

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS' EFFICACY IN
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT IN THOSE WHO DID OR DID NOT SUBSTITUTE
TEACH

THOMAS O'CONNOR

2020

The undersigned, approved by the Department Chair of Graduate Studies in Education, have examined a dissertation entitled:

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS EFFICACY IN CLASSROOM
MANAGEMENT IN THOSE WHO DID OR DID NOT SUBSTITUTE TEACH

Presented by Thomas O'Connor a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Education and hereby certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.



Dr. Duane Widhalm, Advisor, Chair
Graduate Education, Southwest Baptist University



Dr. Pam Hedgpeth, Committee Member
Graduate Education, Southwest Baptist University



Dr. Benny Fong, Committee Member
Graduate Education, Southwest Baptist University

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS EFFICACY IN CLASSROOM
MANAGEMENT IN THOSE WHO DID OR DID NOT SUBSTITUTE TEACH

A Dissertation
Presented to
The Faculty of the Graduate Education Department
Southwest Baptist University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

By

Thomas O'Connor

Dr. Duane Widhalm, Dissertation Advisor

August, 2020

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are so many people that I owe so much to in order to get me to the end of this journey. God knew the people to put in my life in order to help me achieve this victory and from this day on I will strive to use this in a way that brings the glory back to him. My wife Paije has been so supportive throughout this whole journey, helped me persevere through tough times, and sacrificed many potential plans in order for me to work on this paper. I owe many of thanks to my parents Tom and Cathey. They have stood by my side through all of my educational journey, always modeling a love for education and personal growth. I have had so many teachers and mentors in my life who have instilled in me the importance of education and a passion for teaching.

My family has been such a big reason for why I have made it this far, yet there are still others who drove me to exceed my own expectations. My committee members were on my side through the whole process working hard to ensure that my paper would make a difference in education. Gratitude is not a strong enough word to describe how much I'm thankful for Dr. Widhalm my advisor. He helped guide and shape my paper always remaining steady and calm. Dr. Widhalm fought by my side this whole journey helping me make each step with confidence. Two more people who this journey would be impossible without are my two committee members. Dr. Hedgpeth helped shape my mind during so many graduate classes and has been such an inspiration in my life. Her passion for education is contagious to everyone she meets, yet her love for God is always at her core. Dr. Fong helped push my paper beyond normal limits by guiding me and answering tons of questions about statistical operations. He was always willing to Zoom and chat, quick with effective feedback, and modeled what a servant leader looks like. I could have never have done this without either of you by my side on this incredible journey.

Lastly, I need to thank friends and co-workers who have helped support me through this process. My doctorate cohort has been such a loving and supportive group through the whole graduate program. I have made many lifelong friends in this group and hope we accomplish our goal of all graduating at the same time. Thank you to many co-workers who have lent an ear or asked about my paper even when you may not have wanted a long conversation. Also some key friends from all the way back to fourth grade all the way up to new CFNX friends who helped keep me going and sane during this journey. There is so much gratitude in my heart, yet it will never make up for the debt I owe to so many of you. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
INTRODUCTION	1
Theoretical Framework for the Study.....	2
Problem Statement.....	6
Purpose for the Study.....	8
Research Questions.....	9
Statement of Hypotheses.....	10
Significance of Study.....	11
Definition of Key Terms.....	12
Limitations	13
Delimitations.....	13
Assumptions.....	14
Design Controls	14
Summary.....	16
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	18

Introduction.....	18
Teacher Shortage	19
Causes of teacher shortage.....	21
Teacher Efficacy	22
Importance of efficacy for new teachers.....	24
Building Efficacy in New Teachers.....	26
Lack of new teacher efficacy development.....	29
Classroom Management.....	30
How to support new teachers' development of classroom management.....	33
Classroom management difficulties.....	35
Classroom management efficacy development.....	37
Authentic Preparation Experience	40
Substitute teaching.....	45
Substitute teaching as an alternative authentic experience.....	48
Summary.....	50
METHODOLOGY	52
Introduction.....	52
Research Questions.....	53
Null Hypotheses.....	54
Participants.....	55

Selection/Sampling	56
Research Setting.....	57
Research Design.....	58
Instrumentation	60
Procedures.....	60
Data Analysis	62
Summary.....	69
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	71
Introduction.....	71
Research Questions.....	72
Null Hypotheses.....	73
Data Analysis and Findings	74
Participants.....	75
Data Cleaning.....	76
Research Question One and Null Hypothesis $H1_0$	77
Research Question Two	80
Research Question 2A and Null Hypothesis $H2a_0$	80
Research Question 2B and Null Hypothesis $H2b_0$	82
Research Question 2C and Null Hypothesis $H3a_0$	84
Research Question 2D and Null Hypothesis $H4a_0$	86

Open Ended Questions.....	89
Summary.....	91
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	92
Introduction.....	92
Summary of Methods.....	93
Summary of Findings.....	94
Research Question 1 Conclusions and Null Hypothesis.....	96
Research Question 2 Conclusions and Null Hypotheses	100
Open-Ended Questions Conclusions.....	105
Professional Implications and Recommendations	108
Recommendations for Future Research	110
Conclusions.....	111
Appendix A.....	116
Appendix B.....	117
Appendix C.....	118
Appendix D.....	119
Appendix E	120
References.....	121

ABSTRACT

Education preparation programs have studied the impact of authentic experience using student teaching and even a year-long internship model. Unfortunately, teachers are still leaving the profession within the first five years at an alarming rate. Classroom management and efficacy development are key factors in the retention of new teachers. Other types of authentic classroom experiences have yet to be studied leading to an unknown about the impacts it could potentially have. One type of authentic experience is having undergraduates substitute teach. In this quantitative study, the researcher analyzed the difference substitute teaching experience made for first-year teachers in classroom management efficacy. The researcher sought to understand if this type of experience helped develop classroom management efficacy. The research analyzed if there was any difference in classroom management efficacy based on the amount of experience substitute teaching. The researcher also analyzed if there was a difference in classroom management efficacy based on any training the substitutes had during the experience. Additionally, the researcher used two open-ended questions in order to gather more insight into the difference substitute teaching experience made as well as the impact of Covid-19 on the development of classroom management efficacy. Findings indicated the amount of substitute teaching experience did make a difference in participant's classroom management efficacy development. Also, the trainings provided to undergraduate substitute teachers made little difference in the classroom management efficacy of participants.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

According to The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, in the United States, over 5,000 more dollars are spent on both primary and secondary public education per student than other countries around the world (OECD, 2018). In addition, almost 9,000 more teaching hours per year which is about 1,000 over the average (OECD, 2018). More money and hours invested in education should equate to higher academic performance in the United States (OECD, 2018). Despite more money and time spent on education, the United States continues to struggle academically when compared to similar countries (OECD, 2018). Even with more time in the classroom each year, The New Teacher Project (TNTP) supported the findings showing 10% of classes in schools are taught by low-performing experienced teachers (2013). Furthermore, around half of high-performing teachers in the United States leave within the first five years of teaching (The New Teacher Project, 2013).

Reitman and Karge (2019) sought to understand why so many new teachers leave the profession within the first five years of teaching. Zaharis (2019) studied first-year teachers and found a perception of a lack of experience before entering the profession. Morris, Usher, and Chen (2017) identified the lack of experience had a harmful effect on a new teacher's development of efficacy or the ability to accomplish difficult tasks in the classroom. Teachers entering the profession are lacking the necessary experiences and efficacy to provide a classroom environment where learning and teaching can occur (Aldeman & Mitchel, 2016; Flower, McKenna, & Haring, 2017; Nguyen, 2018). A common struggle resulting from the lack of experience of pre-service teachers and novice

teachers is the inability to effectively deal with classroom management. Classroom management is described as a “safe, positive, and consistent environment where teaching and learning can take place” (Wong, Wong, Jondahl, and Ferguson, 2014, p. 24).

Theoretical Framework for the Study

The study is supported by Kounin’s (1970) Classroom Management Theory as well as Bandura’s (1997) Self-Efficacy Theory. The purpose of the study was to look specifically at first-year teachers and their level of classroom management efficacy in regard to substitute teaching experience. In order to understand the basis of classroom management and teacher self-efficacy, the researcher used a framework to help guide the research while helping to answer the research questions. Using components of both Kounin’s (1970) Classroom Management Theory and Bandura’s (1997) Self-Efficacy Theory helped address if substitute teaching experience makes a difference in classroom management efficacy.

Kounin’s foundational research over classroom management identified a teacher’s “withitness” allowed the teacher to improve classroom management (1970, p. 80). “Withitness,” refers to how aware a teacher is of the surroundings and the functioning parts of the classroom and predict incidents which could potentially occur (Kounin, 1970, p. 80). The idea of “withitness” is a highly important skill, yet rarely found within any classroom management training (Marzano, Pickering, & Marzano, 2003, p. 69). One challenge of classroom management training is providing effective practice in authentic situations (Marzano et al., 2003). Teachers “withitness” occurs when a teacher demonstrates awareness of surroundings without having to state what they are seeing in order to convey to the students they know what is going on (Kounin, 1970, p. 80.) This

non-verbal cue reassures students the teacher has control of what is going on and will help redirect the student in implementing the correct behavior. This non-verbal cue is sometimes referred to as the teacher look, and also consists of more complex parts such as building effective relationships with students.

Effective momentum and “smoothness” are also significant predictors of a well-managed classroom of students (Kounin, 1970, p. 93). During teacher lessons, many transitions from one topic to the next occur, as well as other factors such as bathroom breaks, lunch, recess, and many more. Transitions can create a loss of momentum and smoothness or flow of a lesson. Early in teaching, lack of experience creating an over confidence in skills potentially causes classroom management to be a challenge when the teacher has to use underdeveloped skills (Aldeman & Mitchel, 2016; Flower, McKenna, & Haring, 2017; Nguyen, 2018). Bandura (1997) noted a lack of self-efficacy or belief in the ability to overcome difficult tasks cause people to become less resilient and adaptable to change.

Bandura (1997) identified self-efficacy as a factor which influences the quality of life. Self-Efficacy is defined as “people’s beliefs in their capabilities to produce desired effects by their actions” (Bandura, 1997, p. 7). With classroom management being a difficult task for teachers to implement, self-efficacy is important for teachers to find success in the classroom. Within the Self-Efficacy Theory, Bandura (1997) noted people need to use or adapt skills to multiple circumstances for the skill to solidify. In order to become resilient with the efficacy of a skill, one must persevere through obstacles (Bandura, 1997). Teachers need to be able to work through and balance obstacles based on Kounin’s “Withitness” theory (1970, p. 80). In more complicated processes, efficacy

is generally gained over a longer period of time (Bandura, 1997). Dweck (2008) used the idea of a fixed and growth mindset to explain similar beliefs found in Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory. A person with a growth mindset generally sees failure as a learning opportunity, whereas a person with a fixed mindset generally cannot handle failure effectively or tries to find outside reasons for failure (Dweck, 2008). In Dweck's research, the difference between a fixed and growth mindset is how the person interprets failures with a difficult task (2008).

Bandura (1997) describes two main types of understanding learning which are used to help understand efficacy. The two types of understanding include "declarative knowledge" and the second includes "procedural knowledge" (Bandura, 1997, p. 25). Declarative knowledge is very similar to the knowledge gained in teacher preparation programs which provides pre-service teachers the foundational skills of education before implementing the practices (Bandura, 1997). Declarative knowledge established in schema, prior to teaching experience, is important (Bandura, 1997). In contrast, procedural knowledge is developed through the experience of applying the knowledge to situations while adapting to meet the complexities of each situation (Bandura, 1997). Procedural knowledge is not only gained and developed over time, but with experience, procedural knowledge can be achieved almost automatically without much thought taking place (Marzano et al., 2003). Therefore, teacher preparation programs help provide declarative knowledge, while experience in the classroom allows the teacher to start developing an automaticity with procedural knowledge in areas such as classroom management (Bandura, 1997). Without both forms of knowledge, one will struggle to build self-efficacy due to the lack of successful experience needed to support knowledge

gained and develop teacher “withitness” (Kounin, 1970, p. 80). Additionally, Bandura (1997) and Dweck (2008) both shared similar views of effort as a primary driving force towards success.

While using knowledge, it is important classroom skills are able to be adaptive and used for multiple purposes. As knowledge is applied in various experiences, each experience helps the learning become a natural reaction when similar situations arise. For example, when a disruption occurs the teacher relies on previous strategies to help solve the new situation (Kounin, 1970). Bandura (1997) elaborated and stated, “After people develop adequate ways of managing situations that recur regularly, they act on their perceived efficacy without requiring continuing directive or reflective thought” (p. 34). Unfortunately, if the learner continuously uses ineffective strategies, self-efficacy for the task will not be improved (Bandura, 1997). In Senge’s work (2006), he describes mental models or a person's viewpoint toward a task, idea, or thing. Mental models change how a person reacts or approaches a situation (Senge, 2006). For example, a new teacher who struggles with classroom management may develop a mental model that the individual will always struggle with classroom management (Senge, 2006).

Bandura’s Self-Efficacy Theory has implications for improving classroom management skills (1997). One aspect Bandura mentions is the need to learn and practice sub-skills which lead to the accumulation of one comprehensive skill (1997). While gaining experience in authentic situations relating to a comprehensive skill, one can gain efficacy in applying knowledge to specific situations (Bandura, 1997). As these experiences connect with a main skill, efficacy helps the reactions to other situations become more automatic and effective due to the development within the subskills. If the

experience is not similar enough to the skill being developed, the less likely a transfer to the efficacy of the skill will occur (Bandura, 1997).

Bandura (1997) and Senge (2006) believed when novice teachers are confident, the teachers can effectively manage a classroom. During student teaching, pre-service teachers are given opportunities to practice “withitness” while also building efficacy and mental model of classroom management practices will go when they receive their own classroom (Kounin, 1970, p. 80). If negative beliefs are developed during student teaching experiences, the student is more likely to develop a lower sense of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). If a pre-service teacher can develop positive efficacy toward classroom management, the individual could potentially have a different level of self-efficacy upon entering the classroom (Bandura, 1997).

Problem Statement

According to the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE, 2019), from 2013-2019 about 4,000 first-year teachers entered the profession of teaching each year. Yet, during the 2018-2019 school year, the retention rate of teachers in the profession for three to five years dropped over 14% (DESE, 2019). One of the main struggles new teachers face is implementing classroom management (Eckert, 2014; Gifford, Snyder, & Cuddapah, 2013; Headden, 2014; Hill, 1999; Petersen, 2017). Spooner, Flowers, Lambert, and Algozzine, (2008) explored extending the length requirement of student teaching to see if a longer student teaching requirement would benefit pre-service teachers. Spooner et al., (2008) discovered a positive impact on the amount of growth accomplished by pre-service teachers based on extra experience.

Teacher preparation programs are working to meet the need for expanded experience with pre-service teachers (Spooner et al, 2008). Glatfelter (2006) determined principals, teachers, and substitute teachers each believe classroom management is reliant on experience and is essential for learning to occur in a classroom. Research regarding classroom management (Garrett, 2013; Kounin, 1970; Marzano et al., 2003; Smith, Fisher, & Frey, 2015; Wong & Wong, 2009) and substitute teaching (Glatfelter, 2006; Heinsen, 2012; Khronholz, 2013; Mathewson, 2017; Wheeler-Ayers, 2002) has been conducted, but there is a gap in determining if substitute teaching directly impacts pre-service teacher's classroom management efficacy when teachers enter the field. Yüksel (2014) and Heinsen (2012) mentioned future research should focus on possible factors or experiences which influence pre-service teacher efficacy in classroom management. Pre-service teachers with substitute educational experience receive opportunities to practice skills learned in undergraduate studies and apply the skills with students quickly (Yahui, Cuiqiu, & Iler, 2008). Effective preparation programs have a balance of pedagogy knowledge and pedagogy application to solidify learning so such pedagogy can be directly applied to a classroom setting (Atilas & Pinholster, 2013). Pre-service teachers enter the field lacking experiences in classroom management and as a result struggle during the first years of teaching (Gibbs & Miller, 2014). Garrett (2014) identified many teacher preparation programs do not deny the need for effective classroom management in teaching, but often lack a specific course on classroom management. This study was conducted done to determine if substitute teaching experience during undergraduate studies has a relationship with pre-service teacher's classroom management efficacy in Missouri's schools.

Purpose for the Study

The purpose of this quantitative causal comparative study was to look specifically at first-year teachers and their level of classroom management efficacy in regard to substitute teaching experience. Based on the theories of Bandura (1997) and Kounin (1970), this study will seek to determine based on self-efficacy and classroom management development looking, specifically at first-year teachers with and without substitute teaching experience to determine if there is a statistically significant difference in teacher classroom management efficacy in Missouri school districts. This study helped to fill the gap of literature about outside teaching experiences.

This study compared the differences in experience of pre-service teachers having substitute teaching experiences prior to entering the profession of teaching. A statistically significant difference in classroom management efficacy helped fill a gap in literature as well as contribute to potential research on other forms of experience pre-service teachers may complete prior to becoming first-year teachers. The participants involved were comprised of first-year teachers in the state of Missouri who either did or did not substitute teach prior to becoming a first-year teacher.

The study was measured using a classroom management efficacy survey created by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001). The two independent groupings were first-year teachers who substitute taught before becoming teachers and first-year teachers who did not substitute teacher prior to becoming a teacher. The classroom management efficacy scores were the dependent variable while there were multiple groupings.

In research question one, an ANOVA was used to compare differences among groups. The groups for research question one were first-year teachers who had not

substitute taught during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who had substitute taught during undergraduate studies. The first-year teachers were then grouped by how many days of substitute teaching had been completed. The days included: one to 10 days, 11-20 days, or over 20 days. The substitute teaching experience included both consecutive or non-consecutive days. According to Dr. T. Vest, the Director of Professional Learning for substitute teachers in multiple districts in Missouri, over one third of the substitute teaching pool are pre-service teachers potentially limited on possible opportunities to substitute consecutive days (personal communication, October 21, 2019).

While using the same dependent variable of classroom management efficacy score for research question two, the grouping were done using separate independent samples *t*-tests. The *t*-test was used to measure if a statistically significant difference in the dependent variable between the two independent measures existed. The independent groups for research question two were the different levels of support or structure during substitute teaching experiences. The independent groups were first-year teachers with no substitute teaching training experience, teachers with an orientation training, teachers with one to two classroom observations or trainings, and teachers with more than two classroom observations or training.

Research Questions

The purpose of the study was to determine if a difference between classroom management efficacy in first-year teachers who substitute taught during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies existed. The following questions guided the study:

1. What is the difference in the classroom management efficacy score among first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies, over a period of one to 10 days, 11-20 days, and over 20 days?
2. What is the difference in the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies with:
 - a. No substitute training overall?
 - b. One orientation training conducted by a professional educator?
 - c. One-two classroom visits or formal classroom management training sessions by a professional educator?
 - d. More than two classroom visits or formal classroom management training sessions by a professional educator?

Statement of Hypotheses

Null hypothesis $H1_0$: There is no statistically significant difference in the classroom management efficacy score among first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies, over a period of one to 10 days, 11-20 days, and over 20 days?

Null hypothesis $H2a_0$: There is no statistically significant difference between the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies.

Null hypothesis H2b₀: There is no statistically significant difference between the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies with one orientation training for substitute teaching by a professional educator.

Null hypothesis H4a₀: There is no statistically significant difference between the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies with one-two classroom visits or formal training sessions by a professional educator.

Null hypothesis H5a₀: There is no statistically significant difference between the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies more than two classroom visits or formal training sessions by a professional educator.

Significance of Study

This study is significant because there is gap in research focusing on the relationship between classroom management experience and substitute teaching prior to first-year teachers entering the profession of teaching (Heinsen, 2012; Yüksel, 2014). Currently, teachers are not adequately trained, have a lack experience in classroom management, and have little efficacy once in the field (Colson, Sparks, Berridge, Frimming, & Willis, 2017; Zaharis, 2019). This study could potentially help teacher preparatory programs better understand the significance of the substitute teaching

experience prior to pre-service teaching (Vignoli, Guglielmi, & Balduzzi (2018). Classroom management is a foundational skill needed by all teachers (Denton & Kriete, 2000; Marzano et al., 2003; Wong et al., 2014), yet the main source of pre-service teaching experience is only practicum and student teaching experiences (Zaharis, 2019). Other experiences such as after school programs and substitute teaching may potentially have value and deserve consideration to help teachers develop classroom management efficacy before entering the field (Danyluk, 2013; Baran, Cilsalar, & Mesutoglu, 2017; Reynolds, Howley, Southgate, & Brown, 2016).

Definition of Key Terms

Pre-service Teacher. A student teacher in a graduate program gaining teaching experience while under the supervision or guidance of a cooperating teacher (Virginia Wesleyan University, 2018).

Novice Teacher. A teacher having acquired less than three years of teaching experience (IGI Global, 2018).

Teacher Efficacy. Teachers' sense of efficacy is the belief in the capability to make a difference in student learning, and the ability to reach students who are difficult or unmotivated (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

Classroom Management. Attempting to eliminate classroom disruptions during teaching and learning (Sivri & Balci, 2015).

Classroom Management Self-Efficacy. Teacher's belief in their ability to handle student behavior (Martin and Stephenson, 1999).

Substitute. A temporary teacher assuming the role of the regular teacher due to the absence of the regular teacher (Robinson, 2016).

Limitations

Oftentimes with any study there are a number of variables which affect the outcomes beyond the control of the researcher. In this study the limitations are detailed below.

1. Random sampling could not occur.
2. The number of participants with substitute experience.
3. The reliability and validity of the Classroom Management Efficacy section of the survey created by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001).
4. The time period in which the study was conducted.
5. The time the participants earned certification versus when participants entered the profession.
6. The number of consecutive or non-consecutive days participants substitute taught.
7. The time period in which Covid-19 occurred during the 2019-2020 academic school year.

Delimitations

The researcher intentionally imposed the following factors to narrow the scope of research.

1. The study only included school districts in the state of Missouri.
2. The study only included first-year teachers.
3. Data was only collected from participants once permission was granted.
4. The implementation of Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory and Kounin's Classroom Management Theory.
5. The study used an online survey to gather data.

6. The study was delimited to new teachers entering the profession during the 2019-2020 academic school year.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made during this study.

