NOVICE TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT IN RELATION TO SELF-EFFICACY AND JOB SATISFACTION

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of

Immaculata University

by

Kayla Carney Switzer

In partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Immaculata, Pennsylvania March, 2021

IMMACULATA UNIVERSITY

TITLE OF DISSERTATION DEFENSE

NOVICE TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT IN RELATION TO SELF-EFFICACY AND JOB SATISFACTION

AUTHOR: **Kayla Switzer**

Dale W. Brenan, Ed.D.
Chairperson

Salvatore D. Lenna, Ed.D.
Committee Member

Louis C. DeAngelo, Ed.D.
Committee Member

ON BEHALF OF IMMACULATA UNIVERSITY

Marcia Parris, Ed. D.
Dean, College of Graduate Studies

Melissa Reed, Ed.D.
Melissa Reed, Ed. D.
Chair, Education Division

DATE: March 22, 2021

Abstract

The purpose of this qualitative study was to determine the impact of preservice classroom management training on novice teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction. There were 51 teachers who completed the online questionnaire and 25 teachers who were purposefully selected based on the qualifications of novice teacher. Six teachers participated in a structured interview. The participants were from K-12 classrooms across a variety of subjects. This study was conducted using eight school districts in central Pennsylvania, most of which were rural with one in a more urban area. Results indicated that novice teachers did not feel prepared to implement classroom management strategies they had learned in their preservice classrooms, nor did they feel they had an adequate amount of strategies from which to pull. In addition, the study found that novice teachers who were not happy in their job had less preservice classroom management training. This research also suggests that a stand-alone course in classroom management during preservice teacher preparation not only provided more resources, but also lead to greater job satisfaction for novice teachers.

Acknowledgements

- To my loving husband, Brian, thank you for your kindness and unwavering support. Thank you for understanding how important this is to me and loving me through the grouchy research days. Most of all, thank you for the uninterrupted time and positive encouragement I needed to get this work done. I love you.
- Thank you to my family. To Mom and Dad, thank you for supporting me through all of my academic endeavors and for being the only other two people on the planet who are genuinely interested in my research. To my little brother, Drew, thank you for always being a shoulder to cry on and an ear to hear me. To my wonderful sister-in-law, Kay, thank you for commiserating with me about the research process; it is so helpful to talk to someone who understands completely. I am lucky to have such a close family in the four of you, and I love you all dearly.
- Dr. Starmack, thank you for being a continued mentor to me in my research and someone to look up to as an educator. I'm so grateful for you.
- Lorinda, thank you for being an amazing boss and mentoring me through my first rough years of teaching, thank you for taking the time to help me with this project, and thank you for continuing to be my mentor and my friend.
- Thank you to Dr. Brennan, Dr. DeAngelo, and Dr. DiNenna for your guidance, support, and assistance in this project. Thank you for taking the time to help me present the best paper possible.
- Thank you Dr. Corabi for helping me take my first few steps in this research.

- To Ashley and Brittany, I am eternally grateful to have had you both in my cohort. In a room full of administrators, it was far less intimidating to have two brilliant teachers by my side.
- Finally, to Mrs. Springer. Thank you for instilling a love of writing into me all those years ago. You helped shape my future in so many ways; you truly are my role model.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter One - Introduction

Overview

There is much debate over what makes a well-prepared teacher. This debate generally revolves around two factors, whether well-prepared teachers are good at content knowledge "knowing what to teach" or pedagogy "knowing how to teach" (Ingersoll et al., 2012, p. 30). While content knowledge is an important factor in teaching, pedagogical knowledge proves just as important. Sivri and Balcı (2017) agree, stating that pedagogy is vital in increasing student achievement by creating an effective classroom for students to achieve. After all, if teachers do not know how to manage a classroom, it does not matter what they are trying to teach.

Preservice teacher preparation programs in Pennsylvania revolve around six components under the Standards Aligned System (SAS) including: standards, curriculum, instruction, materials and resources for instruction, fair assessments, and appropriate interventions. In order to meet these SAS components, programs across the state require a Professional Core of subject-specific content, "early and varied" field experiences, and student teaching. The goal of preservice teacher preparation programs in Pennsylvania is to mold future PreK-12 teachers to help their students achieve academic success (Pennsylvania Department of Education, 2017). Christofferson and Sullivan (2015) note that nearly 25% of preservice teachers did not have a classroom management course. They also state that courses in classroom management do not always fit into preservice teachers' degree emphasis or schedule. Many researchers suggest that education programs should reevaluate the classroom management training within their teacher preparation programs in order to effectively prepare novice teachers for the reality of

teaching (Klopfer et al., 2019; Ma & Cavanagh, 2018; O'Neill & Stephenson, 2012b; Sciuchettie et al., 2019; Smart & Igo, 2010).

Regardless of the current preservice teacher preparation programs in place, transitioning from preservice preparation to novice teacher still proves overwhelming. Although teachers participate in student teaching through their teacher preparation programs, they rarely have immediate knowledge of discipline problems, curriculum issues, or other matters teachers experience in the field (Dias-Lacy & Guirguis, 2017). Christofferson and Sullivan (2015) suggest that only when preservice teachers had a specific classroom management course did they feel prepared to prevent off-task behavior, pace instruction, establish procedures, and create an effective classroom layout. Discipline problems prove one of the major contributions to teacher stress, burnout, and attrition (Tores, 2012).

Teachers' self-efficacy greatly impacts their control of the classroom. Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) suggest that in order to produce effective, committed, and enthusiastic teachers, supporting the development of teacher self-efficacy is essential. Teachers who know how to manage a classroom effectively are less likely to experience difficulties, therefore they are more likely to appeal to students' interests, needs, and capabilities. As teachers' efficacy about their classroom management increases, so too do their expectations of their own teaching. Positive self-efficacy beliefs of teachers allow them to keep order and maintain the instructional process, as well as develop new strategies for problem solving and instruction (Sivri & Balcı, 2017). Teachers with high self-efficacy are more resilient in their teaching, experience less burnout, and try harder to reach all students (Aloe et al., 2013; Pendergast et al., 2011).

When teachers believe in their own abilities, they are less critical of student errors (Tsouloupas et al., 2014). In a study conducted by Smart and Igo (2019) teachers were more likely to focus on areas where they were not successful, specifically when pertaining to classroom management. Novice teachers struggled when handling severe misbehavior in the classroom and did not have effective strategies in reserve, lowering their self-efficacy overall. Preservice teachers who had less formal classroom experience had lower efficacy about their teaching (Ma & Cavanagh, 2018; Sciuchettie et al., 2019; Smart & Igo, 2010).

Pedagogical training, specifically in classroom management, is a substantial factor in teacher attrition (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Ingersoll et al., 2014). In particular, the turnover rate of teachers with three or less years of experience is high across all schools (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; DeAngles et al., 2013). Ingersoll et al. (2014) and Podolsky et al. (2019) found that teachers with little to no pedagogy training were three times more likely to leave teaching after one year than those with substantial pedagogy training. In a study conducted by Smart and Igo (2010), three of 19 teachers did not return for a second year of teaching specifically because they did not feel equipped to handle behavior management issues within their classroom.

Sutcher et al. (2019) state that teacher attrition rates are at 8% annually, yet policymakers tend to focus on how to get more teachers in the profession. However, it is just as important to keep teachers from leaving the profession as reducing attrition could "virtually eliminate" overall shortages (p. 25). Costs of replacing teachers because of attrition are estimated at almost $7 billion a year, but even more importantly, teacher attrition hurts students (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Darling-Hammond

et al., 2016; Ronfeldt et al, 2012; Sutcher et al., 2019). Teacher attrition creates costs for student learning, as high turnover rates reduce achievement for students across the school (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019). Researchers suggest that a specific focus on reducing teacher attrition to reduce demand for new teachers would save money which could be better spent on retaining teachers and increasing student achievement (Darling-Hammond et al., 2016).

Need for Study

Attrition is the largest contributor to teacher demand (Sutcher et al., 2019). Teacher attrition rates are high, with about 8% of teachers leaving teaching every year (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Sutcher et al., 2019). Retiring teachers make up approximately one-third of the teachers that leave the profession, which means the majority of teachers leave for other reasons (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Ingersoll et al., 2014). Beginning teachers have the highest rate of attrition, as more than 40% of beginning teachers leave within five years of entering the profession (Gray et al., 2015; Ingersoll et al., 2012; Ingersoll et al., 2014). It has been found that education and preparation have more to do with teacher attrition than the individual characteristics of teachers; pedagogy is the most important factor in teacher attrition (Ingersoll et al. 2012; Ingersoll et al., 2014; Zhang & Zeller, 2016). However, there is an ongoing concern about the gap between what preservice teachers learn and what novice teachers are expected to do (Sciuchettie et al., 2019).

Researchers recommend that it is important that preservice preparation programs link theory to practical applications in order for novice teachers to be successful (Ma & Cavanagh, 2018). Some researchers recommend that education programs should

reevaluate their content, especially in regards to classroom management training (O'Neill & Stephenson, 2012b). Current teacher preparation programs vary widely (Christofferson & Sullivan, 2015; Hammerness, 2011; Ingersoll et al., 2014; Klopfer et al., 2019; Smart & Igo, 2010; Stough et al., 2015). Dias-Lacy and Guriguis (2017) state that despite the amount of time spent in teacher preparation programs, first year teachers commonly have issues with classroom management skills. Teachers who have more pedagogical training are less likely to depart teaching, possibly because they feel more secure about their ability to manage a classroom (Ingersoll et al. 2012; Ingersoll et al., 2014).

Preservice teachers' confidence has been found to increase as they have specific instruction on pedagogical areas, specifically classroom management (O'Neill & Stephenson, 2012b; Wyss et al., 2012). Preservice teachers who did not have much experience practicing classroom management did not have as much confidence in their teaching ability (Brown et al., 2015; Christofferson & Sullivan, 2015; Hudson et al., 2016; Sciuchettie & Yssel, 2019). There are many studies on self-efficacy that use preservice teachers as subjects, especially during student teaching (Brown et al., 2015; Christofferson & Sullivan, 2015; DeAngelis et al., 2013; Hammerness, 2011; Hudson et al., 2016; Klassen et al., 2011; Ma & Cavanagh, 2018; Sciuchettie & Yssel, 2019; Sivri & Balcı, 2015). Some studies test teacher self-efficacy using specific classroom management programs (Klopfer et al., 2019; Leckey et al., 2016; Marquez et al., 2016). There is little research on novice teacher classroom management and preparation in relation to self-efficacy. There is also little research conducted on novice teachers' intentions in their careers.

Research makes it clear that effective classroom management leads to higher student achievement; however, since first year teachers seem to have consistent issues with classroom management, it seems that preservice teachers might not be getting the kind of training they need (Back et al., 2016; Dias-Lacy & Guriguis, 2017). Further study is needed to examine the disconnect between training in preservice programs and needs of novice teachers. The purpose of this study is to determine how preservice classroom management training affects novice teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction.

Statement of the Problem

Teachers are leaving the field of education with rates as high as 8% annually (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Sutcher et al., 2019). Attrition is the largest component of teacher demand (Sutcher et al., 2019). The accepted thought is that teacher shortages occur because teachers are retiring at a greater rate; however, retirees make up less than one-third of the portion of teachers leaving, as low as 14% in recent years (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Ingersoll et al., 2014). The highest attrition rate occurs within novice teachers, with more than 40% of teachers leaving within their first five years of teaching (Gray et al., 2015; Ingersoll et al., 2012; Ingersoll et al., 2014; Perda, 2013). Teacher turnover harms education in two specific ways: monetarily and academically (Back et al., 2016; Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Kini & Podolsky, 2016; Ronfeldt et al, 2012; Sutcher et al., 2019). The replacement costs for teachers is found to be about $18,000 per teacher who leaves adding up to about $7 billion a year (Ingersoll & Perda, forthcoming; Darling-Hammond et al., 2016). It has been proven that students do worse when teacher turnover is higher which goes beyond the leaving teacher's immediate classroom; students throughout the

school demonstrate lower test scores in English Language Arts (ELA) and math (Ronfeldt et al, 2012; Sutcher et al., 2019).

Pedagogical knowledge proves to be one of the most important factors in whether or not teachers leave the profession (Ingersoll et al., 2012; Ingersoll et al., 2014). DeAngelis et al. (2013) found that development of pedagogical knowledge during preservice programs had more of an effect on teacher intentions to move or leave than anything else. Pedagogical knowledge also proves to be very important to student achievement as well, specifically classroom management (Ingersoll et al., 2012; Ingersoll et al., 2014). Many researchers have suggested classroom management to be the most influential contributing factor to student learning as it can increase both student achievement and school climate (Back et al., 2016; Omoteso & Semudara, 2011; Sivri & Balcı, 2017; Smart & Igo, 2010; Strong et al., 2011).

Despite the importance of classroom management, it seems that preservice educators might not be getting the kind of preparation they need in order to create an effective classroom environment. First year teachers seem to have consistent issues with classroom management. Teacher education programs try to establish a foundation for novice teachers through student teaching; however, student teachers do not have an opportunity to experience any discipline issues or curriculum problems first hand because they are guests in another teacher's classroom (Dias-Lacy & Guriguis, 2017). The quality of student teaching experiences in and of themselves can also vary widely, therefore so can the quality of strategies novice teachers have when handling classroom management (Smart & Igo, 2010). There seems to be little consistency in how classroom management is taught in preservice programs. Very few preservice teachers report that

their preservice program requires, or even offers, a course in classroom management (Christofferson & Sullivan, 2015; Hammerness, 2011; Ingersoll et al., 2014; Klopfer et al., 2019; Oliver & Reschly, 2010; O'Neill & Stephenson, 2012b; Smart & Igo, 2010). Courses that were offered in classroom management varied widely in content (Hammerness, 2011). Although preservice teachers who had taken a course in classroom management were familiar with many classroom management strategies, their confidence level in implementing them was minimal and they struggled with how to handle more challenging behavioral issues. Many specifically cited these issues as reasons they did not return to teaching (O'Neill & Stephenson, 2012b; Smart & Igo, 2010). Therefore, it is reasonable to surmise that novice teachers are more likely to leave the teaching profession because they are not trained well in classroom management and do not feel like effective teachers.

Definition of Terms

Classroom management. A series of processes undertaken by the teacher to promote student engagement; including classroom rules, facilitating smooth transitions, monitoring student performance, and communicating awareness of classroom behavior (Christofferson & Sullivan, 2015).

Novice teacher. Teachers with five or fewer years of experience (Mehrenberg, 2013).

Preservice preparation program. Admit, prepare, and support candidates for the teaching profession who, upon graduation, have the knowledge, skills, and competencies to enable PreK-12 students to achieve academic success. Also known as a teacher preparation program (Pennsylvania Department of Education, 2017).

Preservice teacher. Teacher candidates in training and preparation before becoming employed as teachers; includes clinical training such as student teaching (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004).

Self-Efficacy. An individual's perceived ability to implement the behavior necessary to yield a specific outcome despite external factors (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1995).

Teacher preparation program. Admit, prepare, and support candidates for the teaching profession who, upon graduation, have the knowledge, skills, and competencies to enable PreK-12 students to achieve academic success. Also known as a preservice preparation program (Pennsylvania Department of Education, 2017).

Teacher Self-Efficacy. The extent to which teachers, including preservice teachers, believe they are capable of achieving certain specific teaching goals (Ma & Cavanagh, 2018).

Limitations

Limitations to this study include that all school districts are located within the same Intermediate Unit (IU), making the study geographically limited, and the results not generalizable. As universities have different requirements for their teacher education programs, novice teachers in this study will have various preservice training. This study will be conducted during a worldwide pandemic, so it is possible that there will not be as many participants as there would normally be. The pandemic will also effect the experiences of first year teachers, many of whom are beginning their teaching career by instructing online. Results of this study will be based on teacher perceptions. The limitations may also include some researcher bias as the researcher experienced difficult

first and second years teaching as a result of minimal classroom management preparation within their teacher preservice preparation program.

Research Questions

1. What are novice teacher perceptions regarding their preservice training relative to classroom management strategies?
2. What are novice teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of training on the implementation of classroom management strategies?
3. What are novice teacher perceptions of classroom management strategies on job satisfaction?

