

2020

Factors Predictive of Self-Efficacy in First Year Teachers

Jessica Leigh Hamelin
n00635133@unf.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Educational Leadership Commons](#), [Elementary Education Commons](#), [Elementary Education and Teaching Commons](#), [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Other Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Suggested Citation

Hamelin, Jessica Leigh, "Factors Predictive of Self-Efficacy in First Year Teachers" (2020). *UNF Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 954.

<https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/etd/954>

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at UNF Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in UNF Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UNF Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [Digital Projects](#).

© 2020 All Rights Reserved

Running head: FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR
TEACHERS

Factors Predictive of Self-Efficacy in First Year Teachers

by

Jessica Hamelin

A Dissertation submitted to the Department of Leadership,

School Counseling & Sports Management

in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES

May 2020

This dissertation titled Factors Predictive of Self-Efficacy in First Year Teachers

Dr. Anne Swanson, Committee Chair

Dr. Hope Wilson, Methodologist

Dr. Colleen Wilson, Committee Member

Dr. Matthew Ohlson, Committee Member

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my mother and father, both whom have been an incredible example of work ethic, determination, and unconditional love. Thank you for the sacrifices you have made in order to help me achieve many dreams, including this doctoral degree, over the last 29 years. Your patience, resilience, and unwavering support have made my childhood dreams a reality.

I would also like to dedicate this body of work to all of the first-year teachers who are pursuing their dreams of making a difference in students' lives. The work of education is incredibly difficult but monumentally rewarding. Continue to do what you love, and you will never have to work a day in your life. We are making a difference.

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Acknowledgments

The following people have contributed to my success in earning this doctoral degree. Without their guidance and support, the completion of this degree would not have been possible.

First and foremost, I want to thank God for placing these people in my life at the appropriate time. It is because of this timeliness that I have felt supported, loved, and valued through this entire process. The Lord's hand in this academic journey and body of work is evident.

To my mother and father who have sacrificed and humbly given me an opportunity to pursue my dreams. They have been there to celebrate my progress, provide encouragement, and offer a listening ear during times of adversity. They are the definition of love and unconditional commitment. Without them, I would not be the academic scholar that I am today.

I would also like to thank a specific group of people who attributed to my academic success. First, I would like to thank Mr. Allen Anderson. Thank you, Mr. Anderson, for seeing value in me and being a constant positive light in my life. Thank you for your belief in me; you have truly changed the trajectory of my academic journey and professional career. Your leadership and love for Christ is a significant part of who I am as a leader today and will continue to inform my journey. Thank you to Dr. Anne Swanson for not only committing to this dissertation process with me, but for your academic guidance, support, and tireless work. Your expertise and poise have provided me with the ability to create a body of work that I am proud of. Thank you for your commitment and belief in me. Thank you to Dr. Colleen Wilson. It is because of you that I am fortunate enough to write this body of work. Your leadership,

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

commitment to mentoring, humor, intelligence, and wisdom have provided me the confidence I needed in order to sustain my academic career. To Dr. Hope Wilson and Dr. Matthew Ohlson, thank you for your effort, joy, and guidance in completing this process. You have both provided me with a level of support that very few graduate students are fortunate enough to receive.

This academic journey has been tireless and at times overwhelming. However, through the guidance, love, and support of the mentioned people my lifelong dream has become a reality. For that, I am forever grateful.

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Dedication | iii |
| Acknowledgments..... | iv |
| LIST OF TABLES | viii |
| Abstract | ix |
| Chapter 1: Introduction | 10 |
| Statement of the Problem..... | 12 |
| Purpose of the Study | 12 |
| Research Questions..... | 12 |
| Theoretical Framework..... | 13 |
| Significance of the Study | 15 |
| Significance for Practice and K-12..... | 15 |
| Significance for Research | 15 |
| Chapter 2: Review of the Research..... | 17 |
| Teacher Preparedness | 17 |
| Traditional certification..... | 19 |
| Alternative certification. | 20 |
| EPIs. | 22 |
| Field Experience | 23 |
| History of field experience..... | 25 |
| Best practices in field experience. | 26 |
| First Year Teachers | 27 |
| Characteristics of first year teachers. | 27 |
| Challenges..... | 28 |
| Systems of support. | 29 |
| Retention..... | 30 |
| Route to certification..... | 32 |
| Retention and self-efficacy. | 33 |
| Self-Efficacy | 34 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