1. It was assumed participants responded truthfully to survey questions.
2. It was assumed participants had an equal understanding of efficacy and classroom management.
3. It was assumed first-year teachers had similar classroom management issues occur in the classroom.
4. It was assumed first-year teachers entered the profession with similar undergraduate studies and experience.
5. It was assumed first-year teachers entered the profession with similar levels of classroom management efficacy.
6. It was assumed participants responded completely to survey questions.
7. It was assumed results were generalizable pending a significant statistical difference in first-year teachers teaching in Missouri.

Design Controls

This quantitative comparative study focused on Missouri first-year teachers who did and did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies. The study focused on new teachers in public schools. All school districts in Missouri were sent an invitation to participate in the study to broaden the data pool and allow more generalizability since one of the limitations was no random sampling. Districts willing to participate were sent a survey to distribute to teachers completing the first year of teaching during the 2019-2020

academic school year. During the first part of the classroom management efficacy survey, permission to use the data from the participant was asked. The study was based on Bandura's (1997) Self-Efficacy Theory and Kounin's (1970) Classroom Management Theory. Both theories and the research questions were used to guide and direct the research to narrow the scope of the study. In order to gather data, a survey was administered electronically to identify which first-year teachers had or had not substitute taught during undergraduate studies.

The study was limited to the use of purposive sampling due to the groups studied. The groups being studied were first-year teachers who had or had not substitute taught before entering the profession. With purposive sampling, the researcher attempted to create as even and random groups as possible to help balance the limitation. Another section of the survey was administered to gain data about first-year teachers' classroom management efficacy. The section was given to new teachers' who had completed their first full year of teaching to allow participants to reflect on the entirety of the school year. The classroom management efficacy section of the survey from Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) was used, limiting the study to the reliability and validity of the classroom management efficacy portion of the survey. The survey was sent to all first-year teachers regardless if the substitute experience was consecutive or not consecutive to increase the sample size and obtain more accurate information regarding when participants earned certification, as well as to increase generalizability.

The survey was given using QuestionPro to ensure anonymity of the respondents. A reminder was also sent via email after one week in to increase the number of responses. Participants responded anonymously to ensure honesty of answers and there

were no identifying characteristics for individuals or districts, so privacy was protected. The study assumed participants each had similar classroom management issues occur as well as similar teacher preparation programs. The study also assumed preparation programs led to similar classroom management efficacy beliefs, knowledge of efficacy, and classroom management upon entering the profession.

Summary

Currently there is a gap in research identifying if other experiences, besides student teaching and practicums, may have a relationship with classroom management efficacy. The purpose of the study was to identify if a relationship between substitute teaching experience before entering the profession and classroom management efficacy scores exists. Undergraduate teacher preparatory programs attempt to provide pre-service teachers with adequate experience before entering the profession, yet more experience may be needed (Colson et al., 2017; Lowder, 2017; Vignoli et al., 2018; Zaharis, 2019). Bandura's (1997) Self-Efficacy Theory supports an improvement in efficacy may increase the belief of new teachers feeling more prepared for effective classroom management. The study was designed to examine if efficacy in relation to classroom management is higher in undergraduates who substitute taught versus undergraduates who did not substitute teach.

Chapter Two consists of a literature review organized thematically. Topics include: difficulties early in the education profession, efficacy in education, substitute teaching experience, and classroom management effectiveness. Chapter Three includes the methods utilized in the study, as well as the design and data analysis. Chapter Four presents the significant findings of the study. Lastly, Chapter Five analyzes the results of

the study along with the author's interpretations of the findings and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Classroom management and teacher efficacy are topics of substantial research (Banas, 2014; Bandura, 1997; Boysen, 2015; Lew & Nelson, 2016; Lowder, 2017; Moore, 2016; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). Classroom management and efficacy are also challenges new teachers often face (Bandura, 1997; Eckert, 2014; Gibbs & Miller, 2014; Kounin, 1970; Petersen, 2017). Even with substantial research about classroom management and efficacy, teachers are still struggling. In addition, there is a direct link between student achievement and teacher self-efficacy (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Borgogni, Petitta, & Rubinacci, 2003; Engin, 2020; Kim & Seo, 2018). Out of the first-year teachers, nearly 60% achieved more academic progress with students than teachers with more than seven years of experience (Moore, 2016; The New Teacher Project, 2013). Currently, little research connecting classroom management and teacher efficacy has been conducted. Presently, a lack of research exists which examines how classroom management efficacy potentially impacts first-year teachers.

New teachers often blame education preparation programs for management struggles as the reality of the profession settles (Sutcher et al., 2016). Pre-service teachers often struggle transitioning into the profession due to a lack of personal teaching identity (Trent, 2013). New teachers try to reference their undergraduate experience with previous mentor teachers to construct personal teaching identity (Trent, 2013). Previous mentor teacher practices which new teachers are mimicking may not be best practice or relevant (Trent, 2013). Pre-service teachers entering the profession identify more with the

teaching style of others due to their own lack of experience (Sutcher et al., 2016; Trent, 2013). New teachers lack efficacy, or belief in personal abilities as a teacher and professional (Bandura, 1997). In Eckert's (2014) research of pre-service teachers, he identified a large discrepancy between pre-service teachers and expert teachers in the ways each directed groups of students during an activity. Discrepancies in teaching experience of first-year teachers seem to create a gap in classroom management and teacher effectiveness.

Chapter Two consists of a literature review discussing the current teacher shortage and the impact teacher shortage has on the quality of new teacher training and service in the profession. Additional information including difficulties of pre-service and novice teachers, the impact of efficacy on teaching, effects of substitute teaching experience, impacts of a teacher's classroom management, and classroom management efficacy is presented as well. Additionally, authentic learning experiences such as student teaching and substitute teaching lead to increased efficacy with classroom management in first-year teachers. Authentic learning experiences are linked to the theoretical framework of Bandura (1997) and Kounin (1970) and build efficacy in classroom management for first-year teachers.

Teacher Shortage

Each year, school districts identify how many teachers move, retire, stay, and/or succumb to attrition which results in an increase in a shortage of teacher enrollment in schools (American Institutes for Research, 2016; Ingersoll, 2001; Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas, 2016). Effective teachers are a necessity for schools to become or remain proficient, and part of retaining effective teachers is balancing

struggles which commonly occur during teaching (Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas, 2016).

While the number of teachers leaving the profession is on the rise, at the same time, the enrollment rate in teacher preparation programs is declining and creating a cascading problem (American Institutes for Research, 2016; Sutcher et al., 2016). New teachers have a higher likelihood of departure within the first five years of teaching, while the lowest amount of school turnover was from teacher retirement (Ingersoll, 2001). Across the United States, Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, and Carver-Thomas (2019) found the estimated teacher shortage for elementary and secondary positions was between 47,000- 80,000 teachers during the 2015-2016 academic school year. Moore (2016) and The New Teacher Project (2013) found nearly half of effective new teachers leave the teaching profession within the first five years.

Due to the shortage of teachers available to replace teachers leaving the profession, school districts across the United States are losing money and added stress is placed on district (American Institutes for Research, 2016; Ingersoll, 2001; Sutcher et al., 2016; Zembytska, 2016). The New Teacher Project or TNTP (2013) estimates when one quality teacher leaves the profession, the process can take up to eleven new hires before a comparable person is eventually hired. In a study completed by the Australian Education Union (2008), nearly 50% of first-year teachers do not think they will be teaching within the next ten years. Moore (2016) found a large district in Missouri reported 70% of the district's new teacher population left before completing four years of teaching. According to the Texas Center for Educational Research (2000), the turnover rates of all teachers across the state averaged 15% of the teacher population. Of the teacher population who

left, 40% were teachers in their first three years of teaching (Texas Center for Educational Research, 2000). The financial impact on the state of Texas was found to be around \$330,000,000 a year based on things such as teacher trainings (Texas Center for Educational Research, 2000). The cost of not retaining teachers can lead to a loss of between one billion to over two billion dollars annually in the United States (Ali, 2017). Across the United States, school districts and universities struggle to compensate for teacher shortages while new teachers struggle when entering the profession.

Causes of teacher shortage.

With the alarming number of teachers leaving the profession and the number joining the profession decreasing, multiple issues such as classroom management and high class sizes are making an impact. The American Institutes for Research (2016) reported in 2012-2013, the enrollment of students in teacher preparation programs decreased by almost 20%, while Sutchter et al. (2016) identified enrollment decreased by nearly 35%. Therefore, the motivation to enter teacher preparation programs was not appealing to college students due to low income earned upon graduation and stress (Sutchter et al., 2016).

Research demonstrates new teachers tend to need more assistance with lesson planning, analyzing student work, and effective classroom management strategies (Brown, Lee, & Collins, 2015; DeMonte, 2016; McKim & Velez, 2017; Stobaugh & Houchens, 2014). Teachers already in the profession were found to leave due to feeling lonely, lack of support or communication, and the negative behavior of students (Bullock, Coplan, & Bosacki, 2015; Morrison, 2013; Yirci, 2017). Due to lack of assistance and experience, nearly one third of new teachers leave the profession (Sutchter et al., 2019).

Smith and Dearborn (2016) suggested the average teacher must teach the same grade level or topic at least three years before actually feeling confident with the content area or particular grade level. Confidence in teaching relates to Bandura's (1997) Self-Efficacy Theory as efficacy is the belief one can use knowledge, apply the knowledge to a situation, and experience success in a difficult situation. Renbarger and Davis (2019) discovered a high sense of efficacy is a common characteristic for teachers remaining in the profession. Aloe, Amo, and Shanahan (2014) determined teachers have a greater likelihood of experiencing burnout as a result of teachers who struggle with classroom management. Struggling with classroom management impacts teacher's efficacy causing the feeling of exhaustion and increased levels of stress (Aloe, Amo, & Shanahan, 2014). With the high percentage of teachers leaving due to dissatisfaction in the profession, something must be done to help the attrition rate of new teachers (American Institutes for Research, 2016).

Teacher Efficacy

Teachers struggling with self-efficacy have a higher chance of experiencing burnout, poor job satisfaction, motivation, and commitment to the profession (Engin, 2020; Jurado, Perez-Fuentes, Atria, Ruiz, & Linares, 2019). Bandura (1997) defined self-efficacy as a person's belief in their abilities to internalize and act on a situation to achieve particular results. Believing in one's ability to address new situations is a challenging yet important task for teachers entering the profession (Bandura, 1997). Engin (2020) found teachers with five or less years of experiences tend have less motivation and efficacy than teachers with more teaching experience. Cooper (2019) identified teacher self-efficacy as an important characteristic for teachers to develop for a

better chance of success. Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory (1997) identifies personal belief in one's capabilities as what helps make one successful in certain situations, yet unsuccessful in other situations. Teachers with a high sense of emotional intelligence tend to have a high sense of self-efficacy (Wu, Lian, Hong, Liu, Lin, & Lian, 2019). If one does not personally believe the necessary skills have been acquired for a task, a higher probability of implementing necessary efforts to accomplish the task will not exist (Bandura, 1997).

In understanding efficacy, the distinction between perceived self-efficacy and perceived competence is important to note. A study conducted by Rodgers, Markland, Selzler, Murray, and Wilson (2014) used an example from exercise for clarity noted competence is the ability to accomplish something with success. Competence relates to efficiency in accomplishing a task, whereas efficacy relates to the persistence or grit to accomplish the task (Rodgers et al., 2014). Senge (2006) relates to Bandura's work within efficacy, identifying mental models are how people perceive the world around them using previous experiences which influence actions. If one approaches a task with negative mental models or a high perception of failure, one often gives up (Senge, 2006). Rather a person approaching a task as a chance to learn and grow with positive mental models, has a better likelihood of success. A person having a high sense of efficacy will more likely regain the level of efficacy lost due to a difficult task more quickly than one who views a task too difficult to even begin (Bandura, 1997).

Belief in potential success can influence how one approaches a situation before even starting (Bandura, 1997). Efficacy is one's belief in personal abilities during difficult or challenging circumstances (Bandura, 1997). Some individuals may have a

higher or lower sense of personal capabilities regarding a specific task (Senge, 2006). For example, pre-service teachers often enter university undergraduate teaching experiences with an unrealistic opinion of their actual personal teaching abilities (Kennedy, 2016). Senge's work (2006) is supportive by finding personal mental models can hinder growth because a person is unaware of the unbiased analysis of personal abilities. For example, if a person does not foresee an issue, but outsiders clearly identify the problem, one will not be willing to make changes to fix known issues. Kim and Seo (2018) found years of teaching experience has a significant impact on efficacy development. Bandura (1997) and Senge (2006) demonstrate efficacy and mental models are affected by multiple factors and can be changed slowly over time with experience. Perseverance while completing a difficult task helps to solidify efficacy for a particular task (Bandura, 1997). The more positive opportunities the learner can experience, the better chance efficacy and adapting the skill to similar situations can be improved (Bandura, 1997). Improved efficacy is important based on Hattie's (2012) findings of teachers with a positive self-efficacy and effect size of .92 on learning with a .6 being a large effect.

Importance of efficacy for new teachers.

In a longitudinal study of novice teachers in low-income schools with frequent turnover, Robertson-Kraft and Duckworth (2014) found teachers with grit, or willingness to pursue challenging tasks with passion and perseverance, were more effective in the classroom and had better retentions in the profession. Hattie (2012) noted a person with low self-efficacy is less likely to pursue difficult tasks and takes longer to redevelop confidence after facing a setback. Difficult tasks in teaching are unavoidable and lack of efficacy and resilience in education is something which cannot be ignored (Gibbs &

Miller, 2014). Keeping new teachers from experiencing continuous setbacks, improving sense of efficacy, and preventing burnout is important to help retain teachers (Colson et al., 2017; Derosier & Soslau, 2014; Dicke et al., 2014; Holzberger, Philipp, & Kunter, 2013; Kim & Buric, 2019; Leckey et al., 2016; Vignoli et al., 2018).

Before new teachers experience burnout, helping new teachers view difficult tasks as growing experiences may help new teachers avoid feelings of self-doubt and thus increase retention of new teachers (Bandura, 1997; Robertson-Kraft & Duckworth, 2014). Liu and Huang (2019) determined efficacy leads to better engagement in work activities, persistence with difficult tasks at work, and even more frequent positive work outcomes. The increased belief an individual establishes in regard to meeting self-directed expectations increases the likelihood of future success (Bandura, 1997). Makara-Studzinska, Golonka, and Izydorczy (2019) compared the burnout faced when teaching with that of a firefighter and found self-efficacy helps workers cope with stress and slow down the burnout in a profession. Self-efficacy helps firefighters and teachers deal with work-related stressors which come with the reality of the job (Makara-Studzinska et al., 2019). Cevik (2017) identified a positive correlation between teacher efficacy and job satisfaction. Kim and Buric (2019) also noted self-efficacy did not determine the level of burnout, yet burnout predicted the teacher's self-efficacy levels. Therefore, a person with a low level of burnout was more likely to also have high efficacy levels (Kim and Buric, 2019). If a teachers' self-efficacy is negative, a potential to improve one's self-efficacy is still possible. Yet if the teacher has already experienced burnout, an improvement in one's self-efficacy beliefs and retention in the profession of teaching is less likely (Kim

and Buric, 2019). High efficacy helps keep teachers in the classroom and increases the rate of teacher satisfaction (Robinson, 2016; Turkoglu, Cansoy, & Parlar, 2017).

Developing efficacy in new and experienced teachers helps lead to higher teacher satisfaction and retention, as well as better outcomes for students (Tian, Wang, Zhang, & Wen, 2019). Hattie's (2012) work on characteristics which influence student learning show a teacher with positive self-efficacy has an effect size of .92 for the school year with a .6 being a large impact. Potentially, Hattie's (2012) work indicates efficacy must be instilled in teachers who are in charge of a room full of student's academic growth and development each year. Teachers with authentic experiences such as substitute teaching have a higher teacher efficacy and have a positive impact on student achievement (Caprara et al., 2003; Engin, 2020; Kim & Seo, 2018).

Building Efficacy in New Teachers.

Bandura (1997) found new teachers' efficacy develops through new experiences when a person can overcome obstacles. Morris et al. (2017) defined teacher self-efficacy as when a teacher has a firm belief in their potential to find success in each part of teaching. As a teacher develops self-efficacy and teacher identity, teachers who consider themselves highly efficacious tend to expect more positive results, whereas teachers who view themselves with low efficacy tend to expect more negative results (Bandura, 1997). Teacher self-efficacy is influenced regularly based on the teacher's reaction to difficult challenges (Bandura, 1997).

Bandura's (1997) identified two key forms of mastery and vicarious experience, which can help individuals develop efficacy. Mastery experience focuses on the previous success of a task and vicarious experience centers on the comparison of skills to similar

peers (Bandura, 1997). Both mastery and vicarious experience help improve instructional quality as well as the development of efficacy (Holzberger et al., 2013). Mastery experiences may lead to higher rates of teacher retention when efficacy and grit are able to be developed (Robertson-Kraft & Duckworth, 2014). Additionally, Renbarger and Davis (2019) also found mastery experiences can provide teachers time to build efficacy which may ultimately lead to new teacher retention.

Vicarious experiences occur when the abilities of one person are compared to another individual at a similar level when working to accomplish a task (Bandura, 1997). An example of vicarious experience could be seen when an undergraduate student participates in student teaching and the undergraduate student compares various experiences which happen during the student teaching experience with other students who are also currently involved in the student teaching experience as well. Vicarious experiences are important for new teachers as well (Driedger-Enns, 2014). In teacher preparation programs, it is better for the new teachers to compare themselves to other new teachers instead of someone with more years of experience (Driedger-Enns, 2014).

During teacher preparation programs, some classes develop pedagogical knowledge and other classes help build declarative knowledge (Atilas & Pinholster, 2013). Atilas and Pinholster (2013) found field experience or declarative knowledge and pedagogical knowledge important in building efficacy in teachers because both declarative and pedagogical knowledge help add meaning to learning in the classroom. Applying both types of knowledge to authentic experiences allows teachers to gain more knowledge and experience (Bellibas & Liu, 2017). Using authentic experiences such as student teaching allows the new teacher to apply declarative and pedagogical knowledge

thus, giving a higher probability of an improvement in efficacy (Bellibas & Liu, 2017). Bandura's (1997) work analyzed how procedural knowledge is part of the learning process and how a person could have the knowledge on how to accomplish the task, yet lack the skill to perform the task. Deriving skill from both learning and effort can help individuals better develop and adapt declarative and procedural knowledge and successfully engage in difficult tasks which may have resulted in failure otherwise. (Bandura, 1997; Marzano et al., 2003). If a task was considered easy in regard to transferring declarative and procedural knowledge, the experience would not help improve efficacy because the effort would not be necessary for success and would inherently be high predictability of success (Bandura, 1997). If a person lacks authentic and stressful experiences in which declarative and procedural knowledge must be used, improvement of efficacy will not occur (Bandura, 1997).

Investing time for mastery experiences, such as mentorship programs, can increase a teacher's level of efficacy (Bandura, 1997; Edwards & Nuttall, 2015; Renbarger & Davis, 2019; Tait, 2008). Ali (2017) identified effective support from administration leads to higher job satisfaction as well as higher teacher efficacy. Additionally, Calik Sezgin, Kavgaci, and Kilinc (2012) discovered teacher efficacy increased with effective instructional leadership from the principal. Effective leadership provides new teachers opportunities to participate in reflective practices (Calik et al., 2012). When new teachers are able to process and reflect after teaching a lesson, teachers are able to acknowledge the experience as a whole and improve their self-efficacy (Atiles & Pinholster, 2013). As teachers create internal mental models, the teacher is able to grow and develop higher self-efficacy beliefs (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, National

Academy of Sciences - National Research Council, 2000; Senge, 2006). Mental models help individuals apply new skills and learning to new situations (Senge, 2006). When teachers are able to acknowledge setbacks as potential learning experiences, teachers are actually able to grow from the situations which were initially viewed as negative experiences and develop a greater sense of efficacy (Morris et al., 2017). Concurrently, Hattie (2012) found when a teacher is supported and has opportunities to experience multiple successes, efficacy is increased. New teachers acknowledging experiences and reflecting on positive experiences occurring, even in times of struggle, can experience a growth in efficacy (Atiles & Pinholster, 2013; Bandura, 1997; Morris et al., 2017). If a person does not believe the necessary skills are present to accomplish a task, there is a higher probability necessary measures will not be taken to accomplish the task (Bandura, 1997). Mastery and vicarious experiences are important for the development of efficacy as each allow teachers to experience using grit to successfully complete a task and also use the reflection of the knowledge to compare more accurately to peers (Bandura, 1997).

Lack of new teacher efficacy development.

Novice teachers tend to struggle to find personal identities, are more isolated, have lower efficacy, and have negative views toward teaching (Morrison, 2013). Classroom experiences alongside undergraduate coursework are needed to help pre-service teachers build efficacy before entering the profession (Atiles & Pinholster, 2013; Bandura, 1997; Colson et al., 2017; Edwards & Nuttall, 2015; Hattie, 2012; Morris et al., 2017; Robertson-Kraft & Duckworth, 2014; Vignoli et al., 2018). Relating undergraduate coursework and classroom experience to Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory (1997), Morrison (2013) noted teachers discovering teacher identity early on often experience an

increased level of efficacy. Subsequently, teachers with more classroom level experiences showed an increase in self-efficacy beliefs (Ali, 2017).

Colson et al. (2017) found undergraduate students participating in student teaching placements lasting for a full year experienced higher levels of efficacy than student teachers participating in a placement only lasting a semester. As novice teachers experience success in the classroom, their belief in handling classroom management struggles improved (Buchanan, Prescott, Schuck, Aubusson, Burke, & Louviere, 2013). New teachers with increased efficacy will have a higher likelihood of job satisfaction (Buchanan et al., 2013). Morris et al. (2017) found professional development and undergraduate studies help build efficacy by providing teachers opportunities to apply knowledge to situations and gain mastery experiences. Self-efficacy can help teachers cope with negative situations such as classroom disruptions which occur during teaching (Dicke et al., 2014).