Summary

Novice teachers are leaving the profession at high rates. Although pedagogical knowledge proves to be one of the most important factors of whether or not teachers leave the profession, pedagogical training during preservice programs varies widely, especially in regards to classroom management. Teacher efficacy in classroom management greatly impacts their abilities as well. An effective classroom allows teachers to better maintain the instructional process as well as develop new strategies for teaching. Most research revolves around preservice teachers or implementation of specific classroom management programs. There is a gap that exists in the research concerning novice teacher classroom management efficacy. This study seeks to determine if preservice classroom management training affects the abilities and self-efficacy of novice teachers by questioning novice teacher perceptions of preservice training in classroom management, the implementation of that training, and their job satisfaction. This study is limited by the location and requirements of different teacher

preparation programs, as well as a worldwide pandemic. Results will not be generalizable as it will be specific to location.

Chapter Two - Literature Review

Teachers are leaving the teaching profession at high rates, especially novice teachers (Ingersoll et al., 2012; Ingersoll et al., 2014; Zhang & Zeller, 2016). Teacher attrition carries with it a high cost to districts, both monetarily to fill the gaps left by trained professionals, and academically, with research showing that students fall behind in math and ELA in all classes when teachers leave (Back et al., 2016; Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Ronfeldt et al., 2012; Smart & Igo, 2010).

DeAngelis et al. (2013) found that development of pedagogical knowledge during preservice programs had more of an effect on teacher intentions to move or leave than anything else. In a comprehensive review of state accreditation policy and teacher preparation course outlines, Freeman et al. (2014) concluded that many preservice teachers do not receive the education necessary to prepare them to effectively manage their classrooms. Studies of preservice teachers have demonstrated that classroom management training is offered only about half of the time in teacher preparation programs and rarely required (Christofferson & Sullivan, 2015; Hammerness, 2011; Ingersoll et al., 2014; Klopfer et al., 2019; Oliver & Reschly, 2010; O'Neill & Stephenson, 2012; Smart & Igo, 2010). Classroom management is the most influential contributing factor to student learning and can improve both school climate and academic achievement (Back et al., 2016; Smart & Igo, 2010). Novice teachers do not have a bank of strategies to draw upon in order to effectively manage their classrooms which leads them feeling unprepared (Dias-Lacy & Guriguis, 2017; Ma & Cavanagh, 2018; O'Neill & Stephenson, 2012b; Sciuchettie et al., 2019; Smart & Igo, 2010). High teacher self-efficacy is essential in effective teaching (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001).

Ineffective classroom management causes increased student misbehavior, which can have harmful effects on teacher exhaustion and burnout, potentially leading to turnover (Carson et al., 2011; Tsouloupas et al., 2010).

Classroom Management

Administrators in a large urban district commissioned researchers Back et al. (2016) to evaluate a specific classroom management training program implemented to increase student achievement. In urban settings there is a need for more research on classroom management as behavioral challenges often reflect academic achievement (McEvoy & Welker, 2000). Administration organized a three-day training session using Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement, Participation (CHAMPs: Sprick et al., 1998) classroom management curriculum. At the completion of this training, Back et al. (2016) used ACT scores and a 24 item survey on a 9-point Likert scale to assess 208 teachers from 38 high schools ranging from 20-66 years old with an average of 8.44 years of teaching experience. The teachers had an average of 25.9 students in classrooms with 5.18 disruptive students. Researchers found that classroom management is very important to student achievement, especially in urban high schools. They suggested that implementing classroom management training could benefit schools by increasing teacher knowledge and providing effective tools as well as giving teachers the chance to exchange ideas about classroom management. Implementing training is also beneficial to the school climate and improves academic achievement. Successful classroom management implementation allows students and teachers to draw on their strengths and work together in spite of racial and socio-economic barriers.

Dias-Lacy and Guirguis (2017), used a grounded theory examination of a first year high school Spanish teacher from Chicago to determine challenges to new teachers. By coding her diary, they were able to make determinations about her entries and found that the top three challenges were perceived lack of support from other teachers and administrators, time management, and discipline issues within the classroom. The researchers found that classroom management has appeared to be a common issue for first year educators. Teacher education programs try to establish a foundation for new teachers through student teaching, but preservice teachers do not have an opportunity to experience many discipline issues or curriculum problems first hand as they are a guest in another teacher's classroom. New teachers cope with these challenges in one of two ways, either by reaching out to immediate co-workers and supervisors for help, or by reevaluating themselves on what is already in place within their own classrooms. However, the stress for novice teachers is much greater than that of seasoned teachers.

In a qualitative study conducted on first year elementary teachers from two neighboring public school districts, diverse in both rural and suburban students, researchers Smart and Igo (2010) investigated novice teachers' self-reported classroom management strategies and their effectiveness. All 19 participants were trained in general education and lacked formal preservice classroom management training or a semester-long course in theories and applications of behavior management. Information was gathered using interviews and coded to determine themes. Novice teachers experienced behaviors that were placed in two categories: mild behaviors where the student briefly interrupts the class or their own learning by being off task, disruptive, or attention seeking; or severe behaviors where students were physically or verbally

aggressive, defiant, or deviant. When handling mild behaviors, novice teachers had several areas from which they drew strategies including preservice field experience, mentoring, and classroom experience. However, when handling severe behaviors, novice teachers did not have strategies in reserve. Typical responses when asked where they got the strategies they implemented were "'I just sort of thought up a system'" or "'trying anything out of desperation'" (p. 576). Teachers perceived their handling of mild behaviors as mostly effective and their handling of severe behaviors as ineffective. Many of the novice teachers finally tried handling severe behavior issues by ignoring them. Researchers found that teachers tended to focus on the areas where they were not successful, as with severe behavior management problems, which may account for low efficacy for behavior management overall. Four of the 19 teachers did not return for a second year of teaching, specifically citing behavior management as the reason why.

In the fall of 2011, Pas et al. (2015) studied 1262 classrooms in 52 high schools across 10 districts in Maryland to examine teacher use of classroom management strategies. Observers used event-based tallies including teacher use of Proactive Behavioral Management, Opportunities to Respond, Approval, Disapproval, and Reactive Behavior Management. Participation was voluntary and data were collected anonymously; this was part of a larger study of school climate in high schools. Results demonstrated three specific high school behavioral profiles based on teacher classroom management strategies: consistently met expectations, inconsistently met expectations, and noncompliant. Researchers found that in classrooms where students consistently met expectations teachers used Opportunities to Respond, positive recognition for behavior, few disapproving statements, and limited use of reactive behavior management strategies,

as well as gave more opportunities for leadership. The researchers also found that teachers in noncompliant classrooms used three times as many reactive strategies compared to classrooms where students consistently met expectations.

Classroom Management Training within Preservice Preparation Programs

Christofferson and Sullivan (2015) surveyed 157 preservice teachers on classroom management. These teachers were in the final two years of their coursework taken from teacher education programs accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The survey used 36 items, including multiple choice, rating scale, and open ended questions, to determine the sources these teachers had used to acquire classroom management training, whether their program offered a stand-alone course in classroom management and their plans to enroll in that course, the content of their classroom management training across different sources of preparation, their satisfaction with the different sources of classroom management training they had received, and their sense of preparedness to perform classroom management activities. Approximately 25% of the participants reported that their program did not offer a classroom management course. Students whose program did offer the course said it did not always fit into their degree emphasis and/or it did not fit into their schedule, which meant it was not required for graduation. They found "significant associations" between preparedness to implement multiple practices within classroom management and taking a stand-alone class or practicum in classroom management (p. 255).

In order to analyze new teachers' preparation for classroom management in New York City, Hammerness (2011) studied 31 teacher preparation programs - 26 traditional

and five alternative - as well as surveyed 460 graduates of the programs. The study collected multiple sources of data on the preparation programs including administrative data; program structure, faculty, and curriculum data; interviews with program directors and directors of field experience; and survey data from cohort teachers. The researcher found that courses in classroom management were required in less than half of the programs, and only half of those courses were linked to field work. Classroom management was not clearly discussed in many courses other than those that were specific to the topic, and courses on classroom management were very varied in content.

In a study which focused on the gaps of preservice classroom management training of seasoned teachers, Stough et al. (2015) surveyed 62 experienced teachers who graduated from a specific southwestern U.S. university training program in special education using an 18 item tool. Researchers found that only 52% of the participants reported that their classroom management course prepared them well or extremely well. Other respondents learned most about classroom management in their own classrooms, from student teaching fieldwork, or from other university training coursework. Eighty-four percent of participants responded that they would have liked more training in classroom management during their university program. All respondents believed that a course in classroom management should be required for all teacher preparation programs. The researchers suggested that preservice programs should include opportunities for practice with classroom management skills throughout teacher training and that classroom management training is needed beyond the university level.

While studying preservice teacher education students registered in two practicums during the final stages of the degree programs at a Midwestern university, Wyss et al.

(2012) found that preservice teachers' comfort level with classroom procedural experiences increased when they had instruction on specific pedagogical areas while student teaching. They emphasized that, overall, their preservice teachers' comfort level increased in all prescribed areas during the practicum, particularly in classroom management.

In a mixed methods study, Hudson et al. (2016) polled 312 final year preservice teachers from three universities across two Australian states using a self-reported five point Likert scale to determine their confidence in teaching. Researchers then followed up with one-on-one interviews with ten volunteer participants from the original subjects. Surveys were administered at the end of the first semester of their final program year and interviews were conducted four weeks after the survey. Interviews were between 30-45 minutes long and were hand coded to determine themes. Researchers found that lack of classroom experience impacted preservice teachers' confidence. Only 62% of preserve teachers agreed they could use strategies to support students with disabilities. Overall, researchers found that preservice placements did not provide a variety of experiences for novice teachers.

In a study to explore the relationship between preservice coursework, student teaching, and professional development and the self-efficacy of early career agricultural teachers, McKim and Valez (2017) used a six point Likert scale to survey 150 first through fifth year early career agricultural teachers on classroom management, instructional strategies, leadership, science teaching and math teaching. Teachers identified student teaching as the most impactful on their self-efficacy and preservice coursework to be the least impactful. The researchers suggested that cooperating

teachers need to work with the university to ensure the most positive placements possible in order for preservice teachers to have mastery experiences.

A survey of 573 participants from 21 Australian public and private 4-year degree schools conducted by O'Neill and Stephenson (2012b) sought to determine whether preservice teachers' perceptions of their preparedness in classroom management differed from the classroom management issues they experienced. These participants, mostly female and in various stages of the last segment of their degree program, were surveyed using three different tools including the Managing Behavior Problems Scale (Beaman, et al., 2007; Geving, 2007; Safran, 1989; Stephenson et al., 2000), Behavior Management Strategies Scale (Alberto & Troutman, 2009; Bullock et al., 1994; Charles, 2010; Evertson & Emmer, 2008), and Classroom Management Theories and Approaches Scale (Berk, 2003; Canter & Canter, 1976; Charles, 2010; Gordon, 1974; O'Neill & Stephenson, 2012a; Tauber, 2007). The researchers found that more participants than they expected did not have much classroom management training. Even with some classroom management training, preservice teachers felt "only somewhat prepared to manage disruption, non-compliance, or disorganisation" or the more challenging behaviors possible within the classroom (p. 9). Preservice teachers were familiar with many classroom management strategies from their coursework, but only felt adept enough to use a few of them on their own.

Researchers Klopfer et al. (2019) evaluated the effectiveness of the Errorless Classroom Management (ECM; Ducharme 2007) program in a mixed methods study. They used a variable group in the ECM course of 50 preservice teachers and a control group of 32 preservice teachers, all of whom experienced six hours of education in

general classroom management at the beginning of the study. Preservice teachers in the ECM course met in class four hours a week over nine weeks, six which occurred before their fieldwork and three after; these participants were also required to complete assignments that tested their ability to handle classroom situations. The control group received the same course and fieldwork experience, but in an elective course which did not discuss classroom management. Several Likert-scale surveys were used to collect data over the course of the experiment, as well as two simulated classroom scenarios that were both observed and videotaped by the researchers. These individual simulations required the preservice teachers to react to problems likely to arise in the classroom. This information was coded based on what and how many classroom management strategies the participants used during the simulation. The researchers found that preservice teachers in the ECM training used more proactive and less reactive or inadequate classroom management strategies. The preservice teachers who used more proactive classroom management were also more likely to utilize praise, rapport building, and prompting strategies. The researchers suggest that teachers would benefit "substantially" from proactive behavior management training (p. 61).

Teacher Self-Efficacy

Bandura (1995) postulated that self-efficacy is a predictor of success in many areas, including teaching. He stated there are four types of experiences that determine whether or not an individual believes they are capable of completing certain tasks. The most powerful of these four are mastery experiences, in which an individual successfully completes a task. When an individual successfully completes a task, their self-efficacy increases; conversely, their self-efficacy decreases when unsuccessful at a task. In this

way, their past successes determine their future successes (Bandura, 1986). Psychological and emotional states affect self-efficacy as well (Bandura, 1977). Self-efficacy beliefs can enhance or hinder motivation (Bandura 1997). All four of these indicators of self-efficacy are found in the combination of preservice coursework and student teaching (Can, 2015; McKim & Velez, 2016). Having high self-efficacy is an important resource to combat stress and burnout in teachers (Schwarzer et al., 2000). Those with low self-efficacy tend to have low self-esteem and have pessimistic thoughts about their accomplishments; whereas, those with high self-efficacy will tackle more challenges and make better decisions (Bandura, 1997; Tang et al., 2001).

Sivri and Balcı (2017) conducted a quantitative study of 362 senior preservice teachers from the Department of Primary Education in Faculty of Education of Dokuz Eylul University in Turkey using a 15-item Likert scale to explore prospective teachers' self-efficacy beliefs concerning classroom management before entering the profession. They found that preservice teachers felt differently about their abilities to manage a classroom based on their training areas, with elementary and preschool teachers having a high belief in themselves. Self-efficacy of managing classroom behavior was higher in preservice teachers who had a higher GPA than those who had a lower GPA, and females had greater beliefs about their own classroom management skills than males. The researchers also found a positive correlation between prospective teachers' beliefs in themselves and their expectations for behavior in their classroom.

In a qualitative study, Ma and Cavanagh (2018) examined teacher self-efficacy and the factors which affect it by studying a group of 90 secondary preservice teachers in their final two weeks of the class directly before their student teaching placement. All

participants were in the third year of a four-year bachelor's program or the first year of a two-year master's program and had completed courses in educational psychology and sociology, classroom management, and introductory curriculum. Data were collected through the use of open-ended survey questions on the 12 item 9-point response Scale for Teacher Self-Efficacy (Pfitzner-Eden et al., 2014). Since participants did not have their professional placement yet they cited lack of classroom experience as negatively impacting their self-efficacy. They cited theoretical knowledge for behavior management, and understanding their own subject matter would help them in their classroom management and student engagement. Participants felt classroom management could and would be fostered with good teacher-student relationships and motivation of students. The researchers recommended that it is important that programs link theory to practical applications in order for preservice teachers to be successful.

In a mixed methods study that was part of a larger study, Sciuchettie and Yssel (2019) studied preservice teachers' self-efficacy, specifically for classroom management, over four semesters of field experience. Using a 29 question Likert-scale survey based on the Behaviour Management Self-Efficacy Scale (Main & Hammond, 2008) and the Teacher Efficacy in Classroom Management Discipline Scale (Emmer & Hickman, 1991) with 13 open-ended questions based on their knowledge of classroom management and field experiences, the researchers studied an all-female cohort of 13 preservice teachers at a large Southwestern university in the U.S. The teachers were placed at two large urban school districts that are a minimum of 53% economically disadvantaged. Surveys were administered at five different points throughout the two years, once at the beginning and again after each semester. Researchers found that self-efficacy was higher before the

initial practicum than after first practicum, perhaps because preservice teachers had actually been working with difficult students. Overall as teachers gained more field experience their self-efficacy increased and they could also identify more specific areas of need as opposed to many identifying "'everything'" at the beginning of the study (p. 29). Participants continually requested more training in specific evidence-based practice that they had already had course work, reinforcing the idea that there is an ongoing concern about the gap between research and practice.

In a mixed methods study to investigate how student teaching experiences impact the teaching efficacy and feelings of preparedness of early elementary preservice teachers, Brown et al. (2015) surveyed 71 preservice teachers who completed their program at a large public university in the Southwestern U.S. Qualitative aspects of the study included an open-ended questionnaire and quantitative items consisted of two Likert scale surveys, one to measure preparedness and one to measure efficacy. The study used pre and post surveys to measure how student teaching impacted preparedness and self-efficacy by looking at five different categories including pedagogical content knowledge, planning and preparation for instruction, classroom management, promoting family involvement, and professionalism. Findings showed that preservice teachers benefit from student teaching in both preparedness and efficacy. Participants rated preparedness and efficacy to promote family involvement lowest, probably due to limited family interactions while student teaching. The second lowest rating was pedagogical content knowledge which could prove problematic for student achievement. Self-efficacy was increased by student teaching, with the most gains made in instructional strategies.