| | |
|---|----|
| Teacher self-efficacy..... | 36 |
| Teacher Attributes..... | 39 |
| Demographics. | 39 |
| Level of degree..... | 39 |
| Current teaching position. | 40 |
| Career satisfaction and professional development..... | 40 |
| Preservice program quality. | 40 |
| Chapter 3: Methods..... | 41 |
| Purpose of the Study | 41 |
| Data Collection | 41 |
| Measures | 44 |
| Data Analyses | 44 |
| Reliability and Validity..... | 45 |
| Chapter 4: Results..... | 46 |
| Data Preparation | 46 |
| Results of Analysis | 51 |
| Conclusion | 68 |
| Chapter 5: Summary, Discussion, Conclusions..... | 69 |
| Summary of the Major Research Findings | 69 |
| Discussion of the Findings..... | 70 |
| Limitations and Delimitations | 72 |
| Implications for Practice and Future Research | 72 |
| Implications for practice. | 73 |
| Implications for future research. | 74 |
| References..... | 75 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|---|-------------|
| 1 Response Data | 41 |
| 2 Variables, Items, and Item Reliabilities..... | 46 |
| 3 Descriptive Statistics..... | 49 |
| 4 Results of Regression Predicting Self Efficacy of Decision Making..... | 50 |
| 5 Results of Regression Predicting Self Efficacy to Influence School Resources..... | 53 |
| 6 Results of Regression Predicting Instructional Self Efficacy..... | 55 |
| 7 Results of Regression Predicting Disciplinary Self Efficacy..... | 57 |
| 8 Results of Regression Predicting Efficacy to Enlist Parental Involvement..... | 60 |
| 9 Results of Regression Predicting Efficacy to Enlist Community Involvement..... | 62 |
| 10 Results of Regression Predicting Efficacy to Create a Positive School Climate..... | 64 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Abstract

Research demonstrates that there are increased teacher burnout rates within the first 5 years of entering the field (Darling-Hammond, 2003; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010; Yost, 2006). Consistent with those findings is that teacher preparation matters when conversing about recruitment and retention (Brown, Lee, & Collins, 2014). As more research is conducted in the area of teacher preparation it has become clear that teacher effectiveness is directly related to preparation (Darling-Hammond, 2010). As teachers enter their first-year teaching, philosophical stances can change, inflated beliefs about the teaching profession can be altered, and self-efficacy is influenced. Drawing from Hoy and Spero's (2005) findings on teacher self-efficacy and Bandura's theory of self-efficacy (1993), teachers' self-efficacy is most malleable in the early years of teaching. This study surveyed first year elementary and secondary school teachers and employed a regression analysis to determine factors that are predictive of self-efficacy.

Keywords: teacher self-efficacy

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Factors Predictive of Self-Efficacy in First Year Teachers

Chapter 1: Introduction

Compelling research has accumulated over the last several decades with regard to teachers' beliefs about their ability to positively affect student achievement outcomes in the classroom and their personal motivation (Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2007). Studies support Bandura's (1977) theory that teachers' self-efficacy beliefs are related to the effort teachers invest in teaching, the goals they set and their resilience in the face of setbacks (Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2007). However, there is a gap in the literature regarding other factors that could be predictive of teacher self-efficacy, especially regarding novice, first year teachers. Although Bandura (1993) lays the groundwork in perceived self-efficacy, this study seeks to examine other factors, related to preparedness, that could potentially affect teacher self-efficacy.

Of the four major influences on teachers' self-efficacy, Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2007) describe mastery experiences, "actual teaching accomplishments with students" (p.945) as the most powerful. If teachers are perceiving their performance as successful, their efficacy beliefs, especially about future performances are likely to increase (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). Teachers often derive their self-efficacy from student achievement (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). However, there is a gap in the literature with regard to teacher self-efficacy and program preparation factors. Knowing that the first 5 years of teaching, especially the first year, "can cause novice teachers to doubt their capabilities and in turn may influence their decision to leave the field" (Siwatu, 2011, p. 364), it is important to continue to research programmatic

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

factors that could potentially lead to better preparation of teachers in order to retain and recruit higher performing professionals.

Within the self-efficacy body of research, Bandura (1993) suggests that there are diverse ways in which self-efficacy contributes to cognitive development and functioning. Self-efficacy, according to Bandura (1993), “exerts itself through cognitive, motivational, affective, and selection processes” (p. 117). Bandura (1993) states that “among the mechanisms of personal agency, none is more central or pervasive than people’s beliefs about their capabilities to exercise control over their own level of functioning and over events that affect their lives” (p. 118). The construct, self-efficacy, as defined by Bandura (1993) produces the effects of how people feel, think, motivate themselves, and behave through cognitive, motivational, affective, and selective processes. Application of this theory leads to the notion that “teachers’ beliefs in their personal efficacy to motivate and promote learning affect the types of learning environments they create and the level of academic progress their students achieve” (Bandura, 1993, p. 117). Teachers who have a high sense of self-efficacy produce instructional environments that promote “students’ intrinsic interests and academic self-directedness” (Bandura, 1993, p. 140). Contrary to that, teachers with low self-efficacy are critical, quick to give up, and spend less time on academic accomplishments (Bandura, 1993). However, it remains unclear if more factors exist that are predictive of self-efficacy in first year teachers. Studies have shown that factors such as professional development, context of school, content knowledge, coaching, formal and informal field experiences, school culture, and program features are predictive of teacher self-efficacy (Hasslequist, Herndon, & Kitchel, 2017; Kee, 2012; Martin, McCaughtry, Hodges-Kulinna, & Cothran, 2008; Shilder & Fedor, 2010; Siwatu,

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

2011; Swackhamer, Koellner, Basile, & Kimbrough, 2009; Tuchman & Isaacs, 2011). Factors included in this study are current teaching position, views of teaching, career satisfaction, preservice program quality, and alternative versus traditional certification route. To fill gaps in the literature, this study will seek to clarify which factors are potentially influential in teacher self-efficacy.