Classroom Management

Classroom management is a difficult task which occurs daily and can lead teachers to thrive or decide to exit the teaching profession (Cooper, 2019). In teaching, effective classroom management is one of the most difficult tasks to develop (Kounin, 1970; Marzano et al., 2003; Wong & Wong, 2009). Classroom management includes efforts made by the teacher to sustain an environment in which optimal learning and instruction can take place based on procedures and practices (Garrett, 2013; Wong et al., 2014). As a teacher, it is easier to feel more comfortable in controlling one's own actions than trying to control others (Wong & Wong, 2009). Classroom management or the controlling of student behavior is a topic commonly researched (Kounin, 1970; Wong &

Wong, 2009), a topic of many professional development sessions (Garrett, 2013), and is a component of classes in teacher preparatory programs (Marzano et al., 2003; Smith, Fisher, & Frey, 2005). Classroom management is a foundational skill of learning and teaching (Marzano et al., 2003)

According to Marzano et al., (2003), an effective classroom manager establishes a highly cooperative and dominant relationship with students. In a classroom implementing a cooperative learning environment, the teachers provide positive attention to students working individually and in teams (Kagan, 1992). A teacher implementing a cooperative learning environment has a keen sense of surroundings or “withitness” (Kounin, 1970, p. 80). An effective teacher needs to be observant and have a grasp on students understanding of the rules and procedures before starting any activity (Marzano et al., 2003). Allowing student’s time to practice classroom procedures and also giving effective feedback early in the school year is essential to teacher success (Denton & Kriete, 2000). When classroom expectations are established early and continuously enforced, students recognize poor behavior is not acceptable (Kounin, 1970). Teachers who have high self-efficacy tend to show less authoritative control in the classroom and push students to take ownership and responsibility for behavior (Bandura, 1997). As conditions continue to become more rigorous with high expectations and high pressure from state testing, effective classroom management strategies are imperative for teacher success (Blake, 2017).

Effective classroom management and positive praise does not solve all behavior problems but can help eliminate several issues which may occur regularly in a classroom (Garrett, 2014; Garrett, 2013; Rabin & Smith, 2016; Smith, Fisher, & Frey, 2015; Sprick,

2010). Positive praise and attention on students following expectations is an important part of classroom management and developing a healthy classroom culture (Denton & Kriete, 2000; Kagan, 1992; Smith et al., 2015; Sprick, 2010). Kagan's (1992) style of cooperative learning encourages students to have conversations with each other within a structure set by the teacher to help balance both engagement and control. A common misconception when observing classroom management is the expectation the classroom needs to be quiet (Garrett, 2014). Kagan (1992) explored how traditional classroom management attempts to get students to conform to rules of the classroom, whereas in a cooperative learning-based classroom, the structure instead focuses on the needs of the students. However, a teacher with effective classroom management can still have a quiet classroom.

Classroom management has been directly linked to student achievement (Ben-David, 2017; Gage, Scott, Hirn, & MacSuga-Gage, 2018; Hattie, 2012; Kagan, 1992). Effective classroom management takes practice to master, yet is a foundational skill necessary to acquire (Denton & Kriete, 2000; Kounin, 1970; Marzano et al., 2003; Wong et al., 2014). In Hattie's research (2012), the effect size for classroom management on learning was a .35, which is close to a medium effect on student achievement. Other characteristics related to classroom management have an even larger effect size on student achievement. Characteristics such as teacher-student relationships have an effect size of .52 and classroom discussion has an effect size of .82 (Hattie, 2012). Effective classroom management leads to student engagement, which in return leads to student achievement (Gage et al., 2018; Kagan, 1992; Wong et al., 2014). When teachers are

confident with classroom management, more student learning and higher student achievement result (Marzano et al., 2003).

A lack of classroom management can negatively impact student's learning and is a topic which needs to be addressed in the teaching profession (Zaharis, 2019).

Continuous struggle with classroom management can lead to a long-term loss of much needed instructional time, and negatively impact student achievement (Ben-David, 2017; Sprick, 2010). When pre-service teachers are given the opportunities to overcome obstacles and endure classroom management-related stress, new teachers are more prepared for the realities of the teaching profession and are less likely to experience burnout (Aloe et al., 2014; Atilas & Pinholster, 2013; Bandura, 1997; Driedger-Enns, 2014; Zaharis, 2019). Helping teachers attain success in managing classroom struggles can potentially help alleviate the overall stress of teaching (Zaharis, 2019). Teacher attrition increases when there is a lack of classroom management experiences for pre-service teachers entering the profession (Aloe, et al., 2014; Banas, 2014; Gravett & Ramsaroop, 2015; Kennedy, 2016; Lowder, 2017; Nagro & DeBettencourt, 2017; Tsouloupas, Carson, & Matthews, 2014). New teachers often leave the profession due to the lack of classroom management strategies and not having opportunities to develop efficacy in the field (Ben-David, 2017; Kurt, Ekici, & Gungor, 2014; Patterson & Seabrooks-Blackmore, 2017; Yüksel, 2014).

How to support new teachers' development of classroom management.

Research indicates effective classroom management is a foundational skill which teachers need to start the beginning of the year (Denton & Kriete, 2000; Marzano et al., 2003; Wong et al., 2014). O'Neill and Stephenson (2014) discovered Australian teacher

preparation programs, coursework, and texts lacked research on best practices due to many instructors implementing teaching practices from personal experiences rather than using current research-based contexts. Without learning best practices before entering the profession, declarative and procedural knowledge is difficult to develop (Bandura, 1997). If a new teacher perceives classroom management as difficult, before gaining personal experience, the new teacher may question their classroom management skills (Senge, 2000). New teachers may also believe their personal classroom management is very effective, when in reality their classroom may be chaos instead (Wong & Wong, 2009). Wong et al., (2014) found effective classroom management is a planned balance of engagement and control similar to Kounin's idea of "withitness" (1970, p. 80). Experience along with pedagogical knowledge allows teachers to figure things out using a trial and error approach for development (Kounin, 1970; Tsouloupas et al., 2014). Experience is an essential piece in the development of teacher "withitness" (Kounin, 1970, p. 80).

Classroom management is a common struggle for new or experienced teachers, but can be developed and improved (Marzano et al., 2003). Classroom management is a combination of knowledge for handling specific events in the classroom while ensuring every student is learning (Wolff, Jarodzka, Bogert, & Boshuizen, 2016). Marzano et al., (2003) noted effective teachers practice prior to becoming proficient with classroom management skills. Yamamoto and Imai-Matsumura (2012) determined novice and expert teachers have similar awareness of student misbehaviors and have no issue identifying misbehavior. Kounin (1970, p. 80) noted as experience is gained, teachers develop a "withitness" for recognizing misbehavior, and addressing misbehavior without

interrupting learning. “Withitness” is a skill which allows teachers to anticipate student misbehavior before the misbehavior occurs and helps the teacher predict transitional breakdowns prior to the breakdowns occurring (Kounin, 1970, p. 80). Through experience, teachers develop a keen sense which allows lessons to flow naturally with fewer disruptions (Kounin, 1970).

For teachers to have success during the school year, research shows classroom management is a foundational skill which cannot be overlooked (Kounin, 1970; Marzano et al., 2003; Wong et al., 2014). Classroom management impacts student achievement (Ben-David, 2017; Gage et al., 2018; Hattie, 2012; Kagan, 1992), and is a foundational skill which takes practice and experience to master (Denton & Kriete, 2000; Kounin, 1970; Marzano et al., 2003; Wong et al., 2014). Pre-service teachers need efficacy in classroom management before entering the classroom to more positively impact student achievement (Kwok, 2018).

Classroom management difficulties.

Many teachers struggle with classroom management as the transition is made from undergraduate student to first-year teacher (Aliakbari & Darabi, 2013; Blake, 2017; Kennedy, 2016; Rabin & Smith, 2016). Even though universities have made an effort to teach classroom management, classroom management is still a top concern for pre-service and first-year teachers (Boysen, 2015). According to Dicke et al. (2014), classroom management is the top concern for pre-service and novice teachers. As new teachers transition to the classroom, a lack of classroom management experience can lead to a perceived weakness in classroom management (Boysen, 2015; Hildenbrand & Arndt, 2016; O’Neill & Stephenson, 2013). Additionally, Patterson and Seabrooks-Blackmore

(2017) revealed pre-service teachers lacking classroom experiences are disadvantaged because classroom management is learned through repeated and varying experiences. The largest negative experience in a semester practicum is the lack of classroom management practice (Alemdag and Özdemi, 2017). The experience in the classroom has most impact on the development of classroom management practices among teachers (Kwok, 2018).

Polat, Kaya, and Akdag (2013) determined classroom management courses had no difference in discipline perceptions for first-year teachers. Hildenbrand and Arndt (2016) revealed one stressor for student teachers is knowing the best practice in classroom management yet observing the mentor teacher not using best practice. Often, pre-service teachers watch mentor teachers rely on a punishment and reward system of classroom management, so there tends to be a development of such systems when pre-service teachers joins the profession (Garrett, 2014; Garrett, 2013; Rabin & Smith, 2016). Additionally, student teaching often results in a more controlling management style due to pre-service teachers mimicking the practices of mentor teachers (Garrett, 2014; Garrett, 2013; Rabin & Smith, 2016).

A concern for pre-service teachers and novice teachers regarding effective strategies for classroom management exists (Ben-David, 2017; Lew & Nelson, 2016; Yüksel, 2014). Petersen (2017) surveyed novice teachers and identified a common feeling of struggle as new teachers transition from university to classroom. Stearns (2015) found student teachers show growth in confidence in classroom management yet struggle to transfer confidence when entering the profession. Student teachers often have pedagogy knowledge in classroom management, yet need more opportunities to see how management decisions can lead to success or failure (Stearns, 2015). New teachers often

lack experience in classroom management, but experience can help teachers develop better classroom management skills (Zaharis, 2019).

Pre-service teachers only in the classroom for a semester focused more on classroom management struggles, whereas full-year student teachers focused more on teaching and the learning process (Lowder, 2017). Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) identified undergraduate students have a positive belief in following the classroom management procedures of schools when hired, yet did not believe in their personal ability to effectively manage students when in the actual classroom. A large school district in Missouri provides first-year teachers support focused on classroom management (Moore, 2016). Classroom management should be a priority with training and time spent discussing effective strategies as new teachers enter the profession (Moore, 2016).

Classroom management efficacy development.

New teachers need to increase self-efficacy in regard to classroom management to remain in the profession (Bullock et al., 2015; Kwok, 2018; Robinson, 2016; Turkoglu et al., 2017). Focusing on undergraduate students, Kurt et al. (2014) studied a large group of student teachers and the effect classroom management coursework had on efficacy and discovered a positive effect. A longer field residency, and more experience in the classroom, led to an increase in teacher efficacy (Dorel, Kearney, & Garza, 2016). In addition, the additional classroom experience led to improved ability in pre-service teacher classroom management skills (Reynolds et al., 2016). If new teachers do not have efficacy beliefs in classroom management skills prior to entering the classroom, teacher burnout is more likely to result (Yerli, Usul, & Yerli, 2017).

O'Neill (2015) found pre-service teacher's classroom management efficacy was improved based on undergraduate coursework. During undergraduate studies, student teaching is a time for applying what has been learned about teaching, building reflective practices, and experiencing new concepts such as classroom management (Smith & Rayfield, 2017). Patterson and Seabrooks-Blackmore (2017) added the factor of self-reflection to a classroom management course and determined a positive relationship between self-reflection and pre-service teacher efficacy. In practicum experiences, pre-service teachers developed more efficacy in both classroom management and collaboration (Patterson & Seabrooks-Blackmore, 2017; Sokal, Woloshyn, & Funk-Unrau, 2013). Leckey et al. (2016) identified when undergraduate students participated in a specific classroom management course and were provided opportunities to practice course concepts, results included positive teacher well-being, positive classroom environments for students, reduced the stress level for teachers, increased teacher confidence, and resulted in higher classroom management efficacy.

Ngidi and Ngidi (2019) found classroom management efficacy can be impacted based on the experiences a pre-service teacher receives while attending a university. Lack of experience can hinder a new teacher from developing the performance skills of a task even if procedural knowledge is available (Bandura, 1997). Increased experiences focused on classroom management result in greater improvements of classroom management efficacy (Ben-David, 2017; Boysen, 2015; Kurt et al., 2014; Hildenbrand & Arndt, 2016; O'Neill & Stephenson, 2013; Patterson & Seabrooks-Blackmore, 2017; Sokal et al., 2013; Yüksel, 2014). Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) discovered a positive relationship between classroom management beliefs and teacher efficacy. Yet, Harfitt

(2015) found new teachers tend to struggle with comparing themselves to more experienced teachers in the building. Comparing to more experienced teachers creates a poor vicarious experience because the comparison is not similar enough in the first-year teacher's level of experience, based on Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory (1997).

Aliakbari and Darabi (2013) analyzed the impact different personality types have on classroom management efficacy scores and found a regression with extraverted personality types. In contrast, other researchers found extroverted teachers tend to have higher classroom management efficacy scores (Bullock et al., 2015; Tsouloupas et al., 2014). Wu et al. (2019) identified teachers with better emotional intelligence skills were better equipped to manage a classroom resulting in higher student growth and teacher efficacy. Aloe et al. (2014) connected when classroom management efficacy decreases, teachers tend to feel more exhausted and are more likely to experience burnout.

Research is conflicted on whether classroom management is different between male and female teachers (Gage et al., 2018; Gurcay, 2015; Ahmed, Ambreen, & Hussain, 2018). For example, multiple studies indicate little to no impact of gender on classroom management (Gage et al., 2018; Gurcay, 2015; Nejati, Hassani, & Sahrapour, 2014; Oktan & Çağanağa, 2015; Ugurlu, Usta, & Koybasi, 2019). Yet on the contrary, multiple studies also discovered a significant impact based on gender and classroom management (Ahmed, Ambreen, & Hussain, 2018; Bellibas & Liu, 2017; Hoon, Nasaruddin, & Singh, 2017; Ihtiyaroglu, 2018; Krug et al., 2015; Martin & Yin, 1997; Sahin, 2015; Selçuk et al., 2017). Ahmed et al. (2018) noted pre-service female teachers tend to have better overall classroom management skills while males tend to maintain control using a more authoritative style. Concurrently, Sahin (2015) also gathered men

tend to have lower control of the classroom due to relying on an authoritative approach. On the contrary, Martin and Yin (1997) identified men have overall better classroom management than female teachers. A study conducted by Gurcay (2015) examined a significant difference in the classroom management efficacy of male teachers over female teachers. Bellibas and Liu (2017) identified female teachers have a higher self-efficacy in teaching, student engagement, and classroom management than men.

While student teaching experiences vary, pre-service teachers generally take specific skills and apply those skills to practice effectively with authentic experiences (Brown et al., 2015; Kwok, 2018; McDonnough & Matkins, 2010; McKim & Velez, 2017; Smith & Rayfield, 2017; Tait, 2008). Teachers are lacking in the development of efficacy, classroom management, and classroom management efficacy due to the lack of authentic preparation experience (Cooper, 2019; Filho & Iaochite, 2018; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). Bullock et al. (2015) determined early childhood teachers with more years of experience in the classroom have a higher classroom management efficacy score. High efficacy beliefs generally allow teachers to have a more positive outlook on teaching, less classroom management issues, and implement more best practices (Dicke et al., 2014). The more an experience is directly linked to the task, the more potential for growth is present (Bandura, 1997; Edwards & Nuttall, 2015; Filho & Iaochite, 2018).

Authentic Preparation Experience

Transitioning from undergraduate studies into the teaching profession can be a difficult task (Edwards & Nuttall, 2015; Sokal et al., 2013; Vignoli et al., 2018). As new teachers choose to leave the profession, one must consider why teachers are leaving (The New Teacher Project, 2013). Lowder (2017) examined teacher preparation programs in

Missouri and demonstrated the importance of gaining knowledge from undergraduate coursework as well as student teaching and other clinical experiences. Classroom management, lesson planning, and lack of sleep are common concerns which cause stress for student teachers (Danyluk, 2013). On the contrary, several studies have revealed participants completing student teaching felt the more efficacious about classroom management skills and less efficacious about student engagement skills (Alemdag & Özdemir, 2017; Brown et al., 2015; Elliott, Isaacs, & Chugani, 2010; Kennedy, 2016; McKim & Velez, 2017). Classroom management is a difficult task occurring daily, resulting in teachers leaving the profession and lacking development in efficacy (Cooper, 2019).

In a case study, Atiles and Pinholster (2013) interviewed pre-service teachers and found multiple participants struggle with classroom management which lead to a decrease in efficacy. Derosier and Soslau (2014) discovered student teachers find classroom management a major concern and the development of efficacy can already be negatively influenced before entering the profession. Classroom management is the number one ranked struggle beginning teachers experience (Headden, 2014; Stobaugh & Houchens, 2014; Kwok, 2018). Transitioning from college to the teaching profession, new teachers often encounter a reality shock due to a lack of confidence and experience (Edwards & Nuttall, 2015). Yirci (2017) identified new teachers need assistance in transitioning to a new job, new school, and gaining experience in the classroom. Yet, when analyzing teacher preparation programs, Von Hippel and Bellows (2018) determined similarity between six state education programs as little difference in the quality of the programs was indicated the programs are very similar. Authentic teaching

and preparation experience for pre-service teachers is needed to develop efficacy (Filho & Iaochite, 2018) and classroom management (Edwards & Nuttall, 2015).

Throughout the United States, practicums and student teaching provide pre-service teachers educational experiences prior to joining the profession of teaching (Atiles & Pinholster, 2013; Filho & Iaochite, 2018; Lowder, 2017). Classroom experience applying learning from undergraduate teacher preparation programs is important in the development of efficacy (Filho & Iaochite, 2018; Vignoli et al., 2018). Classroom experience and the length of such experiences are valuable to the development of a teacher (Atiles & Pinholster, 2013; Dicke et al., 2014; Edwards & Nuttall, 2015; Harfitt, 2015; Leckey et al., 2016; Lowder, 2017; Renbarger & Davis, 2019; Vignoli et al., 2018). Even though a higher percentage of pre-service teachers believe personal experience is lacking, experience overall is considered the most important part of an effective mentorship program (Atiles & Pinholster, 2013; Morris et al., 2017; Yirci, 2017). Kozikoglu (2018) identified almost 75% of pre-service teachers believe experience is lacking before even entering the profession. Due to lack of experience, student teachers are unable to encounter authentic stressors which Bandura (1997) finds imperative to increasing efficacy. Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) also found beginning teachers often lack authentic experiences, which in turn leads to poor efficacy related to building and maintaining effective classroom management. Furthering research into university and school partnerships, Allen, Howells, and Radford (2013) surveyed both pre-service teachers and mentor teachers and both wished a more direct link between assignments in classes and the application to actual teaching existed. More experiences to apply learning from preparation programs or professional development lead to greater

opportunities for mastery experiences (Colson et al., 2017; Edwards & Nuttall, 2015; Filho & Iaochite, 2018; Morris et al., 2017; Sokal et al., 2013; Vignoli et al., 2018; Zaharis, 2019).

Clinical experience is often a common criticism of undergraduate preparation programs due to a lack of exposure to the reality of teaching (Driedger-Enns, 2014). Gravett and Ramsaroop (2015) and Kennedy (2016) found student teachers often have declarative knowledge but have little teacher identity and few experiences applying knowledge to challenging authentic situations. Banas (2014) conducted a study in which pre-service teachers were given authentic settings to master skills learned to help increase the likelihood of success when entering the profession. Pre-service teachers when given opportunities to master and practice skills had an easier transition into the classroom (Banas, 2014). Novice teachers often wished for more chances to practice classroom management strategies before entering the profession as new teachers (Lew & Nelson, 2016; Sokal et al., 2013; Zaharis, 2019). Smith and Rayfield (2017) found student teachers desired more concrete experiences and not just active experimentation. Concrete examples help student teachers dive deeper into the practice while capitalizing on the experience through the engagement of authentic management situations (Derosier & Soslau, 2014).

Establishing realistic expectations and getting exposure to authentic struggles allows teachers to develop efficacy more efficiently (Bandura, 1997). Pre-service teachers have more opportunity for growth if authentic stress levels are embedded in experiences before graduation (Banas, 2014; Gravett & Ramsaroop, 2015; Lowder, 2017; Nagro & DeBettencourt, 2017; Tsouloupas et al., 2014; Yahui et al., 2008). Time to

practice skills to build confidence is necessary to avoid negative feelings (Colson et al., 2017). Tait (2008) found pre-service teachers often have a misunderstanding of the expectations required for teaching, and once in the classroom, pre-service teachers lack and efficacy. The authentic climate in which pre-service teachers practice job related stress allows for an easier transition into the profession with increased efficacy and resilience (Garza, Werner, & Wendler, 2016; Robertson-Kraft & Duckworth, 2014).

Novice teachers lacking in authentic struggles have a higher likelihood of undergoing a difficult transition into teaching (Petersen, 2017). Kennedy (2016) found universities struggle with pre-service teachers entering preparation programs with unrealistic opinions of personal abilities and inaccurate ideals of the teaching profession. Transition difficulties are a common struggle for pre-service teachers based on Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory (1997) due to the lack of authentic struggles and pre-service experience. Zaharis (2019) noted new teachers lacking experience often struggle with classroom management within the first few years of teaching. Building efficacy in classroom management and helping teachers gain authentic experiences is needed to avoid the "praxis shock" which results when pre-service teachers enter the classroom with only the knowledge from undergraduate studies (Edwards & Nuttall, 2015, p. 1). Opportunities to prepare pre-service teachers regarding the reality of teaching is often non-existent during teacher preparation programs and the result often leads to lower classroom management and self-efficacy (Driedger-Enns, 2014).

Little research regarding the impact of outside educational experiences has on efficacy and classroom management is available (Reynolds et al., 2016). Outside experiences like serving at the YMCA may have potential impact on gaining professional

experience in teaching (Danyluk, 2013; Baran et al., 2017). Other opportunities including tutoring and other non-supervised practices implemented during field experiences benefit pre-service teachers (Baran et al., 2017). Potential experiences outside of schools such as YMCA or camp counselor provide real world opportunities for managing students (Reynolds et al., 2016). The lack of outside educational experiences can lead to schools struggling to retain teachers (Reynolds et al., 2016). New teachers entering the profession without effective pre-service training and experience are at a higher risk of leaving the profession thus contributing to a teacher retention problem (Vignoli et al., 2018). Pre-service teachers gain experience with authentic situations through student teaching with a mentor teacher and also substitute teaching without the support of a mentor teacher (Driedger-Enns, 2014). Authentic experience helps build efficacy, confidence, and motivation to continue teaching (Filho & Iaochite, 2018).

