have SEL classroom resources available to them, are confident in promoting student growth and development related to SEL, are ready to address issues of diversity, and have integrated SEL into their classroom among respondents who teach debate, teach forensics, and teach both debate and forensics. The final purpose of this study was to examine the effect of school classification on the differences in Kansas debate and forensics teachers' perceptions that they have SEL professional development opportunities available to them, have SEL classroom resources available to them, are confident in promoting student growth and development related to

SEL, are ready to address issues of diversity, and have integrated SEL into their classroom among respondents who teach debate, teach forensics, and teach both debate and forensics.

Significance of the Study

There is an extensive literature base exploring the need to implement SEL instruction into schools. The availability of social-emotional based programs has significantly increased (Evans et al., 2015). Researchers have determined that social and emotional competence is lacking in many students (CASEL, 2013; Gillespie, 2008; Mantz, 2017). Additionally, researchers have indicated that a majority of teachers feel that meeting the social and emotional needs of their students has a drastic impact on student learning in the classroom (Gillespie, 2008; Madueke, 2014). While there has been an increased focus on SEL programs, Mantz (2017) noted that many schools have yet to implement systemic, schoolwide SEL systems and supports.

The individuals who spend the most time in direct contact with students and who are primarily responsible for the implementation of SEL programs are classroom teachers. Debate and forensics teachers spend even more time with students out of class at practices, traveling with students, and at competitions. While a wide variety of research exists surrounding administrator, counselor, teacher, and student perceptions of SEL, little to no research was found concerning the use of SEL programs or instruction in specific content areas.

The intention of this researcher was to add to the literature on SEL for a specific content area by examining Kansas debate and forensics coach's perceptions of SEL integration, professional development opportunities, readiness to address diversity,

promotion of student growth, and availability of resources. The results of this study have the potential to guide SEL implementation and practices used by Kansas debate and forensics teachers at the state, district, classroom, and student level by understanding how teachers are integrating these practices in the content areas of debate and forensics. Additionally, the results of this study could contribute new insight into curricular areas that also have an out of class practice and competition element.

Delimitations

Delimitations are constraints on the components of the study in the direct control of the researcher. Simon (2011) explained, "The delimitations are those characteristics that limit the scope and define the boundaries of your study" (p. 6). This quantitative study is delimited regarding sampling. First, the study was focused geographically and constrained to Kansas only. Additionally, the study was delimited to Kansas debate, Kansas forensics, and Kansas debate and forensics teachers. The sample is restricted to only those who coach ninth- through twelfth-grade students. Furthermore, only head coaches were asked to participate in the research. Head coaches answered questions about preparedness and confidence teaching based on their experiences in implementing SEL in their classrooms. Finally, only debate and forensics classroom teachers who are also coaches were asked to complete the survey.

Assumptions

Several assumptions were made based on the first-hand experience of the researcher as a Kansas debate and forensics coach. The primary assumption was that all debate and forensics teachers know what SEL is. A second assumption was that Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers understood the items on the survey

instruments. It was assumed that teachers would answer the survey items honestly and accurately. Finally, it was assumed that Panorama survey instruments are reliable and valid.

Research Questions

Research questions were used to guide this research on perceptions of Kansas debate and forensics teachers on components. Creswell (2014) noted that research questions help to narrow the focus of the study by transposing the purpose into predictions about what will occur during a study, or questions that the conclusion of the study will answer. The following research questions guided this study:

RQ1. To what extent are SEL professional development opportunities available to Kansas debate and forensics teachers?

RQ2. To what extent does school classification affect the availability of SEL professional development opportunities available to Kansas debate and forensics teachers?

RQ3. To what extent is there a difference in the availability of SEL professional development opportunities among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

RQ4. To what extent does school classification affect the differences in the availability of SEL professional development opportunities among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

RQ5. To what extent do Kansas debate and forensics teachers perceive SEL resources to be adequate in their schools?

RQ6. To what extent does school classification affect Kansas debate and forensics teachers' perception of SEL resource adequacies in their schools?

RQ7. To what extent is there a difference in perception of the adequacy of the classroom SEL resources available among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

RQ8. To what extent does school classification affect the differences in the perceptions of the adequacy of classroom SEL resources available among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

RQ9. To what extent are Kansas debate and forensics teachers confident in promoting student growth and development related to SEL?

RQ10. To what extent does school classification affect Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence in promoting student growth and development related to SEL?

RQ11. To what extent is there a difference in promoting student growth and development related to SEL among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

RQ12. To what extent does school classification affect the differences in their confidence in promoting student growth and development related to SEL among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

RQ13. To what extent do Kansas debate and forensics teachers perceive they are ready to address issues of diversity?

RQ14. To what extent does school classification affect the perceptions of Kansas debate and forensics teachers that they are ready to address issues of diversity?

RQ15. To what extent is there a difference in teacher perceptions of their readiness to address issues of diversity among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

RQ16. To what extent does school classification affect the differences in teacher perceptions of their readiness to address issues of diversity among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

RQ17. To what extent do Kansas debate and forensics teachers perceive they integrate SEL activities into their classrooms?

RQ18. To what extent does school classification affect Kansas debate and forensics teachers' perceptions of how often they integrate SEL activities into their classrooms?

RQ19. To what extent is there a difference in teacher perceptions of how often they integrate SEL activities into their classrooms among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

RQ20. To what extent does school classification affect the differences in teacher perceptions of how often they integrate SEL activities into their classrooms among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

Definition of Terms

In order to fully understand the variables included in this study, phrases and terms need clarification. The following section includes definitions of key terms.

Debate. According to Hensley, Carlin, and Riffer (2020), policy debate is a format of switch-side debating where teams of two alternate between affirmative and negative positions on a resolution of policy each round. Each debater takes part in

answering questions during a cross-examination period, asking questions during a cross-examination period, and delivering two speeches during each debate round.

Forensics. The National Speech and Debate Association (NSDA, 2019) indicated that high school forensics competition includes a variety of events in which students showcase skills in acting, interpretation, speaking, and other formats of debate.

SEL professional development opportunities. Gehlbach (2015) stated that SEL professional development opportunities are frequent, quality learning, and growth available to school faculty and staff.

SEL resources. Fermanich (2003) noted that school resources could include professional development, technology, instructional practices, curriculum, organizational structure, and human resources.

Confidence in promoting student growth. According to Gehlbach (2015), promoting student growth is the teacher's belief that they could effectively grow a student's abilities, talent, and intelligence.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 included the background on SEL, debate, and forensics. In addition, Chapter 1 contained the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, delimitations, and assumptions. The research questions for the study and definition of terms were also included. Chapter 2 includes a review of relevant SEL literature. Chapter 3 contains a discussion of the methodology and research design of the study. Chapter 4 includes the descriptive statistics and the results of the statistical analysis. A study summary, findings related to the literature, and the conclusions are included in Chapter 5.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

SEL has become the newest educational strategy to aid educators in addressing the needs of the whole child. Focus at the national level on SEL instruction has expanded the need for schools to implement programs that provide for both the emotional well-being and the academic needs of the child (McGarrigle, Caira, Hardy, & Langlois, 2018). Schools have shifted focus from teaching students solely academic pursuits to educating the whole child. Kubista (2015) conducted a quantitative study of 13 urban schools ranging from elementary to high school using archival data on schoolwide positive behavior supports and the impact of social-emotional skills on student achievement. This paradigm shift means that students must be able to write, calculate, read, critically think, socialize, be resilient, advocate for themselves, and be self-determined (Kubista, 2015). Creating this whole person is the goal of SEL, which is gaining significance as an important tool of change in pre-kindergarten through 12th-grade research (Yoder, 2014).

Included in this literature review is an exploration of the aspects of SEL that are pertinent to understanding the educational significance of adding instruction beyond the academic needs of students. First, the components of SEL and the definition of the concept are addressed. Second, the importance of SEL in schools is discussed. Third, a review of the current literature on teacher perceptions of SEL was conducted and presented here. Fourth, a brief analysis of current literature on co-curricular content areas and SEL is examined. Fifth, a discussion of professional development opportunities related to SEL is provided. Next, SEL resources are discussed, followed by an

examination of student growth measures and SEL. Finally, a review of teaching diversity issues concludes the chapter.

Components of Social-Emotional Learning

There has been an increased call at all levels of education to implement SEL into the school curriculum. Elias (2006) labeled SEL as the missing piece in education, increasing calls for the implementation of SEL standards. Yoder (2014) noted it is essential to teach the whole child, and the push towards college and career readiness standards has made the need for SEL more critical. The rise of SEL standardization and inclusion has been due in part to The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL), which was founded in 1994 as an international non-profit organization (501(c)(3)) with the mission of promoting evidence-based SEL as a core required component of primary and secondary education systems (Oberle, Domitrovich, Meyers, & Weissberg, 2016). CASEL has focused on disseminating research-based information on SEL to schools through professional development, research, and practice guidelines (Eklund, Kilpatrick, Kilgus, Haider, & Eckert, 2018). The result of CASEL's push for SEL emphasis has been the implication that SEL is for everyone, and a comprehensive, evidence-based curriculum is necessary (McGarrigle et al., 2018). While discussion about how to best implement programs has been robust, there is limited debate about what elements are essential components of SEL. Elias (2013) noted that SEL has a variety of definitions that overlap with a list of different emotional concerns. Despite differences in definitions of SEL, there are many commonalities. Murray, Hurley, and Ahmed (2015) explained the commonality among the emotional areas is the focus on the development of core skills that lead to effective social-emotional growth.

SEL is a process in which students acquire the attitudes, knowledge, and skills needed to manage and understand emotions; show and feel empathy toward others, maintain positive, meaningful relationships; handle difficult situations; and, set, monitor, and achieve goals (CASEL, 2013; Zins & Elias, 2006). Elias et al. (1997) defined SEL as acquiring academic, social, and emotional competence by developing skills in areas such as persistence, resiliency, self-regulation, and adaptability. There are commonly five core components of SEL instruction that have been further refined by researchers, which include (a) responsible decision-making, (b) relationship skills, (c) self-management, (d) social awareness, and (e) self-awareness (CASEL, 2013; Payton et al., 2008; Zins, Weissberg, Wang, & Walberg, 2004). Jones (2018) clarified that SEL is a set of broad, complementary soft skills that belong alongside core academic skills. Furthermore, SEL is the system by which all youth are provided opportunities to acquire, learn, and practice the emotional and social skills needed to be successful in life (Greenberg et al., 2003; Osher, Sprague, Weissberg, Keenan, & Zins, 2008; Payton et al., 2000; Zins et al., 2004). Additionally, using the term learning implies that competences of social and emotional education can be practiced, acquired, fostered, and constructed in all students (Bernard, 2006). The purpose of SEL standards is to clarify further what children should understand and know. Eklund et al. (2018) concluded: "Standards and implementation guidelines provide a framework that sets expectations and guides decisions about what students should learn, and thus about what should be taught and assessed in schools" (p. 318). Implementation of SEL instruction should be longitudinal and ongoing. SEL is a system that works cohesively with academic instruction to teach and improve emotional and social awareness that leads to increased academic success for all students.

SEL implementation is most useful if it is systematic and targeted at all students. Diekstra (2008) noted that positive outcomes as a result of SEL instruction occur for all students, not just students with emotional or behavioral concerns. Eklund et al. (2018) noted that SEL might be taught as a stand-alone curriculum, embedded in physical education courses, handled by counselors, or taught as part of the health class curriculum. Additionally, all states have free-standing SEL programs for preschool; however, only 11 states have implemented free-standing SEL standards for grades K-12 (Eklund et al., 2018). Schoolwide systematic intervention and instruction are needed to maximize the potential for SEL to promote citizenship, scholarship, and community (Oberle et al., 2016). Systemic approaches to SEL create a context for maintaining effective SEL programs for all students and eliminates fragmented and disjointed programs (Greenberg et al., 2003). Schoolwide SEL instruction has an impact on student achievement. Zins et al. (2004) explained that for SEL programming to influence student achievement, "SEL efforts are characterized as being provided in more coordinated, sustained, and systematic ways using comprehensive, multiyear, multicomponent approaches" (p. 197).

Additionally, instruction of SEL competencies is most effectively done in caring, supportive, and well-managed environments, where mutual respect and cooperation are inherent in the culture (Zins & Elias, 2006). Schoolwide implementation of SEL requires the prioritization of students' emotional and social competence and provides the resources necessary to create the structures to sustain quality SEL programming (Mart, Weissberg, & Kendziora, 2015). Bird and Sultmann (2010) found that researchers are beginning to concentrate SEL exploration on the entire school community, interdisciplinary interventions, and the well-being of the overall organization.

Moreover, the implementation of SEL instruction must focus on diversity, cultural understanding, and relationship building. Elias (2006) noted, "effective, lasting academic learning and SEL are built on caring relationships and warm but challenging classroom and school environments" (p. 7). Creating and implementing effective SEL programming is a difficult process. Implementation of SEL requires professional development, significant time with staff, and substantial planning time (Berman, 2018). Implementation of SEL requires the same focus and detailed structure as academic instruction. SEL programming must include "clear messages, a common language, and sequential skill development" (Berman, 2018, p. 32). While many aspects of education are formulaic in presentation, SEL instruction must be culturally responsive and adaptable. Young people are growing up in a time unlike any other, where the number of hate crimes and crimes based on race has been increasing each year (Simmons, 2019). School-aged students are at a pivotal point in social-emotional development. A framework for SEL should be developed using culturally responsive teaching pedagogy because "programs need to be tailored culturally to ethnic and racial minority children to maximize the programs' effectiveness" (Zins & Elias, 2006, p. 9). Berman (2018) explained, "Encouraging students to celebrate their cultural identities and honoring the richness that diverse cultural perspectives bring to learning are essential to creating a safe and affirming classroom" (p. 33). SEL programs should not be used only in a reactionary fashion. SEL instruction must be proactive, and schools should work to build safe, caring learning environments that help teachers and students build stronger relationships (McGarrigle et al., 2018). "Social-emotional learning skills can help us build communities that foster courageous conversations across differences so that our students

can confront injustice, hate, and inequity" (Simmons, 2019, p. 2). SEL is an effective tool to promote and enhance experiences with diverse populations of students. SEL programs are effective, evidence-based approaches to instill change in a wide array of student outcomes. Diversity in the United States has empirically been rich and helped to develop our communities. It is essential to understand the role of culture and diversity within the universal implementation of SEL programs (Rowe & Trickett, 2018). Classroom teachers should strive to be responsive and culturally inclusive. Implementing a comprehensive SEL program is a slow and incremental process, but in the end, is the best way to educate the whole student.

The Importance of Social-Emotional Learning

Preparing the next generation of students for success means that SEL must be included in the school curriculum. The importance of SEL as a core component of education is that it provides the framework and understanding of how best to support students (McGarrigle et al., 2018). Research on SEL has a well-documented list of benefits that stem from SEL integration. Rigorous research across multiple fields has indicated that SEL directly relates to what we learn and how we learn. Research has highlighted that SEL is beneficial in the reduction of behavioral issues, improvement of academic performance, increased citizenship, improved health and well-being, and promotion of positive development (CASEL, 2013).

Student success and academic achievement are two of the most significant benefits to effective integration of SEL. Daniels et al. (2009) found that before student achievement can be increased, students must have stable emotions and social awareness. SEL has been shown to improve grades, increase test scores, reduce external pressure,

and increase academic success. Success in SEL is intrinsically linked to success in academic learning (Buchanan, Gueldner, Tran, & Merrell, 2009; CASEL, 2013; Oberle et al., 2016). Proficiency in SEL competencies leads students to the ability to integrate thinking, feeling, and emotions with mastery of school and life tasks (Zins et al. 2004). Students who receive SEL instruction tend to be better integrated into educational settings and are able to focus on academic tasks better than their peers who lack SEL instruction (Payton et al., 2000; Zins & Elias, 2006, 2007). Skills development through SEL has been found to help younger students excel in school. Douglass (2011) noted, "Components of SEL, such as self-efficacy and self-regulation, play an important role in academic attainment and can be especially beneficial to young readers" (p. 3). Long-term SEL research results have indicated that students who have SEL instruction gained 13 percentile-points in student achievement test scores, and those achievement benefits last leading to increased graduation and postsecondary enrollment (Mahoney & Weissberg, 2018).

The attainment of SEL communication skills supports academic skill development. Hamre, Pianta, Mashburn, and Downer (2012) explained that SEL provides a wealth of benefits, including:

> Socially competent children [who]; 1) communicate effectively, 2) follow directions and cooperate; 3) are attentive, 4) enthusiastic, and actively involved in classroom activities; 5) form positive relationships with adults and peers, and 6) ask for and receive help appropriately than those who are less competent. (p. 150)

The development of SEL attributes could increase the academic achievement of students by allowing them to become articulate communicators who can advocate and regulate

their own learning (Blair & Razza, 2007; Denham & Brown, 2010). Furthermore, these skills may lead to career readiness skills. SEL also provides the foundation for crucial work skills that might have the potential to help students navigate the workforce (Lantieri, 2012).

Relationships and school climate are also tied to the implementation of SEL. Davis (2003) noted the cognitive and social development of students is directly linked to strong relationships. Through SEL programs, students develop skills that increase their ability to set goals, make judgments, build positive relationships, and become emotionally aware of themselves and others (Payton et al., 2008). SEL also might affect the classroom environment. Durlak, Dymnicki, Taylor, Weissberg, and Schellinger (2011) concluded that SEL could create safe and caring learning environments, give students a sense of purpose and belonging, and incorporate family and community into education. Student's goals for learning are strengthened by effective school climates that reflect routines and practices that provide students the chance to give input and make decisions about their education (Doll, 2010). Positive school climate is predictive of how students will, "actively participate in learning, including how consistently they attend school, how attentive they are in class, how carefully they complete their class assignments, and how committed they are to staying in school and doing well there" (Doll, 2010, p. 12). Additionally, SEL and school climate have an important connection that drives the implementation and promotion of academic outcomes that promote racial equity. School improvement efforts should focus on equity for all learners and should promote a positive school climate through SEL (Jones, 2018). There are powerful benefits of implementing SEL beyond the creation of strong relationships.

Comprehensive programs foster higher graduation rates, better test scores, and positive social behavior (Darling-Hammond, 2019).

Additional benefits of SEL programs are the improvement of health, well-being, and school safety. Understanding the social and emotional aspects of one's self plays a key role in the well-being and long-term health of children (Lantieri, 2012). Implementing SEL instruction is of significance when addressing the rising mental health crisis, substance abuse, and behavioral problems, which can jeopardize future success and development in life (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2013). Furthermore, research also indicates that SEL is an essential key to promoting mental health in students (Denham & Brown, 2010; Durlak et al., 2011). SEL education programming is a way to enhance student success in school and their lives (Durlak et al., 2011; Zins & Elias, 2006). Durlak et al. (2011) further explained that the promotion of SEL competency leads to reduced risk factors coupled with positive adjustment mechanisms. These coping mechanisms translated to better mental health. Beyond improving student outcomes and improving mental health, SEL results in better school safety. When schools implement restorative discipline and SEL programs, schools could become safer, and incident rates decline significantly (Darling-Hammond, 2019). Social-emotional education is more than a bonus addition to education; it is a core component of the high school curriculum.

Effective teacher SEL instruction influences not only student achievement but also behavior, well-being, and life-long success (Zins & Elias, 2007). Because schools are able to illicit change across a variety of contexts and over time, they are uniquely poised to implement SEL programs (McGarrigle et al., 2018). Implementation not only

benefits students, teachers, administration, and the community, it also directly has benefits to the school and district as well. Schools that implement universal SEL programs appear to have a tremendous return on investment. Belfield et al. (2015) noted the results of the analyses on universal SEL programs indicated the costs and benefits of the six most widely used SEL programs (4Rs, Positive Action, Life Skills Training, Second Step, Responsive Classroom, and Social and Emotional Training) found that every dollar invested in SEL saved the school $11. School financial savings may lead to better student success. Belfield et al. (2015) further noted SEL program cost savings stemmed from an increase in positive outcomes (e.g., social skills and academic achievement) and a decline in negative outcomes (e.g., delinquency and substance abuse). SEL has a wide-reaching ability to effect change across the educational setting in a variety of ways that are beneficial to educational stakeholders throughout the school and community.

Teachers and Social-Emotional Learning

Society, parents, and educators have long held the shared belief that by the time a student graduates from high school, they should have knowledge of basic academic skills and should have developed the traits to be independent, well-rounded young adults who are capable of being productive and engaged citizens (Greenberg et al., 2003). An emerging goal for many practitioners is to incorporate effective SEL programming into individual classrooms (Oberle et al., 2016). Teachers influence SEL broadly by building relationships, implementing SEL programming, and creating a positive and safe learning environment (McGarrigle et al., 2018). For SEL to be effective, teachers must be trained and knowledgeable about SEL practices. SEL must also be implemented explicitly and

implicitly because meeting the SEL needs of students is a more holistic approach to education that pays positive dividends for all students (Johnson, 2017).

Implementation of SEL in classrooms must be clearly defined. "Teachers need a SEL framework based on empirically sound, robust competencies using formal and informal methods in the classroom, and within the context of the school culture" (Lewis, 2014, p. 96). Ferguson, Hanreddy, and Draxton (2011) used a semi-structured interview tool with elementary students in an inclusive charter school in the Western United States. During the study, information from student interviews was shared with teachers for review. Then teachers were interviewed for their perceptions on using the student data to build stronger classroom climates. The results indicated that teachers understand the significance of using SEL methods to teach empathy and respect in the classroom (Ferguson et al., 2011).

Moreover, research findings have confirmed that there are benefits for teachers who implement SEL. Teachers who are effective in using SEL in the classroom see fewer incidents of discipline, lower levels of student frustration, increased relationships among peers and staff, and higher academic expectations (Lewkowicz, 2007). Motsinger (2018) examined the perceptions of students, teachers, and the administrator at an urban elementary school in a district located in the Southwestern region of the United States. This urban elementary school had made a long-term investment in social-emotional learning and restorative practices, concluding that difficult or troubled relationships between students and teachers greatly impact the number of disciplinary actions students experience. "Social-emotional learning can positively impact the self-regulatory skills and habits of children, and, in turn, positively impact behavior" (Motsinger, 2018, p. 3).

Furthermore, the pressure and demand to produce learners equipped with 21st century skills make the need for SEL instruction even greater. In a qualitative case study of pre-kindergarten teachers working in large urban communities in southern Los Angeles, Johnson (2017) explained that students who are confident and self-aware about their own education have more resilience and will try harder when faced with challenging materials. School accountability and high standards for education can make it difficult to focus on SEL despite the knowledge that social and emotional education has a profound impact on student outcomes. Darling-Hammond (2019) noted that students respond to being seen, heard, understood, cared about, and appreciated by school staff. Motivated students lead to improved learning. "Students often learn as much for a teacher as they learn from a teacher" (Darling-Hammond, 2019, p. 4). Futhermore, Collie, Shapka, Perry, & Martin (2015) collected responses from 485 Canadian teachers through an online interview tool, and noted teachers who lack commitment to SEL in their instruction, have lower levels of job satisfaction. SEL provides benefits not only for improved student expectations, resiliency, and behavior modification but also for teacher employment satisfaction as well.