Leckey et al. (2016) conducted a follow up study of 11 teachers who had been randomly allocated to the classroom management based Incredible Years Teacher Program (IYTP; Webster-Stratton et al., 2011) in the year following the program. This study was based on a study which explored the ITYP on teacher and student behavior involving 11 schools, 22 teachers, and 445 students aged 4-7 in south-west Ireland. Quantitative data were collected on observations of teacher behavior and child conduct as well as teachers' self-reported use of and satisfaction with a range of classroom management strategies. Qualitative data were collected via one-on-one interviews exploring teacher experiences and perception of long-term implementation of classroom management strategies. These interviews were conducted at the beginning of the study and both six and twelve months after the study. The research suggested that teachers found IYTP strategies to be very effective in fostering positive practice including a positive classroom environment, positive teacher-student relationships, and improved teacher confidence and well-being. Before implementation of the classroom management strategies teachers had low levels of confidence in their overall classroom and behavior management abilities. A year later, teachers who participated in the program felt much more empowered with the new strategies and much less isolated from other teachers. The emotional well-being of teachers also improved; before implementation of the program teachers reported feeling stressed and drained, but the training seemed to provide teachers with tools they could use to support their teaching.

In a study of 101 teachers and their students, grade one through six, Marquez et al. (2016) tried to determine whether a specific classroom management training program, called *Classroom Management in Action*, taught teachers evidence-based classroom

management strategies, increased teacher self-efficacy, and improved student behavior. Teachers completed the Teacher Self Efficacy Survey (TSES; Tschannen-Moran & Wollfolk, 2001), the Elementary School Social Behavior Assessment (ESBA; Walker et al., 2015), a 31 item program specific knowledge test, and the 30 item My Class Inventory for Teachers (MCIT; Sink & Spencer, 2007) both before and after training. At the end of the program teachers were asked to complete an additional 16 item Behavioral Intention survey. About half of the teachers were randomly assigned to the intervention group and the other half were assigned in the control group. Teachers in the intervention group were given access to all of the training modules and asked to watch one skill video a week for 15 weeks. At the end of the study, teachers in the intervention group showed "significant improvement" in knowledge of classroom management strategies as well as improvement in self-efficacy (p. 96). Student behavior in the intervention group also improved more than student behavior in the control group.

In a survey conducted using rural high school teachers Shoulders and Krei (2015) investigated perceptions of teacher self-efficacy beliefs in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. The researchers used the TSES (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001) short form to survey 256 public school teachers from 21 rural high schools in Tennessee and Indiana. They found that there was a significant difference in levels of education and self-efficacy, with teachers holding Master's degrees having higher self-efficacy than those holding only Bachelor's degrees. The researchers postulated that this finding may be because teachers holding Master's degrees have generally been teaching longer than those holding only Bachelor's degrees and may have more experience in classroom management. A significant difference was

also found in self-efficacy between teachers of 0-4 years in the classroom and those with 15 or more years of experience, with those who were teaching longer having more self-efficacy.

In a study of 492 teachers within their first four years of teaching, Chang (2013) studied the relationship between teacher emotions and teacher burnout in relation to student misbehavior. The researcher selected the teachers randomly through email contact lists provided by the Teacher Quality Project, a research project team in the Midwest, and used a modified version of the Maslach Burnout Inventory Educator Survey (MBI-ES: Schaufeli & Salanova, 2007) to conduct research. The researcher found that teachers who lacked problem-solving efficacy for handling disruptive behavior experienced more anger and frustration. It was also found that only when teachers adopted problem solving coping strategies were they less likely to experience burnout; teachers who regularly used avoidance reported highest levels of burnout. The researcher suggested that teachers need to be aware of the emotional challenges set before them in the classroom because the impact of just one highly emotional incident can lead to feeling drained.

Can (2015) used a qualitative methodology to study five students in their final year of an undergraduate science education program from different regions of Turkey. All five were female, ranged in age from 21-25, and had similar educational background and teaching experience. The researcher conducted interviews which were tape recorded and then transcribed verbatim. Findings showed that the preservice teachers usually talked about their experiences in student teaching as a large factor in their self-efficacy. Another factor contributing to their self-efficacy was instructor feedback; preservice

teachers who had positive instructor feedback had a higher sense of self-efficacy whereas preservice teachers who had mentor teachers demonstrating disinterest had lower self-efficacy. The researcher also found that all of the preservice teachers thought they could be an effective teacher if they studied more about teaching.

In a study to test the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and burnout, Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2010) used the Norwegian Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (NTSES: Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007) on 2249 Norwegian teachers from 113 elementary and middle schools representing 1st-10th grade. They found that teacher self-efficacy and collective teacher efficacy, which have some similarities, should be considered different for the purposes of this study. Teacher self-efficacy was strongly related to positive relationships with parents, while collective teacher efficacy was strongly related to supervisory support. They found that lower teacher self-efficacy may result in feelings of burnout and vice versa. It has been argued that low expectation of classroom management increases stress which can also lead to burnout (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007). The researchers found that job satisfaction was positively associated with teacher self-efficacy

Teacher Attrition

In a study conducted by Ingersoll et al. (2014), researchers used data from the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and the Teacher Follow-up Survey (TFS) collected by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to draw conclusions about the changing teacher force from 1987-2012. They found that PreK-12 teachers are the largest occupational group in the country, and, in spite of accepted thought, there has been a higher increase of teachers than of students, with student populations increasing 19.4% and teacher populations increasing 46.4%. The accepted thought is that the reason

there are teacher shortages is because teachers are retiring at a larger rate, however retirees make up less than one-third of the portion of teachers leaving, as low as 14% in recent years. According to the research, beginning teachers have the highest turnover rates of any group of teachers. From the 1988-89 school year to the 2008-09 school year, annual attrition from the teaching force as a whole rose by 41%, from 6.4% to 9%.

Using data from the NCES SASS supplemented from the TFS, Ingersoll et al. (2014) sampled 2,651 teachers of the 183,300 first year teachers from the 2003-04 school year to study the effects of teacher preparation programs on beginning teacher attrition. Sampling was taken from all types of schools and focused on only those leaving the profession, not those just moving schools. The research found that new teachers "varied widely" in preparation and education (p. 15). The amount of pedagogical practice teachers had in their preparation programs was "strongly" related to attrition (p. 24). Teacher attrition had much more to do with teacher education and preparation than individual teacher or university characteristics. The researchers conclude that a large part of high attrition among first year science teachers is because of their limited pedagogical preparation. Other factors contributed to teacher attrition such as teaching at a private school vs. public school, secondary school vs. elementary school, and urban school vs. rural school; however, the researchers note that pedagogy was still the most important factor in their study of teacher attrition.

Redding and Smith (2016) used data from the SASS and the TFS administered by the NCES to examine attrition among 18,080 alternatively certified teachers, all with less than five years of teaching experience. They found that the percentage of teachers who came from alternative certification pathways had increased significantly. Teachers from

alternative certified pathways teach more in-demand subjects and come from different backgrounds than traditionally certified teachers. They have less classroom and pedagogical experience when entering the field and report decreased feelings of preparedness before their first assignment. Researchers also found that alternatively certified teachers are more likely to move schools or leave teaching altogether. They drew the conclusion that alternatively certified teachers are underprepared to enter teaching.

Sutcher et al. (2019) examined current trends in teacher supply and demand as well as indicators of teacher shortages. The researchers used the SASS Teacher File, Common Core of Data, and Digest of Educational Statistics to examine teacher demand. Universal data on teacher preparation programs collected by the U.S. Department of Education under Title II of the Higher Education Act as well as the 2008:2012 Baccalaureate and Beyond were used to examine supply. From this information, the researchers gleaned that teacher attrition rates are at 8% annually. They suggest that as the student population increases by three million over the next decade teacher demand will also increase, but teacher supply will decrease. Teacher attrition is the largest component of teacher demand. Attrition rates increased 50% between 1989-2005 and have stayed high. Costs of replacing teachers because of those leaving the profession is estimated at almost $8 billion a year. However, teacher turnover does not just hold a monetary cost, it hurts the students as well, even students in other classes within the same school.

Through a survey developed around teacher standards by 12 public institutions created to gather information and improve their programs, DeAngelis et al. (2013) tried

to determine the impact of preservice preparation on novice teachers' career intentions. This 20 question survey on a four point Likert scale was used to gather information from four-year undergraduate teaching degree completers matched against state administrative data to determine where they had been teaching their first and second year. From this survey, researchers also tried to determine their preservice career goals for further study. On average, teachers were satisfied with their preservice programs, with only a small percentage said they were dissatisfied. However, only about two-thirds of teachers that had intended to stay at their first school of employment were actually there after two years. The researchers found that preservice programs had more of an effect on teacher intentions to move or leave than school district supplied mentors.

Carver-Thomas and Darling Hammond (2019) used a logical regression model to investigate relationships between teacher attrition and school characteristics, teacher characteristics, main teaching subject, and working conditions. They drew information from the U.S. Department of Education, NCES SASS (2011-12), TFS (2012-13), and SASS. Their research states that 8% of teachers leave teaching each year and another 8% change schools. Turnover rates for teachers with three or less years of experience was high in all schools. They emphasized that "in almost every state, the bulk of turnover is due to preretirement leaving and moving" (p. 7). Factors that contributed to teachers moving schools or leaving altogether included compensation, student characteristics, teacher preparation and mentoring, age and experience, and working. While their study suggested that experience levels did not affect teacher turnover, pathways to teaching did affect teacher loss as alternative certification program teachers were 25% more likely to

leave their schools. The researchers suggested teacher residencies as a possible solution for high teacher turnover.

Gray et al. (2015) studied beginning teachers over the course of five years to investigate their careers as well as factors that may influence attrition and mobility. They used the NCES of the Institute of Education Sciences within the U.S. Department of Education undertook the Beginning Teacher Longitudinal Study (BTLS) to study of 1,990 beginning PreK-12 public school teachers who started teaching in the 2007-2008 year through the 2011-12 year. Collections were made by mail (wave 1) or email (wave 2-5) with follow up phone calls. According to the study, "among all beginning teachers in 2007–08, 10 percent did not teach in 2008–09, 12 percent did not teach in 2009–10, 15 percent did not teach in 2010–11, and 17 percent did not teach in 2011–12" (p. 3). Researchers found that teachers who were assigned a first-year mentor were more likely to stay as opposed to those who were not assigned a first year mentor. This finding was true over the course of all five years, so those not assigned a mentor were more likely to leave each of the five years. Researchers also found that teachers from traditional preparation programs stay in teaching longer than those who use alternative prep programs. First year salary level also affected what first year teachers returned.

In a study of mathematics and science teachers, Ingersoll et al. (2012) used the NCES nationally represented 2003-04 SASS as well the 2004-05 TFS to study the effect of preservice preparation on first year teachers. They focused on first year teachers "where attrition is the highest" (p. 31). They found that the likelihood of a teacher leaving the profession did not change whether they went to a more selective school, held education degrees in addition to subject degrees, or entered through teaching via a

traditional route. Pedagogy was most important as it was “strongly related” to teacher attrition (p. 33). These findings were partly related to the route teachers took to education, but these researchers found that pedagogical programs varied within both traditional and nontraditional arenas as well as between them.

Ronfeldt et al. (2012) used administrative data from the New York City Department of Education and the New York State Education Department focusing on about 1.1 million observations of fourth and fifth grade students across New York City elementary schools over a ten-year period to link student test scores in math and ELA to student, class, school, and teacher characteristics. The researchers found that students did worse when teacher turnover is higher, especially those schools with large populations of black students and low-performing students. Teacher turnover has a “significant and negative” impact on students’ math and ELA scores. Teacher turnover was harmful to students regardless of teacher quality, and had a negative effect beyond the students of the teachers who left. Researchers recommended that schools would benefit from policies dedicated to retention of teachers.

In a qualitative study of teachers from five preservice cohorts including 1,126 teachers, Vagi et al. (2017) sought to evaluate a teacher preparation program at a large university in the southwestern U.S. The researchers found that preservice teachers who performed better in their preparation programs were significantly more likely to remain in teaching during the first two years of their employment. The researchers associated this finding with the fact that highly rated preservice teachers received high feedback which increased their confidence.

In order to draw conclusions about the factors that contribute to teachers' decisions to enter and leave teaching in U.S. public schools as well as policy strategies that are effective at finding and keeping teachers, Podolsky et al. (2019) used the TFS conducted by the NCES. The researchers found that attrition is higher for those who enter teaching without adequate preparation. Beginning teachers who had comprehensive preparation, defined as "observing others teaching; student teaching a full semester; receiving feedback; taking courses in teaching methods, learning theory and selecting instructional materials" were two and a half times less likely to leave teaching after a year than those teachers with little or no pedagogy (p. 8). It was also found that having a course in classroom management in addition to student teaching also reduced teacher attrition. Teachers who had at least one semester of practice teaching during their preservice program were half as likely to leave. The researchers suggested that in order to combat teacher attrition, school districts should develop strong relationships with teacher preparation programs to recruit new teachers (Kreig et al., 2016; Simon et al., 2015). They also suggested that steps should be taken for states to develop teacher induction programs with a range of support for teachers as well as training and technical support for districts.

In a longitudinal mixed-methods study in North Carolina, Zhang and Zeller (2016) studied whether pathways to teaching affected teacher attrition. The study surrounded 20 doctoral students asked to replicate Johnson and Birkeland's (2003) study of teacher retention by each doctoral student interviewing three newly licensed teachers three times over the course of six years. Each of the three interviewees had to represent one of three different types of preparation: regular teacher education program, lateral

entry, or a statewide alternative teacher licensure program focused on retaining mid-career, high-quality professionals. In total they interviewed 60 teachers. They found that none of the background demographics or variables of the teachers affected their retention. The largest group of leavers were from the lateral entry teachers, who also reported being less prepared to teach. The second largest group of leavers were the alternatively certified group. Researchers determined that preparation is vital to retention of teachers.

Summary

Classroom management is very important to student achievement and school climate (Back et al., 2016). Teacher education programs try to establish a foundation for new teachers through student teaching, but preservice teachers do not have an opportunity to experience any discipline issues or curriculum problems first hand as they are a guest in another teacher's classroom when student teaching (Dias-Lacy & Guirguis, 2017). Many teacher preparation programs do not require a course in classroom management (Christofferson & Sullivan, 2015; Hammerness, 2011). Preservice placements do not provide a variety of experiences for novice teachers (Hudson et al., 2016). Teachers who have more classroom management strategies and experience to pull from reach their students more effectively, are more likely to use proactive vs. reactive behavior management strategies, and have better overall teaching experiences (Pas et al., 2015; Klopfer et al., 2019; Smart & Igo, 2010).

Bandura (1995) suggested that self-efficacy is a predictor of success in many areas, including teaching. Researchers have found a positive correlation between prospective teachers' beliefs in themselves and their expectations for behavior in their classroom (Sivri & Balcı, 2017). In a study conducted by Leckey et al. (2016) the

implementation of a classroom management based program helped to improve the emotional well-being of teachers, whereas before implementation of the program teachers reported feeling stressed and drained. A significant difference was also found in self-efficacy between teachers of 0-4 years in the classroom and those with 15 or more years of experience, with those who were teaching longer having more self-efficacy (Shoulders & Krei, 2015). Teachers need to be aware of the emotional challenges set before them in the classroom because the impact of just one highly emotional incident can lead to feeling drained (Chang 2013).

Beginning teachers have the highest turnover rates of any group of teachers (Gray et al., 2015; Ingersoll et al., 2012; Ingersoll et al., 2014). A large part of high attrition among first year teachers is because of their limited pedagogical preparation (Ingersoll et al., 2014). Preservice programs have more of an effect on teacher intentions to leave than many other factors (DeAngelis et al., 2013). Some researchers suggest that in order to combat teacher attrition, school districts should develop strong relationships with teacher preparation programs to recruit new teachers (Kreig et al., 2016; Simon et al., 2015).