Substitute teaching

No Child Left Behind (2002) clarified classroom and substitute teachers should be highly qualified. However, Mathewson (2017) revealed multiple states in the United States hire substitute teachers who have earned a high school diploma or GED. Certain states do not require prior education, high school diploma, or GED credentials, (Mathewson, 2017). Kronholz (2013) identified a teaching certificate was not required in some states nor even classes in teacher education preparation programs to substitute teach. While schools are lowering qualifications to attract more substitute teachers due to teacher shortages, statistics show students spend about a year with a substitute teacher during their K-12 experience (Glatfelter, 2006). Even with lowering certifications or experience, Gonzales (2016) noted due to a shortage of available substitutes,

administrators fill vacancies when no qualified replacement substitute teacher can be found.

Substitutes are often going into classrooms with little or no training on how to teach students and are often seen as a warm body not a professional (Heinsen, 2012; Smith & Tippetts, 2004; Smith, 2002; Zubrzycki, 2012). Dr. T. Vest, the Director of Professional Learning, oversees a substitute's placement for over twenty years in school districts in southwest Missouri, and sends around 250 to 500 substitutes to districts each day (personal communication, October 21, 2019). In California, Wheeler-Ayres (2002) noted the importance of training and supporting substitutes in each building to help with substitute teacher retention and effectiveness. Georgia's teacher absenteeism is on the rise according to Smith (2002), who also noted more than 90% of districts rarely provide training opportunities for substitutes. Schools need highly qualified substitutes to positively impact the amount of time spent with students, yet many districts often scramble for substitute teachers let alone highly qualified substitutes (Iasevoli, 2017; Mathewson, 2017; Peterson, 1991). Iasevoli (2017) identified many districts are trying to increase pay or benefits for substitute teachers to attract more candidates. Jackson (2014) stressed a day of learning cannot be lost and substitutes must be ready to work effectively in a classroom. Placing higher qualified substitute teachers in classrooms would help shorten learning lost during teacher absences (Robinson, 2016).

Hill (1999) and Zubrzycki (2012) uncovered establishing control of the classroom is often one of the hardest tasks for a substitute teacher. Students often attempt to take advantage of the substitute due to a substitute's lack of familiarity of the normal expectations, and lessons are often filled with low engagement activities (Gonzales,

2016). When a teacher is absent, often the teacher lesson plans are busy work for substitutes to follow, or sometimes there are no lesson plans at all (Gonzales, 2016; Kronholz, 2013; Robinson, 2016). When teachers are absent, temporary substitute teachers are expected to manage and engage students at same level as a regular teacher even though efficacy may be low (Driedger-Enns, 2014). Poorly planned lessons result in lack of trust toward the absent teacher and a decreased level of substitute teacher effectiveness (Robinson, 2016). Teachers who develop relationships with substitutes tend to trust substitute teachers more with content lessons and handling misbehaviors (Glatfelter, 2006).

Due to temporary contracts, substitutes spend time on developing respect and creating relationships with students each day (Driedger-Enns, 2014). As one in charge of acquiring a large number of substitutes each day in southwest Missouri, Dr. T. Vest ensures substitutes in each building are qualified, have effective management of the classroom, are building relationships with students, and are leading learning (personal communication, October 21, 2019). Even though subs are essential to continue student learning in a teacher's absence, often substitute teachers receive little training (Smith & Tippetts, 2004). School districts often struggle to provide training for substitute teachers (Smith & Tippetts, 2004). School districts are more likely to hire and request substitute teachers who perform well and demonstrate effective classroom management skills (Robinson, 2016). Substitute teachers receiving training sessions tend to be more prepared and establish more connections with full time faculty and staff (Robinson, 2016). Finding ways to support and train substitute teachers improves the quality of time

the substitute spends with students and potentially decreases the negative impact which can result from teacher absenteeism (Robinson, 2016).

Substitute teaching is an opportunity to gain experience in teaching before entering the profession. Sharer (2009) has allowed undergraduate teacher preparation program students at Wayne State College to substitute teach in to gain experience with positive results. Sharer (2009) found pre-service teachers participating in substitute teaching, as well as completing university teacher preparation programs, gained valuable classroom experience. An expectation of substitute teachers is to teach lessons and appropriately manage the classroom (Elliott, 2014; Heinsen, 2012; Robinson, 2016; Smith & Tippetts, 2002). Substitute teaching is an authentic experience for pre-service teachers to better understand the reality of teaching, receive on the job training, and develop classroom skills (Driedger-Enns, 2014). Many individuals serve as substitute teachers with the goal of eventually being hired for a full-time teaching position (Driedger-Enns, 2014; Trull, 2004; Wheeler-Ayres, 2002).

Substitute teaching as an alternative authentic experience.

Substitute teaching is a form of authentic teaching experience which can provide practice with classroom management, increased efficacy, and application of strategies learned during undergraduate studies (Bandura, 1997). Heinsen (2012) believed substitute teachers with training in classroom management showed an improvement of almost double in overall teacher effectiveness. Dr. T. Vest identified multiple districts in southwest Missouri ask for substitutes to be trained in skills such as classroom management (personal communication, October 21, 2019). In Georgia, Smith (2002) noted a specific district offering substitute teacher training showed an increase in

substitute retention rates and decreased number of complaints from teachers about substitutes. Experiences outside of teacher education programs add classroom management experiences leading to learning and growth of efficacy (Baran et al., 2017). Supporting Bandura (1997), Robinson (2016) revealed having success as a substitute teacher can increase overall confidence and efficacy.

An expectation of substitute teachers is only one person appropriately manages the classroom, whereas during the student teaching experience another adult is often in the room to help control behaviors (Boysen, 2015; Gifford et al., 2013). Adding substitute teaching experience to undergraduate teacher preparation programs can help pre-service teachers better understand the reality of teaching prior to entering the profession after graduation (Driedger-Enns, 2014). Many districts are trying to provide more training for substitutes before substitutes enter the classroom and also throughout the year to increase the likelihood of potential student achievement (Jackson, 2014). Pre-service teachers serving as substitutes as part of undergraduate requirements would gain classroom experience training from school districts (Heinsen, 2012; Robinson, 2016). Universities, such as Wayne State College, allow pre-service teachers to substitute teach and establish connections with school districts the pre-service teachers would consider working for upon graduation (Sharer, 2009). Although lack of empirical evidence exists, according to Dr. T. Vest, less than 50% of substitutes serving in buildings throughout southwest Missouri are pre-service teachers or individuals pursuing education degrees (personal communication, October 21, 2019).

Summary

Classroom management efficacy is necessary to consider as pre-service teachers transition from undergraduate students to first-year teachers. Both classroom management and teacher efficacy have been shown to affect student achievement, teacher job satisfaction, and teacher retention (Caprara et al., 2003; Engin, 2020; Gage et al., 2018; Hattie, 2012; Kagan, 1992; Kim & Seo, 2018; Marzano et al., 2003; Sprick, 2010; Wong et al., 2014). Teachers are leaving the profession each year due to lack of efficacy and need more classroom training and classroom experience to be successful (The New Teacher Project, 2013). Teachers who complete alternative certification programs, other than university undergraduate teacher preparation programs, show significant differences from teachers who received training along the way in the field (Aldeman & Mitchel, 2016). Teachers must enter the classroom with skills necessary to adapt and be successful with students (The New Teacher Project, 2013). Yet, Flower et al. (2017) identified many teacher preparation programs do not have classroom management courses and often reinforce reactive strategies instead of proactive strategies helping to prevent classroom management issues (2017). Nguyen (2018) noted undergraduate programs are teaching ineffective strategies, implementing out-of-date material, and are not applicable to the actual classroom setting. Novice teachers find practicums and experience in the field to be the most beneficial components of training to become a teacher (Nguyen, 2018).

Jong, Tartwijk, Wubbels, Veldman, and Verloop's study on self-efficacy found student teachers often underestimate personal abilities at the beginning of student teaching and overestimate personal abilities by the end (2013). Based on the research completed by Jong et al. (2013), studying teacher efficacy and competency is important

for first-year teachers. Competence identifies a person's belief about personal success in an area, whereas efficacy addresses a person's confidence in the ability to handle difficult problems. Classroom management efficacy is a teacher's confidence in one's personal ability to handle and resolve classroom management situations. Without classroom management efficacy, first-year teachers will most likely struggle and potentially leave the teaching profession (Baran et al., 2017).

Chapter Three describes the methods of the study, how the study was designed, how the participants were selected, and how the data was analyzed. Chapter Four presents the findings from the study. Chapter Five states the researchers' interpretation of the findings and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative causal comparative study was to look specifically at first-year teachers and their level of classroom management efficacy in regard to substitute teaching experience. Patterson and Seabrooks-Blackmore (2017) revealed pre-service teachers often lack teacher efficacy, which can lead to struggles with classroom management. Classroom management experiences are important as pre-service teacher's transition into first-years teachers (Kwok, 2018). Kwok (2018) also identified how pre-service teachers who have support from school personnel, such as mentors or coaches, have a positive growth with classroom management. The intent of the study was to find if a difference between first-year teachers who substitute teach while pre-service teachers and pre-service teachers not substitute teaching while completing undergraduate programs make a difference on an individual's classroom management efficacy scores. The researcher utilized a quantitative comparative study approach to help identify differences in classroom management efficacy in first-year teachers who did or did not substitute teach before entering the classroom. The quantitative comparative method was selected because an ANOVA and *t*-test examine if any of the means found differ from each other (Pelham, 2013).

Chapter Three introduces the quantitative comparative approach implemented to study the efficacy in classroom management of teachers who did or did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies. The initial section describes the purpose of the study and research questions used to guide the study, including the null hypothesis for each

question. Next, the participants of the study, selection of the sample, setting for the research, research design, and a description of the survey used to gather data is described. The researcher also describes the procedures of the study and the measures took to analyze the data. Lastly, a summary is given to review the process in developing the study.

Research Questions

Classroom management efficacy survey data was analyzed to determine if there is a difference based on classroom experience. These questions were used to guide the study:

1. What is the difference in the classroom management efficacy score among first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies, over a period of one to 10 days, 11-20 days, and over 20 days?
2. What is the difference in the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies with:
 - a. No substitute training overall?
 - b. One orientation training conducted by a professional educator?
 - c. One-two classroom visits or formal classroom management training sessions by a professional educator?
 - d. More than two classroom visits or formal classroom management training sessions by a professional educator?

Null Hypotheses

Null hypothesis H1₀: There is no statistically significant difference in the classroom management efficacy score among first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies, over a period of one to 10 days, 11-20 days, and over 20 days?

Null hypothesis H2a₀: There is no statistically significant difference between the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies.

Null hypothesis H2b₀: There is no statistically significant difference between the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies with one orientation training for substitute teaching by a professional educator.

Null hypothesis H3a₀: There is no statistically significant difference between the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies with one-two classroom visits or formal training sessions by a professional educator.

Null hypothesis H4a₀: There is no statistically significant difference between the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during

undergraduate studies more than two classroom visits or formal training sessions by a professional educator.

Participants

The participants in this study were first-year teachers in the state of Missouri. Teachers were extracted from the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) open access database. Within Missouri, there are 114 counties and a total of 518 public school districts. School district buildings include elementary schools comprised of students from grades K-6, middle schools containing grades 6-8, and high schools housing grades 9-12. Additionally, some smaller districts in the state may have K-8 or K-12 buildings due to smaller student populations. According to Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), around 7,000 teachers are in the teaching profession in Missouri with approximately 80% are female teachers. A majority of teachers are white and between the ages 30 to 50. Approximately 30% of teachers in Missouri are new teachers. A demographic question was asked to see if differences in classroom management efficacy, based on gender, were present even though the participants were predominately female.

In order to ensure a proficient and safe study, the researcher received approval from the Research Review Board of Southwest Baptist University. Teachers were purposely sorted based on experience with or without substitute teaching. The sorting of data between participants with and without substitute teaching experience served as the purposive sampling in which the survey was given and analyzed.

Selection/Sampling

In order to select the participants, principals in all 518 school districts in Missouri were sent an email describing the survey with the request the survey be sent to any new teachers. A random sampling could not be used and instead a purposive sampling occurred based on the different experiences of each participant who submitted the survey. Purposive sampling was used to choose a specific population to sample to meet the specific criteria examined to gather data (Creswell, 2003). New Missouri teachers meeting the criteria for the study were first-year teachers who did substitute teach prior to becoming a teacher and first-year teachers who did not substitute teach prior to becoming a teacher. In the survey, there was one demographic question and one question which separated the participant group into two main categories. The first main group included first-year teachers who did substitute teach as undergraduate students and the second main group included first-year teachers who did not substitute taught during undergraduate studies. The same survey was given to each group which allowed accurate comparison of data. Participants' responses were made anonymous using QuestionPro which is a program which collects data without sharing identifying participant information. The survey and procedure were reviewed by an Institutional Review Board before the survey was sent out which ensured compliance with ethical standards. The first question of the survey asked for the participants consent and as well as instructions for completing the survey.

After data was collected, the researcher used the information based on each participant's substitute teaching experience and each participant's sense of classroom management efficacy to analyze the data. In order to calculate the sample size for the

ANOVA test in research question one, a G*Power was used. In a G*Power, a medium effect size where $\alpha = .05$, the power = .8 with 180 total or 45 per group (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). In research question one, an ANOVA was used to compare differences among the first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies, over a period of one to 10 days, 11-20 days, and over 20 days by using an ANOVA or analysis of variance.

In order to find an effective sample size for the *t*-test in research question two, a Group Statistics table was used to see if a variation in groups occurred or if each group had an equal number of participants (Laerd Statistics, 2019). Research question two used an independent samples *t*-test to compare the differences in each sub-category. In the study, the independent variable had two levels and the groupings were independent for research question two. One group of participants had substitute taught before becoming a teacher and the other group of participants had not substitute taught prior to becoming a teacher. Sample size calculation for research question two included the independent samples *t*-test with a medium effect size of an $\alpha = .05$ and a power = .8. The sample size was 102 total or 51 per group for research question two (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007).

Research Setting

The research setting included classrooms in Missouri public schools in which new teachers were employed. Teachers from preschool to twelfth grade in a public school setting were included to broaden the sample size. The setting was chosen based on research showing classroom management was a struggle for many novice public school

teachers (Blake, 2017; DeMonte, 2016; Dorel et al., 2016; Kennedy, 2016; Rabin & Smith, 2016; Spooner et al., 2008).

According to the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), the new teachers asked to participate in the study should number around 4,000 based on the number of average new teachers over the past six academic school years. According to the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) almost three-fourths of new teachers entering the field of teaching are women. In the 2018-2019 academic school year, according to DESE, there were 518 total districts in Missouri. According to the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), Missouri public schools had 88% to 89% percent graduation rate in over last three years. According to DESE, the current spending per ADA ranged between \$10,000 to \$11,000 over the two years. The dropout rate over the last three years remained below two percent while the mobility rate remained 23%. In Missouri, according to DESE, the percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch aid represented approximately 50% of the population over the last three years. Substitutes enter classrooms and are expected to manage students which is often the hardest part of the job (Hill, 1999; Zubrzycki, 2012). Though it is challenging to establish training for substitutes, Robinson (2016) found training helped provide improvements in multiple areas. Some districts try to provide training for substitutes, yet often struggle to find the financial means when teacher preparedness is also a priority (Jackson, 2014).

Research Design

Initial research design utilized demographic questions for grouping purposes. Demographic questions gave the researcher data to sort participants into a group which

did substitute teach during undergraduate studies and a group which did not. A causal comparative study was chosen for the research design to best answer the research questions and help identify if there was a difference between the variables (Creswell, 2003). The design was chosen for the researcher to compare the differences substitute teaching experience had on first-year teacher's classroom management efficacy. Creswell (2003) believed causal comparative study was best to test a theory or understanding. A qualitative study would not allow the researcher to accurately compare the demographics and experiences because results would be based on interpretation rather than important variable of study (Creswell, 2003). A qualitative study also requires a smaller sample size, which would decrease the generalizability of the study (Creswell, 2003).

A survey was used to gather data for the study which measured teacher classroom management efficacy. A survey was used because a survey allows for a large sample size, had efficient turnaround time, and can accommodate a broad population (Creswell, 2003). The survey used was Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy's (2001) Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form, revised with only the questions regarding classroom management efficacy given to participants. Only giving the classroom management efficacy section allowed the researcher to add to the body of knowledge regarding classroom management efficacy. The survey effectively identifies teachers' self-efficacy in the form of classroom management and has a specific section dedicated to classroom management efficacy. Other surveys focus specifically on efficacy or classroom management but few if any focus on both. Data was analyzed using SPSS software to determine whether or not to accept or reject the null hypotheses.

Instrumentation

The instrumentation of the study utilized a survey created by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001). The survey is originally a 24 question Likert survey designed to give knowledge about a teacher's beliefs in personal efficacy (Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, 2001). The main themes of the survey are instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management (Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, 2001). For the study, approval was given by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy to administer only the classroom management section and add demographic questions to better identify the population. The classroom management section of the survey using the Long Form are questions 3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, and 21. The Likert Scale used in the study runs one through nine with a one indicating none at all and a nine indicating a great deal. The survey was appropriate due to the specific section focusing on classroom management efficacy. The reliability of the classroom management efficacy section of the survey (Long Form) has a mean of 6.7, standard deviation of 1.1, and a Cronbach's alpha of .90. An acceptable reliability of coefficient for Cronbach alpha is .70 or higher (Laerd Statistics, 2018). Permission to use the survey was obtained from the author and can be found in Appendix A. The construct validity for each separate component of the Long Form is located in Appendix E.

Procedures

The survey was developed by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) to capture teacher efficacy. The researcher used the classroom management efficacy section of the Long Form of the survey. The survey also collected data regarding the gender of each participant. Two open-ended questions were added to the survey which allowed the participants the opportunity to add any additional information to their responses. The first

question asked if substitute teaching made an impact on individual classroom management. The second question allowed for the participants to respond to the impact the Covid-19 virus had on their classroom management preparedness. During the 2019-2020 academic school year, the Covid-19 virus caused a global pandemic which resulted in schools to shut down in early spring for the remainder of the school year. Schools offered instruction through virtual learning for the remainder of the school year and missed nearly one-fourth of the traditional face-to-face learning structure.

Permission to use the survey was obtained via email from Megan Tschannen-Moran and Mary Anita Woolfolk Hoy and can be found in Appendix A. The researcher created a cover letter sent to Missouri public school principals which can be found in Appendix B. The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education open access website was used to gather the name and email of each administrator in Missouri. The cover letter explained the purpose of the survey and how the survey would be used. Within the letter was a link to the survey and a request for principals to forward the survey to all first-year teachers in their building.

Before beginning the process of gathering data, the researcher applied and met the approval of a Research Review Board ensuring the ethics of the study. Emails were then sent to administrators throughout Missouri schools explaining the study. Once administrators sent first-year teachers details of the survey, permission was asked of each participant prior to completing the survey. First-year teachers were grouped according to individual answers to questions indicating if each participant did or did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies. Each group identified in the research questions was given a survey to help indicate personal levels of classroom management efficacy belief.

The survey was administered through QuestionPro in a digital format to ensure participants remained anonymous. The survey was administered over a one-month period and across the state of Missouri to maximize the number of participants studied. An email requesting permission from principals was sent and is located in Appendix B. Reminder emails and notices were sent to participants on the first and third week of the study (Appendix C & D). The survey was sent using an email to each new teacher's school email address. Upon request, findings were shared with participants at the conclusion of the study and findings were also shared with the creators of the survey Megan Tschannen-Moran and Mary Anita Woolfolk Hoy. Demographics were obtained using the survey to identify how many days of substitute teaching experience occurred as well as the gender of each participant. Two open-ended questions were added to the survey to allow participants the ability to add any additional information on their substitute teaching experience and the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic had on their classroom management efficacy beliefs. Data was downloaded, gathered, and gleaned before being exported into SPSS to run analytics for the multiple tests. An ANOVA was used for the first research question and an independent samples *t*-test was used for the second research question.

Data Analysis

The Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale was created by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001). The scale analyzes overall teacher efficacy using three categories, but this study only used the classroom management questions. For the study, the Long Form version of the classroom management section was given to measure classroom management efficacy. Permission was given to use the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale focusing on

classroom management efficacy by the creator Megan Tschannen-Moran and Mary Anita Woolfolk Hoy and can be found in Appendix A. The survey was appropriate due to the specific section focusing on classroom management efficacy. The demographic questions asked of participants and reported included whether the substitute teaching experience was consecutive or non-consecutive days, if participants acquired teacher certification immediately after completing an undergraduate degree, and gender to identify discrepancies in the results. Once data was collected, the information was entered into an Excel spreadsheet. Due to the number of respondents, the data was scrutinized multiple times to ensure information was accurate and free from error. After ensuring the data had been entered correctly, outliers were identified to help validate the accuracy of the information. Next, the data was gleaned and put into SPSS to run the statistics. For research question one, an ANOVA was used and for research question two, an independent samples *t*-test was used. The ANOVA allowed the researcher to compare the difference of the four independent groups. The independent samples *t*-test was used to see if a statistically significant difference occurred between groups.

Research Question One:

In research question one, an ANOVA was used to compare differences among the first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies over a period of one to 10 days, 11-20 days, and over 20 days by using an ANOVA or analysis of variance. Data from the survey was taken to compare the statistical differences between groups and put into an Excel spreadsheet. Data was then exported from the spreadsheet in Excel into SPSS software where the statistical findings were used to provide graphs to provide a

better visual and understanding of any significant differences discovered. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to compare differences among the first-year teachers who did not substitute teach and did substitute teach during undergraduate studies over a period of one to 10 days, 11-20 days, and over twenty days by using an ANOVA or analysis of variance. An ANOVA was used to analyze the differences among the group means or variations between multiple groups instead of two groups like an independent sample *t*-test.

Multiple assumptions were considered while running the ANOVA. The first assumption of the two independent groups were participants who did and did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies. The second assumption of this test was the dependent variable measured on a continuous scale using the classroom management efficacy score. The third assumption of the study was met because of the independence of observation where participants taking part in the survey were independent from each other and choose to participate in the study. The participants had either some substitute teaching experience or did not have any substitute teaching experience. The fourth assumption was the dependent variable, followed a normal distribution using the Shapiro-Wilk test of normality. The Shapiro-Wilk test of normality with a Sig. value of .05 or greater means the data is normal, and less than .05, indicates the data deviates from normality (Laerd Statistics, 2018). The fifth assumption was the homogeneity of the variances which was measured using the Levene's Test in SPSS to ensure the standard deviation of the dependent variable was equal for the population. The Levene's Test allowed the variance of the data to be tested in a non-normal distribution of the data

(Laerd Statistics, 2019). If the assumption of homogeneity was violated, a Welch test could be used to regulate the data (Laerd Statistics, 2018).