Statement of the Problem

Teacher self-efficacy affects perception of education as well as instructional practices leading to student achievement (Bandura, 1993). However, first year teachers are heavily underrepresented in teacher self-efficacy research. Often, research is focused on seasoned teachers who possess years of educational experience or around early year teachers ranging from 1 to 3 years of experience, grouping novice teachers. Typically, this grouping has occurred in the past due to teachers' interest in gaining tenure. In an effort to improve teacher self-efficacy, sense of preparedness, and retention of first year teachers this study is designed to address questions regarding predictive factors related to self-efficacy in first year teachers.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine factors predictive of self-efficacy for first year teachers.

Research Questions

The present study will address the following research questions:

1. What factors (current teaching position, views of teaching, career satisfaction, preservice program quality) of teacher education programs have an effect on teacher self-efficacy in first year teachers?

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

2. Does the type of teacher preparation program (alternative certification versus traditional certification) have an effect on teacher self-efficacy in first year teachers?

Theoretical Framework

Many researchers align social cognitive theory with self-efficacy. Pajares (1996) defines social cognitive theory as “self-referent thought *that* mediates between knowledge and action, and through self-reflection individuals evaluate their own experiences and thought processes” (p. 543). Bandura describes this self-referent thought as triadic reciprocity (Pajares, 1996) involving behavior, environment, and personal factors. Each reciprocal phase involves a specific process that Bandura (1989) describes as motivational, selection, affective, and cognitive. Bandura (1989) suggests that the agency a person has over their thoughts and actions falls between autonomous and mechanical based on “environmental influences” (p. 1175). There is an importance of resiliency as each of these triadic phases is experienced, so that there is less of a setback and a quick recovery throughout the beginning years of teaching (Bandura, 1989). Bandura (1989) describes this as “a robust sense of personal efficacy” (p. 1176).

Bandura’s (1993) theory on self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning, coupled with social cognitive theory, provides the framework guiding this study. Bandura (1993) suggests that SE is influenced through four major processes: (a) cognitive, (b) motivational, (c) affective, and (d) selection. At the cognitive level, self-efficacy is influenced by conception of ability, social comparison influences, framing of feedback, and perceived controllability (Bandura, 1993). The cognitive processes affect the goals people set for themselves. The stronger the self-efficacy, the higher the goals, and the firmer the commitment to them. At the motivational level, self-efficacy is influenced by cognized goals, self-reactive influences, and

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

proactive control of motivation (Bandura, 1993). “The stronger the belief in their capabilities, the greater and more persistent are their efforts” (Bandura, 1989, p. 1176). At the affective level, self-efficacy is influenced by thought control efficacy, coping efficacy and achievement anxiety, and self-efficacy and depression (Bandura, 1993). During this process the course of thinking and a person’s beliefs in their capabilities is altered by the amount of stress in situations. At the selection level, self-efficacy is influenced by choice making (Bandura, 1993). People select and create environments in which they believe they can navigate successfully. These choices influence career and educational decisions in terms of commitment and education pursued (Bandura, 1989).

By adopting Bandura’s (1997) definition of self-efficacy “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (p. 3), a lens is provided through which self-efficacy can be understood. Bandura’s (1993) study “has been thought to impact novice individuals early in the context of new learning” (Swackhamer, Koellner, Basile, & Kimbrough, 2009, p. 64), thus reiterating its transferability to studies with first year teachers, self-efficacy, preparation, and retention.

In summary, cognitive, motivational, affective, and selection processes can contribute to cognitive development and functioning in self-efficacy. By adopting the four major processes, this study aims to correlate external factors that could potentially be related to teachers’ sense of self-efficacy in order to positively build the triadic reciprocity that teachers experience in the classroom.

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Significance of the Study

The present study has significance for practice and research. These are discussed in more detail below.

Significance for Practice and K-12

The results from the proposed study could potentially impact teacher preparation programs, whether traditional or alternative. More specifically, policy requirements for preparation programs and a more uniform requirement of field experience could change to better support the preparation and readiness of first year teachers- ultimately influencing their self-efficacy. K-12 school leaders could ultimately benefit from this study by understanding types of programmatic factors that are predictive of self-efficacy in first year teachers in order to better recruit candidates who are prepared in a high-quality preparation program. This could increase the potential for high-quality teacher-candidates to be hired and retained for longer periods of time which would ultimately affect the level of student-achievement within a school building. Essentially, k-12 leaders could focus on hiring practice, new teacher induction, and professional development.