Chapter Three - Methods and Procedures

Novice teachers are leaving the profession at high rates. Although pedagogical knowledge proves to be one of the most important factors of whether or not teachers leave the profession, pedagogical training during preservice programs varies widely, especially in regards to classroom management. Teacher efficacy in classroom management greatly impacts their abilities as well. An effective classroom allows teachers to better maintain the instructional process as well as develop new strategies for teaching. Most research revolves around preservice teachers or implementation of specific classroom management programs. There is a gap that exists in the research concerning novice teacher classroom management efficacy. This study seeks to determine if preservice classroom management training affects the abilities and self-efficacy of novice teachers by questioning novice teacher perceptions of preservice training in classroom management, the manifestation of that training, and their job satisfaction. Chapter Three includes descriptions of the subjects, those who will participate in the study, and the setting, where the study will take place. The instruments and design of study sections describe what the researcher used to gather information. This chapter reviews the steps the researcher took to collect and analyze data as well as the steps taken to ensure the study's validity and reliability. The methodology used to investigate novice teachers' perceptions of their classroom management self-efficacy in relation to both their preservice preparation programs and job satisfaction are also discussed.

Subjects

The subjects of this study are 28 novice teachers, that is, teachers with five or fewer years of experience, from eight public school districts located in central Pennsylvania. Of the 51 participants who indicated the number of years they had been teaching 28 (54.9%) stated they were in their first five years of teaching and 23 (45.1%) said they had been teaching for six or more years. The data of 28 participants were purposefully selected by the researcher to include because they fell into the definition of novice teacher. Subsequently data were paired down to 25 participants as not all 28 original participants completed the survey in its entirety.

Information about the grade they currently teach was provided by 28 teachers. The following data demonstrates the respondents current teaching position: two (10.7%) teach Kindergarten, six (21.4%) teach first grade, two (10.7%) teach second grade, two (7.1%) teach third grade, two (7.1%) teach fourth grade, five (17.9%) teach fifth grade, four (14.3%) teach sixth grade, (10.7%) teach seventh grade, eight (28.6%) teach eighth grade, nine (32.1%) teach ninth grade, 7 (25%) teach tenth grade, six (21.4%) teach eleventh grade, and eight (28.6%) teach twelfth grade. Of the 28 participants, 16 taught multiple grade levels.

Of the 28 respondents who chose to indicate their certification 7 (25%) were certified in special education, nine (32.1%) were grade level certified, five (17.9%) were certified to teach history, 7 (25%) were certified to teach English, 7 (25%) were certified to teach math, five (17.9%) were certified to teach science, two (7.14%) were certified to teach music, one(3.6%) was certified to teach art, two (7.1%) were certified to teach technology, and three (10.7%) were certified to teach physical education. Five

participants (17.8%) indicated “other” with one (3.6%) teacher each stating reading specialist, psychology, social sciences, agriculture, health and driver’s education. Of the 28 respondents, 12 held multiple certifications.

Of the 28 respondents who chose to indicate their college or university, 21 (75%) attended public and 7 (25%) attended private.

Setting

The eight school districts included in this study represent rural and suburban communities in central Pennsylvania. Teachers were surveyed from primary and secondary schools including 13 elementary schools, two intermediate schools, eight middle schools, and eight high schools. The school districts serve anywhere from 600 to 2900 students and vary in student-teach ratio, median household income, and percentage of the population that receive free and reduced lunch. Table 3.1 provides demographic data for each district.

School District A is a rural school comprising one elementary school (K-2), one intermediate school (3-5), one middle school (6-8), and one high school (9-12). This district served 2,619 students during the 2018-2019 school year with an average student-teacher ratio of 16:1. The median household income in this district is $50,417 and 40.4% of the student population receive free or reduced lunch (Niche.com Inc., 2020).

District B is a rural school district comprising two elementary schools (K-5), one middle school (6-7), and one high school (8-12). This district served 2,124 students during the 2018-2019 school year with an average student-teacher ratio of 14:1. The median household income in this district is $42,337 and 41.8% of the student population receive free or reduced lunch (Niche.com Inc., 2020).

Table 3.1

School District Demographic Information

Name	Student Population	Student-Teacher Ratio	Free and Reduced Lunch	Median Household Income	Number of Schools
District A	2,619	16:1	40.4%	$50,417	4
District B	2,124	14:1	41.8%	$42,337	4
District C	2,302	13:1	33.4%	$34,410	4
District D	1,884	14:1	33.2%	$44,671	3
District E	644	10:1	40.8%	$55,577	3
District F	1,352	14:1	19.2%	$72,053	3
District G	2,067	15:1	36%	$51,830	4
District H	2,869	19:1	57.1%	$67,719	6

District C is a rural school district comprising two elementary schools (K-5), one middle school (6-8), and one high school (9-12). This district served 2,302 students during the 2018-2019 school year with an average student-teacher ratio of 13:1. The median household income in this district is $34,410 and 32.4% of the student population receive free or reduced lunch (Niche.com Inc., 2020).

District D is a rural school district comprising one elementary school (K-4), one middle school (5-8), and one high school (9-12). This district served 1,884 students during the 2018-2019 school year with an average student-teacher ratio of 14:1. The median household income in this district is $44,671 and 33.2% of the student population receive free or reduced lunch (Niche.com Inc., 2020).

District E is a rural school district comprising one elementary school (K-6), one middle school (7-8), and one high school (9-12). This district served 644 students during the 2018-2019 school year with an average student-teacher ratio of 10:1. The median household income in this district is $55,577 and 40.8% of the student population receive free or reduced lunch (Niche.com Inc., 2020).

District F is a rural school district comprising one elementary school (K-4), one middle school (5-8), and one high school (9-12). This district served 1,352 students during the 2018-2019 school year with an average student-teacher ratio of 14:1. The median household income in this district is $72,053 and 19.2% of the student population receive free or reduced lunch (Niche.com Inc., 2020).

District G is a rural school district comprising one elementary school (K-2), one intermediate school (3-5) one middle school (6-8), and one high school (9-12). This district served 2,067 students during the 2018-2019 school year with an average student-teacher ratio of 15:1. The median household income in this district is $51,830 and 36% of the student population receive free or reduced lunch (Niche.com Inc., 2020).

District H is a suburban district comprising four elementary schools (K-5), one middle school (6-8), and one high school (9-12). This district served 2,869 students during the 2018-2019 school year with an average student-teacher ratio of 19:1. The median household income in this district is $67,719 and 57.1% of the student population receive free or reduced lunch (Niche.com Inc., 2020).

Instruments

Three instruments were used to conduct this study: an online survey, short answer questions, and a set of interview questions. Both the survey instruments and the research questions were developed by the researcher.

Survey. The online survey developed for novice teachers (Appendix A) consisted of 32 items. The survey consisted of one confirmation of consent, four demographic questions, two multiple choice questions, three binary questions, three short answer questions, and 17 Likert scale statements. The final question in the survey asks if participants would be willing to participate in a follow up interview with space to fill in contact details if needed. These questions were asked through the use of Survey Monkey to gather information to better understand novice teacher perceptions of preservice training in classroom management, the manifestation of that training, and their job satisfaction. The survey took approximately ten minutes to complete.

Short answer questions. The second instrument consisted of three open ended questions, one per each of the three research questions. These questions were added to the survey sent to novice teachers via Survey Monkey (Appendix A). These questions were attached to the end of the survey in Survey Monkey and took approximately five minutes to complete.

Interview. The third instrument was a set of five interview questions (Appendix B) to allow the researcher to gain a more detailed understanding of how novice teachers feel about their ability to control a classroom. Two of these questions revolved around teachers' feelings about their classroom management, two questions asked about their preparation, and one question asked about their job satisfaction. Participating teachers

were able to complete the interview using an online format. The interviews took approximately ten minutes. These interviews also offered the opportunity for flexible questioning if needed. The flexible questioning allowed the researcher to ask the teachers to elaborate on certain answers, if it was important to the research process. Interviews were recorded using Google Meet in order to code using Temi and determine themes.

All three instruments were evaluated by two experts in the field of education and research to ensure effectiveness (Appendix C). These two experts were sent the three research instruments along with the purpose of the study, research questions, and the Survey/Interview Validation Rubric for Expert Panel (VREP) (Simon & White, 2016). Based on feedback from these experts, adjustments were made to the research instruments.

Validity and reliability. It is the responsibility of the researcher to remain impartial and unbiased during all parts of the study in order to ensure validity and reliability. Reliability is the ability to replicate the results of the study, and validity refers to the quality, rigor, and trustworthiness of the study (Cresswell, 2000). Validity was established by using an expert panel to evaluate the instrument (Appendix C). The experts used the VREP (Appendix D) to evaluate the research instruments on a multitude of standards including clarity, wordiness, negative wording, overlapping responses, balance, use of jargon, appropriateness of responses listed, the use of technical language, application to praxis, and relationship to the problem. Reliability was achieved through an expert panel review of survey items as well as the collection of data through three means, the survey, the short answer questions, and the interview. This three-pronged approach allowed the researcher to determine common themes through data triangulation.

Design of the Study

This qualitative study was designed to learn more about novice teachers' preservice training in classroom management and its effect on their self-efficacy and job satisfaction. Multiple methods of data collection were used, including Likert-scale, open ended, and multiple choice questions along with transcriptions from follow up interviews. The use of survey, short answer questions, and interview questions allowed the researcher to triangulate the data to determine common themes.

Procedure

The first step was to obtain superintendent permission from the eight school districts. The researcher contacted the superintendents to further explain the purpose of the study. The researcher first called each superintendent to establish contact and discuss the topic. The researcher then sent a follow up email to the superintendent to obtain written permission. With permission to conduct the study in a school district, the researcher received confirmation via email with the superintendents' approval of the study. The researcher worked with the administrative secretary of each district to determine the best way to contact their teachers who fell under the definition of a novice teacher.

An expert panel tested the validity of the three research tools in relation to the researchers' three research questions using the VREP (Appendix D). After the researcher received feedback from the experts, the researcher made the necessary adjustments to the research tools. The researcher submitted the research proposal to the Immaculata University Research Ethics and Review Board (RERB). Once the researcher obtained

consent from the RERB and gained written approval from the university it was time to complete the study (Appendix E).

After approval was obtained from both the superintendents and the RERB, the researcher started the data collection process in the method determined by each district; either by sending an email directly to the novice teachers or contacting a district designee who disseminated the information to all novice teachers in the approved districts. These emails explained the purpose of the study and asked the teachers to complete a Survey Monkey survey (Appendix F). The email also included an explanation of consent for the survey. The first question of the survey was the informed consent for the survey. If the participant chose "yes" they continued on with the survey, if the participant chose "no" the survey did not continue. The survey took participants through a series of questions based on the three research questions. The final question of the survey asked if they would like to participate in an interview. If the participant answers "yes" they were directed to enter their contact information. If the participant selected "no" the survey ended.

As surveys were completed, the researcher set up interviews with participants who agreed to participate in the interview and provided contact information. The researcher sent the participants an email explaining the interview process and requesting consent (Appendix G). The researcher used DigiSigner for the Interview Consent Form so that participants could electronically sign the Consent Form for the interview. Once the interview was scheduled and consent obtained, the researcher asked each participant five additional questions in order to gain a deeper understanding of their classroom management training in relation to their self-efficacy and job satisfaction (Appendix B).

All interviews were recorded for coding purposes. The researcher used Temi transcription service for recording the interview. The privacy policy for Temi states that they only share data of the user under the circumstances of legitimate interests, honor of contractual commitments to the individual, consent, or legal compliance. The researcher determined accuracy of the transcription by comparing the transcript to the recording of the interview two times. Survey and interview responses were then compiled and analyzed.

Data were analyzed first from the online survey. The researcher first selected the 25 teachers that fit the definition of a novice teachers. The researcher then categorized the data and then identified common themes. The researcher ensured reliability of the data by triangulation through the use of Likert-scale, multiple choice, and open ended questions. The researcher maintained confidentiality of each participant through the settings on the online survey. The researcher used the transcripts from the interviews to determine themes. The confidentiality of each participant was maintained by labeling each interview Teacher 1-6.

All electronic data are protected by a secure permission required server with password for accessibility known only to the researcher. Any printed data is kept in a locked filing cabinet accessible only to the researcher. All data will be kept for the duration of five years.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine novice teachers' perceptions of their preservice program preparation in classroom management and its effect on their self-efficacy and job satisfaction. This chapter discussed the subjects, setting, and

instruments used to answer the three research questions. This chapter also reviewed the design of the study and procedure for collecting data.

Eight public school districts in central Pennsylvania were the target population for this study. The novice teachers in these districts allowed for varied research from which to identify themes. The researcher collected and analyzed data from an online survey given to novice teachers, and compared that data to follow up interviews completed by some of the teachers. The teachers were asked to identify their perceptions of preservice training in classroom management, the manifestation of that training, and their job satisfaction.

The researcher triangulated all responses through the use of survey questions, open-ended questions, and follow up interviews. The survey and interview data were analyzed in order to identify common themes. Chapter Four discusses the results of this data analysis.

Chapter Four – Results

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative study was to find the perceptions of preservice classroom management training to novice teachers and whether that training might affect their self-efficacy and job satisfaction. This chapter reports the findings of data collected from teachers using the following methods: (a) binary responses, (b) multiple choice questions, (c) Likert scale questionnaire, (d) open-ended questions, and (e) structured interviews. Data for this study was collected using SurveyMonkey for the questionnaire and open-ended questions. The structured interviews were conducted using the Google Meet videoconferencing tool. This chapter will provide an analysis of the data organized into three sections to align with each research question. The research questions focused on novice teachers' perceptions regarding their preservice classroom management training, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction. Teachers in eight Pennsylvania school districts had the opportunity to respond to a survey containing 32 items including six binary, six multiple choice, 17 Likert scale, and three open-ended (Appendix D). Of the 152 teachers who received this survey, 51 (33.6%) teachers took the online questionnaire and six teachers participated in the interview portion of the data collection process. The open-ended questions and interview responses were coded and analyzed to identify themes. The data in this chapter are reported by research question and includes analysis and graphical display of the data.

Report of Data Results

Research Question One. *What are novice teacher perceptions regarding their preservice training relative to classroom management strategies?*

Survey. The survey included two multiple choice, three binary, and four Likert scale questions for the first research question. Of the 28 teachers who responded to these questions, eight (28.6%) indicated they had 0-1 years of teaching experience, 10 (35.7%) indicated they had 2-3 years of teaching experience, and 10 (35.7%) indicated they had 4-5 years of teaching experience. 21 (75%) of the 28 respondents attended a public college or university and 7 (25%) attended a private college or university.

Participants were asked to indicate from where they had received classroom management training. Teachers were able to indicate as many sources of classroom management training as applicable. Of the 28 teachers who answered the question, 22 (78.6%) indicated supervised fieldwork, 19 (67.9%) indicated a semester-long course in classroom management, 15 (53.6%) indicated a seminar or workshop in classroom management, 14 (50%) indicated a practicum-type course in which classroom management was addressed, 13 (46.4%) indicated mentoring from a licensed teacher, 11 (39.3%) indicated a lecture or presentation dedicated to classroom management, nine (32.1%) indicated a semester-long course in another topic, 7 (25%) indicated mentoring from someone outside of required coursework, four (14.3%) indicated a book other than those required by coursework, two (7.1%) indicated a seminar or workshop in another topic, and one(3.6) indicated a lecture or presentation dedicated to another topic. No respondents chose “I have not received any type of training in classroom management.”

The teachers were then asked if a classroom management course was available in their preservice program. Of the 28 respondents, 18 (64.3%) participants indicated their program did offer a classroom management course while eight (28.6%) teachers stated that a classroom management course was not available in their preservice program. Of

the eight who indicated there was not a classroom management program available in their program, six (75%) attended a public university and two (25%) attended a private university. For this question it was also possible for respondents to indicate that they were unsure of the requirements for their preservice program; two (7.1%) teachers said they were unsure if a classroom management course was required.

When asked if they were required to take a classroom management course, 10 (35.7%) of the 28 respondents indicated that they had not been required to take this course. Of these 10, eight (80%) attended a public university while two (20%) attended a private university. 18 (64.3%) of respondents indicated that they had been required to take a course in classroom management; 13 (72.2%) of whom attended a public university and five (27.8%) attended a private university.

Participants were asked if they took a course in classroom management. Of the 28 respondents, 19 (67.9%) did take a course in classroom management, while nine (32.1%) did not take this course. Those 19 teachers who responded that they had taken a course in classroom management were then asked what areas of classroom management were discussed in the course. What the classroom management course covered is represented in the following data: 19 (100%) indicated creating classroom rules/expectations, 18 (94.7%) indicated teaching procedures/routines, 18 (94.7%) indicated teaching classroom rules and expectations, 18 (94.7%) indicated creating a community of learners, 17 (89.5%) indicated organizing the physical environment of the classroom, 17 (89.5%) indicated using reinforcement strategies, 14 (73.9%) teachers indicated pacing instruction, and 14 (73.9%) indicated applying interventions for students with difficult behavior. Table 4.1 provides binary question data for research question

one, and Table 4.2 provides multiple answer data on what topics were discussed within the classroom management course.