The standard deviation and mean were calculated for each part of the research questions. An alpha of .05 was the acceptable probability value in order to reject or fail to reject a null hypothesis (Pelham, 2013). An alpha value of over .05 represents a failure to reject the null hypothesis, while an alpha value of .05 or less represents a rejection of the null hypothesis (Pelham, 2013). The alpha value allows an understanding of a statistically significant difference because the closer the value is to .05 the less statistically significant the findings are (Cohen, 1988). Effect size was measured using Partial Eta Squared to evaluate how much of an effect the difference made based on the two variables tested. Partial Eta Squared was used to find the difference between two means and allowed a comparison of one variable in multiple studies (Cohen, 1988). Using the Partial Eta Squared formula, the sum of squares and the sum of squares within the means were gleaned from the ANOVA summary table and calculated using SPSS. Results were compared to the standard effect size for Partial Eta Squared with a small effect of 0.01, medium effect of 0.06, and large effect of 0.14 (Cohen, 1988).

The use of an ANOVA can help monitor the Experiment-Wise Error Rate when comparing multiple groups, yet shares the same assumptions as the *t*-test (Pelham, 2013). The Experiment-Wise Error Rate reduces the likelihood the effects occurred by chance (Pelham, 2013). By using the ANOVA, there is less likelihood of differences occurring by chance instead because multiple means are compared and computed (Pelham, 2013). The Fisher's F Test allows for the control of the variations among groups. This test is an omnibus test showing if something statistically, significantly different is found in any of

the means while not identifying where the difference lies. Each of the four variables were compared to each other to find the degrees of variance between each variable. The comparison of the variables helped show the amount of difference in the efficacy score between each variable group. In order to determine where the difference was occurring, a Post Hoc analysis was done to find the least significant difference among the variables. The Post Hoc was done to determine if there was a significant difference and what level of significance was between each of the groups. The Post Hoc test used in the study was the Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) Test using SPSS. With the attempt to include a high number of participants, HSD allowed for more degrees of freedom in the study.

Research Question Two:

Research question two used an independent samples *t*-test to compare the differences in each sub-category. In the study, the independent variable had two levels and the groupings were independent for research question two. One group had substitute taught before becoming a teacher and the other group had not substitute taught prior to becoming a teacher. Data from the survey for the second research question was put into a spreadsheet to determine if a statistical difference between groups was found to be significant. Data was then exported from the spreadsheet into SPSS software and the statistical findings were used to provide graphs to provide a better visual and representation of any significant difference discovered. Research question two used an independent samples *t*-test to compare the differences in each sub-category. In the study, the independent variable had two levels and the groupings were independent for research question two. One group had substitute taught before becoming a teacher and the other

group had not substitute taught prior to becoming a teacher. Therefore, the score on the classroom management efficacy scale was the dependent variable of the *t*-test while experience was an independent variable.

There are multiple assumptions to be considered while running the independent samples *t*-test. The first assumption of two independent groups exist for the study included participants who did substitute teach and who did not substitute teach prior to becoming first-year teachers. The second assumption of the tests was the dependent variable can be measured on a continuous scale using the classroom management efficacy score. The third assumption of the study was met because of the independence of observation where participants taking part in the survey were independent from each other and choose to participate in the study. The participants had either some substitute teaching experience or did not have any substitute teaching experience prior to becoming first-year teachers. The fourth assumption was the dependent variable and followed a normal distribution using the Sharpiro-Wilk Test of Normality. The fifth assumption was the homogeneity of the variances and was measured using the Levene's Test in SPSS to ensure the standard deviation of the dependent variable was equal for the population (Laerd, 2019).

The standard deviation and mean were calculated for each part of the research questions. An alpha of .05 was the acceptable probability value in order to reject or fail to reject a null hypothesis (Pelham, 2013). An alpha value of over .05 means an acceptance of the null hypothesis was represented, while an alpha value of .05 or less means a rejection of the null hypothesis was represented. The alpha value allows an understanding if there was a statistically significant difference present, while the effect size using

Cohen's d measurement evaluates specifically how much effect the difference makes. The sample size, mean, and standard deviation were used to find the value of d . The formula to find Cohen's d is: mean of group two subtracted by the mean of group one, all divided by the pooled standard deviation of both groups (Cohen, 1977). As the d value moves from zero, the effect size gets bigger with zero meaning no effect (Cohen, 1977). The closer the effect size is to one, the greater the effect between the variables (Cohen, 1977). Durlak (2009) recommends data be compared to similar studies to more accurately interpret the effect size of a study and help put the significance into perspective. Using a Cohen's d , the value of .2 represents a small effect size, a .5 represents a medium effect size, and a .8 represents a large effect size (McLeod, 2019).

The independent samples t -test was used for the second research question. In the second question, four sub questions identifying the variables tested to see if a difference in any of the categories was present. A separate t -test was done on each of the categories to represent the variables in SPSS. In order to represent each of the categories in the SPSS software, a number was assigned to each category. For example, no substitute training was a one, one orientation training was a two, classroom visits or formal training was a three, and multiple classroom visits or trainings was a four. Each one of the categories were then used to test if there was a difference in classroom management efficacy scores. With each category, the participants answered the survey using a numerical score for each answer. Each question was used to figure out the level of classroom management efficacy for each participant based on the category which represented each participant. The answers to the survey were then compared for each

group, identifying the differences in scores among each category and revealing if a statistically relevant difference was present.

The one independent variable tested was the amount of experience the first-year teacher had in substitute teaching before entering the profession. The dependent variable was the classroom management efficacy score which was measured on a continuous scale. In the study, there was a level of independent observation held because each participant's classroom management efficacy was not predictive of the level of substitute teaching experience. The survey was composed of Likert Scales in which the data from each question was analyzed using the scoring directions of the creator, Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) and the numbers were then placed into the spreadsheet representing overall classroom management efficacy scores. A normal distribution in statistical data of the population occurred because a bimodal distribution due to the two subsamples was created due to the amount of the sample size (Pelham, 2013).

Summary

Chapter Three presented the methodology of the study, how data was collected, and how data was analyzed. A review of the research questions and hypotheses, the participants for the study, the sampling, research setting and design, instrumentation, procedures, and data analysis was also presented. The intent of the study was to determine differences in first-year teachers who substitute taught and first-year teachers who did not substitute teach prior to becoming teachers. The study specifically examined differences in classroom management efficacy scores after one year of teaching to determine if substitute teaching experience made a difference. The survey used was Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy's (2001) Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale Long

Form, revised with only the questions regarding classroom management efficacy given to participants. Only giving the classroom management efficacy section allowed the researcher to add to the body of knowledge regarding classroom management efficacy.

Chapter Four presents the findings of the study based on methodology of Chapter Three. Chapter Five interprets the findings as well as provides a summary of the entire study. Also included in Chapter Five are recommendations for future study and implications.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative causal comparative study was to look specifically at first-year teachers and their level of classroom management efficacy in regard to substitute teaching experience. Using the Theory of Efficacy by Bandura (1997) and the Classroom Management Theory by Kounin (1970), this study sought to determine if first-year teachers with and without substitute teaching experience had a statistically significant difference in teacher classroom management efficacy in Missouri public school districts. The intent of the study was to find if an impact on classroom management efficacy scores between first-year teachers who substitute taught during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies existed. This study helps fill in a gap of literature regarding outside teaching experiences.

The study used the classroom management efficacy questions on the Long Form version of Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale which was developed by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) and measures teacher self-efficacy. Participants were asked to identify substitute teaching experience, number of days of substitute teaching experience acquired, and if any substitute training had been provided. Other demographic questions were collected and included the identification of gender and whether the substitute teaching experience was consecutive, non-consecutive, or a combination. Two open-ended questions were added to allow participants an opportunity to expand on the impact substitute teaching experience and the Covid-19 pandemic had on their classroom

management efficacy. The data was collected using QuestionPro software and was placed into SPSS software to run statistical analysis.

Chapter Four introduces the participants involved in the study, the data analysis for each research question, and the findings for each research question. Demographic data of participants as well as findings from the open-ended questions are reported. The findings for each null hypothesis are presented and tables and descriptive statistics are included. Lastly, a summary is given to review the process used in developing the study.

Research Questions

Classroom management efficacy survey data was analyzed to determine if a difference based on classroom experience exists. The following questions were used to guide the study:

1. What is the difference in the classroom management efficacy score among first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies, over a period of one to 10 days, 11-20 days, and over 20 days?
2. What is the difference in the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies with:
 - a. No substitute training overall?
 - b. One orientation training conducted by a professional educator?
 - c. One-two classroom visits or formal classroom management training sessions by a professional educator?

- d. More than two classroom visits or formal classroom management training sessions by a professional educator?

Null Hypotheses

Null hypothesis H1₀: There is no statistically significant difference in the classroom management efficacy score among first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies, over a period of one to 10 days, 11-20 days, and over 20 days?

Null hypothesis H2a₀: There is no statistically significant difference between the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies.

Null hypothesis H2b₀: There is no statistically significant difference between the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies with one orientation training for substitute teaching by a professional educator.

Null hypothesis H3a₀: There is no statistically significant difference between the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies with one-two classroom visits or formal training sessions by a professional educator.

Null hypothesis H4a₀: There is no statistically significant difference between the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did not substitute

teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies more than two classroom visits or formal training sessions by a professional educator.

Data Analysis and Findings

The survey was administered over a two-week period and took an average of four minutes to complete. Out of the 518 public schools in the state of Missouri, 1,862 emails were sent to each district's building administration. According to the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, approximately 4,000 new teachers enter the profession of teaching each year based on previous year's data. There were 114 participants who completed the survey with the return rate at about 6.12% with an average of 4 minutes to complete. For research question one, the sample size calculation used G*power which indicated a total of 180 or 45 per group (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). With only 114 participants, participant size may have impacted the effect size and power. For the second research question, the sample size calculation revealed a total of 102 participants or 51 per group was needed. At the closure of the survey, incomplete surveys were eliminated. Only surveys granting permission were used. The data was then downloaded from QuestionPro into Microsoft Excel, where the data was cleaned and inspected. Once the data was formatted properly and then uploaded into SPSS software, and a complete analysis was run. For research question one, an ANOVA test was conducted. For research question two, four Independent Samples t-test were conducted for each of the null hypotheses. A question regarding participant's gender is reported along with a brief analysis of the two open ended questions and can be found in Table 1.

Participants

Table 1

Participants Gender

Gender	<i>N</i>
Male	31
Female	102

A total of 114 surveys were completed by first-year teachers of the academic 2019-2020 school year. The participant's gender can be found in Table 1. Females were the majority of participants and consisted of 102 (76.69%) of the total participants while males made up the minority of participants and represented the remaining 31 participants (23.31%). Below in Table 2, further descriptive information about participants is listed. Out of the 114 participants, 88 (72.73%) had substitute taught before entering the profession while 33 (27.27%) participants had no substitute teaching experience. Of the participants with substitute teaching experience, 18.39% had 1-10 days of substitute teaching experience, 9.2% had 11-20 days of substitute teaching experience, and 72.41% had over 20 days of substitute teaching experience. During the substitute teaching experience, 17.05% of the participants substitute taught consecutive days, 28.41% substitute taught non-consecutive days, and 54.55% of participants substitute taught a combination of the two.

Table 2

Participants Experience

Substitute Teaching Experience	<i>N</i>
Had Experience	88
No Experience	33
1-10 Days of Experience	16
11-20	8
Over 20	63

Data Cleaning

Data was collected using QuestionPro program over a two-week period and 136 participants started the survey. The researcher cleaned the data from QuestionPro eliminated incomplete surveys for a total of 114 surveys taken and used for the study. The data was then downloaded into Microsoft Excel where the Classroom Management Efficacy Scores were calculated by finding the total sum of the eight Classroom Management Efficacy questions. The score was used to run the tests for Research Questions one and two. Research question one required a coding system for the data before tests were run. The coding system was a zero to three based on the amount of substitute teaching experience. A zero represented none, one represented one-10 days, two represented 11-20 days, and a three represented over 20 days of substitute teaching. Using the clean data, the researcher was able to run the one-way ANOVA test for the first research question.

For research question two, a coding system was required and represented the type of training the participant had if the individual had substitute teaching experience. A zero represented none, one represented one orientation training by a professional educator,

two represented one-two classroom visits or formal classroom management training sessions by professional educator, and a three represented more than two classroom visits or formal classroom management training sessions by a professional educator.

Using the coding system for both of the research questions, the data was transferred into SPSS. Once the data was in SPSS, the data was cleaned for any errors made during transfer, coded to run statistics, and then checked for accuracy. Using the clean data, the researcher was able to conduct a one-way ANOVA for the first research question and an independent samples *t*-test for the second research question. Both tests were needed to reject or fail to reject the null hypothesis.

Research Question One and Null Hypothesis H_{10}

First-year teacher responses to the classroom management efficacy questions on the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale were used to answer Research Question One: What is the difference in the classroom management efficacy score among first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies, over a period of one to 10 days, 11-20 days, and over 20 days? A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if the participants classroom management efficacy scores was different for groups with different substitute teaching experience. Participants were classified into four groups: no substitute teaching experience ($n = 30$), one to 10 days ($n = 16$), 11-20 days ($n = 8$), and over 20 days ($n = 60$). Group statistics for Research Question One are shown in Table 2.

H_{10} : There is no statistically significant difference in the classroom management efficacy score among first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during

undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies, over a period of one to 10 days, 11-20 days, and over 20 days?

Table 3

Classroom Management Efficacy Score Based on Substitute Experience

Substitute Experience	Mean Score on TSES	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
None	57.63	8.861	30
One-10 Days	54.75	9.030	16
11-20 Days	64.88	4.422	8
Over 20 Days	60.20	7.171	60

Note. *SD* = standard deviation; *N* = number of sample size.

In Table 4, a Test for Normality was conducted to identify if the dependent variable followed a normal distribution. This was done using the Shapiro-Wilk test of normality. A *Sig.* value of .05 or greater means the data is normal with less than .05 indicating non-normal distribution.

Table 4

Tests of Normality

Days Subbed		Statistic	Shapiro-Wilk	
			<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
CMES	None	.966	30	.426
	1-10	.982	16	.975
	11-20	.986	8	.986
	Over 20	.959	60	.042

Note. CMES = classroom management efficacy score

There were no outliers, as assessed by a boxplot. Data was normally distributed for each group, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test ($p > .05$) and shown in Table 4. There was homogeneity of variances except for group 4, as assessed by Levene's test of homogeneity of variances ($p = .082$). An ANOVA is robust enough to handle the violation of one group. The classroom management efficacy score was statistically significantly different between the different substitute teaching experiences, $F(3, 110) = 3.885, p = .011$, Partial Eta Squared = .096. This is a medium effect size for Partial Eta Squared (Cohen, 1988) as calculated using SPSS Tests of Between Subjects Effects.

Table 5

ANOVA

CMES	Sum of Sq.	<i>df</i>	Mean Sq.	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Between groups	706.681	3	235.560	3.885	.011
Within groups	6670.442	110	60.640		

Note. CMES = classroom management efficacy score

In Table 6, a Post Hoc analysis was done to find the least significant difference among each group. The Post Hoc analysis determined if a significant difference occurred and to what level of significance was between groups. The Post Hoc test for the study was the Tukey Honestly Significant Difference Test using SPSS.

Table 6

Tukey HSD

Days Subbed	Mean Diff.	Std. Error	Sig.	95% CI	
				LB	UB
1-10 Days					
None	-2.883	2.411	.631	-9.17	3.41
11-20	-10.125	3.372	.017	-18.92	-1.33
Over 20	-5.450	2.191	.067	-11.17	.27

Tukey revealed a statistically significant difference in substitute teaching experience. Specifically, in participants with one-10 days and 11-20 days of substitute teaching experience. This is a statistically significant difference therefore the null hypothesis was rejected by $M = -10.125$, 95% CI [-18.92, -1.33] $p = .017$, Cohen's $d = 1.42$.

Research Question Two

Research Question 2A and Null Hypothesis $H2a_0$

Participants classroom management efficacy score based on the TSES were used to answer the research question 2A: What is the difference in classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies with no substitute teaching training? $H2a_0$: There is no statistically significant difference between the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did not substitute teach training during undergraduate studies.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics Classroom Management Efficacy Score

Substitute Training	Mean Score on TSES	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
No Experience	57.63	8.861	30
No Training	59.61	7.772	84

Note. *SD* = standard deviation; *N* = number of sample size.

In Table 8, a Test for Normality was conducted to identify if the dependent variable followed a normal distribution. This was done using the Shapiro-Wilk test of normality. A *Sig.* value of .05 or greater means the data is normal with less than .05 indicating non-normal distribution.

Table 8

Tests of Normality

		Shapiro-Wilk		
	Substitute Training	Statistic	<i>df</i>	Sig.
Classroom Management Efficacy Score	None	.966	30	.426
	Trained	.973	84	.077

An independent-samples *t*-test was run to determine if there were differences in classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers with no substitute teaching experience and first-year teachers with substitute teaching experience but no substitute teacher training. Table 8 revealed there was only one outlier in the data based on the inspection of a boxplot. The independent-samples *t*-test is robust enough to handle

one outlier. Efficacy scores for each level of experience were normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test ($p > .05$), and there was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's test in Table 9 for equality of variances ($p = .208$). The classroom management efficacy score for the group with no experience was ($M = 57.63$, $SD = 8.86$). The classroom management efficacy score for the group with no training was ($M = 59.61$, $SD = 7.77$). The scores failed to reject the null hypothesis, $M = -1.97$, 95% $CI [-5.37, 1.43]$, $t(112) = -1.150$, $p = .253$, $d = .24$. A Cohen's d score such as this indicates a small effect size. This data can be found in the independent-samples t -test in Table 9.

Table 9

Independent Samples Test

Efficacy Score	t	df	Sig.	Mean difference	SEM difference	95% CI	
						LL	UL
	-1.150	112	.253	-1.974	1.716	-5.374	1.426

Note. CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.

Research Question 2B and Null Hypothesis $H2b_0$

The classroom management efficacy score based on the TSES was used to answer the research question 2B: What is the difference in the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies with one orientation training conducted by a professional educator? $H2b_0$: There is no statistically significant difference between the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and

first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies with one orientation training for substitute teaching by a professional educator.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics Classroom Management Efficacy Score

Substitute Training	Mean Score on TSES	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
None	59.20	8.077	100
Orientation	58.29	8.361	14

Note. *SD* = standard deviation; *N* = number of sample size.

In Table 11, a Test for Normality was conducted to identify if the dependent variable followed a normal distribution. This was done using the Shapiro-Wilk test of normality. A *Sig.* value of .05 or greater means the data is normal and less than .05 indicates non-normal distribution.

Table 11

Tests of Normality

		Shapiro-Wilk		
	Substitute Training	Statistic	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Classroom Management Efficacy Score	None	.974	100	.048
	Orientation	.964	14	.0792

An independent-samples *t*-test was conducted to determine if there were differences in the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers with no substitute teaching experience and first-year teachers with substitute teaching experience and one orientation substitute teacher training. There were no outliers in the

data based on the inspection of a boxplot. Efficacy scores for each level of experience were normally distributed except for one non-normal group with no substitute training, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test ($p > .05$). A homogeneity of variances as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances ($p = .757$) is located in Table 12. The classroom management efficacy score for the participant with no substitute training was ($M = 59.20$, $SD = 8.08$). The classroom management efficacy score for the participant receiving one substitute teacher orientation training was ($M = 58.29$, $SD = 8.36$). The scores failed to reject the null hypothesis, $M = -.914$, 95% $CI [-3.671, 5.50]$, $t(112) = .395$, $p = .69$, $d = .12$. A Cohen's d score such as this indicates a small effect.

Table 12

Independent Samples Test

Efficacy Score	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	Mean difference	<i>SEM</i> difference	95% <i>CI</i>	
						<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>
	.395	112	.69	-.914	2.314	-3.671	5.500

Note. *CI* = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

Research Question 2C and Null Hypothesis $H3a_0$

The classroom management efficacy score based on the TSES was used to answer the research question 2C: What is the difference in the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies with one-two classroom visits or formal classroom management training sessions by a professional educator? $H3a_0$: There is no statistically significant difference between the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did not substitute

teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies with one-two classroom visits or formal training sessions by a professional educator.

Table 13

Descriptive Statistics Classroom Management Efficacy Score

Substitute Training	Mean Score on TSES	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
None	59.07	8.20	107
1-2 CV or Trainings	59.29	6.422	7

Note. CV = Classroom Visits; *SD* = standard deviation; *N* = number of sample size.

In Table 14, a Test for Normality was conducted to identify if the dependent variable followed a normal distribution. This was done using the Shapiro-Wilk test of normality. A *Sig.* value of .05 or greater means the data is normal and less than .05 indicates non-normal distribution.

Table 14

Tests of Normality

		Shapiro-Wilk		
	Substitute Training	Statistic	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Classroom Management Efficacy Score	None	.975	107	.041
	1-2 CV/T	.965	7	.863

Note. CV/T = classroom visits or trainings.

An independent-samples *t*-test was conducted to determine if there were differences in the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers with no substitute teaching experience and first-year teachers with substitute teaching

experience and one-two classroom visits or formal classroom management training sessions by a professional educator. There were no outliers in the data based on the inspection of a boxplot. Efficacy scores for each level of experience were normally distributed except for one non-normal participant with no substitute training, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test ($p > .05$) located in Table 14, and there was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances ($p = .276$). The classroom management efficacy score for the participants with no substitute teacher training was ($M = 59.07, SD = 8.20$). The classroom management efficacy score for the participant with one-two classroom visits or trainings was ($M = 59.29, SD = 6.42$). The scores failed to reject the null hypothesis, $M = -.211, 95\% \text{ CI} [-6.48, 6.06], t(112) = -.067, p = .95, d = .03$. A Cohen's d score such as this indicates a small effect size and the data can be found in the Independent Samples Test in Table 15.