Significance for Research

Findings from this study might also be important to inform future research. Future studies might benefit from comparing factors identified in this study related to first year teachers, with seasoned teachers to identify a possible correlation with years of teaching. Future research could also study the possible predictive factors related to a more diverse population of first year teachers to perhaps contribute to the retention literature. Studies such as these would contribute

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

to the current understanding of teacher self-efficacy and help retain and better prepare future educators.

Chapter 2: Review of the Research

Teacher Preparedness

It is widely understood that teachers with little professional education have greater difficulties in the classroom (Darling-Hammond, Chung, & Frelow, 2002; Fox & Peters, 2013; Kee, 2012). For more than a decade, accountability requirements and instructional leadership models have influenced the need for state approved programs to refocus teacher preparation programs in order to meet the needs of schools (Darling-Hammond et al., 2002). Some of the areas of focus for universities include “more subject matter preparation, more intensive coursework on content pedagogy and strategies for meeting the needs of diverse learners, and more systematic and connected clinical experiences” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2002, p. 287). Some universities have developed 5-year models that include intensive training plus a yearlong clinical experience. Specifically, universities in the State of Florida require four years of course work and then progress into a master’s degree-bearing program. These programs allow for gradual-release field experience that begins at the observation level and progress to full-time student teaching. Darling-Hammond et al. (2002) suggested that these efforts produce teachers who feel more prepared, who are better retained, and who are assessed and evaluated as more effective. However, there will be little teacher quality improvement if states continue to hire teachers without more preparation (Darling-Hammond et al., 2002).

According to the Summary and Analysis of 2018 Annual Program Reports presented by Sandi Jacobs (2019), the state of Florida offers 363 teacher preparation programs. There are 33

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

preparation programs offered by local school districts, 65 by the Florida College System, 171 by the State University System, and 94 by private colleges or universities. Of these programs, 20 are Educator Preparation Institutes (EPIs), 33 are district-run Professional Development Certification Programs (PDPs), and 310 are Initial Teacher Preparation Programs (ITPs), (Jacobs, 2019). The 310 ITPs “cover a wide range of subject matter, with the most commonly-offered program Elementary Education, which is offered by 47 providers” (Jacobs, 2019, p. 3). Of the three program options, ITPs are the traditional route when seeking licensure, leading to a bachelor’s or master’s degree, EPIs provide an alternate route to certification for those who already hold an out-of-field bachelor’s degree, and PDPs which is another alternate route that is provided by school districts that allow teachers with temporary licenses to work full time while completing their certification requirements (Jacobs, 2019). No matter which route, the state of Florida has made it clear that they want to continue to hold preparation programs accountable “ensuring that all students have effective teachers” (Jacobs, 2019, p. 1). The state continues to do this by evaluating programs based on placement rate of program completers, rate of retention of program completers, performance of students, performance of students by student subgroup, results of annual evaluations, and program completers employed in critical shortage areas.

In order to effectively implement the necessary areas of focus, as mentioned above, states and school districts must invest in improving teachers’ access to preparation programs as well as incentives for entering these programs (Darling-Hammond et al., 2002). Some of these high-level strategies include increasing and equalizing teacher salaries, providing financial aid to replace the cost of teacher education, incentives for entering high-need fields, and providing mentors for beginning teachers to limit turnover. If society wants to ensure high-quality learning

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

for all students, there needs to be a “more deliberate set of strategies for ensuring that teachers gain access to knowledge” (Darling- Hammond et al., 2002, p. 298). Kee (2012) argued that program components can be more readily fixed to meet the needs of schools, rather than the characteristics of a school site in which teachers are placed.

Traditional certification. The traditional route to teacher certification typically involves prospective teachers completing an undergraduate or graduate degree at a university in the field of education, prior to becoming certified to teach. Traditional university teacher education programs provide the methodology, pedagogy, and student teaching necessary to earn certification credentials, under the supervision of faculty (Fox & Peters, 2013). Faculty members then use teaching, modeling, and various forms of experiences to help students gain familiarity with basic elements of teaching pedagogy (Tuchman & Isaacs, 2011). Upon completion, candidates earn a bachelor’s or master’s degree and are eligible for a professional teaching certificate in one or more specific subject areas. Specifically, in Florida, these programs are titled Initial Teacher Preparation Programs (ITPs), (The Florida Department of Education, 2018).

ITPs in the state of Florida must meet four specific standards in order to receive program approval. The four standards address candidate selection, academic achievement, field and clinical experiences, program effectiveness and data driven program improvement (FLDOE, 2018). In order to ensure quality candidate selection, the state of Florida requires admission requirements of at least a 2.5 GPA, mastery of the general knowledge examination, collecting, monitoring, and reporting data on all admitted candidates, and assigned responsibility to personnel who will monitor the completion of requirements for temporary or professional certification (FLDOE, 2018). With regard to academic achievement, candidates in the state of