Table 4.1

Binary Question Responses for Research Question One

Statement	Yes	No	Unsure
a. A classroom management course was available in my program.	18 (64.3%)	8 (28.6%)	2 (7.1%)
b. I was required to take a classroom management course.	18 (64.3%)	10 (35.7%)	-
c. I took a course in classroom management.	19 (67.9%)	9 (32.1%)	-

Note. N=28

Table 4.2

Multiple Answer Data on Topics Discussed in Classroom Management Course

Statement	Checked
Pacing Instruction	14 (73.7%)
Creating classroom rules/expectations	19 (100%)
Organizing the physical environment of your classroom	17 (89.5%)
Using reinforcement strategies	17 (89.5%)
Teaching procedures/routines	18 (94.8%)
Applying interventions for students with difficult behavior	14 (73.7%)
Teaching classroom rules and expectations	18 (94.8%)
Creating a community of learners	18 (94.8%)

Note percentages do not total 100% because multiple responses were permitted. N=19

Of the 25 participants who answered the Likert scale questions for research question one, 12 (48%) agreed they had the opportunity to develop their own classroom

management plan during their preservice program. Another six (24%) indicated strongly agree, four (16%) indicated neutral, and three (12%) indicated disagree.

In terms of implementing a classroom management plan during student teaching, 11 (44%) teachers stated agree, four (16%) strongly agree, five (20%) neutral, four (16%) disagree, and one (4%) strongly disagree.

When asked if they had learned the difference between proactive and reactive behavior intervention, 14 (58%) respondents indicated agree, four (16%) strongly agree, three (12%) disagree, three (12%) strongly disagree, and one (4%) neutral.

Participants overwhelmingly indicted that they would like more professional development on classroom management strategies with 14 (56%) of 25 respondents selecting agree and three (12%) selecting strongly agree. six (24%) of respondents were neutral and two (8%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the idea of more professional development on classroom management. The information in Table 4.3 provides the Likert scale data for research question one.

Open-Ended Response Questions. Participants were asked what their preservice program could have offered to better prepare them for classroom management. This allowed participants to reflect upon their classroom management training during their preservice programs. Of the respondents, 25 choose to answer this question. Four major themes emerged through these answers: needing more practice with classroom management, needing more instruction on classroom management, needing more information on the causes of student behaviors, and satisfaction with the preservice program.

Table 4.3

Likert Scale Responses for Research Question One

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. In my preservice preparation program, I had the opportunity to develop my own classroom management plan.	6 (24%)	12 (48%)	4 (16%)	3 (12%)	0 (0%)
b. In my preservice preparation program, I was able to implement a classroom management plan during student teaching.	4 (16%)	11 (44%)	5 (20%)	4 (16%)	1 (4%)
c. In my preservice preparation program, I learned the difference between proactive and reactive behavior intervention.	4 (16%)	14 (56%)	1 (4%)	3 (12%)	3 (12%)
d. I set clear behavior expectations for my students.	7 (28%)	17 (68%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Note. N= 25

Ten teachers (40%) mentioned needing more practice with classroom management during their preservice program. Teachers wanted more practice in the classroom earlier in their program, mentioning their only experience in the classroom as student teaching or passive observations. One teacher specifically mentioned wanting more observation opportunities “when something goes WRONG” to better understand how to implement strategies. Another teacher stated:

> Operating a classroom all starts out with classroom management, and I unfortunately feel as if undergraduate programs DO NOT provide enough preparation for this area. You really do not get the experience in developing a classroom management system until you are in a classroom with students. I wish my undergraduate program provided a class that gave you better hands on and role play scenarios on different types of behaviors that can be displayed in the classroom and strategies and techniques on how to redirect those behaviors.

Another theme which emerged from this open-ended question was needing more instruction on classroom management to have more resources from which to pull. Seven teachers (28%) specifically mentioned wishing their program had given them more instruction on classroom management. Three (12%) teachers mentioned they wished they had more opportunity to learn classroom management in their specific discipline. Another teacher stated:

> At my college it was very much drilled into our heads that you can't learn classroom management in a class but rather have to learn it on the job. With that said I wish we learned about classroom management in a class or at least strategies for it rather than having to be thrown into it and figure it out.

A third theme which emerged from this open-ended question was suggesting that if their preservice program had offered more instruction on student psychology they could better understand the root of problem student behaviors. Teachers who answered in this manner suggested that understanding the reasoning behind the behavior would help them better resolve the situation. Five (20%) teachers reflected that they wished they had more training in this area.

Three (12%) teachers stated they were satisfied with their preparation in classroom management through their preservice program.

Interviews. Interview questions two and five were designed to gather further information about teacher perceptions of their preservice program in terms of classroom management (Appendix G). These questions allowed teachers to elaborate on their perception of their own preparedness and whether or not their preservice program made them feel prepared for their own classrooms.

Interview question two asked teachers what they felt most and least prepared for in the classroom. The participants generally felt prepared for their content. Teacher #4 answered interview question two by stating "But for [sic] the most instruction I'm prepared for is [sic] the ELA. I love finding [sic] reading instruction, spelling activities that they can do."

What teachers felt least prepared for was varied. Teacher #1 felt least prepared for evaluating assessment data. Teacher #3 stated:

> Probably working with parents, actually, I feel like [sic] I, we didn't really receive that much training on dealing with parents. Um, like [sic], you know, how to respond, like [sic] when they come after you and I [want to] be on their child's side and not yours. So I feel like kind of just handling any issues with parents is probably what I felt like least prepared with.

One theme which emerged in the answers was that the teachers did not feel prepared to handle varied situations within their classrooms. Teacher #2 had a large class of all boys which they felt they were not prepared to handle. Teacher #3 changed

demographics from where they student taught to where they completed their first year of teaching. Teacher #3 stated:

> I mean I took classes, but sometimes there's just days where the kids throw these behaviors at you, that you don't expect and you have to be flexible and figure out how you can still get what you need to get done…. behavior was definitely THE biggest challenge and those kids, um, just the demographics of where it is. They don't tend to listen. So I had to be extremely strict with my behavior and establishing that behavior plan was the hardest challenge.

Teacher #4 reflected:

> They do not prepare you enough for classroom management. And it's going to change depending on the students in your class, what might work, um, a classroom management strategy might work for this class. It may not work for your class next year, or it may not work for that student. So you kind of have to have multiple ones and use the one that works best with your students and change it. I mean, you have to be consistent with your expectations and your classroom rules.

Teacher #5 also did not feel prepared stating:

> I came into a situation where the teacher who taught my course before me failed 16 students. Um, and all, almost all of those failures turned up in that seventh, eighth period. And they were all behavior issues. Um, so me as a first year teacher trying to manage that it got really bad…. Um, it did get to the point where I adopted the philosophy. I narrowed it down to like [sic], if I took out one or two kids from the class, I couldn't manage it. So a lot of times it was just a matter, like

> if they started acting up, I would send them to the office, just try to teach the ones I could. Um, at the same time, I always fought with myself. Like [sic] you should still try to be teaching them.

The fifth interview question asked teachers if they felt that their preservice preparation program prepared them for leading a classroom. One theme which emerged among the responses was that the teachers felt like they did not know how to implement classroom management strategies they learned in their preservice program once they entered the work force. Teacher #1 said:

> My pre-service preparation program was a little disjointed in that, I felt like I got a really strong English degree. I felt like I really knew that content. And I also felt like I learned a lot about education, but there wasn't, there weren't a ton of courses that really helped to connect like both the English component and the pre-service component…. And I would say, I felt like a lot of my education courses focused primarily on elementary ed.… I mean, obviously my student teaching kind of connected a lot of those dots for me, but it would have been nice to have that earlier.

Teacher #2 reflected:

> We had a classroom management course and I feel like the professor is one of the best I ever had and he gave us some legitimate tools. I just feel like no class can truly prepare you, um, that until you're in the classroom facing some of the situations talking about it and the theory of it, doesn't always actually like [sic] translate. So I feel like it's a mix. I did like that class. I learned some legitimate things, but I just feel like until you have kids throwing erasers behind your back

where you literally have to not turn around during a classroom…and until that happens to you. I feel like nothing in class can prepare you.

Teacher #3 stated:

I mean, we did a lot of stuff that was on, um, like [sic] lesson plans and setting up things. And my student teaching experience was also really great because we had those seminars, but it definitely did not prepare me for behaviors that I would see in a different area school since all around me is rural school districts. And that's all I had really been in. So it didn't really prepare me for that, but I mean, I learned as I went.

Teacher #6 reflected:

When you're student teaching, you know, you have your, I had one class in classroom management in my undergrad and it makes sense, but sometimes once you get out there, it doesn't quite work out like how you're supposed, how you think its [going to] work out.

Another theme which emerged among the participants was pulling ideas for classroom management from other life experiences. Teacher #3 stated:

So I took, um, I had used Class Dojo when I was student teaching, so I used that as a tool, but I had different pieces with it…. I just thought of it. Yeah, the sticker chart was more like, I did it for chores when I was little.… every kid loves class parties. So I was like [sic], well, I'll have this be a class goal.

Teacher #4 also pulled from life experiences:

…when I was in elementary school, my third grade teacher, she did a marble jar. So that was more of a whole class [strategy]. So any positive, um, like [sic] each

week we kind of go over, a behavior that I want to work on as a whole class. And if we do that, then we get a marble in the jar. Once our jars filled, we have a party.

Research Question Two. *What are novice teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of training on the implementation of classroom management strategies?*

Survey. The survey included eight Likert scale responses and one open-ended question for research question two. 25 teachers responded to all survey questions for the second research question. Of the 25 teachers, 7 (28%) indicated they had 0-1 years of teaching experience, eight (32%) indicated they had 2-3 years of teaching experience, and 10 (40%) indicated they had 4-5 years of teaching experience. 20 (80%) of the 25 respondents attended a public college or university and five (20%) attended a private college or university.

Participants were asked if they set clear behavior expectations for their students. Of the respondents, 17 (68%) indicated agree, 7 (28%) strongly agree, and one (4%) neutral.

When participants where asked if they develop routines in their classrooms to keep activities running smoothly, 13 (52%) of respondents indicated agree. Another 10 (40%) respondents indicated strongly agree and two (8%) indicated neutral.

Responses indicated that 15 (60%) teachers agreed they were able to keep students on task, with six (24%) strongly agreeing and four (16%) indicating neutral.

In terms of redirecting student disruptions, 16 (64%) of respondents agreed they could redirect students who disrupt the lesson quickly; five (20%) selected strongly agree and four (16%) selected neutral.

When asked if they were able to use multiple interventions with students who behave inappropriately, 16 (64%) respondents agreed and another three (12%) strongly agreed; two (8%) respondents disagreed and four (16%) selected neutral.

Participants were asked if they felt like they build rapport with their students. Respondents stated overwhelmingly that they do, with 18 (72%) selecting strongly agree and 7 (28%) selecting agree.

When asked if they were able to adjust their classroom management strategies to different classes' needs, 12 (48) of respondents selected agree, 11 (44%) strongly agree, one (4%) neutral, and one (4%) disagree.

In terms of keeping the problem behavior of a few students from ruining the lesson for the rest, 15 (60%) of respondents indicated agree; five (20%) indicated strongly agree, four (16%) neutral, and one (4%) disagree. The information in Table 4.4 provides the Likert scale data for research question two.

Open-Ended Response Questions. Participants were asked to list three areas of classroom management in which they could benefit from getting more training. This question allowed them to reflect on the effectiveness of their classroom management training. Twenty-five respondents chose to answer this question.

Of the teachers who answered the questions, 11 (44%) wished they had more training on handling disruptive students. Ten (40%) wished they had more training on developing classroom routines. Eight (32%) stated they wished they had more training on handling extreme behaviors. Eight (32%) wished they had more training on positive classroom management strategies such as token economies or positive behavior

Table 4.4

Likert Scale Responses for Research Question Two

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. I set clear behavior expectations for my students.	7 (28%)	17 (68%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
b. I develop routines in my classroom to keep activities running smoothly.	10(40%)	13 (52%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
c. I am able to keep my students on task.	6 (24%)	15 (60%)	4 (16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
d. If a student disrupts the lesson, I am able to redirect them quickly.	5 (20%)	16 (64%)	4 (16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
e. I am able to use multiple interventions with students who behave inappropriately.	3 (12%)	16 (64%)	4 (16%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)
f. I build rapport with my students.	18 (72%)	7 (28%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
g. I adjust my classroom management strategies to different classes' needs.	11 (44%)	12 (48%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
h. I am able to keep the problem behavior of a few students from interfering in a lesson for the rest.	5 (20%)	15 (60%)	4 (16%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)

Note. N= 25

management. Six (24%) teachers stated they would have liked more training on consistent discipline and consequences. Four (16%) teachers stated they would have liked more training on redirecting behaviors. Four (16%) wished they better knew how to handle poor student motivation. Two (8%) teachers specifically mentioned classroom

management strategies for special education students. Two (8%) teachers reflected that they wished they better understood when to take classroom behaviors to the administrative level.

Interviews. Interview questions three and four were designed to gather further information about teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of training on the implementation of classroom management strategies (Appendix G). These questions allowed teachers to elaborate on their perception of their own effectiveness and what their greatest challenges included when entering teaching.

Interview question three asked teachers what were some of their greatest challenges during their first year of teaching. Teacher #1 reflected that their most difficult aspect of their first year was building their curriculum. Teacher #2 had a large class of all boys which was really problematic during their first year:

> I had a classroom of all boys, students, and I took over midyear in January with, um, for a teacher who was a male football coach. So, you know, coming in there being a like [sic] tiny, you know, 24-year-old female teacher was really hard on that specific class of all boys. I felt like I had no control over. Um, there was days I literally just wanted to run out of the room and cry. Every other class was great out of six classes. That was the only class I had an issue with, but just trying to deal with the classroom management aspect when an entire class feels like they're against you, um, was very difficult.

Teacher #3 also had issues with challenging behavior during their first year stating:

> …behavior was definitely THE biggest challenge and those kids, um, just the demographics of where it is. They don't tend to listen. So I had to be extremely strict with my behavior and establishing that behavior plan was the hardest challenge.

Teacher #5 also had a rowdy class their first year, stating:

> I came into a situation where the teacher who taught my course before me failed 16 students. Um, and all, almost all of those failures turned up in that seventh, eighth period. And they were all behavior issues. Um, so me as a first year teacher trying to manage that it got really bad. Um, I actually, towards the end, before we, which switched to virtual, I had other two other co-teachers in there trying to help me, uh, one of them special ed., the other one, also a special ed., but specifically for behavior. Um, we're just trying to manage that classroom and attempting to teach the kids who actually cared about being there, uh, was a real struggle.

One theme which emerged among the responses was that teachers felt like their classroom management experience improved with practice. Teacher #1 stated:

> Also just figuring out myself as far as classroom management, like I had all the concepts together, but, um, it was hard to just kind of learn what was most important to me and what I needed…not get upset about, but also things that I knew I needed to be like [sic] hard on my students for. So that balance was, was challenging my first year.

Teacher #2 also felt like their classroom management improved since their first year of teaching, stating:

> I feel like my classroom management improved because now I just don't let things bother me. I have one rowdy class this year and it's like [sic], at the end of the day, you know, I try to get them back under control, but I don't really see it as a personal reflection on myself where last year I felt bad that I couldn't control the class.

Teacher #4 reflected:

> I feel like the first year of teaching; you are just getting your feet in the mud. So college, I feel like you, it does not give you the, the, uh, instruction experience you need, because you're not really in the classroom when you're sitting in a lecture hall, I feel like you get the most experience during your student teaching and your first year.

Teacher #5 stated that subbing the year after graduating really improved their classroom management since they were "thrown into a classroom that doesn't know you." Teacher #6 agreed, stating "I know when I substituted, it was different. If I was teaching an AP class versus a class that was down in the agriculture rooms, because you just have a different, uh, personality in your students."

Interview question four asked teachers if they felt they were effective a reaching their students. All participants felt that they were effective at reaching their students. One theme that emerged from the responses to this question was changes this school year because of the Covid-19 pandemic. Teacher #1 reflected:

> I would say this year with being online a lot of the time, I, I feel like I'm having to relearn this completely. Uh, but I do think that I do a good job of, of connecting it

> to like [sic] real life things. And I, I really do try to ask them questions that can show them that my content relates to them.

