

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SELF-EFFICACY AND BURNOUT OF TEACHERS
WHO BEGAN THEIR CAREER DURING THE 2020/2021 SCHOOL YEAR

by

Corey DeFelice, M.Ed.

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of
The University of Houston-Clear Lake

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements

For the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in Educational Leadership

THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON-CLEAR LAKE

DECEMBER, 2022

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SELF-EFFICACY AND BURNOUT OF TEACHERS
WHO BEGAN THEIR CAREER DURING THE 2020/2021 SCHOOL YEAR

by

Corey DeFelice

APPROVED BY

Kent Divoll, EdD, Chair

Michelle Peters, EdD, Committee Member

Roberta Raymond, EdD, Committee Member

Jennifer Grace, PhD, Committee Member

RECEIVED BY THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION:

Terry Shepherd, EdD, Associate Dean

Joan Y Pedro, PhD, Dean

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge my committee. I never had any of you as a professor, yet each of you were willing to take me on and assist me through this journey. Dr. Divoll, thank you for your guidance, for continuing to push me to the final hour of this process, and for never allowing me to accept a “good enough” paper. Dr. Peters, when I needed patience and a straightforward approach to my understanding of statistical analysis, you were there to offer me both. Dr. Raymond, I am grateful for your expertise in qualitative analysis and for attention to detail as I navigated the sea of data. Dr. Grace, your feedback was instrumental to my growth as a writer.

I would like to thank my parents, Steve and Alice DeFelice. As I grew up, they instilled in me, both an understanding of the value of education and a deep respect for teachers. Each of these was a driving force as I pursued my goals in this process. Thank you and congratulations to everyone in my cohort. I appreciate the constant support and the relationships we have formed these past few years.

Lastly, I have to thank my wife, Itziar, and my three kids; Amaya, Ander, and Anne. They have endured three and a half years of absenteeism and nearly constant venting. Yet, they never stopped supporting me. I love each of you and thank you for being the support I needed to complete this journey.

Abstract

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SELF-EFFICACY AND BURNOUT OF TEACHERS WHO BEGAN THEIR CAREER DURING THE 2020/2021 SCHOOL YEAR

Corey DeFelice
University of Houston Clear Lake, 2022

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Kent Divoll

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to examine the difference in classroom management self-efficacy (CMSE) of year one taught virtually and year two taught in-person for beginning teachers and if this transition impacted teacher burnout. A purposeful sample of second-year teachers was selected to complete the *Efficacy in Classroom Management* subscale of the *Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale* (TSES) and the *Work-related Burnout* subscale of the *Copenhagen Burnout Inventory* (CBI). The survey data were analyzed using a paired t-test and frequencies and percentages while qualitative data were analyzed using an inductive coding process. The quantitative findings indicated that there was a statistically significant mean difference in the CMSE of second-year teachers who taught their first-year virtually and their second year in-person. The findings further indicated that the transition to in-person learning did influence teacher burnout. The quantitative data indicated that elementary and middle school teachers have experienced greater feelings of burnout than high school teachers. The qualitative data

supported these findings and identified themes related to the reasons for the significant mean difference in CMSE and the feelings of burnout.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	viii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Research Problem	2
Significance of the Study	4
Research Purpose and Questions	4
Definitions and of Key Terms.....	5
Conclusion	6
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
Classroom Management.....	7
Classroom Management Training and Preparation.....	8
Classroom Management Self-Efficacy	13
Beginning Teacher Classroom Management Self-Efficacy.....	14
Teacher Stress and Burnout	17
Beginning Teacher Stress and Burnout.....	21
Teacher Stress and Burnout During the COVID-19 Pandemic	23
Virtual Education	24
Transitioning between Virtual and In-Person Instruction.....	27
Summary of the Findings.....	29
Theoretical Framework.....	30
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	32
Overview of the Research Problem	32
Operationalization of Theoretical Constructs	33
Research Purpose, Questions, and Hypothesis	33
Research Design.....	34
Population and Sample	34
Participant Selection	38
Instrumentation	40
Teachers' Sense of Self-Efficacy.....	40
Copenhagen Burnout Inventory	41
Data Collection Procedures.....	46
Quantitative.....	46
Qualitative.....	46
Data Analysis	47
Quantitative.....	47
Qualitative.....	48
Qualitative Validity.....	48
Privacy and Ethical Considerations	49

Research Design Limitations	49
Conclusion	50
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS.....	51
Participant Demographics.....	51
Research Question Two	74
Research Question Three	85
Teacher Training and Preparation.....	85
<i>Teacher Preparation Program</i>	85
<i>Mentoring and Support</i>	87
Classroom Management Self-Efficacy and the COVID-19 Pandemic.....	89
Overall Experience in the Classroom	94
Research Question Four.....	96
Stress Caused by the Transition from Virtual to Fully In-Person Teaching.....	97
Desire to Continue in the Teaching Profession.....	101
Conclusion	105
CHAPTER V: SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	106
Summary	107
Research Question 1	108
Research Question 2	111
Research Question 3	115
Research Question 4	121
Implications.....	125
Implications on Schools.....	126
Recommendations for Future Research	128
Conclusion	129
REFERENCES	131
APPENDIX A: CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SENSE OF EFFICACY SCALE (TSES).....	152
APPENDIX B: COPENHAGEN BURNOUT INVENTORY	156
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....	158
APPENDIX D: INFORMED CONSENT: ADULT RESEARCH PARTICIPANT	159
APPENDIX E: INTRODUCTORY LETTER WITHIN THE SURVEY	163

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1	Participating School District Student Population and Demographics.....	36
Table 3.2	Participating School District Teacher Population and Demographics.....	37
Table 3.3	Participating School District Teacher Years of Experience.....	38
Table 3.4	TSES Subscales and Corresponding Items	41
Table 3.5	CBI Scales and Corresponding Questions	43
Table 3.6	CBI Work-Related Burnout Scale Question Values, Questions 1-3.....	45
Table 3.7	CBI Work-Related Burnout Scale Question Values, Questions 4-7.....	45
Table 3.8	CBI Work-Related Burnout Scale Scoring	45
Table 4.1	Teacher Participant Demographics	52
Table 4.2	Paired t-test: Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale.....	53
Table 4.3	Expanded Responses to Classroom Management Subscale of the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES).....	54
Table 4.4	Collapsed Responses to the Classroom Management Subscale of the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES).....	56
Table 4.5	Frequencies and Percentages on the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory	75
Table 4.6	Expanded Responses to the Work-Related Subscale of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (Q1-3).....	77
Table 4.7	Expanded Responses to the Work-Related Subscale of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (Q4-7).....	79
Table 4.8	Collapsed Responses to the Work-Related Subscale of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (Q1-3).....	81
Table 4.9	Collapsed Responses to the Work-Related Subscale of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (Q4-6).....	83

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Beginning teachers face many challenges entering the classroom for the first time. Challenges which can be overcome, as beginning teachers report improved self-efficacy and improved outcomes as they move into their third year and beyond. However, most teacher turnover occurs at the beginning of teachers' careers (Regional Educational Laboratory at Education Development Center, Inc., 2012). The COVID-19 Pandemic added new challenges to the development of beginning teachers. Hodgman et al. (2021) discusses how school districts implemented various learning modes to accommodate the need to stop the spread of the virus, and these modes changed fluidly throughout the 2020-2021 school year. By the winter of 2020 only 18% of school districts nationally reported being 100% in-person (Hodgman et al., 2021). Some school districts had teaching positions dedicated to virtual learning while other teachers conducted in-person learning. Other districts implemented virtual education in the form of hyflex models where teachers had both in-person and virtual learners. Hyflex models of virtual learning had the side effect of smaller in-person class sizes, often as small as five to 10 students. As COVID-19 infection rates fluctuated so did modes of instruction (Hodgeman et al., 2021).

This study will include a review of the current literature on the topic. This research will help to determine how the first-year classroom experiences of teachers during the 2020-2021 school year may affect issues in education including teacher burnout. This study will add to the research in classroom management self-efficacy (CMSE). This chapter will present the statement of the problem, the significance of the study, the research purpose and questions, and a definition of key terms to be used throughout the study.

Research Problem

For a beginning teacher whose first experience in education was teaching in a nontraditional environment, the potential for a gap in his or her development as a teacher was exposed. While in a traditional school year a beginning teacher will learn the nuances of teaching, including collaboration with colleagues and community, pedagogical knowledge, and managing a classroom (Stenberg & Maaranen, 2021). In the environment of the COVID-19 Pandemic education, beginning teachers missed much of the on-the-job training their colleagues received in previous years. Everything from classroom management to small group instruction was different than any other year (Zamarro et al., 2021).

A teacher entering a classroom for the first time without a strong foundation will potentially have a lower sense of CMSE because classroom management practices are directly related to experience (Colson et al., 2017). It is obvious when an individual observes a classroom where the teacher is not in control, or the students are not engaged in the lesson. In these instances, the teacher is spending time attempting to control behavior issues, and this has negative repercussions on academic instruction (Flower et al., 2017). Instruction in these instances is not happening, and if instruction is not happening, learning is not happening. The teachers who are in these situations have a lower CMSE and are the teachers at greatest risk of burnout and leaving the teaching profession (Sokman & Kilic, 2019). Hagenauer et al. (2015) connect teacher burnout to the negative emotions that come from student misbehavior. This connects directly to the self-efficacy of a teacher who is under prepared to engage his or her students.

Teachers who began their career in the midst of the COVID-19 Pandemic are in a situation where they may not have gained the necessary experience to be successful in a traditional school year. Some of these teachers learned how to be effective in an

environment where they were teaching in a hyflex model in which they learned to work between virtual and face-to-face learners. They may have only had between five-10 students physically in the classroom, and this caused them to develop skills in managing student behavior and engagement in an online environment. Additionally, many teachers had their first-year teaching experience in a fully virtual classroom. This did require these teachers to develop specific skills necessary to be successful in that environment, such as, how to maintain engagement or monitor attendance and participation. It was not necessarily beneficial experience in areas like managing student behaviors in the classroom because many students were not sitting physically in the classroom, and the teacher did not have manage the behaviors and engagement of 25-30 students.

Now with the majority of students returning the classroom, these same teachers may have as many as 25 students sitting in class (Oxner, 2021). Managing students in a room with 10 students is different than managing 25. Having to learn new classroom management strategies or how to set up your room for small group instruction could lead to many teachers, who on paper have experience, feeling like a first-year teacher for a second time.

When one feels unprepared for a task, or if he or she is lacking pedagogical skills, his or her self-efficacy decreases (Redmon, 2007). The impact of a low teacher self-efficacy is negative on student achievement. Mahmoe and Pirkamali (2013) show a connection between teacher self-efficacy and the effort they put forth in the classroom. It stands to reason that less effort on the part of the teacher will translate into lower student achievement. The combination of less effort, lower student achievement, and increased stress is a recipe for teachers choosing to leave the teaching profession.

Significance of the Study

Beginning teachers who gained their initial experience in virtual instruction are now navigating the traditional educational world. While it is hoped that teachers dedicated to becoming good teachers will eventually acquire the necessary skills to do the job, that is of little comfort to the current students and/or their parents. Furthermore, the stress of teaching without the proper training or support could lead to teachers abandoning the profession (Womack-Wynne et al., 2011). Complicating the teaching profession is having additional teachers, who in most years would be able to rely on their experience, now needing additional support. Brown (2012) stated that the idea of trial by fire is not best for new teachers. It takes a community of support from the district and campus leadership down. According to a report published by the Economic Policy Institute the attrition rate for teachers with fewer than five years' experience is as high as 20% (Garcia & Weiss, 2019). Feng et al. (2019) indicates that as many as one fourth of the teachers leaving within the first five years are first-year teachers. With the possible increase in emotional stress and burnout brought on by having to transition from virtual teaching platforms to fully in-person, there is a real concern that this number could increase. This study will benefit any entity with an interest in recruiting or developing new teachers, including; school districts, preparation programs, and the new teachers themselves. This is because understanding how the first year may have affected this group of beginning teachers will help create an understanding of how to best support them.

Research Purpose and Questions

The purpose of this study is to examine whether there is a difference in classroom management self-efficacy between year one being taught virtually and year two being

taught fully in person for beginning teachers, and does this affect burnout in the second year. The study will address the following research questions:

1. Is there a statistically significant mean difference in the classroom management self-efficacy of beginning teachers who taught their first year virtually and second year fully in-person?
 H_a : There is a statistically significant mean difference in the classroom management self-efficacy of beginning teachers who taught their first year virtually and second year fully in-person.
2. To what extent did transitioning from virtual to fully in-person teaching influence teacher burnout?
3. How does the assigned mode of instruction affect beginning teachers' classroom management self-efficacy?
4. What impact did transition from a first-year teaching assignment in a virtual model have on teachers' feelings of burnout?

Definitions and of Key Terms

The following terms are defined for the purpose of this study.

Beginning Teacher: A teacher with zero to two years-experience teaching who is required to have a mentor provided by the school district (TEA, 2019).

Burnout: The result of high levels of stress in a teaching environment. Burnout is characterized by mental fatigue and possibly depression. Teachers who reach this level are more likely to leave teaching (Camacho et al., 2021).

Classroom Management: A concept that refers to the strategies teachers use to control their classroom environment (Mulvahill, 2018).

Classroom Management Self-Efficacy: A teachers' personal perception of his or her ability to maintain a positive learning environment (Poulou et al., 2019).

In-Person Learning: A method of teaching in which students are physically present in the classroom for instruction (Gillespie et al., 2021).

Virtual Learning: A learning environment where teachers and some or all students are separated by time and/or space. Interactions may come through course content provided via the internet or through video conferencing (Rashid et al., 2021).

Conclusion

This chapter provided an overview of the need for this study, a description of the research problem, the significance of the study, and the research purpose and questions. This study will look at whether transitioning from a virtual learning environment to an in-person learning environment will have an impact on second-year teachers' CMSE and burnout potential. Chapter 2 will include a review of the literature as it relates to classroom management, classroom management self-efficacy, teacher experiences in various models of virtual education, and teacher stress and burnout.

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study is to determine if there is a difference in the CMSE of second-year teachers whose first-year teaching was during the 2020-2021 school, in a virtual environment. Furthermore, this study will seek to understand if these teachers are at an increased level of burnout. This literature review will focus on: (a) classroom management (b) classroom management training and preparation, (c) classroom management self-efficacy, (d) teacher stress and burnout potential, (e) virtual education, and (f) transitioning between virtual and in-person teaching.

Classroom Management

Classroom management is best described as teachers developing an environment which is supportive of the academic and social-emotional well-being of their students (Emmer & Sabornie, 2015, p. 6). In the *Handbook of Classroom Management*, Emmer & Sabornie (2015) further express the goal of classroom management as minimizing disruption so instruction can occur. When considering this definition, one must examine preparation and training and the levels of experience of teachers to gain insight into how teachers develop and maintain CMSE. Furthermore, of all pedagogical areas in which a teacher can develop self-efficacy, CMSE is one of the most critical (El Abd & Chaaban, 2020). These researchers further surmised that the training teacher candidates receive in their preparation programs is of critical importance. How teachers approach classroom management, whether through more authoritarian methods (Malmgren et al., 2005; Sahin, 2015) or through the building of student-teacher relationships (Divoll, 2010; Divoll & Ribeiro, in press; Divoll & Ribeiro, 2022; Malmgren et al., 2005; Sahin, 2015), the method contributes to the CMSE development of teachers as they gain more experience.

Classroom Management Training and Preparation

The literature on classroom management training and preparation is generally split between pre-service training (Kwok et al., 2020), and the training and mentoring received in beginning years of a teachers' career (Ingersoll et al., 2012). Pre-service classroom management preparation is even further divided between the training received in traditional training programs which include student teaching are considered by some to be the stronger of the two options (Darling-Hammond, 2010). While ACP preparation is a secondary pathway to education which some perceive as lacking in classroom management training. This could be because ACP coursework is typically covered within the teachers' first-year and tends to be shorter in duration than traditional program coursework (Fox & Peters, 2013). Fox and Peters (2013) acknowledge that many in education, including school leaders, view traditionally trained teachers as better prepared to manage classrooms (Darling-Hammond et al., 2002), however, ACP participants do bring additional life experiences which can be of use (Flores et al., 2004; Fox & Peters, 2013). This real-world experience could lessen the impact of the type preparation program of a beginning teachers' effectiveness in the classroom (Fox & Peters, 2013).

Teacher candidates (TC)s consider classroom management to be the most difficult of all pedagogical skills to master (Kwok et al., 2020). The researchers conducting this study presented a group of TCs with an entry and exit survey to gauge their perceptions of how the demographics of the classroom impact classroom management. The sample for this entry survey part of the study included 226 enrolled students, of which 67 both consented and answered questions of interest. The sample for the exit survey part of the study included 301 enrolled students, of which 145 consented and completed the questions of interest. The entry survey covered the teacher candidates' beliefs in the following areas: (a) demographic characteristics, (b) confidence in specific pedagogical

areas, (c) desired school characteristics, and (d) their career plans. The entry survey was administered when the TCs were starting the preparation program, prior to receiving any coursework. An exit survey covering the same topics was administered after three semesters of learning, just as the TCs were about to graduate from the program.

The two most prominent themes taken from the entry survey was that TCs believed that student demographics did impact classroom management and there was a need for inclusivity in the classroom. The themes taken from the exit survey demonstrated the influence of experience on teacher candidates. While there was still the belief that student demographics impact classroom management, the TCs expressed these beliefs at a deeper level. The themes taken from the exit survey were the need for both equity and equality within a diverse classroom. The TCs recognized that it is important for a teacher to create an inclusive environment which accommodate the needs of the students while still maintaining high standard for behaviors.

Many teachers new to the profession consider classroom management to be the most challenging aspect of their growth as educators (Sinclair et al., 2021). The purpose of this study was to see if being trained and implementing a CHAMPS behavior intervention strategy had a positive impact on students who had already been identified as having behavior challenges. Researchers received consent from 102 teachers and 1,405 students to participate in a controlled trial of CHAMPS interventions. The teachers were primarily white (70.9%) females (79.1%), with African American (AA) (25.6%), and Asian (2.3%) completing the sample. The students were identified by their teachers as either in need of behavior intervention or as having no need. About 44% of the student population was described as in need of individual behavior support. Males constituted 59% of the student identified as needing supports and females 41%. The racial/ethnic

breakdown of the in-need students was 87% AA, 11% white and 2% a mix of Latinx, Asian, and multiracial.

The 102 teachers participating in the study were broken into an intervention control group and a non-intervention control group. The intervention control group received a three-day CHAMPS intervention training, and the non-intervention control group were asked to continue teaching as usual. The teachers who attended CHAMPS training was observed and rated using the STOIC rating form three times following their training sessions to ensure fidelity. The researchers used repeated-measure analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs) to determine the intervention effect on the STOIC rating and the average, $F(1,96) = 7.51, p = .007, \eta^2 = .074$, represented a significant effect with CHAMPS teachers having higher STOIC ratings. Teachers completed the *Teacher Observation of Classroom Adaptation-Checklist* (TOCA-C) which was completed for each student and measured their behavior. Additionally, researchers assessed students using the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) and with sub-tests of the Stanford Achievement Test, 10th edition (SAT-10) to measure academic progress of the participating students. Researchers found that teachers implementing the CHAMPS intervention strategies scored higher on their STOIC ratings than the teachers not using the interventions. Furthermore, students receiving the CHAMPS interventions showed more growth on the MAP assessment than their peers who did not receive the CHAMPS interventions.

Mitchell et al (2017) revealed coaching as an important component of a beginning teachers' growth. Coaching is a process which allows a teacher to not only learn new practices, but to receive consistent feedback on their implementation of whatever is being learned. This study was designed to demonstrate the importance of training to pre-service teachers and coaching for beginning teachers. The authors accomplished this through a

description of a research example and a case study narrative. The research example described a study in which participating teachers received continuous training in discipline intervention strategies. The study showed that when teachers implemented the interventions with fidelity, student outcomes were positively impacted. The Mitchell (2017) study also contained a case study example in the area coaching. Experienced teachers volunteered to work with a teacher for the purpose of providing coaching. Follow-up surveys were provided, and the results were overwhelmingly favorable in regard to the coaching provided, and the teachers who participated felt more comfortable within their role as a teacher.

Moore (2016) supports the argument that coaching is a crucial part of a beginning teacher's development, describing it as a foundation of the supports needed. This report described coaching in greater detail by relating a coaching program called STEP UP. Coaching within this program calls for coaches to work with anywhere between 24-48 teachers in a variety of areas. STEP UP as a program specifically geared towards building beginning teacher capacity, and getting teachers through the tough first few years of their careers.

Pre-service and in-service training is important and is at the root of what a beginning teacher needs, and if it is not sufficient there is an increased likelihood that beginning teachers will not remain teachers (Stevenson et al., 2020). Stevenson's study is a commentary on the importance of classroom management training for all teachers, in particular, beginning teachers. Classroom management amid the COVID-19 Pandemic is specifically mentioned, and the authors maintain that with the new challenges facing schools, classroom management has to be a focus in order to maximize instruction.

Stephenson et al. (2020) provided further insight around classroom management and teacher preparation. According to the authors, only 27% of participating teacher

preparation institutions offer a course specific to classroom management. Many institutions teach classroom management in the context of the content of other courses. Further complicating teacher preparation is that even within the institutions explicitly teaching classroom management, only 65% report teaching evidence-based classroom management strategies. The final determination of the researchers was that classroom management is not something that should be taught in isolation. Classroom management strategies should be directly taught to perspective teachers, in addition to the classroom management skills they may develop in their field experience. Additionally, classroom management is a skill that needs to be solidified in pre-service training for teachers. According to the research, professional development in classroom management has not shown to be as effective because teachers tend to revert to their comfort zone in managing their classrooms, making the skills and habits developed in their preparation programs to be all the more important.

Classroom management training is also not always prevalent for teachers, experienced or inexperienced. For instance, 89% of middle school teachers report having students with behavior problems in their classes, and most of these teachers also express a need for more classroom management training (Zoromski et al., 2021). In this study, the researchers focused on the amount of training middle school teachers receive in the classroom behavior management (CBM) strategies. To complete this study, the researchers included a sample of 58 middle school teachers from four schools in Ohio. The sample was comprised of 100% Caucasian and 63.8% female teachers. All participants had between 10-14 years of experience. Of these schools, there was a mix of rural and urban schools. All teachers who participated identified as Caucasian and female.

To collect data, researchers observed the participating teachers in the classroom using the Student Behavior Teacher Response-Secondary (SBTR-S) observation system. Using this observation instrument, observers viewed both student behaviors as they occurred and the teachers' responses to the behaviors, including the use or non-use of CBM strategies. The data were conducted in 30-minute observations on days which were predetermined to not have tests or quizzes. The data were then coded for analyzation by the researchers.

The data showed that there was an average of 18.76 rule violations per half hour. There were more rule violations during whole group instruction ($M=3.08$, $SD=2.87$) than during small group/partner activities ($M=1.60$, $SD=1.80$), and each of these had fewer rule violations than individual work time ($M=4.04$, $SD=6.00$) leading researchers to conclude that teachers are better equipped to manage their classroom through student engagement.

Classroom Management Self-Efficacy

While teacher self-efficacy has been studied for years and is considered one of the more critical components of a teacher's social and emotional development (Bandura, 1977), classroom management self-efficacy (CMSE) has received less attention (Sivri & Balci, 2015). Sivri and Balci (2015) state that CMSE has long been considered a sub-area of teacher self-efficacy, yet it is complex enough that it should be considered its own domain of research. CMSE is described as a teachers' belief in his or her ability to organize a classroom and engage students (Aloe et al., 2014; Sivri & Balci, 2015)

Sivri and Balci (2015) stated that because beginning teachers are expected to teach immediately when given classrooms of their own, it is important to understand the CMSE of pre-service teachers prior to their being hired to instruct students. Therefore, they conducted a study to determine the CMSE of pre-service teachers. In this study 362

teachers currently studying education at a university consented to participate in their survey. Of these teachers 69.3% were female and 30.3% were male. In addition, all pre-service teachers were enrolled in school of primary education, with 22.8% enrolled in the elementary education program, 17.1% in the science teaching program, 20.2% in the math teaching program, 18.5% in the social sciences teaching program, and 20.4 in the pre-school teaching program.

Participants in this study were presented with the Classroom Management Self-Efficacy Beliefs Scale (CMSBS). This scale has 15 items divided into two sub-dimensions which cover classroom management efficacy and classroom management result expectancy. The data from the survey was analyzed in IBM SPSS using a independent t-test and a one way analysis of variances (ANOVA). The results of the survey found that the participants had a high degree of CMSE ($M= 47.82$; $SD=3.90$), and it was revealed that female pre-service teachers had a slightly higher degree of CMSE than male pre-service teachers. The results of this research furthered the study of CMSE and emphasized the importance of pre-service teacher training to emphasize classroom management training, so CMSE is developed prior to pre-service teachers entering the profession.

Beginning Teacher Classroom Management Self-Efficacy

The number one factor in the overall self-efficacy in beginning teachers is their ability to manage a classroom (Potter, 2021; Savran & Çakıroğlu, 2003). Potter (2021) explicitly states that veteran teachers have a higher self-efficacy due to their increased comfort in managing classrooms.

Potter (2021) argues that to a lesser degree, availability of resources and teaching assignment can contribute to a teachers' self-efficacy. This study was designed to compare novice and experienced elementary music teachers in the area of CMSE. The

data can be applied to teachers across grade levels and content areas. The researcher used an adapted version of the *Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale* (TSES). The researcher used eight CMSE questions included in the TSES. She added an additional four demographic questions and four open-ended questions designed to gain perspective on the relationships between experience, setting, and CMSE. In this study 292 participants were interviewed across several regions. Most participants (233, 80%) reported having more than four years of teaching experience, leaving (59, 20%) as teachers with 0-3 years' experience. Participating teachers taught in the following locations: urban=15.8%, suburban=32.5%, and rural/small town=51.7%. An analysis of the data showed that experienced elementary music teachers showed a statistically higher levels of CMSE with a $M=57.1$, $SD= 9.5$ versus $M=53.9$, $SD=9.3$. The data collected in this study led the researcher to the conclusion the experienced teachers have a higher sense of CMSE than beginning teachers.