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Florida must master the core curriculum in which the candidate is seeking subject-area approval, pass each portion of the Florida Teacher Certification Examination (FTCE), align curriculum maps to the Competencies and Skills for Teacher Certification, and draft a plan to monitor and remediate candidates who receive less than effective on their performance evaluation (FLDOE, 2018). In order to implement high quality clinical and field experiences in the state of Florida, programs must describe the process in which cooperating teachers and school districts are selected, how programs plan to monitor the selected personnel, complete a final summative evaluation of the candidate aligned with The Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs), ensure a positive impact on student learning growth, provide feedback on clinical and field experiences, and describe the setting in which field experiences are selected and monitored (FLDOE, 2018). Field experiences must also ensure exposure to an economically diverse population of students, placement in high performing/improving schools, and are strongly suggested to consider lengths of field experiences throughout the school year (FLDOE, 2018). The final standard in which Florida addresses program quality is through data driven improvement and program effectiveness. ITPs must use multiple sources of data to drive program improvement, monitor candidate performance, monitor the connection between coursework and field experiences, and engage in a continuous improvement process (FLDOE, 2018).

Alternative certification. In an effort to enlarge the teaching pool and fill specific geographical gaps, alternative certification programs are on the rise (Kee, 2012). The number of alternatively certified teachers has grown by as much as 30% (Kee, 2012). In the 1980's teacher shortages were addressed by the creation of alternative certification programs (ACPs), (Kee,

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

2012). ACPs argued that school districts would be better served if certification programs could match the needs of the local district by creating certification programs within (Kee, 2012). Many prospective teachers jumped at the idea, considering the incentives involved. Most ACPs award prospective teachers the opportunity to teach within a shorter time frame and for cost lower than that of a traditional preparation program. ACPs “provide individuals who have already received a bachelor’s degree in another field the opportunity to become certified teachers” (Fox & Peters, 2013, p. 4). Most ACP members already have experience in the workforce and are transitioning from a different career. Given the increase of current teacher retirement, student enrollment, and the need for teachers- alternative certification programs are on the rise (Fox & Peters, 2013). Fox and Peters (2013) reported that there are currently 48 states that offer an alternative route to teacher certification.

Program components of ACPs differ than that of traditional certification programs. Most ACPs receive on the job teacher training during their first year as full-time teachers (Kee, 2012). During this time, most ACP members are completing professional learning and focusing on practical aspects of teaching (Fox & Peters, 2013; Kee, 2012). Most ACPs argue that focusing on the practical, rather than theoretical, enhances on the job learning (Kee, 2012). However, some argue that the “abbreviated preservice preparation of ACP members leads them to feel less prepared” (Kee, 2012, p. 24). Teachers with less comprehensive preparation need time to catch up and those completing ACPs are less likely to stay in the field of teaching, adding to the critical shortage issue (Kee, 2012). It is difficult to acquire skills on a job, if one does not stay on the job. Although some would argue that prior work experience helps ACP members navigate

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

the challenges of teaching, research shows that alternatively certified teachers receive less practice teaching than those of traditional certification programs (Kee, 2012).

EPIs. In the state of Florida EPIs are required to meet four approval standards to ensure high-quality programming. The four standards cover candidate selection, academic achievement, high-quality clinical and field experiences, program effectiveness and data driven program improvement (FLDOE, 2018). Candidate selection is chosen based on retrieval of a statement of eligibility from the FLDOE indicating eligibility for the applied subject area. The program must also create a plan to effectively collect, monitor, and report candidate data, as well as facilitate personnel to oversee professional or temporary certificate awarding (FLDOE, 2018). Each candidate must also follow an educational plan that is developed to “ensure each candidate is able to meet certification requirements and demonstrate his or her ability to teach the subject area shown on the statement of status of eligibility” (FLDOE, 2018, p. 4). EPIs in the state of Florida must also instruct and assess program candidates using a core curriculum, as well as prepare candidates to pass the Florida Teacher Certification Examination (FTCE) prior to program completion (FLDOE, 2018). All EPI programs must provide a curriculum map to show how coursework is aligned to the Professional Education examination (FLDOE, 2018). Clinical and field experiences in EPI programs in the state of Florida must be based on a process for monitoring quality of placements and clinical supervision, complete a final summative evaluation for each candidate, indicate positive student growth prior to program completion, and provide timely and relevant feedback to each candidate (FLDOE, 2018). Specifically, EPI programs are awarded the opportunity to choose field experience length and time of teaching in a classroom, but also must describe a plan for the monitoring of each experience (FLDOE, 2018).

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

EPIs must describe how they will collect aggregated data in order to monitor impact of learning for all kindergarten-12th grade students, performance as evidenced by the Annual Program Performance Report Card (APPR), field experience impact, performance evaluations, employee satisfaction surveys, FTCE subtest results, and any other applicable data (FLDOE, 2018). The APPR is a measurement of program performance in the state of Florida that reports on placement rates, retention rates, performance of students, teacher evaluations, and critical teacher shortage areas. The purpose of this report card is to support the continuous improvement and accountability of teacher preparation programs in the state of Florida.