Teacher #4 stated:

> I know I've seen my students improve so much from the beginning of the year and that's them missing half a year, last year. So there are times I'm like [sic], oh my gosh, what is going on? But other times I'm like [sic], this is what I'm teaching for, because I know I had teachers in, when I was in elementary, I loved them. They made a difference in my life. So this is what I want for my students.

Teacher #6 felt they had a problem with the technology aspect of the pandemic:

> with virtual learning and I'm still fairly young, and I would like to think I'm on top of a lot of my technology, but my special ed. students with them being life skills, they aren't very good at technology themselves. And I know I don't utilize it as much because of that. So when COVID hit, um, I had to relearn pretty much how to teach and how to use all these tools.

Research Question Three. *What are novice teachers' perceptions of classroom management strategies on job satisfaction?*

Survey. The survey included one binary, five Likert style, and one open-ended question for research question two. 25 teachers responded to the survey items for the first research question and 24 responded to the open-ended question. Of the 25 total teachers, 7 (28%) indicated they had 0-1 years of teaching experience, eight (32%) indicated they had 2-3 years of teaching experience, and 10 (40%) indicated they had 4-5 years of teaching experience; 20 (80%) of the 25 respondents attended a public college or university and five (20%) attended a private college or university.

When asked if they had interviewed for jobs in other career paths since beginning their teaching career, three (12%) teachers responded they had; 22 (88%) had not.

When asked if they were an effective teacher, 20 (80%) respondents agreed and three (12%) respondents strongly agreed; two (8%) selected neutral.

Participants overwhelmingly indicted that their classroom was a happy place with 15 (60%) respondents selecting agree and nine (36%) selecting strongly agree; 1 (4%) respondent was neutral on whether or not their classroom was a happy place.

Responses were varied when asked if they would want to work at any other school. The question was phrased "I would not want to work at any other school." Of the responses, nine (36%) teachers agreed, five (20%) strongly agreed, and five (20%) selected neutral. six (24%) of teachers disagreed, indicating they would like to work somewhere else.

When asked if they look forward to going to work each day, 14 (56%) respondents indicated agree, 7 (28%) indicated strongly agree, three (12%) were neutral, and one (4%) disagreed.

Participants were asked if they planned on returning to their school next year. 13 (52%) respondents stated strongly agree, eight (32%) agreed, and four (16%) selected neutral. The information in Table 4.5 provides the Likert scale data for research question three.

Open-Ended Response Questions. Participants were asked if they could change three aspects of their current job to increase job satisfaction, what they would be and why. This question allowed teachers to reflect on their job satisfaction. 24 respondents

choose to answer this question. Of the nine themes which emerged, three themes directly related to classroom management.

Table 4.5

Likert Scale Responses for Research Question Three

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. I am an effective teacher.	3 (12%)	20 (80%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
b. My classroom is a happy place.	9 (36%)	15 (60%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
c. I would not want to work at any other school.	5 (20%)	9 (36%)	5 (20%)	6 (24%)	0 (0%)
d. I look forward to going to work.	7 (28%)	14 (56%)	2 (12%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
e. I plan on returning to my school next year.	12 (52%)	8 (32%)	4 (16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Note. N= 25

Of the respondents to the question, six (25%) teachers stated they felt like they needed more preparation time. Three (13%) teachers stated they had difficulty reaching students with above average needs. Two (8%) teachers reflected that they wished they had better training.

Other themes which emerged were better pay (four teachers, 17%), more student supports (two teachers, 8%), staff rapport and participation (three teachers, 13%), more administrative support (five teachers, 21%), and problems surrounding the Covid-19 pandemic (five teachers, 21%).

Interviews. Interview question one was designed to gather further information about teacher perceptions of classroom management strategies on job satisfaction (Appendix G). This question allowed teachers to elaborate on what they enjoy most and

least about teaching. Overwhelmingly, teachers most enjoy their students. Teacher #1 stated:

> I love getting to know my students and like learning their personalities and, um, just honestly learning from them as I teach them. Uh, I also love my content area. I love teaching ELA. I think it's really kind of a unique opportunity to really connect with kids' lives and connect it to literature. And I love that.

Teacher #2 said "I love having classroom discussions and hearing my students' viewpoints on topics, especially if it's something maybe like [sic] related, but not directly with the class…. I love hearing them bring in their knowledge and incorporate that into our classroom discussion."

Teacher #3 also mentioned love of students stating "I would say most just working with the kids in general. I mean, I really enjoy the interactions with them. I enjoy teaching them and when they understand things." Likewise, Teacher #4 reflected:

> My favorite thing about teaching is getting, um, a good relationship with your students. I mean, they add a lot of excitement throughout your day…I love going into this, into the school, seeing my students in my classroom, um, and just kind of getting a connection and making a difference.

Teacher #5 agreed, stating "[the] main reason I wanted to become a teacher in the first place was because I enjoyed working with teenagers, not necessarily because I enjoyed teaching math." Teacher #6 stated:

> I mean, I spend pretty much all day with [my students] and we just have built a really good relationship and rapport. Um, we get to celebrate all those little goals

> that they hit or benchmarks. And, um, even though there were some bad days, I mean, they're just the sweetest kids and I would not ever replace them.

Answers varied as to what the participants enjoyed least. Teacher #1 stated that paperwork was what they enjoyed least about teaching, calling it "busy work." Teacher #3 agreed, stating:

> …least is probably the paperwork since I'm a special ed. teacher. And especially right now with all the Covid stuff going on, the, the changes from like how we used to be able to teach and being flexible and making those changes. So it's not that fun but that's probably my least favorite part.

Teacher #6 said paperwork was their least favorite stating:

> …it definitely can bog you down unfortunately, and kind of take you away from actually teaching. Um, mean specifically you have the IEP [Individualized Education Plan], which are great essential pieces for those students, but they're time consuming that you could be spending your time doing other things…. like the SLOs [Student Learning Objectives] that you have to do every year. Um, you know, it's something that you're teaching already, but now you have to kind of, you know, make sure that you actually hit what is expected of you. Um, so unfortunately it sometimes can take away from the art of teaching when you're more worried about hitting and getting all those things accomplished.

Teacher #4 felt like they had to put in a lot of extra hours outside of school, which was what they least enjoyed about teaching:

> I mean, I love all my students. I want what is best for them. So I don't mind putting in the extra time, um, to find resources that, um, best fit their needs. But a lot of the times I am working many hours outside of school.
>
> Teacher #2 said that they least enjoyed classroom management by stating:
>
> I don't like as a young teacher feeling disrespected and I feel like I have some students, um, who I feel like don't respect me because I'm a young female teacher and that's very difficult for me to deal with.
>
> Teacher #5 agreed that student behaviors were problematic:
>
> I enjoy working with the kids. I love seeing them grow but I hate having to deal with like one or two kids behaviors and having that not affect the rest of the classroom or trying to mitigate how that affects the rest of the classroom.

Summary.

The data collected and analyzed in Chapter Four represents the results of a qualitative research study on the perceptions of novice teacher classroom management in relation to self-efficacy and job satisfaction. The study also reported data on the perceptions of novice teachers on how their classroom management training effected their job satisfaction. In this study, 51 teachers from eight Pennsylvania school districts responded to a survey of 32 items including six binary, six multiple choice, and 17 Likert scale (Appendix D). Of those teachers, 25 responded to two of the open-ended questions and 24 responded to the third open-ended question.

The results indicated that, in most cases, novice teachers feel like they lacked training in classroom management. The open-ended responses allowed teachers to further detail their experiences with classroom management training, the implementation

of that training, and their perceived job satisfaction. There were also mentions of how the Covid-19 pandemic has affected their classrooms and job satisfaction.

Of the 51 initial respondents to the survey, six teachers were further interviewed. The interview consisted of five questions: two from research question one, two from research question two, and one from research question three (Appendix G). These interviews revealed that teachers did not know how to implement classroom management strategies learned within their preservice programs in their classrooms, especially in extreme situations. The interviews also revealed that the teachers learned more about classroom management once they were practicing teachers, many pulling from outside resources such as their own grade school experiences. Here, again, there were mentions of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Chapter Five includes a summary of the results for the research questions. The limitations of the study, relationship to other research, and suggestions for further research are also presented.

Chapter Five - Discussion

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative study was to determine the quality of novice teacher classroom management training during their preservice programs and whether or not that training affected their self-efficacy and job satisfaction. After securing permission from eight superintendents in central Pennsylvania, the researcher examined responses from 51 teachers across eight districts. The number of subjects was purposefully limited to 28 as those were the participants who qualified as novice teachers. Data were collected using the online survey tool, SurveyMonkey, which included binary, multiple choice, Likert scale, and open-ended questions. Additionally, six interviews were conducted and recorded using the Google Meet videoconferencing tool.

All Likert scale, binary, and multiple choice responses were analyzed and organized by research question, articulated through tables, and reported in summary form in Chapter Four. Select open-ended and interview responses were coded for themes and reported by research question in Chapter Four as well.

Summary of the Results

Research Question One. *What are novice teacher perceptions regarding their preservice training relative to classroom management strategies?*

Each of the participants were given a survey containing two multiple choice, three binary, and four Likert scale questions for the first research question. Data collected from 28 K-12 teachers revealed that all teachers who answered this question had some type of classroom management training. However, not every teacher had the opportunity to take a classroom management class in their preservice program. About 29% of

respondents did not have a classroom management class available during their preservice program. This finding occurred across both public and private institutions. Thirty-five percent of respondents were not required to take a classroom management course during their preservice program. Again this finding applied to both public and private institutions.

About 68% of the 28 respondents did take a classroom management course. These teachers stated the courses covered a variety of topics. All respondents described their preservice classroom management course as having covered creating classroom rules and expectations. Other descriptions were identified: teaching procedures/routines or reaching a community of learners; using reinforcement strategies and organizing the physical environment of the classroom; as well as pacing instruction and applying interventions for students with difficult behavior as reported by 95, 90 and 74 percent of the teachers, respectively. Of the 25 teachers who answered the Likert scale questions for research question one, 12% did not have the opportunity to create a classroom management plan and 20% did not have the opportunity to implement such a plan. This data ties to themes discussed in the interview section for this research question. Furthermore, six (24%) respondents did not learn the difference between proactive and reactive behavior management strategies; only one (4%) of this group had taken a classroom management course during their preservice program. Participants overwhelmingly indicated that they would like more professional development on classroom management strategies. Only two teachers indicated they did not want more professional development on this topic, and both of them had taken a course in classroom management during their preservice program.

The open-ended responses revealed four major themes in relation to research question one. Of the 25 teachers who answered the question, 10 (40%) mentioned needing more practice with classroom management during their preservice program. This data corresponds to previously mentioned data that 12% did not have the opportunity to create a classroom management plan and 20% did not have the opportunity to implement such a plan. Another theme which emerged from this open-ended question was that 7 (28%) teachers mentioned needing more instruction on classroom management during the preservice program in order to have and adequate reserve of resources while a novice teacher. These data correspond to a theme discussed in the interview section of research question one. Of the 25 teachers, five (20%) teachers wished they had more instruction on student psychology to better understand the root of problem behaviors in their classroom; three (12%) teachers were satisfied with their preservice preparation in classroom management.

Two interview questions were associated with research question one. The interview responses conveyed the idea that teachers did not feel prepared for classroom management from their preservice programs. They did feel prepared to teach their content, but four out of six of them encountered extreme classroom management situations they were not prepared for during their first year of teaching. Five out of six teachers indicated they did not know how to implement the classroom management strategies they had learned about in their preservice programs once they had their own classroom. Another theme which emerged was teachers drawing classroom management strategies from other life events, such as their experiences with their grade school teachers. This theme corresponds to the previously mentioned idea of teachers needing a

reserve of classroom management strategies to use in their own classrooms, discussed in the open-ended section of this research question.

Research Question Two. *What are novice teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of training on the implementation of classroom management strategies?*

Each of the participants were given a survey containing eight Likert scale statements for the second research question. Data collected from 25 K-12 teachers revealed that most teachers believed they had good classroom management strategies. All of the teachers who responded they built good rapport with their students; these data correspond to themes which emerged in the interview portion of this research question. Most teachers stated they set clear behavior expectations, developed routines, could redirect disruptions quickly, and could keep kids on task, with only a two to four teachers (8%-16%) selecting neutral to these questions. When asked if they could use multiple interventions with students who behave inappropriately, two (8%) teachers indicated they could not; neither of these teachers took a course in classroom management during their preservice program. When asked if they were able to adjust their classroom management strategies to different classes' needs, one (4%) teacher answered they could not; this teacher did not take a classroom management course during their preservice program. When asked if they could keep the problem behavior of a few students from ruining the lesson for the rest, one (4%) teacher answered they could not; this teacher did not take a classroom management course during their preservice program.

Open-ended responses for the second research question indicated many areas in which teachers felt lacking in classroom management training. Of the 25 teachers who answered the question, 11 (44%) wanted to have more training on handling disruptive

students, and 10 (40%) wanted more training on developing classroom routines. Additionally, eight (32%) wished they had more training on handling extreme behaviors, which corresponds to previously mentioned data collected in the interview section of research question one; eight (32%) of the respondents wanted more training in positive classroom management strategies such as token economies or positive behavior management. Furthermore, six (24%) teachers stated they would have liked more training on consistent discipline and consequences; four (16%) would have liked more training on redirecting behaviors; and four (16%) wished they better knew how to handle poor student behaviors. Additionally, two (8%) teachers specifically mentioned wanting more classroom management strategies for students in special education, and two (8%) teachers reflected they wished they better understood when to take problem behaviors to the administrative level.

Two interview questions were associated with research question two. One theme which emerged from the interviews was that teachers felt like practice had increased their classroom management abilities. Five of the six teachers interviewed stated that they felt like their classroom management improved once they were actually in the classroom as novice teachers. When asked what were some of their greatest challenges during their first year of teaching, three of the six teachers quoted problem student behaviors. All six teachers interviewed believed they were effective at reaching their students. Another theme which emerged for this research question during interviews was the changes which occurred this school year because of the Covid-19 pandemic; half of the interviewed teachers mentioned the effects of the pandemic on their classrooms.

Research Question Three. *What are novice teachers' perceptions of classroom management strategies on job satisfaction?*

Each of the participants were given a survey containing one binary question and five Likert scale statements for the first research question. Data collected from 25 K-12 teachers revealed that three (12%) teachers had interviewed for a job in another career since becoming a teacher. Most teachers felt they were effective, with only two (8%) participants selecting neutral. Almost all of the teachers thought their classroom was a happy place, with only one (4%) teacher selecting neutral. Most teachers plan on returning to their school next year, with four (16%) participants selecting neutral. Responses varied when asked if they would want to work at any other school, with six (24%) teachers stating they would want to work at another school; all three teachers who interviewed for jobs in other careers were in this category. Of the six teachers who were not satisfied with their current jobs, three (50%) had not taken a classroom management course. Most teachers looked forward to going to work, with only three (12%) participants selecting neutral. Moreover, one (4%) teacher did not look forward to going to work. This teacher also did not have the chance to develop their own classroom management plan, nor did they learn about the difference between proactive and reactive strategies, in their preparation program; however, they did take a course in classroom management.

Open-ended responses for research question three came from 24 teachers. Of the nine themes which emerged when the teachers were asked what could change about their current job to increase job satisfaction, three themes directly related to classroom management. Of the responses to the question, six (25%) teachers stated they felt like

they needed more time; three (13%) teachers stated they had difficulty reaching students with above average needs; and two (8%) teachers stated that they wished they had better trainings. Other themes which emerged were better pay (17%), more student supports (8%), staff rapport and participation (13%), more administrative support (21%), and problems surrounding the Covid-19 pandemic (21%).

One interview question correlated to research question three. This question asked what teachers enjoy most and least about teaching. All six teachers answered that they most enjoyed their students. There data correspond to previously mentioned findings on building rapport with students in research question two. Answers varied on what they enjoyed least. Of the six interviews, three teachers mentioned paperwork, feeling excess paperwork took away time they could be using to better reach their students. Two teachers mentioned problematic student behaviors being their least favorite part of teaching.

Limitations Found in the Study

While some limitations of the study were identified in Chapter One, additional limitations emerged during the study. First, permissions were received from eight superintendents to survey novice teachers in their schools with a possibility of 152 participants. However, only 51 teachers responded to the first question regarding years of experience, 28 responded to the first set of demographic questions, 25 responded to the Likert-scale questions and first two open-ended questions, and 24 responded to the last open-ended question. Additionally, while 15 teachers indicated they would be willing to participate in a follow-up interview, only six actually responded to researcher contact. The study was completed in eight school districts within a central Pennsylvania

intermediate unit; therefore, the results of the study may not be generalizable to all school districts in Pennsylvania.