Despite federal and state mandates to implement positive, supportive learning climates, many schools in the United States are failing to meet those goals. Lewis (2014) noted that schools are still heavily reliant on office referrals and suspensions as a form of discipline, and numbers of discipline incidents are on the rise. Student support staff also have expressed a lack of knowledge about SEL instruction. Moudry-Quilty (2007) conducted a study of three paraprofessional-student pairs, and determined that small numbers of teacher aides have been provided training on how to teach social skills, and

instead have focused on academic teaching. Training and knowledge of SEL instruction for paraprofessional educators may be lacking in some schools.

There is a gap in knowledge for teachers in terms of SEL instruction. Teachers have expressed the desire to incorporate SEL competencies into their classrooms but perceive that they lack the resources to carry out implementation (Bridgeland, Bruce, & Hariharan, 2013; Buchanan et al., 2009). Douglass (2011) collected survey data from 170 inservice teachers and 155 preservice teachers at a public university in the Southwest United States measuring their overall understanding and knowledge of SEL concepts. Research, including interviews of preservice and inservice teachers, has shown that teachers are not confident in their ability to teach SEL concepts in the classroom (Douglass, 2011; Lewis, 2014; Youngblood, 2015). This lack of confidence extends to students with special needs. Anderson (2017) conducted a mixed model study to examine the different perspectives of teachers, administrators, and parents of students with intellectual disabilities regarding student social and academic performance in a middle Tennessee school district. The perceptions of the population were different, and educators had some gaps in knowledge of SEL. Anderson (2017) found that educators were unclear about incorporating methods to engage students with disabilities to help educate the whole child. Lewis (2014) found that K-5 elementary teachers in a Georgia school district need to learn their role in implementing SEL into their own classrooms. Furthermore, researchers call into question the knowledge and training educators have had on SEL. Douglass (2011) conducted a review of two studies that surveyed 170 inservice and 155 preservice elementary teachers from 42 public and private institutions in a state in the Southwestern United States. Douglass (2011) concluded that both

inservice and preservice teachers felt that SEL was a key component of student achievement but were unclear about the role SEL should play in the classroom at all grade levels. Teachers have significant knowledge about their content, but there may be a gap in teaching SEL competences.

Arguably, students should learn mathematics and literacy; however, educators must realize that instruction of core educational skills cannot be separated from the instruction of social-emotional competencies (Douglass, 2011). Researchers have found that there are other barriers to full SEL implementation by teachers. Lewis (2014) explained that due to the essential need to acquire SEL skills and develop them fully in every student, teachers must have the tools and training to support the implementation of SEL. While conducting a qualitative study, Youngblood (2015) interviewed eight high school teachers from a public institution in the Midwestern United States who taught SEL courses. Youngblood (2015) found that challenges to implementation of SEL programs were lack of support, lack of resources, low student buy-in, scheduling, and lack of ongoing, consistent support for SEL. The mindset of teachers has also created a barrier to full SEL implementation. SEL is essential, and educators must begin to reframe curriculum designed to "teach students' skills that empower them and provide resources in order to have their needs met, which will improve their quality of life in addition to promoting student success" (Johnson, 2017, p. 26). SEL is no longer an option or addition to instruction; it is instruction.

Co-Curricular Activities and Social-Emotional Learning

The goal of education is to create a well-rounded and developed individual. Education's higher purpose should be to help create citizens who can lead a good life, but

that purpose cannot solely be achieved with teachings in a classroom setting only (Bhagabati, 1986). In a mixed-methods study, Bhagabati (1986) reviewed intelligence tests, interviewed extracurricular teachers, and reviewed school data on student achievement of secondary schools in Assam. Much of schooling surrounds the idea that becoming well-rounded means that students balance curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular activities (Das, 2016). Bhagabati (1986) explained that schools are not just places where students go to learn, but rather a setting where students are disciplined in various forms of activity, especially those that have the greatest application to the wider world. Co-curricular opportunities supplement, complement, and support learning in the classroom. "Co-curricular refers to activities, programs and learning experiences that complement, in some way, what students are learning in school – i.e., experiences that are connected to or mirror the academic curriculum" (Das, 2016, p. 76). These activities differ from those that are solely extra-curricular that take part exclusive of the curriculum. Activities such as debate, theater, and forensics were once considered to be extra or in addition to education and were called extra-curricular; however, they are now considered to be integral components of a well-rounded education and have a placement in the curriculum (Das, 2016).

In 2018, Newton conducted a qualitative study about student participation in a theater production and performance of an issue of social awareness. The sample consisted of students who participated in *The Laramie Project,* a play concerning social issues surrounding LGBTQ youths. Newton tracked the long-term effects of social justice theater on students SEL. Newton (2018) found that participation in theatre programs leads to increased self-awareness and social-awareness of students. While SEL

is a topic of great interest in the early part of the 21st century, few researchers have examined high school settings, including specific curricular contents, and co-curricular content areas. These co-curricular areas have deep ties to SEL attributes and provide many benefits for participants. Co-curricular activities are essential because they allow for training in character, ethics, positive habits, and citizenship (Bhagabati, 1986). Safe co-curricular classrooms that practice SEL provide opportunities for diverse groups of students to explore their identity in meaningful ways while allowing others to make connections and build understanding (Newton, 2018). Participating in co-curricular activities helps to build social-emotional qualities such as "cooperation, tolerance, friendliness, loyalty, courtesy, etc. which are required in a person to adjust in a democratic society" (Bhagabati, 1986, p. 195). These qualities help build success in postsecondary settings. Pillar (2016) conducted a study with 690 sophomores enrolled at a private institution and found that college students who were involved in co-curricular activities persisted 2.68 times more than their uninvolved peers, and students who participated in co-curricular activities were more likely to remain enrolled into their junior year of college.

Students who participate in debate and forensics have the unique opportunity to explore educational experiences in the classroom, after school at practices, and while traveling to competitions. The rise of critical debate has sought to make debate real, by allowing students to advocate for beliefs they hold dear (Woods, 2003). The increase in critical debate has led to real conversations about serious power imbalances in our society. Additionally, students are faced with messaging about powerful political subjects more so now than ever. Simmons (2019) found that "American youth are

consuming these narratives of hate with too few opportunities to digest what is happening or to recognize their agency in creating meaningful change" (p. 2). Students and teachers in these activities may not be able to avoid difficult conversations about social justice issues. SEL programs have a chance to promote social change and civic engagement (Simmons, 2019).

One of the most effective tools for promoting engagement and understanding among diverse populations is debate. Simmons (2019) noted using SEL and debate can build equity by having students "debate an issue in their school or community that matters to them as a way to develop their abilities to build relationships with diverse team members, resolve disagreements, and work collaboratively to debate in effective ways" (p. 3). Using debate and discourse as a tool to address issues that matter personally to students allows those who participate to build powerful relationships and address concerns in ways that help them understand and know their emotions. "True wisdom and helpful experience come through the involvement of pupils in varied co-curricular activities, and such activities are looked upon as legitimate part of the work of school" (Bhagabati, 1986, p. 13). Despite the SEL benefits of these activities, little research has been conducted into how teachers, students, and schools are using SEL in co-curricular content areas. Newton (2018) noted that co-curricular activities allow students access to additional outlets for growth and development that needs to be further examined and implemented into programming for SEL to meet the needs of all learners effectively.

Professional Development Opportunities and Social-Emotional Learning

SEL is a wide-reaching term that encompasses a large number of learning areas that teachers, staff, and leaders must seek to understand and develop skills in so that they

are able to pass that instruction on to students. Hardy (2018) conducted a qualitative case study through the use of semi-structured interviews with district and school building leaders concerning the cohesion of SEL implementation and professional development. Professional development opportunities for SEL instruction are often driven from the top of the organization and distributed to individual building leaders and teachers (Hardy, 2018). The process of how information and resources are distributed is often varied. District leaders often begin the process by setting broad direction, redesigning the organization, and training human resources to carry out instruction and implementation of SEL professional development (Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). For professional development to be effective, leaders must take initiative and set direction. Leithwood et al. (2004) noted that organizational structure could have the potential to yield positive results if staff development supports the direction articulated by leadership. Leaders must ensure that they have established a clear vision and that professional development has a direct link to that vision.

There is a clear link that exists between teacher professional development opportunities in SEL and increased implementation that is thorough and complete. Teachers who had been through high-quality SEL programming were more likely to carry out SEL education in their classrooms, leading to improved student achievement and outcomes (Reyes, Brackett, Rivers, Elbertson, & Salovey, 2012). However, implementation was not always successful. SEL program implementation is difficult to achieve in a social setting such as school, and the effectiveness has been difficult to measure as a result (Fixsen, Blase, Naoom, & Wallace, 2009). Other factors may impact the implementation of SEL. Gager and Elias (1997) noted that schools have a variety of

priorities, including political priorities that may get in the way of thorough and complete implementation of SEL. It is essential that school leadership, support professional learning and development. Ingvarson, Meiers, and Beavis (2005) explained that schools must have an established support level for professional development to affect program outcomes:

> Policymakers and school administrators need to give equal attention to building the conditions that will enable schools to provide fertile ground for professional learning on an ongoing basis and as a routine part of the job. This study indicates that a substantial level of professional community is vital to significant change. The key ingredients here are time to think, analyze, and talk about the specifics of what is going on in the classrooms and what students are doing and learning. (p. 17)

Buildings with pre-existing conditions that support professional development opportunities are moving toward the future in effectively promoting teacher growth and development.

While there is a large body of work in which the effectiveness of SEL programming is discussed, the program's effectiveness is limited by its implementation (Reyes et al., 2012). Professional development can also be equated to training programs for teachers. Reyes et al. (2012) defined teacher training as "the knowledge acquisition component of an SEL program and is the main avenue by which programs are introduced and implemented in schools" (p. 83). Teacher professional development and training might include a variety of different components, which could include coaching, and workshops in which teachers gain background and skills to implement SEL theory and

practices into their classrooms (Reyes et al., 2012). Joyce and Showers (2002) noted that when combined with coaching, the implementation of SEL training was 95% more effective than singular implementation. Gissy (2010) posited that understanding teacher's perceptions of professional development and its effectiveness could help leaders frame professional development in a more effective light.

Professional development is a key component of improving teacher efficacy and improving student achievement. Despite research elaborating on the effectiveness of improving teacher's pedagogy, there is often a lack of access to the time and money necessary to complete professional development (Gissy, 2010). Even when schools may not have formal professional learning communities, there are opportunities for staff to grow. Wilson and Berne (1999) noted that professional development might occur "in conversations with colleagues, passing glimpses of another teacher's classroom, on the way to the photocopying machine, tips swapped in the coffee lounge, not to mention the daily experiences of the classroom" (p. 174). Professional growth may occur in formal and informal educational experiences.

Results on the outcomes of professional development and teacher's attitudes on professional development have varied. Adada (2007) explored the difference in teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of professional development delivered face-to-face and development delivered through computer mediations. The results indicated that teachers felt more positively toward professional development delivered in a face-to-face format (Adada, 2007). There is also evidence that elementary teachers and newer teachers have higher positive attitudes toward professional development. Torff and Sessions (2008) concluded that elementary teachers had favorable attitudes toward professional

development compared to those of secondary teachers. Additionally, teachers in their first and second years of teaching held more positive feelings toward professional development than those in their third year or beyond (Torff & Sessions, 2008). More research is needed to clarify the extent to which teachers perceive they are receiving adequate, effective professional development that connects to their content areas.

Social-Emotional Learning Resources

Schools have a large variety of resources that are used each day. School leaders must determine how to utilize and divide resources better to develop people, design the curriculum, implement technology, and set direction (Leithwood et al., 2004). Effective implementation of SEL instruction relies on leadership to implement practices that will motivate and grow human capital. Minckler (2014) conducted a quantitative study of school leadership and the role of school leaders in building lasting teacher capital. Minckler (2014) found that leaders are able to improve conditions for professional learning by creating a location, giving time for collaboration, and providing clear guidance and expectations. Beyond human capital, the capital of buildings, space, and grounds is an important SEL resource. In order for leaders to fully support SEL reforms, organizational capital, such as well-structured environments, should be in place (Leithwood, Steinbach & Jantzi, 2002; Zins, Bloodworth, Weissberg, & Walberg 2007). Witziers, Bosker, and Krüger (2003) determined that educational leaders build their "organization's innovative capacity, teacher's working conditions, and smooth internal organizational function" (p. 416). Van Holten (2016) conducted a descriptive study of perceptions of preservice teachers in Wicomico Public Schools who had been exposed to professional development opportunities and compared those perceptions to preservice

teachers who had no professional development opportunities. The results indicated that teachers need resources to improve diversity in instruction, support English Language Learner (ELL) students, and continue to grow and implement SEL policies and practices (Van Holten, 2016).

Student Growth and Social-Emotional Learning

Student growth and development is a core component of education. Most states now require that schools provide and measure student growth and achievement (Gould, 2015). The stakes surrounding the assessment of student growth have never been higher. Not only do states make determinations about the quality of schools based on student growth data, but administrators are beginning to use student growth data to drive hiring decisions and teacher evaluation processes (Gould, 2015). Student academic growth is typically measured using a student growth model. These growth models use terminology and methodology such as value-table, value-added, trajectory, student growth percentile, and projection (Gould, 2015). While there is variance between the different models, they can be used for a variety of purposes. Gould (2015) noted that states are beginning to use student growth models as part of student comparison, teacher evaluation, state accountability, and determination of school progress. Prince et al. (2009) noted that student growth models can be effective in specific content areas that rely on standardized testing, and have clear vertical alignment such as science, reading, and math. Unfortunately, for subjects that do not adhere to that model of instruction or do not have standardized tests, the converse is true. Out of all educators, 69% do not teach classes that have standardized tests, and basing teacher evaluation on student growth measured in areas that do may not be an accurate representation of a teacher's ability to promote

student growth (Prince et al., 2009). Compounding the issue is the fact that ELL teachers and special education teachers may have class sizes too small to use a student growth model to monitor teacher's efficacy (Gould, 2015). There is no consensus on one method of evaluating student growth that will work for all teachers, all schools, and all contents.

Teachers play an important role in student achievement. Nye, Konstantopoulos, & Hedges (2004) conducted a 4-year study in Tennessee in which students were randomly assigned to teachers' classrooms to examine teacher effectiveness. Nye et al. (2004) found that teachers are more important to student growth than leadership, the school itself, funding, and the organization of the school. This effect can be compounded if there are multiple effective teachers. Stronge (2010) defined the "cumulative effect" as the influence of multiple teachers on a student's achievement and growth over time, leading to a greater total impact. Likewise, there is an additional effect if a teacher is highly influential in a student's growth. Long-term impacts on student achievement and growth are residual instructional effects, and the impact might last as long as two years and be negative or positive (Stronge, 2010).

Gould (2015) conducted a mixed-methods study in a large school district in Virginia, including an online survey and semi-structured interviews of career and technical education teachers' regarding their perceptions of using student growth data to determine teacher effectiveness in their evaluation process. It is possible to mitigate the negative effects of poor instruction on student growth; however, even if a student has an excellent teacher following a year taught by a poor teacher, they will not be able to recover the loss in academic growth (Gould, 2015). Teachers play a key role in

determining the success and growth of students in educational settings, and that impact could be long-term.

Issues of Diversity

Society is constantly evolving and changing. As a result, educators face an enormous amount of pressure to meet the needs of all learners and to use a culturally responsive pedagogy. Gollnick and Chinn (1986) noted, "educators today are faced with an overwhelming challenge to prepare students from diverse cultural backgrounds to live in a rapidly changing society and world" (p. 2). Students who come from middle-class to upper-class communities have an advantage because they often understand the code and expectations and are able to carry out code-switching at school (Delpit, 1995). Lack of understanding for students of color may create situations where educators inaccurately label their achievement ability. Teachers who perceive that there is a deficit in student achievement for African-American students can promote stereotypes and poor ideals in regards to cultural diversity leading to lowered education outcomes and expectations for diverse learners (Ford, Grantham, & Harris, 1998).

Teacher's perceptions of students may lead to bias and impact relationships with students in the classroom. Poor relationships due to ill-formed teacher bias can impact student self-esteem and academic achievement (Cooper, 2003). Furthermore, these biases often lead to discrepancies between the expectations of the teacher and the student's family. Fu (2013) conducted an explorative study of two Midwestern English as a second language (ESL) teachers' perspectives on diversity and noted, "Teachers tended to standardize education through forcing the students to follow school norms while ignoring the norms accepted and applauded in ESL students' families or local

communities" (p. 16). Suárez-Orozco (2000) conducted a historical review of immigration in the United States and concluded that parents of diverse populations often hold significantly differing views on mainstreaming cultural norms and expectations of the United States in schools, and expecting all students to understand and operate under those understandings. Despite the cultural differences, educators frequently implement and use standardized practices and materials even if they do not match the norms from cultural expectations at home.

Teacher attitudes toward diverse groups of students who receive ESL services have also been found to be negative. Byrnes, Kiger, and Manning (1997) determined that teachers' attitudes toward ESL students with diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds in Arizona, Utah, and Virginia were 64.87% negative in regards to the diversity those students brought to their classrooms. Attitudes in further studies have varied by region, content area, attitudes, and whether or not the teacher had participated in formal training (Fu, 2013). For some students, having the ability to connect with a qualified, effective teacher is essential to their education. Haberman (1995) reported, "For children and youth in poverty from diverse cultural backgrounds who attend urban schools, having effective teachers is a matter of life and death" (p. 1). Challenges for diverse learners come in a variety of ways and experiences in education.

Diversity in debate and forensics activities has been increasing significantly. Young (2011) explored two scholarly discussions of the role of convictions and sincerity in policy debate. Young (2011) examined how personal beliefs may put debaters in a position where they are forced to argue against a personal conviction. For example, traditional policy debate roles may have the unintended consequence of marginalizing

students who feel that alternating sides forces them to debate against their beliefs (Young, 2011). The creation of urban debate leagues and the increased acceptance of critical literature has helped to create safe competition paces for diverse groups of students. In theory, critical debate should allow sincerity of argumentation and students to use their voice to speak their truth; however, Young (2011) noted that traditional debate might not be ethically harmful because the gap between students' ethical convictions and public utterances is marginal, and even could be beneficial.

Despite the growth, there are still many barriers to competition faced by women, transgender, gender non-binary, and femme presenting members of the community. While women have competed since the inception of the NSDA, they have remained significantly underrepresented in the world of competitive debate and forensics (Ronald, 2017). A critical analysis of participation in the final rounds of the NSDA national tournament from 1931-2015 is telling. In policy debate, only 21 women have been represented in the final round, despite the gender make-up of the NSDA membership consisting of 51.4% percent female identifying students (Ronald, 2017).

It is a common belief that the gender disparity in debate can be accounted for with the fact that women are more successful in forensics competitions. Competitive competition equity in forensics is not an accurate representation of participants at national competitions. Women are often more gifted than men in oral expression from an early age (Ronald, 2017). Despite this fact, in competitive communication events, women are underrepresented at high-level competitions. From 2013 to 2016, women made up between 21-43% of semifinalists at the NSDA national tournament in extemporaneous speaking, dramatic interpretation, and humorous interpretation (Ronald, 2017). Women

in these activities are caught in a double bind: appear sweet, feminine, and attractive yet appear to lack successful masculine traits; or be aggressive, lower their voices, and take on more masculine traits and be criticized for being unfeminine (Ronald, 2017). Women competing in debate and forensics must see representation, amplification, and validation of their emotions and social integration in the activities.

Summary

SEL is a crucial and needed component of a comprehensive education curriculum. Teachers must work to help develop the whole child, including the social and emotional needs of students in their classrooms. Co-curricular educators have a unique opportunity to influence student SEL growth because they work with students in a variety of settings during and beyond the school day. Given the need for additional research regarding co-curricular education and SEL implementation and standards, this study was designed to examine Kansas debate and forensics teacher's perceptions of SEL in their schools, in their classrooms, and on their teams. The next chapter contains the methods used to collect and analyze data for this study.

Chapter 3

Methods

CASEL (2013) posited that teacher awareness and the use of SEL instruction in the classroom are important in order to promote the growth of students academically, emotionally, and socially. The purpose of this study was to determine the extent Kansas debate and forensics teachers have SEL professional development opportunities available to them, have integrated SEL into their classroom, have SEL classroom resources available to them, perceive they are confident in promoting student growth and development related to SEL, and the extent to which they perceive they are ready to address issues of diversity. Further purposes of this study were to determine the effect KSHSAA school classification and teacher assignment (debate, forensics, debate and forensics) may have on the aforementioned perceptions of debate and forensics teachers. As such, Kansas debate and forensics teachers' perceptions were analyzed to examine the extent to which SEL is effectively integrated into their classrooms and on their debate and/or forensics teams. This chapter includes the research design, selection of participants, measurement, data collection procedures, data analysis and hypothesis testing, and the limitations.

Research Design

A quantitative descriptive survey design was selected for use in this study. Lunenburg and Irby (2008) noted that the descriptive research design is about the perception of the phenomena being researched from the view of the survey participants. The survey was cross-sectional and included questions centering on characteristics and trends associated with instruction related to SEL that were occurring in high school

debate and forensics in Kansas at the time of this study. A cross-sectional survey design best elicited information to examine the extent to which SEL is being incorporated by Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

Surveys are effective tools to administer in order to gauge the attitudes, beliefs, characteristics, or opinions of the sample (Creswell, 2014). A cross-sectional survey was designed to measure perceptions of Kansas debate and forensics teachers on SEL, at one singular point in time. Survey research is commonplace. Creswell (2014) explained, "Most people are familiar with surveys." (p. 375). People can easily relate to participating in survey research and are commonly asked to do so. There are additional benefits to the use of surveys in research. Fowler (2009) indicated that the time to collect and organize survey data is quick, and survey design is economical. Creswell (2014) furthered that survey designs are used when the researcher would like to describe trends or characteristics of a population.

For this study, the independent variables were the type of teacher (debate, forensics, debate and forensics) and school classification (6A, 5A, 4A, 3A, 2A, and 1A). The dependent variables were teachers' perceptions of the availability of SEL-related professional development, the adequacy of SEL-related resources, confidence in promoting SEL-related growth, perceptions they are ready to address issues of diversity, and integration of SEL instruction into their classrooms. No effort was made to manipulate or control the variables.

Selection of Participants

The population of interest was Kansas debate and forensics teachers. Purposive sampling was used to select the participants for the study. Lunenburg and Irby (2008)

explained that purposive sampling includes the selection of a sample from a population "based on the researcher's experience or knowledge of the group to be sampled" (p. 175). The researcher, in this instance, was a Kansas debate and forensics teacher and had knowledge of the population of Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers. These individuals teach at diverse schools across the state with diverse populations of students and a variety of classification sizes. Some of the participants teach exclusively debate or exclusively forensics, but many of them teach both courses. The teachers for the sample taught debate, forensics, or debate and forensics at a Kansas high school governed by the KSHSAA during the 2019-2020 school year.

Measurement

The Panorama Teacher Skills and Perceptions surveys were used to gather data for the study. The survey instrument was developed by Gehlbach (2018), director of research at Panorama Education, and a team of researchers. More specifically, subcategories for each section of the survey were: Professional Learning/Professional Development Opportunities, Resources, Teacher Self-Efficacy, and Educating All Students. The survey questions include faculty perceptions of their professional strengths and areas for growth in SEL, perceptions of the quality and amount of professional growth and learning opportunities available to teachers related to SEL, perceptions of the adequacy of school resources for student support, and teacher perceptions of their readiness to address diversity in their schools. Each of the surveys uses a Likert-type scale, and participants were asked to answer based on their perceptions at the time of survey administration. The measurement for this study involved a survey constructed from five sections of the surveys.