Field Experience

Research shows that most traditional certification programs value pedagogy and student teaching experiences (Darling-Hammond et al., 2002; Fox & Peters, 2013; Siwatu, 2011). These field experiences provide prospective teachers opportunities to form relationships with cooperating teachers, observe experienced teachers, and engage in hands-on teaching (Brown et al., 2015). According to Siwatu (2011), most teacher education programs use field experiences to “integrate knowledge and experience, practice teaching skills, and connect theory to practice” (p. 358). Darling-Hammond (2010) reports that many alternative certification programs (ACPs) skip field experiences altogether, limiting the field-based practice closely supervised by expert guidance. Although this is not true for all ACPs, most programs offer between 1 to 7 weeks of practice before entering as a full-time teacher (Kee, 2012). Kee (2012) argued that “alternative certification programs that recruit teachers and provide abbreviated preservice education, but do not continue the initial education into the first year, will yield beginning teachers who do not feel well prepared” (p. 36). Based on Jacobs (2019) review of clinical placement, it was noted that

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

programs in the state of Florida are emphasizing “the amount of clinical/field work over ensuring that field work would include high quality placements with clear mechanisms for ensuring high quality observations and feedback” (p. 78). Jacobs (2019) also reported that the level of timely and actionable feedback, in the 2018 Florida Teacher Preparation Program Review, data was too vague and left to the discretion of supervisors and observers, suggesting that there should be an appropriate tool that would monitor growth and feedback.

Regardless of feedback tool, the state of Florida is certainly vague in field experience requirements per program type. ITPs are required to provide field experiences throughout the program including a culminating experience of no less than 10 weeks in duration. Field experiences must also represent a diverse population and schools located in urban settings. However, EPI candidates are only required to complete field experiences that are aligned with their educational plan. Each program requirement has distinct differences in field experience, a construct of preparation that researchers agree to be the most profound (Brown et al., 2015; Darling-Hammond, 2010). Some of these stipulations stem from the competitive marketplace for students who are seeking the shortest and most economical choice for teacher education.

Brown, Lee, and Collins (2015) consider student teaching to be the “demanding and stressful work among pre-service teachers” (p. 80), but the most necessary and significant component of preparation programs. Whether or not a program candidate is completing a traditional preparation program or an alternative route, the lack of direct classroom experience is causing a downward trend in perception of teaching (Evans and Tribble, 1986). According to Darling-Hammond (2010) and a review of Schools and Staffing Surveys, first year teachers with minimal student teacher field work leave the profession at double the rate of those who had more

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

student teaching and coursework experiences. Researchers found that increasing field experience time and educational coursework ultimately adds to feelings of preparation, helping to avoid the rise and fall within their first year (Fox & Peters, 2013; Kee, 2012).

History of field experience. In the 1930's, John Dewey emphasized learner-centered instruction (Huling, 1998). Dewey viewed the teacher as a learner, thus advocating for experiences that allowed teachers to construct his or her own knowledge (Huling, 1998). Before this progressive movement, most teacher candidates only experienced teaching during their student teaching phase. Early field experiences "typically consisted of candidates being sent to observe in schools and classrooms" (Huling, 1998, p. 2). Dewey argued, early on, that there must be a connection between theory and practice (Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009). Dewey suggested that there needs to be conceptualization between theory and practice in order to "support prospective teachers to develop theories and practical strategies for teaching" (Grossman et al., 2009). From 1975 to 1993, many authors (Lortie, 1975; Zeichner & Tabachnik, 1981; Veenman, 1984; Cole & Knowles, 1993) found that field experiences in teacher education were washed out, limiting connections between theory and practice (Korthagen, 2001, p. 2). In the early 1990's, there was a need for a transition between solo experiences to cohort models (Bullough Jr., Young, Erickson, Birrell, Clark, Egan, Berrie, Hales, & Smith, 2002). Bullough Jr. et al., (2002) found that partner experiences in the field provided preservice teachers with tools in which they could transfer to their first-year teaching. Currently, field experiences differ in models, times during the semester, and types of placements. The state of Florida does not have

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

rigid requirements when it comes to field experiences, which allows for a more open interpretation of when and how field experiences should occur per preparation program type.

Best practices in field experience. Teacher preparation research has focused on various ways programs have approached field experiences. Limited research exists on the topic of effect of field experience on student achievement (Washburn-Moses, 2018) leaving room for growth in the body of research on the potential impact of best practices in field experiences on preservice and novice teachers. Many researchers suggest that longer field experiences are certainly necessary, and it is the field experience factors that ultimately matter (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Kee, 2012; Seiforth & Samuel, 1979; Washburn-Moses, 2018). Therefore, expanding field work is important but only if the experience is implemented in a meaningful way. Besides connecting to course work (or educational plans in the alternative certification route) field experiences should allow for the analysis, application, and reflection of teaching practices (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Seiforth & Samuel, 1979; Washburn-Moses, 2018; Yost, 2006). These teaching experiences should be practical and be entrenched with diversity of student population as well as variety of experiences (Brown et al., 2015; Seiforth & Samuel, 1979; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998; Yost, 2006). Through quality feedback and established objectives, effective field experiences allow program candidates to build a relationship with instructors and cooperating teachers in order to further K-12 student achievement (Ball & Forzani, 2010; Darling-Hammond, 2010; O'Brian, Stoner, Appel, & House, 2007; Seiforth & Samuel, 1979;

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Washburn-Moses, 2018). Darling-Hammond (2010) suggests that these experiences should result in a capstone project that displays a portfolio of work completed by the program candidate.