The researcher sent survey requests to six of the districts through the use of a district appointed designee. Miscommunication of requests between the researcher and district designees might have led to a lower response rate. In particular, a designee in one district thought the survey was supposed to be sent out to all teachers in the district. A second email was sent out specifying that only teachers who were in year one through five of their teaching career should take the survey. Designees in other districts sent some surveys to teachers who were in year one through five of teaching at their district, but had more than five years of cumulative teaching experience. These instances could account for a higher number than expected of responses from teachers who had more than five years of teaching experience.

The data collection phase of this study was conducted during the Covid-19 pandemic. This fact combined with the fact that the month between Thanksgiving break and winter break is a notoriously busy time of year for teachers might have led to fewer survey responses. Teachers might have been reluctant to participate because of the combination of an increased work load this time of year and switching between virtual and in-person teaching at their schools.

Finally, the process of determining themes in qualitative research always adds limitations. The researcher is using their own filter to investigate their research data and may not perceive the data the same as another person would.

Relationship to Other Research

The findings in this current study revealed many similarities to established research in preservice classroom management training, teacher self-efficacy, and teacher attrition. The researcher found that approximately 29% of participants in the study did not have access to a preservice course in classroom management, which is similar to that of Christofferson and Sullivan (2015) who found that 25% of the participants in their study of preservice teachers did not have access to a classroom management course. The researcher also found that topics covered in preservice classroom management courses were varied, a finding also noted in Ingersoll et al. (2014) and their study of 2,651 first year teachers using National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) data from the 2003-04 school year.

Christofferson and Sullivan (2015) also found a correlation between novice teacher preparedness to implement multiple practices within classroom management and taking a stand alone course in classroom management. The researcher found that both of the teachers who indicated they could not use multiple interventions with students who behaved inappropriately did not take a course in classroom management. The researcher also found that the one teacher who indicated that they could not adjust their classroom management strategies to different classes' needs did not take a course in classroom management. Similarly, the one teacher who indicated they could not keep the problem behavior of a few students from ruining the lesson for the rest did not take a course in classroom management.

Hudson et al. (2016) found that preservice placements did not provide a variety of experiences for novice teachers. The researcher had similar findings, with several

teachers describing situations during their first year of teaching for which they were not prepared because they fell outside of their limited student teaching experiences. The researcher also found that there were many areas of classroom management in which novice teachers wanted more experience.

The researcher found that novice teachers felt like they had not learned enough classroom management resources during their preservice programs. Novice teachers reflected that they also did not know how to implement the strategies they had learned in their classroom management courses once they had their own classroom, and they wished they had a larger reserve of strategies overall. The findings of this research match the those of several studies which suggest that novice teachers do not have strategies from which to draw in order to effectively manage their classrooms (Dias-Lacy & Guriguis, 2017; Ma & Cavanagh, 2018; O'Neill & Stephenson, 2012b; Sciuchettie et al., 2019; Smart & Igo, 2010).

Klopfer et al. (2019) found that teachers who are better trained in classroom management use more proactive strategies. The researcher found a similar comparison between preparation and use of proactive strategies; three of the four teachers who did not know the difference between proactive and reactive strategies had not taken a course in classroom management.

Another theme which the researcher found was that novice teachers indicated practice in the classroom had increased their classroom management abilities. Sciuchettie and Yssel (2015) and Brown et al. (2015) found similar results in their studies of preservice teachers, as did Shoulders and Krei (2015) in their study of teachers in rural high schools.

Dias-Lacy and Guirguis (2017) found through their grounded theory study of a first year high school Spanish teacher that the top three challenges to novice teachers were perceived lack of support from administrators, time management, and discipline issues within the classroom. The researcher found that when asked what aspects of their current job could change to make them feel more satisfied, novice teachers stated they needed more time and more administrative support. When asked what were some of their greatest challenges during their first year of teaching, half of the respondents quoted student behavior issues.

The researcher found that novice teachers who answered that they were not happy in their jobs were also not well prepared for classroom management. When asked if they looked forward to going to work, one teacher answered they did not. This teacher had taken a classroom management course, but did not have the opportunity to develop and implement their own classroom management plan through the course. This teacher also did not learn the difference between proactive and reactive behavior management strategies. DeAngelis et al. (2013) found that development of pedagogical knowledge during preservice programs had more of an effect on teacher intentions to move or leave than anything else. Similarly, Ingersoll et al. (2014) found that teacher attrition had much more to do with teacher education and preparation than individual teacher or university characteristics. Podolsky et al. (2019) found that attrition is higher for those who enter teaching without adequate preparation.

When novice teachers were asked what could change about their current job to increase satisfaction, the researcher found that one of the themes to emerge was the idea of increased pay. There is mention of increased compensation in both the Gray et al.

(2015) study of beginning teacher attrition influences and Carver-Thomas and Darling Hammond (2019) study of relationships between teacher attrition and working conditions. This topic appears in the research, but requires further study.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study sought to find out if preservice classroom management training is related to novice teacher perceptions of their self-efficacy and job satisfaction. The data revealed that approximately 29% of novice teachers did not have access to a course in classroom management during their preservice training. Although topics covered within classroom management courses were varied, novice teachers felt they did not receive varied enough experiences through their preservice programs and struggled once they were in the classroom. Novice teachers also believed they did not learn a variety of classroom management strategies through their preservice program from which to draw upon once they became teachers. The data also revealed that novice teachers felt their ability to control a classroom increased as they practiced. The study found novice teachers who are not happy at their job were also not well prepared in classroom management. This study has prompted recommendations for further research.

One topic which was revealed in this study as well as previous research is the idea of teacher attrition in relation to compensation. Additional research concerning novice teacher job satisfaction and salary could prove beneficial to teacher attrition research. It would be interesting to investigate whether or not novice teachers believe they are being compensated for the amount of work they put in and any links to wanting to leave the profession.

Another topic which was revealed through the study was that novice teachers were not prepared for situations which differed from their student teaching experiences. Further study of movement of teachers between their student teaching placement demographics and their first teaching placement demographics might provide additional background information as to why so many novice teachers leave the profession.

These data collected in this study suggests that most novice teachers feel they are effective at reaching their students. It could prove valuable to compare their perceived effectiveness with actual student data to determine themes.

This study did not yield any data about teachers who enter the profession through alternative programs. Additional research as to effectiveness of classroom management preparation in relation to self-efficacy and job satisfaction for teachers who use alternate routes to teaching might prove beneficial.

Participants in this study were mostly from rural districts. Unique patterns may be revealed by repeating a similar study in more suburban or urban areas. These findings could then be compared to rural districts to find new themes of perceived classroom management effectiveness.

Conclusion

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to determine if connections exist between classroom management training for preservice teachers and novice teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction. The data collected from kindergarten through twelfth grade teachers found that novice teachers did not feel prepared to implement classroom management strategies they had learned in their preservice classrooms, nor did they feel they had an adequate amount of strategies in reserve. Many novice teachers also felt that,

regardless of their classroom management training, they had not had enough opportunities to practice classroom management strategies through their preservice program. Novice teachers also wished they had more training though their preservice program on how to handle extreme student behaviors. In addition, the study found that novice teachers who were not happy in their job had less preservice classroom management training.

When asked if they felt like their preservice preparation program prepared them well for leading a classroom two teachers summarized their experiences nicely. Teacher #1 stated, "I felt like I got a really strong English degree…and I also felt like I learned a lot about education, but there wasn't a ton of courses that really helped to connect both [components]." This quote reflects two important themes from the research; that novice teachers felt very prepared to teach content, but also that novice teachers did not know how to implement classroom management strategies learned in their preservice courses. Teacher #4 reflects similarly by stating:

> I feel like student teaching and teaching my first year has prepared me most for teaching. I mean, there's some things that I took from my preparation program, my undergrad, but you're not going to get the experience sitting in the lecture hall that you are going into a classroom…. I'm still building everything up. I'm not saying I know everything there's still a lot to learn. There always is a lot to learn.

In consideration of the findings of this study, school districts and universities should consider working together to offer preservice teachers more opportunities to practice classroom management. Perhaps another alternative could be school district implementation of teacher residency programs where novice teachers work with seasoned

teachers to increase their classroom experience before taking over a full teaching load. Hopefully, further research will provide a better understanding into how preservice preparation programs may provide a foundation for teacher retention.

References

Alberto, P. A., & Troutman, A. C. (2009). *Applied behaviour analysis for teachers* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Aloe, A. M., Amo, L. C., & Shannahan, M. E. (2014). Classroom management self-efficacy and burnout: A multivariate meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review, 26*(1), 101-126. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-013-9244-0

Back, L. T., Polk, E., Keys, C. B., & McMahon, S. D. (2016). Classroom management, school staff relations, school climate, and academic achievement: Testing a model with urban high schools. *Learning Environments Research, 19*(3), 397–410.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self- efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavior change. *Psychological Review, 84*, 191-215. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191

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

Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.W. Freeman.

Beaman, R., Wheldall, K., & Kemp, C. (2007). Recent research on troublesome classroom behaviour: a review. *Australasian Journal of Special Education, 31*, 45-60 http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10300110701189014.

Berk, L. E. (2003). *Child development* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Brown, A. L, & Lee, J., & Collins, D. (2015). Does student teaching matter? Investigating teacher candidates' sense of teaching efficacy. *Teaching Education, 26*(1).

Bullock, L. M., Ellis, L. L., & Wilson, M. J. (1994). Knowledge/skills needed by teachers who work with students with severe emotional/behavioral disorders: a revisitation. *Behavioral Disorders, 19*, 108-125.

Can, H. (2015). Sources of teaching efficacy beliefs in pre-service science teachers. *Elementary Education Online, 14*(1), 333-348.

Canter, L., & Canter, M. (1976). *Assertive discipline: A take-charge approach for today's educators*. Seal Beach, CA: Canter & Associates.

Carson, R. L., Plemmons, S., Templin, T. J., & Weiss, H. M. (2011). "You are who you are:" A mixed-methods study of affectivity and emotional regulation in curbing teacher burnout. *Research on stress and coping in audition* (Vol. 6 Personality, stress and coping: Implications for education, pp. 239-265). Information Age Publishing.

Carver-Thomas, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2019). The trouble with teacher turnover: How teacher attrition affects students and schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 27*(36).

Chang, M. (2013). Toward a theoretical model to understand teacher emotions and teacher burnout in the context of student misbehavior: Appraisal, regulation and coping. *Motiv Emot, 37*, 799-817. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11031-012-9335-0

Charles, C. M. (2010). *Building classroom discipline* (10th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Christofferson, M., & Sullivan, A. L. (2015). Preservice teachers' classroom management training: A survey of self-reported training experiences, content coverage, and preparedness. *Psychology in the Schools, 52*(3), 248–264.

Cresswell, J. W. & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining the validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice, 39*(3), 124-131.

Darling-Hammond, L., Furger, R. C., Shields, P. M., & Sutcher, L. (2016). *Addressing California's emerging teacher shortage.* Learning Policy Institute.

DeAngelis, K. J., Wall, A. F., & Che, J. (2013). The impact of preservice preparation and early career support on novice teachers' career intentions and decisions. *Journal of Teacher Education, 64*(338), 338-355. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487113488945

Dias-Lacy, S. L., & Guirguis, R. V. (2017). Challenges for new teachers and ways of coping with them. *Journal of Education and Learning, 6*(3), 265-272.

Ducharme, J. M. (2007). Errorless classroom management: A proactive approach to behavioral challenges in the classroom. *Orbi, 37*, 28-31.

Emmer, E. T. & Hickman, J. (1991). The teacher efficacy in classroom management and discipline. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 51*, 755-765. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164491513027

Evertson, C. M., & Emmer, E. (2008). *Classroom management for elementary teachers* (8th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Freeman, J., Simonsen, B., Briere, D. E., & MacSuga-Gage, A. A. (2014). Pre-service teacher training in classroom management: A review of state accreditation policy and teacher preparation programs. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children, 37*, 106-120.

Geving, A. M. (2007). Identifying the types of students and teacher behaviours associated with teacher stress. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*, 624-640. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.02.006.

Gordon, T. (1974). *Teacher effectiveness training*. New York: Peter H. Wyden.

Gray, L., Taie, S., & O'Rear, I. (2015). Public school teacher attrition and mobility in the first five years: Results from the first through fifth waves of the 2007-08 beginning teacher longitudinal study. *U.S. Department of Education.*

Hammerness, K. (2011). Classroom management in the United States: A view from New York City. *Teaching Education, 22*(2).

Hudson, S. M., Hudson, P., Weatherby-Fell, N. L., & Shipway, B. (2016). Graduate standards for teachers: Final-year preservice teachers potentially identify the gaps. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(9). http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n9.8

Ingersoll, R., Merril, L., & May, H. (2012). Retaining teachers: How preparation matters. *Educational Leadership, 69*(8), 30–34.

Ingersoll, R., Merril, L., & May, H. (2014). *What are the effects of teacher education and preparation on beginning teaching attrition?* Research Report (#RR-82). Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education, University of Pennsylvania

Ingersoll R., Merril, L., & Stuckey, D. (2014). *Seven trends: The transformation of the teaching force, updated April 2014. CPRE Report (#RR-80).* Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education, University of Pennsylvania.

Ingersoll, R., & Perda, D. (forthcoming). *How high is teacher turnover and is it a problem?* Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education, University of Pennsylvania.

Johnson, S. M., & Birkeland, S. E. (2003). Pursuing a "sense of success": New teachers explain their career decisions. *American Educational Research Journal, 40*(3), 581-617.

Kini, T., & Podolsky, A. (2016). *Does teaching experience increase teacher effectiveness? A review of the research.* Palo Alto: Learning Policy Institute

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

Klopfer, K. M., Scott, K., Jenking, J., & Ducharme, J. (2019). Effect of preservice classroom management training on attitudes and skills for teaching children with emotional and behavioral problems: A randomized control trial. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 42*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406417735877

Kreig, J. M., Goldhaber, D., & Theobald, R. (2016). A food in the door: Exploring the role of student teaching assignments in teachers' initial job placements. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 38(2), 364-388.

Leckey, Y., Hyland, L., Hickey, G., Lodge, A., Kelly, Pl, Bywater, T., Comiskey, C., Donnelly, M., & McGilloway, S. (2016). A mixed-methods evaluation of the longer-term implementation and utility of a teacher classroom management training programme in Irish primary schools. *Irish Educational Studies, 35*(1), 35-55.

Ma, K., & Cavanagh, M.S. (2018). Classroom ready? Pre-service teachers' self-efficacy for their first professional experience placement. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 43*(7). http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n7.8

Main, S. & Hammond, L. (2008). Best practice of most practiced? Pre-service teachers' beliefs about effective behaviour management strategies and reported self-efficacy. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 33*(4), 28-39. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2008v33n4.3

Marquez, B., Vincent, C., Marquez, J., Pennefather, J., Smolkowsi, K., & Sprague, J. (2016). Opportunities and challenges in training elementary school teachers in classroom management: Initial results from classroom management in action, an online professional development program. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, *24*(1), 87-109.

McEvoy, A., & Welker, R. (2000). Antisocial behavior, academic failure, and school climate: A critical review. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 8*, 130-140.

McKim, A. J., & Velez, J. J. (2016). An evaluation of the self-efficacy theory in agricultural education. Journal of Agricultural Education, 57(1), 73-90. https//:doi.org/10.5032/jae2016.0073

McKim, A. J. & Velez, J. J. (2017). Developing self-efficacy: Exploring preservice coursework, student teaching, and professional development exercises. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 58*(1), 172-185.

Mehrenber, R.L. (2013). Red tape and green teachers: The impact of paperwork on novice special education teachers. *International Journal of Special Education, 28*(1), 80-87.

Niche.com Inc. (2020, August 7). *Find your Niche: Discover the schools and neighborhoods that are right for you*. Niche. https://www.niche.com/

Oliver R. M., & Reschly, D. J. (2010). Special education teacher preparation in classroom management Implications for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders, 35*(3), 188-199.

Omoteso, B. A. & Semudara, A. (2011). The relationship between Teachers' effectiveness and management of classroom misbehaviours in secondary schools. *Psychology, 2*(9). https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2011.29136

O'Neill, S., & Stephenson, J. (2012a). Classroom behaviour management content in Australian undergraduate primary teaching programs. *Teaching Education, 23,* 287-308. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2012.699034.