Question 1 asked participants to choose whether they teach solely debate, solely forensics, or both courses. The responses to this question were used to determine the type of teacher. Question 2 asked participants to choose which classification their school is assigned. School classification was determined using the Kansas State High School Activities Association classification list for the 2019-2020 calendar year. The KSHSAA places each school that participates in competitive debate and forensics into six classifications based on student enrollment in ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades: 6A (36 schools- Student Range 2462-1320), 5A (36 Schools- Student Range 1313-748), 4A (36 Schools- Student Range 679-317), 3A (64 Schools- Student Range 315-174), 2A (64 schools- Student Range 172-105), and 1A (119 Schools- Student Range 105-14) (KSHSAA, 2018).

The Panorama Teacher Skills and Perceptions survey section Professional Learning/Professional Development Opportunities was used by the researcher to measure "perceptions of the amount and quality of professional growth and learning opportunities available to school faculty and staff" (Gehlbach, 2018, p. 10). The survey contains eight questions; measurement for each question involves the use of a different Likert-type scale. See Table 3 for the items and the numerical rating scale for each. Responses to the questions in the Professional Learning survey were used in the analysis of RQ1-RQ4.

Table 3

Professional Learning/Professional Development Survey Questions and Scales

Item	Rating Scales
Overall, how supportive has the school been of your growth as a teacher?	1 (*Not at all supportive*), 2 (*Slightly supportive*), 3 (*Somewhat supportive*), 4 (*Quite supportive*), 5 (*Extremely supportive*)
At your school, how valuable are the available professional development opportunities?	1 (*Not at all valuable*), 2 (*Slightly valuable*), 3 (*Somewhat valuable*), 4 (*Quite valuable*), 5 (*Extremely valuable*)
How helpful are your colleagues' ideas for improving your teaching?	1 (*Not at all helpful*), 2 (*Slightly helpful*), 3 (*Somewhat helpful*), 4 (*Quite helpful*), 5 (*Extremely helpful*)
How often do your professional development opportunities help you explore new ideas?	1 (*Almost never*), 2 (*Once in a while*), 3 (*Sometimes*), 4 (*Frequently*), 5 (*Almost all the time*)
How relevant have your professional development opportunities been to the content that you teach?	1 (*Not at all relevant*), 2 (*Slightly relevant*), 3 (*Somewhat relevant*), 4 (*Quite relevant*), 5 (*Extremely relevant*)
Through working at your school, how many new teaching strategies have you learned?	1 (*Almost no strategies*), 2 (*A few strategies*), 3 (*Some strategies*), 4 (*Many strategies*), 5 (*A great number of strategies*)
How much input do you have into individualizing your own professional development opportunities?	1 (*Almost no input*), 2 (*A little bit of input*), 3 (*Some input*), 4 (*Quite a bit of input*), 5 (*A tremendous amount of input*)
Overall, how much do you learn about teaching from the leaders at your school?	1 (*Learn almost nothing*), 2 (*Learn a little bit*), 3 (*Learn some*), 4 (*Learn quite a bit*), 5 (*Learn a tremendous amount*)

Note. Adapted from *User Guide: Panorama Teacher and Staff Survey*, by Hunter Gehlbach, 2018. Retrieved from https://www.panoramaed.com/

The Panorama Teacher Skills and Perceptions survey section Resources Teacher Survey was used to determine "perceptions of the adequacy of the school's resources" (Gehlbach, 2018, p. 20). The survey contains 10 questions; measurement for each question involves the use of a different Likert-type scale. See Table 4 for the questions

and the rating for each item. Responses to questions in the Resources-Teacher survey were used in the analysis of RQ5-RQ8.

Table 4

Resources Teacher Survey Items and Scales

Item	Scale
To what extent does the quality of the resources at your school need to improve?	1 (*Does not need to improve at all*), 2 (*Needs to improve a little bit*), 3 (*Needs to improve some*), 4 (*Needs to improve quite a bit*), 5 (*Needs to improve a tremendous amount*)
When students need help from an adult, how often do they have to wait to get that help?	1 (*Almost never*), 2 (*Once in a while*), 3 (*Sometimes*), 4 (*Frequently*), 5 (*Almost all of the time*)
How urgently does your school's technology need to be updated?	1 (*Not at all urgently*), 2 (*Slightly urgently*), 3 (*Somewhat urgently*), 4 (*Quite urgently*), 5 (*Extremely urgently*)
How often do your school's facilities need repairs?	1 (*Almost never*), 2 (*Once in a while*), 3 (*Sometimes*), 4 (*Frequently*), 5 (*Almost all of the time*)
For students who need extra support, how difficult is it for them to get the support that they need?	1 (*Not at all difficult*), 2 (*Slightly difficult*), 3 (*Somewhat difficult*), 4 (*Quite difficult*), 5 (*Extremely difficult*)
How much of your own money do you spend on your classroom?	1 (*Almost none*), 2 (*A little bit*), 3 (*Some*), 4 (*Quite a bit*), 5 (*A tremendous amount*)
How important is it for your school to hire more specialists to help students?	1 (*Not important at all*), 2 (*Slightly important*), 3 (*Somewhat important*), 4 (*Quite important*), 5 (*Extremely important*)
How many more resources do you need to adequately support your students' learning?	1 (*Almost no resources*), 2 (*A few more resources*), 3 (*Several more resources*), 4 (*Quite a few more resources*), 5 (*A lot more resources*)
Overall, how much does your school struggle due to a lack of resources?	1 (*Does not struggle at all*), 2 (*Struggles a little bit*), 3 (*Struggles some*), 4 (*Struggles quite a bit*), 5 (*Struggles a tremendous amount*)
At your school, how crowded do the learning spaces feel?	1 (*Not at all crowded*), 2 (*Slightly crowded*), 3 (*Somewhat crowded*), 4 (*Quite crowded*), 5 (*Extremely crowded*)

Note. Adapted from *User Guide: Panorama Teacher and Staff Survey*, by Hunter Gehlbach, 2018.

Retrieved from https://www.panoramaed.com/

The Panorama Teacher Skills and Perceptions section Teacher Self-Reflection survey was used to determine "faculty perceptions of their professional strengths and areas for growth related to social-emotional learning" (Gehlbach, 2015, p. 29). The survey contains eight questions; the measurement for each question involves the use of a different Likert-type scale. See Table 5 for survey items and numerical rating for each. Responses to questions in the Teacher Self-Reflection survey were used in the analysis of RQ9-RQ12.

Table 5

Teacher Self-Reflection Survey Items and Scales

Item	Scale
How confident are you that you can engage students who typically are not motivated?	1 (*Not at all confident*), 2 (*Slightly confident*), 3 (*Somewhat confident*), 4 (*Quite confident*), 5 (*Extremely confident*)
How confident are you that you can help your school's most challenging students to learn?	1 (*Not at all confident*), 2 (*Slightly confident*), 3 (*Somewhat confident*), 4 (*Quite confident*), 5 (*Extremely confident*)
How thoroughly do you feel that you know all the content you need to teach?	1 (*Not at all confident*), 2 (*Slightly confident*), 3 (*Somewhat confident*), 4 (*Quite confident*), 5 (*Extremely confident*)
Thinking about grit in particular, how confident are you that you can support your students' growth and development?	1 (*Not at all confident*), 2 (*Slightly confident*), 3 (*Somewhat confident*), 4 (*Quite confident*), 5 (*Extremely confident*), *I am not sure what we mean by "grit"*
Thinking about growth mindset in particular, how confident are you that you can support your students' growth and development?	1 (*Not at all confident*), 2 (*Slightly confident*), 3 (*Somewhat confident*), 4 (*Quite confident*), 5 (*Extremely confident*), *I am not sure what we mean by "growth mindset"*
Thinking about social awareness in particular, how confident are you that you can support your students' growth and development?	1 (*Not at all confident*), 2 (*Slightly confident*), 3 (*Somewhat confident*), 4 (*Quite confident*), 5 (*Extremely confident*), *I am not sure what we mean by "social awareness"*
Thinking about self-management in particular, how confident are you that you can support your students' growth and development?	1 (*Not at all confident*), 2 (*Slightly confident*), 3 (*Somewhat confident*), 4 (*Quite confident*), 5 (*Extremely confident*), *I am not sure what we mean by "self-management"*
Thinking about self-efficacy in particular, how confident are you that you can support your students' growth and development?	1 (*Not at all confident*), 2 (*Slightly confident*), 3 (*Somewhat confident*), 4 (*Quite confident*), 5 (*Extremely confident*), *I am not sure what we mean by "self-efficacy"*

Note. Adapted from *User Guide: Panorama Teacher and Staff Survey*, by Hunter Gehlbach, 2015. Retrieved from https://www.panoramaed.com/

The Panorama Teacher Skills and Perceptions survey section Educating All Students survey was used to determine "faculty perceptions of their readiness to address issues of diversity." (Panorama, 2018, p. 13). The survey contains nine questions; the measurement for each question involves the use of a different Likert-type scale. See

Table 6 for survey questions and numerical ratings for each. Reponses to the questions in the Educating All Students survey were used in the analysis of RQ13-RQ16.

Table 6

Educating All Students Survey Items and Scales

Item	Scale
How easy do you find interacting with students at your school who are from a different cultural background than your own?	1 (*Not at all easy*), 2 (*Slightly easy*), 3 (*Somewhat easy*), 4 (*Quite easy*), 5 (*Extremely easy*)
How comfortable would you be incorporating new material about people from different backgrounds into your curriculum?	1 (*Not at all comfortable*), 2 (*Slightly comfortable*), 3 (*Somewhat comfortable*), 4 (*Quite comfortable*), 5 (*Extremely comfortable*)
How knowledgeable are you regarding where to find resources for working with students who have unique learning needs?	1 (*Not knowledgeable at all*), 2 (*Slightly knowledgeable*), 3 (*Somewhat knowledgeable*), 4 (*Quite knowledgeable*), 5 (*Extremely knowledgeable*)
If students from different backgrounds struggled to get along in your class, how comfortable would you be intervening?	1 (*Not at all comfortable*), 2 (*Slightly comfortable*), 3 (*Somewhat comfortable*), 4 (*Quite comfortable*), 5 (*Extremely comfortable*)
How easy would it be for you to teach a class with groups of students from very different religions from each other?	1 (*Not at all easy*), 2 (*Slightly easy*), 3 (*Somewhat easy*), 4 (*Quite easy*), 5 (*Extremely easy*)
In response to events that might be occurring in the world, how comfortable would you be having conversations about race with your students?	1 (*Not at all comfortable*), 2 (*Slightly comfortable*), 3 (*Somewhat comfortable*), 4 (*Quite comfortable*), 5 (*Extremely comfortable*)
How easily do you think you could make a particularly overweight student feel like a part of class?	1 (*Not at all easy*), 2 (*Slightly easy*), 3 (*Somewhat easy*), 4 (*Quite easy*), 5 (*Extremely easy*)
How comfortable would you be having a student who could not communicate well with anyone in class because his/her home language was unique?	1 (*Not at all comfortable*), 2 (*Slightly comfortable*), 3 (*Somewhat comfortable*), 4 (*Quite comfortable*), 5 (*Extremely comfortable*)
When a sensitive issue of diversity arises in class, how easily can you think of strategies to address the situation?	1 (*Not at all easy*), 2 (*Slightly easy*), 3 (*Somewhat easy*), 4 (*Quite easy*), 5 (*Extremely easy*)

Note. Adapted from *User Guide: Panorama Teacher and Staff Survey,* by Hunter Gehlbach, 2018. Retrieved from https://www.panoramaed.com/

A final survey question was added to determine the extent to which Kansas high school debate and forensics teachers are implementing SEL instruction into their

classrooms and on their teams. The survey questions used a Likert-type scale in the same format as the other survey items. The question used was, "How often do you integrate SEL activities into your classroom?" Available answers were: *almost all the time, frequently, sometimes, once in a while, and almost never*. The responses were used to analyze RQ17-RQ20.

Lunenburg and Irby (2008) explained that "Validity is the degree to which an instrument measures what it purports to measure" (p. 181). Reliability, according to Lunenburg and Irby (2008), is "the degree to which an instrument consistently measures whatever it is measuring" (p. 182). According to Gehlbach (2015), the Panorama survey instruments have been used in thousands of schools in the United States, and the validity and reliability have been regularly checked; however, there were no reliability statistics provided. The updated Panorama Teacher Skills and Perceptions survey was developed through the guidance and expertise of Gehlbach, an associate dean and associate professor at the University of California Santa Barbara Gevirtz Graduate School of Education. Gehlbach (2018) and his team of experts utilized modern principles of survey design that follow best practices for instrument construction. The best practices for survey instrument design on the Panorama Teacher Skills and Perceptions Survey included:

- Wording Survey items as questions rather than statements
- Avoiding "agree-disagree" response options that may introduce acquiescence bias and instead verbally labeled response options that reinforce the underlying topic

- Asking about one idea at a time rather than using double-barreled items (e.g., "how happy and engaged are you?")
- Using at least five response options to capture a wider range of perceptions (Gehlbach, 2018, p. 3)

In order to further confirm the validity of the Panorama Teacher Skills and Perceptions surveys that were selected for use in this research, an expert panel was asked to review the questions for accuracy and relatability to the content area being surveyed. The expert panel included three retired coaches from the high school debate and forensics community who had each coached and taught debate and forensics during their careers. The panel was also asked to suggest changes if needed. No changes were recommended for the survey instrument.

A reliability analysis was not needed because a scale was not constructed from the survey items. The researcher used single-item measurement.

> Most commonly used single-item measures can be divided into two categories: (a) those measuring self-reported facts ... and (b) those measuring psychological constructs, e.g., aspects of personality ... measuring the former with single items is common practice. However, using a single-item measure for the latter is considered to be a "fatal error" in research. If the construct being measured is sufficiently narrow or is unambiguous to the respondent, a single item may suffice. (Sackett & Larson, 1990, p. 421)

The individual questions used in this research measured self-reported facts that were sufficiently narrow and unambiguous. Therefore, the reliability of the measurement was not an issue for the measurement using this survey instrument.

Data Collection Procedures

Before data collection began, approval to conduct the study was obtained from Baker University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) on August 30, 2019 (see Appendix A for IRB approval). Once approval was granted, the survey instrument was uploaded into the web-based instrument Google Forms (see Appendix B for survey information). The letter of request for survey participation was prepared to send via email to potential participants.

The target population of debate and forensics teachers was selected because Kansas has a large population of debate and forensics teachers across the state who must officially register to compete at state each year with the state activities association by September 19, 2019. Kansas debate and forensics teachers were sent an email through the KSHSAA listserv for content teachers in those fields. The e-mail included an invitation, informed consent statement, confidential and anonymous data usage information, encouragement to participate in the study, and a link to the survey site. Participants were also given a brief introduction to the study, the purpose of the study, and the researcher's contact information. The first email was sent on September 23, 2019, after the KSHSAA email lists for 2019-2020 had been released (see Appendix C: Survey Items). A follow-up email was sent two weeks later on October 14, 2019. A final reminder to complete the survey was sent by email on October 18, 2019. Data collection was closed on November 1, 2019. Data were downloaded into an Excel worksheet and then transferred into IBM SPSS Statistics Faculty Pack 25 for Windows.

Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing

Responses to the survey questions were the data analyzed in this study. The data files were stored on a password-protected personal computer, in a password-protected file. Data was stored for three years and then destroyed. Included is a listing of each research question, a list of the hypotheses specified for that question, and the analysis used to test each of the hypotheses. For this study, one-sample *t* tests and two-factor analysis of variance (ANOVA) statistical analysis were used.

RQ1. To what extent are SEL professional development opportunities available to Kansas debate and forensics teachers?

H1. Schools are supportive of Kansas debate and forensics teachers' growth as a teacher.

H2. The available professional development opportunities at schools are valuable for Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

H3. Colleagues' ideas are helpful for improving Kansas debate and forensics teachers' teaching.

H4. Professional development opportunities help Kansas debate and forensics teachers explore new ideas.

H5. Professional development opportunities have been relevant to the content that Kansas debate and forensics teachers teach.

H6. Through working at their schools, Kansas debate and forensics teachers have learned new teaching strategies.

H7. Kansas debate and forensics teachers have input into individualizing their own professional development opportunities.

H8. Kansas debate and forensics teachers learn about teaching from the leaders at their school.

Eight one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H1-H8. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3 for each test. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing since it compares one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size, as indexed by Cohen's *d*, is reported.

RQ2. To what extent does school classification affect the availability of SEL professional development opportunities available to Kansas debate and forensics teachers?

H9. School classification affects schools' supportiveness of Kansas debate and forensics teachers' growth as a teacher.

H10. School classification affects the value of the available professional development opportunities for Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

H11. School classification affects the helpfulness of colleagues' ideas for improving Kansas debate and forensics teachers' teaching.

H12. School classification affects the helpfulness of professional development opportunities that help Kansas debate and forensics teachers explore new ideas.

H13. School classification affects the relevance of professional development opportunities have on the content that Kansas debate and forensics teachers teach.

H14. School classification affects the new strategies Kansas debate and forensics teachers have learned.

H15. School classification affects the input that Kansas debate and forensics teachers have on individualizing their own professional development opportunities.

H16. School classification affects how much Kansas debate and forensics teachers learn about teaching from the leaders at their school.

Eight two-factor analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were used to address RQ2-RQ4. The categorical variables of school classification (6A, 5A, 4A, 3A, 2A, 1A) and teacher type (debate coach, forensics coach, both debate and forensics coach) were used to group the dependent variable for each test. The two-factor ANOVA can be used to test three hypotheses including a main effect for school classification, a main effect for teacher type, and a two-way interaction effect (school classification x teacher type). The main effect for school classification was used to test each hypothesis (H9-H16). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, was calculated and reported.

RQ3. To what extent is there a difference in the availability of SEL professional development opportunities among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

H17. There is a difference in schools' supportiveness of Kansas debate and forensics teachers' growth as a teacher among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H18. There is a difference in the value of the available professional development opportunities for Kansas debate and forensics teachers among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H19. There is a difference in the helpfulness of colleagues' ideas for improving Kansas debate and forensics teachers' teaching among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H20. There is a difference in the helpfulness of professional development opportunities that help Kansas debate and forensics teachers explore new ideas among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H21. There is a difference in the relevance professional development opportunities have on the content that Kansas debate and forensics teachers teach among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H22. There is a difference in the new strategies Kansas debate and forensics teachers have learned among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H23. There is a difference in the input that Kansas debate and forensics teachers have on individualizing their own professional development opportunities among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H24. There is a difference in how much Kansas debate and forensics teachers learn about teaching from the leaders at their school among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The main effect for teacher type from each of the ANOVAs used to address RQ2-RQ4 was used to test each hypothesis (H17-H24). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, was calculated and reported.

RQ4. To what extent does school classification affect the differences in the availability of SEL professional development opportunities among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

H25. School classification affects the differences among schools' supportiveness of Kansas debate and forensics teachers' growth as a teacher among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H26. School classification affects the difference in perceptions of the value of the available professional development opportunities for Kansas debate and forensics teachers among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H27. School classification affects the difference in the helpfulness of colleagues' ideas for improving Kansas debate and forensics teachers' teaching among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H28. School classification affects the difference in the helpfulness of professional development opportunities that help Kansas debate and forensics teachers explore new ideas among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H29. School classification affects the difference in the relevance professional development opportunities have on the content that Kansas debate and forensics teachers teach among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H30. School classification affects the difference in the new strategies Kansas debate and forensics teachers have learned among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H31. School classification affects the difference in the input that Kansas debate and forensics teachers have on individualizing their own professional development opportunities among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H32. School classification affects the difference in how much Kansas debate and forensics teachers learn about teaching from the leaders at their school among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The interaction effect for school classification by teacher type from each of the ANOVAs used to address RQ2-RQ4 was used to test each hypothesis (H25-H32). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, was calculated and reported.

RQ5. To what extent do Kansas debate and forensics teachers perceive SEL resources to be adequate in their schools?

H33. The quality of school resources available to Kansas debate and forensics teachers needs to improve.

H34. Students taught by Kansas debate and forensics teachers do not wait frequently or all of the time to get help from an adult when needed.

H35. The need to update the school technology used by Kansas debate and forensics teachers is not quite urgent or extremely urgent.

H36. School facilities do not need repairs where Kansas debate and forensics teachers work.

H37. Students who need extra support do not find it quite or extremely difficult to get that support.

H38. Kansas debate and forensics teachers do not spend quite a bit or a tremendous amount of their own money on their classrooms.

H39. There is no need to hire more specialists to help students at schools where Kansas debate and forensics teachers work.

H40. Almost no more or a few more resources are needed for Kansas debate and forensics teachers to support student learning.

H41. Schools do not struggle at all or struggle a little bit due to a lack of resources.

H42. The learning spaces of Kansas debate and forensics teachers are not at all or are slightly crowded.

Ten one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H33-H42. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3 for each test. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing since it compares one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size, as indexed by Cohen's *d*, is calculated and reported.

RQ6. To what extent does school classification affect Kansas debate and forensics teachers' perception of SEL resource adequacies in their schools?

H43. School classification affects the quality of resources available to Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

H44. School classification affects whether students who need help do not need to wait to get help from an adult when needed.

H45. School classification affects the need for technology to be updated for Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

H46. School classification affects the need for school facilities to be repaired for Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

H47. School classification affects the ability for students who need extra support to get it for Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

H48. School classification affects the amount of their own money Kansas debate and forensics teachers spend on their classrooms.

H49. School classification affects the schools' need to hire additional specialists to help students of Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

H50. School classification affects the amount of additional resources needed to support student learning for Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

H51. School classification affects the amount a school struggles due to lack of resources for Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

H52. School classification affects how crowded the learning spaces feel for Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

Ten two-factor ANOVAs were used to test H43-H52. The categorical variables of school classification (6A, 5A, 4A, 3A, 2A, 1A) and teacher type (debate coach, forensics coach, both debate and forensics coach) were used to group the dependent variables for each test. The two-factor ANOVA can be used to test three hypotheses including a main effect for school classification, a main effect for teacher type, and a

two-way interaction effect (school classification x teacher type). The main effect for school classification was used to test each hypothesis (H43-H52). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, is calculated.

RQ7. To what extent is there a difference in perception of the adequacy of the classroom SEL resources available among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

H53. There is a difference in the quality of school resources available among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H54. There is a difference in the amount of time students taught by Kansas debate and forensics teachers need to wait to get help from an adult when needed among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H55. There is a difference in the need to update technology among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H56. There is a difference in the need for school facilities to be repaired among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H57. There is a difference in student difficulty of attaining extra support when needed among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H58. There is a difference in the amount of personal money spent out of pocket on their classrooms among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H59. There is a difference in the need to hire more specialists to help students at schools among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H60. There is a difference in the need for additional resources to support student learning among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H61. There is a difference in the struggle due to lack of resources among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H62. There is a difference in the crowdedness of learning spaces among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The main effect for teacher type from each of the 10 two-factor ANOVAs used to address RQ6-RQ8 was used to test each of the hypotheses (H53-H62). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, is calculated.

RQ8. To what extent does school classification affect the difference in the perceptions of the adequacy of classroom SEL resources available among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

H63. School classification affects the difference in the quality of school resources available to Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H64. School classification affects the difference in the amount of time students taught by Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers need to wait to get help from an adult when needed.