Although many of these best practices are suggested there is still a gap in the literature about the effect of these program components on first year teachers with regard to retention.

First Year Teachers

Novice teachers often enter the field with high expectations and then experience a reality-shock “when they learn that it may be more difficult than they had realized to have the hoped-for results with students” (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007, p. 946). Regardless, first year teachers are held to the same standard as veteran colleagues (Fox & Peters, 2013). Novice teachers who experience this shock may end up not liking their “teacher self” and begin to self-protect in order to “reduce the gap between the requirements of excellent teaching” and teaching competence (Hoy & Spero, 2005, p. 353). The experience of self-doubt and enthusiasm can be best described as “survival and discovery” (Klassen & Chiu, 2010, p. 748). Clark (2012) suggests that some of this shock can be decreased through structured mentoring and a network of teachers.

Characteristics of first year teachers. According to the 2015-2016 Characteristics of Public-School Teachers data from the United States Department of Education Condition of Education Report (2019) there are reportedly 89% female and 11% male elementary teachers, and 64% female and 36% male secondary teachers. Of those teachers, 80% are white, 7% are Black, 9% are Hispanic, 2% are Asian, less than 1% are Pacific Islander and American Indian/Alaska Native, and 1% are two or more races. Of elementary and secondary teachers, 57% hold a post-baccalaureate degree and 90% hold a regular or standard state teaching certificate or advanced professional certificate. In 2015-2016 only 10% of current employed

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

teachers have less than 3 years' experience, 28% have 3 to 9 years' experience, 39% have 10 to 20 years' experience, and 22% have over 20 years' experience. With regard to the 10% of teachers having 3 years of less teaching experience, beginning teachers often come with a unique set of characteristics. Daugherty (2003) suggests that most beginning teachers possess attributes that can be built on. Those attributes include setting high personal expectations, genuine concern and commitment to success for students, enthusiasm, resiliency, and encouraging attitudes (Daugherty, 2003). However, it is the constant feelings of isolation and being overwhelmed that add to the stress and challenges of beginning teachers (Duggan, Carlson, Jordan, Gaias, Abry, & Granger, 2017; Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; Heirdsfield, Walker, Walsh, & Wilss, 2008; Marable & Raimondi, 2007).

Challenges. Educational researchers have recognized “that the beginning years of teachers' careers are extremely challenging” (Fry 2005, p. 95). Throughout research, challenges for first year teachers are correlated with burnout and retention rates, as well as effectiveness of beginning educators. The inadequate socialization structures that exist for first year teachers lead to feelings of being burned out, spending more time trying to survive rather than planning, setting goals, and addressing student needs, managing workload, balancing time, and maintaining personal sanity (Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; Duggan et al, 2017; Veenman, 1984). As mentioned previously, the reality shock first year teachers experience comes from their lack of preparation and readiness to cope with the internal challenges in which they will most likely face (Veenman, 1984).

First year teachers are faced with not only internal challenges, but external hurdles exist as well. Authors suggest that most beginning teachers face challenges with regard to curriculum

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

expectations, classroom setup, resources, salary, and late hiring/difficult positions (Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; Marable & Raimondi, 2007; Veenman, 1984).

Among other research, beginning teachers are said to also experience challenges with relationships, the role of the practitioner, and angst navigating school culture. Trouble managing behavior and student needs, building relationships and communicating with parents, effective use of teaching methods, classroom management, discipline, meeting special needs (Individualized Education Plans, English Language Learners, etc.), assessing student work, long range planning, uncaring principals, and lack of support from colleagues are just a few of the structural difficulties first year teachers will face upon entrance to the field of education (Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; Duggan et al., 2017; Marable & Raimondi, 2007; Veenman, 1984).

Systems of support. Support programs in many school districts exist for the first 3 years of teachers' careers (Fry, 2009). Induction support can often lead to growth in teaching strategies and relationship building among colleagues. Thorough research has shown that many systems of support are effective in the growth and retention of first year teachers. Smith and Ingersoll (2004) found that mentors from the same subject area and collective induction activities (cohort model) were two strong predictors of retention for beginning teachers. Mentoring, specifically however, has produced best results when it is frequent and purposeful (Daugherty, 2003; Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; Heirdsfield et al., 2008; Marable & Raimondi, 2007; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Smith and Ingersoll (2004) and Fantilli and McDougall (2009) both found that benefits of mentoring include increased retention rates, improved reflection, greater confidence and self-esteem, and increased positive attitudes among beginning teachers. Clark (2012) suggests that mentoring can be achieved in two ways: structured and networking. Structured mentoring

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

involves teachers in the same grade level (or subject area) collaborating in order to provide support for a novice teacher. In order for this mentoring model to be appropriately implemented, it is suggested that mentor teachers have specific time allotted in their day for mentoring and a lighter teaching load created for novice teachers in order to provide time for observations and reflections (Clark, 2012). A network of teachers involves a variety of learning and is not limited by grade level and/or subject area. This network is categorized through peer observations, model lessons, discussions, and constructive feedback (Clark, 2012).