O'Neill, S., & Stephenson, J. (2012b). Does classroom management coursework influence pre-service teachers' perceived preparedness or confidence? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 28,* 1131-1143. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.06.008

O'Neill, S., & Stephenson, J. (2012c). Exploring Australian pre-service teachers sense of efficacy, its sources, and some possible influences. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 28,* 535-545. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.01.008.

Pas, E. T., Cash, A. H., O'Brennan, L., Debnam, K. J., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2015). Profiles of classroom behavior in high schools: Associations with teacher behavior management strategies and classroom composition. *Journal of School Psychology, 53,* 137-148.

Pendergast, D., Garvis, S., & Keogh, J. (2011). Pre-service student-teacher self-efficacy beliefs: An insight into the making of teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(12), 45-58.

Pennsylvania Department of Education. (2017). The framework for K-12 program guidelines. *Pennsylvania Department of Education*. Retrieved 5 June 2020 from https://www.education.pa.gov/Documents/Teachers-Administrators/Certification%20Preparation%20Programs/Framework%20Guidelines%20and%20Rubrics/K-12%20Program%20Framework%20Guidelines.pdf

Perda, D. (2013). *Transitions into and out of teaching: A longitudinal analysis of early career teacher turnover* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Pfitzner-Eden, F., Thiel, F., & Horsley, J. (2014). An adapted measure of teacher self-efficacy for preservice teachers: Exploring its validity across two countries. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogische Psychologie, 28*, 83-92. https://doi.org/10.1024/10100652/a000125

Podolsky, A., Kini. T., Darling-Hammond, L., & Bishop, J. (2019). Strategies for attracting and retaining educators: What does the evidence say? *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 27*(38). http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.27.3722

Redding, C., & Smith, T. M. (2016). Easy in, easy out: Are alternatively certified teachers turning over at increased rates?. *American Educational Research Journal, 53*(4). 1086-1125. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216653206

Ronfeldt, M., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2012). How teacher turnover harms student achievement. *CALDER Working Paper,* (70).

Safran, S. P. (1989). Australian teachers' views of their effectiveness in behaviour management. International Journal of Disability, *Development and Education, 36*, 15-27. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0156655890360103.

Schaufeli, W. B. & Salanova, M. (2007). Efficacy or inefficacy, that's the question: Burnout and work engagement, and their relationship with efficacy beliefs. *Anxiety, Stress and Coping, 20*, 177-196.

Schwarzer, R., Schmiz, G. S., & Tang, C. (2000). Teacher burnout in Hong Kong and Germany: A cross-cultural validation of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping, 13*(3), 309-326.

Sciuchettie, M. B. & Yssel, N. (2019). The development of preservice teachers' self-efficacy for classroom and behavior management across multiple field experiences. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 44*(6).

Shoulders, T. L. & Krei, M. S. (2015). Rural high school teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. *American Secondary Education, 44*(1).

Simon, M. & White, J. (2016). *Survey/Interview Validation Rubric for Expert Panel – VREP*. Dissertation Recipes. http://www.dissertationrecipes.com/surveyinterview-validation-rubric-for-an-expert-panel/

Simon, N. S., Johnson, S. M., & Reinhorn, S. K. (2015). *A quest for "the very best": Teacher recruitment in six successful, high-poverty, urban schools.* [Working paper]. Cambridge, MA: The Project on the Next Generation of Teachers, Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Sink, C. A., & Spencer, L. R. (2007). Teacher version of the My Classroom Inventory - Short Form: An accountability tool for elementary school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 11,* 129-139.

Sivri, H., & Balcı, E. (2015). Pre-service teachers' classroom management self-efficacy beliefs. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 7*(4), 37-50. https://doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2015.04.004

Skaalvik, E. & Skaalvik, S. (2007). Dimensions of teacher self-efficacy and relations with strain factors, perceived collective teacher efficacy, and teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(3), 611-625. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.3.611

Skaalvik, E. & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of relations. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(4), 1059-1069. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.11.001

Smart, J. B. & Igo, L. B. (2010). A grounded theory of behavior management strategy selection, implementation, and perceived effectiveness reported by first year elementary teachers. *The Elementary School Journal, 110*(4), 567-584.

Smith, T., & Ingersoll, R. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(3), 681-714. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312041003681

Sprick, R., Garrison, M., & Howard, L. (1998). *Champs: A proactive & positive approach to classroom management for grades K-9*. Longmont, CO: Sopris.

Stephenson, J., Linfoot, K., & Martin, A. (2000). Behaviours of concern to teachers in the early years of school. I*nternational Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 47*, 225-235.

Stough, L. M., Montague, M. L., Landmark, L. J., & Williams-Diehm, K. (2015). Persistent classroom management training needs of experienced teachers. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 15*(5) 36-48.

Strong, J. H., Ward, T. J., & Grant, L., W. (2011). What makes good teachers good? A cross-case analysis of the connection between teacher effectiveness and student achievement. *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*, 339-355.

Sutcher, L., Darling-Hammond, L., & Carver-Thomas, D. (2019). Understanding teacher shortages: An analysis of teacher supply and demand in the United States. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 27*(35).

Tang, C. S. K., Au, W. T., Schwarzer, R., & Schmitz, G. (2001). Mental health outcomes of job stress among Chinese teachers: Role of stress resource factors and burnout. *Journal of Organisational Behavior, 22*(8), 887-901.

Tauber, R. T. (2007). *Classroom management: Sound theory and effective practice (3rd ed.)*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Torres, A. S. (2012). Hello, goodbye: Exploring the phenomenon of leaving teaching early. *Journal of Educational Change, 13*, 117-154. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-011-9172-z

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 783-805.

Tsouloupas, C. N., Carson, R. L., Matthews, R., Grawich, M., & Barber, L. (2010). Exploring the association between teachers' perceived student misbehavior and emotional exhaustion: The importance of teacher efficacy beliefs and emotion regulation. *Educational Psychology, 30*, 173-189.

Tsouloupas, C. N., Carson, R. L., & Matthews, R. A. (2014). Personal and school cultural factors associated with the perceptions of teachers' efficacy in handling student misbehavior. *Psychology in the Schools*, *51*(2), 164-180. Doi: 10.1002/pits.21739

Vagi, R. L., Pivovarova, M., & Barnard, W. (2016). Keeping our best? A survival analysis examining a measure of preservice teacher quality and teacher attrition. *Journal of Teacher Education, 00*(0), 1-13.

Walker, H., Marquez, B., Yealton, P., Pennefather, J., Fitness, S., & Vincent, C. (2015). Teacher judgement in assessing students' social behavior with a response-to-intervention framework: Utilizing what teachers know. *Education and Treatment of Children, 38*, 363-382.

Webster-Stratton, C., Reinke, W. M., Herman, K. C., & Newcomer, L. L. (2011). The incredible years teacher classroom management training: The methods and principles that support fidelity of training and delivery. *School Psychology Review*, *40*(4), 509-529.

Wyss, V. L., Siebert, C. J., & Dowling, K. A. (2012). Structuring effective practicum experiences for pre-service teachers. *Education*, *132*(3), 600–606.

Zhang, G., & Zeller, N. (2016). A longitudinal investigation of the relationship between teacher preparation and teacher retention. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *43*(2), 73–92.

Appendices

Appendix A

Survey

1. I have read the consent form in the invitation; I understand that participation in this survey is on a voluntary basis**,** and I have the right to refuse to participate at any time without consequence or prejudice. **(Yes/No)**

If a participant answers no, the survey will end.

2. What is the cumulative total number of years you have been teaching?

0-1 2-3 4-5 more than 5

If a participant answers more than 5, the survey will end.

3. What grade do you currently teach?

K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

4. In what subjects are you certified through your degree? (check all that apply)

Special Education
Grade Level
History
English
Math
Science
Music
Art
Technology Education
PE
Business
Family and Consumer Science
Other: specify

5. What type of college/university did you attend to earn your teaching degree?

Public private I have a teaching license from an alternative path.

6. From which of the following sources, if any, have you received classroom management training? (check all that apply)

A semester-long course in classroom management
A semester-long course in another topic

A practicum-type course in which classroom management was addressed
A seminar or workshop in classroom management
A seminar or workshop in another topic
A lecture or presentation dedicated to classroom management
A lecture or presentation dedicated to another topic
Mentoring from someone outside of required coursework
Mentoring from a licensed teacher
A book other than those required by coursework
Supervised fieldwork (student teaching)
I have not received any type of training in classroom management.
Other: specify

7. A classroom management course was available in my program. **(Yes/No/Unsure)**

8. I was required to take a classroom management course. **(Yes/No)**

9. I took a course in classroom management. * **(Yes/No)**

10. *(This question will only be seen with a Yes answer to question 9.) During the course you took in classroom management, which of the following areas, if any, were discussed? (check all that apply)

Pacing instruction
Creating classroom rules/expectations
Organizing the physical environment of your classroom
Using reinforcement strategies
Teaching procedures/routines
Applying interventions for students with difficult behavior
Teaching classroom rules and expectations
Creating a community of learners
Other: _____

11. I have interviewed for jobs for other career paths since beginning my teaching career. **(Yes/No)**

Choose the best answer for the following statements:

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
12	In my preservice preparation program, I had the opportunity to develop my own classroom management plan.					
13	In my preservice preparation program, I was able to implement a classroom management plan during student teaching.					
14	In my preservice preparation program, I learned the difference between proactive and reactive behavior intervention.					
15	I set clear behavior expectations for my students.					
16	I develop routines in my classroom to keep activities running smoothly.					
17	I am able to keep students on task.					
18	If a student disrupts the lesson I am able to redirect them quickly.					
19	I am able to use multiple interventions with students who behave inappropriately.					
20	I build rapport with my students.					
21	I adjust my classroom management strategies to different classes' needs.					

22	I am able to keep the problem behavior of a few students from interfering in a lesson for the rest.					
23	I am an effective teacher.					
24	My classroom is a happy place.					
25	I would not want to work at any other school.					
26	I look forward to going to work.					
27	I plan on returning to my school next year.					
28	I would like more professional development on classroom management strategies.					

29. What could your preservice program have offered to better prepare you for classroom management?

30. List three areas of classroom management that you could benefit getting more training on.

31. If you could change three aspects of your current job to increase your job satisfaction, what would they be? Why?

32. I would be willing to participate in a follow up interview.

Yes No

Please enter your preferred contact information:

Name, Email, Phone #

Appendix B

Interview Questions

1. What do you enjoy most/least about teaching?

2. What do you feel most/least prepared for in the classroom?

3. Look back at your first year of teaching, what were some of your greatest challenges?

4. Do you feel you are effective at reaching your students? Why?

5. Do you feel like your preservice preparation program prepared you well for leading a classroom? Why or why not?

Appendix C

Expert Panel

1. Dr. Thomas Starmack Ed.D. – Bloomsburg University Associate Professor
2. Dr. Lorinda Krause Ed.D. – Operations Director for SUMMIT Early Learning & Susquehanna University Adjust Faculty

Appendix D
Survey/Interview Validation Rubric for Expert Panel - VREP©

Criteria	Operational Definitions	Score **1=Not Acceptable** (major modifications needed) **2=Below Expectations** (some modifications needed) **3=Meets Expectations** (no modifications needed but could be improved with minor changes) **4=Exceeds Expectations** (no modifications needed)				Questions NOT meeting standard **(List page <u>and</u> question number) and need to be revised.** ***Please use the comments and suggestions section to recommend revisions.***
		1	2	3	4	
Clarity	• The questions are direct and specific. • Only one question is asked at a time. • The participants can understand what is being asked. • There are no *double-barreled* questions (two questions in one).					
Wordiness	• Questions are concise. • There are no unnecessary words					

Negative Wording	• Questions are asked using the affirmative (e.g., Instead of asking, "Which methods are not used?", the researcher asks, "Which methods *are* used?")					
Overlapping Responses	• No response covers more than one choice. • All possibilities are considered. • There are no ambiguous questions.					
Balance	• The questions are unbiased and do not lead the participants to a response. The questions are asked using a neutral tone.					
Use of Jargon	• The terms used are understandable by the target population. • There are no clichés or hyperbole in the wording of the questions.					
Appropriateness of Responses Listed	• The choices listed allow participants to respond appropriately. • The responses apply to all situations or offer a way for those to respond with unique situations.					

Use of Technical Language	• The use of technical language is minimal and appropriate. • All acronyms are defined.					
Application to Praxis	• The questions asked relate to the daily practices or expertise of the potential participants.					
Relationship to Problem	• The questions are sufficient to resolve the problem in the study • The questions are sufficient to answer the research questions. • The questions are sufficient to obtain the purpose of the study.					

Comments and Suggestions

Appendix E

RERB Approval Form

IMMACULATA UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW BOARD
REQUEST FOR PROTOCOL REVIEW--REVIEWER'S COMMENTS FORM
(R1297)

Name of Researcher: Kayla Switzer

Project Title: Novice Teachers' Perceptions of Classroom Management in Relation to Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction

Reviewer's Comments:

Your proposal is **Approved**. You may begin your research or collect your data.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS APPROVAL IS VALID FOR ONE YEAR **(365 days)** FROM DATE OF SIGNING.

Reviewer's Recommendations:

_____ Exempt	___X__ Approve
_____ Expedited	_____ Conditionally Approved
_____ Full Review	_____ Do Not Approve

Marcia Parris

Marcia Parris, Ed.D.,
Chair, Research Ethics Review Board

November 16, 2020
Date

Appendix F

Novice Teacher Survey Email

Research Study:

Teachers' Perceptions of Classroom Management in Relation to Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction

We are currently engaged in a study of novice teacher perceptions regarding classroom management and its impact on self-efficacy and job satisfaction. You have been invited to participate in this study because of your experiences as a novice teacher, year one through five.

To help us gain insight into this area, we will ask you to complete a brief interview which should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. I would like to contact you to request a short telephone or in-person interview consisting of five additional questions related to classroom management, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction. This interview will be recorded for the purpose of transcription.

Upon completion of this study's data analysis, a report detailing the research and findings associated with classroom management in relation to self-efficacy and job satisfaction will be available to your school district.

The data collected in the surveys and interviews will be held in the strictest confidence. Any notes taken during the interview will not include your name or reference to your school district.

Your participation in this study is on a voluntary basis, and you may refuse to participate at any time without consequence or prejudice. Any questions you have about the research can be directed to me, Kayla Switzer, doctoral candidate in the College of Graduate Studies at Immaculata University. I can be reached at (570) 578-2220 or at kswitzer@mail.immaculata.edu. You may also contact Dr. David Brennan in the College of Graduate Studies at Immaculata University at (610) 647-4400 ext. 3164 or at dlbrennan@immaculata.edu.

Any questions about your rights as a research subject may be directed to Dr. Marcia Parris, the dean of the College of Graduate Studies, at (610) 647-4400 ext. 3222 or at mparris@immaculata.edu. Dr. Parris’s office is located in Room 130 of Loyola Hall.

Appendix G

Novice Teacher Interview Email

Research Study:

Teachers' Perceptions of Classroom Management in Relation to Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction

We are currently engaged in a study of novice teacher perceptions regarding classroom management and its impact on self-efficacy and job satisfaction. You have been invited to participate in this study because of your experiences as a novice teacher, year one through five.

To help us gain insight into this area, we will ask you to complete a brief interview which should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. I would like to contact you to request a short telephone or in-person interview consisting of five additional questions related to classroom management, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction. This interview will be recorded for the purpose of transcription.

Upon completion of this study's data analysis, a report detailing the research and findings associated with classroom management in relation to self-efficacy and job satisfaction will be available to your school district.

The data collected in the surveys and interviews will be held in the strictest confidence. Any notes taken during the interview will not include your name or reference to your school district.

Your participation in this study is on a voluntary basis, and you may refuse to participate at any time without consequence or prejudice. Any questions you have about the research can be directed to me, Kayla Switzer, doctoral candidate in the College of Graduate Studies at Immaculata University. I can be reached at (570) 578-2220 or at kswitzer@mail.immaculata.edu. You may also contact Dr. David Brennan in the College of Graduate Studies at Immaculata University at (610) 647-4400 ext. 3164 or at dlbrennan@immaculata.edu.

Any questions about your rights as a research subject may be directed to Dr. Marcia Parris, the dean of the College of Graduate Studies, at (610) 647-4400 ext. 3222 or at mparris@immaculata.edu. Dr. Parris’s office is located in Room 130 of Loyola Hall.