Savran and Çakıroğlu (2003) collected data on 646 pre-service science teachers on both their efficacy in teaching science and their efficacy in classroom management. To measure classroom management, teachers were presented with the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control (ABCC) Inventory. A two-way ANOVA analysis was conducted and the results showed that teachers were more comfortable in classroom management when employing more controlling classroom management techniques when delivering instruction, but were more open in their understanding of the importance of student-teacher relationships in their classroom management. Divoll and Ribeiro (2021; 2022) corroborated the importance of teacher-student relationships, particularly in managing the challenging behaviors of middle school students.

In a similar study, Tok and Tok (2016) looked at the CMSE beliefs of novice teachers. These researchers surveyed 85 novice teachers using the Classroom

Management Self-Efficacy Convictions Scale. The study found that how the teachers were prepared was not statistically significant, however, male novice teachers had a higher CMSE than their female counterparts, which was interpreted by the researchers as conforming to social norms in which men are more comfortable with administrative tasks than females.

Poulou et al. (2019) describe CMSE to be a dimension of the overarching construct of self-efficacy. The article discusses self-efficacy as a theoretical construct, but it also recognizes the limited research in the area of CMSE as its own construct. The study the researchers presented was designed to address the limitations in the research. The study consisted of a sample of 58 teachers who participated in the *Classroom strategy assessment system* (CSAS) which is an assessment designed to rate teachers in their use of instruction and behavior management. Additionally, teachers also completed the TSES to determine their self-efficacy.

The behavior management section of the assessment measured the teachers in the clarity versus the vagueness of their instructions, their implementation of praise as a strategy, and their use of corrective feedback. Most teachers in the study did score high on the TSES in classroom management. On the CSAS the teachers scored well on the instructional sections, however, the lowest scores were in behavior management, with the lowest score coming on behavioral corrective feedback. Overall, the purpose of this study was to determine if there is a correlation between these teachers' CMSE and their behavior management practice in the classroom. The study ultimately showed that experience equals higher self-efficacy, and that self-efficacy is higher in a teachers' mid-career years, and it will start to decline in the latter years.

In an additional study conducted by Feng et al. (2019) researchers looked at teacher self-efficacy as a whole. In this study 1364 teachers participated in a survey

covering all facets of the first-year teaching experience, including classroom management. The purpose of the study was to determine why so many first-year teachers are leaving the profession, and how preparation and content-specific support affect these teachers' self-efficacy. The survey used in this study was the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), which was developed in 2011-2012 by the National Center for Education Statistics.

The survey items covered all of the areas in which a beginning teacher could rate his or her self-efficacy. Teachers who participated in the study were classified into three groups: *High Self-Efficacy* (HSE), *Moderate Self-Efficacy* (MSE), and *Low Self-Efficacy* (LSE). The largest group being MSE, with 52% (n=709) falling into this category. One area rated was classroom management. According to the researchers, classroom management was the only area in which HSE participants felt less than prepared. Classroom management was the only area in which all three groups had less than 50% indicate feeling very well-prepared. This led the researchers to the conclusion that classroom management is an area of beginning teacher self-efficacy that requires more support from schools and school districts.

Teacher Stress and Burnout

With the challenges posed by teacher shortages, teacher stress and burnout has been area of focus for researchers (Carroll et al., 2020; Divoll & Ribeiro, 2021; 2022; McCarthy, 2019; Shen et al., 2015; von der Embse et al., 2019). McCarthy (2019) detailed several causes of teacher stress and burnout, ranging from administrative burdens and long hours to the wage gap between teachers and those with similar experience and education. The concept of teacher burnout is critical to the success of students in schools (Kasalak & Dağyar, 2021; Shen et al., 2015), with teacher burnout described as a

syndrome which can translate into student motivation, engagement, and learning (Shen et al., 2015).

Kasalak & Dağyar (2021) describe the importance of enthusiasm on the part of the teachers in relation to student success. In the study the researchers used a descriptive correlational model, a method of comparing two or more variables, to determine if there is a correlation between teacher enthusiasm for teaching/subject matter and student behaviors. The researchers selected 3166 teachers from a pool of 77 high schools to participate in the study, and from these selected teachers, 366 returned completed surveys. For data collection, teachers were asked to complete two measures, the Teacher Enthusiasm Scale (TES) and the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI). The researchers further connect teacher burnout to the loss of enthusiasm. Many factors ranging from a lack of training and preparation to outside stressors like the COVID-19 Pandemic can lead to an increased level of burnout among teachers.

Shen et al. (2015) also researched the effects of teacher burnout on students, particularly on student motivation. In this study, both teachers ($n = 33$) and students ($n = 1302$) were part of the sample. Specifically, researchers were looking to see if a relationship existed between 33 physical education teachers' burnout and the motivation of their students. Student data was collected near the beginning of the semester and again at the end of the semester. The teachers were also given the *Maslach Burnout Inventory* (MBI) to measure their perceptions of their own burnout. An analysis of the data found that students' autonomous motivation was affected as the teachers experienced burnout as the year progressed.

Teacher stress is a leading cause of burnout and can have a negative impact on both teacher and student experiences (von der Embse et al., 2019). The causes of teacher stress were briefly discussed in the article, but the main focus of the authors was to

present interventions for teachers experiencing stress. Interventions ranged from additional training to the importance of wellness. Wellness can come in many forms including taking time for one's self or meditation (Ribeiro & Divoll, 2020; von der Embse et al., 2019), or in revisiting why one entered education by writing one's 'best-loved self' story (Craig, 2017; Divoll & Ribeiro, 2022a)

Divoll and Ribeiro (2021, 2022), discuss the stress felt by beginning teachers, particularly middle school beginning teachers. The chapter discusses how middle school teachers experience greater stress as a result of classroom behaviors than elementary teachers, leading to higher attrition rates. Several strategies which middle school teachers can use, which are specific to teaching middle school age students, can lower their own stress levels. These include; learning more about the brain development of middle school age students, focusing on what the teacher can control, breaking tasks into small chunks, and approaching the job with a positive mindset (Divoll & Ribeiro, 2021; 2022). The chapter offers a unique perspective on how this specific student group requires teachers to approach their jobs differently in order to have a better chance at success in classroom management. Additionally, in applying these strategies, middle school teachers can reduce their work-related stress.

Carroll et al. (2020) expanded upon the idea of teacher stress and how to address it. This study sought to understand why teachers feel stress in the workplace and what possible solutions might exist. The participants included 74 high school teachers who had previously expressed feeling stressed at work. These teachers agreed to take part in a stress reducing study. As they moved through the study participants completed several open-ended question measurements which were subsequently transcribed, coded, and analyzed. Some of the comments provided by teachers indicated increased administrative expectations and ever-changing documentation and curriculum as leading causes of stress

in the workplace. Additionally, disengaged students and students with behavior challenges were cited as stressors as well. The researchers concluded that personal care and additional supports from their administration were the most needed interventions to alleviate stress.

An additional study connected CMSE to teacher burnout. Aloe et al. (2014) conducted a meta-analysis of 16 studies covering both CMSE and teacher burnout. The researchers had a specific set of criteria to be included in their meta-analysis; the study had to report a relationship between the three dimensions of burnout, the study included in-service teachers, and the manuscript had to be in English. The researcher found a mix of journal articles and dissertations to reach a total of 16 articles. The articles were coded by the researchers. The results found by the researchers indicated that there is a relationship between lower CMSE and increased teacher burnout.

Another leading cause of teacher stress and burnout which was amplified by the COVID-19 Pandemic is the concept of role ambiguity. Merida-Lopez et al. (2017) describe role ambiguity as a teachers' lack of understanding of their role, and little to no training in their job. In this study 288 teachers were selected from a variety of teaching roles. They were administered the *Wong and Law Scale of Emotional Intelligence*, the *Role Stress Scale*, and the *Utrecht Work Engagement Scale*. What the researchers determined was that teachers with higher scores in emotional intelligence (EI) were less affected by role ambiguity, leading the researchers to conclude that EI is a key factor in reducing teacher stress and burnout. Lastly, the researchers found that higher feelings of role ambiguity lead to less work engagement, and that each of these are factors in teacher burnout rates.

Beginning Teacher Stress and Burnout

New teachers entering the profession will all feel a level of stress on the job and how this stress affects their job performance can inform their decision to remain in the profession or not. DiCarlo et al. (2019) emphasize that teaching as a profession is one of the most stressful professions an individual can have. They further discussed the effects that teacher stress can have on students, as they described stress as “contagious”. They discuss how teacher perceived stress can have a negative impact on the classroom climate. To gather their information, the researchers used a *Perceived Stress Scale* given to eight teachers of varying experience and backgrounds. The teachers were assessed, assigned a mindfulness exercise, and assessed again. While in the initial test most showed high levels of perceived stress, following the mindfulness exercise only two remained a high stress level. The results demonstrated that teacher mindfulness is effective in eliminating stress and decreasing burnout.

A result of burnout can be teacher attrition (Madigan & Kim, 2021). The researchers in this study conducted a meta-analysis of previous research on teacher stress and burnout. The researchers used a procedure which included analyzing and coding the information found in studies related to burnout, and they used this information to look for correlations between burnout and teachers’ intentions to quit. After all the data being analyzed, the researchers found that all four of the indicators of burnout, exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced accomplishment, were factors in teachers’ decisions to quit teaching, at least to some degree. The study concluded with a discussion of the implications of teachers quitting, with the highlight being the potential increase of an already concerning teacher shortage.

In another study, beginning teachers monitored and surveyed over a two-year period about their perceptions of their work-environment and burnout (Goddard et al.,

2006). A total of 142 teachers initially participated in the study, with 79 eventually completing each of the four surveys sent over the two-year period. The researchers used two instruments, the *Work Environment Scale* (WES) to measure work climate and the *Maslach Burnout Inventory* (MBI) to measure burnout. According to the researchers, 35% of beginning teachers, in their first six-weeks teaching, believed they were putting in more work than the rewards they were receiving. On the fourth survey, two years later, there was an increase to 49% who believed the same.

In the area of burnout, there was increase in burnout on each of the three subscales presented in the MBI: (a) *emotional exhaustion* $F(3,76)53.83$, $p<.05$, *depersonalization* $F(3,76)52.96$, $p<.05$, and *personal accomplishment* $F(3,76)536.13$, $p<.001$. These results led the researchers to conclude that significant burnout was occurring with beginning teachers over the course of their first two-years teaching.

Garcia and Weiss (2019) in their report to the Economic Policy Institute put teacher attrition within the first five years at 20%, and there are estimates that as many as 50% of new teachers leave teaching in the first few years (Moore, 2016). Regardless of whether the true number falls on the lower end or higher end of this range, the high percentages are concerning, considering the added stress that has occurred in the years since these studies were conducted. Teacher turnover and attrition is widely researched and is a concern in the field of education (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Ingersoll et al., 2012; 2014). Carver-Thomas and Darling-Hammond (2019) less than one third of teachers leaving the profession each year is due to retirement, meaning that teachers are leaving the profession early for a variety of reasons. The greatest influence on teacher success and not leaving the profession is the preparation they receive during their first-year teaching, rather than their pathway to education (Ingersoll et al., 2012; 2014).

Teacher Stress and Burnout During the COVID-19 Pandemic

While workers in any profession have the potential to experience both stress and burnout, the COVID-19 Pandemic added a new and relatively unstudied element of stress and burnout in the workplace (Hermann et al., 2021; Kraft et al., 2020). Herman et al. (2021) explored how the COVID-19 Pandemic affected teachers. The study was not limited to any demographic, grade level, or years of experience. The researchers surveyed 639 teachers from 31 schools, of these, about 31% were suburban schools and about 61% were rural schools. The teachers were spread as follows: (a) 45% from elementary, (b) 32% from middle school, (c) 13% from high school, and (d) 10% from a combination of two or more levels.

The researchers expressed that the COVID-19 Pandemic is impacting teachers in two ways. First, the stress of their traditional work is being amplified, and second, the Pandemic has added new stressors in the form of new paperwork, insufficient infrastructure, and minimal training in addressing the needs of students.

Kraft et al. (2020) focused largely on the stress teachers faced while being forced to teach from home at the beginning of the COVID-19 Pandemic. Teachers who were forced to move to teaching virtually from home felt a drop in their feelings of success due to a lack of student engagement. Adding to the problems teachers faced at this time was their having to learn an entirely new set of pedagogical skills while not having the training or support to implement them. A sample of 7,841 teachers were surveyed with an 80% response rate. The majority (80%) of the respondents were female and white non-Hispanic (79%) teachers. The survey covered both how teachers felt about their jobs prior to the COVID-19 school closures and also how they felt about their jobs after having to work at home following the COVID-19 school closures. Overwhelmingly, teachers of all levels of experience showed a drop in their perceptions of their own success as teachers.

Teacher responses indicated that they went into the teaching profession with a desire to well at their jobs and many experienced teachers pre-COVID-19 felt a sense of success in the classroom. The survey results indicated that these same teachers had feelings of being unsuccessful at their jobs when forced to teach virtually from home during the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Virtual Education

One of the benefits of online learning is that it provides greater flexibility for students than a traditional face to face learning environment (Potter, 2015). A negative aspect of virtual education is that when teachers are thrust into teaching virtually with little to no training, as it occurred during the COVID-19 Pandemic, they may not feel up to the task (Babcock et al., 2022). The researchers conducted a qualitative study to examine the experiences of secondary students who were forced to transition to online learning through the eyes of their teachers. They gathered data through round-table discussions with both secondary educators and dissertation chairs who were forced to transition to virtual instruction with the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Some themes that emerged during this study were the difficulty in engaging students in an online environment and the challenges teachers faced in building relationships with students through a screen. Each of these are critical components of classroom management (Terada, 2019). Babcock (2022) emphasized the importance of teachers receiving the training and resources necessary to create the nurturing environment students need to thrive in an online learning environment.

Potter (2015) focused on a higher education model, but the concept can be applied to public school education during the COVID-19 Pandemic. In this instance, it was not a job or a family which necessitated the flexibility. It was students and their parents fear of the virus which made virtual instruction appealing. The researchers used a nonrandom

sample of students and followed the academic progress of three sections of an undergraduate course in management. Each section was presented in a different way. One was presented fully face to face, while the others were hybrid with 40% of the course taking place online and 60% of the course was face-to-face. The material presented in the courses was identical. There were differences in the methods of submitting assignments. Traditional classroom students were required to submit hard copies of their work, while online students submitted through a dropbox. The sample included 52% female students and 48% male students. To control the possibility of differences in the group being based on academic ability, the students chosen for each group did not have a statistically significant difference in their grade point average (GPA).

The results were determined by examining assessment scores and final grades. The final grades of the students demonstrated that if presented appropriately, online instruction can be an effective mode of instruction. Once students in the hybrid sections became used to the process they showed academic growth. The students participated in a short three-question survey to gauge their satisfaction in the course they took. The students in both the face-to-face version and hybrid version were equally satisfied. However, the final grades for the students enrolled in the hybrid courses were significantly higher than those in the face-to-face classes.

While Potter (2015) did demonstrate the effectiveness of virtual education, these successes are limited to established virtual schools. Kingsbury (2020) conducted a study in the midst of the COVID-19 Pandemic to compare the effectiveness of virtual education between established virtual schools and traditional schools forced to operate virtually. The researcher administered a survey to parents of students in 48 states. These included parents of both virtual students and traditional students learning remotely. The survey itself focused on active learning, communication, and classroom management. The

results overwhelmingly showed that parents whose children attended established virtual schools were more satisfied than parents of traditional school students. Parents of students in established virtual schools were 6.5 times more likely to share that their child “learned a lot” following the Spring 2020 school shutdown due to the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Further studies of virtual education during the COVID-19 Pandemic found that the initial experiences of teachers thrust into a virtual environment were negative (COVID-19). The factors that teachers struggled with the most were adjusting to and learning the necessary technology as well as how to engage students and manage behaviors in a virtual environment. The researchers measured the self-efficacy of teachers in the use of technology as mode of instruction. Of 432 teachers who participated in the study, 81% indicated they had fewer than five years’ experience teaching online, and of that group, 88% reported having one year or less experience in teaching online. A survey was collected from a sample of secondary teachers which consisted of 32 questions relating to their self-efficacy in the use of technology. While there were not statistically significant findings in all areas of the study, there was a higher self-efficacy score for teachers who had taken technology integration professional development. Years of teaching experience was not shown to be a factor in the technology self-efficacy of the teachers surveyed. The study showed that 96% of teachers surveyed had at least 11 years teaching experience, but the online teaching survey scores ($M=22.06$, $SD=4.3$) showed that these teachers did not have confidence in their abilities to teach online courses.

It was not only core content teachers who needed to find ways to adjust to teaching in a virtual environment due to the COVID-19 Pandemic. Almonacid-Fierro et al. (2021) conducted a study of the practices employed by physical education teachers who were forced to teach virtually. In this study semi-structured interviews were

conducted and an inductive coding process used to analyze the interviews when they were complete. A total of 14 physical education teachers from a mix of rural and urban schools participated in the interviews.

The results of the study indicated that the quality of life of students forced into a virtual education environment was initially negative because of many factors. For instance, smaller homes lacked the space for children to play when they were forced to be in the house. The researchers also found that the lack of physical education also negatively affected the teachers themselves. The teachers were stressed because of their concern for both the physical and emotional well-being of their students.

Transitioning between Virtual and In-Person Instruction

The current literature on transitioning between virtual and in-person instruction is minimal. Most existing literature focuses on the unprecedented and abrupt transition from in-person to virtual instruction at the onset of the COVID-19 Pandemic. There is some, however, minimal research on the transition back to in-person beginning with the 2021-2022 school year.

Much of the current literature on the subject of returning to fully in-person learning focuses on the needs of students. In a newspaper article, Chuck (2021, August 31) writes about many of the challenges students are bringing with them as they return from remote learning. Challenges described in the article range from elementary students being unable to sit still and high school students being exhausted in the classroom. The author uses the article to discuss steps that school officials can take to help with the transition. The ideas range from red carpet roll outs to offering alternative elective courses. Interestingly, the greatest need mentioned by the school counselor interviewed for the article is the need for schools to address mental health of students, and she states that this is an issue which predates the COVID-19 Pandemic.

The current literature tells us that teachers were nervous at best when being asked to teach online with little or no training on how to be effective at doing so. Ray and Ntuli (2022) presented research at the Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education (SITE) Conference in San Diego about teacher experiences in the early stages of the Pandemic. The data collected came from public tweets posted on Twitter by teachers. The tweets collected demonstrated that teachers felt the situation was chaotic and they were uncertain about their roles. An interesting theme which emerged in the data, however, was the supportive replies concerned teachers received when posting their problems with transitioning to online teaching.

Research on the transition between multiple modes of instruction has generally focused more on health and safety rather than teacher self-efficacy. Pattison et al. (2021) that the greatest concerns of teachers making this transition were related to fears regarding health and health safety measures that schools were trying to implement. The study consisted of a survey being sent to 7,467 members of the American School Health Association (ASHA). 375 members responded, of which 91.7% were female, 83.7 were white, and 58% were school nurses. The remainder were school employees whose role was not identified. However, the researchers did state that some teachers did express concerns about the social and emotional well-being of students. Of the respondents, 93% reported feeling concerned with their schools' ability to maintain social distancing, and 92.8% feared a resurgence of COVID-19 with the reopening of schools.

Pattison et al. (2021) found further evidence that school employees mental well-being is also tied to school decisions to return to face-to-face instruction. 83.7% of respondents expressed concerns about the potential of increased behavior concerns with students returning. Additionally, 87.9% felt that school staff will be ill-equipped to

address the behavioral and mental concerns that could be potentially increased as students return to face-to-face instruction.

Summary of the Findings

Classroom management is heavily researched and defined as creating an environment in which students can thrive (Emmer & Sabornie, 2015). El Abd and Chaaban (2020) place CMSE as the most critical of all pedagogical areas in which a teacher can develop self-efficacy. Most research in these areas is focused on student engagement and instruction, rather than on classroom management or CMSE. Studies that did focus on CMSE were consistent in that CMSE is developed through a combination of the preparation received from a preparation program and in the experiences gained in a teaching assignment. Sinclair et al. (2021) conducted research on the CMSE of teachers who were trained in the implementation of CHAMPS, a behavior implementation program, while Mitchell et al. (2017) discussed the importance of the coaching new teachers received from experienced mentors. CMSE is an area of concern for many teachers. 89% of middle school teachers, experienced and inexperienced, reported having difficulties in managing student behaviors, and most of these included the need for additional training in classroom management among their concerns (Zoromski et al., 2021).

Teacher stress and burnout is not a new concept. Researchers have been studying the factors contributing to teacher stress and burnout for years. Administrative burdens and the wage gap are among many of the contributors to teacher stress (McCarthy, 2019). Kasalak and Dağyar (2021) connected teacher enthusiasm to student success, and they further connected a loss of enthusiasm to teacher burnout. Research into the effects of stress on beginning teacher burnout showed that the strains of expectations were affecting enthusiasm, not equivalent to the rewards achieved, and leading to a desire to exit the

teaching profession (DiCarlo et al. 2019; Madigan & Kim, 2021; Goddard et al., 2006). Some of the recent literature on teacher burnout discusses how the COVID-19 Pandemic has affected teacher stress and burnout. Herman et al. (2021) conducted a study demonstrating that the pandemic has added to teacher stress by both amplifying traditional stresses while also adding new stresses.

Recent literature on virtual models of instruction is scarce, particularly in the area of hyflex instruction. Most research in this area focuses on the academic achievement and engagement of students and the ability of teachers to foster these needs (Potter, 2015; Babcock, 2022). The consensus of the literature is that there are opportunities for technology innovation and growth even as the world moves forward from the virtual environment of the COVID-19 Pandemic. Current literature on the transition from virtual to traditional teaching shows that students have both academic and achievement gaps (Chuck, 2021, August 31). Pattison et al. (2021) stated that the greatest challenges facing teachers during these this transition was the fear of COVID-19 itself. CMSE and burnout due to this transition is not a focus of the current literature.

Theoretical Framework

Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy theory provides the theoretical framework for this study. Bandura defines self-efficacy as an individuals' beliefs in his or her own abilities when performing a given task. There are multiple levels of ones' determination of his or her self-efficacy, and the same person might have a higher self-efficacy in one aspect of his or her life and a lower in another area (Bandura, 2006, pg. 307). In the realm of education this concept can be applied in much the same way. A teacher might have a higher self-efficacy in an area like curriculum knowledge and the same teacher might have a lower self-efficacy in building relationships with students. Bandura (2006) maintains that there is no catch-all for self-efficacy, and that because it is about self-

perception it varies from individual to individual. This applies to this study because there are countless factors which can contribute to a beginning teacher developing high CMSE, and a transition from virtual to fully in-person learning only increases the uncertainty. This strengthens the importance of the fact that self-efficacy theory relies on distinguishing between the source and the level of self-efficacy. Meaning, it is critical that the level of experience (beginning teachers) be acknowledged when measuring CMSE.

Classroom management is described by Kwok (2019) as teachers' ability to manage negative behaviors in a classroom, promote positive behaviors, and maintain engagement with the students. Combining the construct of classroom management with self-efficacy, the result is CMSE, which is teachers' beliefs in their ability to manage the behaviors in their classrooms so learning can occur. Teachers who can accomplish this task are more likely to remain in the field of education (Kwok, 2018). Teacher who struggle in this area run the risk of burnout.

When considering the work of Kwok who describes failures in classroom management as one of the key contributors to teacher stress (Kwok, 2018) and Doherty (2020) who attributes increased stress as a key contributor to burnout, one can easily understand how one affects the other. Ineffective classroom management leads to lower CMSE and higher stress, and this leads to burnout.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine whether there was a difference in classroom management self-efficacy and burnout between year one being taught virtually and year two being taught in person for beginning teachers. Survey and interview data were collected from a purposeful sample of second-year teachers from a mid-sized suburban school district. Quantitative data were collected using the *Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale* (TSES) and the *Copenhagen Burnout Survey* (CBI). Qualitative data were collected from a series of carefully crafted interview questions. Data were analyzed using frequencies, percentages, paired t-test, and an inductive coding process. This chapter presents the research problem, operational theoretical constructs, research purpose, research questions, hypotheses, research design, population and sampling, instrumentation, data collection, data analysis, ethical considerations, and limitations to the study.

Overview of the Research Problem

There has been much research on teachers' classroom management self-efficacy (CMSE) in relation to their teaching experience (Colson et al., 2017). The COVID-19 Pandemic necessitated a change in how K-12 education traditionally provided instruction and the development of multiple modes of teaching. School districts and individual campuses across the United States (U.S.) made decisions of how they would serve their students. Many opted for a choice between in-person or virtual instructional models, and they assigned teaching positions respectively (Zamarro et al., 2021). Understanding how beginning teachers' CMSE was affected by the transition from virtual to in-person teaching can help school districts implement supports to reduce burnout among beginning teachers.

Operationalization of Theoretical Constructs

This study consisted of the following constructs: (a) beginning teachers, (b) mode of instruction, (c) classroom management self-efficacy, and (d) teacher burnout.

Beginning teachers are defined as teachers with fewer than two years' experience in the teaching profession (TEA, 2019). Mode of instruction is defined as means in which instruction is presented, either online or traditional in-person (Slover & Mandernach, 2018). Mode of instruction was determined through the demographic questions on the survey. Participants identified as either virtual or in-person teachers. Classroom management self-efficacy is defined as how competent a teacher feels in his or her ability to organize and maintain a classroom (Aloe et al., 2013). Classroom management self-efficacy was measured using the *Efficacy in Classroom Management* subscale of the *Classroom Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale* (TSES). Teacher burnout is defined as teacher stress having reached a level nearing emotional exhaustion or depression, with teacher being at risk of leaving the teaching profession (Camacho, et. al., 2021). Teacher burnout was measured using the *Copenhagen Burnout Inventory* (CBI).