H65. School classification affects the difference in the need to update technology among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H66. School classification affects the difference in the need for school facilities to be repaired among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H67. School classification affects the difference in student difficulty of attaining extra support when needed among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H68. School classification affects the difference in the amount of personal money spent out of pocket on their classrooms among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H69. School classification affects the difference in the need to hire more specialists to help students at schools among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H70. School classification affects the difference in the need for additional resources to support student learning among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H71. School classification affects the difference in the struggle due to lack of resources among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H72. School classification affects the difference in the crowdedness of learning spaces among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The interaction effect for school classification by teacher type from each of the ANOVAs used to address RQ6-RQ8 was used to test each hypothesis (H63-H72). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, is calculated.

RQ9. To what extent are Kansas debate and forensics teachers confident in promoting student growth and development related to SEL?

H73. Kansas debate and forensics teachers are confident they can engage students who are not typically motivated.

H74. Kansas debate and forensics teachers feel confident they know the content they teach thoroughly.

H75. Kansas debate and forensics teachers are confident that they can move through material at a pace that works for all students.

H76. When a teaching strategy fails, Kansas debate and forensics teachers can easily think of another.

H77. Kansas debate and forensics teachers are confident they can have productive conversations with upset parents.

H78. Kansas debate and forensics teachers are effective at managing disruptive classes.

H79. Kansas debate and forensics teachers are confident they can engage unmotivated students.

H80. Kansas debate and forensics teachers can clearly explain complicated content to students.

H81. Kansas debate and forensics teachers are confident they can meet the needs of their most advanced learners.

Nine one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H73-H81. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3 for each test. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing since it compares one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size, as indexed by Cohen's *d*, is reported.

RQ10. To what extent does school classification affect Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence in promoting student growth and development related to SEL?

H82. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence that they can engage students who are not typically motivated.

H83. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence that they know the content they teach thoroughly.

H84. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence that they can move through material at a pace that works for all students.

H85. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence in selecting a new teaching strategy when one fails.

H86. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence that they can have productive conversations with upset parents.

H87. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' effectiveness at managing disruptive classes.

H88. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence that they can engage unmotivated students.

H89. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' perception that can clearly explain complicated content to students.

H90. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence that they can meet the needs of their most advanced learners.

Nine two-factor ANOVAs were used to address RQ10-RQ12. The categorical variables of school classification (6A, 5A, 4A, 3A, 2A, 1A) and teacher type (debate coach, forensics coach, both debate and forensics coach) were used to group the dependent variable, confidence in promoting student growth and development of Kansas debate and forensics teachers. The two-factor ANOVA can be used to test three hypotheses including a main effect for school classification, a main effect for teacher type, and a two-way interaction effect (school classification x teacher type). The main effect for school classification was used to test each hypothesis (H82-H90). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, is calculated.

RQ11. To what extent is there a difference in promoting student growth and development related to SEL among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

H91. There is a difference in the confidence of teachers that they can engage students who are not typically motivated among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H92. There is a difference in the confidence of teachers that they know the content that they teach thoroughly among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H93. There is a difference in the confidence of teachers that they can move through material at a pace that works for all students among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and teachers.

H94. There is a difference in the confidence of teachers that when a teaching strategy fails, they can easily think of another among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and teachers.

H95. There is a difference in the confidence of teachers that they can have productive conversations with upset parents among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H96. There is a difference in the effectiveness of teachers' management of disruptive classes among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and teachers.

H97. There is a difference in the confidence of teachers that they can engage unmotivated students among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teacher, and debate and forensics teachers.

H98. There is a difference in the confidence of teachers that they can clearly explain complicated content to students among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teacher, and debate and forensics teachers.

H99. There is a difference in the confidence of teachers that they can meet the needs of their most advanced learners among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teacher, and debate and forensics teachers.

The main effect from each of the two-factor ANOVAs used to address RQ10-RQ12 was used to test each hypothesis (H90-H99). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, is calculated.

RQ12. To what extent does school classification affect the differences in their confidence in promoting student growth and development related to SEL among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

H100. School classification affects the difference in their confidence that they can engage students who are not typically motivated among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H101. School classification affects the difference in their confidence that they know the content they teach thoroughly among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H102. School classification affects the difference in their confidence that they can move through material at a pace that works for all students among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H103. School classification affects the difference in their confidence that when a teaching strategy fails they can easily think of another among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H104. School classification affects the difference in their confidence that they can have productive conversations with upset parents among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H105. School classification affects the difference in their effectiveness in managing disruptive classes among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H106. School classification affects the difference in their confidence that they can engage unmotivated students among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H107. School classification affects the difference in their confidence that they can clearly explain complicated content to students among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

H108. School classification affects the difference in their confidence that they can meet the needs of their most advanced learners among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The interaction effect for school classification by teacher type from each of the two-factor ANOVAs used to address RQ10-RQ12 was used to test each hypothesis (H100-H108). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, is calculated.

RQ13. To what extent do Kansas debate and forensics teachers perceive they are ready to address issues of diversity?

H109. It is easy to interact with a student from a different cultural background for Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

H110. Kansas debate and forensics teachers feel comfortable incorporating new material about people from different backgrounds into their curriculum.

H111. Kansas debate and forensics teachers are knowledgeable regarding where to find resources for students with unique learning needs.

H112. Kansas debate and forensics teachers feel comfortable intervening if students from a different background struggled to get along in their classes.

H113. Kansas debate and forensics teachers find it easy to teach a class with students from very different religious backgrounds.

H114. Kansas debate and forensics teachers are comfortable having conversations about race with their students.

H115. Kansas debate and forensics teachers are confident they can easily make a particularly overweight student feel like a part of the class.

H116. Kansas debate and forensics teachers are confident that they could have a student who could not communicate well due to a unique home language in their classes.

H117. Kansas debate and forensics teachers can easily think of strategies to address sensitive issues of diversity in their classrooms.

Nine one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H109-H117. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3 for each test. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing since it compares one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size, as indexed by Cohen's *d*, is reported.

RQ14. To what extent does school classification affect the perceptions of Kansas debate and forensics teachers that they are ready to address issues of diversity?

H118. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' ease of interaction with students from a different cultural background.

H119. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers comfort for incorporating new material about people from different backgrounds into their curriculum.

H120. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' knowledge regarding where to find resources for students with unique learning needs.

H121. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' comfort intervening if students from a different background struggled to get along in their classes.

H122. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' ease in teaching a class with students from very different religious backgrounds.

H123. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' comfort in having conversations about race with their students.

H124. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence that they can easily make a particularly overweight student feel like a part of the class.

H125. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence that they could have a student who could not communicate well due to a unique home language in their classes.

H126. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' ease in thinking of strategies to address sensitive issues of diversity in their classrooms.

Nine two-factor ANOVAs were used to address RQ14-RQ16. The categorical variables of school classification (6A, 5A, 4A, 3A, 2A, 1A) and teacher type (debate

coach, forensics coach, both debate and forensics coach) were used to group the dependent variable, perceptions of readiness to address issues of diversity of Kansas debate and forensics teachers. The two-factor ANOVA can be used to test three hypotheses including a main effect for school classification, a main effect for teacher type, and a two-way interaction effect (school classification x teacher type). The main effect for school classification was used to test each hypothesis (H118-H126). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, is calculated.

RQ15. To what extent is there a difference in teacher perceptions of their readiness to address issues of diversity among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

H127. There is a difference in the ease of interaction with students from a different cultural background among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

H128. There is a difference in comfort incorporating new material about people from different backgrounds into their curriculum among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

H129. There is a difference in knowledge regarding where to find resources for students with unique learning needs among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

H130. There is a difference in comfort intervening if students from a different background struggled to get along in their classes among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

H131. There is a difference in ease of teaching a class with students from very different religious backgrounds among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

H132. There is a difference in comfort having conversations about race with their students among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

H133. There is a difference in confidence that they can easily make a particularly overweight student feel like a part of the class among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

H134. There is a difference in confidence that they could have a student who could not communicate well due to a unique home language in their classes among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

H135. There is a difference in ease of thinking of strategies to address sensitive issues of diversity in their classrooms among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

The main effect for teacher type from each two-factor ANOVA used to address RQ14-RQ16 was used to test each hypothesis (H127-H135). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, is calculated.

RQ16. To what extent does school classification affect the differences in teacher perceptions of their readiness to address issues of diversity among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

H136. School classification affects the difference in the ease of interaction with students from a different cultural background among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

H137. School classification affects the difference in their comfort incorporating new material about people from different backgrounds into their curriculum among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teacher.

H138. School classification affects the difference in knowledge regarding where to find resources for students with unique learning needs among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

H139. School classification affects the difference in comfort intervening if students from a different background struggled to get along in their classes among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

H140. School classification affects the difference in ease of teaching a class with students from very different religious backgrounds among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

H141. School classification affects the difference in comfort having conversations about race with their students among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

H142. School classification affects the difference in confidence that they can easily make a particularly overweight student feel like a part of the class among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

H143. School classification affects the difference in confidence that they could have a student who could not communicate well due to a unique home language in their

classes, can clearly explain complicated content to students among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

H144. School classification affects the difference in ease of thinking of strategies to address sensitive issues of diversity in their classrooms among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

The interaction effect for school classification by teacher type from each of the two-factor ANOVAs used to address RQ14-RQ16 was used to test each hypothesis (H136-H144). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, is calculated.

RQ17. To what extent do Kansas debate and forensics teachers perceive they integrate SEL activities into their classrooms?

H145. Kansas debate and forensics teachers perceive that they frequently or almost all the time integrate SEL activities into their classrooms.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test H145. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing since it compares one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is caculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size, as indexed by Cohen's *d*, is reported.

RQ18. To what extent does school classification affect Kansas debate and forensics teachers' perceptions of how often they integrate SEL activities into their classrooms?

H146. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' perceptions of how often they integrate SEL activities into their classrooms.

A two-factor ANOVA was used to address RQ18-20. The categorical variables of school classification (6A, 5A, 4A, 3A, 2A, 1A) and teacher type (debate coach, forensics coach, both debate and forensics coach) were used to group the dependent variable for each test. The two-factor ANOVA can be used to test three hypotheses including a main effect for school classification, a main effect for teacher type, and a two-way interaction effect (school classification x teacher type). The main effect for school classification was used to test H146. The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, was calculated and reported.

RQ19. To what extent is there a difference in teacher perceptions of how often they integrate SEL activities into their classrooms among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

H147. There is a difference in the perceptions of how often SEL activities are integrated into the classrooms among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The main effect for teacher type from the ANOVA used to address RQ18-RQ20 was used to test H147. The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, was calculated and reported.

RQ20. To what extent does school classification affect the differences in teacher perceptions of how often they integrate SEL activities into their classrooms among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

H148. School classification affects the difference in teacher perceptions of how often they integrate SEL activities into their classrooms among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The interaction for school classification by teacher type from the ANOVA used to address RQ18-RQ20 was used to test H148. The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, was calculated and reported.

Limitations

All research designs have limitations that cannot be controlled by the researcher. Kothari (2004) noted that the use of a scale as a survey instrument might allow respondents to check any position along the scale, which can lead to difficulty in the analysis of responses. What people perceive to be "somewhat" and "very much" depends on the frame of reference used by each individual person. Respondents may also become careless on surveys that are longer than 10 items (Kothari, 2004). Researchers can use scales to infer that people are in agreement or disagreement with a topic, but there is no clear way to tell how much individuals agree or disagree. Further, the respondents' own words and feelings cannot be interpreted from survey data (Kothari, 2004). The study was dependent on participants answering each survey question, and there were no recorded notes for why a person chose not to respond to a question. Additionally, the survey was dependent upon the percentage of Kansas debate and forensics teachers who responded. Finally, the researcher was limited by the list of email addresses provided by the KSHSAA, and dependent upon the accuracy and completeness of the list provided.

Summary

In this chapter, the methodology used to conduct this study on Kansas debate and forensics teacher's perceptions of SEL were described. The purpose of this study was linked to the research questions. Included in this chapter were the research design used, the selection of participants, measurement, the data analysis, and the data collection procedures. The trustworthiness of the research tool, including validity and reliability, were also discussed. Finally, the limitations of the study were addressed. Chapter 4 includes the descriptive statistics and the results of the hypothesis testing.

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent Kansas debate and forensics teachers have SEL professional development opportunities available to them, have integrated SEL into their classroom, have SEL classroom resources available to them, perceive they are confident in promoting student growth and development related to SEL, and perceive they are ready to address issues of diversity. Further purposes of this study were to determine the effect KSHSAA school classification and teacher assignment (debate, forensics, debate and forensics) may have on the aforementioned perceptions of debate and forensics teachers. This chapter included the descriptive statistics and the results of the data analysis.

Descriptive Statistics

Surveys were sent via email to 311 high school debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers in the state of Kansas. The sample consisted of 142 debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers who returned surveys that were complete and useable. Due to sample size issues for type of teacher, it was necessary to recode the teacher type from the original grouping of debate only, forensics only, or debate and forensics. In order to provide an equal sample size for comparison, the groupings for teacher type became debate or forensics teachers and debate and forensics teachers. See Table 7 for the frequencies of original and recoded teacher type categories.

Table 7

Frequency and Percentages for Original and Recoded Teacher Type Categories

Teacher Type	N	%
Original		
Debate	6	4.2
Forensics	58	40.8
Debate and Forensics	78	54.9
Recoded		
Debate or Forensics	64	45.1
Debate and Forensics	78	54.9

School classifications originally were intended to be compared individually as 6A, 5A, 4A, 3A, 2A, and 1A divisions. Sample size issues made it necessary to collapse six classification to two classification groupings. Schools were recoded into small school classification 1A-3A and large school classification 4A-6A. See Table 8 for original and recoded school classification categories frequencies and percentages.

Table 8

Frequency and Percentages for Original and Recoded School Classification Categories

School Classification	N	%
Original		
1A	28	19.7
2A	19	13.4
3A	25	17.6
4A	21	14.8
5A	26	18.3
6A	23	16.2
Recoded		
1A-3A	72	50.7
4A-6A	70	49.3

Specific information about the sample was detailed by descriptive statistics. The next section includes hypothesis testing, statistical analysis, and results of the current research. The results allowed the researcher to compare teacher perceptions of SEL elements between type of teacher, and across different classifications.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing was conducted to address 20 research questions. The results of 148 hypothesis tests are presented below. RQ1-RQ4 address the availability of SEL professional development opportunities first in general, then by teacher type, next by school classification, and finally by the interaction between teacher type and school classification. RQ5-RQ8 address the adequacy of SEL classroom resources first in

general, then by teacher type, next by school classification, and finally by the interaction between teacher type and school classification. RQ9-RQ12 address confidence in promoting student growth and development in SEL first in general, then by teacher type, next by school classification, and finally by the interaction between teacher type and school classification. RQ13-RQ16 address perceptions of readiness to teach issues of diversity first in general, then by teacher type, next by school classification, and finally by the interaction between teacher type and school classification. RQ17-RQ20 address the frequency of SEL instruction in the classroom of Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers first in general, then by teacher type, next by school classification, and finally by the interaction between teacher type and school classification. Each research question is followed by the analysis paragraph, and then each hypothesis is specified and accompanied by the paragraph containing the results of the test.

RQ1. To what extent are SEL professional development opportunities available to Kansas debate and forensics teachers?

Eight one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H1-H8. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3 for each test. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing since it compares one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is caculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size, as indexed by Cohen's *d*, is reported.

H1. Schools are supportive of Kansas debate and forensics teachers' growth as a teacher.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 10.268$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 0.861$.

The sample mean (M = 3.76, SD = 0.88) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H1 was supported. Participants agree that schools are quite supportive or extremely supportive of Kansas debate and forensics teachers' growth as a teacher. The effect size indicated a large effect.

H2. The available professional development opportunities at schools are valuable for Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the one-sample t test indicated no difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = -0.179$, $p = 858$. The sample mean (M = 2.99, SD = 0.94) was not different from the test value (3). H2 was not supported.

H3. Colleagues' ideas are helpful for improving Kansas debate and forensics teachers' teaching.

The results of the one-sample t test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 3.753$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 0.318$. The sample mean (M = 3.32, SD = 1.01) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H3 was supported. Participants agree that colleagues' ideas are helpful in supporting Kansas debate and forensics teachers' growth as a teacher. The effect size indicated a small effect.

H4. Professional development opportunities help Kansas debate and forensics teachers explore new ideas.

The results of the one-sample t test indicated no difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 1.230$, $p = .221$. The sample mean (M = 3.10, SD = 0.956) was not different from the test value (3). H4 was not supported.

H5. Professional development opportunities have been relevant to the content that Kansas debate and forensics teachers teach.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = -4.528$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = -0.384$. The sample mean ($M = 2.63$, $SD = .96$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H5 was supported. Participants disagree that professional development opportunities have been relevant to the content they teach. The effect size indicated a small effect.

H6. Through working at their schools, Kansas debate and forensics teachers have learned new teaching strategies.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated no difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 0.861$, $p = .391$. The sample mean ($M = 3.08$, $SD = 1.07$) was not different from the test value (3). H6 was not supported.

H7. Kansas debate and forensics teachers have input into individualizing their own professional development opportunities.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated no difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 1.543$, $p = .125$. The sample mean ($M = 3.15$, $SD = 1.14$) was not different from the test value (3). H7 was not supported.

H8. Kansas debate and forensics teachers learn about teaching from the leaders at their school.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = -4.652$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = -0.386$. The sample mean ($M = 2.61$, $SD = 1.01$) was significantly higher than the test value (3).

H8 was supported. Participants disagree that leaders at their school provided valuable learning. The effect size indicated a small effect.

RQ2. To what extent does school classification affect the availability of SEL professional development opportunities available to Kansas debate and forensics teachers?

Eight two-factor analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were used to address RQ2-RQ4. The categorical variables of school classification (6A, 5A, 4A, 3A, 2A, 1A) and teacher type (debate coach, forensics coach, both debate and forensics coach) were used to group the dependent variable for each test. The two-factor ANOVA can be used to test three hypotheses including a main effect for school classification, a main effect for teacher type, and a two-way interaction effect (school classification x teacher type). The main effect for school classification was used to test each hypothesis (H9-H16). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, was calculated and reported.

H9. School classification affects schools' supportiveness of Kansas debate and forensics teachers' growth as a teacher.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = .154$, $p = .695$. See Table 9 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H9 was not supported.

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H9

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.76	0.94	72
4A-6A	3.76	0.82	70

H10. School classification affects the value of the available professional development opportunities for Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 1.596$, $p = .209$. See Table 10 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H10 was not supported.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H10

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.15	0.90	72
4A-6A	2.81	0.95	70

H11. School classification affects the helpfulness of colleagues' ideas for improving Kansas debate and forensics teachers' teaching.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = .818$, $p = .367$. See Table 11 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H11 was not supported.

Table 11

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H11

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.42	1.03	72
4A-6A	3.21	.98	70

H12. School classification affects the helpfulness of professional development opportunities that help Kansas debate and forensics teachers explore new ideas.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 3.598$, $p = .060$. See Table 12 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H12 was not supported.

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H12

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.28	0.91	72
4A-6A	2.91	0.97	70

H13. School classification affects the relevance of professional development opportunities have on the content that Kansas debate and forensics teachers teach.

The results of the analysis indicated a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 5.372$, $p = .022$, $\eta^2 = .037$. See Table 13 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. The mean for teachers from 1A-3A schools ($M = 2.90$) was higher than the mean for teachers from 4A-6A schools ($M = 2.36$). H13 was supported. Teachers from 1A-3A schools disagree less strongly than teachers from

4A-6A schools about the relevance of professional development opportunities to the content that Kansas debate and forensics teachers teach. The effect size, as indexed by *eta squared,* indicated a small effect.

Table 13

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H13

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	2.90	.92	72
4A-6A	2.36	.93	70

H14. School classification affects the new strategies Kansas debate and forensics teachers have learned.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.137$, $p = .712$. See Table 14 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H14 was not supported.

Table 14

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H14

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.07	1.05	72
4A-6A	3.09	1.10	70

H15. School classification affects the input that Kansas debate and forensics teachers have on individualizing their own professional development opportunities.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 1.571$, $p = .212$. See Table 15 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H15 was not supported.

Table 15

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H15

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.29	1.11	72
4A-6A	3.00	1.17	70

H16. School classification affects how much Kansas debate and forensics teachers learn about teaching from the leaders at their school.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.885$, $p = .348$. See Table 16 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H16 was not supported.

Table 16

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H16

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	2.69	1.07	72
4A-6A	2.51	0.94	70

RQ3. To what extent is there a difference in the availability of SEL professional development opportunities among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

The main effect for teacher type from each of the ANOVAs used to address RQ2-RQ4 was used to test each hypothesis (H17-H24). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, was calculated and reported.

H17. There is a difference in schools' supportiveness of Kansas debate and forensics teachers' growth as a teacher among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.770$, $p = .382$. See Table 17 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H17 was not supported.

Table 17

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H17

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.83	0.95	64
Both Debate and Forensics	3.71	0.82	78

H18. There is a difference in the value of the available professional development opportunities for Kansas debate and forensics teachers among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 1.017$, $p = .315$. See Table 18 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H18 was not supported.

Table 18

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H18

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.16	0.91	64
Both Debate and Forensics	2.85	0.94	78

H19. There is a difference in the helpfulness of colleagues' ideas for improving Kansas debate and forensics teachers' teaching among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.006$, $p = .940$. See Table 19 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H19 was not supported.

Table 19

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H19

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.38	1.11	64
Both Debate and Forensics	3.27	0.92	78

H20. There is a difference in the helpfulness of professional development opportunities that help Kansas debate and forensics teachers explore new ideas among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.011$, $p = .916$. See Table 20 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H20 was not supported.

Table 20

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H20

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.19	0.96	64
Both Debate and Forensics	3.03	0.95	78

H21. There is a difference in the relevance professional development opportunities have on the content that Kansas debate and forensics teachers teach among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.663$, $p = .417$. See Table 21 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H21 was not supported.

Table 21

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H21

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	2.83	0.88	64
Both Debate and Forensics	2.47	1.00	78

H22. There is a difference in the new strategies Kansas debate and forensics teachers have learned among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.151$, $p = .698$. See Table 22 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H22 was not supported.

Table 22

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H22

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.09	1.09	64
Both Debate and Forensics	3.06	1.06	78

H23. There is a difference in the input that Kansas debate and forensics teachers have on individualizing their own professional development opportunities among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.005$, $p = .945$. See Table 23 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H23 was not supported.

Table 23

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H23

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.22	1.05	64
Both Debate and Forensics	3.09	1.22	78

H24. There is a difference in how much Kansas debate and forensics teachers learn about teaching from the leaders at their school among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.004$, $p = .950$. See Table 24 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H24 was not supported.

Table 24

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H24

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	2.66	1.06	64
Both Debate and Forensics	2.56	0.98	78

RQ4. To what extent does school classification affect the differences in the availability of SEL professional development opportunities among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

The interaction for school classification by teacher type from each of the ANOVAs used to address RQ2-RQ4 was used to test each hypothesis (H25-H32). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, was calculated and reported.

H25. School classification affects the differences in schools' supportiveness of Kansas debate and forensics teachers' growth as a teacher among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 0.071$, $p = .791$. See Table 25 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H25 was not supported.