Table 15

Independent Samples Test

Efficacy Score	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	Mean difference	<i>SEM</i> difference	95% <i>CI</i>	
						<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>
	-.067	112	.95	-0.211	3.166	-6.484	6.062

Note. *CI* = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

Research Question 2D and Null Hypothesis $H4a_0$

The classroom management efficacy score based on the TSES was used to answer the research question 2D: What is the difference in the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies with

more than two classroom visits or formal classroom management training sessions by a professional educator? *H4a0*: There is no statistically significant difference between the classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies more than two classroom visits or formal training sessions by a professional educator.

Table 16

Descriptive Statistics Classroom Management Efficacy Score

Substitute Training	Mean Score on TSES	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
None	58.79	8.084	107
Multiple CV or Trainings	63.57	7.068	7

Note. CV = Classroom Visits; *SD* = standard deviation; *N* = number.

In Table 17, a Test for Normality was conducted to identify if the dependent variable followed a normal distribution. This was done using the Shapiro-Wilk test of normality. A *Sig.* value of .05 or greater means the data is normal and less than .05 indicates non-normal distribution.

Table 17

Tests of Normality

		Shapiro-Wilk		
Substitute Training		Statistic	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Classroom Management Efficacy Score	None	.978	107	.070
	1-2 MCV/T	.927	7	.524

Note. MCV/T = multiple classroom visits or trainings.

An independent-samples *t*-test was conducted to determine if there were differences in classroom management efficacy score between first-year teachers with no substitute teaching experience and first-year teachers with substitute teaching experience and with more than two classroom visits or formal classroom management training sessions by a professional educator. There were no outliers in the data based on the inspection of a boxplot. Efficacy scores for each level of experience were normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test ($p > .05$) found in Table 17, and there was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances ($p = .542$). The classroom management efficacy score for the participant with no training was ($M = 58.79, SD = 8.08$). The classroom management efficacy score for the participant with more than two classroom visits or trainings was ($M = 63.57, SD = 7.07$). The scores failed to reject the null hypothesis, $M = -4.78, 95\% CI [-10.986, 1.432], t(112) = -1.524, p = .13, d = .63$. A Cohen's *d* score such as this indicates a medium effect size and the data can be found in the independent-samples *t*-test in Table 18.

Table 18

Independent-Samples t-test

Efficacy Score	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	Mean difference	<i>SEM</i> difference	95% <i>CI</i>	
						<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>
	-1.524	112	.13	-4.777	3.134	-10.986	1.432

Note. *CI* = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

Open Ended Questions

The survey included two open ended questions. Participants having substitute teaching experience were asked both questions, and participants without substitute teaching experience were asked just one question. The first question asked participants with substitute teaching experience if the experience had an impact on individual classroom management. The second question asked all participants to determine if an impact on classroom management preparedness was made by the occurrence of Covid-19 pandemic. An analysis of categorical data and consistent themes were found in this qualitative section.

Table 19

Open Ended Q1

Substitute Teaching Experience	<i>N</i>
Positive	70
Negative	6
Indifferent	4
Total	80

A total of 80 participants answered the first open-ended question toward participants with substitute teaching experience. The open-ended question: Do you believe substitute teaching impacted your classroom management skills? If so, explain the impact. Out of the 80 participants, 70 participants stated substitute teaching had a positive impact on their classroom management skills, six stated a negative impact, and four were indifferent regarding the impact. Several common themes emerged from the responses such as: opportunities to see many classroom management styles and

opportunities to see multiple grade levels, time to practice teaching alone, increased confidence, and opportunities to practice skills learned in undergraduate studies.

Table 20

Open Ended Q2

Covid-19 Impact	<i>N</i>
No Impact	43
Impact	26
Indifferent	3
Total	72

A total of 72 participants answered the second open-ended question. The open-ended questions: Did the conditions created by Covid-19 impact your perception regarding classroom management preparedness? If so, explain the impact. Out of the 72 total participants, 43 stated there was no impact, 26 stated there was an impact, and three participants were indifferent. Several common themes emerged from the responses including virtual learning, omitted the classroom management component of teaching, difficulties maintaining communication, digital distractions, student's motivation or lack of motivation to learn digitally, and difficulty to meet individual student needs.

The responses and patterns identified helped the researcher better understand the perspective of the participants. The responses also helped the researcher understand how the Covid-19 pandemic impacted individual teachers and potentially the data. The qualitative analysis provides specific context the outside impacts potentially made on first-year teachers.

Summary

Chapter Four included the data analysis and findings of the study. The findings comprised of 114 total responses from first-year teachers in the academic school year of 2019-2020. The analysis of the one-way ANOVA data revealed a statistically significant difference in the classroom management efficacy score among first-year teachers who did not substitute teach during undergraduate studies and first-year teachers who did substitute teach during undergraduate studies, over a period of one to 10 days, 11-20 days, and over 20 days. Specifically, there was a statistically significant difference between one to 10 days and 11-20 days of substitute teaching experience.

The analysis of the independent-samples *t*-test data revealed no statistically significant difference in the classroom management efficacy score based on substitute teacher trainings. Each of the sub-questions for the second research question failed to reject the null hypothesis. Also, open-ended questions were analyzed to identify common themes in participant responses and provided further insight into the perspectives and contexts of this study.

Chapter Five provides an overview of the research, conclusions, and recommendations for future research. Included in the overview of the research and conclusion, is a brief description of each research question and recommendations for future research related to authentic experiences and classroom management efficacy.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to focus specifically on first-year teachers and classroom management efficacy based on substitute teaching experience. There is a gap in current literature about experiences outside of undergraduate studies. Using a survey, the impact of substitute teaching on first-year teacher's classroom management efficacy was measured. With first-year teachers finishing up the first-year of teaching, the transition was of interest to measure the potential impact substitute teaching had on the first-year of teaching.

In the literature review, a need for both classroom management and self-efficacy in teachers was evident. First-year teachers specifically struggle to develop both classroom management and self-efficacy before entering the profession (Bandura, 1997; Eckert, 2014; Gibbs & Miller, 2014; Kounin, 1970; Petersen, 2017). Teachers with higher self-efficacy and classroom management contribute to higher academic achievement for students (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Borgogni, Petitta, & Rubinacci, 2003; Engin, 2020; Hattie, 2012; Kim & Seo, 2018). Also, teachers reporting a higher sense of self-efficacy and less issues with classroom management, have showed less signs of burnout and are more likely to remain in the profession (Bullock et al., 2015; Kwok, 2018; Robinson, 2016; Turkoglu et al., 2017). Substitute teaching as an authentic experience provides time for pre-service teachers to practice skills with classroom management and develop higher self-efficacy in teaching (Heinsen, 2012; Robinson, 2016).

The purpose of this quantitative causal comparative study was to look specifically at first-year teachers and their level of classroom management efficacy in regard to substitute teaching experience. Chapter Five provides a summary of the different methods used to collect and analyze the data related to the two research questions. Findings for each of the research questions, recommendations for future research, practical implications, and conclusions are included in Chapter Five.

Summary of Methods

This quantitative study was conducted with the approval of the Research Review Board of Southwest Baptist University in June 2020. With approval, the researcher collected the email addresses of administrators in Missouri public schools using the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) website. After administrator email addresses were collected, an initial email was sent to all Missouri school principals asking them to forward the survey to first-year teachers in their buildings. QuestionPro was used to collect all the survey results to keep participant data anonymous. First-year teachers were initially asked for permission to take part in the study, and asked to specify their gender. Participants were then sorted into two participant. The first participant group were first-year teachers with substitute teaching experience and the second participant group were first-year teachers without substitute teaching experience. For the first participant group with substitute teaching experience, three questions were asked and expanded on individual substitute teaching experience along with one open-ended question to identify if substitute teaching made an impact on individual classroom management. Both participant groups were asked the same questions using the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form, specifically the

classroom management efficacy questions, created by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy's (2001). To conclude the survey, a last open-ended question identifying if the conditions of Covid-19 pandemic had an impact on individual classroom management preparedness was asked. The quantitative data was collected over a two week period with a follow-up email sent to principals after the first week. The data was cleaned using Microsoft Excel and then uploaded into SPSS software to analyze. A one-way ANOVA and *t*-test were used to determine if a statistical significance occurred in the study in order to reject or fail to reject the null hypothesis for both research questions. All first-year teachers were asked to participate by the Missouri buildings principals who were willing to forward the survey. A total of 114 surveys were completed from the 136 participants who started the survey. The survey took an average of four minutes to complete.

Summary of Findings

This research was focused on substitute teaching's impact on first-year teacher efficacy in regard to classroom management. The researcher was looking specifically at the impact the length of the substitute teaching experience as well as the trainings or observations had on first-year teachers. While there is significant research about teacher efficacy and classroom management, little research has been found about the impact substitute teaching experience has in teacher preparation. As a result of this gap in research, the researcher used two research questions to analyze the impact of substitute teaching experience on first-year teachers.

For the first research question, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis. There was a statistically significant difference in classroom management efficacy, specifically in participants with one-10 days of substitute teaching experience and 11-20 days of

substitute teaching experience. There was a statistically significance difference $p = .011$, and Partial Eta Squared = .096. Specifically, there was a statistically significant difference in first-year teachers who had one-10 days of substitute teaching experience and first-year teachers who had 11-20 days of substitute teaching experience. The data showed first-year teachers with 11-20 days of substitute teaching experience had a higher classroom management efficacy score when compared to first-year teachers with one-10 days of substitute teaching experience. The difference indicated 11-20 days of substitute teaching had more of a positive impact on classroom management efficacy scores when compared to one-10 days of substitute teaching experience. The difference in the classroom management efficacy score could be due to the amount of authentic and classroom management efficacy experiences when substitute teaching more than 10 days. With no significant difference with more than 20 days of substitute teaching experience, this could be due to the possibility that after 20 days, the number of positive classroom management experiences could potentially decrease.

For the second research question, an independent-samples t -test was conducted to identify if a statistically significant difference occurred. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis for each of the four sub-questions in this research question. There was no statistically significant difference in the classroom management efficacy of the participants regardless of the training or observations provided. This may be a result of the limited number of participants with substitute teacher training and the differences in substitute trainings provided in each region across the state of Missouri.

The researcher provided qualitative data analysis by examining the responses to the two open-ended questions and identified common themes and categories. The themes

and categorical data was shared for a more accurate context of the experiences of first-year teachers during the 2019-2020 academic school year. A brief analysis and interpretation of the two open-ended questions encompasses the context of the experiences of the first-year teachers and the data from the two research questions. In the following sections, an in-depth analysis of the results is shared for each of the research questions including the open-ended questions.

Research Question One Conclusions and Null Hypothesis

This section provides an in-depth analysis, interpretation, and synthesis of the findings based on Research Question One. This section analyzes the impact of substitute teaching experience on the participant's classroom management efficacy. A one-way ANOVA was used to determine if a statistically significant difference occurred. The data revealed $F(3, 110) = 3.885, p = .011, \text{Partial Eta Squared} = .096$ so therefore the researcher rejected the null hypothesis H_{10} . In order to determine where the statistically significant difference occurred $p < .05$, the data revealed $M = -10.125, 95\% \text{ CI } [-18.92, -1.33] p = .017, \text{Cohen's } d = 1.42$ between one-10 days of substitute teaching experience and 11-20 days of substitute teaching experience. Therefore, there was a statistically significant difference in the first-year teacher's classroom management efficacy based on individual substitute teaching experience. The classroom management efficacy score of participants reporting no substitute teaching experience was ($n = 30, M = 57.63, SD = 8.861$), participants reporting one to 10 days of substitute teaching experience was ($n = 16, M = 54.75, SD = 9.030$), participants reporting 11-20 days of substitute teaching experience was ($n = 8, M = 64.88, SD = 4.422$), and participants reporting over 20 days of substitute teaching experience was ($n = 60, M = 60.20, SD = 7.171$). The Partial Eta

Squared was a .096 which indicates a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988). The mean of the classroom management efficacy scores from one-10 days of substitute teaching experience and 11-20 days of substitute teaching experiences was over 10 points of the mean classroom management efficacy score with an effect size of Cohen's $d = 1.42$.

This data both supports and possibly contradicts the research stated in related research. For example, Renbarger and Davis (2019) found mastery experiences could provide teachers with an opportunity to build efficacy, potentially leading to new teacher retention. The data shows not all substitute teaching experience provided an improvement of efficacy. Bandura (1997) found once people develop a way of managing a situation, they rely on the perceived efficacy without having to consciously think the situation. This appears to be reflected in the data causing a difference in the classroom management efficacy score between participants with one-10 days of substitute teaching experience and participants with 11-20 days of substitute teaching experience. Renbarger and Davis (2019) identified mastery experiences allow teachers opportunities to build efficacy. First-year teachers with 11-20 days of experience established the most efficacy with classroom experience when compared with the amount of time spent as a substitute teacher. This supports the findings of Buchanan et al. (2013) when teachers experience success in classroom management, an individual's belief in managing difficult classroom management situations is improved. The data also supports Kounin's (1970) study showing teachers develop a sense through experience which help lessons flow with less disruptions. Additionally, Patterson and Seabrooks-Blackmore (2017) indicated teachers lacking experiences were at a disadvantage because classroom management is learned through experiences. Yet, from this study the data shows almost each participant group

had similar classroom management scores except the participants with 11-20 days of substitute teaching experience. It would appear within 11-20 days of substitute teaching experience, first-year teachers find more success in classroom management, thus supporting Hattie's (2012) findings that multiple experiences with success increases efficacy beliefs. Therefore, specifically 11-20 days of substitute teaching experience may be more valuable in the development of classroom management efficacy. Research indicates allowing pre-service teachers to gain classroom management strategies, along with opportunities to develop efficacy in the classroom, results in a higher likelihood for teacher retention (Ben-David, 2017; Kurt, Ekici, & Gungor, 2014; Patterson & Seabrooks-Blackmore, 2017; Yüksel, 2014). The results of this study do not mean substitute teaching experience is not valuable if a first-year teacher does not substitute teach 11-20 days, but the results do show 11-20 days impacts classroom management efficacy. According to the data, a first-year teacher may have not been able to experience multiple successes with classroom management with less than 10 days or even 20 or more days of substitute teaching experience. This supports research often establishing classroom management is often the most challenging task for a substitute teacher (Hill, 1999; Zubrzycki, 2012). The data suggest if a first-year teacher cannot substitute teach more than 10 days, developing classroom management efficacy when substitute teaching for less than 10 days. Kounin (1970) found when experience is gained, teachers are better equipped to identify misbehavior and address interruptions without disrupting the lesson. However, up to 10 days may not be enough experience for teachers to develop this skill. In support of less than 10 days of substitute teaching experience may not be enough time, Patterson and Seabrooks-Blackmore's (2017) found classroom management is developed

through repeated and varying experiences. The difference between the group with no substitute teaching experience and one-10 days of substitute teaching experience was only a mean difference of three points, thus not a strong enough difference to indicate substitute teaching less than 10 days was completely invaluable. This could be supported by Bandura (1997) research finding once someone has developed a poor sense of efficacy about a skill, the effort to overcome the obstacle may not be exerted. Also, Ali's (2017) research supports the findings indicating that more classroom level experience in the grade the first-year teachers will teach when entering the profession, increases personal efficacy beliefs. Substitute teaching experience is valuable to increase classroom management efficacy if the participant substitute teaches at least 11-20 days. Increased classroom management efficacy could be due to the fact undergraduate students have practicums and student teaching experiences with a mentor teacher, whereas serving as a substitute teacher for 11-20 days allows first-year teachers to have new efficacy developing experiences without the support of another teacher. Having classroom experience without the support of a mentor could potentially help develop individual teacher identity. Student teaching placements lasting up to a full year led to higher efficacy beliefs when compared to student teacher placements only lasting a semester (Colson et al., 2017). The amount of experience effective in developing efficacy is reliant on the support of a mentor and authentic experience and is supported by Bandura's (1997) work on vicarious experience and mastery experience.

Another potential variable impacting the value of the substitute teaching experience is the lesson plans left for the substitutes. The researcher had no control over the quality of the lessons given to the substitutes each day. Robinson (2016) indicated

poor lesson plans left for teachers lead to a decreased level of substitute teacher effectiveness. The impact poor lesson plans left for substitute teachers has on effectiveness may potentially relate to a decrease in self-efficacy development for substitute teachers.

The results of this study suggest an investigation on other outside experiences should be completed to identify if outside experiences can impact the retention of novice teachers. Reynolds et al. (2016) stated the need for further research on outside educational experiences and the potential impact such experiences could have on efficacy. Experiences such as serving with kids at the YMCA or even as a camp counselor could potentially have an impact in gaining experiences similar to teaching which could be beneficial for first-year teachers. (Danyulk, 2013; Baran et al., 2017). Other forms of authentic experience provide opportunities for first-year teachers to gain experience and build efficacy. The findings of Sharer (2009) found pre-service teachers engaging in substitute teaching gain valuable classroom experience before entering the profession. Substitute teaching experiences could be valuable to the retention and well-being of new teachers as first-year teachers transition from college to the profession.

Research Question Two Conclusions and Null Hypotheses

This section provides an in-depth analysis, interpretation, and synthesis of the findings based on Research Question Two. For Research Question Two, four separate independent-samples *t*-tests conducted on each separate sub-section of the question. This section discusses non-statistically significant difference in the classroom management efficacy scores between the various groups.

An independent-samples t -test was conducted to determine if a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) occurred. The data for research sub-question 2A revealed participants with no substitute teaching experience and participants with substitute teaching experience but no training were a $t(112) = -1.150$, p -value of .253. Participants with no substitute teaching experience reported ($M = 57.63$, $SD = 8.861$, $N = 30$) while participants with substitute teaching experience but no training reported ($M = 59.61$, $SD = 7.772$, $N = 84$). A statistically significant difference would have a p -value of $< .05$ which this t -test did not indicate. Therefore, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis $H2a_0$.

The data for research sub-question 2B revealed participants with no substitute teaching experience and participants with one orientation training were a $t(112) = .395$, p -value of .69. Participants with no substitute teaching experience reported ($M = 59.20$, $SD = 8.08$, $N = 100$) and participants with one orientation training revealed ($M = 58.29$, $SD = 8.361$, $N = 14$). A statistically significant difference would have a p -value of $< .05$ which this t -test did not indicate. Therefore, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis $H2b_0$.

Using the data for research sub-question 2C, participants with no substitute teaching experience when compared to participants with one-two classroom management trainings or observations had a $t(112) = -0.067$, p -value of .947. Participants with no substitute teaching experience reported ($M = 59.07$, $SD = 8.201$, $N = 107$) and participants with one-two classroom management trainings or observations reported ($M = 59.29$, $SD = 6.422$, $N = 7$). A statistically significant difference would have a p -value of $<$

.05 which this *t*-test did not indicate. Therefore, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis *H3a0*.

Lastly, the data for research sub-question 2D revealed participants with no substitute teaching experience and participants with over two classroom management trainings or observations had a $t(112) = -1.524$, *p*-value of .13. Participants with no substitute teaching experience reported ($M = 58.79$, $SD = 8.084$, $N = 107$) and participants with more than two classroom management trainings or observations reported ($M = 63.57$, $SD = 7.07$, $N = 7$). A statistically significant difference would have a *p*-value of $< .05$ which this *t*-test did not indicate. Therefore, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis *H4a0*.

This data contradicts the little related research about substitute teaching experience and training. Smith and Tippetts (2004) found a lack of training often exists for substitute teachers. The findings in this study indicate trainings or observations had very little effect on the first-year teacher's classroom management efficacy. Trainings and observations having very little impact contradicts the research supporting undergraduate students build efficacy by having training alongside mastery experiences (Morris et al., 2017; Leckey et al., 2016). The results of this study could have resulted due to when the trainings for substitute teacher occurred in relation to when the survey used for the study was administered as well as the quality of training for substitute teacher in each region in the state of Missouri. A majority of the participants received no training with the second closest and the next largest group of 19% received one orientation training. The study contradicts the findings that many districts are trying to provide more training to substitutes (Jackson, 2014). The sample size of participants

specifically receiving classroom management training or classroom observations was less than 10%. The results suggest specific classroom management training could potentially be more effective if the training was more of a common practice for substitutes. Yet, Polat, Kaya, and Akdag (2013) indicated classroom management training courses had little to no effect on discipline perceptions. It appears the data is conflicting on the true impact of training in the application of teaching.

The results of this study conclude substitute teacher training had little impact on teacher classroom management efficacy. The results of the study does not necessarily indicate substitute teacher training is not beneficial for all substitute teachers, but the results of the study do indicate substitute training is potentially not as effective when substitute teachers still completing undergraduate coursework. This study only examined the differences of substitute teacher training for undergraduates and did not examine any other category, thus an additional reason why substitute teaching experience could be beneficial for other categories of first-year teachers. Undergraduate students can potentially receive pedagogical knowledge while at a university as well as receive training from individual schools while serving as a substitute teacher. The results from the study could suggest the training and pedagogical knowledge gained from the undergraduate college experience, blended with the substitute teacher trainings has no significance. The literature research demonstrates experience as one of the better ways to improve classroom management skills as the work of Bandura (1997) supports vicarious and mastery experiences. Vicarious and mastery experiences typically do not occur outside of potential classroom observations by a professional educator. Research indicates training is important for substitute teachers and is often overlooked, yet this

study potentially indicates the training may be better suited for substitute teachers not recently out of or in college. According to the data, the results suggest training for substitute teachers potentially overlaps with undergraduate studies. Atilas and Pinholster (2013) stated teacher preparation programs are able to build pedagogical knowledge in undergraduate students. Supporting the work of Atilas and Pinholster (2013), O'Neill (2015) linked undergraduate coursework with an improvement on classroom management efficacy. Undergraduate students already receiving effective classroom management pedagogical knowledge in undergraduate studies may lead to the little impact of substitute training experience found in the data. While there was no statistical significance, there was a difference in the mean classroom management efficacy score between participants with no substitute teaching experience and participants with substitute teaching experience receiving more than two classroom management trainings or observations. The group with two or more classroom management trainings or observations had almost five more points in the classroom management efficacy score. The data supports classroom management training improves efficacy and multiple trainings or observations give substitute teachers a chance to practice what was learned in an authentic situation. Hattie (2012) identified if a teacher has multiple opportunities to find success, efficacy can be increased. According to the data, the substitute teacher may have not been able to experience multiple successes with classroom management potentially leading to a decrease or little impact on personal classroom management efficacy.