Research Purpose, Questions, and Hypothesis

The purpose of this study was to examine whether there was a difference in classroom management self-efficacy between year one being taught virtually and year two being taught in person for beginning teacher, and did this affect burnout in the second year. The study addressed the following research questions:

1. Is there a statistically significant mean difference in the classroom management self-efficacy of beginning teachers who taught their first year virtually and second year in-person?

H_a : There is a statistically significant mean difference in the classroom management self-efficacy of beginning teachers who taught their first year virtually and second year in-person.

2. To what extent did transitioning from teaching virtually the first year to in-person the second-year influence teacher burnout?
3. How does the assigned mode of instruction affect beginning teachers' classroom management self-efficacy?
4. What impact did transition from a first-year teaching assignment in a virtual model have on beginning teachers' feelings of burnout?

Research Design

This research study used a sequential mixed methods design. The study consisted of two phases: first, a quantitative phase and second, a qualitative phase. The advantage of implementing this design is that a thorough examination of the quantitative data will be followed by a qualitative phase. A purposeful sample of second-year teachers from a mid-sized suburban school district was solicited to complete the *Efficacy in Classroom Management* subscale of the *Classroom Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale* (TSES) and the *Copenhagen Burnout Inventory* (CBI). In addition, focused interviews were conducted to provide a deeper analysis of how teachers perceive their own CMSE and potential for burnout. Data were analyzed using frequencies, percentages, and a paired t-test. Qualitative data were analyzed using an inductive coding process.

Population and Sample

A population for this study consisted of a mid-sized suburban Texas school district. The participating school district serves approximately 27,000 students in Southeast Texas. There are 36 total campuses in the district: four high schools, nine middle schools, 19 elementary schools, and four specialized campuses. The total number

of teachers serving these campuses is 1,824. Table 3.1 displays the student demographics of the district. The data indicates that there were 26,801 students in the district in the 2020-2021 school year. Of these students, 22.8% were African American (AA), 41.8% were Hispanic, 22.7% were White, and 9.8% were Asian. Additionally, 17.3% of students were English Learners, 11.9% were in special education, 6.7% were in gifted and talented, and 52.9% were economically disadvantaged.

Table 3.1*Participating School District Student Population and Demographics*

	Students (n)	Percentage (%)
African American	6,111	22.8
Hispanic	11,198	41.8
White	6,071	22.7
Asian	2,617	9.8
American Indian/Alaska Native	43	0.2
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	19	0.1
Two or More Races	742	2.8
Female	13,000	48.5
Male	13,801	51.5
English Learner	4,671	17.3
Special Education	3,180	11.9
Gifted and Talented	1,801	6.7
Economically Disadvantaged	14,165	52.9
Total Students	26,801	100.0

Table 3.2 displays the school district's teacher demographics. In the 2020-2021 school year there were 1,824 teachers employed in this district. Of these teachers 56.4% are White, 19.1% are AA, 19.0% are Hispanic, and 3.2% are Asian. Table 3.3 displays teacher experience for the 2020-2021 school year (Texas Education Agency, 2021). During the 2020-2021 school year, the district employed 1,824 teachers. Of these

teachers, 102 (5.6%) were in their first-year teaching, 460 (25.2%) had 1-5 years' experience, 439 (24.1%) had 6-10 years' experience, 626 (34.3%) had 11-20 years' experience, and 196 (10.8%) had more than 20 years' experience. For the purpose of this study, a purposeful sample of second-year teachers who taught their first year virtually and their second year in-person was solicited to participate.

Table 3.2

Participating School District Teacher Population and Demographics

	Teachers (n)	Percentage (%)
African American	348	19.1
Hispanic	346	19.0
White	1,029	56.4
Asian	59	3.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	5	0.3
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	0.0
Two or More Races	37	2.0
Total Teachers	1,824	100.0

Table 3.3*Participating School District Teacher Years of Experience*

	Years of Experience	Percentage (%)
0 Years of Experience	102	5.6
1-5 Years of Experience	460	25.2
6-10 Years of Experience	439	24.1
11-20 Years of Experience	626	34.3
Over 20 Years of Experience	196	10.8
Total	1,824	100.0

Participant Selection

Following an analysis of the survey data, a purposeful sample of teachers was chosen to participate in focused interviews. Teachers were chosen to participate in interviews based on having two years' experience, having begun their career in the 2021-2022 school year, and having taught virtually as a first-year teacher. Teachers were selected from each of the following levels: (a) elementary grades PK-5, (b) middle school grades 6-8, and (c) high school grades 9-12. Details about each of the participants interviewed for this study are provided in-depth below.

Luis is a high school chemistry teacher. He attended and was certified through a traditional university education program. Luis participated in a year-long student teaching experience through his university.

Jane is a high school choir teacher. She is the lone choir director at her assigned campus. Jane was trained in a traditional university certification program and participated in student teaching at the middle school level.

Maria is a high school algebra 1 teacher. She is one of only two algebra 1 teachers on her campus. She was certified through a traditional program and participated in student teaching.

Tom is a middle school social studies teacher. He was certified through an alternative certification program (ACP), and this is a second career for him.

Mark is a middle school English language arts teacher. This is also a second career for him. He was in the military and attended a university later in life and was certified through a traditional certification program. He participated in student teaching.

Skye is a middle school band director. She comes from a family of teachers, including her father who was a high school band director. She was certified through a traditional university certification program. Skye participated in student teaching in a junior high band program.

Megan is an elementary fundamental skills teacher. She was certified through a traditional certification program and completed her student teaching in a middle school special needs classroom.

Tina is an elementary school teacher. She was certified through an ACP, and is currently teaching kindergarten.

Lauren is an elementary school teacher. She taught fifth grade in her first year, and she is now teaching third grade. She was certified through an ACP and worked in a corporate setting prior to moving to Texas.

Instrumentation

Teachers' Sense of Self-Efficacy

The Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES), originally called the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale, was developed by Tschannon-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) has gone through multiple research studies which tested the TSES for both validity and reliability through item development, selection and finally factor analysis (Tschannon-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). The TSES is divided into three subscales, designed to measure teacher self-efficacy in three areas: (a) efficacy for instructional strategies, b) efficacy for classroom management, and c) efficacy for student engagement.

The TSES was developed to address gaps in measuring teacher self-efficacy from previous measurement tools which did not accurately capture the everyday work life of teachers (Tschannon-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). The TSES was developed through multiple studies to ensure reliability and validity. The first study reduced the original 52 items to 36. The second study eliminated 18 more items. Following a third study, the TSES was refined to its current format. There is a long form consisting of 24 items and short form with 12 items. Participants using the survey are asked items on a nine-point Likert scale with a combined score possibility ranging from 24 to 216. The higher the score on the range, the higher the teacher self-efficacy.

For the purposes of this study, this researcher used questions items #3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21 as these are the items on the long form dealing with CMSE. According to Tschannon-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) the overall reliability coefficient is .94. Broken down: engagement is .87, instruction is .91, and classroom management items have a reliability coefficient of 0.90. Table 3.4 describes the three subscales of the TSES and the corresponding item numbers associated with each subscale.

Table 3.4

TSES Subscales and Corresponding Items

Long Form	Items
Efficacy in Student Engagement	1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 14, 22
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24
Efficacy in Classroom Management	3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21

Copenhagen Burnout Inventory

The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) was developed to address perceived gaps with previous burnout measures, such as the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI). According to Kristensen et al. (2005) previous burnout measures focused on a restricted population of individuals who work in the human service world, or the questions themselves were difficult to answer. The CBI was created to cover a more holistic view of the human experience than the MBI, and it is divided into three categories; personal burnout, work burnout, and client burnout. Additionally, The CBI has a clearer definition of what burnout is. Additionally, feedback provided by the initial respondents to the CBI was that the survey consists of easy-to-answer questions. Kristensen et al. (2005) defined burnout as being in a situation for a long period of time causing both physical and emotional exhaustion.

Participants are asked to rate their feelings for each item as *always*, *often*, *sometimes*, *seldom*, or *never/almost never* (Kristensen et al., 2005). The Cronbach's

alphas for the survey have a high reliability. The personal burnout scale has a reliability of .87. The work-related burnout subscale has a reliability of .87. The client-related burnout subscale has a reliability of .85. Kristensen et. al. (2005) designed the CBI as three distinct scales with the intent that each scale can be used independently depending on the intended population. Table 3.5 shows each of the scales within the CBI and the questions associated with each scale.

Table 3.5*CBI Scales and Corresponding Questions*

Scale	Questions
A. Personal Burnout	How often do you feel tired? How often do you feel emotionally exhausted? How often are you physically exhausted? How often do you think: “I can’t take it anymore”? How often do you feel worn out? How often do you feel weak and susceptible to illness?
B. Work Related Burnout	Do you feel worn out at the end of the working day? Are you exhausted in the morning at the thought of another day at work? Do you feel that every working hour is tiring for you? Do you have enough energy for family and friends during leisure time?

	Is your work emotionally exhausting?
	Does your work frustrate you?
	Do you feel burnt out because of your work?
C. Client Related Burnout	Do you find it hard to work with clients?
	Does it drain your energy to work with clients?
	Do you find it frustrating to work with clients?
	Does it feel like you give more than you get back when you work with clients?
	Are you tired of working with clients?
	Do you sometimes wonder how long you will be able to continue working with clients?

For the purposes of this study, the researcher presented participants with the work-related burnout scale of the CBI. Tables 3.6 and 3.7 describe the values assigned to each of the seven questions of the work-related scale of the CBI. When a respondent completes the survey, the scores for each of the seven questions are added together and averaged for a final score. Table 3.8 describes the level of burnout associated with the final score. If a respondent answers three or fewer questions, he or she is classified as a non-responder.

Table 3.6*CBI Work-Related Burnout Scale Question Values, Questions 1-3*

Question Number	To a Very High Degree	To a High Degree	Somewhat	To a Low Degree	To a Very Low Degree
One	100	75	50	25	0
Two	100	75	50	25	0
Three	100	75	50	25	0

Table 3.7*CBI Work-Related Burnout Scale Question Values, Questions 4-7*

Question Number	Always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never/Almost Never
Four	100	75	50	25	0
Five	100	75	50	25	0
Six	100	75	50	25	0
Seven	0	25	50	75	100

Table 3.8*CBI Work-Related Burnout Scale Scoring*

	Low Burnout	Moderate Burnout	High Burnout	Severe Burnout
Scoring Range	49 and below	50-74	75-99	100

Data Collection Procedures

Quantitative

Prior to the collection of any data, the researcher obtained permission from the school district institutional review board (IRB) and the University of Houston-Clear Lake (UHCL) Committee for the Protection of Human Rights (CPHS). District officials were contacted to assist in the identification of beginning teachers who have moved from their first into their second-year teaching. The researcher distributed the survey via email. A cover letter was presented to the teachers detailing the timeframe, purpose of the study, assurance of voluntary participation, and privacy and ethical considerations. Appendix B represents the letter accompanying the survey email to teachers. The letter states that participation in the survey is voluntary and that the appropriate amount of time needed to complete the survey is 20-30 minutes. Identified teachers were presented with both the TSES and CBI in this email.

Survey results were collected over a four-week period. Reminder emails were sent weekly because initial participation is low. As survey results were collected, they were entered into the research software IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to be analyzed. Once data were collected it was stored on a dedicated and secure hard drive. In compliance with CPHS guidelines, data will be stored for five years, and it will then be destroyed following the completion of the study.

Qualitative

After reviewing the demographic and quantitative data, the researcher selected a sample of three teachers from each of the following levels: (a) elementary grades PK-5, (b) middle school grades 6-8, and (c) high school grades 9-12. This group of teachers participated in focused interviews to further examine the CMSE and burnout of identified beginning teachers. The researcher assigned pseudonyms to the participating teachers to

protect their identity and to ensure confidentiality. The researcher conducted an inductive coding process of the transcripts of these interviews. The data collected during interviews was subject to member-checking by having participants review transcripts and preliminary results in order to increase validity. Participating teachers were asked a series of open-ended questions (Appendix C) designed to gauge their CMSE and feelings of burnout. Interview sessions lasted approximately 30-45 minutes. Interview sessions were recorded to ensure accuracy and to assist in the transcription process.

Data Analysis

Quantitative

All quantitative data was compiled in a spreadsheet and transferred into the IBM Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis. Data were collected using the TSES and analyzed to determine the CMSE of second-year teachers during their first-year teaching. To answer research question one, a paired t-test was used to determine if there is a statistically significant mean difference in the CMSE of second-year teachers who taught their first-year virtually and those who taught their first-year in-person, comparing reflective and current survey data. The independent variable is a categorical variable: (a) second-year teachers who taught their first-year virtual and (b) second-year teachers who taught their first-year in-person. The dependent variable, CMSE, is a continuous variable. Effect size was measured using Cohen's d and a coefficient of determination (r^2), and a significance value of .05 was used for this study. Research question two was answered using descriptive analysis (frequencies and percentages) to determine the extent of transitioning between virtual to fully in-person teaching on burnout (low, moderate, high, severe).

Qualitative

To address research questions three and four, the researcher conducted focused interviews of a sample of three teachers from each of the following levels: (a) elementary grades PK-5, (b) middle school grades 6-8, and (c) high school grades 9-12. in the study. The recordings were transcribed into Microsoft Word using the speech to text feature in the program. The researcher replayed the recording as many times as necessary to obtain an accurate transcription.

The researcher then uploaded the transcriptions into Dedoose for inductive coding and analysis. An inductive coding process allows for the researcher to determine the codes and themes as the data is transcribed and analyzed (Thomas, 2006). Themes that emerge in the coding process will be divided into sub-themes. Identification of key patterns, themes, and sub-themes will be used to organize interview responses into meaningful pieces of information. A narrative description of the findings will be presented, and direct quotes from the interviews will be used to support the themes and sub-themes that are derived during the coding process. The data obtained from interviews was used in conjunction with the data obtained in the TSES and CBI to provide further insight into effects of transitioning from virtual to in-person on beginning teacher CMSE and burnout.

Qualitative Validity

The qualitative analysis process included validation through the triangulation of individual teacher responses. The interview questions were reviewed by experienced educators in the field through peer-debriefing. Peer-debriefing with an independent party increased the validity of the interview questions (Hail et al., 2011). All interviews were recorded digitally and was immediately transcribed. The data collected during interviews were subject to member-checking by having participants review transcripts and

preliminary results in order to increase validity. Member checking served the purpose of ensuring that the voices of the participants was accurately captured in the findings which increased the validity of the findings.

Privacy and Ethical Considerations

Prior to the collection of data, the researcher obtained the permission of UHCL's CPHS and the school district IRB. The study did not make mention of the names of any district, school, or teacher who participates. A survey letter was attached to the email containing the survey, including instructions to complete the survey, and to ensure that participants are aware that participation is voluntary. Completion of the survey implied consent to participate. All quantitative data was transferred to IBM SPSS for analysis and it was verified to ensure the transfer was correct. The researcher used pseudonyms to protect the identity of interviewees. Informed consent to participate was obtained from all interviewees. All data collected in this study will be stored on a secure hard drive, and the only individual with access to the drive will be the researcher. The researcher will store the data for a period of five years, and he will then destroy the data.

Research Design Limitations

This research study consisted of several limitations. First, restricting the study to second-year teachers is a limitation in that it was difficult to obtain an effective sample. It was necessary that a majority of the beginning teachers participate in order for the population to give the desired results. Second, is the reliability of the reflective TSES. It required teachers' memories to reflect back over a year. This is a limitation because there is possibility that teachers' recollections were affected by their current experiences. Third, it is a limitation when teachers self-reflect, as some participants may have felt uncomfortable self-describing their own challenges. The validity of this study could be challenged if teachers did not accurately self-reflect. An external limitation of the study is

generalizability. A purposeful sample of teachers, specifically second-year teachers, was interviewed; therefore, the results are not generalizable to all teachers.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to determine the classroom management self-efficacy and burnout potential of beginning teachers following the 2020-2021 school year. This chapter provided an overview of the research problem and an explanation of the population and sample of participants used in the study. Furthermore, this chapter provided a conceptualization of the instruments used in the study, complete with explanations of instrumentation, data collection both quantitative and qualitative, privacy and ethical considerations, and limitations of the study.

CHAPTER IV:

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine whether there was a difference in classroom management self-efficacy between year one being taught virtually and year two being taught in person for beginning teacher, and did this affect burnout in the second year. This chapter presents the quantitative and qualitative data analysis of the study. First, a demographic analysis of the participants of the study will be presented followed by an analysis of the data. This chapter will include an analysis of each of the four research questions. The chapter concludes with a summary of the findings.

Participant Demographics

For this study 89 second-year teachers who had taught a form of virtual instruction completed the *Classroom Management Subscale* of the *Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale* and the *Copenhagen Burnout Inventory*. Table 4.1 provides the response data for each of the three surveyed levels; (a) elementary school (n = 38, 42.7%), (b) middle school (n = 23, 25.8%), and (c) high school (n = 28, 31.5%). Of the 89 participants, 64 indicated they were female (71.9%) and 21 indicated they were male (23.6%). Twenty-eight teachers indicated they were Hispanic (28.1%), 56 (62.9%) were non-Hispanic, and eight (9.0%) preferred not to report their ethnicity. One teacher (1.1%) indicated being an American Indian/Alaska Native, nine (10.1%) were Asian, 19 (21.3%) were African American, 48 (53.9%) were White, and 12 (13.5%) preferred not to report their race.

Table 4.1*Teacher Participant Demographics*

	All (%)	Elementary (%)	Middle School (%)	High School (%)
Total Teacher	100.0 (n = 89)	42.7 (n = 38)	25.8 (n = 23)	31.5 (n = 28)
Female	71.9 (n = 64)	86.8 (n = 33)	52.1 (n = 12)	67.8 (n = 19)
Male	23.6 (n = 28)	7.8 (n = 3)	43.4 (n = 10)	28.5 (n = 8)
Prefer Not to Report	4.5 (n = 4)	5.4 (n = 2)	4.5 (n = 1)	3.7 (n = 1)
Hispanic	28.1 (n = 25)	28.9 (n = 11)	26.0 (n = 6)	28.5 (n = 8)
Non-Hispanic	62.9 (n = 56)	63.1 (n = 24)	65.2 (n = 15)	60.7 (n = 17)
Prefer Not to Report	9.0 (n = 8)	8.0 (n = 3)	8.8 (n = 2)	10.8 (n = 3)
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.1 (n = 1)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	3.7 (n = 1)
Asian	10.1 (n = 9)	8.0 (n = 3)	8.8 (n = 2)	14.2 (n = 4)
African American	21.3 (n = 19)	34.2 (n = 13)	4.5 (n = 1)	17.8 (n = 5)
White	53.9 (n = 48)	47.3 (n = 18)	73.9 (n = 17)	46.4 (n = 13)
Prefer Not to Report	13.5 (n = 12)	10.5 (n = 4)	12.8 (n = 3)	17.9 (n = 5)

Research Question One

Research question one, *Is there a statistically significant mean difference in the classroom management self-efficacy of beginning teachers who taught their first year virtually and second year fully in-person?*, was measured using a paired sample-test to determine if there was a statistically significant mean difference in the classroom management self-efficacy of beginning teachers who taught their first year virtually and their second year in-person. The results of the paired sample t-test indicated there was a

statistically significant mean difference in the CMSE of beginning teachers who taught their first year virtually and their second year fully in-person, $t(89) = -3.60$, $p = 0.001$, $d = .38$ (small effect size), $r^2 = .108$. On average, teachers who taught their first-year virtually ($M = 6.58$) had a higher CMSE during their second-year teaching ($M = 7.20$). This suggested there was an increase in the CMSE of teachers who returned to teach their second-year fully in-person. Approximately 11.0% of the variance in classroom management self-efficacy could be attributed to mode of instruction. Table 4.2 shows the results of the paired sample t-test.

Table 4.2

Paired t-test: Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale

Type of Survey	N	M	SD	t-value	df	p-value	Cohen's d	r^2
1 st Year	89	6.58	1.54	-3.60	89	.001*	0.38	0.108
2 nd Year	89	7.20	1.30					

*Statistically significant ($p < .05$)

Teachers' improved CMSE is evident when comparing the responses to the TSES scores from the first-year teaching to the second-year teaching. For instance, 35.6% of teachers believed a great deal in their ability to make expectations clear to students during their first-year teaching. In their second-year 68.9% of teachers indicated they believed a great deal in their ability to make expectations clear to students. Additionally, there was a notable increase in teachers' belief in their ability to establish routines in the classroom from their first year (35.5%) to their second year (52.2%) teaching. Table 4.3 show the expanded responses to the TSES. Table 4.4 shows the collapsed responses to the TSES.

Table 4.3*Expanded Responses to Classroom Management Subscale of the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES)*

Survey Item	Years Teaching	Nothing	Very Little	Some Influence	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal
1. How much could you control disruptive behavior in the classroom	1 st Year	2.2 (n = 2)	13.3 (n = 12)	18.9 (n = 17)	34.4 (n = 31)	31.1 (n = 28)
	2 nd Year	1.1 (n = 1)	4.4 (n = 4)	8.9 (n = 8)	45.5 (n = 41)	40 (n = 36)
2. To what extent did you make expectations clear about student behavior?	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 0)	14.4 (n = 13)	22.3 (n = 20)	43.4 (n = 39)	35.6 (n = 32)
	2 nd Year	0.0 (n = 0)	1.1 (n = 1)	2.2 (n = 2)	27.8 (n = 25)	68.9 (n = 62)
3. How well did you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 0)	3.3 (n = 3)	17.8 (n = 16)	43.4 (n = 39)	35.5 (n = 32)
	2 nd Year	0.0 (n = 0)	2.2 (n = 2)	2.2 (n = 2)	43.3 (n = 39)	52.2 (n = 47)
4. How much could you get the children to follow classroom rules?	1 st Year	1.1 (n = 1)	8.8 (n = 8)	17.8 (n = 16)	44.5 (n = 40)	27.8 (n = 25)
	2 nd Year	1.1 (n = 1)	4.4 (n = 4)	4.4 (n = 4)	43.4 (n = 39)	46.7 (n = 42)
5. How much could you calm a student who was disruptive or noisy?	1 st Year	1.1 (n = 1)	10 (n = 9)	20 (n = 18)	41.2 (n = 37)	27.8 (n = 25)
	2 nd Year	1.1 (n = 1)	3.3 (n = 3)	15.6 (n = 14)	43.4 (n = 39)	36.6 (n = 33)

6. How well could you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 0)	6.7 (n = 6)	18.9 (n = 17)	37.8 (n = 34)	36.6 (n = 33)
	2 nd Year	1.1 (n = 1)	3.3 (n = 3)	6.7 (n = 6)	26.7 (n = 24)	57.3 (n = 56)
7. How well could you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?	1 st Year	2.2 (n = 2)	10 (n = 9)	15.6 (n = 14)	37.8 (n = 34)	34.4 (n = 31)
	2 nd Year	1.1 (n = 1)	6.6 (n = 6)	17.7 (n = 16)	34.4 (n = 31)	40.0 (n = 36)
8. How well did you respond to defiant students?	1 st Year	2.2 (n = 2)	10.0 (n = 9)	15.5 (n = 14)	42.2 (n = 38)	33.4 (n = 30)
	2 nd Year	2.2 (n = 2)	5.5 (n = 5)	10.0 (n = 9)	36.6 (n = 33)	45.5 (n = 41)

Table 4.4*Collapsed Responses to the Classroom Management Subscale of the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES)*

Survey Item	Years Teaching	Very Little/Some Influence	Quite a Bit/A Great Deal
1. How much could you control disruptive behavior in the classroom	1 st Year	32.2 (n = 29)	65.5 (n = 59)
	2 nd Year	13.3 (n = 12)	85.5 (n = 77)
2. To what extent did you make expectations clear about student behavior?	1 st Year	14.4 (n = 13)	85.5 (n = 77)
	2 nd Year	3.3 (n = 3)	96.7 (n = 87)
3. How well did you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	1 st Year	21.1 (n = 19)	78.9 (n = 71)
	2 nd Year	4.4 (n = 4)	95.6 (n = 86)
4. How much could you get the children to follow classroom rules?	1 st Year	26.7 (n = 24)	72.3 (n = 65)
	2 nd Year	8.9 (n = 8)	90.0 (n = 81)
5. How much could you calm a student who was disruptive or noisy?	1 st Year	30.0 (n = 27)	69.0 (n = 62)
	2 nd Year	18.8 (n = 17)	80.1 (n = 72)
6. How well could you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	1 st Year	25.6 (n = 23)	74.4 (n = 67)
	2 nd Year	10.0	88.9

		(n = 9)	(n = 79)
7. How well could you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?	1 st Year	25.6 (n = 23)	72.2 (n = 65)
	2 nd Year	24.3 (n = 22)	74.6 (n = 67)
8. How well did you respond to defiant students?	1 st Year	22.2 (n = 20)	75.6 (n = 68)
	2 nd Year	15.5 (n = 14)	82.2 (n = 74)

Regarding elementary teachers, the results of the paired sample t-test indicated there was a statistically significant mean difference in the CMSE of beginning elementary teachers who taught their first year virtually and their second year fully in-person, $t(38) = -3.30$, $p = .001$, $d = .54$ (medium effect size), $r^2 = .135$. On average, elementary teachers who taught their first-year virtually ($M = 6.46$) had a higher CMSE during their second-year teaching ($M = 7.36$). This suggested there was an increase in the CMSE of elementary teachers who returned to teach their second-year fully in-person. Approximately 14.0% of the variance in classroom management self-efficacy could be attributed to mode of instruction. Table 4.5 shows the results of the paired sample t-test.

Table 4.5

Paired t-test: Elementary Classroom Management Self-Efficacy

Year Taught	N	M	SD	t-value	df	p-value	Cohen's d	r^2
1 st Year	38	6.46	1.59	-3.30	37	.001*	.54	0.135
2 nd Year	38	7.36	1.39					

*Statistically significant ($p < .05$)

Elementary teachers' improved CMSE is evident when comparing the responses to the TSES scores from the first-year teaching to the second-year teaching. For instance, 35.6% of teachers believed a great deal in their ability to make expectations clear to students during their first-year teaching. In their second-year 89.4% of teachers indicated they believed a great deal in their ability to keep routines running smoothly. Additionally, there was a notable increase in teachers' belief in their ability to manage disruptive behaviors from their first year (57.9%) to their second year (89.4%) teaching. Table 4.6

show the expanded responses to the TSES. Table 4.7 shows the collapsed responses to the TSES.