Table 25

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H25

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.82	0.97	51
	4A-6A	3.85	0.90	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.62	0.87	21
	4A-6A	3.74	0.81	57

H26. School classification affects the difference in perceptions of the value of the available professional development opportunities for Kansas debate and forensics teachers among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 0.045$, $p = .832$. See Table 26 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H26 was not supported.

Table 26

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H26

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.20	0.87	51
	4A-6A	3.00	1.08	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.05	0.97	21
	4A-6A	2.77	0.93	57

H27. School classification affects the difference in the helpfulness of colleagues' ideas for improving Kansas debate and forensics teachers' teaching among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 0.239$, $p = .626$. See Table 27 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H27 was not supported.

Table 27

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H27

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.39	1.13	51
	4A-6A	3.31	1.03	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.48	0.75	21
	4A-6A	3.19	0.97	57

H28. School classification affects the difference in the helpfulness of professional development opportunities that help Kansas debate and forensics teachers explore new ideas among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 0.435$, $p = .511$. See Table 28 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H28 was not supported.

Table 28

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H28

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.24	0.91	51
	4A-6A	3.00	1.16	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.38	0.92	21
	4A-6A	2.89	0.94	57

H29. School classification affects the difference in the relevance professional development opportunities have on the content that Kansas debate and forensics teachers teach among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 3.681$, $p = .057$. See Table 29 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H29 was not supported.

Table 29

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H29

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	2.84	0.90	51
	4A-6A	2.77	0.83	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.05	0.97	21
	4A-6A	2.26	0.94	57

H30. School classification affects the difference in the new strategies Kansas debate and forensics teachers have learned among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 0.750$, $p = .388$. See Table 30 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H30 was not supported.

Table 30

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H30

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.04	1.10	51
	4A-6A	3.31	1.11	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.14	0.96	21
	4A-6A	3.04	1.10	57

H31. School classification affects the difference in the input that Kansas debate and forensics teachers have on individualizing their own professional development opportunities among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 0.230$, $p = .632$. See Table 31 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H31 was not supported.

Table 31

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H31

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.25	1.04	51
	4A-6A	3.08	1.12	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.38	1.28	21
	4A-6A	2.98	1.89	57

H32. School classification affects the difference in how much Kansas debate and forensics teachers learn about teaching from the leaders at their school among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 0.065$, $p = .800$. See Table 32 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H32 was not supported.

Table 32

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H32

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	2.71	1.14	51
	4A-6A	2.46	0.66	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	2.67	0.91	21
	4A-6A	2.53	1.00	57

RQ5. To what extent do Kansas debate and forensics teachers perceive SEL resources to be adequate in their schools?

Ten one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H33-H42. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3 for each test. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing since it compares one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size, as indexed by Cohen's *d*, is reported.

H33. The quality of school resources available to Kansas debate and forensics teachers needs to improve.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 2.048$, $p = .042$, Cohen's $d = 0.172$. The sample mean ($M = 3.16$, $SD = 0.94$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H33 was supported. Participants agree that the quality of school resources needs to improve some or quite a bit. The effect size indicated a small effect.

H34. Students taught by Kansas debate and forensics teachers do not wait frequently or all of the time to get help from an adult when needed.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = -8.792$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 0.983$. The sample mean ($M = 2.27$, $SD = 0.98$) was significantly lower than the test value (3). H34 was supported. Students must wait to get help from an adult when needed once in a while or sometimes. The effect size indicated a large effect.

H35. The need to update the school technology used by Kansas debate and forensics teachers is not quite urgent or extremely urgent.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = -9.321$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 0.782$. The sample mean ($M = 2.08$, $SD = 1.18$) was significantly lower than the test value (3). H35 was supported. The need to update the school technology used by Kansas debate and forensics teachers is slightly to somewhat urgent. The effect size indicated a medium effect.

H36. School facilities do not need repairs where Kansas debate and forensics teachers work.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated no difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 1.075$, $p = .284$. The sample mean ($M = 3.11$, $SD = 1.17$) was not different from the test value (3). H36 was not supported.

H37. Students who need extra support do not find it quite or extremely difficult to get that support.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = -15.122$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 1.269$. The sample mean ($M = 1.92$, $SD = 0.86$) was significantly lower than the test value (3). H37 was supported. Students find it not at all to slightly difficult to get extra support when needed at the schools of Kansas debate and forensics teachers. The effect size indicated a large effect.

H38. Kansas debate and forensics teachers do not spend quite a bit or a tremendous amount of their own money on their classrooms.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 5.537$, $p = .000$. The sample mean

(M = 3.47, SD = 1.02) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H38 was not supported. Teachers spend some to quite a bit of their own money on their classrooms.

H39. There is no need to hire more specialists to help students at schools where Kansas debate and forensics teachers work.

The results of the one-sample t test indicated no difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = -0.337$, $p = .737$. The sample mean (M = 2.97, SD = 1.00) was not different from the test value (3). H39 was not supported.

H40. Almost no more or a few more resources are needed for Kansas debate and forensics teachers to support student learning

The results of the one-sample t test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = -4.265$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 0.360$. The sample mean (M = 2.66, SD = 0.94) was significantly lower than the test value (3). H40 was supported. A few more or several more resources are needed to support student learning. The effect size indicated a small effect.

H41. Schools do not struggle at all or struggle a little bit due to a lack of resources.

The results of the one-sample t test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = -4.588$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 0.385$. The sample mean (M = 2.64, SD = 0.93) was significantly lower than the test value (3). H41 was supported. Schools struggle a little bit or some due to lack of resources. The effect size indicated a small effect.

H42. The learning spaces of Kansas debate and forensics teachers are not at all or are slightly crowded.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = -7.592$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 0.637$. The sample mean ($M = 2.22$, $SD = 1.23$) was significantly lower than the test value (3). H42 was supported. The learning spaces of Kansas debate and forensics teachers feel slightly crowded or somewhat crowded. The effect size indicated a medium effect.

RQ6. To what extent does school classification affect Kansas debate and forensics teachers' perception of SEL resource adequacies in their schools?

Ten two-factor ANOVAs were used to test H43-H52. The categorical variables of school classification (6A, 5A, 4A, 3A, 2A, 1A) and teacher type (debate coach, forensics coach, both debate and forensics coach) were used to group the dependent variables for each test. The two-factor ANOVA can be used to test three hypotheses including a main effect for school classification, a main effect for teacher type, and a two-way interaction effect (school classification x teacher type). The main effect for school classification was used to test each hypothesis (H43-H52). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, is calculated.

H43. School classification affects the quality of resources available to Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.108$, $p = .742$. See Table 33 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H43 was not supported.

Table 33

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H43

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.14	0.89	72
4A-6A	3.19	1.00	70

H44. School classification affects whether students who need help do not need to wait to get help from an adult when needed.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 3.301$, $p = .071$. See Table 34 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H44 was not supported.

Table 34

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H44

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	2.11	1.00	72
4A-6A	2.44	0.94	70

H45. School classification affects the need for technology to be updated for Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.541$, $p = .463$. See Table 35 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H45 was not supported.

Table 35

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H45

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	1.92	1.15	72
4A-6A	2.24	1.20	70

H46. School classification affects the need for school facilities to be repaired for Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.247$, $p = .620$. See Table 36 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H46 was not supported.

Table 36

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H46

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.00	1.08	72
4A-6A	3.21	1.26	70

H47. School classification affects the ability for students who need extra support to get it for Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 5.764$, $p = .018$, $\eta^2 = .040$. See Table 37 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. The mean for teachers from 1A-3A schools ($M = 1.74$) was lower than the mean for teachers from 4A-6A schools ($M = 2.10$). H47 was supported. Teachers from 1A-3A schools find it not at all difficult to slightly

difficult for students who need extra support to get it. Teachers from 4A-6A schools find it slightly difficult to somewhat difficult for students who need extra support to get it. The effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, indicated a small effect.

Table 37

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H47

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	1.74	0.86	72
4A-6A	2.10	0.82	70

H48. School classification affects the amount of their own money Kansas debate and forensics teachers spend on their classrooms.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.199$, $p = .656$. See Table 38 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H48 was not supported.

Table 38

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H48

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.42	0.93	72
4A-6A	3.53	1.10	70

H49. School classification affects the schools' need to hire additional specialists to help students of Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.005$, $p = .942$. See Table 39 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H49 was not supported.

Table 39

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H49

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	2.94	0.99	72
4A-6A	3.00	1.01	70

H50. School classification affects the amount of additional resources needed to support student learning for Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.712$, $p = .400$. See Table 40 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H50 was not supported.

Table 40

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H50

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	2.63	0.86	72
4A-6A	2.70	1.03	70

H51. School classification affects the amount a school struggles due to lack of resources for Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.002$, $p = .969$. See Table 41 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H51 was not supported.

Table 41

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H51

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	2.67	0.96	72
4A-6A	2.61	0.91	70

H52. School classification affects how crowded the learning spaces feel for Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 40.725$, $p = .000$, $\eta^2 = .228$. See Table 42 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. The mean for teachers from 1A-3A schools ($M = 1.57$) was lower than the mean for teachers from 4A-6A schools ($M = 2.89$). H52 was supported. Teachers from 1A-3A schools find learning spaces at their schools not at all crowded to slightly crowded. Teachers from 4A-6A schools find learning spaces at their schools slightly crowded to somewhat crowded. The effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, indicated a medium effect.

Table 42

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H52

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	1.57	0.93	72
4A-6A	2.89	1.14	70

RQ7. To what extent is there a difference in perception of the adequacy of the classroom SEL resources available among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

The main effect for teacher type from each of the 10 two-factor ANOVAs used to address RQ6-RQ8 was used to test each of the hypotheses (H53-H62). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, is calculated.

H53. There is a difference in the quality of school resources available among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.017$, $p = .897$. See Table 43 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H53 was not supported.

Table 43

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H53

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.16	0.96	64
Both Debate and Forensics	3.17	0.93	78

H54. There is a difference in the amount of time students taught by Kansas debate and forensics teachers need to wait to get help from an adult when needed among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.082$, $p = .775$. See Table 44 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H54 was not supported.

Table 44

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H54

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	2.20	1.01	64
Both Debate and Forensics	2.33	0.96	78

H55. There is a difference in the need to update technology among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 2.515$, $p = .115$. See Table 45 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H55 was not supported.

Table 45

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H55

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	1.81	1.01	64
Either Debate or Forensics	2.29	1.27	78

H56. There is a difference in the need for school facilities to be repaired among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.488$, $p = .486$. See Table 46 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H56 was not supported.

Table 46

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H56

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	2.98	1.15	64
Either Debate or Forensics	3.21	1.19	78

H57. There is a difference in student difficulty of attaining extra support when needed among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.134$, $p = .715$. See Table 47 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H57 was not supported.

Table 47

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H57

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	1.83	0.87	64
Either Debate or Forensics	1.99	0.85	78

H58. There is a difference in the amount of personal money spent out of pocket on their classrooms among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 3.741$, $p = .055$. See Table 48 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H58 was not supported.

Table 48

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H58

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.28	0.95	64
Either Debate or Forensics	3.63	1.05	78

H59. There is a difference in the need to hire more specialists to help students at schools among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.538$, $p = .464$. See Table 49 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H59 was not supported.

Table 49

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H59

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	2.88	1.00	64
Either Debate or Forensics	3.05	0.99	78

H60. There is a difference in the need for additional resources to support student learning among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 5.431$, $p = .021$, $\eta^2 = .038$. See Table 50 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. The mean for debate or forensics teachers ($M = 2.47$) was lower than the mean for debate and forensics teachers ($M = 2.82$). H60 was supported. Debate and forensics teachers perceived the need for additional resources to support student learning more strongly than debate or forensics teachers. The effect size, as indexed by e*ta squared,* indicated a small effect.

Table 50

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H60

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	2.47	0.89	72
Either Debate or Forensics	2.82	0.96	70

H61. There is a difference in the struggle due to lack of resources among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.253$, $p = .616$. See Table 51 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H61 was not supported.

Table 51

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H61

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	2.69	0.96	64
Either Debate or Forensics	2.60	0.92	78

H62. There is a difference in the crowdedness of learning spaces among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.008$, $p = .930$. See Table 52 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H62 was not supported.

Table 52

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H62

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	1.81	1.13	64
Either Debate or Forensics	2.55	1.21	78

RQ8. To what extent does school classification affect the difference in the perceptions of the adequacy of classroom SEL resources available among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

The interaction effect for school classification by teacher type from each of the ANOVAs used to address RQ6-RQ8 was used to test each hypothesis (H63-H72). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, is calculated.

H63. School classification affects the difference in the quality of school resources available to Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 0.025$, $p = .874$. See Table 53 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H63 was not supported.

Table 53

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H63

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.14	0.94	51
	4A-6A	3.23	1.09	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.14	0.79	21
	4A-6A	3.18	0.98	57

H64. School classification affects the difference in the amount of time students taught by Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers need to wait to get help from an adult when needed.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 0.029$, $p = .866$. See Table 54 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H64 was not supported.

Table 54

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H64

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	2.14	1.06	51
	4A-6A	2.46	0.78	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	2.05	0.87	21
	4A-6A	2.44	0.98	57

H65. School classification affects the difference in the need to update technology among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 2.316$, $p = .130$. See Table 55 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H65 was not supported.

Table 55

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H65

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	1.71	0.99	51
	4A-6A	2.23	1.01	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	2.43	1.36	21
	4A-6A	2.25	1.24	57

H66. School classification affects the difference in the need for school facilities to be repaired among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 0.172$, $p = .679$. See Table 56 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H66 was not supported.

Table 56

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H66

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	2.98	1.10	51
	4A-6A	3.00	1.35	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.05	1.02	21
	4A-6A	3.26	1.25	57

H67. School classification affects the difference in student difficulty of attaining extra support when needed among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 0.338$, $p = .562$. See Table 57 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H67 was not supported.

Table 57

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H67

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	1.73	0.85	51
	4A-6A	2.23	0.83	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	1.76	0.89	21
	4A-6A	2.07	0.82	57

H68. School classification affects the difference in the amount of personal money spent out of pocket on their classrooms among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers based on teacher type.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 0.018$, $p = .894$. See Table 58 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H68 was not supported.

Table 58

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H68

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.29	0.90	51
	4A-6A	3.23	1.17	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.71	0.96	21
	4A-6A	3.60	1.08	57

H69. School classification affects the difference in the need to hire more specialists to help students at schools among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers based on teacher type.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 2.824$, $p = .095$. See Table 59 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H69 was not supported.

Table 59

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H69

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	2.80	1.02	51
	4A-6A	3.15	0.90	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.29	0.85	21
	4A-6A	2.96	1.03	57

H70. School classification affects the difference in the need for additional resources to support student learning among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers based on teacher type.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 0.053$, $p = .818$. See Table 60 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H70 was not supported.

Table 60

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H70

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	2.51	0.86	51
	4A-6A	2.31	1.03	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	2.90	0.83	21
	4A-6A	2.79	1.01	57

H71. School classification affects the difference in the struggle due to lack of resources among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 0.253$, $p = .616$. See Table 61 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H71 was not supported.

Table 61

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H71

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	2.67	0.97	51
	4A-6A	2.77	0.93	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	2.67	0.97	21
	4A-6A	2.58	0.91	57

H72. School classification affects the difference in the crowdedness of learning spaces among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 1.469$, $p = .228$. See Table 62 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H72 was not supported.

Table 62

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H72

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	1.49	0.86	51
	4A-6A	3.08	1.19	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	1.76	1.09	21
	4A-6A	2.84	1.13	57

RQ9. To what extent are Kansas debate and forensics teachers confident in promoting student growth and development related to SEL?

Nine one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H73-H81. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3 for each test. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing since it compares one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size, as indexed by Cohen's *d*, is reported.

H73. Kansas debate and forensics teachers are confident they can engage students who are not typically motivated.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 3.262$, $p = .001$, Cohen's $d = 3.704$. The sample mean ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.88$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H73 was supported. Participants are somewhat to quite confident they can engage students who are not typically motivated. The effect size indicated a large effect.

H74. Kansas debate and forensics teachers feel confident they know the content they teach thoroughly.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 9.166$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 3.803$. The sample mean ($M = 3.76$, $SD = 0.99$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H74 was supported. Participants are somewhat to quite confident they know the content they teach thoroughly. The effect size indicated a large effect.

H75. Kansas debate and forensics teachers are confident that they can move through material at a pace that works for all students.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 6.641$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 3.901$. The sample mean ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 0.90$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H75 was supported. Participants are somewhat to quite confident they can move through material at a pace that works for all students. The effect size indicated a large effect.

H76. When a teaching strategy fails, Kansas debate and forensics teachers can easily think of another.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 6.068$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 3.952$.

The sample mean (M = 3.44, SD = 0.87) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H76 was supported. Participants are somewhat to quite easily able to think of a new teaching strategy when another fails. The effect size indicated a large effect.

H77. Kansas debate and forensics teachers are confident they can have productive conversations with upset parents.

The results of the one-sample t test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 12.127$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 4.405$. The sample mean (M = 3.90, SD = 0.89) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H77 was supported. Participants are somewhat to quite confident they can have productive conversations with upset parents. The effect size indicated a large effect.

H78. Kansas debate and forensics teachers are effective at managing disruptive classes.

The results of the one-sample t test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 5.577$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 3.736$. The sample mean (M = 3.43, SD = 0.92) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H78 was supported. Participants are somewhat to quite effective at managing disruptive classes. The effect size indicated a large effect.

H79. Kansas debate and forensics teachers are confident they can engage unmotivated students.

The results of the one-sample t test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 2.961$, $p = .004$, Cohen's $d = 3.456$. The sample mean (M = 3.23, SD = 0.94) was significantly higher than the test value (3).

H79 was supported. Participants are somewhat to quite confident they can engage unmotivated students. The effect size indicated a large effect.

H80. Kansas debate and forensics teachers can clearly explain complicated content to students.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 9.979$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 4.715$. The sample mean ($M = 3.65$, $SD = 0.77$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H80 was supported. Participants can somewhat to quite clearly explain complicated content to students. The effect size indicated a large effect.

H81. Kansas debate and forensics teachers are confident they can meet the needs of their most advanced learners.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 9.551$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 3.934$. The sample mean ($M = 3.77$, $SD = 0.96$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H81 was supported. Participants are somewhat to quite confident they can meet the needs of their most advanced learners. The effect size indicated a large effect.

RQ10. To what extent does school classification affect Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence in promoting student growth and development related to SEL?

Nine two-factor ANOVAs were used to address RQ10-RQ12. The categorical variables of school classification (6A, 5A, 4A, 3A, 2A, 1A) and teacher type (debate coach, forensics coach, both debate and forensics coach) were used to group the dependent variable, confidence in promoting student growth and development of Kansas

debate and forensics teachers. The two-factor ANOVA can be used to test three hypotheses including a main effect for school classification, a main effect for teacher type, and a two-way interaction effect (school classification x teacher type). The main effect for school classification was used to test each hypothesis (H82-H90). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, is calculated.

H82. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence that they can engage students who are not typically motivated.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.124$, $p = .725$. See Table 63 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H82 was not supported.

Table 63

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H82

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.25	0.87	72
4A-6A	3.23	0.89	70

H83. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence that they know the content they teach thoroughly.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.500$, $p = .481$. See Table 64 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H83 was not supported.

Table 64

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H83

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.76	0.99	72
4A-6A	3.76	1.00	70

H84. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence that they can move through material at a pace that works for all students.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.087$, $p = .769$. See Table 65 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H84 was not supported.

Table 65

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H84

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.54	0.82	72
4A-6A	3.46	0.97	70

H85. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence in selecting a new teaching strategy when one fails.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.560$, $p = .456$. See Table 66 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H85 was not supported.

Table 66

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H85

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.42	0.88	72
4A-6A	3.47	0.86	70

H86. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence that they can have productive conversations with upset parents.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.248$, $p = .619$. See Table 67 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H86 was not supported.

Table 67

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H86

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.81	0.80	72
4A-6A	4.00	0.96	70

H87. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' effectiveness at managing disruptive classes.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.254$, $p = .615$. See Table 68 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H87 was not supported.

Table 68

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H87

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.43	0.89	72
4A-6A	3.43	0.96	70

H88. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence that they can engage unmotivated students.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.169$, $p = .682$. See Table 69 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H88 was not supported.

Table 69

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H88

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.26	0.87	72
4A-6A	3.20	1.00	70

H89. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' perception that can clearly explain complicated content to students.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.415$, $p = .521$. See Table 70 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H89 was not supported.

Table 70

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H89

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.71	0.74	72
4A-6A	3.59	0.81	70

H90. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence that they can meet the needs of their most advanced learners.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.019$, $p = .889$. See Table 71 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H90 was not supported.

Table 71

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H90

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.74	0.96	72
4A-6A	3.80	0.96	70

RQ11. To what extent is there a difference in promoting student growth and development related to SEL among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

The main effect from each of the two-factor ANOVAs used to address RQ10-RQ12 was used to test each hypothesis (H91-H99). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, is calculated.

H91. There is a difference in the confidence of teachers that they can engage students who are not typically motivated among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.083$, $p = .774$. See Table 72 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H91 was not supported.

Table 72

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H91

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.23	0.87	64
Both Debate and Forensics	3.24	0.89	78

H92. There is a difference in the confidence of teachers that they know the content that they teach thoroughly among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 3.099$, $p = .081$. See Table 73 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H92 was not supported.

Table 73

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H92

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.92	0.90	64
Both Debate and Forensics	3.63	1.05	78

H93. There is a difference in the confidence of teachers that they can move through material at a pace that works for all students among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.465$, $p = .496$. See Table 74 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H93 was not supported.

Table 74

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H93

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.59	0.87	64
Both Debate and Forensics	3.42	0.92	78

H94. There is a difference in the confidence of teachers that when a teaching strategy fails, they can easily think of another among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 1.426$, $p = .234$. See Table 75 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H94 was not supported.

Table 75

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H94

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.53	0.89	64
Both Debate and Forensics	3.37	0.85	78

H95. There is a difference in the confidence of teachers that they can have productive conversations with upset parents among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.792$, $p = .375$. See Table 76 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H95 was not supported.

Table 76

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H95

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.80	0.91	64
Both Debate and Forensics	3.99	0.86	78

H96. There is a difference in the effectiveness of teachers' management of disruptive classes among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.519$, $p = .472$. See Table 77 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H96 was not supported.

Table 77

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H96

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.39	0.95	64
Both Debate and Forensics	3.46	0.89	78

H97. There is a difference in the confidence of teachers that they can engage unmotivated students among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teacher, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.025$, $p = .874$. See Table 78 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H97 was not supported.

Table 78

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H97

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.28	0.92	64
Both Debate and Forensics	3.19	0.95	78

H98. There is a difference in the confidence of teachers that they can clearly explain complicated content to students among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teacher, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.187$, $p = .666$. See Table 79 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H98 was not supported.

Table 79

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H98

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.72	0.81	64
Both Debate and Forensics	3.59	0.75	78

H99. There is a difference in the confidence of teachers that they can meet the needs of their most advanced learners among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teacher, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.025$, $p = .874$. See Table 80 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H99 was not supported.