Open-Ended Questions Conclusions

This section provides a brief analysis, interpretation, and synthesis of the findings based on the open-ended questions of the survey. Two open-ended questions were given to participants and a thematically and categorical analysis was completed to analyze the results. The first open-ended question sought to determine if substitute teaching impacted individual classroom management. The second open-ended question sought to identify if the conditions during Covid-19 impacted individual classroom management preparedness. This section is to understand the impact of substitute teacher experience on the classroom management efficacy of participants and to provide further context into the conditions participants were placed in during the Covid-19 pandemic potentially impact the results.

In the first open-ended question regarding the impact of each participant's substitute teaching experience, a total of 80 participants responded. Out of the 80 total participants, 70 indicated substitute teaching made a positive impact on personal classroom management skills. The data supports Driedger-Enns' (2014) research regarding extra exposure to the reality of teaching is a common criticism of undergraduate preparation programs and substitute teaching gives participants more exposure to real-life teaching experience. One common theme found throughout the responses of the participants included how substitute teaching gave an opportunity to try classroom management strategies allowing participants to see before entering the profession which strategies worked and which strategies did not work. Substitute teaching allowed participants to practice using both pedagogical knowledge and declarative knowledge thus supporting Bellibas and Liu's (2017) study indicating the

importance of both types of knowledge. A second common theme which became evident was that substitute teaching gave participants an opportunity to see multiple teacher's classroom management styles thus allowing participants to practice with many classroom management structures. The findings support the work of Trent (2013) which identified new teachers often reference mentor teachers from their undergraduate studies to develop a sense of teacher identity. Substitute teaching allows participants to observe multiple classroom management styles to help form personal teaching identities instead of just one style from one mentor teacher. Due to extra exposure and experience to multiple classroom management styles, participants can identify with multiple teaching styles instead of just one teaching style which Sutcher et al. (2016) findings identified this often occurs due to lack of experience. The third common theme which appeared from the positive substitute teaching experience was the ability to observe multiple grade levels and evaluate the grade level which best fit the participants. Substitute teaching contributed to helping fifteen out of 80 total participants the grade level the participant would end up teaching for the first year of teaching. Ali's (2017) research indicated the more classroom level experience a teacher has, the more an individual's self-efficacy can increase. Based on the 80 total responses to the first open-ended question, only six participants indicated having a negative impact from substitute teaching and four participants were indifferent about the impact of the experience. The common themes on negative impact which occurred was a lack of substitute teaching experience and the student teaching experience providing the same opportunities or learning experiences substitute teaching provided. Overall, not much was indicated by the negative impacts of substitute teaching experience. The overwhelming response of positive substitute

teaching experience does not match the classroom management efficacy scores indicated by research question one.

The second open-ended question was used to give a more accurate context of the participant's experience during the first-year of teaching and the impact the Covid-19 pandemic potentially had on the classroom management preparedness for each individual. The open-ended question was answered by 72 participants with 26 responses to this open-ended question with 26 participants indicating an impact from the Covid-19 pandemic on classroom management preparedness, 43 participants indicating no impact from the Covid-19 pandemic on classroom management preparedness, and three indicating an indifference. Out of the 26 participants indicating having an impact from Covid-19, the common theme which emerged regarded trying to balance engagement and manage students using a digital platform such as Zoom. Twenty-four out of the 72 participants indicated having a difficulty in maintaining student participation since not all districts had requirements regarding returning and submitting work for students. Kagan (1992) and Kounin (1970) emphasized the importance of teacher interactions with students to help manage students while also maintaining engagement and supporting participants. Participants found maintaining student engagement difficult when teaching transitioned to digital learning. Based on the 43 participants indicating having no impact from the Covid-19 pandemic with classroom management preparedness, the common theme emerging emphasized difficulty maintaining student engagement. Eleven out of the 72 total participants indicated since not much was expected from the students during the pandemic, classroom management was not an issue. With classroom management Wong and Wong (2009) identified it is easier to control one's personal actions instead of

another person's, thus supporting participants not indicating much difficulty with digital classroom management because teachers did not have to control student actions. Covid-19 placed school districts in a unique position as the adaptation of common learning had to be shifted from an in-person setting to a digital platform. Due to the transition to digital learning, Covid-19 was a limitation of this study potentially impacted the findings.

Professional Implications and Recommendations

This study strived to fill in a gap of research regarding the transitions from university to the teaching profession for first-year teachers and examine if substitute teaching made an impact on classroom management. Very little research has been conducted in regard to analyzing different forms of experience outside of practicums, student teaching, or internships. Teacher preparation programs are designed to help graduates find success in the profession. Unfortunately, new teachers are joining the profession and leaving early into alternative careers outside of education (American Institutes for Research, 2016; Ingersoll, 2001; Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas, 2016). The quantitative data from this study revealed other forms of experience could potentially have value for pre-service teachers and should be considered and researched by teacher preparation programs. In this study, first-year teachers with up to 11-20 days of substitute teaching experience had a higher mean classroom management efficacy score than any of the other participant groups. It appears substitute teaching experience if potentially added in the current expectations, practicums, or student teaching requirement implemented by many undergraduate college programs, higher classroom management could result.

One key implication this study has on the current body of research is the impact substitute teaching experience could have on individual school districts along with the university. The literature review suggests a current shortage in the number of substitute teachers available to accommodate teacher absences each day. If individual school districts and cooperating universities worked together, both could help fill in the void of available substitute teachers and allow for authentic experience to be had by undergraduate students. Allowing undergraduate students an opportunity to substitute teach would help school districts undergoing substitute shortages and also help universities give undergraduate students opportunities to experience additional authentic teaching situations. School districts could also use the data from this study to help with the hiring practices in individual buildings. Applicants with substitute teaching experience, may potentially have an advantage in efficacy development.

The literature review suggests substitute teachers need more training and observations to help decrease the negative impact on student achievement which occurs during teacher absences. Based on the results of this study, school districts providing substitute teacher training could potentially avoid training substitute teachers who are in or recently graduated from a university. The data does not mean training of substitute teachers is not valuable, but substitute teachers who are still in undergraduate studies seem to already have enough access to declarative knowledge. Thus substitute teacher training may not be as effective and may be more irrelevant to specific substitutes. Yet, this study revealed 54 out of the 84 total participants with substitute teaching experience did not receive any substitute teacher training. The results of the study may have been different if a larger majority of participants had some type of training. The literature

review indicates substitute teachers who experience support from principals and fellow teachers report more positive feelings about the school and the substitute teaching experience. The study did not look at the potential involvement of other teachers and principals who could potentially impact the experience the participant had when substitute teaching.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following recommendations for future research will add to current educational research in regard to authentic experiences for first-year teachers:

1. As a result of the absence of certain demographic questions in this study, the study could be replicated and report the regions where each participant taught in Missouri to identify if certain regions have better substitute teacher preparation programs and if the region where the participant taught had an impact on classroom management efficacy.
2. This study could be replicated using other forms of authentic experiences such as participating with YMCA events, positions/roles as camp counselor, or other leadership opportunities/positions in working and interacting with students.
3. A further analysis could examine if gender had an impact on participant substitute teaching experience and classroom management efficacy.
4. Replication of this study could measure instructional strategies and student engagement which are the other two sections of the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale Long Form created by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy's (2001).
5. Based on participant responses to the first open-ended question, 70 of the 80 stated substitute teaching made an impact, thus a qualitative version of the study

could add to the current research and provide additional insight of the potential impact substitute teaching has on first-year teachers.

6. Replication of this study could measure if each participant's substitute teaching experience was consecutive or non-consecutive if an impact on the classroom management efficacy of the first-year teachers was evident.
7. Replication of this study occurring during a time period in which first-year teachers can finish an academic school year absent of situations similar to the Covid-19 pandemic.

Conclusions

The purpose of this quantitative causal comparative study was to look specifically at first-year teachers and their level of classroom management efficacy in regard to substitute teaching experience. Based on the theory of Bandura (1997) and Kounin (1970) the study analyzed data on self-efficacy and classroom management development, looking specifically at first-year teachers with and without substitute teaching experience to determine if a statistically significant difference in teacher classroom management efficacy in Missouri school districts exists. Participants in the study were first-year teachers during the 2019-2020 academic school year in Missouri public schools. The survey was sent to over 1,855 principals across the state of Missouri and asked each principal to forward the email to any first-year teachers in their individual buildings. QuestionPro was used to collect survey results, cleaned in Microsoft Excel, and then a one-way ANOVA and independent-samples *t*-test were conducted to determine if a statistically significant difference occurred in the two research questions.

There were multiple limitations to the study which potentially played an impact on the results received from the participants. One of the limitations which was surprising to the researcher was the number of participants with substitute teaching experience. Based on the gap in research on the impact of substitute teaching, the researcher predicted to have a low number of participants with substitute teaching experience. Contrary to the researcher's belief, 84 of the 114 participants, had some substitute teaching experience with the largest group of 60 participants having over 20 days of substitute teaching experience. With the shortage of substitute teachers mentioned in the research, the researcher expected to have fewer participants having substitute teaching experience. Actually having more participants having substitute teaching experience than anticipated by the researcher could be due to pre-service teachers using substitute teaching as a way to make money during undergraduate studies as well as building relationships with potential future employers. This data supports findings showing many substitutes use the experience to increase their chances of potential full-time employment (Driedger-Enns, 2014; Trull, 2004; Wheeler-Ayres, 2002).

Another limitation potentially impacting the results of the study is the time period the study was conducted. The Covid-19 global pandemic caused many schools to not return physically to school after spring break. Schools adapted by using various digital platforms to try and keep learning occurring. Based on the second open-ended question, over half of the participants stated having no impact on classroom management preparedness based on Covid-19. Yet, many of the participants revealed without having a physical teaching environment, classroom management was not a concern for nearly the second half of the academic school year. The lack of physical classroom management

may have impacted the findings of this study. The time absent from students could potentially allow teachers feel better prepared to manage a classroom as individuals missed out on concluding the academic school year with the student's behavior present.

Another potential impact a limitation in this study was the number of consecutive or non-consecutive days participants substitute taught. The number of days taught were not a part of the research questions, yet could have played an important role in the development of the classroom management efficacy for participants with substitute teaching experience. Out of the 84 participants with substitute teaching experience, 15 reported the experience was over consecutive days, 24 reported non-consecutive days, and 45 stated a combination of the two. This data could potentially be used to guide a replication of the study examining if consecutive days of substitute teaching experience is more valuable than non-consecutive days. It appears a majority of participants sought to have a combination of both consecutive and non-consecutive days of substitute teaching experience. Participants seeking both consecutive and non-consecutive time serving as a substitute teacher could happen for many reasons, but participants could be motivated by income as long-term substitutes generally are paid more than single day substitutes. Additionally, more time serving as a substitute teacher could allow more opportunities to build relationships with the same students as the research indicates is an important part of classroom management (Driedger-Enns, 2014).

Previous research revealed experience and training is important for first-year teachers to make an effective transition from college to the workplace. Bandura (1997) found in order to build efficacy with a topic or skill, the individual would need to persist through challenges and have opportunities to experience successes. Kounin (1970) also

indicated an importance of experience when trying to establish classroom management skills. Results from this study indicate trainings are not as valuable to improving classroom management efficacy in substitute teachers when actually compared to the amount of substitute teaching experience. While no statistically significant difference occurred based on substitute teacher trainings, a statistically significant difference did occur based on the amount of experience first-year teachers had substitute teaching. There was a statistically significant difference in classroom management efficacy scores between first-year teachers with one-10 days of substitute teaching experience and 11-20 days of substitute teaching experience. The statistically significant difference in the classroom management efficacy score could potentially help the first-year teachers remain in the profession longer as well as reduce the chances of experiencing burnout. A gap in research continues in other ways substitute teaching experience may be valuable, as well as other forms of authentic experiences such as a camp counselor or YMCA coach. Baran et al. (2017) identified opportunities such as tutoring or other non-supervised practices occurring during undergraduate studies benefit pre-service teachers. Retaining quality teachers is important and preventing the feeling of burnout due to lack of authentic experiences could help keep more new teachers in the classroom longer. The findings from this study provide new information on the authentic experience of substitute teaching which has not previously been considered for new teachers preparing in transitioning from college to the profession. This information could be helpful to universities, schools, and undergraduate education majors by opening the possibilities of other experiences contributing to developing efficacy. As a result, additional research in the area of substitute teaching and other forms of authentic experiences must be

conducted to better understand the possible options to developing and retaining new teachers.

Appendix A



William & Mary School of Education

MEGAN TSCHANNEN-MORAN, PHD
PROFESSOR OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

December 2, 2019

Thomas,

You have my permission to use the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (formerly called the Ohio State Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale), which I developed with Anita Woolfolk Hoy, in your research.

You can find a copy of the measure and scoring directions on my web site at <http://wmpeople.wm.edu/site/page/mxtsch>.

Please use the following as the proper citation:

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

I will also attach directions you can follow to access my password protected web site, where you can find the supporting references for this measure as well as other articles I have written on this and related topics.

All the best,

Megan Tschannen-Moran
William & Mary School of Education

P.O. Box 8795 • Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795 • (757) 221-2187 • mxtsch@wm.edu

Appendix B

Cover letter to Principals

Dear Principals,

As you have finished out a unique end to the year, let me be the first to say congratulations! Classroom management is often a struggle many first-year teachers lack and generally they lack the efficacy or the belief they can accomplish effective classroom management even during hard times. In order to add much needed research regarding experiences effecting classroom management efficacy, I ask you send this survey to all first-year teachers in your building. Their response to this survey is much needed to help Missouri develop best practices in preparing first-year teachers.

This research is to find out if substitute teaching experience or trainings before becoming a teacher have an influence on classroom management efficacy in first-year teachers. I want to measure if the experiences first-year teachers have had with or without substitute teaching have affected their classroom management efficacy belief. I'm hoping to gather data from all first-year teachers across the state of Missouri.

Participation in this study is voluntary. Confidentiality and anonymity will be taken seriously and is assured. At the beginning of the survey, if participants would like to respond to the study, there will be a question seeking permission. The responses will be grouped based on responses, yet will not allow individual identification. You may express any concerns to myself or my doctoral advisor, Dr. Widhalm at SBU Graduate Education.

I greatly appreciate you taking the time have first-year teachers participate in this study that will make such a difference. The survey should take approximately 5 minutes to complete. If you know of another first-year teacher who could participate, please forward this email to them as well.

Thank you again for your participation during this crazy time.

Thomas O'Connor
Southwest Baptist University Doctoral Candidate
417-230-5888/ toconnorsbu@yahoo.com

Appendix C

First Participant Email

Dear First-Year Teachers,

As you have finished out your first year of teaching, let me be the first to say congratulations! Odds are this year was a unique situation that had many ups, downs, and a lot of growth. Some of you may feel like this year went really smooth and some not so much. Classroom management is often a struggle and many first-year teachers lack the efficacy or the belief they can accomplish effective classroom management even during hard times. In order to add much needed research regarding experiences effecting classroom management efficacy, your response to this survey is much needed to help Missouri develop best practices in preparing first-year teachers.

This research is to find out if substitute teaching experience or trainings before becoming a teacher have an influence on classroom management efficacy in first-year teachers. I want to measure if the experiences you have had with or without substitute teaching have affected your classroom management efficacy belief. I'm hoping to gather data from all first-year teachers across the state of Missouri.

Participation in this study is voluntary. Confidentiality and anonymity will be taken seriously and are guaranteed. At the beginning of this survey, if you would like to respond to the study, there will be a question seeking permission. The responses will be grouped based on responses, yet will not allow individual identification. You may express any concerns to myself or my doctoral advisor, Dr. Widhalm at SBU Graduate Education.

I greatly appreciate you taking the time to participate in this research. The survey should take approximately 5 minutes to complete. Please submit this survey by May 1, 2020 in order to save a follow up email. If you know of another first-year teacher who could participate, please forward this email to them as well. Thank you again for your participation during this crazy time.

Thomas O'Connor
Southwest Baptist University Doctoral Candidate
417-230-5888/ toconnorsbu@yahoo.com

Appendix D

Second Participant Email

Dear First-Year Teachers,

A few weeks ago I contacted you to participate in my study on Missouri first-year teacher's classroom management efficacy. Please take advantage of this second reminder to complete a short survey, taking less than 5 minutes!

This research is to find out if substitute teaching experience or trainings before becoming a teacher have an influence on classroom management efficacy in first-year teachers. I want to measure if the experiences you have had with or without substitute teaching have affected your classroom management efficacy belief. I'm hoping to gather data from all first-year teachers across the state of Missouri.

Participation in this study is voluntary. Confidentiality and anonymity will be taken seriously and guaranteed. At the beginning of this survey, if you would like to respond to the study there will be a question seeking permission. The responses will be grouped based on responses, yet will not allow individual identification. You may express any concerns to myself or my doctoral advisor, Dr. Widhalm at SBU Graduate Education.

I greatly appreciate you taking the time to participate in this research. The survey should take approximately 5 minutes to complete. Please submit this survey by May 29, 2020 in order to save a follow up email. If you know of another first-year teacher who could participate, please forward this email to them as well. Thank you again for your participation during this crazy time.

Thomas O'Connor
Southwest Baptist University Doctoral Candidate
417-230-5888/ toconnorsbu@yahoo.com

Appendix E

Construct Validity

802

M. Tschannen-Moran, A.W. Hoy / Teaching and Teacher Education 17 (2001) 783–805

Table 6
Validity correlations^a

	OSTES	Instruct	Manage	Engage	Rand 1	Rand 2	GTE	PTE
OSTES		0.89**	0.84**	0.87**	0.18**	0.53**	0.16**	0.64**
Instructional strategies	0.84**		0.60**	0.70**	0.07	0.45**	0.06	0.62**
Classroom management	0.79**	0.46**		0.58**	0.29**	0.46**	0.30**	0.45**
Student engagement	0.85**	0.61**	0.50**		0.11*	0.47**	0.06	0.58**
Rand 1	0.18**	0.08	0.26**	0.11*		0.23**	0.65**	0.12*
Rand 2	0.52**	0.45**	0.39**	0.45**	0.23**		0.13*	0.65**
General teaching efficacy	0.16**	0.08	0.26**	0.06	0.65**	0.13*		0.07
Personal teacher efficacy	0.61**	0.60**	0.37**	0.56**	0.12*	0.65**	0.07	

^aAbove diagonal, long form (24 items); below diagonal, short form (12 items); ** $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed); * $p < 0.05$ (2-tailed).

References

- Ahmed, M., Ambreen, M., & Hussain, I. (2018). Gender differentials among teachers' classroom management strategies in Pakistani context. *Journal of Education & Educational Development, 5*(2), 178-193.
- Alemdağ, E., & Özdemir, Ş., P. (2017). Pre-service teachers' evaluation of their mentor teachers, school experiences, and theory-practice relationship. *International Journal of Progressive Education, 13*(2), 165-179.
- Aldeman, A., & Mitchel, A. L. (2016). *No guarantees: Is it possible to ensure teachers are ready on day one?* Bellwether Education Partners, 1, 1-34.
- Ali, F. P. (2017). *A qualitative narrative inquiry on teacher attrition*. (Publication No. AAT 10743601) [University of Phoenix]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Aliakbari, M., & Darabi, R. (2013). On the relationship between efficacy of classroom management, transformational leadership style, and teachers' personality. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 93*, 1716-1721.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.105>
- Allen, J. M., Howells, K., & Radford, R. (2013). A 'partnership in teaching excellence': Ways in which one school–university partnership has fostered teacher development. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(1), 99-110.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2012.753988>
- Aloe, A., Amo, L., & Shanahan, M. (2014). Classroom management self-efficacy and burnout: A multivariate meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review, 26*(1), 101-126.

- American Institutes for Research (2016). *It's 2016: Do you know where the teachers are?*
Retrieved December 1, 2019, from <https://www.air.org/resource/it-s-2016-do-you-know-where-teachers-are>
- Atiles, J., & Pinholster, L. (2013). Student teaching: reflections of a relentless journey. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 34*(4), 308–319.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10901027.2013.845632>
- Australian Education Union. (2008). *New educators survey*. Retrieved from
<http://www.aeufederal.org.au/index.php>
- Banas, J. R. (2014). Impact of authentic learning exercises on pre-service teachers' self-efficacy to perform bullying prevention tasks. *American Journal of Health Education, 45*(4), 239-248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19325037.2014.916634>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W. H. Freeman.
- Baran, E., Çilsalar, H., & Mesutoğlu, C. (2017). Investigating the pre-service teachers' knowledge sources for classroom management: A case study. *Kastamonu Education Journal, 25*(1), 155-170.
- Ben-David, J. (2017). *Novice educators' reports of the strategies teacher education programs use to promote self-efficacy in classroom management* (Publication No. 10689472) [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Hartford]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Bellibas, M. S., & Liu, Y. (2017). Multilevel analysis of the relationship between principals' perceived practices of instructional leadership and teachers' self-efficacy perceptions. *Journal of Educational Administration, 55*(1), 49-69.

- Blake, A. L. (2017). How do we manage? Classroom management strategies for novice teachers in high-poverty urban schools. *National Teacher Education Journal*, *10*(2), 13-19.
- Boysen, T. L. (2015). *Comparative case study of beginning elementary teachers: Year-long and semester-long student teaching* (Publication No. 3714395) [Doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Bransford, J., Brown, A. L., Cocking, R. R., & National Research Council (U.S.). (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, D.C: National Academy Press
- Brown, A. L., Lee, J., & Collins, D. (2015). Does student teaching matter? Investigating teacher candidates' sense of teaching efficacy. *Teaching Education*, *26*(1).
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10476210.2014.957666>
- Buchanan, J., Prescott, A., Schuck, S., Aubusson, P., Burke, P., & Louviere, J. (2013). Teacher retention and attrition: Views of early career teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *38*(1-20).
- Bullock, A., Coplan, R. J., & Bosacki, S. (2015). Exploring links between early childhood educators' psychological characteristics and classroom management self-efficacy beliefs. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement*, *47*(2), 175-183.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038547>
- Calik, T., Sezgin, F., Kavgaci, H., & Kilinc, A. C. (2012). Examination of relationships between instructional leadership of school principals and self-efficacy of teachers

and collective teacher efficacy. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 12(4), 2498-2504.

Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Borgogni, L., Petitta, L., & Rubinacci, A. (2003).

Teachers', school staff's and parents' efficacy beliefs as determinants of attitudes toward school. *European Journal of Psychology of Education - EJPE (Istituto Superior de Psicologia Aplicada)*, 18(1), 15.

Çevik, G. B. (2017). The roles of life satisfaction, teaching efficacy, and self-esteem in predicting teachers' job satisfaction. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 5(3), 338-346.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. New York, NY: Routledge Academic.

Cohen, J. (1977). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Routledge.

Colson, T., Sparks, K., Berridge, G., Frimming, R., & Willis, C. (2017). Pre-service teachers and self-efficacy: A study in contrast. *Discourse and Communication for Sustainable Education*, 8(2), 66–76. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/dcse-2017-0016>

Cooper, L. A. (2019). The impact of conscious discipline on teacher efficacy and burnout: Perspectives for elementary teachers. *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership*, 15(14), 1–19.

<https://doi.org/10.22230/ijepl.2019v15n14a882>

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.

- Danyluk, P. (2013). The role of the prepracticum in lessening student teacher stress: Student teachers' perceptions of stress during practicum. *Action in Teacher Education, 35*, 323-334. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2013.846148>
- DeMonte, J. (2016). Toward better teacher prep. *Educational Leadership, 73*(8), 66.
- Denton, P., & Kriete, R. (2000). *The first six weeks of school*. Greenfield, MA: Northeast Foundation for Children.
- Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (2019). *Missouri comprehensive data system*. Retrieved from <https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx>
- Derosier, S., & Soslau, E. (2014). Teacher candidates speak out: Exploring concerns related to pupil learning and efficacy when learning to teach. *Education, 134*(4), 488–496.
- Dicke, T., Parker, P. D., Marsh, H. W., Kunter, M., Schmeck, A., & Leutner, D. (2014). Self-efficacy in classroom management, classroom disturbances, and emotional exhaustion: A moderated mediation analysis of teacher candidates. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 106*(2), 569–583. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0035504>
- Dorel, T. G., Kearney, W. S., & Garza, E. (2016). Ready from day one? The relationship between length of pre-service teacher field residency and teacher efficacy. *Critical Questions in Education, 7*(1), 38–52.
- Driedger-Enns M. (2014). Relational identity making on the professional landscape as a substitute teacher: Interruptions and continuities. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 41*(3), 87.
- Durlak, J. (2009) How to select, calculate, and interpret effect sizes. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 34*(9), 917-28.

- Dweck, C. S. (2008). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. New York, NY: Ballantine Books.
- Eckert, J. (2014). Teach like a novice: Lessons from beginning teachers. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 96(2), 13.
- Edwards, S., & Nuttall, J. (2015). Beginning teachers: Issues and experiences. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(1), 1–3.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2014.969415>
- Elliott, E. M., Isaacs, M. L., & Chugani, C. D. (2010). Promoting self-efficacy in early career teachers: A principal's guide for differentiated mentoring and supervision. *Florida Journal of Educational Administration & Policy*, 4(1), 131-146.
- Elliott, K. S. (2014). *A case study of peer-driven efforts to improve instructional effectiveness during teacher absences: Implications for school leaders in an era of accountability* (Publication No. 10181632) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Engin, G. (2020). An examination of primary school students' academic achievements and motivation in terms of parents' attitudes, teacher motivation, teacher self-efficacy and leadership approach. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 16(1), 257–276. doi: 10.29329/ijpe.2020.228.18
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39, 175-191.

- Filho, R. A.C., & Iaochite, R. T. (2018). Constitution of self-efficacy in the early career of physical education teachers. *Journal of Physical Education & Sport*, 18(4), 2410–2416. doi: 10.7752/jpes.2018.04363
- Flower, A., McKenna, J. W., & Haring, C. D. (2017). Behavior and classroom management: Are teacher preparation programs really preparing our teachers? *Preventing School Failure*, 61(2), 163-169.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2016.1231109>
- Gage, N. A., Scott, T., Hirn, R., & MacSuga-Gage, A. S. (2018). The relationship between teachers' implementation of classroom management practices and student behavior in elementary school. *Behavioral Disorders*, 43(2), 302-315.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0198742917714809>
- Garrett, T. (2014). Classroom management: A world of misconceptions. *Teaching & Learning*, 28(1), 36-43.
- Garrett, T. (2013). Classroom management: It's more than a bag of tricks. *Education Digest*, 78(9), 45.
- Garza, R., Werner, P., & Wendler, L. F. (2016). Transitioning from student to professional: Pre-service teachers' perceptions. *New Waves - Educational Research & Development*, 19(2), 19-35.
- Gibbs, S., & Miller, A. (2014) Teachers' resilience and well-being: A role for educational psychology. *Teachers and Teaching*, 20(5), 609-621.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2013.844408>
- Gifford, J., Snyder, M. G., & Cuddapah, J. L. (2013). Novice career changers weather the classroom weather. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, (6), 50.

- Glatfelter, A. G. (2006, June 19). *Substitute teachers as effective classroom instructors*. (AAT ED494940) [Doctoral dissertation, University of California]. Institute of Education Sciences.
- Gonzales, L. (2016). Support for substitute teachers is crucial as shortage grows. *Leadership*, 46(3), 14.
- Gravett, S., & Ramsaroop, S. S. (2015). Bridging theory and practice in teacher education: Teaching schools - a bridge too far? *Perspectives in Education*, 33(1), 131-146.
- Gurcay, D. (2015). Pre-service physics teachers' beliefs regarding their teacher efficacy and classroom management. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197, 1101-1106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.353>
- Harfitt, G. J. (2015). From attrition to retention: A narrative inquiry of why beginning teachers leave and then rejoin the profession. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(1), 22–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2014.932333>
- Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge.
- Headden, S. (2014). Beginners in the classroom: What the changing demographics of teaching mean for schools, students, and society. *Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*.
- Heinsen, V. K. (2012). *The effectiveness of training substitute teachers*. (AAT 3499962) [Doctoral dissertation, Walden University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Hildenbrand, S. M., & Arndt, K. (2016). Student teachers' management practices in

- elementary classrooms: A qualitative study. *Teacher Development*, 20(2), 147-161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2016.1143869>
- Hill, D. (1999). Substitutes unite! *Education Week*, 19(6), 34-39.
- Holzberger, D., Philipp, A., & Kunter, M. (2013). How teachers' self-efficacy is related to instructional quality: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105(3), 774–786. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0032198>
- Hoon, T. S., Nasaruddin, N. F. B. M., & Singh, P. (2017). Communication skills among different classroom management styles teachers. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 13(1), 67-78.
- Iasevoli, B. (2017). School systems confront shortages of substitute teachers. *Education Week*, 36(18), 6.
- IGI Global. (2018). *What is a novice teacher?* Retrieved from <https://www.igi-global.com/dictionary/teacher-fellows/51329>
- Ihtiyaroglu, N. (2018). Analyzing the relationship between happiness, teachers' level of satisfaction with life and classroom management profiles. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 6(10), 2227-2237.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499-534. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038003499>
- Jackson, N. M. (2014). Strengthen your substitute pool. *District Administration*, 50(3), 69.
- Jong, R., Tartwijk, J., Wubbels, T., Veldman, I., & Verloop, N. (2013). Beginning and end of the internship: Student teachers' interpersonal profiles and the accuracy of

- their self-beliefs. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(4), 393-412.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2013.835801>
- Jurado, M., Pérez-Fuentes, M. del C., Atria, L., Ruiz, N. F. O., & Linares, J. J. G. (2019). Burnout, perceived efficacy, and job satisfaction: Perception of the educational context in high school teachers. *BioMed Research International*, 1–10.
<https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/1021408>
- Kagan, S. (1992). *Cooperative learning*. San Juan Capistrano, CA: Resources for Teachers, Inc.
- Kennedy, M. (2016). Parsing the practice of teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 67(1), 6-17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487115614617>
- Kim, K. R., & Seo, E. H. (2018). The relationship between teacher efficacy and students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 46(4), 529-540. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.6554>
- Kim, L., & Burić, I. (2019). Teacher self-efficacy and burnout: Determining the directions of prediction through an autoregressive cross-lagged panel model. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000424>
- Kozikoğlu, İ. (2018). A metaphorical analysis of novice teachers' perceptions concerning first year in teaching, induction process, school administrators and mentor teacher. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 42(1), 3-44.
- Kounin, J. (1970). *Discipline and group management in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Kronholz, J. (2013). No substitute for a teacher. *Education Next*, 13(2), 16-21.
- Krug, D. K., Love, D. J., Mauzey, D. E., & Dixon, W. (2015). Problem solving ability

confidence levels among student teachers after a semester in the classroom.

College Student Journal, 49(3), 331-340.

Kurt, H., Ekici, G., & Güngör, F. (2014). The effect of classroom management course on self-efficacy of student teachers regarding teaching. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 791-795.

Kwok, A. (2018). Promoting “quality” feedback: First-year teachers’ self-reports on their development as classroom managers. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 53(1), 22-36.

Laerd Statistics (2018). *One-way ANOVA in SPSS statistics*. <https://statistics.laerd.com/spss-tutorials/one-way-anova-using-spss-statistics.php>

Laerd Statistics (2018). Cronbach’s Alpha (a) using *SPSS statistics*. <https://statistics.laerd.com/spss-tutorials/cronbachs-alpha-using-spss-statistics.php>

Laerd Statistics (2019). Independent-samples t-test using SPSS Statistics. *Statistical tutorials and software guides*. Retrieved May 4, 2020, from <https://statistics.laerd.com/spss-tutorials/independent-t-test-using-spss-statistics.php>

Leckey, Y., Hyland, L., Hickey, G., Lodge, A., Kelly, P., Bywater, T., & 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.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2016.1147974>

Lew, M. M., & Nelson, R. F. (2016). New teachers’ challenges. *Multicultural Education*,

23(3/4), 7-13.

Liu, E., & Huang, J. (2019). Occupational self-efficacy, organizational commitment, and work engagement. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 47(8), 1–7.

Lowder, G. (2017). *Cultivating efficacious teachers: A case study of the impact of socialization on self-efficacy belief development* (Publication No. 10620689) [Doctoral dissertation, Southwest Baptist University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

Makara-Studzińska, M., Golonka, K., & Izydorczyk, B. (2019). Self-efficacy as a moderator between stress and professional burnout in firefighters. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(2), 1-17.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16020183>

Martin, N. K., & Yin, Z. (1997). *Attitudes and beliefs regarding classroom management style: Differences between male and female teachers*. (AAT ED404738) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at San Antonio]. Institute of Education Sciences.

Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). *Classroom management that works: Research-based strategies for every teacher*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Mathewson, T. (2017). Sub shortage leaves schools scrambling. *Education Digest*, 83(3), 24.

McDonnough, J. T., & Matkins, J. J. (2010). The role of field experience in elementary pre-service teachers' self-efficacy and ability to connect research to practice. *School Science and Mathematics*, 110(1), 13-23.

- McKim, A. J., & Velez, J. J. (2017). Developing self-efficacy: Exploring pre-service coursework, student teaching, and professional development experiences. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 58(1), 172-185.
- McLeod, S. A. (2019, July 10). *What does effect size tell you? Simply psychology*.
<https://www.simplypsychology.org/effect-size.html>
- Moore, A. (2016). Stepping up support for new teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 73(8), 60.
- Morris, D., Usher, E., & Chen, J. (2017). Reconceptualizing the sources of teaching self-efficacy: A critical review of emerging literature. *Educational Psychology Review*, 29(4), 795–833. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-016-9378-y>
- Morrison, C. M. (2013). Teacher identity in the early career phase: Trajectories that explain and influence development. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(4).
- Nagro, S. A., & DeBettencourt, L. U. (2017). Reviewing special education teacher preparation field experience placements, activities, and research: Do we know the difference maker? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 44(3), 7-33.
- Nejati, R., Hassani, M. T., & Sahrapour, H. A. (2014). The relationship between gender and student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management of Iranian EFL teachers. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 4(6), 1219-1226.
<https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.6.1219-1226>
- Nguyen, H. (2018). Teacher preparation programs in the United States. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 14(3), 76-92.
<https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2018.146.6>

- Ngidi, D. P., & Ngidi, S. A.. (2019). Determination of factors influencing pre-service teachers' sense of self-efficacy. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 33(5), 98–111. <https://doi.org/10.20853/33-5-3598>
- No Child Left Behind Act, 20 U.S.C. § 6319 (2002).
- Oktan, D., & Kıvanç Çağanağa, Ç. (2015). The impact of teachers' gender differences on classroom management. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 2(4), 239-247. <http://iojet.org/index.php/IOJET/article/view/106/117>
- O'Neill, S. C. (2015). Preparing pre-service teachers for inclusive classrooms: Does completing coursework on managing challenging behaviours increase their classroom management sense of efficacy? *Australasian Journal of Special Education*, 40(2), 117-140.
- O'Neill, S. C., & Stephenson, J. (2014). Evidence-based classroom and behaviour management content in Australian pre-service primary teachers' coursework: Wherefore art thou? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(4). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2014v39n4.4>
- O'Neill, S., & Stephenson, J. (2013). One year on: First-year primary teachers' perceptions of preparedness to manage misbehaviour and their confidence in the strategies they use. *Australasian Journal of Special Education*, 37(2), 125-146. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/jse.2013.15>
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2018). *Education at a glance 2018*. May, 1, 2020. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag-2018-en>
- Patterson, K., & Seabrooks-Blackmore, J. J. (2017). The effects of self-reflection and classroom management course on pre-service teachers' self-efficacy. *Journal of*

Theoretical Educational Science / Kuramsal Eğitim Bilim Dergisi, 10(3), 335-348.

<https://doi.org/10.5578/keg.57464>

Pelham, B. W. (2013). *Intermediate statistics: A conceptual course*. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Petersen, N. (2017). The liminality of new foundation phase teachers: Transitioning from university into the teaching profession. *South African Journal of Education*, 37(2), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v37n2a1361>

Peterson, S. (1991). An action plan for training substitute teachers. *The Clearing House*, (1), 37.

Polat, S., Kaya, S., & Akdag, M. (2013). Investigating pre-service teachers' beliefs about classroom discipline. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 13(2), 885-890.

Rabin, C., & Smith, G. (2016). My lesson plan was perfect until I tried to teach: Care ethics into practice in classroom management. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 30(4), 600-617. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02568543.2016.1214192>

Reitman, G. C., & Karge, B. D. (2019). Investing in teacher support leads to teacher retention: Six supports administrators should consider for new teachers. *Multicultural Education*, 27(1), 7-18.

Renbarger, R., & Davis, B. K. (2019). Mentors, self-efficacy, or professional development: Which mediate job satisfaction for new teachers? A regression examination. *Journal of Teacher Education and Educators*, 8(1), 21-34.

Reynolds, R., Howley, P., Southgate, E., & Brown, J. (2016). Just add hours? An assessment of pre-service teachers' perception of the value of professional experience in attaining teacher competencies. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(5), 455-469. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2015.1086971>

- Robinson, M. C. (2016). *Understanding substitute teachers' preparedness for the classroom*. (AAT 10142523) [Doctoral Dissertation, Keiser University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Robertson-Kraft, C., & Duckworth, A. L. (2014). True grit: Trait-level perseverance and passion for long-term goals predicts effectiveness and retention among novice teachers. *Teachers College Record* 116(3), 1-40.
- Rodgers, W. M., Markland, D., Selzler, A. M., Murray, T. C., & Wilson, P. M. (2014). Distinguishing perceived competence and self-efficacy: An example from exercise. *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport*, 85(4), 527-539.
- Sahin, A. E. (2015). Comprehending elementary school teachers' classroom management approaches. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 11(3), 131-139.
- Selçuk, G., Kadi, A., Yildirim, R., & Çelebi, N. (2017). A study on teacher candidates' competencies in classroom management. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*, 10(4), 63-68.
- Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art & practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Currency Doubleday.
- Sharer, T. (2009). Does substitute teaching before graduation improve first-year teacher quality? *Journal of Inquiry and Action in Education*, 3(1), 46-57.
- Sivri, H., & Balci, E. (2015). Pre-service teachers' classroom management self-efficacy beliefs. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 7(4), 37-50.
- Smith, D., Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2015). *Better than carrots or sticks: Restorative practices for positive classroom management*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Smith, G. G. (2002). Quick to criticize, slow to train. *Education Week*, 21(20), 34.

- Smith, G. G., & Tippetts, Z. (2004). Cultivating a higher quality substitute teacher. *SubJournal for Personnel Responsible for Substitute Teaching*, 5(1), 9-88.
- Smith, K. L., & Rayfield, J. (2017). Student teaching changed me: A look at Kolb's Learning Style Inventory scores before and after the student teaching experience. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 58(1), 102-117.
<https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2017.01102>
- Smith, R., & Dearborn, G. (2016). *Conscious classroom management: Unlocking the secrets of great teaching*. San Rafael, CA: Conscious Teaching Publications.
- Sokal, L., Woloshyn, D., & Funk-Unrau, S. (2013). How important is practicum to pre-service teacher development for inclusive teaching? Effects on efficacy in classroom management. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 59(2), 285-298.
- Spooner, M., Flowers, C., Lambert, R., & Algozzine, B. (2008). Is more really better? Examining perceived benefits of an extended student teaching experience. *The Clearing House*, (6), 263.
- Sprick, R. S. (2010). *Coaching classroom management strategies & tools for administrators & coaches*. Eugene, OR: Pacific Northwest Publishing.
- Stearns, C. L. (2015). *Student teachers' changing confidence in teaching* (Publication No. 10034408) [Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Stobaugh, R., & Houchens, G. (2014). Preparing for success. *Principal Leadership*, 14(7), 36-40.

- Sutcher, L., Darling-Hammond, L., & Carver-Thomas, D. (2016). *A coming crisis in teaching? Teacher supply, demand and coming shortages in the U.S.* Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
- 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).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.27.3696>
- Tait, M. (2008). Resilience as a contributor to novice teacher success, commitment, and retention. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 35*(4), 57–75.
- Texas Center for Educational Research. (2000). *The cost of teacher turnover.* Austin, TX: Texas State Board for Teacher Certification.
- The New Teacher Project. (2013). The irreplaceables: Understanding the real retention crisis in America's urban schools. *Education Digest, 78*(6), 58.
- Tian, G., Wang, J., Zhang, Z., & Wen, Y. (2019). Self-efficacy and work performance: The role of work engagement. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal, 47*(12), 1–7.
- Trent, J. (2013). From learner to teacher: Practice, language, and identity in a teaching practicum. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(4), 426-440.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2013.838621>
- Trull, C. (2004). *The effects of substitute teacher training on the teaching efficacy of prospective substitute teachers in the state of West Virginia.* (Publication No. 14481) [Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University]. Virginia Tech University

- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(7), 783-805.
- 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.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.21739>
- Turkoglu, M. E., Cansoy, R., & Parlar, H. (2017). Examining relationships between teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 5*(5), 765-772.
- Ugurlu, C. T., Usta, G., & Koybasi, F. (2019). An investigation of teachers' classroom management skills in terms of gender variability: A meta-analysis study. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 11*(1), 71-90.
<https://doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2019.01.006>
- Vignoli, M., Guglielmi, D., & Balduzzi, L. (2018). Application to practice during practicum as a key player in determining the development of self-efficacy among pre-service teachers. *Journal of Psychological & Educational Research, 26*(2), 132–153.
- Virginia Wesleyan University. (2018). *Pre-service teaching at VWU*. Retrieved from <https://www.vwu.edu/academics/majors/education/pdfs/Clinical-Experience-Handbook-2018.pdf>
- Von Hippel, P., & Bellows, L. (2018). Rating teacher-preparation programs: Can value-added make useful distinctions? *Education Next, 18*(3), 34-41.

- Wheeler-Ayres, S. (2002). A substitute teacher pre service staff development program: A case study of the Los Angeles county office of education (Publication No. 3093935) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Wolff, C., Jarodzka, H., Bogert, N., & Boshuizen, H. (2016). Teacher vision: Expert and novice teachers' perception of problematic classroom management scenes. *Instructional Science, 44*(3), 243-265. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-016-9367-z>
- Wong, H. K., & Wong, R. T. (2009). *The first days of school: How to be an effective teacher*. Mountain View, CA: Harry K. Wong Publications.
- Wong, H. K., Wong, R. T., Jondahl, S. F., & Ferguson, O. F. (2014). *The classroom management book*. Mountain View, CA: Harry K. Wong Publications, Inc.
- Woolfolk, A. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*(1), 81-91.
- Wu, Y., Lian, K., Hong, P., Liu, S., Lin, R., & Lian, R. (2019). Teachers' emotional intelligence and self-efficacy: Mediating role of teaching performance. *Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal, 47*(3). <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.7869>
- Yahui, R., Cuiqiu, B., & Iler, H. (2008). A reflection on the teaching practice through substitute teaching model and its implementation. *Chinese Education & Society, 41*(4), 75-86.
- Yamamoto, T., & Imai-Matsumura, K. (2012) Teachers' gaze and awareness of students' behavior: Using an eye tracker. *Innovative Teaching, 2*(6). <https://doi.org/10.2466/01.IT.2.6>

- Yerli, S., & Yerli, K. (2017). The differences between novice and experienced university prep-class teachers' classroom management, self-efficacy perceptions and students' academic achievement level. *International Journal of Language Academy*, 5, 123-133. <https://doi.org/10.18033/ijla.3646>
- Yirci, R. (2017). The evaluation of new mentoring program for novice teachers according to their perceptions. *Pedagogy Studies / Pedagogika*, 126(2), 29-47. <https://doi.org/10.15823/p.2017.18>
- Yüksel, İ. (2014). Investigating the impact of classroom management course on self-efficacy levels: An experimental study on pre-service teachers. *Education & Science / Egitim ve Bilim*, 39(171), 259-269.
- Zaharis, M. (2019). High-quality teacher induction and multi-year mentoring: Are the new teachers in your school thriving or merely surviving? *Lutheran Education*, 155(4), 1–6.
- Zembytska, M. (2016). Mentoring as the core element of new teacher induction in the USA: Policies and practices. *Comparative Professional Pedagogy*, 6(2), 67-73. [doi:10.1515/rpp-2016-0021](https://doi.org/10.1515/rpp-2016-0021)
- Zubrzycki, J. (2012). Educators take another look at substitutes. *Education Week*, 31(16), 16.