Table 4.6*Elementary: Expanded Responses to Classroom Management Subscale of the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES)*

Survey Item	Years Teaching	Nothing	Very Little	Some Influence	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal
1. How much could you control disruptive behavior in the classroom	1 st Year	5.3 (n = 2)	10.5 (n = 4)	26.3 (n = 10)	34.2 (n = 13)	23.7 (n = 9)
	2 nd Year	2.6 (n = 1)	0.0 (n = 0)	7.9 (n = 3)	44.7 (n = 17)	44.7 (n = 17)
2. To what extent did you make expectations clear about student behavior?	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 0)	10.5 (n = 4)	10.5 (n = 4)	21.1 (n = 8)	57.9 (n = 22)
	2 nd Year	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	5.3 (n = 2)	18.4 (n = 7)	76.3 (n = 29)
3. How well did you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 0)	2.6 (n = 1)	18.4 (n = 7)	42.1 (n = 16)	36.9 (n = 14)
	2 nd Year	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	5.3 (n = 2)	42.1 (n = 16)	52.7 (n = 20)
4. How much could you get the children to follow classroom rules?	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 0)	5.3 (n = 2)	23.7 (n = 9)	42.1 (n = 16)	28.9 (n = 11)
	2 nd Year	2.6 (n = 1)	0.0 (n = 0)	2.6 (n = 1)	36.9 (n = 14)	57.9 (n = 22)
5. How much could you calm a student who was disruptive or noisy?	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 1)	7.9 (n = 3)	23.7 (n = 9)	44.8 (n = 17)	23.7 (n = 9)
	2 nd Year	2.6 (n = 1)	0.0 (n = 0)	15.8 (n = 6)	39.5 (n = 15)	42.2 (n = 16)

6. How well could you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 0)	7.9 (n = 3)	23.7 (n = 9)	44.8 (n = 17)	23.7 (n = 9)
	2 nd Year	2.6 (n = 1)	2.6 (n = 1)	7.9 (n = 3)	21.0 (n = 8)	65.8 (n = 25)
7. How well could you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?	1 st Year	5.3 (n = 2)	7.9 (n = 3)	23.7 (n = 9)	29.0 (n = 11)	34.2 (n = 13)
	2 nd Year	2.6 (n = 1)	5.2 (n = 2)	15.8 (n = 6)	29.0 (n = 11)	47.4 (n = 18)
8. How well did you respond to defiant students?	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 0)	13.2 (n = 5)	18.4 (n = 7)	36.9 (n = 14)	31.3 (n = 12)
	2 nd Year	2.6 (n = 1)	2.6 (n = 1)	10.5 (n = 4)	36.9 (n = 14)	47.4 (n = 18)

Table 4.7*Elementary: Collapsed Responses to the Classroom Management Subscale of the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES)*

Survey Item	Years Teaching	Very Little/Some Influence	Quite a Bit/A Great Deal
1. How much could you control disruptive behavior in the classroom	1 st Year	36.8 (n = 14)	57.9 (n = 22)
	2 nd Year	7.9 (n = 3)	89.4 (n = 35)
2. To what extent did you make expectations clear about student behavior?	1 st Year	21.0 (n = 8)	79.0 (n = 30)
	2 nd Year	5.3 (n = 2)	94.7 (n = 36)
3. How well did you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	1 st Year	21.0 (n = 8)	78.9 (n = 30)
	2 nd Year	5.3 (n = 2)	94.7 (n = 36)
4. How much could you get the children to follow classroom rules?	1 st Year	29.0 (n = 11)	71.0 (n = 27)
	2 nd Year	2.6 (n = 1)	97.4 (n = 37)
5. How much could you calm a student who was disruptive or noisy?	1 st Year	31.6 (n = 12)	68.5 (n = 26)
	2 nd Year	15.8 (n = 6)	81.7 (n = 31)
6. How well could you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	1 st Year	31.6 (n = 12)	68.5 (n = 26)

	2 nd Year	10.5 (n = 4)	86.8 (n = 33)
7. How well could you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?	1 st Year	31.6 (n = 12)	63.2 (n = 24)
	2 nd Year	21.0 (n = 8)	76.4 (n = 29)
8. How well did you respond to defiant students?	1 st Year	31.6 (n = 12)	68.5 (n = 26)
	2 nd Year	13.1 (n = 5)	84.3 (n = 32)

Regarding middle school teachers, the results of the paired sample t-test indicated there was a statistically significant mean difference in the CMSE of beginning elementary teachers who taught their first year virtually and their second year fully in-person, $t(23) = -2.14$, $p = .022$, $d = .45$ (small effect size), $r^2 = .084$. On average, elementary teachers who taught their first-year virtually ($M = 6.20$) had a higher CMSE during their second-year teaching ($M = 6.96$). This suggested there was an increase in the CMSE of elementary teachers who returned to teach their second-year fully in-person. Approximately 8.0% of the variance in classroom management self-efficacy could be attributed to mode of instruction. Table 4.8 shows the results of the paired sample t-test.

Table 4.8

Paired t-test: Middle School Classroom Management Self-Efficacy

Year Taught	N	M	SD	t-value	df	p-value	Cohen's d	r^2
1 st Year	23	6.20	1.52	-2.14	22	.022*	.45	0.084
2 nd Year	23	6.96	1.33					

*Statistically significant ($p < .05$)

Middle school teachers' improved CMSE is evident when comparing the responses to the TSES scores from the first-year teaching to the second-year teaching. Approximately 36.0% of teachers believed a great deal in their ability to make expectations clear to students during their first-year teaching. In their second-year 95.6% of teachers indicated they believed a great deal in their ability to make expectations clear to students. Additionally, there was a notable increase in teachers' belief in their ability to get children to follow classroom rules from their first year (56.6%) to their second year (86.9%) teaching. Table 4.9 show the expanded responses to the TSES. Table 4.10 shows the collapsed responses to the TSES.

Table 4.9*Middle School: Expanded Responses to Classroom Management Subscale of the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES)*

Survey Item	Years Teaching	Nothing	Very Little	Some Influence	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal
1. How much could you control disruptive behavior in the classroom	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 0)	21.7 (n = 5)	13.0 (n = 3)	43.4 (n = 10)	21.7 (n = 5)
	2 nd Year	0.0 (n = 0)	8.7 (n = 2)	13.0 (n = 3)	43.4 (n = 10)	4.8 (n = 8)
2. To what extent did you make expectations clear about student behavior?	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 0)	8.6 (n = 2)	8.7 (n = 2)	30.4 (n = 7)	52.1 (n = 12)
	2 nd Year	0.0 (n = 0)	4.3 (n = 1)	0.0 (n = 0)	30.4 (n = 7)	65.2 (n = 15)
3. How well did you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 0)	8.7 (n = 2)	13.0 (n = 3)	43.4 (n = 10)	34.7 (n = 8)
	2 nd Year	0.0 (n = 0)	4.3 (n = 1)	0.0 (n = 0)	39.1 (n = 9)	56.5 (n = 13)
4. How much could you get the children to follow classroom rules?	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 0)	21.7 (n = 5)	21.7 (n = 5)	39.1 (n = 9)	17.3 (n = 4)
	2 nd Year	0.0 (n = 0)	8.7 (n = 2)	4.3 (n = 1)	47.8 (n = 11)	39.1 (n = 9)
5. How much could you calm a student who was disruptive or noisy?	1 st Year	4.3 (n = 1)	13.0 (n = 3)	21.7 (n = 5)	52.1 (n = 12)	8.6 (n = 2)
	2 nd Year	0.0 (n = 0)	8.7 (n = 2)	17.3 (n = 4)	43.4 (n = 10)	30.4 (n = 7)

6. How well could you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 0)	8.7 (n = 2)	30.4 (n = 7)	34.7 (n = 8)	26.0 (n = 6)
	2 nd Year	0.0 (n = 0)	4.3 (n = 1)	4.3 (n = 1)	26.0 (n = 6)	65.2 (n = 15)
7. How well could you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 0)	17.3 (n = 4)	8.6 (n = 2)	47.8 (n = 11)	26.0 (n = 6)
	2 nd Year	0.0 (n = 0)	8.7 (n = 2)	26.0 (n = 6)	34.7 (n = 8)	30.4 (n = 7)
8. How well did you respond to defiant students?	1 st Year	4.3 (n = 1)	0.0 (n = 0)	17.4 (n = 4)	56.5 (n = 13)	21.7 (n = 5)
	2 nd Year	4.3 (n = 1)	4.3 (n = 1)	21.7 (n = 5)	34.7 (n = 8)	34.7 (n = 8)

Table 4.10

Middle School: Collapsed Responses to the Classroom Management Subscale of the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES)

Survey Item	Years Teaching	Very Little/Some Influence	Quite a Bit/A Great Deal
1. How much could you control disruptive behavior in the classroom	1 st Year	34.7 (n = 8)	65.1 (n = 15)
	2 nd Year	21.7 (n = 5)	78.3 (n = 18)
2. To what extent did you make expectations clear about student behavior?	1 st Year	17.4 (n = 4)	82.5 (n = 19)
	2 nd Year	4.3 (n = 1)	95.6 (n = 22)
3. How well did you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	1 st Year	21.7 (n = 5)	78.3 (n = 18)
	2 nd Year	4.3 (n = 1)	95.6 (n = 22)
4. How much could you get the children to follow classroom rules?	1 st Year	43.4 (n = 10)	56.6 (n = 13)
	2 nd Year	13.0 (n = 3)	86.9 (n = 20)
5. How much could you calm a student who was disruptive or noisy?	1 st Year	34.7 (n = 8)	60.7 (n = 14)
	2 nd Year	26.0 (n = 6)	74.0 (n = 17)

6. How well could you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	1 st Year	39.1 (n = 9)	60.7 (n = 14)
	2 nd Year	8.6 (n = 2)	91.2 (n = 21)
7. How well could you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?	1 st Year	26.0 (n = 6)	74.0 (n = 17)
	2 nd Year	34.7 (n = 8)	65.1 (n = 15)
8. How well did you respond to defiant students?	1 st Year	17.4 (n = 4)	78.2 (n = 18)
	2 nd Year	26.0 (n = 6)	69.4 (n = 16)

Regarding high school teachers, the results of the paired sample t-test indicated there was not a statistically significant mean difference in the CMSE of beginning elementary teachers who taught their first year virtually and their second year fully in-person, $t(28) = -.549$, $p = 0.294$. On average, high school teachers who taught their first-year virtually ($M = 7.00$) had a similar CMSE during their second-year teaching ($M = 7.17$). Table 4.11 shows the results of the paired sample t-test.

Table 4.11

Paired t-test: High School Classroom Management Self-Efficacy

Year Taught	N	M	SD	t-value	df	p-value
1 st Year	28	7.00	1.43	-.549	27	.294
2 nd Year	28	7.17	1.20			

*Statistically significant ($p < .05$)

High school teachers' CMSE appeared to be stronger in the first year than the elementary and middle school teachers. For instance, high school teachers in their first year indicated high CMSE in making expectations clear (96.4%). This could explain where there was not a significant mean difference in the CMSE of high school teachers from their first-year teaching virtually to their second-year teaching in-person. Table 4.12 shows the expanded responses to the TSES. Table 4.13 shows the collapsed responses to the TSES.

Table 4.12*High School: Expanded Responses to Classroom Management Subscale of the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES)*

Survey Item	Years Teaching	Nothing	Very Little	Some Influence	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal
1. How much could you control disruptive behavior in the classroom	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 0)	10.7 (n = 3)	14.3 (n = 4)	28.6 (n = 8)	46.5 (n = 13)
	2 nd Year	0.0 (n = 0)	3.6 (n = 1)	7.1 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 14)	39.3 (n = 11)
2. To what extent did you make expectations clear about student behavior?	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	3.6 (n = 1)	21.4 (n = 6)	75.0 (n = 21)
	2 nd Year	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	39.3 (n = 11)	60.8 (n = 17)
3. How well did you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	21.4 (n = 6)	46.5 (n = 13)	32.1 (n = 9)
	2 nd Year	0.0 (n = 0)	3.6 (n = 1)	0.0 (n = 0)	50.0 (n = 14)	46.5 (n = 13)
4. How much could you get the children to follow classroom rules?	1 st Year	3.6 (n = 1)	3.6 (n = 1)	7.1 (n = 2)	53.6 (n = 15)	32.1 (n = 9)
	2 nd Year	0.0 (n = 0)	7.1 (n = 2)	7.1 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 14)	35.7 (n = 10)
5. How much could you calm a student who was disruptive or noisy?	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 0)	10.7 (n = 3)	14.3 (n = 4)	28.6 (n = 8)	46.5 (n = 13)
	2 nd Year	0.0 (n = 0)	3.6 (n = 1)	14.3 (n = 4)	50.0 (n = 14)	32.1 (n = 9)

6. How well could you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)	14.3 (n = 4)	35.7 (n = 10)	50.0 (n = 14)
	2 nd Year	0.0 (n = 0)	3.6 (n = 1)	7.1 (n = 2)	35.7 (n = 10)	53.6 (n = 15)
7. How well could you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?	1 st Year	0.0 (n = 0)	7.1 (n = 2)	10.7 (n = 3)	42.9 (n = 12)	39.3 (n = 11)
	2 nd Year	0.0 (n = 0)	7.1 (n = 2)	14.3 (n = 4)	42.9 (n = 12)	35.7 (n = 10)
8. How well did you respond to defiant students?	1 st Year	3.6 (n = 1)	3.6 (n = 1)	10.7 (n = 3)	39.3 (n = 11)	42.9 (n = 12)
	2 nd Year	0.0 (n = 0)	10.7 (n = 3)	0.0 (n = 0)	39.3 (n = 11)	50.0 (n = 14)

Table 4.13

High School: Collapsed Responses to the Classroom Management Subscale of the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (TSES)

Survey Item	Years Teaching	Very Little/Some Influence	Quite a Bit/A Great Deal
1. How much could you control disruptive behavior in the classroom	1 st Year	25.0 (n = 7)	65.1 (n = 15)
	2 nd Year	20.7 (n = 3)	89.3 (n = 25)
2. To what extent did you make expectations clear about student behavior?	1 st Year	3.6 (n = 1)	96.4 (n = 27)
	2 nd Year	0.0 (n = 0)	100.0 (n = 28)
3. How well did you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	1 st Year	21.4 (n = 6)	78.6 (n = 21)
	2 nd Year	3.6 (n = 1)	96.4 (n = 27)
4. How much could you get the children to follow classroom rules?	1 st Year	10.7 (n = 3)	85.7 (n = 24)
	2 nd Year	14.2 (n = 4)	85.7 (n = 24)
5. How much could you calm a student who was disruptive or noisy?	1 st Year	25.0 (n = 7)	75.0 (n = 21)
	2 nd Year	17.9 (n = 5)	82.1 (n = 23)

6. How well could you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	1 st Year	14.3 (n = 4)	85.7 (n = 24)
	2 nd Year	10.7 (n = 3)	89.3 (n = 25)
7. How well could you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?	1 st Year	17.8 (n = 5)	82.2 (n = 23)
	2 nd Year	21.4 (n = 6)	78.6 (n = 22)
8. How well did you respond to defiant students?	1 st Year	14.3 (n = 4)	82.2 (n = 23)
	2 nd Year	10.7 (n = 3)	89.3 (n = 25)

Research Question Two

Research question two, *To what extent did transitioning from teaching virtually the first year to in-person the second year influence teacher burnout?*, was measured using frequencies and percentages to examine the influence on teacher burnout due to the transition from virtual to fully in-person teaching. Participants were asked to complete *The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory*. Questions one through three were answered on a five-point Likert scale (1= *To a Very High Degree*, 2= *To a High Degree*, 3= *Somewhat*, 4= *To a Low Degree*, 5= *To a Very Low Degree*). Questions four through seven were answered using a five-point Likert scale (1= *Always*, 2= *Often*, 3= *Sometimes*, 4= *Seldom*, 5= *Never/Almost Never*). Question seven's answer choices were reversed. Scores were then calculated and responses were categorized into (low, moderate, high, and severe) levels of burnout.

The descriptive analysis (frequencies and percentages) of the CBI indicated that teachers transitioning from virtual to fully in-person learning are feeling burned out on some level. Only 16.9% (n = 15) of teachers' CBI scores were at the "low" level of burnout. However, 43.8% (n = 39) scored as "moderate", 32.6% (n = 30) teachers scored "high" in burnout, and 6.7% (n = 6) scored as "severe" levels of burnout on the CBI. The analysis further indicated that high school teachers (25.0%) felt "low" burnout in comparison to middle school (17.4%) and elementary (10.5%) teachers, while middle school teachers reported the largest percentage (13.1%) of those feeling "severe" burnout. Table 4.14 shows the frequencies and percentages of scores on the CBI.

Table 4.14*Frequencies and Percentages on the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory*

Grade Level	Number of Teachers	Severe	High	Moderate	Low
Elementary School	38	7.9 (n = 3)	34.2 (n = 13)	47.4 (n = 18)	10.5 (n = 4)
Middle School	23	13.1 (n = 3)	30.4 (n = 7)	39.1 (n = 9)	17.4 (n = 4)
High School	28	0.0 (n = 0)	32.1 (n = 9)	42.9 (n = 12)	25.0 (n = 7)
Total	89	6.7 (n = 6)	32.6 (n = 29)	43.8 (n = 39)	16.9 (n = 15)

The teachers indicated high levels of work-related stress in their answers to the CBI. For instance, 52.8% indicated they feel worn out at the end of the day. Additionally, 9.0% answered that they *never/almost never* feel burned out because of work. Most teachers (76.4%) stated to a *very high/high degree* they felt worn out at the end of the work day. Additionally, 66.3% felt, to a *very high/high degree*, exhausted at the thought of going to work, however fewer (47.2%) felt to a *very high/high degree* that every waking hour is tiring. Most teachers (78.6%) *always/often* believe they had enough energy for leisure activities, while 52.8% *always/often* found work emotionally exhausting. Also, 40.5% of teachers *always/often* believe that work is frustrating. Lastly, 45.5% of teachers *always/often* feel burnt out because of work.

High school teachers indicated lower levels of work-related stress than the elementary and middle school teachers in their answers to the CBI. For instance, 53.9% of high school teachers indicated *very high/high* that they are exhausted in the morning at

the thought of work compared to 69.6% (middle school) and 72.6% (elementary). Additionally, high school teachers (28.6%) have more energy for their family and friends than middle school (17.4%) and elementary (7.9%) teachers. Tables 4.15 and 4.16 show the expanded responses to questions one through three and four through seven respectively. Tables 4.17 and 4.18 show the collapsed responses to questions one through three and four through six of the CBI.

Table 4.15*Expanded Responses to the Work-Related Subscale of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (Q1-3)*

Survey Item	Grade Level	To a Very High Degree	To a High Degree	Somewhat	To a Low Degree	To a Very Low Degree
1. Do you ever feel worn out at the end of the working day?	Elementary School	55.3 (n = 21)	23.7 (n = 9)	13.2 (n = 5)	5.3 (n = 2)	2.6 (n = 1)
	Middle School	52.2 (n = 12)	30.4 (n = 7)	13.0 (n = 3)	0.0 (n = 0)	4.3 (n = 1)
	High School	50.0 (n = 14)	17.9 (n = 5)	17.9 (n = 5)	3.6 (n = 1)	10.7 (n = 3)
	Total	52.8 (n = 47)	23.6 (n = 21)	14.6 (n = 13)	3.4 (n = 3)	5.6 (n = 5)
2. Are you exhausted in the morning at the thought of another day at work?	Elementary School	47.4 (n = 18)	26.3 (n = 10)	13.2 (n = 5)	5.3 (n = 2)	7.9 (n = 3)
	Middle School	43.5 (n = 10)	26.1 (n = 6)	21.7 (n = 5)	4.3 (n = 1)	4.3 (n = 1)
	High School	32.1 (n = 9)	21.4 (n = 6)	21.4 (n = 6)	14.3 (n = 4)	10.7 (n = 3)
	Total	41.6 (n = 37)	24.7 (n = 22)	18.0 (n = 16)	7.9 (n = 7)	7.9 (n = 7)

3. Do you feel that every waking hour is tiring for you?	Elementary School	31.6 (n = 12)	21.1 (n = 8)	28.9 (n = 11)	13.2 (n = 5)	5.3 (n = 2)
	Middle School	30.4 (n = 7)	21.7 (n = 5)	34.8 (n = 8)	8.7 (n = 2)	4.3 (n = 1)
	High School	25.0 (n = 7)	14.3 (n = 4)	32.1 (n = 9)	17.9 (n = 5)	10.7 (n = 3)
	Total	29.2 (n = 26)	18.0 (n = 16)	32.6 (n = 29)	13.5 (n = 12)	6.7 (n = 6)

Table 4.16*Expanded Responses to the Work-Related Subscale of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (Q4-7)*

Survey Item	Grade Level	Always	Often	Seldom	Sometimes	Never/Almost Never
4. Do you have enough energy for family and friends during leisure time?	Elementary School	57.9 (n = 22)	28.9 (n = 11)	5.3 (n = 2)	2.6 (n = 1)	5.3 (n = 2)
	Middle School	47.8 (n = 11)	34.8 (n = 8)	17.4 (n = 4)	0.0 (n = 0)	0.0 (n = 0)
	High School	35.7 (n = 10)	28.6 (n = 8)	17.9 (n = 5)	10.7 (n = 3)	7.1 (n = 2)
	Total	48.3 (n = 43)	30.3 (n = 27)	12.4 (n = 11)	4.5 (n = 4)	4.5 (n = 4)
5. Is your work emotionally exhausting?	Elementary School	34.2 (n = 13)	21.1 (n = 8)	23.7 (n = 9)	15.8 (n = 6)	5.3 (n = 2)
	Middle School	26.1 (n = 6)	30.4 (n = 7)	21.7 (n = 5)	13.0 (n = 3)	8.7 (n = 2)
	High School	25.0 (n = 7)	21.4 (n = 6)	21.4 (n = 6)	21.4 (n = 6)	10.7 (n = 3)
	Total	29.2 (n = 26)	23.6 (n = 21)	22.5 (n = 20)	16.9 (n = 15)	7.9 (n = 7)

6. Does your work frustrate you?	Elementary School	34.2 (n = 13)	13.2 (n = 5)	28.9 (n = 11)	13.2 (n = 5)	10.5 (n = 4)
	Middle School	17.4 (n = 4)	30.4 (n = 7)	26.1 (n = 6)	21.7 (n = 5)	4.3 (n = 1)
	High School	10.7 (n = 3)	17.9 (n = 5)	17.9 (n = 5)	32.1 (n = 9)	21.4 (n = 6)
	Total	22.5 (n = 20)	18.0 (n = 16)	25.8 (n = 23)	21.3 (n = 19)	12.4 (n = 11)
7. Do you feel burnt out because of your work?	Elementary School	21.1 (n = 8)	23.7 (n = 9)	28.9 (n = 11)	15.8 (n = 6)	10.5 (n = 4)
	Middle School	17.4 (n = 4)	26.1 (n = 6)	34.8 (n = 8)	8.7 (n = 2)	13.0 (n = 3)
	High School	10.7 (n = 3)	35.7 (n = 10)	25.0 (n = 7)	25.0 (n = 7)	3.6 (n = 1)r
	Total	16.9 (n = 15)	28.1 (n = 25)	29.2 (n = 26)	16.9 (n = 15)	9.0 (n = 8)

Table 4.17*Collapsed Responses to the Work-Related Subscale of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (Q1-3)*

Survey Item		To a Very High Degree/To a High Degree	Somewhat/To a Low degree
1. Do you ever feel worn out at the end of the working day?	Elementary School	77.0 (n = 30)	18.5 (n = 7)
	Middle School	72.6 (n = 19)	13.0 (n = 3)
	High School	67.9 (n = 19)	21.5 (n = 6)
	Total	76.4 (n = 68)	18.0 (n = 16)
2. Are you exhausted in the morning at the thought of another day at work?	Elementary School	73.7 (n = 28)	18.5 (n = 7)
	Middle School	69.6 (n = 16)	26.0 (n = 6)
	High School	53.5 (n = 15)	35.7 (n = 10)
	Total	66.3 (n = 59)	25.9 (n = 23)

3. Do you feel that every waking hour is tiring for you?	Elementary School	52.7 (n = 20)	42.1 (n = 16)
	Middle School	52.1 (n = 12)	43.5 (n = 10)
	High School	39.3 (n = 11)	50.0 (n = 14)
	Total	47.2 (n = 42)	46.1 (n = 41)

Table 4.18*Collapsed Responses to the Work-Related Subscale of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (Q4-6)*

Survey Item		Always/Often	Sometimes/Seldom
4. Do you have enough energy for family and friends during leisure time?	Elementary School	86.8 (n = 33)	7.9 (n = 3)
	Middle School	82.6 (n = 19)	17.4 (n = 4)
	High School	64.3 (n = 18)	28.6 (n = 8)
	Total	78.6 (n = 70)	16.9 (n = 15)
5. Is your work emotionally exhausting?	Elementary School	55.3 (n = 21)	39.5 (n = 15)
	Middle School	56.5 (n = 13)	34.7 (n = 8)
	High School	46.4 (n = 13)	44.8 (n = 12)
	Total	52.8 (n = 47)	39.4 (n = 35)

6. Does your work frustrate you?	Elementary School	47.4 (n = 18)	42.1 (n = 16)
	Middle School	47.8 (n = 11)	47.8 (n = 11)
	High School	26.6 (n = 8)	50.0 (n = 14)
	Total	40.5 (n = 36)	47.1 (n = 42)
7. Do you feel burnt out because of your work?	Elementary School	44.9 (n = 17)	44.9 (n = 17)
	Middle School	43.8 (n = 10)	43.8 (n = 10)
	High School	46.4 (n = 13)	50.0 (n = 14)
	Total	45.0 (n = 40)	46.1 (n = 41)

Research Question Three

Research question three, *How does the assigned mode of instruction affect beginning teachers' classroom management self-efficacy?*, was answered by conducting an inductive coding process. To gain an in-depth understanding of how mode of instruction affects beginning teacher CMSE, nine teachers (three elementary, three middle school, three high school) were interviewed regarding their perceptions on the issue. Two themes emerged based on a review of the literature and the responses to interview items: (a) *teacher training and preparation*, (b) *classroom management self-efficacy and the COVID-19 Pandemic*, and (c) *overall experience in the classroom*. From the identified themes, subthemes emerged. These themes and the subsequent subthemes for each of the identified groups of teachers are explained in depth below.