Table 80

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H99

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.75	0.94	64
Both Debate and Forensics	3.78	0.98	78

RQ12. To what extent does school classification affect the differences in their confidence in promoting student growth and development related to SEL among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

The interaction effect for school classification by teacher type from each of the two-factor ANOVAs used to address RQ10-RQ12 was used to test each hypothesis (H100-H108). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, is calculated.

H100. School classification affects the difference in their confidence that they can engage students who are not typically motivated among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 0.581$, $p = .447$. See Table 81

for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H100 was not supported.

Table 81

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H100

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.27	0.92	51
	4A-6A	3.08	0.64	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.19	0.75	21
	4A-6A	3.26	0.94	57

H101. School classification affects the difference in their confidence that they know the content they teach thoroughly among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 2.838$, $p = .094$. See Table 82 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H101 was not supported.

Table 82

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H101

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.96	0.89	51
	4A-6A	3.77	0.93	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.29	1.06	21
	4A-6A	3.75	1.02	57

H102. School classification affects the difference in their confidence that they can move through material at a pace that works for all students among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 2.903$, $p = .091$. See Table 83 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H102 was not supported.

Table 83

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H102

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.67	0.79	51
	4A-6A	3.31	1.11	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.24	0.83	21
	4A-6A	3.49	0.95	57

H103. School classification affects the difference in their confidence that when a teaching strategy fails they can easily think of another among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 3.271$, $p = .073$. See Table 84 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H103 was not supported.

Table 84

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H103

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.57	0.92	51
	4A-6A	3.38	0.77	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.05	0.67	21
	4A-6A	3.49	0.89	57

H104. School classification affects the difference in their confidence that they can have productive conversations with upset parents among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 1.530$, $p = .218$. See Table 85 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H104 was not supported.

Table 85

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H104

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.82	0.84	51
	4A-6A	3.69	1.18	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.76	0.70	21
	4A-6A	4.07	0.90	57

H105. School classification affects the difference in their effectiveness in managing disruptive classes among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 1.205$, $p = .274$. See Table 86 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H105 was not supported.

Table 86

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H105

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.45	0.95	51
	4A-6A	3.15	0.99	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.38	0.74	21
	4A-6A	3.49	0.95	57

H106. School classification affects the difference in their confidence that they can engage unmotivated students among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 2.138$, $p = .146$. See Table 87 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H106 was not supported.

Table 87

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H106

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.35	0.91	51
	4A-6A	3.00	0.91	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.05	0.74	21
	4A-6A	3.25	1.02	57

H107. School classification affects the difference in their confidence that they can clearly explain complicated content to students among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 0.647$, $p = .422$. See Table 88 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H107 was not supported.

Table 88

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H107

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.76	0.76	51
	4A-6A	3.54	0.97	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.57	0.68	21
	4A-6A	3.60	0.78	57

H108. School classification affects the difference in their confidence that they can meet the needs of their most advanced learners among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 1.023$, $p = .314$. See Table 89 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H108 was not supported.

Table 89

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H108

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.78	0.95	51
	4A-6A	3.62	0.96	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.62	1.02	21
	4A-6A	3.84	0.96	57

RQ13. To what extent do Kansas debate and forensics teachers perceive they are ready to address issues of diversity?

Nine one-sample *t* tests were conducted to test H109-H117. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3 for each test. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing since it compares one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is calculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size, as indexed by Cohen's *d*, is reported.

H109. It is easy to interact with a student from a different cultural background for Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 13.616$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 1.143$. The sample mean ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.88$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H109 was supported. Participants agree that it is quite easy to interact with a student from a different cultural background. The effect size indicated a medium effect.

H110. Kansas debate and forensics teachers feel comfortable incorporating new material about people from different backgrounds into their curriculum.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 14.948$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 1.254$. The sample mean ($M = 4.05$, $SD = 0.84$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H110 was supported. Participants agree they are quite comfortable incorporating new material about people from different backgrounds into their curriculum. The effect size indicated a medium effect.

H111. Kansas debate and forensics teachers are knowledgeable regarding where to find resources for students with unique learning needs.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 2.648$, $p = .009$, Cohen's $d = 0.222$. The sample mean ($M = 3.20$, $SD = 0.92$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H11 was supported. Participants are somewhat knowledgeable regarding where to find resources for students with unique learning needs. The effect size indicated a small effect.

H112. Kansas debate and forensics teachers feel comfortable intervening if students from a different background struggled to get along in their classes.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 10.217$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 0.857$. The sample mean ($M = 3.75$, $SD = 0.87$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H112 was supported. Participants are somewhat to quite comfortable intervening if students from a different background struggled to get along in their class. The effect size indicated a small effect.

H113. Kansas debate and forensics teachers find it easy to teach a class with students from very different religious backgrounds.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 11.961$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 1.004$. The sample mean ($M = 3.89$, $SD = 0.88$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H113 was supported. Participants find it somewhat to quite easy to teach a class with students from very different religious backgrounds. The effect size indicated a medium effect.

H114. Kansas debate and forensics teachers are comfortable having conversations about race with their students.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 12.612$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 1.058$. The sample mean ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 0.89$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H114 was supported. Participants are quite comfortable having conversations about race with their students. The effect size indicated a medium effect.

H115. Kansas debate and forensics teachers are confident they can easily make a particularly overweight student feel like a part of the class.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 18.883$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 1.585$. The sample mean ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 0.76$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H115 was supported. Participants are confident that they can quite or extremely easily make a particularly overweight student feel like a part of the class. The effect size indicated a medium effect.

H116. Kansas debate and forensics teachers are confident that they could have a student who could not communicate well due to a unique home language in their classes.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 4.225$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 0.355$. The sample mean ($M = 3.36$, $SD = 1.01$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H116 was supported. Participants are somewhat to quite comfortable having a student who cannot communicate well in class due to a unique home language. The effect size indicated a small effect.

H117. Kansas debate and forensics teachers can easily think of strategies to address sensitive issues of diversity in their classrooms.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = 5.997$, $p = .000$, Cohen's $d = 0.503$. The sample mean ($M = 3.49$, $SD = 0.97$) was significantly higher than the test value (3). H117 was supported. Participants can somewhat to quite easily think of strategies to address sensitive issues of diversity in their classrooms. The effect size indicated a small effect.

RQ14. To what extent does school classification affect the perceptions of Kansas debate and forensics teachers that they are ready to address issues of diversity?

Nine two-factor ANOVAs were used to address RQ14-RQ16. The categorical variables of school classification (6A, 5A, 4A, 3A, 2A, 1A) and teacher type (debate coach, forensics coach, both debate and forensics coach) were used to group the dependent variable, perceptions of readiness to address issues of diversity of Kansas debate and forensics teachers. The two-factor ANOVA can be used to test three hypotheses including a main effect for school classification, a main effect for teacher type, and a two-way interaction effect (school classification x teacher type). The main effect for school classification was used to test each hypothesis (H118-H126). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, is calculated.

H118. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' ease of interaction with students from a different cultural background.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.004$, $p = .952$. See Table 90 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H118 was not supported.

Table 90

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H118

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	4.00	0.84	72
4A-6A	4.00	0.92	70

H119. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers comfort for incorporating new material about people from different backgrounds into their curriculum.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 2.069$, $p = .153$. See Table 91 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H119 was not supported.

Table 91

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H119

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.89	0.83	72
4A-6A	4.21	0.82	70

H120. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' knowledge regarding where to find resources for students with unique learning needs.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.558$, $p = .456$. See Table 92 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H120 was not supported.

Table 92

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H120

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.24	0.94	72
4A-6A	3.17	0.90	70

H121. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' comfort intervening if students from a different background struggled to get along in their classes.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.182$, $p = .671$. See Table 93 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H121 was not supported.

Table 93

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H121

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.74	0.86	72
4A-6A	3.76	0.89	70

H122. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' ease in teaching a class with students from very different religious backgrounds.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.243$, $p = .623$. See Table 94 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H122 was not supported.

Table 94

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H122

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.75	0.92	72
4A-6A	4.03	0.83	70

H123. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' comfort in having conversations about race with their students.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 1.993$, $p = .160$. See Table 95 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H123 was not supported.

Table 95

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H123

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.76	0.93	72
4A-6A	4.11	0.81	70

H124. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence that they can easily make a particularly overweight student feel like a part of the class.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.255$, $p = .614$. See Table 96 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H124 was not supported.

Table 96

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H124

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	4.18	0.76	72
4A-6A	4.21	0.76	70

H125. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' confidence that they could have a student who could not communicate well due to a unique home language in their classes.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.712$, $p = .400$. See Table 97 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H125 was not supported.

Table 97

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H125

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.26	0.96	72
4A-6A	3.46	1.06	70

H126. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' ease in thinking of strategies to address sensitive issues of diversity in their classrooms.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.161$, $p = .689$. See Table 98 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H126 was not supported.

Table 98

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H126

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	3.39	1.02	72
4A-6A	3.59	0.91	70

RQ15. To what extent is there a difference in teacher perceptions of their readiness to address issues of diversity among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

The main effect for teacher type from each two-factor ANOVA used to address RQ14-RQ16 was used to test each hypothesis (H127-H135). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, is calculated.

H127. There is a difference in the ease of interaction with students from a different cultural background among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.175$, $p = .677$. See Table 99 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H127 was not supported.

Table 99

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H127

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	4.05	0.84	64
Both Debate and Forensics	3.96	0.90	78

H128. There is a difference in comfort incorporating new material about people from different backgrounds into their curriculum among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.261$, $p = .610$. See Table 100 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H128 was not supported.

Table 100

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H128

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.95	0.83	64
Both Debate and Forensics	4.13	0.84	78

H129. There is a difference in knowledge regarding where to find resources for students with unique learning needs among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.065$, $p = .799$. See Table 101 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H129 was not supported.

Table 101

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H129

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.23	0.96	64
Both Debate and Forensics	3.18	0.89	78

H130. There is a difference in comfort intervening if students from a different background struggled to get along in their classes among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.416$, $p = .520$. See Table 102 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H130 was not supported.

Table 102

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H130

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.72	0.93	64
Both Debate and Forensics	3.77	0.82	78

H131. There is a difference in ease of teaching a class with students from very different religious backgrounds among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 3.153$, $p = .078$. See Table 103 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H131 was not supported.

Table 103

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H131

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.70	0.92	64
Both Debate and Forensics	4.04	0.83	78

H132. There is a difference in comfort having conversations about race with their students among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.867$, $p = .353$. See Table 104 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H132 was not supported.

Table 104

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H132

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.78	0.92	64
Both Debate and Forensics	4.06	0.84	78

H133. There is a difference in confidence that they can easily make a particularly overweight student feel like a part of the class among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.918$, $p = .340$. See Table 105 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H133 was not supported.

Table 105

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H133

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	4.27	0.65	64
Both Debate and Forensics	4.14	0.83	78

H134. There is a difference in confidence that they could have a student who could not communicate well due to a unique home language in their classes among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.017$, $p = .898$. See Table 106 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H134 was not supported.

Table 106

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H134

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.30	0.95	64
Both Debate and Forensics	3.41	1.06	78

H135. There is a difference in ease of thinking of strategies to address sensitive issues of diversity in their classrooms among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.161$, $p = .689$. See Table 107 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H135 was not supported.

Table 107

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H135

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	3.36	1.03	64
Both Debate and Forensics	3.59	0.90	78

RQ16. To what extent does school classification affect the differences in teacher perceptions of their readiness to address issues of diversity among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

The interaction effect for school classification by teacher type from each of the two-factor ANOVAs used to address RQ14-RQ16 was used to test each hypothesis

(H136-H144). The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, is calculated.

H136. School classification affects the difference in the ease of interaction with students from a different cultural background among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 2.221$, $p = .138$. See Table 108 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H136 was not supported.

Table 108

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H136

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	4.10	0.83	51
	4A-6A	3.85	0.90	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.76	0.83	21
	4A-6A	4.04	0.93	57

H137. School classification affects the difference in their comfort incorporating new material about people from different backgrounds into their curriculum among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teacher.

The results of the analysis indicated a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 8.197$, $p = .005$, $\eta^2 = .056$. See Table 109 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A follow up post hoc was conducted to determine which pairs of means were different. The Tukey's Honestly Significant

Difference (HSD) post hoc was conducted at $\alpha = .05$. Due to the conservative nature of the HSD, some of the significant differences were not identified. Therefore, a Fisher's Least Significant Differences (LSD), a less conservative test, was also conducted at $\alpha = .05$. For completeness, the results of both tests are included. According to the HSD, the mean for teachers from 1A-3A schools who teach debate and forensics ($M = 3.62$) was lower than the mean for teachers from 4A-6A schools who teach debate and forensics ($M = 4.32$). According to the LSD, the mean for teachers from 1A-3A schools who teach debate and forensics ($M = 3.62$) was lower than the mean for teachers from 4A-6A schools who teach debate and forensics ($M = 4.32$), and the mean for teachers from 4A-6A schools who teach debate or forensics ($M = 3.77$) was lower than the mean for teachers from 4A-6A schools who teach debate and forensics ($M = 4.32$). H137 was supported. School classification affects the difference in their comfort incorporating new material about people from different backgrounds into their curriculum among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers. The effect size indicated a small effect.

Table 109

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H137

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	4.00	0.83	51
	4A-6A	3.77	0.83	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.62	0.81	21
	4A-6A	4.32	0.78	57

H138. School classification affects the difference in knowledge regarding where to find resources for students with unique learning needs among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 5.992$, $p = .016$, $\eta^2 = .042$. See Table 110 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A follow up post hoc was conducted to determine which pairs of means were different. The Tukey's HSD post hoc was conducted at $\alpha = .05$. Due to the conservative nature of the HSD, some of the significant differences were not identified. Therefore, a Fisher's LSD, a less conservative test, was also conducted at $\alpha = .05$. For completeness, the results of both tests are included. According to the HSD, there were no differences among the means. According to the LSD, the mean for teachers from 1A-3A schools who teach debate or forensics ($M = 3.35$) was higher than the mean for teachers from 4A-6A schools who teach debate or forensics ($M = 2.77$). H138 was supported. School classification affects the difference in knowledge regarding where to find resources for students with unique learning needs among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers. The effect size indicated a small effect.

Table 110

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H138

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.35	0.91	51
	4A-6A	2.77	1.01	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	2.95	0.97	21
	4A-6A	3.26	0.86	57

H139. School classification affects the difference in comfort intervening if students from a different background struggled to get along in their classes among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 3.913$, $p = .050$. See Table 111 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H139 was not supported.

Table 111

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H139

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.80	0.87	51
	4A-6A	3.38	1.12	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.57	0.81	21
	4A-6A	3.84	0.82	57

H140. School classification affects the difference in ease of teaching a class with students from very different religious backgrounds among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 2.820$, $p = .095$. See Table 112 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H140 was not supported.

Table 112

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H140

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.75	0.91	51
	4A-6A	3.54	0.97	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.76	0.94	21
	4A-6A	4.14	0.77	57

H141. School classification affects the difference in comfort having conversations about race with their students among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 0.897$, $p = .345$. See Table 113 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H141 was not supported.

Table 113

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H141

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.76	0.93	51
	4A-6A	3.85	0.90	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.76	0.94	21
	4A-6A	4.18	0.78	57

H142. School classification affects the difference in confidence that they can easily make a particularly overweight student feel like a part of the class among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 4.331$, $p = .039$, $\eta^2 = .030$. See Table 114 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A follow up post hoc was conducted to determine which pairs of means were different. The Tukey's HSD post hoc was conducted at $\alpha = .05$. Due to the conservative nature of the HSD, some of the significant differences were not identified. Therefore, a Fisher's LSD, a less conservative test, was also conducted at $\alpha = .05$. For completeness, the results of both tests are included. According to the HSD, there were no differences among the means. According to the LSD, the mean for teachers from 1A-3A schools who teach debate or forensics ($M = 4.31$) was higher than the mean for teachers from 1A-3A schools who teach debate and forensics ($M = 3.86$). H142 was supported. School classification affects the difference in confidence that they can easily make a particularly overweight student feel

like a part of the class among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers. The effect size indicated a small effect.

Table 114

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H142

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	4.31	0.62	51
	4A-6A	4.08	0.76	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.86	0.96	21
	4A-6A	4.25	0.76	57

H143. School classification affects the difference in confidence that they could have a student who could not communicate well due to a unique home language in their classes, can clearly explain complicated content to students among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 0.094$, $p = .760$. See Table 115 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H143 was not supported.

Table 115

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H143

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.27	0.96	51
	4A-6A	3.38	0.96	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.24	1.00	21
	4A-6A	3.47	1.06	57

H144. School classification affects the difference in ease of thinking of strategies to address sensitive issues of diversity in their classrooms among Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 0.540$, $p = .464$. See Table 116 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H144 was not supported.

Table 116

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H144

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	3.37	1.08	51
	4A-6A	3.31	0.86	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	3.43	0.87	21
	4A-6A	3.65	0.92	57

RQ17. To what extent do Kansas debate and forensics teachers perceive they integrate SEL activities into their classrooms?

H145. Kansas debate and forensics teachers perceive that they frequently or almost all the time integrate SEL activities into their classrooms.

A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test H145. The sample mean was compared to a test value of 3. The one-sample *t* test was chosen for the hypothesis testing since it compares one group mean with a known value, and the group mean is caculated from a numerical variable. The level of significance was set at .05. When appropriate, the effect size, as indexed by Cohen's *d*, is reported.

The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated no difference between the group mean and the test value, $t(141) = -1.438$, $p = .153$. The sample mean ($M = 2.85$, $SD = 1.23$) was not different from the test value (3). H145 was not supported.

RQ18. To what extent does school classification affect Kansas debate and forensics teachers' perceptions of how often they integrate SEL activities into their classrooms?

H146. School classification affects Kansas debate and forensics teachers' perceptions of how often they integrate SEL activities into their classrooms.

A two-factor ANOVA was used to address RQ18-RQ20. The categorical variables of school classification (6A, 5A, 4A, 3A, 2A, 1A) and teacher type (debate coach, forensics coach, both debate and forensics coach) were used to group the dependent variable for each test. The two-factor ANOVA can be used to test three hypotheses including a main effect for school classification, a main effect for teacher type, and a two-way interaction effect (school classification x teacher type). The main

effect for school classification was used to test H146. The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, was calculated and reported.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.005$, $p = .941$. See Table 117 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H146 was not supported.

Table 117

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H146

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
1A-3A	2.85	1.25	72
4A-6A	2.86	1.21	70

RQ19. To what extent is there a difference in teacher perceptions of how often they integrate SEL activities into their classrooms among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

H147. There is a difference in the perceptions of how often SEL activities are integrated into the classrooms among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The main effect for teacher type from the ANOVA used to address RQ18-RQ20 was used to test H146. The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, was calculated and reported.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two means, $F(1, 138) = 0.000$, $p = 1.000$. See Table 118 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. H147 was not supported.

Table 118

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H147

Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Either Debate or Forensics	2.84	1.22	64
Both Debate and Forensics	2.86	1.24	78

RQ20. To what extent does school classification affect the differences in teacher perceptions of how often they integrate SEL activities into their classrooms among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers?

H148. School classification affects the difference in teacher perceptions of how often they integrate SEL activities into their classrooms among Kansas debate teachers, forensics teachers, and debate and forensics teachers.

The interaction for school classification by teacher type from the ANOVA used to address RQ18-RQ20 was used to test H148. The level of significance was set at .05. Where appropriate, an effect size, as indexed by *eta squared*, was calculated and reported.

The results of the analysis indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between at least two of the means, $F(1, 138) = 0.106$, $p = .745$. See Table 119 for the means and standard deviations for this analysis. A post hoc was not warranted. H148 was not supported.

Table 119

Descriptive Statistics for the Results of the Test for H148

Course	Classification	*M*	*SD*	*N*
Debate or Forensics	1A-3A	2.82	1.23	51
	4A-6A	2.92	1.26	13
Debate and Forensics	1A-3A	2.90	1.34	21
	4A-6A	2.84	1.21	57

Summary

Chapter 4 included the results of hypothesis testing and data analysis related to Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers' perceptions of elements of SEL instruction. The results of the one-sample *t* tests, two-factor ANOVAs, the main effect for teacher type from the ANOVAs, and the main effect for school classification from the ANOVAs were presented. Chapter 5 includes the interpretation and study summary, the major findings, findings related to literature, and the conclusions section, which contains the implications for action, recommendations for future research, and concluding remarks.

Chapter 5

Interpretation and Recommendations

The implementation of SEL learning into schools is increasingly becoming a key component of educational pedagogy. Despite increased awareness and implementation of SEL programs, there is still much to be learned about teachers' perceptions of SEL instruction in their content areas. Chapter 5 contains a study summary. The major findings are presented. Chapter 5 also provides the findings related to the literature and the conclusions.

Study Summary

This section of the chapter includes a description of the current study. This summary includes an overview of the problem. Second, the purpose of the study is provided. The third section contains a review of the methodology utilized in the current study. Finally, the major findings of the study are presented.

Overview of the problem. Despite the well-documented importance of SEL instruction in the classroom, preservice and inservice teachers have indicated they do not have the confidence to implement SEL education in their classrooms (Douglass, 2011; Lewis, 2014; Youngblood, 2015). Additionally, limited research was available on the perceptions of teachers regarding SEL. Particularly in the debate and forensics classroom, students are encountering diverse literature and arguments that contain mature themes and subject matter; however, as stated in Chapter 2, little research exists on specific content area teachers' perceptions of SEL instruction.

Purpose statement and research questions. As stated in Chapter 1, the first purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which Kansas debate and forensics

teachers perceive that they have SEL professional development opportunities available to them, have SEL classroom resources available to them, are confident in promoting student growth and development related to SEL, are ready to address issues of diversity, and have integrated SEL into their classrooms. The second purpose of this study was to determine if there is a difference in SEL perceptions between school classifications in terms of professional development opportunities available to Kansas debate and forensics teachers, SEL classroom resources available to them, confidence in promoting student growth and development related to SEL, readiness to address issues of diversity, and integration of SEL into their classrooms. The third purpose of this study was to determine if there is a difference in SEL perceptions between those who only teach debate, only teach forensics, and those who teach both contents in terms of professional development opportunities available to Kansas debate and forensics teachers, SEL classroom resources available to them, confidence in promoting student growth and development related to SEL, readiness to address issues of diversity, and integration of SEL into their classrooms. A final purpose of this study was to determine if there is a difference in the SEL perceptions between school classification and teacher type in terms of professional development opportunities available to Kansas debate and forensics teachers, SEL classroom resources available to them, confidence in promoting student growth and development related to SEL, readiness to address issues of diversity, and integration of SEL into their classrooms. To address the purposes of the study, 20 research questions were posed, and 148 hypotheses were tested.

Review of the methodology. A quantitative descriptive survey design was selected for use in this study that was conducted in Kansas. The population included

Kansas debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers from schools ranging in classification size from 1A-6A. The sample consisted of 142 debate, forensics, and debate and forensics teachers who returned surveys that were complete and useable. A list of email addresses from KSHSAA was used to request survey participation. As noted in Chapter 3, the independent variables were the type of teacher (debate, forensics, debate and forensics) and school classification (6A, 5A, 4A, 3A, 2A, and 1A). Due to participation numbers, the teacher type groupings were shifted to debate or debate and forensics and forensics, and classification was regrouped to 1A-3A and 4A-6A. The dependent variables were teachers' perceptions of the availability of SEL-related professional development, the adequacy of SEL-related resources, confidence in promoting SEL-related growth, and perceptions they are ready to address issues of diversity. For this study, one-sample *t* tests and two-factor ANOVAs were used to analyze teacher perceptions of professional development opportunities available to Kansas debate and forensics teachers, SEL classroom resources available to them, confidence in promoting student growth and development related to SEL, readiness to address issues of diversity, and integration of SEL into their classrooms.