Teacher Training and Preparation.

The responses to the questions pertaining to CMSE developed into the first major theme, *teacher training and preparation*. Due to the unknowns that the COVID-19 Pandemic created in education, it was hard for new teachers, traditionally trained or ACP trained, to be prepared for what they would experience in a virtual environment. Mentors were experiencing these new challenges for the first time alongside their mentees. Knowing how beginning teachers were prepared for their roles in a virtual environment and the transition back to fully in-person was critical to understanding how their mode of instruction affected their CMSE. This theme was broken down into three subthemes: (a) teacher preparation program and (b) mentoring and support. These subthemes are described in detail below.

Teacher Preparation Program

The interviews with the nine teachers revealed a variety of experiences in how they were prepared to be new teachers. Five teachers were trained in a traditional

university-based program complete with student teaching, and four were trained through an ACP. Of the nine teachers interviewed, Luis, Maria, Skye, Megan, and Mark attended a traditional university-based certification program. Jane, Tom, Tina, and Lauren were certified through an alternative certification program. Each of these experiences had an impact on how prepared these teachers felt when beginning their teaching career in a virtual environment. Seven of the teachers interviewed expressed a lack of preparation in the area of classroom management. For instance, Lauren commented, “I did do an ACP program that taught me briefly about classroom management and point system, reward system, so on.” Lauren made it clear that the training she received through her ACP was not enough to prepare her for a first-year in a virtual environment. She stated, “There was no classroom management, basically, and being a first-year teacher, I had absolutely no experience in a school.” Similarly, Skye stated, “I got six weeks student teaching in before it just stopped.” Following the shutdown, when she became a first-year teacher, her experiences were drastically different than what she had seen in those six weeks of student teaching when all students were physically on campus.

However, Mark was satisfied with how his student teaching experience prepared him. He stated, “because my internship is what really set me up. Uh, because I was with a guy that was a lot like me and he really showed me how to do it.” These comments were in contrast to how most of the teachers indicated they were prepared for their first-year teaching, but they corroborated the idea that an effective teacher preparation program is important to a teachers’ CMSE. Tom stated on multiple occasions that his CMSE was low, for example stating, “I just feel like my classroom is a lot louder than it should be and there's just a lot more chaos than there should be.” However, he did not attribute his challenges to a lack of preparation, even commenting, “I guess I come from kind of a high stress background, so it doesn't bother me much.” This comment seemed to indicate

that Tom considered his life experience prior to his ACP as part of his preparation to feel secure in the classroom.

Luis was perhaps the most well-prepared teacher beginning his career, having attended a university-based program that allowed him an entire year of student teaching. He explained, “I was a fifth year. I was in a middle school classroom for six months every day.” According to Luis this was helpful, but he still did not feel confident in his CMSE as a first-year teacher in a virtual environment, he stated, “I kind of have had a set idea about my classroom management, but at the very end of it, I’ll be honest, it was not that amazing.” This comment indicated that being prepared to succeed in one way, like in-person teaching, did not necessarily translate into success in a virtual environment.

The comments shared by the teachers illustrated how teachers feel about the importance of teacher preparation in relation to CMSE. Teachers believe that adequate preparation will make them ready for what they face in the classroom and inadequate preparation will leave them feeling lost. The success of a first-year teacher is contingent on the model and depth of the preparation they receive.

Mentoring and Support

The second subtheme of teacher preparation is the mentoring and support they receive in their first teaching assignment. The teachers shared their experiences with mentors and with other supports offered by their campuses. Mark recognized the value of a good mentor, whether official or unofficial, to his CMSE development. He said, “You know Jones and Johnson are phenomenal and one day I hope to be them.” While he did not mention that either of these two teachers were actually school assigned mentors, it was obvious that he had been impacted by their guidance. Maria had a similar experience with the support offered to her during her first-year teaching:

My mentor teacher like or not my mentor teacher, but my instructional coach would come in during like my really bad class periods and I was kind of watching her as like I would teach and see how she was managing them. And so, I had to like kind of copy that and be super, super proactive and like how she managed so like. I would teach and then as soon as I was done, I would like walk up and down the rows and phones away. No, keep working and just like the entire class period. Just like on them.

In contrast Lauren stated:

That was something I struggled with like I needed to do something and I couldn't do it because I didn't know how to do it, I didn't know who to ask. That was something that I also struggled with as a first-year teacher. I was assigned a mentor, someone to guide me, but those mentors don't do well in my experience, didn't really help out or didn't make the time...or didn't know.

Lauren's experiences differed with Mark and Maria, further illustrating the importance of on-campus support for beginning teachers. Jane somewhat agreed, commenting:

I feel like if I had a mentor to come in and be like, OK, I know you were trying to get them to do X, But this is actually what was coming across, that...that didn't carry...that didn't come across, and so a lot of that has to do with not having...um, outside perspective and then a lot of it mostly is just not having anything to compare it to because I'm just getting used to it.

Tina discussed support from a campus finance perspective, stating:

like it would be nice if we got more like resources from like, for example, I'm kindergarten and so we did our graduation last night for the kindergarteners. Look, we all have to go out and we all had to buy all the supplies.

She added, “I just kind of wish we got more resources or some kind of like, um, budget from the district to help us with that kind of stuff.” Tina’s comments seemed to indicate that teachers view support from multiple lenses.

The comments provided above seemed to indicate that mentoring and campus support is a critical component of a first-year teachers’ experience and CMSE. Both the positive and negative experiences described above reinforce the idea that new teachers need the support of experienced and willing individuals to grow as teachers. Five or nine teachers offered specific comments on mentoring and support. These teachers’ comments, both positive and negative, demonstrate that the level of a teachers’ CMSE is influenced by the level of support he or she is offered.

Classroom Management Self-Efficacy and the COVID-19 Pandemic

The second major theme, *classroom management self-efficacy and the COVID-19 Pandemic* is important to understanding how CMSE was affected by teachers’ assigned mode of instruction. Each of the teachers interviewed taught virtually as first-year teachers and transitioned to fully in-person as second-year teachers. These teachers offer a unique perspective as the effects of learning to teach in one mode of instruction before immediately transitioning to another. This theme was broken down into two subthemes: (a) CMSE in a virtual environment and (b) CMSE following the return to a fully in-person environment. The subthemes are explained in-depth below.

CMSE in Virtual Teaching

Managing a classroom in a virtual environment is a new idea to the teaching profession. Many factors impact the level of success a teacher may or may not have in this area. Mark said:

There's always those classes that have the kids that we all know. That there's no managing, right. They're just gonna be a distraction, but, as far as all my other classes for the most part. I did the same thing every day.

Skye said, "So, like the classroom environment in general, had a lot less structure just because we didn't need it." Megan described trying to manage a classroom:

In person was a lot easier for me I think than what we saw in virtual because a lot of these kids, you know, the parents were just kind of sitting at the computer and being like, OK and look. And, the kids like in bed with blankets on, and so...

Tina also discussed the importance of parents in this environment because of the lack of an ability to control the classroom environment on her part:

I did feel like unless the parents were very disciplined and they were like, 'you pay attention in class', it really depended a lot more on the parents than on me. If the parents didn't care, there wasn't really a whole lot I could do to reach them.

These comments show that while these teachers did not feel as though they were control of their classroom, they also did not see it as a problem because it was not a reflection on them.

However, Tina did expand and state how there were options available in a virtual environment that could boost her CMSE that are not available in an in-person environment, such as:

But last year, a kid interrupting the class...mute them, kick them out of the meeting, and now you don't have an issue anymore, and you can get back to teaching.

Luis simply stated the students "had to control their own learning, and that was the hard part." Luis even described virtual learning as, "Actually. I had never felt so. It was it was a blessing for me because as a brand-new teacher, it felt like, um... it was like

a grace period.” This comment demonstrates further that the teachers did not consider CMSE to be of influence as first-year teachers. Jane didn’t feel that classroom management was even a factor in her first year, saying:

Um, as far as classroom management goes. I would say that it was pretty non-existent just because the kids that did come in were not at all like any kids that would cause any issues for me, so I never really had to exercise classroom management muscles. But online, um, that's if I had any behavioral issues which there wasn't.

Maria had the simplest view of her MSE in virtual teaching during her first year, stating, “Classroom management was pretty bad.” This comment was the closest to ownership over classroom management expressed by the teachers in their interviews.

In summary, each of the teachers did not view virtual instruction as a detriment to their CMSE. They seemed to believe that they did not have control over the virtual environment, but they also did not see that as stress inducing. They seemed to feel that it is just the way it was, some of it was good, and some of it was not as good.

CMSE Following the Return to Fully In-Person Learning

In discussing the return to fully in-person learning, each teacher shared their experiences and views about having full classes of students for the first time in their careers. Every teacher expressed how this shift in mode of instruction influenced their CMSE. Tom shared that his CMSE is low as he continues to have challenges in managing behaviors in his classroom. When talking about the noise levels in his class he said, “Sometimes that can be a good thing I think, but I don’t know. I feel like it goes over where it should be.” Mark talked about having a full class of students, but also discussed the general changes in student behaviors:

Kind of threw me off and I struggled with routine a little bit. So yeah, there was a little bit difference, but the kids were different. Or you know what I mean? It was these kids. The majority of my kids, I could say, yeah, yeah, from whisper. And they would whisper for a while or, you know, slowly get louder. You have to remind him when they come back down, it's a. It's a roller coaster.

These comments seemed to indicate that having a classroom full of students was more challenging to teachers than having students online.

As a band teacher, Skye seemed more concerned with class time rather than numbers of students. The result of this seemed to have a positive effect on her CMSE:

But honestly, given what I've experienced last year and this year and the different ways of how to do things. I think I feel pretty good about where I am as a second-year teacher.

Skye's comments seemed to indicate an understanding that classroom management is more than managing behaviors. It is also managing time and student engagement.

Most of the teachers expressed frustration with the challenges being presented by the return to fully in-person teaching. For instance, Megan commented, "I notice that coming back to a lot of the kids, maybe they haven't been in school for like two years. Their behavior is a lot more aggressive than we're used to seeing." Tina saw similar challenging behaviors, stating:

But this year, like, the kid's behavior would really cut into my time, and then I find myself not getting into everything that I wanted to get into. Um, so then I kind of get frustrated with them, and then, like, it went so much smoothly last year.

In general, the teachers recognized that there were differences in the students' behaviors with the return to fully in-person teaching, and they understood that that was a contributing factor to their CMSE as second-year teachers.

For Luis the issue is about having to engage and teach students who were not engaged in their learning for an extended amount of time. He said:

That allowed students for both from March 2020, since that was a half year since students didn't have to be with us, until this last August, August 2021, from March 2020 from Aug 2021, some students did nothing. It's a fact.

Jane's comments describe her feelings now that students have fully returned to campus:

I don't have anything to compare it to because I had not taught before and before that we were online. So now that I have a year to compare it to, I imagine next year's gonna be very different for me...But. Coming right out of it, it's not non-existent because of course now I have behavioral issues and I have classroom procedures and things like that in place...

Maria revealed the least amount of confidence with students having returned to fully in-person learning, saying:

And also, really feel like I have like a good control 'cause right now I feel like I'm able to just prevent them from being like animals in the classroom, but I don't feel like I really like kind of have them, like, fully listening type situation.

These comments indicate that teachers have had to make big adjustments to what they became used to during virtual teaching. Disengaged students meant higher CMSE as first-year teachers, but it created learning and behavior gaps that had to be addressed and actually lowered CMSE as second-year teachers. More students on campus means more behaviors to address in the classroom. The experiences missed by not teaching students physically in the classroom had a negative impact on the CMSE second-year teachers.

Overall Experience in the Classroom

Overall experience following a year of virtual and a year of fully in-person was an important theme which was established during the interviews with the teachers. Each teacher offered a different perspective on where they currently stand in the area of CMSE. Tom simply stated that his CMSE is, “Probably still pretty terrible compared to a lot of the teachers that have been around a lot that I’ve seen.” He added, “I feel like my class is louder than it should be, and there’s just a lot more chaos than there should be.” Megan simply commented that it was, “...interesting because we have a computer here with a camera.” Leading one to believe there was some uncertainty about her CMSE. Tina had an interesting take in that her CMSE was low, but dealing with specific disruptions could be easier:

I guess as a virtual teacher, it was difficult to be able to make the kids work because there’s not a whole lot you can do when they’re on the other side of a computer. But, if they were being too disruptive, I could, just like, take them out of the meeting.

Lauren was very clear that her CMSE as a first-year teacher was low, stating:

So, um, started off the year virtual, so there was no classroom management basically, and being a first-year teacher, I had no experience in a school, so I had no managerial skills in the classroom.

She added:

Um, I do remember really really struggling mentally and trying to make sure that our kids were learning in the classroom, but that really couldn’t happen because there were a lot of disruptions and again, no classroom management.

Megan has seen a lot of personal growth, stating, “I actually get rated for this. I got accomplished on my evals! I don’t know why I am able to get other peoples’ kids to

listen to me.” Tina echoed this idea of growth, saying, “It’s gotten stronger towards the end of the year than it was at the beginning of the year.” Lauren also noted a change in her CMSE, “I’m definitely more structured. I already know what’s going to happen. I mean where...what goes where, things that I want to implement in the classroom.” The responses provided by these teachers demonstrate that experience breeds confidence.

Luis described his growth and higher CMSE through the context of an increased ability to manage difficult situations, stating:

So, my classroom management would be like that and if anything were to happen that day, something happens at home. Maybe they're stressed about something. Maybe they're crying about something, have the student have a one on one me 'cause there is always time or even do a problem or something like that. Have them step outside. Just have that one on one, me personally. I think. Attitude is everything, and they see a kind of trying to understand. Then, um, they're more open to being, um... to listen to me.

Jane did not share in this level of confidence. She was still of the belief that her nature does not lend itself to being a good classroom manager, and she expressed uncertainty of how to manage her classroom in the wake of the COVID-19 Pandemic, saying:

They're literally coming back from pandemic, so I need to loosen the grip a little bit, um, because I don't have anything to compare it to because I. Had not taught before and before that we were online. So now that I have a year to compare it to, I imagine next year's gonna be very different for me...But. coming right out of it, it's not non-existent because of course now I have behavioral issues and I have classroom procedures and things like that in place, but. Within the context of the pandemic and because of my nature as a human being, it's definitely minimal. So more than last time. Still not a lot.

Maria described riding the fence between the other teachers. She felt stronger toward the beginning of her second-year, but felt herself dropping off. She described:

That's something I want to work on next year of, like trying to maintain that throughout the year. Um, and like just following up on that 'cause, I I'm noticing now like the kids are like, Oh yeah, we can do whatever. And I'm like. I'm too tired at this point to stop them. I'm not let them be crazy, but like, you know...

Mark felt almost the exact opposite, saying, "I think I'm better than some, not near as good as, say, my counterparts." Skye was more in line with Mark and expressed a higher sense of CMSE, stating, "but honestly, given what I've experienced last year and this year and the different ways of how to do things. I think I feel pretty good about where I am as a second-year teacher."

Each of the teachers seemed to be at different places with their CMSE as second-year teachers. Each described multiple factors that put them in the position they were in. Teachers could have a higher or lower CMSE based on the level or subject they taught. They could have a higher or lower CMSE based on the level of support they received.

Research Question Four

Research question four, What impact did transition from a first-year teaching assignment in a virtual model have on beginning teachers' feelings of burnout?, was answered by conducting an inductive coding process of the participant's responses to the individual interview questions. To gain an in-depth understanding of the impact of transitioning from a virtual model of instruction on beginning teachers' feelings of burnout, nine teachers (three elementary, three middle school, three high school) were interviewed regarding their perceptions on the issue. Two themes developed from a review of the literature and the responses to the interview questions: (a) stress caused by the transition from virtual to fully in-person learning and (b) desire to continue in the

teaching profession. These themes and their subsequent subthemes are explained in-depth below.

Stress Caused by the Transition from Virtual to Fully In-Person Teaching

The first major theme of burnout, *stress caused by the transition from virtual to fully in-person teaching*. The first-year teachers who taught virtually in their first-year and fully in-person in their second year was a unique group of teachers who experienced something no other group of teachers has experienced. Comprehending how this transition affected their level of work-related stress and burnout is important. This theme was broken down into two subthemes: (a) stress caused by expectations and a perceived lack of support, and (b) the impact of the grade level/content the beginning teacher taught.

Stress Caused by Expectations a Perceived Lack of Support.

Responses to questions about work-related stress revealed a range of feelings from the participants. Five of the participants felt a complete lack of support from their schools, districts, and the state of Texas. For example, Megan commented:

They came down with these reading academies. And that's just crazy. Like they'll tell you the times on the modules. We're literally here 8:00 o'clock in the morning on your computer till 4:00. O'clock in one module. I mean, it's worse than any, any college course I've taken. It's really, really bad and I think I think they're talking about doing some for the upper levels too.

These comments were in reference to the state mandated Reading Academies which Texas implemented during the 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 school years. Jane echoed these comments, stating:

Lack of context. It's just like a running theme for me this year. Sometimes things would get really bad as far as behavior goes, as far as like...how or if I felt

supported by my admin. And that lack of context had me like asking the question all the time. Is this bad? Because it really is bad? Or is this just the way it is because of the pandemic, or is this going to be the way if I stay?

Tina recognized an area where financial support from the district was lacking. She stated:

like it would be nice if we got more like resources from like, for example, I'm kindergarten and so we did our graduation last night for the kindergarteners. Look, we all have to go out and we all had to buy all the supplies.

While Megan was more concerned with the behaviors students had brought to campus and how these behaviors were being addressed by her administration, commenting, "it's kind of hard, if they cannot, if we cannot get these kids back under, I wanna say under control. I think it's gonna be very difficult for teachers." Jane indicated that it is not worth what is being asked, she said, "Or if the profession has gotten to a point where, the ends just don't justify the means anymore." While Maria said, "It's really just, there's just so much to do." This seemed to line up with her cohorts in their belief that there is more work than worth in the teaching profession.

Each of these comments seemed to support the perception that there were decisions made at the campus, district, and state levels which were strong contributors to the work-related stress that was leading to teacher burnout.

Other teachers were less pointed in their belief that they had been supported. There was work-related stress, however, it was not because what was being asked of them. For example, Tina said:

Like I said, it was kind of like this year was my first year, just because it was so different compared to last year. So, I did have to stay late a lot more than most of my colleagues who've been doing this for a lot longer.

These comments seemed to indicate that Tina felt that to meet the same expectations as her more experienced colleagues, she needed to work longer hours.

Lauren recognized that even veteran teachers were struggling at this time, stating: that was something I struggled with like I needed to do something and I couldn't do it because I didn't know how to do it I didn't know who to ask that was something that I also struggled with as a first-year teacher I was assigned a mentor someone to guide me but that those mentors don't well in my experience didn't really help out or didn't make the time...or didn't know.

These comments demonstrate that not having someone who has experienced the challenges of teaching in a pandemic available to assist new teachers was a contributing factor of work-related stress and burnout.

Whether teachers believe the stress has been caused by those in positions above them, either through action or inaction, or by the lack of people with the ability to assist, these comments illustrated that teachers were feeling that the job was causing undue stress. Work-related stress is a major contributor to the burnout that teachers are feeling following the return to fully in-person teaching.

The Impact of the grade level or Content the Beginning Teacher Taught.

The grade level/content being taught was shown to have an impact on teacher stress and burnout. For example, Megan, a fundamental skills teacher, expressed: "...coming into elementary school like because they don't know they don't know how to walk in line like these simple little things that you have to teach them." Showing her belief that having to teach elementary students basic skills adds to teacher stress. Tina stated:

Or maybe I overdid it a little bit and I kept trying to go above and beyond like I wanted my classroom to look cute. So, I go out and spend more money than I

should to dress up the classroom when I stay longer to put it together. Or like, every holiday I wanted to do cute little gift bags. And that was like time and money. And I mean, part of it was my own fault. Like, I didn't really have to do it, but I was just so excited to be able to do this finally, so...

Lauren commented:

I am still very burnt out tired from summer school and I kind of regret working summer school, it comes out every single day after summer school. I never used to do this I have to take a nap.

It is important to note that teaching Summer School is not a requirement. Lauren commented that her burnout is also somewhat “self-inflicted”, and Tina also seems to be feeling more burnout after participating in activities not required of her.

In describing how being a band director is a source of stress, Skye stated, “The past few years, I was like, considering, teaching another subject of like teaching choir instead.” This statement seemed to demonstrate that Skye attributes the stress and burnout she was feeling to her subject matter and that a solution to this problem could be changing content areas.

Luis described these feelings from the perspective of a chemistry teacher, stating, “That's been the burnout. It's taking things twice as long as they should with everything. And that's not even just regular. It's also my pre-AP.” Jane also expressed that her content is a factor in her stress and the burnout she was experiencing. She said:

My program is going to stay where it's been completely forgotten, not completing UIL, not doing any sort of competitive singing or academic singing other than just concerts, which is where my program started before me.

Jane's response suggests that choir is not considered a priority of her school or district and being expected to teach it and grow the program with a perceived lack of support has

deepened her experiences with burnout. Maria also made comments that indicate that her burnout has been affected by her content, saying:

So, I do feel like my like experiences with the burnout are a little different from like other teachers. Like I mentioned, like the algebra one teachers they're like. It's a constant struggle 'cause like I've heard, like the freshmen are crazy. Um, they gotta teach algebra one, which is like the STAAR tested. So, like, it's super like they gotta really go, go, go, go, go. Um, and you know, their content by the test, the biggest support I've seen for them, cause they seem like very very burnt out

This response suggests that Maria feels she is experiencing less burnout than her colleagues because she is teaching a less stressful content which is not stated tested and the students are not as needy. These comments seemed to corroborate those who feel the stress of their content and grade level. What teachers teach and who they teach is a contributing factor in work-related stress which is leading to teacher burnout.

Desire to Continue in the Teaching Profession

The second major theme of burnout, *a desire to continue in the teaching profession* was also an important theme of the interviews that were conducted. For example, Luis expressed frustration that he currently does not feel he will have a longer career, stating:

My goal was at least five years at least with all how benefits work. And as you know how that is, it goes and it's been disappointing to me because I can't. I don't know if I can achieve that goal. It's because of the burnout. It's because. I thought I had thicker skin, to be very honest with you, but like, I feel like. I can only handle so much patience and, um... Not disrespect, cannot call disrespect because

I've never faced it until this year, where there's certain times, of course, as a teacher, you're never gonna be fully respected.

This answer seemed to indicate that the challenges of returning to fully in-person learning has created challenges that are making it difficult to continue teaching.

Jane is also unsure about the longevity of her career. Her comments suggested that she needs more from her district to continue her career, responding:

I definitely know that if you told me I had to stay where I was. Stay in my district, stay on my campus. 'cause I I really don't think the problems that I have would change even if I switched to another school in my district because most of the problems that I have are with my district admin. If you told me that I had to stay around in that, I probably would not be here.

Jane added:

Of course, I don't do this job just for the money, but if we're just talking about money and logistical things, it is a stable, well-paying job that I love. But if those types of policy started, you know, kind of edging me out, then I'm. I'm kind of looking for the door.

These responses suggest that Jane does not believe that a love for teaching is enough to keep her in the profession, support and realistic expectations from those above her are determining factors of her stress and feelings of burnout.

Like Luis, Maria does not see herself in the high school classroom for more than five years. There difference in her comments indicate that it is not about contributing stress factors, stating:

So, I'm really thinking about like 5 to maybe 10 years and it's not really anything against like. Like the like the teaching itself, I was just mostly more interested in like maybe after like five or six years... Kind of I go back to school and doing like

higher education 'cause, that's just what I'm more interested in. See, I think about 5 to 10 years. For like secondary and then maybe going to like the college level.

This response seemed to suggest that a shorter teaching career was always the plan for Maria and that the return to fully in-person teaching did not add an unacceptable level of stress.

Two other teachers made comments which indicated that they may have a short career, but it is not because of stress or burnout. Mark was not as confident in the longevity of his career, stating, "I don't feel that I could spend 15 years in a classroom." He added, however, "You know that would put me 65 years old, and I really don't think I could do that." This response seemed to indicate that Mark was not burned out due to his experiences as a beginning teacher, rather was feeling his career would not last because of age.

Skye, however, seemed to feel stress and burnout was going to affect her longevity in education. She said:

But I think we're also in education coming to a huge tipping point and I don't who knows where it's gonna go. So as much as I would like to stay as long as I can.

You know that just might not be the culture anymore.

This response seemed to indicate that Skye did not view education as a long-term career and that it is becoming less so for more teachers. The responses provided by these teachers seemed to demonstrate that the life experiences gained by older individuals new to the teaching profession are in a better place to handle the stress that leads to teacher burnout.

Megan initially said:

Uhm, I don't intend to stay in the classroom for my whole career. I do intend to go admin. But. I think before I can even think about that program, I'd like to at least have five years of teaching under my belt.

This response seemed to indicate that while she intends to leave the classroom, she still intends on remaining in the education field. However, as the conversation continued she added, "I will say that this last. This last grading period I did, I almost took a job with, uh, Child Protective Services." This contradiction seemed to indicate that her current stresses were causing increased burnout.

Tina echoed the first comments provided by Megan. She said, "I'm really enjoying it so far. I mean, I'm actually hoping to start a master's program in the fall for educational management with a principal certification." The difference between the two was that Tina did not add comments about occasionally wanting to leave teaching.

Lauren was more on the fence than her counterparts. She responded:

So, I have two answers and it recently changed. Prior to Summer ISD's pay raise, I was like no absolutely not. I'm not gonna stay here I'm gonna do my minimum three years and then move on.

She followed this up by saying, "Before when the pay wasn't that great I was like I can't do this for long but now that I see the pay is better I would like to teach onto another at least five years". These comments seemed to show that while her burnout is high, it is not so high that increased compensation cannot make it worth it.

In summary, teachers are not looking at teaching as a long-term career choice. Most teachers seemed feel enough work-related stress and burnout that it affected their intentions to make teaching a long-term career choice. Outliers such as Mark and Tina are also planning on short careers, but not because of stress or burnout, rather because of age or the prospects of career advancement.

Conclusion

This chapter presented an analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data obtained from two survey and a series of interviews. In the next chapter a summary of the findings based on this analysis will be explained and described. Future implications and suggestions for further study will also be discussed.

CHAPTER V: SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the classroom management self-efficacy (CMSE) and burnout of second-year teachers in the 2021-2022 school year who taught virtually during their first year. Classroom management is described by Emmer and Sabornie (2015, p. 6) as developing an environment in which all students can thrive academically and socially. There is a relationship between CMSE and burnout. CMSE is one of the most critical areas in which a teacher can develop self-efficacy (El Abd & Chaaban, 2020) and the level of CMSE can be a factor in the level of work-related stress and burnout (Carol et al., 2020; Ingersoll et al., 2012; Klassen & Chui, 2010). Teacher stress and burnout are considered leading factors in overall student success (Kasalak & Dağyar, 2021; Shen et al., 2015). While there has been much research in CMSE and teacher burnout, there has been minimal research of the effects of transitioning to fully in-person learning following a teachers' first-year being taught in a virtual environment. The COVID-19 Pandemic necessitated this transition and the current research was designed to examine the impact of this change on teacher CMSE and burnout.

This study consisted of two phases of data collection. Quantitative data from 89 second-year teachers was gathered through the completion of the *Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale, Classroom Management subscale*. The data was inputted into SPSS and a paired t-test was conducted for analysis. The same 89 teachers completed the *Copenhagen Burnout Inventory, work-related burnout subscale*. This data was also inputted into SPSS, and frequencies and percentages were run to determine the influence of mode of instruction on burnout.

From these 89 teachers, nine (three elementary, three middle school, and three high school) were selected to participate in focused interviews covering both CMSE and

burnout. These interviews were transcribed and coded for qualitative analysis. Within this chapter the findings are contextualized within the larger body of research. This chapter further includes, implications for school districts and teacher preparation programs, as well as recommendations for future research.

Summary

This study was based on Bandura's (1977) theory of self-efficacy. The theory states that self-efficacy is a person's belief in his or her own ability to accomplish a task. Bandura's theory further details that an individual's self-efficacy in various areas can be higher or lower. For instance, a teacher might feel strong in curriculum knowledge, but might have a lower self-efficacy in classroom management. The current study sought to understand teachers' CMSE in relation to the fact that they taught virtually as first-year teachers before transitioning to fully in-person as second-year teachers. This study further examined if the mode of instruction and this transition was a determining factor of teachers' feelings of work-related stress and burnout.

The theoretical framework was significant to this study. Bandura's self-efficacy theory connects to the idea of CMSE of teachers in the classroom, particularly teachers who have learned to teach in one mode of instruction and then transitioned to a new mode of instruction. The teachers interviewed expressed that there were several factors included in the development of their CMSE and the burnout they may or may not be feeling. This connects to Bandura (1977), whose research found that self-efficacy is the product of numerous influences. An influence of self-efficacy, as described by Bandura, is vicarious learning, in which a person develops self-efficacy through the observation of someone who is experienced in the task. The participants in the current study expressed that teaching virtually during the COVID-19 Pandemic was new to every educator, and there were no mentors from which to learn. The current study seemed to indicate that a

lack of vicarious learning opportunities for first-year teachers during the 2020-2021 school year contributed to the lower CMSE of these teachers.

The following research questions were developed to guide this study and to help determine if there was a statistically significant mean difference in the CMSE of second-year teachers who taught a form of virtual instruction during their first year.

1. Is there a statistically significant mean difference in the classroom management self-efficacy of beginning teachers who taught their first year virtually and second year fully in-person?
2. To what extent did transitioning from teaching virtually the first year to in-person the second-year influence teacher burnout?
3. How does the assigned mode of instruction affect beginning teachers' classroom management self-efficacy?
4. What impact did transition from a first-year teaching assignment in a virtual model have on teachers' feelings of burnout?

The researcher used these questions and the instrumentation to examine the relationship between mode of instruction and CMSE and burnout among second-year teachers.

Research Question 1

Research question one focused on if there was a statistically significant mean difference in the CMSE of teachers who taught their first year virtually and their second year fully in-person. The question was answered using a paired t-test comparing the CMSE of these teachers from their first-year teaching to their second-year teaching. Beginning teachers traditionally do not have high CMSE, and many consider it to be one of their greatest struggles (Hicks, 2012; Potter, 2021; Tok & Tok, 2016) Additional factors contributing to the development of CMSE among beginning teachers includes pedagogical knowledge, gender, and the quality of their training (Ingersoll et al., 2012;

Kalin et al., 2017; Sivri & Balci, 2015; Tok & Tok, 2016) The data in the current study suggests that experience is a top contributor to a higher CMSE. While the literature maintains that there are many influences on beginning teacher CMSE, it is being in a classroom, managing behaviors and learning, which are the most influential (Giallo & Little, 2003). The data collected in the current study showed that teachers grew in their CMSE despite gaps in many of the previously mentioned contributors to CMSE. This indicates that the simple experience of working within their classroom each day was significant to their development.

Classroom Management Self-Efficacy. Previous literature was primarily focused on the CMSE of second-year teachers who went through a teacher preparation program and who had the traditional experiences of a first-year teacher (Kwok et al., 2020; Sinclair et al., 2021; Mitchell et al., 2017; Moore, 2016). The current study focused on teachers whose first year was during the COVID-19 Pandemic, and therefore, taught their first year virtually. Kwok et al. (2020) emphasized that classroom management is the most difficult pedagogical skill new teachers learn. An analysis of the data found a statistically significant mean difference in the CMSE between first and second year of teachers who taught virtually during their first year. The study showed that teachers had a higher self-efficacy following their second year than they did their first year. This is consistent with the literature which states that first-year teachers who received in-service training in classroom management strategies had higher CMSE (Kraft et al., 2020; Sinclair et al., 2021; Stevenson et al., 2020). The current study, however, did not focus on the in-service training teachers did or did not receive during their first-year teaching. The data indicated growth in teachers' CMSE despite the volatile environment and a perceived lack of traditional in-service supports and training. The increase in CMSE could be explained by the experience of having a second-year with students physically in the classroom. The

data seemed to validate the notion that experience was the reason for the increase in CMSE of second-year teachers who taught their first year virtually.

The quality of the preparation program, teacher gender, and experience in the classroom are some of the things that can influence a beginning teachers' CMSE (Ingersoll et al., 2012; Kalin et al., 2017; Sivri & Balci, 2015; Tok & Tok, 2016). An analysis of the data in the current study expands upon this. The grade level the teacher was working in at the time of transitioning from virtual to fully in-person teaching affected their CMSE as well. The data seemed to indicate that high school teachers did not show a significant mean difference or growth in their CMSE in comparison to elementary and middle school teachers. An analysis of the data appeared to establish that high school teachers had a higher average ($M = 7.00$) CMSE in their first-year than elementary ($M = 6.46$) and middle school teachers ($M = 6.20$), leaving less room for an increase in CMSE from year one to year two which could account for high school teachers not showing significant growth.

This could be explained by the ability of high school students to perform in a virtual environment in comparison to the ability of elementary and middle school students. Access to technology, ability to independently access class without parents, and social skill development are a few of the indicators of success or a lack of success for students in a virtual learning environment (Harvey et al., 2014; Scheick, 2007). When considering these indicators of success in a virtual environment, high school students appear to have the greatest capacity for success because they are less likely to need parental guidance for logging into a virtual class and they likely had years of opportunities to develop social skills prior to transitioning to virtual instruction as a result of the COVID-19 Pandemic. Teachers' CMSE at the different grade levels, when viewed in conjunction with the Indicators of success in virtual learning (Harvey et al., 2014;

Scheick, 2007) and the capacity of high school students to achieve success in virtual learning, could be explained by teachers' first-year CMSE being largely dictated by the preparedness of their students to participate in virtual learning. Conversely, elementary ($p = .001$) showed the most significant growth from year one to year two (*middle school*, $p = .022$; *high school*, $p = .294$). Elementary teachers had some of the greatest challenges with virtual teaching due to both managing student behaviors in an online environment and a reliance on parental support which may or may not have existed (Leech et al., 2022). These challenges could explain why the data shows elementary teachers gained more CMSE than their middle school and high school colleagues with the return to in-person teaching.

Middle school teachers traditionally have the greatest difficulty in managing student behaviors because of the nature of middle school students (Divoll & Ribeiro, 2021; 2022; Howell et al., 2016; Miller & Thompson, 2016; Pomykal Franz, 2016). The data from the current study supported this, as middle school teachers in the current study had the lowest average ($M = 6.96$) in comparison to elementary ($M = 7.46$) and high school ($M = 7.17$) during their second-year on the TSES.

Research Question 2

Research question two pertained to whether teaching virtually the first year influenced teacher burnout the second year. DiCarlo et al. (2019) suggested that teaching is one of the most stressful positions a person can have. Additionally, teacher stress and burnout can lead to teachers leaving the profession early in their careers (Carroll et al., 2020; Hurley, 2021; Ingersoll et al., 2012; Madigan & Kim, 2021). As the literature indicates, there were already concerns about teacher attrition as a result of work-related stress and burnout (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Ingesoll et al., 2012; 2014). The COVID-19 Pandemic necessitated a large quantity of teachers, including first-

year teachers, in the 2020-2021 school year to teach in a virtual environment (Dolighan & Owen, 2021; Kingsbury, 2020), leading to the concerns posed in this study about the potential of an increase in work-related stress and burnout with the transition back to in-person instruction. An Analysis of the data in the current study found that transitioning from teaching virtually the first year to in-person the second year did influence teacher burnout. The frequencies and percentages analysis suggested that a majority (83.%, n = 74) of the 89 teachers surveyed experienced moderate to high burnout. On the CBI, middle school teachers reported the high levels of work-related stress (13.4%) which is consistent with the literature which describes middle school teaching as possibly the most challenging due to unique student behaviors, and there is an attrition rate as high as 40% for middle school teachers by year five (Divoll & Riberiro, 2021, 2022; Klassen & Chiu, 2011). These numbers indicate that the magnitude of the impact of transitioning from virtual to in-person teaching for teachers who started their careers during the 2020-2021 school is great. It is greater than disparity in feelings of burnout between beginning teachers coming from an ACP vs. traditional preparation program (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Ingersoll et al., 2012). If anything, these numbers show that a lack of classroom experience in the first year (Ingersoll et al., 2014) coupled with fears of the COVID-19 virus (Pattison et al., 2021), increased student challenges (Chuck, 2021, August 31; Swartz, 2021, July 30), and increased demands (Davis, 2022) combined with a lack of necessary supports, have magnified the burnout problem into a problem affecting nearly all second-year teachers.

Previous literature has linked teacher work-related stress and burnout to the preparation pathway (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Ingersoll et al., 2012), the self-efficacy developed during the first-year teaching (Ingersoll et al., 2014), and teacher gender (Klassen & Chiu, 2010). The data from the current study shows that these

lines have blurred. With all teachers struggling to adjust to the challenges of this transition, it is difficult to provide beginning teachers with the necessary supports. However, an analysis of the data in the current study did reveal that a disparity in teacher burnout does exist between the grade level teachers were teaching when transitioning between their first-year virtually and their second-year in-person.

Pre-COVID-19 research suggests that that secondary teachers have traditionally experienced higher work-related stress (Chan et al. 2010; Kavita & Hassan, 2018). Factors including; time constraints, teacher-parent relationships, and student attitudes are cited as possible reasons why secondary teachers had higher levels of work-related stress (Kavita & Hassan, 2018). In contrast, the current study seemed to indicate a shift to the opposite. High school teachers taking the CBI reported lower levels of work-related stress (25%) compared to elementary (10.5%) and middle school (17.4%) teachers. Additionally, no high school teachers taking the CBI reported severe stress levels. The COVID-19 Pandemic has exposed social-emotional learning gaps for all students at all grade levels (NCES, 2022, July 6; Robinson et al., 2022). Developmentally, elementary age students are just beginning to acquire the social skills necessary for success in school (Robinson et al., 2022), and the COVID-19 kept many elementary students out of school for an extended amount of time, further challenging this development. These increased social-emotional gaps at the elementary level could be increasing demands on elementary teachers in a way that was not seen prior to the COVID-19 Pandemic explaining the shift in work-related stress for teachers at the different grade levels.

This shift could further be explained by the impact of increased administrative demands being placed on teachers at certain grade levels more than others (Davis, 2022; Pressley, 2021). For instance, in Texas, 2019 House Bill (HB) 3 implemented the Reading Academies, and all kinder-third grade teacher are required to complete these by

2023 (Texas Education Agency (TEA), 2021, March 9). It could also be explained by the challenges unique to educating middle school aged children (Divoll & Ribeiro, 2021, 2022; Emmer & Gerwels, 2006; Harrison et al., 2012; Paris, 2016; Wills et al., 2019). While high school teachers were not immune to the effects of returning to in-person teaching, and some burnout is evident, they were perhaps shielded from the larger contributors to burnout which affected their colleagues at the elementary and middle school levels.

The data in the current study seemed to indicate that the transition from teaching virtually in the first year to teaching fully in-person the second year following the COVID-19 Pandemic was a contributing factor to teacher burnout. There are concerns that there may be increased burnout among new teachers during the COVID-19 Pandemic (Pressley, 2021). The percentage of teachers in the current study (83%) support this concern. All teachers experienced the challenges brought on by students returning to in-person instruction (Chuck, 2021), but beginning teachers whose first year was during virtual instruction did not have a pre-COVID-19 reference point. Supports typically provided to first-year teachers, often through mentoring (Divoll et al., 2018; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Ingersoll et al., 2014) which traditionally curbed some burnout (Ingersoll et al., 2014) were not available to beginning teachers in virtual teaching during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Quality mentoring not only improves instruction (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011), but increases the likelihood that beginning teachers stay in the profession (Johnson et al., 2005; Divoll et al., 2018; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Sutchter et al., 2016). Not having teachers with experience in virtual teaching or transitioning to in-person (Chuck, 2021) meant fewer teachers to formally or informally mentor beginning teachers. These factors combined with increased demands faced by some beginning teachers

following the return to in-person teaching have magnified an already concerning burnout problem facing education.

Research Question 3

Research question three included an inductive coding process based on structured interviews conducted with nine teachers (three elementary, three middle school, and three high school). The responses to the interview questions were organized into two themes: teacher training and preparation, and classroom management self-efficacy and the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Teacher Training and Preparation

The teachers who participated in the interviews expressed that the preparation they received did not prepare them for what they experienced as first-year teachers. They either participated in an alternative certification program which did not include much training in classroom management, or they participated in a traditional program which was cut off early due to the COVID-19 Pandemic. They stated that this preparation did not prepare them for virtual teaching. The importance of strong teacher preparation was consistent with the literature, which says when teachers receive direct instruction in classroom management strategies they are more effective, lifting their self-efficacy (Stephenson et al., 2020). An analysis of the qualitative data in the current study demonstrated that teachers who began their career by teaching virtually and transitioned to in-person did not receive adequate preparation and mentoring. This analysis adds to the current literature, as it seems to indicate that experience gained in a classroom setting is as essential to CMSE development as training and mentoring.

According to research, mentoring and coaching is a critical for new teachers in general and specifically the development of CMSE among beginning teachers (Divoll et al., 2018; Mitchell et al., 2017). The interviewees expressed that a good mentor, or a lack

of a good mentor, could be a determining factor in their success. Mentorship can come in the form of a formal mentor assigned by the school or district, or an informal mentor, who could be either someone off-campus or just another member of the teacher's team (Divoll et al., 2018). Formal mentoring is an important part of a beginning teachers' first-year experience because the mentor is typically someone who has been around for some time and can help the beginning teacher navigate classroom management, curriculum implementation, and the additional requirements that come with being a teacher (Bullough & Draper, 2004; Divoll et al., 2018; Edwards, 1998; Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1993; Wang & Odell, 2002). Informal mentoring has an important place in the development of new teachers as well. While formal mentors have their own jobs to concern themselves with and may not always have the time to devote to their mentees, informal mentors have the potential to be invaluable (Divoll et al., 2018). These individuals may be on campus or not, and are more likely to be peers who have shared experiences (Coburn, 2001; Divoll et al., 2018), and by having these relationships, the beginning teacher has someone who can relate and in turn assist in ways a formal mentor might not be able to (Desimone et al., 2014).

The consensus was that volatile nature of virtual education during the COVID-19 Pandemic did not allow for quality formal mentorship. Veteran teachers were also learning to navigate the challenges of virtual teaching (Babcock, 2022; Kingsbury, 2020; Truzoli et al., 2020) making mentorship a challenge. The teachers who would typically be assigned as formal mentors were also teaching virtually for the first time (Kraft & Simon, 2020). They might be able to assist with tasks like grading and paperwork, but they were also learning how to manage students in a virtual environment which impacted both the time and ability they had to mentor beginning teachers. The benefits of informal mentors during the interviewees first-year were evident. The shared challenges experienced by the

veteran and beginning teachers were important to the successes of the beginning teachers during the first-year. However, the comments seemed to indicate that the support provided was more of an emotional support (Divoll et al., 2018), and not formal support in the areas of student engagement and classroom management in virtual teaching. First-year teachers need support in curriculum implementation and in creating student engagement (Bullough & Draper, 2004; Divoll et al., 2018; Edwards, 1998; Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1993; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Wang & Odell, 2002), and when beginning teachers receive strong versions of this they are more likely to be successful and remain in the teaching profession (Johnson et al., 2005; Divoll et al., 2018; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Sutchter et al., 2016). Prior to the COVID-19 Pandemic, formal mentoring had the potential to be helpful or not, depending on the quality of the mentoring received (Divoll et al., 2018). Pre-COVID-19, quality mentoring was most often determined by the willingness of the mentor the time he or she had to offer outside of his or her own duties (Divoll et al., 2018; Lee & Feng, 2007; Robinson & Robinson, 1999; Simpson et al., 2007). In the midst of the COVID-19 Pandemic, this became a larger problem, as even the most experienced teachers became novices again (Lopez, 2022, January 26). At a time when formal mentors were needed the most, willing or unwilling, they did not exist.

Self-Efficacy and the COVID-19 Pandemic

An important component of CMSE during the COVID-19 Pandemic was how teachers felt about their own abilities to manage student behaviors in a virtual environment. Pre-COVID-19 literature on virtual education in K-12 schools had focused on the flexibility that online learning can provide students who may not benefit from a traditional educational setting (Potter, 2015). Virtual education in K-12 schools within the context of the COVID-19 Pandemic created many challenges for teachers, such as a

lack of training into how to nurture students in an online classroom, and a lack of knowledge of the tools needed to be successful in a virtual environment (Almonacid-Fierro et al., 2021; Babcock, 2022; Kingsbury, 2020) or how teachers struggled with learning how to use the technology necessary to be successful with the switch to online learning (Dolighan & Owen, 2021). The current literature on virtual teaching, particularly, the literature covering the COVID-19 Pandemic has focused heavily on student engagement and the use of technology.

The current study has expanded upon this research to include teachers' CMSE in a virtual environment. The participants of the current study shared their experiences in managing student behaviors in an online environment. This is an area not covered in detail in previous research. The teachers explained that there was not the need to exercise classroom management skills. The teachers did not consider classroom management in this environment to be their responsibility. The teachers expressed that parents should bear the responsibility in managing student behaviors online. Additionally, in a traditional classroom, when a student is misbehaving on a regular basis, teachers are generally called upon to find ways to minimize these disruptions (Emmer & Sabornie, 2015). In contrast, the teachers in the current study explained they had other options which did not require specific strategies to manage student behaviors. Teachers commented that they could simply mute students or remove them from the virtual classroom if they exhibited negative online behaviors. Traditionally, classroom management skill development have been rooted in the building of student-teacher relationships (Byrk & Driscoll, 1988; Christenson & Haysy, 2004; Divoll, 2010; Kalin et al., 2017; Watson & Ecken, 2006; Wolk, 2002; Wubbels et al., 2014) and these relationships are essential to teachers maintaining control in their classrooms (Sahin, 2015). An analysis of the qualitative data highlighted a disconnect between the literature

and the participants in the study. The participants' comments indicated that they did not view relationship building to be important or even possible, and students were simply faces on a screen who were welcome to log on or not. A byproduct of distancing themselves from the responsibilities of managing the classroom was that relationships were not established between students and their teachers. The participants' comments seemed to indicate that time constraints and students not being physically present made building relationships difficult. The COVID-19 Pandemic and virtual education created new challenges for teachers in building relationships, with teachers in general expressing this is a component of their jobs that they miss (Sayman & Cornell, 2021; Sepulveda-Escobar & Morrison, 2020), and these challenges could explain the low first-year CMSE and behavior concerns expressed by the interviewees with the return to in-person teaching. The developmental needs of elementary age students (Kaufman, n.d.; Robinson et al., 2022) and the unique behavioral needs of middle school age children (Divoll & Ribeiro, 2021, 2022; Klem & Connell, 2004; Prewitt et al., 2018) highlight the importance of student-teacher relationships on students' success in elementary and middle school. In particular, as elementary age children bond with their teachers, they are more likely to achieve academically, ask questions, develop social skills, and behave in the classroom (Karasek et al., 2022; Kaufman, n.d.). Middle school students show dramatic improvements in their classroom engagement when they have a positive relationship with their teachers (Divoll & Ribeiro, 2021, 2022; Klem & Connell, 2004; Prewitt et al., 2018). Not only did first-year teachers teaching virtually during the 2020-2021 school year struggle with building relationships in the virtual environment, they may not have built the skills necessary to build relationships with the return to in-person teaching. Missing this skillset likely negatively affected student engagement and

behaviors (Divoll & Ribeiro, 2021, 2022; Karasek et al., 2022; Kaufman, n.d; Klem & Connell, 2004; Prewitt et al., 2018) leading to lower CMSE amongst these teachers.

The transition from virtual instruction to fully in-person is also scarce in the current literature. The literature that does exist in this area focuses more on the fears that teachers, students, and parents felt with coming back to fully in-person learning during a global pandemic (Pattinson et al., 2021). Chuck (2021) discussed the biggest challenges facing schools during this transition as being elementary school students being unable to sit and high school students being exhausted in the classroom. This is in contrast to the analysis of the interviews conducted for this study. The participants expressed challenges in student behaviors and academic achievement gaps requiring their attention as the biggest challenges being faced by teachers following the return to in-person teaching. There is a perception among the participants that students returned to in-person learning with more aggressive behaviors. Increased aggressive behaviors has been attributed by schools to the negative impact on socio-emotional development the Pandemic had on students (Chatelain, 2022, July 9). Teacher aggression is a growing concern in the area of classroom management, with increased instances of teachers overtly harming children psychologically (Albright et al., 2017; Divoll, 2022; Montuoro & Lewis, 2018) with the stress of teaching being a reason for the increase in aggression (Albright et al., 2017; Divoll, 2022; McCarthy et al., 2015; Ribeiro & Divoll, 2020). When considering the perceived increased behaviors described in this study in correlation with the increased teacher aggression (Albright et al., 2017; Divoll, 2022; Montuoro & Lewis, 2018) it is possible that the stresses experienced with the return to in-person teaching by the teachers in this study are impacting their perception of the student behaviors in their classrooms.

Research Question 4

Research question four was meant to understand how the mode of instruction taught in the first-year and the return to fully in-person learning affected teacher feeling of burnout. The question was analyzed through an inductive coding process of interview responses of nine teachers (three elementary, three middle school, and three high school). The responses of these nine teachers were organized into two themes: stress caused by the return to fully in-person teaching and desire to continue in the teaching profession.

Stress Caused by the Return to Fully In-Person Teaching

There is much research currently in the literature discussing work-related stress and burnout among teachers. The current research claims that much of the stress felt by teachers is the result of administrative burdens, long hours, and the wage gap between teachers and others with similar education (Di Carlo et al., 2019; Goddard et al., 2006; McCarthy, 2019). Merida-Lopez et al. (2017) expanded on this within the context of the COVID-19 Pandemic, stating that role ambiguity with teachers had added a new layer to teacher burnout. The current study is consistent with much of the current literature, however, it also expands on the existing research. An analysis of the data showed that the transition from teaching virtually to fully in-person brought additional contributors to teacher stress and burnout. Teachers described concerns such as: increased negative student behaviors and increased expectations from schools and districts as stressors leading to burnout. With the return to fully in-person they are uncertain of how to work within new experiences. Teachers, particularly middle school teachers, can react harshly to student misbehaviors (Divoll & Ribeiro, 2021, 2022; Sutton et al., 2009) which can actually lead to increased student misbehaviors (Divoll & Ribeiro, 2021, 2022; Sutton et al., 2009). This could explain the perceived increased student aggression seen in the

current study, as an almost circular effect of student misbehavior and teacher aggression continues to build upon each other.

Research on teacher stress and burnout concentrates on the effects of teacher stress and burnout on teacher enthusiasm and in turn on student achievement (Kasalak & Dağyar, 2021; Shen et al., 2015). An analysis of the data seemed to describe low student achievement as a cause of teacher burnout rather than as an effect as described in the literature. Students were not as heavily engaged in learning during the COVID-19 Pandemic (Darling-Aduana, 2022; Truzoli et al., 2020). The teachers interviewed expressed frustration with gaps presented by their students following the return to in-person learning, and shared that the extra workload required to plan and catch their students up was a leading cause of the burnout they were feeling after their second-year teaching. Increased negative student behaviors are leading to teacher aggression, which also can have an effect on student achievement (Aysan et al., 2001; Divoll, 2022; Kearney et al., 1991; Sava, 2002; Stipek & Miles, 2008). While this is a reality, the most concerning subtheme to emerge from an analysis of the data in the current study is that teachers are considering leaving the profession earlier than they originally expected. Teachers choosing to leave earlier than expected could lead to an increase in the already concerning attrition numbers expressed in the literature (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Garcia & Weiss, 2019; Ingersoll et al., 2012; 2014).