Major findings. Five of the findings regarding SEL professional development opportunities available to Kansas debate and forensics teachers were noteworthy. When the teachers responded to the survey items, they agreed that schools are quite supportive or extremely supportive of Kansas debate and forensics teachers' growth as a teacher. Participants also agreed that colleagues' ideas are helpful in supporting Kansas debate and forensics teachers' growth as a teacher. However, teachers disagreed that professional development opportunities have been relevant to the content that they teach,

and participants disagreed that they learn from the leaders at their schools. Teachers from 1A-3A schools disagreed less strongly than teachers from 4A-6A schools about the relevance of professional development opportunities to the content that Kansas debate and forensics teachers teach. There were no differences regarding the SEL professional development opportunities available based on teacher type or the interaction between school classification and teacher type.

Eleven of the findings regarding adequate SEL resources in the schools of Kansas debate and forensics teachers were meaningful. When participants responded to the survey, they agreed that the quality of school resources needs to improve some or quite a bit. Participants also agreed that students must wait to get help from an adult when needed once in a while or sometimes. Respondents further agreed there was a slightly to somewhat urgent need to update the school technology used by Kansas debate and forensics teachers. Participants reported that students find it not at all to slightly difficult to get extra support when needed at the schools of Kansas debate and forensics teachers. Respondents agreed that a few more or several more resources are needed to support student learning. Kansas debate and forensics teachers reported that their schools struggle a little bit or some due to lack of resources. Participants also reported that the learning spaces of Kansas debate and forensics teachers feel slightly crowded or somewhat crowded. However, debate and forensics disagreed that they do not spend a tremendous amount of their own money on their classrooms and reported that Kansas debate and forensics teachers spend some to quite a bit of their own money on their classrooms. Debate and forensics teachers from 1A-3A schools found it not at all difficult to slightly difficult for students who need extra support to get it, while teachers

from 4A-6A schools found it slightly difficult to somewhat difficult for students who need extra support to get the extra support needed. Debate and forensics teachers from 1A-3A schools also found learning spaces at their schools not at all crowded to slightly crowded, while teachers from 4A-6A schools found learning spaces at their schools slightly crowded to somewhat crowded. Regarding the differences based on type of teacher, debate and forensics teachers perceived the need for additional resources to support student learning more strongly than debate or forensics teachers. There were no differences regarding adequate SEL resources in the schools of Kansas debate and forensics teachers based on the interaction between school classification and teacher type.

Nine of the findings regarding confidence in promoting student growth and development related to SEL were meaningful. When participants responded to the survey, they were somewhat to quite confident they could: engage students who are not typically motivated, knew the content that they teach thoroughly, can move through material at a pace that works for all students, could have productive conversations with upset parents, and could meet the needs of their most advanced learners. Kansas debate and forensics teachers were somewhat to quite easily able to think of a new teaching strategy when another fails. Participants were somewhat to quite effective at managing disruptive classes. Kansas debate and forensics teachers also reported they were somewhat to quite confident they could engage unmotivated students. Participants reported they were somewhat to quite clearly able to explain complicated content to students. There were no differences regarding the confidence in promoting student growth and development related to SEL based on school classification, teacher type, or the interaction between school classification and teacher type.

Twelve of the findings regarding Kansas debate and forensics teacher's perceptions that they are ready to address issues of diversity were noteworthy. When participants responded to the survey, they agreed that it is quite easy to interact with a student from a different cultural background. Participants also agreed they are quite comfortable incorporating new material about people from different backgrounds into their curriculum. Respondents reported they were somewhat knowledgeable regarding where to find resources for students with unique learning needs. Respondents were somewhat to quite comfortable intervening if students from a different background struggled to get along in their class. Kansas debate and forensics teachers found it somewhat to quite easy to teach a class with students from very different religious backgrounds. Kansas debate and forensics teachers reported they were quite comfortable having conversations about race with their students. Participants were somewhat to quite comfortable having a student who cannot communicate well in class due to a unique home language. Participants were also somewhat to quite easily able to think of strategies to address sensitive issues of diversity in their classrooms. Regarding the interaction between school classification and teacher type, teachers from 1A-3A schools who teach debate and forensics reported lower comfort incorporating new material about people from different backgrounds into their curriculum than those who teach debate and forensics at 4A-6A schools, and teachers from 4A-6A schools who teach debate or forensics reported lower comfort incorporating new material about people from different backgrounds into their curriculum than teachers from 4A-6A schools who teach debate and forensics. Participants from 1A-3A schools who teach debate or forensics reported higher confidence in the knowledge regarding where to find resources for students with

unique learning needs than participants from 4A-6A schools who teach debate or forensics. Teachers from 1A-3A schools who teach debate or forensics reported higher confidence that they could easily make a particularly overweight student feel like a part of the class than the teachers from 1A-3A schools who teach debate and forensics. There were no differences regarding Kansas debate and forensics teacher's perceptions that they are ready to address issues of diversity based on school classification or teacher type.

None of the findings regarding the respondent's perceptions that they often integrate SEL activities into their classrooms were meaningful. No differences were found regarding Kansas debate and forensics teacher's perceptions that they often integrate SEL activities in their classrooms, no differences in perceptions that participants often integrate SEL activities into their classrooms based on school classification, teacher type. Finally, there were no differences in perceptions found in the interaction between school classification and teacher type.

Findings Related to the Literature

The following section contains a discussion of the results as they relate to the literature on SEL reviewed in Chapter 2. Included in the literature are topics related to SEL professional development opportunities, SEL resources, student growth and SEL, issues of diversity, and cocurricular activities and SEL. A comparison of relevant literature on SEL and the results of the current study returns several differences and similarities. The discussion is found below, following the order of the research questions.

The study's first set of research questions were formulated to determine teachers' perceptions of SEL professional development opportunities available to them, and if there are differences in those perceptions based on teacher type and school classification. The

results of the current study indicated that Kansas debate and forensics teachers perceive their schools to be quite supportive of their growth as an educator through professional development opportunities, which is similar to the findings of Reyes et al. (2012) who concluded that high quality professional development led teachers to have improved implementation and to perceive higher support from building leaders. However, this finding is also in contrast with Torff and Sessions (2008), who concluded that secondary teachers tend to have less favorable views of professional development opportunities.

Furthermore, the results of this study indicated that Kansas debate and forensics teachers learn a great deal from their colleagues, which is analogous with Wilson and Berne (1999), who found that professional development can occur in many formats, including learning from peers in a variety of methods. The results of the current study also indicated that Kansas debate and forensics teachers disagreed that professional development was relatable to the content they teach, which aligns with Lewis (2014) that SEL framework must be clearly defined within the school culture, and with Leithwood et al. (2004) that SEL professional development can only be effective if the organization does a broad redesign with training clearly articulated by building leadership.

The results of the current study also indicated that Kansas debate and forensics teachers do not believe they learn from building leadership, which is in agreement with research conducted by Leithwood et al. (2004) and Hardy (2018). Leithwood et al. (2004) noted that leaders must have clear direction and guidance in order to effectively implement SEL professional development that teachers can use in their classrooms and as part of the building culture.

The analysis that addressed Research Questions (5-8) was focused on Kansas debate and forensics teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of SEL resources in their schools and the differences in the perceptions based on teacher type and school classification. The results of the current study indicated that Kansas debate and forensics teachers need more adequate resources in terms of technology, room size, and support for student learning, which is in agreement with the findings of Leithwood et al. (2002), Leithwood et al. (2004), and Zins et al. (2007) that organizational capital including well-structured environments is key to supporting student learning and teacher growth in SEL.

The results of the current study also provided evidence that Kansas debate and forensics teachers report students must wait to get extra support when needed, which is analogous with the research of Van Holten (2016) that indicated teachers need resources to improve diversity instruction and support diverse learners in their classrooms. The current students reporting of teacher perceptions on lack of support and need for additional resources are also in agreement with the research of Youngblood (2015), who concluded that lack of resources was a barrier to effective SEL implementation. In contrast to Leithwood et al. (2002), Leithwood et al. (2004), Witziers et al. (2003), and Zins et al. (2007), findings from the current study indicated that size of the school might play a difference in the resources available for SEL instruction, and how organizational capital is utilized. The results of the current study indicated that teachers in larger school classifications 4A-6A reported that their learning environments are more crowded than the learning environments of their smaller school counterparts. Debate and forensics teachers at large schools also indicated that students have to wait longer for extra support than those at small classification 1A-3A schools.

Research questions 9-12 were developed to determine Kansas debate and forensics teacher's confidence in promoting student growth and learning. The current research indicated that Kansas debate and forensics teachers perceive themselves as effective at helping struggling learners. Additionally, Kansas debate and forensics teachers indicated that they are able to engage all students and explain difficult content, which is in agreement with Nye et al. (2004), who concluded that teacher effectiveness could improve outcomes for struggling learners. Likewise, in the current study, it was found that Kansas debate and forensics teachers perceive that they can meet the needs of the most advanced learners effectively while adapting to the needs of struggling learners, which is consistent with research by Stronge (2010) who concluded that effective teachers who are highly influential have a lasting impact on student achievement for all learners.

The results of the current study stand in contrast to the research of Anderson (2017), who concluded that educators often struggled to meet the needs of all students and to engage students with disabilities effectively. Kansas debate and forensics teachers reported that they are confident in the knowledge of their content area and are able to explain complex topics to all learners, which supports the research of Moudry-Quilty (2007) who concluded that content area teachers are confident in their knowledge of their individual content areas even if they do not know all elements of SEL instruction.

Research questions 13-16 were designed to determine Kansas debate and forensics teachers' readiness to address issues of diversity in their classrooms. The current study concluded that Kansas debate and forensics teachers are comfortable having difficult conversations about race and incorporating diverse materials from different

backgrounds into their classrooms. This finding stands in contrast to research conducted by Suárez-Orozco (2000) and Fu (2013), who concluded that educators often standardize materials and instruction based on mainstreaming cultural norms and stereotypes. However, the results of the current study did indicate a discrepancy based on the size of the school in how comfortable teachers were in finding and incorporating diverse materials, teachers at 1A-3A schools reported higher discomfort in locating and using diverse materials in their classrooms.

Kansas debate and forensics teachers also indicated that perceptions of their willingness to have students who struggle to communicate in class were positive. Kansas debate and forensics teachers perceive that it is easy to have a student with a unique home language barrier in class. This finding disagrees with research by Byrnes et al. (1997) that found that teachers' attitudes toward students with communication challenges like ELL students are typically more negative. Kansas debate and forensics teachers may be more willing to work with students who have language barriers in the classroom.

Conclusions

Schools are increasingly facing new demands to meet the needs of the whole child. The changing nature of education now means that administrators, teachers, and support staff must be prepared to address the social-emotional learning needs of the students in their buildings as well as the academic needs. As discussed in Chapter 1, SEL education offers the potential to address concerns about student achievement, health, and social behavior in school settings, the community, and the homes of students. In order to achieve the full benefits offered from SEL implementation, district leaders must take a whole system approach that spreads through each building administrator, and that is

clearly articulated to their staff. SEL needs are not only addressed in individual classrooms but also by teachers who work in co-curricular content areas, who, by the nature of their jobs, spend additional hours outside of the classroom working with students. Kansas debate and forensics coaches spend long hours in the classroom, and outside of the classroom at practices and competitions working with students. Data from survey results have the potential to help administrators guide SEL implementation in the districts, help professional organizations to support the needs of teachers, and help teachers understand the unique needs of the Kansas debate and forensics communities. The following subsections include implications for action, recommendations for future research, and concluding remarks.

Implications for action. The current study results provide guidance for action on SEL instruction. It is impossible to make broad generalizations about debate and forensics teachers across the nation based on the perceptions of a set of Kansas debate and forensics teachers, which merits further analysis; however, there is meaningful action that can be taken as a result of the current study. The current research has implications for action for Kansas debate and forensics teachers, administrators, state organizations, and national organizations.

Based on the results of the current study, there are implications for further action for Kansas debate and forensics teachers. Kansas debate and forensics teachers indicated that they learn a great deal from peers, and teachers may want to utilize this peer to peer learning to seek out additional methods for teaching difficult content to all learners, adapting materials for struggling students, finding ways to supplement resources, and locating culturally diverse materials for their classrooms. It may be helpful for teachers

at larger classifications 4A-6A to reach out to their peers at small schools to help them locate and develop diverse resources for their classrooms and students. The current research results also indicate that Kansas debate and forensics teachers may want to explore additional education and professional development opportunities on SEL instruction so that they are able to further implement SEL strategies into their classrooms and work to educate the whole child. Madueke (2014) concluded that teachers perceive SEL instruction to be incredibly important in teaching and educating students. Kansas debate and forensics teachers also have a role in implementing and using SEL in their classrooms and on their competitive teams.

Building administrators may also benefit from the results of the current study. Principals may want to focus professional development opportunities on elements of SEL and strategies for engaging all students. Building leaders must find a way to model educational strategies of SEL and incorporate professional learning that is meaningful and applicable in all content areas. Darling-Hammond (2019) explained that schools with system SEL programs had better behavioral outcomes, fewer discipline issues, and students who were empowered to ask for help when needed. These outcomes are limited by the effectiveness of building leadership. Lewis (2014) found that teachers need clear direction and guidance to make SEL implementation effective. Leadership must consider the perceptions of teachers in each content area and how professional development can be applied effectively for each content in order to implement strategies like SEL systematic.

State organizations like the Kansas Speech Communication Association (KSCA) and the KSHSAA may find the results of the current research applicable. The KSCA works to educate Kansas debate and forensics teachers on elements of coaching, teaching,

and provide instruction on issues of equity and diversity. Future materials and conference sessions may want to focus on SEL and how it can be incorporated into the classrooms of Kansas debate and forensics teachers so that there is a cohesive framework for effective SEL instruction in debate and forensics classes. Additionally, these state organizations may want to help locate and provide resources for educating diverse student populations. A final implication for state organizations that govern Kansas debate and forensics educators lies in the promotion of resources and finding ways to help debate and forensics instruction be equitable for all students in Kansas who participate in those classes.

Finally, national organizations like the NSDA have actions they can take. The NSDA has long held the goal of empowering the voices of our nation's youth to be heard. Timmons (2016) noted that empowering students' voices includes embracing ways to empower all students, no matter how diverse their needs are. To this end, the NSDA should consider providing professional development that centers on educating the whole student through SEL. Additionally, the NSDA should continue to celebrate diversity and encourage coaches to use the diverse set of classroom materials that are produced and provided to debate and forensics educators who are members of the organization. National organizations have an opportunity to reach a greater number of educators, which increases the direct impact on students participating in debate and forensics activities across the United States. The NSDA has committed to an increased focus on issues of diversity and equity, and the results of this research indicate that they should consider expanding that focus to include elements of SEL.

Recommendations for future research. The first recommendation for future research is to replicate this research and take into consideration the gender of participants and years of teaching experience. Analyzing gender may yield insight into Kansas debate and forensics teachers' familiarity with SEL and how they incorporate it into their classrooms. The second recommendation is to replicate this research in other states or through a larger body like the NSDA to compare the perceptions of debate and forensics educators from across the United States. Replicating the survey in other states may offer insight into how systemically SEL is being implemented in the classrooms of debate and forensics teachers throughout the United States.

A third recommendation for future research is to consider the perceptions of students in debate and forensics classrooms in the areas of SEL included in this study. In some instances, the perceptions of students could differ significantly from the perceptions of their teachers since teachers often struggle with self-rating in difficult areas of conversation. Replicating this study using the Panorama Surveys for students may offer meaningful information and insight into how students view the implementation and effectiveness of SEL in our schools.

A fourth recommendation for future research is to replicate this study and provide the participants with a definition for SEL and add open-ended questions from the Panorama Teacher Surveys to allow Kansas debate and forensics teachers to isolate specific areas of SEL that they feel their schools need to address. Providing a definition of SEL would ensure that all respondents have the same idea of what SEL entails as they participate in the survey. Allowing narrative responses would also allow teachers to

clarify their perceptions and may provide meaningful insight into SEL implementation in debate and forensics classrooms.

A fifth recommendation is to replicate the current research but use different Panorama surveys on SEL. Panorama has a wealth of survey instruments, and some of those instruments such as "Grit," "Faculty-Family Relationships," and "Faculty Growth Mindset" may provide additional insight into how SEL is used in the classrooms of co-curricular educators in the state of Kansas. SEL has a wide array of educational components, and further research is needed to determine the extent SEL is being implemented in the classrooms of Kansas debate and forensics teachers.

A sixth recommendation is to replicate the current research but offer the survey to other co-curricular teachers like band, choir, and drama teachers. Many classes have similar requirements for in-school and out-of-school instruction. Asking other co-curricular content teachers to participate in the survey will also allow future researchers to draw comparisons between the perceptions of those who teach debate and forensics and those who teach other content on how SEL is used in their content areas.

Finally, the current study could be replicated and offered to core content teachers and teachers who do not teach co-curricular classes at the secondary level. This information could also be compared to the perceptions of core content teachers or those who do not teach co-curricular courses to see if there are significant differences in the perceptions based off of the content taught. Comparisons could also be made between teachers who have co-curricular classes and those who just teach curricular courses.

Concluding remarks. Finding ways to ensure that educators are aware of the components of SEL and are incorporating SEL into their classroom instruction continues

to be of concern, especially in co-curricular content areas like debate and forensics, where teachers spend long hours working to educate and coach students. Focus on SEL teaching strategies tends to be broad in scope. That broad focus may mean that educators in specific content areas perceive that SEL professional development is not relevant or useful in their classrooms. Administrators and teachers must seek ways to create caring environments that accept diverse populations of students regardless of their backgrounds, and that the social-emotional needs of students are addressed in addition to their academic needs. With the increase of diversity and equity issues in our schools, it is imperative that education shifts to a focus on the whole child. Durlack et al. (2011) noted that a whole-child educational focus develops and fosters positive relationships and culture not only in the individual classrooms of teachers but also throughout the entire school community. The integration of SEL instruction equips teachers to build stronger relationships, create healthier school culture, and promote the success of all students regardless of their background or educational needs.

References

Adada, N. N. (2007). *The role of technology in teachers' professional development* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Southern Mississippi). Retrieved from http://aquila.usm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2290&context=dissertations

Anderson, V. (2017). *The importance of teaching social-emotional learning to intellectually disabled students* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 1952703488)

Arbenz, C., & Beltran, S. (2001). *First affirmatives, first negatives and first generation students.* Paper presented at the Western States Communication Association conference, Coeur d' Alene, Idaho.

Belfield, C., Bowden, A. B., Klapp, A., Levin, H., Shand, R., & Zander, S. (2015). The economic value of social and emotional learning. *Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis*, *6*(3), 508-544. https://doi.org/10.1017/bca.2015.55

Berman, S. (2018). What we've learned about implementing social-emotional learning. *The School Administrator*, *75*(8), 32-36. Retrieved from http://my.aasa.org/AASA/Resources/SAMag/2018/Sep18/Berman.aspx

Bernard, M. E. (2006). It's time we teach social-emotional competence as well as we teach academic competence. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, *22*(2), 103-119. https://doi.org/10.1080/10573560500242184

Bhagabati, N. (1986). *Co-curricular activities organized in the secondary schools of Assam, and its relevance on physical, social, emotional aspects of adolescent girls and boys (Doctoral dissertation).* Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 1789669514)

Bird, K. A., & Sultmann, W. F. (2010). Social and emotional learning: Reporting a system approach to developing relationships, nurturing well-being, and invigorating learning. *Educational & Child Psychology, 27(*1), 143-155. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/e032/81044004c0516e92499cf237ffd46f8da5a2.pdf

Blair, C., & Razza, R. P. (2007). Relating effortful control, executive function, and false belief understanding to emerging math and literacy ability in kindergarten. *Child Development, 78*(2), 647-663. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01019.x

Bridgeland, J., Bruce, M., & Hariharan, M. (2013). *The missing piece*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED558068)

Buchanan, R., Gueldner, B. A., Tran, O. K., & Merrell, K. W. (2009). Social and emotional learning in classrooms: A survey of teachers' knowledge, perceptions, and practices. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 25*(2), 187–203. doi:10.1080/15377900802487078

Byrnes, D. A., Kiger, G, & Manning, M. L. (1997). Teachers' attitudes about language diversity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 13*(6), 637-644. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(97)80006-6

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2013). Mental health surveillance among children– United States, 2005–2011. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR), 62*(02), 1–35. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/su6202a1.htm

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (2013). *CASEL guide: Effective social and emotional learning programs—Preschool and elementary school* (2nd ed.). Retrieved from https://casel.org/ preschool-and-elementary-edition-casel-guide/

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (2015). *2015 CASEL guide: Effective social and emotional learning programs: Middle and high school edition.* Retrieved from http://secondaryguide.casel.org/casel-secondary-guide.pdf

Collie, R., Shapka, J. D., Perry, N. E., & Martin, A. J. (2015). Teachers' beliefs about social-emotional learning: Identifying teacher profiles and their relations with job stress and satisfaction. *Learning & Instruction, 39*, 148-157. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2015.06.002

Cooper, C. (2003). The detrimental impact of teacher bias: Lessons learned from the standpoint of African American mothers. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 30*(2), 101-116. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ852360)

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Daniels, L. M., Stupnisky, R. H., Pekrun, R., Haynes, T. L., Perry, R. P., & Newall, N. E. (2009). A longitudinal analysis of achievement goals: From affective antecedents to emotional effects and achievement outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*(4), 948-963. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ860903)

Darling-Hammond, L. (2019). What makes social-emotional learning so important? *Education Digest, 84*(6), 4-10. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED581059)

Das, D. (2016). Role of co-curricular activities in bringing all-round development to the students of high school stage with specials reference to Guwahati, India: A study. *Clarion: International Multidisciplinary Journal, 5*(2), 75–81. doi:10.5958/2277-937X.2016.00035.6

Davis, H. A. (2003). Conceptualizing the role and influence of student-teacher relationships on children's social and cognitive development. *Educational Psychologist, 38*(4), 207–234. doi:10.1207/S15326985EP3804_2

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Culture conflict in the classroom.* New York: The New Press.

Denham, S. A., & Brown, C. (2010). "Plays nice with others": Social-emotional learning and academic success. *Early Education and Development, 21*(5), 652-680. doi:10.1080/10409289.2010.497450

Diekstra, R. F. W. (2008). Effectiveness of school-based social and emotional education programmes worldwide. In R. Diekstra (Ed.), *Social and emotional education: An international analysis* (pp. 255-312). Santender, Spain: Fundacion Marcelino Botin.