Interestingly, not all teachers interviewed claimed to feel burned out. Teachers who previously worked in other careers prior to choosing education bring life experiences which can positively affect their self-efficacy as teachers (Chambers, 2002; Divoll et al., 2018; Wagner & Imanuel-Noy, 2014). Two middle school teachers, for example, expressed little stress in their second-year teaching. One possible explanation for this difference could be the age of these teachers when they started their careers. Each of

these two teachers are middle-aged men who came to teaching following extensive careers in other fields. In particular, one of these male teachers was a career military man, and the other was a construction project manager for over 15 years. Individuals from the military or who have led others in the private sector carry skills which are easily transferrable to teaching (Chambers, 2002; Divoll et al., 2018; Wagner & Imanuel-Noy, 2014), such as maturity and self-confidence. These life experiences, particularly experiences in high stress situations, could explain why these two teachers did not express feelings of burnout in their interviews.

Desire to Continue in the Teaching Profession

There are concerns over the number of teachers leaving the teaching profession. Garcia and Weiss (2019) reported that 20% of teachers who start a career leave within the first five years. Moore (2016) places that number closer to 50%. Wherever the true number falls within this range it is concerning. The quality of Pedagogical preparation is a leading reason for teachers leaving the profession (Ingersoll et al., 2012). Teachers do not feel they have the skills to teach. Beginning teacher burnout and a lack of administrative support is also a contributing factor to teachers leaving the profession (Carver & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Madigan & Kim, 2021). The data in the current study seemed to indicate that pedagogical knowledge (Ingersoll et al., 2012) is not a primary reason why these teachers are considering a shorter career in education. The teachers expressed concerns with students' academic and behavioral gaps and increased work demands as their primary concerns rather than shortcomings in their own preparation (Ingersoll et al., 2012) to teach the content or a lack of administrative support (Carver & Darling-Hammond, 2019).

Feelings of burnout can be the result of job dissatisfaction, increased work demands, and the wage gap between teachers and those with similar education and

experience (Klassen & Chui, 2010; Hurley, 2021; McCarthy, 2019) Much of the data collected in the current study is consistent with this literature. In particular, teachers in the current study described increased expectations from their schools, school districts, and the state as contributing to their feelings of burnout. However, teachers expressed additional concerns directly related to the transition from virtual teaching to fully in-person teaching, including; perceived aggression from students, unrealistic expectations, a perceived lack of support, and students whose academic gaps are adding additional working hours to the day. There are concerns in education about the teacher attrition leading to teacher shortages (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019; Darling-Hammond, 2003; Ingersoll et al., 2012, 2014). While teacher attrition has been a concern for some time (Feng et al., 2019; Garcia & Weiss et al., 2019), beginning teachers prior to the COVID-19 Pandemic did not explicitly state they planned on leaving teaching early, with a majority expressing satisfaction in their service (Kyriacou & Stephens, 2003; Zamarro et al., 2021) In contrast, an analysis of the data showed each of the teachers interviewed expressed an expectation of a short teaching career. Teachers who attended university-based teaching programs with the intention of making teaching a career have now said they cannot see themselves continuing as teachers for even as long as five years. These teachers even went as far as stating they have actively researched alternative careers. The participants expressed that the combination of factors contributing to their burnout, i.e., (a) increased demands from schools, districts, and the state, (b) perceived increase in student aggression, (c) increased academic gaps, and (d) a perceived lack of support. The literature suggests that preparation, whether it be pre-service or at the beginning of the career, was previously helpful in alleviating beginning teacher burnout and combating teacher attrition (Easley, 2000; Hurley, 2021; Ingersoll et al., 2012, 2014) In contrast, the comments of the teachers interviewed in the current study

indicated that factors contributing to their feelings of burnout are beyond what preparation alone can address.

Implications

Classroom management is an area of concern in education with a majority of teachers expressing that they have significant behavior issues in their class (Zoromski et al., 2021). Yet, most teachers also describe having received little training in classroom management, causing a low CMSE (Stephenson et al., 2020). Additionally, teachers are feeling burned out, especially after experiencing the effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic (Herman et al., 2021). The current study established that adequate training and strong mentoring can be instrumental in the CMSE development for beginning teachers. The current study further found that feelings burnout amongst second-year teachers who taught their first-year virtually is high.

There are implications for both schools and school district as a result of this research. For schools, there is the need for high quality formal mentoring programs backed by both the school itself and the teacher preparation program (Casale & Nduagbo, 2021; Desimone et al., 2013) to assist beginning teachers in navigating the early stages of their careers, including strategies for classroom management which will assist in the development of beginning teacher CMSE (Divoll & Ribeiro, in press). For school and district administrators, it is critical that supports are put in place and expectations appropriately managed. Supports to help reduce work-related stress and burnout (Desimone et al., 2013; Divoll & Ribeiro, in press; Divoll & Ribeiro, 2021, 2022; McCarthy et al., 2015; Rebeiro & Divoll, 2020) such as time to complete expected tasks and a formal mentor who works in the same content area are examples of what schools and school districts can provide. This research found that multiple factors can increase a teachers' CMSE, such as: the preparation program the teacher participates in, the

mentoring, both formal and informal a teacher receives, the skills developed at building student-teacher relationships and support provided by schools and districts. These factors are true, whether the teacher taught virtually or in-person. The current research also found that the existence or non-existence of these same factors can help determine if a teacher experiences burnout.

Implications on Schools

Quality formal mentoring is a critical component of teacher development, with good mentoring being a factor in both teacher performance and retention (Desimone et al., 2013; Divoll & Ribeiro, 2018; Weisling & Gardiner, 2018). Formal mentoring requires training mentors in order for them to be most effective (Leshem, 2014), and the challenges described in the current study amplify the need to ensure mentors have the capacity to help grow beginning teachers. Schools need to have quality research-based formal mentoring programs put into place (Desimone et al., 2013; Divoll et al., 2018; Leshem, 2014). While Texas mandates teacher mentoring (Texas Education Agency, 2019, December 5), not all programs are created equally with formal mentors often being nothing more than names on paper so districts can remain in compliance (Divoll et al., 2018; Lee & Feng, 2007; Robinson & Robinson, 1999; Simpson, Hastings, & Hill, 2007).). Districts need to ensure the programs they develop and/or implement include dedicated training for mentors, which should encompass all aspects of how to be mentor. Additionally, if schools are expecting veteran teachers to be mentors, they need to allow for time for the mentors to both help their mentees and be exemplary in their own role as teachers (Leshem, 2014). This research demonstrated that while teachers did grow in their CMSE, there is considerable burnout being felt by teachers because they are unsure of how to best fill their role as a teacher (Di Carlo et al., 2019; Goddard et al., 2006; McCarthy, 2019). To help combat this, schools could allow for more collaborative

planning time for teachers to not only discuss the academic needs of their students, but their emotional and behavioral needs as well (Killion, 2015; Vangrieken et al., 2015). Lastly, schools can look to help teachers both learn and develop strategies in curriculum implementation and building student-teacher relationships (Divoll & Ribeiro, 2021, 2022; Ribeiro & Divoll, 2020), or mindfulness strategies like writing your own best-loved self story (Divoll & Ribeiro, in press) to limit teacher aggression (Albright et al., 2017; Divoll, 2022; Montuoro & Lewis, 2018) while making time for improving social connections and meditation (Ribeiro & Divoll, 2020).

Implications for School Districts

With the return to fully in-person learning following the COVID-19 Pandemic, it is critical for school districts to manage the expectations they put on their teachers. If it is expected that schools return to traditional education, then districts need to assist schools in providing supports to their teachers, and this should be done through supporting campus development of formal mentoring programs (Desimone et al., 2013; Divoll et al., Ribeiro, 2018; Weisling & Gardiner, 2018). Formal mentoring typically comes in the form of an experienced teacher or leader on campus who has their own job responsibilities in addition to mentoring the beginning teacher (Divoll et al., 2018; Ingersoll et al., 2012), and districts can support in assisting campuses in providing training for mentors and time for them to meet with and observe their mentees. and in providing professional learning days (Merritt, 2016) which can be used to complete the necessary administrative requirements being asked of teachers, such as the required Reading Academies (Texas Education Agency, 2021, March 8). This could help address what the participant's comments seemed to indicate; that teachers feel concerned about having to teach students while also having to implement new programs and meet district and state requirements. Appropriate guidance and committing resources to the hiring of

personnel, such as instructional coaches (Desimone & Pak, 2016) or social and emotional learning (SEL) counselors (Hecht-Weber, 2021, September), to assist all students and teachers is critical. In addition, the students are returning to the classroom with more challenges than ever before (Chuck, 2021, August 31). This research suggests that these challenges are adding stress to teachers, and this stress is leading to burnout (Di Carlo et al., 2019; Goddard et al., 2006; McCarthy, 2019). It is important for school districts to identify the root of these student challenges and to put these supports into place to address them.

Recommendations for Future Research

Findings from this study came from feedback provided through quantitative and qualitative data collection. These findings will provide data relating to both classroom management self-efficacy and burnout of second-year teachers who started their careers during the 2020-2021 school year. There are, however, recommendations for future research which could provide further data on the subject. The following recommendations are based upon the findings of this study.

This study included collecting data on second-year teachers coming out of the COVID-19 Pandemic. Therefore, the results are only applicable to teachers who have the same years-of-experience. Data collection on teachers of varying years-of-experience coming out of the COVID-19 Pandemic may produce different results. A recommendation for future research would be to examine the feeling of burnout of all teachers who taught a form of virtual during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Future research into culturally-responsive classroom management self-efficacy of teachers who taught during the return to fully in-person could be potentially beneficial in determining supports for both teachers and students. Teacher preparation programs should examine the effectiveness of current teacher preparation models in getting beginning teachers

ready to manage their classroom, whether that classroom is in-person or virtual. This training should include relationship building skills and mindfulness training for when the job becomes challenging.

This study has shown that burnout is a real concern and it is potentially leading to more attrition among beginning teachers. This study focused on the experiences of second year teachers coming back from virtual teaching to in-person teaching. A recommendation for future research should include the effect of this return on students, and if their negative behaviors are truly magnified and how this is affecting the operation of schools. Lastly, research should be conducted to determine if beginning teacher aggression is contributing to the challenges students and teachers are experiencing with the return to in-person teaching.

Conclusion

The results of this study provide new insight into the following areas: (a) how CMSE is initially developed and how it continues to develop beyond the first-year teaching, i.e. the factors which contribute to CMSE including; preparation, mentoring, and experienced gained by being in the classroom, (b) how transitioning from the virtual teaching to in-person teaching following the COVID-19 Pandemic influenced beginning teacher CMSE, and (c) how transitioning from virtual teaching to in-person teaching impacted beginning teachers' feelings of burnout. Previous understanding of how a teacher developed CMSE is still relevant, however, this study demonstrated a deeper understanding based on new conditions. Preparation programs and mentoring are insufficient when the programs and mentors are not prepared to support beginning teachers in an unstable situation, such as virtual teaching during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Formal mentoring programs were not as effective as in the past due to veteran teachers experiencing new challenges alongside beginning teachers.

The data showed that student capacity and simple experience in the classroom played the larger role in the development of CMSE among this group of teachers. However, as the analysis of the data on burnout demonstrated, this lack of external support took a toll on beginning teachers. The data demonstrated that dealing with increased work demands, perceived increased aggressive behaviors, and increased academic gaps without the necessary supports traditionally provided to beginning teachers has increased the feelings of burnout amongst these teachers. Teacher aggression and the stresses teachers are experiencing was examined as a possible contributor to the overall behaviors students are exhibiting. This study highlighted a need for increased research into the both the reasons for the challenges students are now presenting and for how schools and school districts can better support This suggests that pre-service teachers should be given opportunities to lead classroom activities and manage student behaviors as often as possible, so their CMSE can become more developed. teachers moving forward.

REFERENCES

- Albright, J. L., Safer, L. A., Sims, P. A., Tagaris, A., Glasgow, D., Sekulich, K. M., & Zaharis, M. C. (2017). What factors impact why novice middle school teachers in a large midwestern urban school district leave after their initial year of teaching. *The International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 12(1), 53–68.
- Almonacid-Fierro, A., Vargas-Vitorio, R., De Carvalho, R.S., & Fierro, M.A. (2021). Impact of teaching in times of COVID-19 Pandemic: A Qualitative Study. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*. 10(2). 432-440.
- Aloe, A.M., Amo, L.C., & Shanahan, M.E. (2014). Classroom management self-efficacy and burnout: A multivariate meta-analysis. *Educational Psychological Review*. 26. 101-126. DOI 10.1007/s10648-013-9244-0
- Babcock, A., Brodrick, M., & Lyn, A., (2022). Navigating the seismic shift in expectations: Building online teaching strategies from educators' lived experiences during COVID-19. *EdMedia + Innovate Learning 2022*. 2022(1). 784-789. Retrieved from <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/221374/>
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- Bandura, A. (2006). *Self- efficacy beliefs of adolescents*. Information Age Publishing.
- Bigham, S.G., Hively, D.E., & Toole, G.H. (2014). Principals' and cooperating teachers' expectations of teacher candidates. *Education*, 135(2), 211-229. Retrieved from <http://www.projectinnovation.com/education.html>
- Brown, D. (2012). Now that I know what I know. *Educational Leadership*. 69(8). 24-28. Retrieved from <https://web-s-ebscohost>

- com.uhcl.idm.oclc.org/ehost/detail/detail?vid=5&sid=b645b63e-693e-430a-99be35d25ee3f281%40redis&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#AN=EJ988728&db=eric
- Bowling, A., & Ball, A. (2018). Alternative certification: A solution or an alternative problem? *Journal of Agricultural Education*. 59(2). 109-122.
<https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2018.02109>
- Bowsher, A., Sparks, D., & Mulvaney Hoyer, K. (2018). Preparation and support for public school teachers: Reflections on the first year of teaching. (Report No. 143)
<https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2018143>
- Bryk, A. S., & Driscoll, M. E. (1988). *The school as a community: Theoretical foundations, contextual influences, and consequences for students and teachers*. Madison, WI: National Center on Effective Secondary Schools, University of Wisconsin.
- Bullough, R. V., Jr., & Draper, R. J. (2004). Mentoring and the emotions. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy* 30(3), 271-288.
- Camacho, D., Hoover, S., & Rosete, H. (2021). Burnout in urban teachers: The predictive role of supports and situational responses. *Psychology in the Schools*. 58(9). 1816-1831. doi:10.1002/pits.22561
- Carver-Thomas, D. & Darling-Hammond, L. (2019). The trouble with teacher turnover: How teacher attrition affects students and schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*. 27(36). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.27.3699>
- Carroll, A., Flynn, L., Sanders-O'Connor, E., Forrest, K., Bower, J., Fynes-Clinton, S., York, A., & Ziaei, M. (2020). In their words: Listening to teachers' perceptions

- about stress in the workplace and how to address it. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 49(4), 420-434.
- Casale, C. & Nduagbo, K. (2021) Mentor partnerships. *Educational Research: Theory and Practice*. 32(1). 13-17. Retrieved from <http://www.nrmera.org/educational-research-theory-practice/>
- Chambers, D. (2002). The real world and the classroom: Second-career teachers. *Teacher Renewal*. 75(4). 212-217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00098650209604935>
- Chan, A.H., Chen, K., & Chong, E.Y. (March 17-19, 2010). *Work stress of teachers from primary and secondary school in Hong Kong*. International Multiconference of Engineers and Computer Sciences, Hong Kong.
- Chatelain, R. (2022, July 9) *In survey, public schools blame pandemic for rise in behavioral problems*. Retrieved from <https://www.ny1.com/nyc/all-boroughs/education/2022/07/06/more-than-80--of-public-schools-blame-pandemic-for-rise-in-behavior-problems>
- Christenson, S. L., & Havsy, L. H. (2004). Family-school-peer relationships: Significance for social-emotional and academic learning. In J. E. Zins, R. P. Weissberg, M. C. Wang, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say?* (pp. 59-75). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Chuck, E. (2021, August 31). *For remote learners returning to classrooms, back-to-school brings a host of challenges*. NBC News. <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/remote-learners-returning-classrooms-back-school-brings-host-challenges-n1277822>
- Coburn, C. E. (2001). Collective sensemaking about reading: How teachers mediate reading policy in their professional communities. *Educational Evaluation and*

- Policy Analysis*, 23(2), 145-170.
- 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). DOI: 10.1515/dcse-2017-0016
- Craig, C. (2017). Sustaining teachers: Attending to the best-loved self in teacher education and beyond. In A. Zhu, A.L. Goodwin, H. Zhang (Eds.), *Quality of teacher education and learning: Theory and practice*. (pp. 193-205). Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-981-10-3549-4
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2003). Keeping good teachers: Why it matters and what leaders can do. *Educational Leadership*. 60(8). 6-13.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2009) Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 61(1-2). 35-47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109348024>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Chung, R., & Frelow, F. (2002). Variations in teacher preparation: How well do different pathways prepare teachers to teach? *Journal of Teacher Education*. 53(4). 286-302.
- DiCarlo, C., Meaux, A., & LaBiche, E. (2019). Exploring mindfulness for perceived teacher stress and classroom climate. *Early Childhood Education Journal*. 48. 485-496. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-019-01015-6>
- Divoll, K.A. (2010) *Creating classroom relationships that allow students to feel known*. (Publication No. 3427518) [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst] ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Divoll, K.A. (2022). Teacher aggression and classroom management. In, E.J. Sabornie & D.L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of Classroom Management*. (pp. 415-435). Routledge

- Divoll, K., Gauna, L., & Ribeiro, A. (2018). Career changers' experiences as neophyte middle school ESL teachers. In D. McDonald (Ed.), *Facing challenges and complexities in retention of novice teachers* (179-260). Information Age.
- Divoll, K.A. & Riberio, A.R. (2021). Strategies to overcome middle school teachers' classroom management stress. *Promoting Positive Learning Experiences in Middle School Education*. (pp. 217-235). IGI Global.
- Divoll, K.A. & Riberio, A.R. (2022). Strategies to overcome middle school teachers' classroom management stress. In Information Recourses Management Associates (IRMA) (Ed.). *Research anthology on instructions in student behavior and misconduct*. (pp. 822-840). IGI Global.
- Divoll, K.A. & Ribeiro, A. (in press). Exploring your past to strengthen you best-loved self. In C. Craig, D. McDonald, & G. Curtis. (Eds.), *Best-loved self: Learning and leading in teaching and teacher education* (pp. xx-xx). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Desimone, L. M., Hochberg, E. D., Porter, A. C., Polikoff, M. S., Schwartz, R., & Johnson, L.J. (2014). Formal and informal mentoring: Complementary, compensatory, or consistent? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65(2), 88-110.
- Desimone, L.M., & Pak, K. (2016). Instructional coaching as high-quality professional development. *Theory into Practice*. 56(1). 3-12.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2016.1241947>.
- Doherty, J. (2020). A systematic review of literature on teacher attrition and school related factors that affect it. *Teacher Education Advancement Network Journal*. 12(1). 75-85. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1276033>
- Dolighan, T. & Owen, M. (2021). Teacher efficacy for online teaching during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Brock Education Journal*. 30(1). 95-116.
[HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.26522/BROCKED.V30I1.851](https://doi.org/10.26522/BROCKED.V30I1.851)

- Edwards, A. (1998). Mentoring student teachers in primary schools: Assisting student teachers to become learners. *European Journal of Teacher Education*. 21(1), 47-62.
- El Abd, M. & Chaaban, Y. (2020). The role of vicarious experiences in the development of pre-service teachers' classroom management self-efficacy beliefs. *International Journal of Early Years Education*. 29(3). 282-297.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09669760.2020.1779669>
- Emmer, E. T., & Gerwels, M. C. (2006). Classroom management in middle and high school classrooms. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 407–437). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Emmer, E.T. & Sabornie, E.J. (2015). *Handbook of classroom management* (2nd Ed.). Taylor and Francis.
- Feiman-Nemser S., & Parker, M. B. (1993). Mentoring in context: A comparison of two U.S. programs for beginning teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research*. 19(8), 699-718.
- Feng, L., Hodges, T.S., Waxman, H.C., & Joshi, R.M. (2019). Discovering the impact of reading coursework and discipline-specific mentorship on first-year teachers' self-efficacy: A latent class analysis. *Annals of Dyslexia*. 69. 80-98.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11881-018-00167-1>
- Flower, S., McKenna, J.W., & Haring, C. (2017). Behavior and classroom management: Are teacher preparation programs really preparing our teachers? *Preventing School Failure*. 61(2). 163-169.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2016.1231109>
- Flores, B., Desjean-Perrotta, B., & Steinmetz, L. (2004). Teacher efficacy: A comparative

- study of university certified and alternatively certified teachers. *Action in Teacher Education*, 26(2), 37-46.
- Fox, A.G. & Peters M.L. (2013). First-year teachers: Certification program and assigned subject on their self-efficacy. *Current Issues in Education*. 16(1).
- Garcia, E. & Weiss, E. (2019). *U.S. schools struggle to hire and retain teachers: The second report in 'The Perfect Storm in the Labor Market Series*. Economic Policy Institute <https://www.epi.org/publication/u-s-schools-struggle-to-hire-and-retain-teachers-the-second-report-in-the-perfect-storm-in-the-teacher-labor-market-series/>
- Giallo, R. & Little E. (2003). Classroom behaviour problems: The relationship between preparedness, classroom experiences, and self-efficacy in graduate and student teachers. *Australian Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*. 3. 21-34.
- Gillespie, D., Meyers, L., Lachmann, M., Redd, S., & Zenilman, J. (2021). The experience of two independent schools with in-person learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of School Health*. 91. 347-355. doi: 10.1111/josh.13008
- Goddard, R., O'Brien, P., & Goddard, M. (2006). Work environment predictors of beginning teacher burnout. *British Educational Research Journal*. 32(6). 857-874.
- Hagenauer, G., Hascher, T., & Volet, S. (2015) Teacher emotions in the classroom: Associations with students' engagement, classroom discipline and the interpersonal teacher-student relationship. *European Journal of Psychology in Education*. 30(4). 385-403. doi: 10.1007/s10212-015-0250-0
- Hail, C., Hurst, B., & Camp, D. (2011). Peer debriefing: Teachers' reflective practices on professional growth. *Critical Questions in Education*. 2(2). 74-83.

- Harvey, D., Greer, D., Basham, J., & Hu, B. (2014). From the student perspective: Experiences of middle and high school students in online learning. *American Journal of Distance Education*. 28(1). 14-26.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08923647.2014.868739>
- Harrison, J. R., Vannest, K., Davis, J., & Reynolds, C. (2012). Common problem behaviors of children and adolescents in general education classrooms in the United States. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 20(1), 55–64.
doi:10.1177/1063426611421157
- Hecht-Weber, K. (2021, September). *Proactive SEL*. American School Counselor Association. <https://www.schoolcounselor.org/Newsletters/September-2021/Proactive-SEL?st=NJ>
- Herman, K.C., James, S., Reinke, W. M., & Huang, F. L. (2021) Individual and school predictors of teacher stress, coping, and wellness during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *School Psychology*. 36(6). 483-493.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000456>
- Hicks, S.D. (2012). *Self-efficacy and classroom management: A correlation study regarding the factors that influence classroom management* [Doctoral Dissertation, Liberty University] ProQuest LLC.
- Hodgman, S., Rickles, J., Carminucci, J. & Garet, M., (2021) *District approaches to instruction in 2020-21: Differences in instruction modes and instruction time across contexts*. American Institute of Research.
https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/2021-07/research-brief-covid-survey-differences-instructional-modes-june-2021_0.pdf
- Howell, P. B., Faulkner, S. A., Cook, C. M., Miller, N. C., & Thompson, N. L. (2016).

- Specialized preparation for middle level teachers: A national review of teacher preparation programs. *Research in Middle Level Education Online*, 39(1), 1–12. doi:10.1080/19404476.2015.1115322
- Hurley, D. (2021). Extinguishing teacher burnout. *BU Journal of Graduate Studies in Education* 13(2). 22-27.
- Ingersoll, R., Merrill, L., & May, H. (2012). Retaining teachers: How preparation matters. *Educational Leadership*. 69(8). 30-34. Retrieved from https://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/550
- Ingersoll, R., Merrill, L., & May, H. (2014). What are the effects of teacher education and preparation on beginning teacher attrition. *Consortium for Policy Research in Education*. Retrieved from https://repository.upenn.edu/cpre_researchreports/78
- Johnson, S.M., Berg, J.H., & Donaldson, M.L. (2005). *Who stays in teaching and why: A review of the literature on teacher retention*. Cambridge, MA. The Project on the Next Generation of Teachers, Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Kalin, J., Peklaj, C., Pečjak, S., Puklek Levpušček, M., & Valenčič Zuljan, M. (2017). Elementary and secondary school students' perceptions of teachers' classroom management competencies. *CEPS Journal*. 7(4). 37-62.
- Karasek, Q., Arsenault-Carter, T., Johnston, J., & Gauci, T. (2022, April 1). *Building elementary student-teacher relationships*. Classroom Practice in 2021. Retrieved from <https://ecampusontario.pressbooks.pub/educ5202/chapter/building-elementary-school-student-teacher-relationships/>
- Kasalak, G., & Dağyar, M. (2021). Teacher burnout and demographic variables as predictors of teachers' enthusiasm. *Participatory Educational Research*. 9(2). 280-296. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17275/per.22.40.9.2>
- Kaufman, T. (n.d.). Building positive relationships with students: What brain science

- says. *Understood*. <https://www.understood.org/en/articles/brain-science-says-4-reasons-to-build-positive-relationships-with-students>
- Kavita, K. & Hassan, N.C. (2018). Work stress among teachers: A comparison between primary and secondary school teachers. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*. 7(4). 60-66.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v7-i4/4802>
- Kingsbury, I. (2021). Online learning: How do brick and mortar schools stack up to virtual schools. *Education and Information Technologies*. 26. 6567-6588.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10450-1>
- Klassen, R.M. & Chiu, M.M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 102(3). 741-756. DOI: 10.1037/a0019237
- Klem, A.M. & Connell, J.P. (2004). Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *Journal of School Health*. 74(7). 262-273.
- Klopfer, K., Scott, K., Jenkins, J., & Ducharme, J. (2019). Effect of preservice classroom management training on attitudes and skills for teaching children with emotional and behavioral problems: A randomized control trial. *Teacher Education and Special Education*. 42(1). 49-66. doi: 10.1177/0888406417735877
- Kraft, M.A. & Simon, N.S. (2020) Teachers' experiences working from home during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Upbeat*. Downloaded July 7, 2020.
- Kraft, M.A., Simon, N.S., & Arnold Lyon, M. (2020). Sustaining a sense of success: The importance of teacher working conditions during the COVID-19 Pandemic.
<https://doi.org/10.26300/35nj-v890>
- Kritensen, T.S., Borritz, M., Villadsen, E., & Christensen, K. (2005). The Copenhagen

- Burnout Inventory: A new tool for the assessment of burnout. *Work and Stress*. 19(3). 192-207.
- 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, Retrieved from <http://www.jciuh.org/issues/vol53no1.htm>
- Kwok, A. (2019). Classroom management actions of beginning urban teachers. *Urban Education*. 54(3). 339-367. doi: 10.1177/0042085918795017
- Kwok, A., McIntush, K., & Svajda-Hardy, M. (2020). Equitable or equal classroom management? Teacher candidates' contrasting beliefs about the impact of student demographics. *Learning Environments Research*. 24. 409-422.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-020-09334-x>
- Lee, J.C. & Feng, S. (2007). Mentoring support and the professional development of beginning teachers: a Chinese perspective. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 15(3), 243-263.
- Leech, N.L., Gullett, S., Cummings, M.H., & Haug, C.A. (2022). The challenges of remote k-12 education during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Differences by grade level. *Online Learning*. 26(1). 245-267.
- Leijon, M. & Lundgren, B. (2019). Connecting physical and virtual spaces in a hyflex pedagogic model with a focus on teacher interaction. *Journal of Learning Spaces*. 8(1).1-9. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1220576>
- Leshem, S. (2014). How do teacher mentors perceive their role, does it matter? *Asia Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*. 42(3). 262-274.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2014.896870>.
- Lopez, C. (2022, January 26). Mentoring in the time of COVID. U.S. Department of Education. <https://blog.ed.gov/2022/01/mentoring-in-the-time-of-covid/>

- Madigan, D.J. & Kim, L.E. (2021). Toward an understanding of teacher attrition: A meta analysis of burnout, job satisfaction, and teachers' intentions to quit. *Teaching & Teacher Education*. 105. N. PAG. <https://doi-org.uhcl.idm.oclc.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103425>
- Mahmoe, H.M. & Pirkamali, M.A. (2013). Teacher self-efficacy and students' achievement: A theoretical overview. *The Social Sciences*. 8(2). 196-202.
Retrieved from
<http://docsdrive.com/pdfs/medwelljournals/sscience/2013/196-202.pdf>
- Malmgren, K.W., Trezek, B.J., & Paul, P.V. (2005). Models of classroom management as applied to the secondary classroom. *The Clearing House*. 79(1). 36-39.
- McCarthy, C.J. (2019). Teacher stress: Balancing demands and resources. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 101(3). 8-14. <http://dx.doi.org.uhcl.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0031721719885909>
- McCarthy, C. J., Lineback, S., & Reiser, J. (2015). Teacher stress, emotion, and classroom management. In E. T. Emmer & E. J. Sabornie (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management* (2nd ed., pp. 301–321). Taylor & Francis
- McLean, D., Eklund, K., Kilgus, S.P. & Burns M.K. (2019). Influence of teacher burnout and self-efficacy on teacher-related variance in social-emotional and behavioral screening scores. *School Psychology*. 34(5). 503-511.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spq000034>
- McKim, A.J. & Velez, J.J. (2017). Developing self-efficacy: Exploring pre-service coursework, student teaching, and professional development exercise. *Journal of Agricultural Education*. 58(1). 172-185. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2017.01172>
- Merida-Lopez, S., Estremero, N., & Rey, L. (2017). Contributions of work-related stress and emotional intelligence to teacher engagement: Additive and interactive

- effects. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 14(10). 1156-1171. doi:10.3390/ijerph14101156
- Miles, R., & Knipe, S., (2018). “I sorta felt like I was out in the middle of the ocean”: Novice teachers’ transition to the classroom. *Australian Journal of Education*. 43(6) 104-121. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n6.7>
- Miller, N. C., & Thompson, N. L. (2016). Teacher preservice preparation. In S. B. Mertens, M. M. Caskey, & N. Flowers (Eds.), *The encyclopedia of middle grades education* (2nd ed., pp. 385–387). Information Age Publishing.
- Mitchell, B., Hirn, R., & Lewis, T. (2017). Enhancing effective classroom management in schools: Structures for changing teacher behavior. *Teacher Education and Special Education*. 40(2) 140-153. doi: 10.1177/0888406417700961
- Montuoro, P., & Lewis, R. (2018). Personal responsibility and behavioral disengagement in innocent bystanders during classroom management events: The moderating effect of teacher aggressive tendencies. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 111(4), 439-445. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2017.1291486>
- Moore, A. (2016). Stepping up support for new teachers. *Educational Leadership*. 73(8). 60-64. Retrieved from <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/stepping-up-support-for-new-teachers>
- Mouza, C. (2021). Editorial: Looking back and moving forward: Technology and teacher education after COVID-19. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education* 21 (2). 227-230. Retrieved from <https://www-learntechlib.org.uhcl.idm.oclc.org/primary/j/CITE/v/21/n/2/>
- Mulvahill, E. (2018, February 12). *What is Classroom Management?* Weareteachers. <https://www.weareteachers.com/what-is-classroom-management/>
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2022, July, 9). *More than 80 percent of*

- schools report Pandemic has negatively impacted student behavior and socio-emotional development.*
- [https://nces.ed.gov/whatsnew/press_releases/07_06_2022.asp#:~:text=WASHINGTON%20\(July%206%2C%202022\),for%20Education%20Statistics%20\(NCES\)](https://nces.ed.gov/whatsnew/press_releases/07_06_2022.asp#:~:text=WASHINGTON%20(July%206%2C%202022),for%20Education%20Statistics%20(NCES))
- Oxner, R. (2021, July 30). *With school openings near, parents and teachers say state leaders have stripped them of weapons against COVID-19.* The Texas Tribune. <https://www.texastribune.org/2021/07/30/school-COVID-parents-teachers-remote/>
- Paris, N. A. (2016). Cognitive Development. In S. B. Mertens, M. M. Caskey, & N. Flowers (Eds.), *The encyclopedia of middle grades education* (2nd ed., pp. 89–92). Information Age Publishing.
- Pattinson, K., Hoke, A., Schaefer, E., Alter, J., & Sekhar, D. (2021). National survey of school employees: COVID-19, school reopening, and student wellness. *Journal of School Health*. 91(5). 376-383. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.13010>
- Pomykal Franz, D. (2016). Teachers certification. In S. B. Mertens, M. M. Caskey, & N. Flowers (Eds.), *The encyclopedia of middle grades education* (2nd ed., pp. 382–384). Information Age Publishing.
- Potter, J. (2015). Applying a hybrid model: Can it enhance student learning outcomes? *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies*. 17. 1-11
- Potter, J. (2021). Novice and experienced elementary general music teachers' classroom management self-efficacy. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*. 30(2). 65-76. doi: 10.1177/1057083720980465
- Poulou, M.S., Reddy, L. A., & Dudek, C.M. (2019). Relation of teacher self-efficacy and classroom practices: A preliminary investigation. *School Psychology International*. 40(1). 25-48. DOI: 10.1177/0143034318798045

- Prewitt, S.L., Bergin D.A., & Huang F.L. (2018). Student and teacher perceptions on student-teacher relationship quality: A middle school perspective. *School Psychology International*. 40(1). 66-87.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034318807743>
- Rashid, A.H., Shukor, N. Tasir, Z., & Si Na, K. (2021). Teachers' perceptions and readiness toward the implementation of a virtual learning environment. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*. 10(1). 209-214.
doi: 10.11591/ijere.v10i1.21014
- Ray, B.B., & Ntuli, E. (2022, April). *Teachers' experiences during the early Pandemic years: Twitter has a role to play in telling the story*. Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International (SITE) Conference 2022. San Diego, California, United States. <https://www.learntechlib-org.uhcl.idm.oclc.org/primary/p/220864/>.
- Redmon, R.J. (2007). Impact of teacher preparation upon teacher efficacy. *Online Submission* Research Educational Laboratory at Education Development Center, Inc. (2012) *The characteristics and experiences of beginning teachers in seven Northeast and Islands Region states and nationally* (No. 133).
<https://www.wested.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/1372372726resource1215-3.pdf>
- Ribeiro, A., & Divoll, K.A. (2020). Keeping your sanity: 6 strategies to promote well-being. *The Teacher Advocate*. 28(2). 14-15.
- Robinson, I., & Robinson, J. (1999). Learning to live with inconsistency in student entitlement. and partnership provision. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*. 7(3), 223-239.
- Robinson, L.E., Valido, A., Drescher, A., Woolweaver, A.B., Espelage, D.L., LoMurray,

- S., Long, A.C.J., Wright, A.A., & Daily, M.M. (2022). Teachers, stress, and the COVID-19 Pandemic: A qualitative analysis. *School Mental Health*.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-022-09533-2>
- Rodriguez, R.C., Mayo, I.C., Gago, A.R.S., & Alvarez, R.B. (2017). Initiation into teaching from the perspective of primary school teachers: Differences between newly qualified and experienced teachers. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*. 6(2). 103-111. doi: 10.7821/near.2017.7.202
- Sahin, A.E. (2015). Comprehending elementary school teachers' classroom management approaches. *International Journal of Progressive Education*. 11(3). 131-139.
- Savran, A. & Çakıroğlu, J. (2003). Differences between elementary and secondary preservice teachers' perceived efficacy beliefs and their classroom management beliefs. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*. 2(4). 15-20.
- Sayman, D. & Cornell, H. (2021). "Building the plane while trying to fly:" Exploring special education teacher narratives during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Planning and Changing*. 50(3-4). 191-207.
- Scheeler, M.C., Budin, S., & Markelz, A. (2016). The role of teacher preparation in promoting evidence-based practice in schools. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*. 14(2). 171-186. Retrieved from
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1118433.pdf>
- Scheick, A. (2007). *Visual Vistas: High school students describing their experiences in online courses*. [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Central Florida] Electronic Theses and Dissertations
- Schwan, A., Wold, C., Moon, A., Neville, A. & Outka, J. (2020). Mentor and new teacher self-perceptions regarding the effectiveness of a statewide mentoring program. *Critical Questions in Education*. 11(3). 190-207.

- Sepulveda-Escobar, P. & Morrison, A. (2020). Online teaching placement during the COVID-19 Pandemic in Chile: Challenges and opportunities. *European Journal of Teacher Education*. 43(4). 587-607.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2020.1820981>
- Shanks, R., Tonna, M.A., Krøjgaard, F., Paaske, K.A., Robson, D., & Bjerkholt, E. (2020). A comparative study of mentoring for new teachers. *Professional Development in Education*. doi: 10.1080/19415257.2020.1744684
- Shen, B., McCaughtry, N., Martin, J., Garn, A., Kulik, N., & Fahlman, M. (2015). The relationship between teacher burnout and student motivation. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. 85. 519-532. DOI:10.1111/bjep.12089
- Simpson, T., Hastings, W., & Hill, B. (2007). "I knew that she was watching me": The professional benefits of mentoring. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 13(5), 481-498.
- Simonsen, B., Freeman, J., Myers, D., Dooley, K., Maddock, E., Kern, L., & Byun, S. (2019) The effects of targeted professional development on teachers' use of empirically supported classroom management practices. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*. 1-12. doi: 10.1177/1098300719859615
- Sinclair, J., Herman, K., Reinke, W., Dong, N., & Stormont, M. (2021). Effects of a universal classroom management intervention on middle school students with or at risk of behavior problems. (2021). *Remedial and Special Education*. 42(1). 18-30.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932520926610>
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932520926610>
- Sivri, H., & Balci, E. (2015). Pre-service teachers' classroom management self-efficacy beliefs. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*. 7(4). 37-50.

- <http://dx.doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2015.04.004>
- Slover, E. & Mandernach, J. (2018). Beyond online versus face-to-face comparisons: The interaction of student age and mode of instruction on academic achievement. *Journal of Educators Online*. 15(1). Retrieved from <http://www.thejeo.com>
- Smith, T.M. & Ingersoll, R.M. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover. *American Education Research Journal*. 41(3). 681-714.
- Sokman, Y. & Kilic, D. (2019). The relationship between primary school teachers' self-efficacy, autonomy, job satisfaction, teacher engagement and burnout: A model development study. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES)*. 5(2). 709-721. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1223635.pdf>
- Stenberg, K., & Maaranen, K. (2021). A novice teachers teacher identity construction during the first year of teaching: A case study from a dialogical perspective. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*. 28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2020.100479>
- Stevenson, N., VanLone, J., & Barber, B. (2020). A commentary on the misalignment of teacher education and the need for classroom behavior management skills. *Education and Treatment of Children*. 49. 393-404. doi: 10.1007/s43494-020-00031-1
- Sutcher, L., Darling-Hammond, L., & Carver-Thomas, D. (2016). *A coming crisis in teaching? Teacher supply, demand, and shortages in the U.S.* Washington, D.C: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/A_Coming_Crisis_in_Teaching_REPORT.pdf

- Sutton, R. E., Mudrey-Camino, R., & Knight, C. C. (2009). Teachers' emotion regulation and classroom management. *Theory into Practice*, 48(2), 130–137.
doi:10.1080/00405840902776418
- Terada, Y. (February 27, 2019). *The key to effective classroom management: A three-phase process helps build strong teacher-student bonds, which can reduce disruptive behavior*. Edutopia. <https://www.edutopia.org/article/key-effective-classroom-management>
- Texas Education Agency. (2019, December 5). *New Teacher Mentoring*. Retrieved from <https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/HB3-Video-Series-New-Teacher-Mentoring.pdf>
- Texas Education Agency. (2021). *2020-2021 Texas Academic Performance Reports*. Retrieved from <https://rptsrv1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport/tapr/2020/index.html>
- Texas Education Agency. (2021). *HB 3 Reading Academies*. Retrieved from <https://tea.texas.gov/academics/early-childhood-education/reading/hb-3-reading-academies>
- Thomas, D.R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 27(2). doi: 10.1177/1098214005283748
- Tok, T.N., & Tok, S. (2016). Novice teachers' classroom management self-efficacy beliefs. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 13(3), 5595-5601.
- Truzoli, R., Pirola, V., & Conte, S. (2020). The impact of risk and protective factors on online teaching experience in high school Italian teachers during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 37, 940-952.
DOI: 10.1111/jcal.12533
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing and elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 783-805

- von der Embse, N., Ryan, S. V., Gibbs, T., & Mankin, A. (2019). Teacher stress interventions: A systematic review. *Psychology Schools*, 56, 1328-1343. DOI: 10.1002/pits.22279
- Wang, J. (2005). The Copenhagen burnout inventory: A new tool for the assessment of burnout. *Work and Stress*, 19(3), 192-207. doi: 10.1080/02678370500297720
- Wang J., & Odell, S. J. (2002). Mentored learning to teach according to standard-based reform: A critical review. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(3), 481-546.
- Watson, M., & Ecken, L. (2003). *Learning to trust: Transforming difficult elementary classrooms through developmental discipline*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Weisling, N.F. & Gardiner, W. (2018). Making mentoring work. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 99(6), 64-69. <http://dx.doi.org.uhcl.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0031721718762426>
- Wills, H. P., Caldarella, P., Mason, B. A., Lappin, A., & Anderson, D. H. (2019). Improving student behavior in middle schools: Results of a classroom management intervention. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 21(4), 213–227. doi:10.1177/1098300719857185
- Wolk, S. (2002). *Being good: Rethinking classroom management and student discipline*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Womack-Wynne, C., Dees, E., Leech, D., LaPlant, J., Brockmeier, L., & Gibson, L. (2011). Teachers' perceptions of the first-year experience and mentoring. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 6(4).
- Wubbels, T., Brekelmans, M., Den Brok, P., Wijsman, L., Mainhard, T., & Van Tartwijk, J. (2014). Teacher-student relationships and classroom management. *Handbook of classroom management*. (pp. 363-386). Routledge
- Zamarro, G., Camp, A., Fuchsman, D., & McGee, J.B. (2021, September 8) How the

pandemic has changed teachers' commitment to remaining in the classroom.
Brookings. <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2021/09/08/how-the-pandemic-has-changed-teachers-commitment-to-remaining-in-the-classroom>

Zoromski, A., Evans, S.W., Sarno Owens, J., Holdaway, A., & Royo Romero, A.S.
(2021). Middle school teachers' perceptions and use of classroom management strategies and associations with student behavior. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*. 29(4). 199-212. DOI: 10.1177/1063426620957264

APPENDIX A:

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SENSE OF EFFICACY SCALE (TSES)

Reflective: Please reflect upon your first-year teaching when answering these questions

Directions: This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities. Please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below. Your answers are confidential.

Please indicate your answer by circling/clicking:

1= Nothing

3= Very Little

5= Some Influence

7= Quite a Bit

9= A Great Deal

1. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
2. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
3. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
4. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)

5. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy? (1) (2) (3) (4)
(5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
6. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
7. How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson? (1)
(2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
8. How well can you respond to defiant students? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)

Current School Year: Please reflect upon how you feel this school year.

Directions: This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities. Please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below. Your answers are confidential.

Please indicate your answer by circling/clicking:

1= Nothing

3= Very Little

5= Some Influence

7= Quite a Bit

9= A Great Deal

9. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom? (1) (2) (3)
(4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
10. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior? (1)
(2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)

11. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
12. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
13. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
14. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
15. How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
16. How well can you respond to defiant students? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)

B. Demographic Data

17. What is your gender?

- a) Male
- b) Female

18. What is your race?

- a) African American
- b) Asian American
- c) Hispanic

d) Native American

e) White

f) Other (please write in) _____

19. Were you a teacher in this district last year (circle one)? If no, write in the name of the district in which you taught last year?

a) Yes

b) No

2020-2021 School

District:_____

20. What was your mode of instruction during the 2020-2021 school year?

a) Virtual

b) In-person

c) other (please specify)

APPENDIX B:
COPENHAGEN BURNOUT INVENTORY

Copenhagen Burnout Inventory

Directions: This inventory is designed to determine your level of work-related burnout.

Please answer according to the directions below. Your responses are confidential.

Please indicate your answer by circling/clicking for questions 1-3:

(a) To a very high degree

(b) To a high degree

(c) Somewhat

(d) To a low degree

(e) To a very low degree

1. Is your work emotionally exhausting? (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

2. Do you feel burnt out because of your work? (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

3. Does your work frustrate you? (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

Please indicate your answer by circling/clicking for questions 4-7:

(a) Always

(b) Often

(c) Sometimes

(d) Seldom

(e) Never/Almost never

4. Do you feel worn out at the end of the working day? (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

5. Are you exhausted in the morning at the thought of another day at work? (a) (b) (c) (d)

(e)

6. Do you feel that every working hour is tiring for you? (a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

7. Do you have enough energy for family and friends during leisure time? (a) (b) (c) (d)

(e)

APPENDIX C:
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Self-efficacy is defined as a person's belief in their own ability to complete a task.

- What is your perception of your ability to manage your classroom as a first-year teacher, within your assigned mode of instruction? Please explain.
- Now that you are a second-year teacher, how has your perception changed?
- Do you believe your classroom management experiences as a first-year teacher impacted your ability to manage a classroom as a second-year teacher? Please explain.
- How would you describe your self-efficacy in the area of classroom management?
- What factors have impacted your self-efficacy in the area of classroom management?
- Do you ever feel burned out as a second-year teacher? Please explain.
- Given your experiences over the past two school years, how likely are you to continue in the teaching profession for the next five years? Ten years? Beyond?
- Do you have any closing thoughts before we end today's interview?

APPENDIX D:
INFORMED CONSENT: ADULT RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

You are being asked to participate in the research project described below. Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you may refuse to participate, or you may decide to stop your participation at any time. Should you refuse to participate in the study or should you withdraw your consent and stop participation in the study, your decision will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you may otherwise be entitled. You are being asked to read the information below carefully and ask questions about anything you don't understand before deciding whether or not to participate.

Title: Classroom Management Self-Efficacy and Burnout Potential of Second-Year Teachers during the 2021-2022 School Year

Principal Investigator(s): Corey DeFelice

Student Investigator(s): Corey DeFelice

Faculty Sponsor: Michelle Peters and Roberta Raymond

Purpose of the Study: To determine the classroom management self-efficacy and burnout of second year teacher

Procedures: Complete one online survey. Possibly participate in one 45-minute interview.

Expected Duration: 20-30 minutes for the survey. If asked to interview, an additional 45 minutes.

Risks of Participation: No anticipated risks

Benefits to the Subject

There is no direct benefit received from your participation in this study, but your participation will help the investigator(s) to better understand why teachers might be leaving the teaching profession.

Confidentiality of Records

Every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of your study records. The data collected from the study will be used for educational and publication purposes, however, you will not be identified by name. For federal audit purposes, the participant's documentation for this research project will be maintained and safeguarded by the Principal Investigator or Faculty Sponsor for a minimum of three years after completion of the study. After that time, the participant's documentation may be destroyed.

Compensation

There is no financial compensation to be offered for participation in the study. {For research involving more than minimal risk, an explanation as to whether any compensation and an explanation as to whether any medical treatments are available if injury occurs and, if so, what they consist of, or where further information may be obtained.}

Investigator's Right to Withdraw Participant

The investigator has the right to withdraw you from this study at any time.

Contact Information for Questions or Problems

The investigator has offered to answer all of your questions. If you have additional questions during the course of this study about the research or any related problem, you

may contact the Principal Investigator, Corey DeFelice by telephone at 832-860-9719 or by email at defelicec7835@uhcl.edu

If you have additional questions during the course of this study about the research or any related problem, you may contact the Faculty Sponsors. Dr. Michelle Peters may be contacted by telephone at 202-321-3752 or email at petersm@uhcl.edu, and Dr. Roberta Raymond may be contacted by telephone at 281-283-3593 or email at raymond@uhcl.edu

Identifiable Private Information *(if applicable)*

Identifiers might be removed from identifiable private information or identifiable biospecimens and that, after such removal, the information or biospecimens could be used for future research studies or distributed to another investigator for future research studies without additional informed consent from the subject or the legally authorized representative, if this might be a possibility

OR

Information or biospecimens collected as part of the research, even if identifiers are removed, will not be used or distributed for future research studies.

Signatures

Your signature below acknowledges your voluntary participation in this research project. Such participation does not release the investigator(s), institution(s), sponsor(s) or granting agency(ies) from their professional and ethical responsibility to you. By signing the form, you are not waiving any of your legal rights.

The purpose of this study, procedures to be followed, and explanation of risks or benefits have been explained to you. You have been allowed to ask questions and your questions have been answered to your satisfaction. You have been told who to contact if you have

additional questions. You have read this consent form and voluntarily agree to participate as a subject in this study. You are free to withdraw your consent at any time by contacting the Principle Investigator or Student Researcher/Faculty Sponsor. You will be given a copy of the consent form you have signed.

Subject's printed name: _____

Signature of Subject: _____

Date: _____

Using language that is understandable and appropriate, I have discussed this project and the items listed above with the subject.

Printed name and title: _____

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent: _____

Date: _____

THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON-CLEAR LAKE (UHCL) COMMITTEE FOR PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS HAS REVIEWED AND APPROVED THIS PROJECT. ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING YOUR RIGHTS AS A RESEARCH SUBJECT MAY BE ADDRESSED TO THE UHCL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS (281.283.3015). ALL RESEARCH PROJECTS THAT ARE CARRIED OUT BY INVESTIGATORS AT UHCL ARE GOVERNED BY REQUIREMENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. (FEDERALWIDE ASSURANCE #FWA00004068

APPENDIX E:

INTRODUCTORY LETTER WITHIN THE SURVEY

Dear teacher,

I am a doctoral student at the University of Houston Clear-Lake and I am conducting a study on second-year teachers who began their career during the 2020-2021 school year. I hope that your first semester has been successful. With this in mind, I have designed a study to investigate the classroom management self-efficacy burnout potential of second year teachers. The purpose of this study is to examine the influence of your experiences as a first-year teacher versus your experiences as a second-year teacher, coming out of the Pandemic.

The data collected from the surveys will only be used for educational and/or publication purposes so you will not be identified by name. Your participation as a survey respondent is entirely voluntary, and you may decide to cease participation after you have begun. The individual responses will be kept confidential, but all responses will be compiled, summarized and shared with the University of Houston Clear-Lake for the purposes of program improvement. If you choose to participate, complete the attached survey. If you decline, do nothing further. There are no benefits and no penalties for choosing or declining to participate, and you may withdraw any time during the study without any consequences and your data will not be included. Your willingness to participate in this study is implied if you proceed with completing the survey. You may keep this cover letter for your records.

Please try to answer all the questions, since responding to each item will make the survey results more useful. The anticipated time commitment for completing the survey will be approximately 20-30 minutes. No obvious undue risks are associated with completing the survey. While you will receive no direct benefit from your participation in the survey process, your participation will help the researcher better understand how the experiences gained in the first and second of teaching affect the potential to continue in the teaching profession.

Sincerely,

Corey DeFelice

832-860-9719

Defelicec7835@uhcl.edu