Doll, B. (2010). Positive school climate. *Principal Leadership, 11*(4), 12. Retrieved from https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:a-tjqnR2SMoJ:https://www.nasponline.org/Documents/Resources%2520and%2520Publications/Handouts/Families%2520and%2520Educators/School_ClimatePLDec10_ftsp.pdf+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us

Douglass, A. G. (2011). *Inservice and preservice teacher knowledge and perceptions of social emotional learning and its impact on reading and overall academic attainment* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 909001907)

Durlak, J. A., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., Weissberg, R. P., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development, 82(*1), 405-422. doi:10.111/j. 1467-8624.2010.01564.x

Eklund, K., Kilpatrick, K. D., Kilgus, S. P., Haider, A., & Eckert, T. (2018). A systematic review of state-level social-emotional learning standards: Implications for practice and research. *School Psychology Review*, *47*(3), 316–326. https://doi.org/10.17105/SPR-2017.0116.V47-3

Elias, M. J. (2006). The connection between academic and social- emotional learning. In M. J. Elias, & H. Arnold (Eds.), *The Educator's Guide to Emotional Intelligence and Academic Achievement* (pp. 1–14). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Elias, M. J. (2013). The character of schools, the character of individuals, and the character of society: Creating educational policy to reflect this inextricable interconnection. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy, Special Issue,* 141–149. ISSN:17394341

Elias, M. J., Zins, J. E., Weissberg, R. P., Frey, K. S., Greenberg, M. T., Haynes, N. M., Kessler, R., … Shriver, T. (1997). *Promoting social and emotional learning: Guidelines for educators*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED414020)

Evans, R., Scourfield, J., & Murphy, S. (2015). The unintended consequences of targeting: Young people's lived experiences of social and emotional learning interventions. *British Educational Research Journal*, *41*(3), 381-397. Retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/berj.3155

Ferguson, D. L., Hanreddy, A., & Draxton, S. (2011). Giving students voice as a strategy for improving teacher practice. *London Review of Education*, *9*(1), 55-70. doi:10.1080/14748460.2011.550435

Fermanich, M. L. (2003). *School resources and student achievement: The effect of school-level resources on instructional practices and student outcomes in Minneapolis public schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 305282167)

Fixsen, D. L., Blase, K. A., Naoom, S. F., & Wallace, F. (2009). Core implementation components. *Research on Social Work Practice, 19*(5), 531–540. doi:10.1177/1049731509335549

Ford, D., Grantham, T., & Harris III, J. (1998). Multicultural gifted education: A wake up call to the profession. *Roeper Review, 19*(2), 72-78. doi:10.1080/02783199609553794

Fowler, F. J. (2009). *Survey research methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Fu, J. (2013). *Teaching for diversity: Addressing diversity issues in responsive ESL instruction* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 1490588106)

Gager, P. J., & Elias, M. J. (1997). Implementing prevention programs in high-risk environments: Application of the resiliency paradigm. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 67*(3), 363–373. doi:10.1037/h0080239

Gehlbach, H. (2015). *User guide social-emotional learning.* Retrieved from https://www.panoramaed.com/social-emotional-learning

Gehlbach, H. (2018). *User guide Panorama teacher and staff survey.* Retrieved https://www.panoramaed.com/social-emotional-learning

Gillespie, P. A. (2008). *Examining the perceptions of American educators on meeting the social and emotional needs of students* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 304689190)

Gissy, C. L. (2010). *Elementary teachers' attitudes about professional development: Professional development schools versus non-professional development schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 859577003)

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ.* New York, NY: Bantam Books.

Gollnick, D., & Chinn, P. (1986). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society (*2nd *ed.)*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Gould, C. A. (2015). *Career and technical education teachers' perceptions on the use of student growth data in teacher evaluation* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 1687799779)

Greenberg, M. T., Weissberg, R. P., O'Brien, M. U., Zins, J. E., Fredericks, L., Resnik, H., & Elias, M. J. (2003). Enhancing school-based prevention and youth development through coordinated social, emotional, and academic learning. *American Psychologist, 58*(6-7), 466–474. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.58.6-7.466

Haberman, M. (1995). *Star teachers of children of poverty.* West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.

Hamre, B. K., Pianta, R. C., Mashburn, A. J., & Downer, J. T. (2012). Promoting young emotional learning initiatives in schools. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 65*(2), 149-163. doi:10.1037/a0032665

Hardy, S. J. (2018). *The role of leadership in social-emotional learning implementation: Making sense of social-emotional learning initiatives* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 2039435227)

Hensley, D., Carlin, D, & Riffer, C. (2020). *Mastering Competitive Debate* 8th Ed. Des Moines, IA: Perfection Learning.

Ingvarson, L., Meiers, M., & Beavis, A. (2005). Factors affecting the impact of professional development programs on teachers' knowledge, practice, student outcomes and efficacy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 13*(10), 1-28. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ846522)

Johnson, R. L. A. (2017). *"The missing piece": Developing opportunities through social emotional learning to support student success* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 1914683761)

Jones, T. M. (2018). *Understanding race differences in academic outcomes, school climate and social emotional learning to promote racial equity and policy reform* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 2125498554)

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development* 3rd ed. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kansas State High School Activities Association. (2018). *KSHSAA handbook,* (2018-2019 ed.). Retrieved from http://www.kshsaa.org/Publications/Handbook.pdf

Kansas State High School Activities Association. (2019a). 2018-19 spring high school student activity participation survey. *KSHSAA May Journal, 81*(10), 29. Retrieved from http://www.kshsaa.org/Publications/May.pdf

Kansas State High School Activities Association. (2019b). KSHSAA 2019 fall senior high school student activity participation survey. *KSHSAA November Journal, 82*(4), 7. Retrieved from http://www.kshsaa.org/Publications/november.pdf

Kothari, K. R. (2004). *Research methodology.* Daryaganj, New Delhi: New Age International (P) Limited Publishers.

Kubista, J. R. (2015). *Social emotional learning to develop positive culture and climate* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 1826873671)

Lantieri, L. (2012). Cultivating the social, emotional, and inner lives of children and teachers. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 21*(2), 27-33. Retrieved from http://reclaimingjournal.com/

Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning.* New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation.

Leithwood, K., Steinbach, R., & Jantzi, D. (2002). School leadership and teachers' motivation to implement accountability policies. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(1), 94-119. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.862.58&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Lewis, S. (2014). *Elementary teachers' perspectives of traditional classroom management training and social emotional learning* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 1562268648)

Lewkowicz, A. (2007). *Teaching emotional intelligence: Strategies and activities for helping students make effective choices.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lunenburg, F. C., & Irby, B. J. (2008). *Writing a successful thesis or dissertation: Tips and strategies for students in the social and behavioral sciences.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press

Madueke, N. A. (2014). *Teachers' perceptions of their responsibilities in teaching social emotional skills: A case study*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 1719055993)

Mahoney, J. L., & Weissberg, R. P. (2018). SEL: What the research says. *Educational Leadership*, *76*(2), 34-35. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ1193584)

Mantz, L. S. (2017). *School-based social-emotional development: The role of relationships and teaching* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 1975370672)

Mart, A. K., Weissberg, R. P., & Kendziora, K. (2015). Systemic support for social and emotional learning in school districts. In J. A. Durlak, C. E. Domitrovich, R. P. Weissberg, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Handbook of social and emotional learning: Research and practice* (pp. 482–499). New York, NY: Guilford.

McGarrigle, D. M., Caira, M. A., Jr., Hardy, S. J., & Langlois, D. (2018). *The role of leadership in social-emotional learning implementation: Leadership and classroom environment* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 2039005842)

Minckler, C. H. (2014). School leadership that builds teacher social capital. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 42*(5), 657-679. Retrieved from https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1741143213510502

Motsinger, S. E. (2018). *Social-emotional learning and restorative practices and its impact on perceptions of teacher and student relationships* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 2119707820)

Moudry-Quilty, K. (2007). Teaching paraprofessionals how to write and implement social stories for students with autism spectrum disorders. *Remedial and Special Education, 28*(3), 182-189. https://doi.org/10.1177/07419325070280030701

Murray, S. D., Hurley, J., & Ahmed, S. R. (2015). Supporting the whole child through coordinated policies, processes, and practices. *Journal of School Health, 85*(11), 795–801. doi:10.1111/josh.12306

National Speech and Debate Association. (2019). *High school competition events guide.* Retrieved from https://www.speechanddebate.org/wp-content/uploads/HS-Competition-Events-At-A-Glance_2019-12-17.pdf

Newton, J. A. (2018). *How theater for social awareness and social emotional learning affects public high school students: A narrative inquiry* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 2170120135)

Nye, B., Konstantopoulos, S., & Hedges, L. V. (2004). How large are teacher effects? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 26*(3), 237-257. Retrieved from https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.3102/01623737026003237

Oberle, E., Domitrovich, C. E., Meyers, D. C., & Weissberg, R. P. (2016). Establishing systemic social and emotional learning approaches in schools: A framework for schoolwide implementation. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 46*(3), 277-297. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ1107271)

Osher, D., Sprague, J., Weissberg, R. P., Keenan, S., & Zins, J. E. (2008). A comprehensive approach to promoting social, emotional, and academic growth in contemporary schools. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology IV* (pp. 1263-1278). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Payton, J. W., Wardlaw, D. M., Graczyk, P. A., Bloodworth, M. R., Tompsett, C. J., & Weissberg, R. P. (2000). Social and emotional learning: A framework for promoting mental health and reducing risk behavior in children and youth. *Journal of School Health, 70*(5), 179–185. doi: 10.1111/j.1746-1561.2000.tb06468.x

Payton, J. W., Weissberg, R. P., Durlak, J. A., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., Schellinger, K. B., & Pachan, M. (2008). *The positive impact of social and emotional learning for kindergarten to eighth grade students: Findings from three scientific reviews.* Retrieved from http://www.lpfch.org/sel/PackardES-REV.pdf

Pillar, J. D. (2016). *Influences of co-curricular participation on academic success and persistence among sophomore students* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 1807435916)

Prince, C. D., Schuermann, P. J., Guthrie, J. W., Witham, P. J., Milanowski, A. T., & Thom, C. A. (2009). *The other 69 percent: Fairly rewarding the performance of teachers of non-tested subjects and grades.* Retrieved from http://www1.gcsnc.com/whatmatters/pdf/other69Percent.pdf

Reyes, M. R., Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., Elbertson, N. A., & Salovey, P. (2012). The interaction effects of program training, dosage, and implementation quality on targeted student outcomes for The RULER approach to social and emotional learning. *School Psychology Review, 41*(1), 82–99. Retrieved from http://ei.yale.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/pub318_Reyesetal2012_SPR.pdf

Ronald, A. (2017). Women in competitive forensics. *The Rostrum, 91*(3), 22-47. Retrieved from https://issuu.com/speechanddebate/docs/2017_winter_rostrum_web/44

Rowe, H. L., & Trickett, E. J. (2018). Student diversity representation and reporting in universal school-based social and emotional learning programs: Implications for generalizability. *Educational Psychology Review, 30*(2), 559-583. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ1179099)

Sackett, P. R., & Larson, J. R. (1990). Research strategies and tactics in industrial and organizational psychology. *Handbook of industrial and organization psychology*, pp.419-489. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.

Simmons, D. (2019). Why we can't afford whitewashed social-emotional learning. *ASCD Education Update, 61*(4), 2-3. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/newsletters/education_update/apr19/vol61/num04/Why_We_Can't_Afford_Whitewashed_Social-Emotional_Learning.aspx

Simon, M. K. (2011). *Assumptions, Limitations and Delimitations* [Online reader version]. Retrieved from http://dissertationrecipes.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/AssumptionslimitationsdelimitationsX.pdf

Stronge, J. H. (2010). *Effective teachers = student achievement: What the research says.* Larchmont, New York: Eye on Education.

Suárez-Orozco, M. (2000). Everything you ever wanted to know about assimilation but were afraid to ask. *Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 129(4),* 1-30. Retrieved from https://eportfolios.macaulay.cuny.edu/benediktsson2014t/files/2014/01/Orozco-Everything-About-Assimilation.pdf

Timmons, C. (2016). Improving access for women in the debate classroom. *The Rostrum 91*(2), 33. Retrieved from https://issuu.com/speechanddebate/docs/2016_fall_rostrum_web?e=11541328/40738896

Torff, B., & Sessions, D. (2008). Factors associated with teachers' attitudes about professional development. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 35*(2), 123-133. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ817314)

Wilson, S. M., & Berne, J. (1999). Teacher learning and the acquisition of professional knowledge: An examination of research on contemporary professional development. *Review of Research in Education, 24*(173), 173-209. doi:10.3102/0091732x024001173

Witziers, B., Bosker, R. J., & Krüger, M. L. (2003). Educational leadership and student achievement: The elusive search for an association. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*(3), 398-425. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X03253411

Woods, S. (2003). Changing the game? Embracing the advocacy standard. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, 24*, 85-99. Retrieved from https://debate.uvm.edu/woods.doc

Van Holten, D. L. (2016). *Classroom teachers' perceptions of effective training programs: Professional development schools vs. non-professional development schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 1848277354)

Yeager, D. S. (2017). Social and emotional learning programs for adolescents. *Future of Children, 27*(1), 73-94. Retrieved from https://labs.la.utexas.edu/adrg/files/2013/12/5-Adolescence-Yeager-2.pdf

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

Young, K. M. (2011). Impossible convictions: Convictions and internality in performance and switch-side debate. *Contemporary Argumentation & Debate, 32,* 1-44. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/2774995/IMPOSSIBLE_CONVICTIONS_CONVICTIONS_AND_INTENTIONALITY_IN_PERFORMANCE_AND_SWITCH-SIDE_DEBATE

Youngblood, S. Y. (2015). *Teachers' perspective on implementing social-emotional learning standards* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (ProQuest No. 1724022631)

Zins, J. E., Bloodworth, M. R., Weissberg, R. P., & Walberg, H. J. (2007). The scientific base linking social and emotional learning to school success. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 17*(3), 191-210. doi:10.1080/10474410701413145

Zins, J. E., & Elias, M. J. (2006). Social and emotional learning. In G. G. Bwar & K. M. Minke (Eds.), *Children's needs III: Development, prevention, and intervention* (pp. 1–13). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

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

Zins, J. E., Weissberg, R. P., Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (2004). *Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say?* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Appendices

Appendix A: IRB Approval Letter

Baker University Institutional Review Board

August 30th, 2019

Dear Megan Hagaman and Susan Rogers,

The Baker University IRB has reviewed your project application and approved this project under Expedited Status Review. As described, the project complies with all the requirements and policies established by the University for protection of human subjects in research. Unless renewed, approval lapses one year after approval date.

Please be aware of the following:

1. Any significant change in the research protocol as described should be reviewed by this Committee prior to altering the project.
2. Notify the IRB about any new investigators not named in original application.
3. When signed consent documents are required, the primary investigator must retain the signed consent documents of the research activity.
4. If this is a funded project, keep a copy of this approval letter with your proposal/grant file.
5. If the results of the research are used to prepare papers for publication or oral presentation at professional conferences, manuscripts or abstracts are requested for IRB as part of the project record.

Please inform this Committee or myself when this project is terminated or completed. As noted above, you must also provide IRB with an annual status report and receive approval for maintaining your status. If you have any questions, please contact me at npoell@bakeru.edu or 785.594.4582.

Sincerely,

Nathan Poell, MA
Chair, Baker University IRB

Baker University IRB Committee
Scott Crenshaw
Jamin Perry, PhD
Susan Rogers, PhD

Appendix B: Solicitation Email

Dear Kansas Debate and/or Forensics Teacher:

You have been selected to participate in a study of Kansas debate and forensics teachers' perceptions of social emotional learning. I am interested in your perceptions of the integration of social emotional learning instruction into your classroom and of the SEL professional development opportunities and classroom resources available to you, your confidence in promoting student growth and development related to SEL, and your readiness to address issues of diversity in your classroom. I am further interested in the effect KSHSAA school classification and teacher assignment (debate, forensics, debate and forensics) may have on the aforementioned perceptions of debate and forensics teachers.

I appreciate your willingness to participate in this study. The survey can be completed in about fifteen minutes. In order for the responses to be validated for measurement, please help me by clicking the link at the end of this email, and then completing the survey by Friday, October 4, 2019. Privacy is an important concern. Information received from you as you complete this survey will be anonymous, and no information reported will point to individual schools, or individual participants. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may elect to stop participation at any point in time without repercussion. You may choose to answer all, or some of the questions listed in the survey. Confidentiality and the anonymity of participants will be maintained.

If you have concerns or questions about your rights as a participant in this research, please contact me (MeganLHagaman@stu.bakeru.edu or 785-787-9696). Should you need additional assistance with other questions do not hesitate to contact my major advisor, Dr. Susan Rogers (srogers@bakeru.edu or 785-230-2801).

To begin the survey, please click on the link:

https://forms.gle/epaUWzctj49aV9gRA

I greatly appreciate your time.

Cordially,

Megan L. Hagaman
Baker University Doctoral Candidate

Appendix C: Survey Items

Social-Emotional Learning Survey of Debate and Forensics Teachers

Part I: Demographics

Please complete the following demographic items by selecting the appropriate response from the drop down menu.

1. What course(s) do you coach? (Dropdown menu: Debate Only. Forensics Only. Both Debate and Forensics).

2. What classification is your current school for debate and/or forensics participation? (Dropdown menu: 6A, 5A, 4A, 3A, 2A, 1A).

Part II: Professional Learning/Professional Development Opportunities

Please read each question and then select the response that indicates your answer based on your perceptions of your school as a debate and/or forensics educator.

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Overall, how supportive has the school been of your growth as a teacher?	Not at all supportive	Slightly supportive	Somewhat supportive	Quite supportive	Extremely supportive
2. At your school, how valuable are the available professional development opportunities?	Not at all valuable	Slightly valuable	Somewhat valuable	Quite valuable	Extremely valuable
3. How helpful are your colleagues' ideas for improving your teaching?	Not at all helpful	Slightly helpful	Somewhat helpful	Quite helpful	Extremely helpful
4. How often do your professional development opportunities help you explore new ideas?	Almost never	Once in a while	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost all the time

5. How relevant have your professional development opportunities been to the content that you teach?	Not at all relevant	Slightly relevant	Somewhat relevant	Quite relevant	Extremely relevant
6. Through working at your school, how many new teaching strategies have you learned?	Almost no strategies	A few strategies	Some strategies	Many strategies	A great number of strategies
7. How much input do you have into individualizing your own professional development opportunities?	Almost no input	A Little bit of input	Some input	Quite a bit of input	A tremendous amount of input
8. Overall, how much do you learn about teaching from the leaders at your school?	Learn almost nothing	Learn a little Bit	Learn some	Learn quite a bit	Learn a tremendous amount

Part III: Resources

Please read each question and then select the response that indicates your answer based on your perceptions of your school as a debate and/or forensics educator.

	1	2	3	4	5
1. To what extent does the quality of the resources at your school need to improve?	Does not need to improve at all	Needs to improve a little bit	Needs to improve some	Needs to improve quite a bit	Needs to improve a tremendous amount
2. When students need help from an adult, how often do they have to wait to get that help?	Almost never	Once in a while	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost all the time
3. How urgently does your school's technology need to be updated?	Not at all urgently	Slightly urgently	Somewhat urgently	Quite urgently	Extremely urgently

4. How often do your school's facilities need repairs?	Almost never	Once in a while	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost all the time
5. For students who need extra support, how difficult is it for them to get the support that they need?	Not at all difficult	Slightly difficult	Somewhat difficult	Quite difficult	Extremely difficult
6. How much of your own money do you spend on your classroom?	Almost none	A little bit	Some	Quite a bit	A tremendous amount
7. How important is it for your school to hire more specialists to help students?	Not important at all	Slightly important	Somewhat important	Quite important	Extremely important
8. How many more resources do you need to adequately support your students' learning?	Almost no resources	A few more resources	Several more resources	Quite a few more resources	A lot more resources
9. Overall, how much does your school struggle due to a lack of resources?	Does not struggle at all	Struggles a little bit	Struggles some	Struggles quite a bit	Struggles a tremendous amount
10. At your school, how crowded do the learning spaces feel?	Not at all crowded	Slightly crowded	Somewhat crowded	Quite crowded	Extremely crowded

Part IV: Teacher Self-Efficacy

Please read each question and then select the response that indicates your answer based on your confidence as a debate and/or forensics educator.

	1	2	3	4	5
1. How confident are you that you can engage students who typically are not motivated?	Not at all confident	Slightly confident	Somewhat confident	Quite confident	Extremely confident

2. How thoroughly do you feel that you know all the content you need to teach?	Not at all confident	Slightly confident	Somewhat confident	Quite confident	Extremely confident
3. How confident are you that you can move through material at a pace that works well for each of your students?	Not at all confident	Slightly confident	Somewhat confident	Quite confident	Extremely confident
4. When one of your teaching strategies fails to work for a group of students, how easily can you think of another approach to try?	Not at all easily	Slightly easily	Somewhat easily	Quite easily	Extremely easily
5. If a parent were upset about something in your class, how confident are you that you could have a productive conversation with this parent?	Not at all confident	Slightly confident	Somewhat confident	Quite confident	Extremely confident
6. How effective do you think you are at managing particularly disruptive classes?	Not at all effective	Slightly effective	Somewhat effective	Quite effective	Extremely effective
7. How confident are you that you can engage students who typically are not motivated?	Not at all confident	Slightly confident	Somewhat confident	Quite confident	Extremely confident
8. How clearly can you explain the most complicated content to your students?	Not at all clearly	Slightly clearly	Somewhat clearly	Quite clearly	Extremely clearly

9. How confident are you that you can meet the learning needs of your most advanced students?	Not at all confident	Slightly confident	Somewhat confident	Quite confident	Extremely confident

Part V: Educating All Students

Please read each question and then select the response that indicates your answer based on your perceptions in your role as a debate and/or forensics educator.

	1	2	3	4	5
1. How easy do you find interacting with students at your school who are from a different cultural background than your own?	Not at all easy	Slightly easy	Somewhat easy	Quite easy	Extremely easy
2. How comfortable would you be incorporating new material about people from different backgrounds into your curriculum?	Not at all comfortable	Slightly comfortable	Somewhat comfortable	Quite comfortable	Extremely comfortable
3. How knowledgeable are you regarding where to find resources for working with students who have unique learning needs?	Not knowledgeable at all	Slightly knowledgeable	Somewhat knowledgeable	Quite knowledgeable	Extremely knowledgeable
4. If students from different backgrounds struggled to get along in your class, how comfortable would you be intervening?	Not at all comfortable	Slightly comfortable	Somewhat comfortable	Quite comfortable	Extremely comfortable
5. How easy would it be for you to teach a class with groups of students from very different religions from each other?	Not at all easy	Slightly easy	Somewhat easy	Quite easy	Extremely easy
6. In response to events that might be occurring in the world, how comfortable would you be having conversations about race with your students?	Not at all comfortable	Slightly comfortable	Somewhat comfortable	Quite comfortable	Extremely comfortable

7. How easily do you think you could make a particularly overweight student feel like a part of class?	Not at all easy	Slightly easy	Somewhat easy	Quite easy	Extremely easy
8. How comfortable would you be having a student who could not communicate well with anyone in class because his/her home language was unique?	Not at all comfortable	Slightly comfortable	Somewhat comfortable	Quite comfortable	Extremely comfortable
9. When a sensitive issue of diversity arises in class, how easily can you think of strategies to address the situation?	Not at all easy	Slightly easy	Somewhat easy	Quite easy	Extremely easy

Part VI: Teaching SEL

Please read each question and then select the response that indicates your answer based on your perceptions in your role as a debate and/or forensics educator.

1. How often do you integrate SEL activities into your classroom?	Almost never	Once in a while	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost all the time

Thank you for your time. The information that you provided to me is an invaluable contribution to the attainment of my doctoral degree.