Administrative support. At the administrative level, focused observations, positive feedback, grade level team collaboration, promotion of collaboration in school cultures, opportunities for professional development and peer observations, as well as resource start up kits were all systems of support that positively impacted beginning teachers (Daugherty, 2003; Duggan et al., 2017; Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; Marable & Raimondi, 2007). These strategies can help assist in the phases that first year teachers face, according to Duggan et al., 2017. These phases are drawn from Moir (1999) and they include: anticipation, survival, disillusionment, rejuvenation, and reflection. Duggan et al., (2017) suggests that many of Moir's phases are true, with one challenge being that some teachers survive longer than others. It is important, at the administrative level, to address these phases through research-based strategies in order to support the retention and professional development of first year teachers.

Retention

In the United States, up to a quarter of teachers leave the profession before their third year of teaching and roughly 50% of teachers leave within the first 5 years (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). This retention issue has many costly effects. Replacing teachers creates a budget

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

problem and teacher shortages ultimately affect student achievement and create a lack of quality teachers (Fry, 2009). Administrators across the United States are in a “constant search for teachers to fill the vacancies caused by those who leave the profession” (Siwatu, 2011, p. 357). Some researchers suggest that inadequate teacher preparation is the root cause of teacher shortages (Siwatu, 2011; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007). Yost (2006) argued that “in order to solve the teacher shortage problem, the focus should be on retaining qualified teachers rather than encouraging alternative routes to certification” (p. 59). Darling-Hammond et al., (2002) found that teachers feel better prepared after attending a single, traditional route to teacher certification, rather than those who were alternatively certified, receiving minimal preservice training and experiences. If teachers feel more prepared after their initial training, the odds of retaining teachers within the first 5 years may increase. Darling-Hammond et al., (2002) concluded that the more prepared beginning teachers feel, the more money districts and states will save through the reduction of new hires and replacing “underprepared recruits” (p. 297).

Importance for practice in k-12 education. Good, McCaslin, Tsang, Zhang, Wiley, and Bozack (2006) suggest that there is evident research regarding teachers making a difference in student achievement. The quality of good teaching is most important (Good et al., 2006). However, there is a discrepancy on the definition of what defines a good teacher. In order to create continuity between preparation programs and retention practices, school districts must play a key role in the relationship (Good et al., 2006). It is crucial for school districts and preparation programs to decide what beginning teachers should know in order to create a parallel between preservice practice and in-field teaching. Darling-Hammond (2003) argues that “teachers who lack adequate initial preparation are more likely to leave the profession” (p. 9-10).

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Consideration must be placed on the amount of money it takes to replace a teacher compared to the cost of preparing one, not only monetarily but school based as well. The process for replacing a teacher ultimately trickles down to student achievement, considering the amount of time it takes to hire, replace, and retrain another educator. Again, placing the emphasis on the collaboration between school districts and preparation programs.

Route to certification. Ingersoll, Merrill, and May (2014) report that it is not a lack of teachers, rather an abundance of teachers leaving the field, that is creating what is known as a teacher shortage. Through their research, however, Ingersoll, Merrill, and May (2014) found that there is less research about retention and the type of preparation teachers experience.

Among the existing research, more information was found regarding best practices in programs that caused teachers to stay in the field, rather than a correlation between program type and retention. Pedagogical practices including longer preparation programs, training, and field experience all showed increasing likelihood of teachers remaining in the field beyond their beginning years (Ingersoll, Merrill, & May, 2014; Jorissen, 2002). Zhang and Zeller (2016) found that about one-fourth of teacher retention is explained by preparation type. Traditional preparation resulted in higher retention with beginning teachers, whereas alternative preparation showed higher teacher attrition (Harris, Camp, & Adkison, 2003; Zhang & Zeller, 2016). Specifically, Burstein, Czech, Kretschmer, Lombardi, and Smith (2009) found that 35% of emergency credentialed teachers leave within the first year and 60% of those teachers never receive a credential. However, 70% of traditionally prepared teachers stay in the field for 5 or more years (Burstein et al., 2009).

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

As Ingersoll, Merrill, and May (2014) reported, the research in this area is limited and provides little insight to the traditional versus alternative argument. Ng and Peter (2010) reported that retention and preparation type are situational, contributing to the idea that no matter how much research exists, it will be difficult to come up with a conclusion, rather the focus should be on practices within each program. Meaning, retention and preparation could potentially be based on dynamics that are unchangeable (location, demographics, etc.) so attention to detail should be spent on refining practices that will support these situational experiences.

Retention and self-efficacy. Many researchers have found a correlation between teacher self-efficacy levels and retention (Chesnut & Burley, 2015; Klassen & Chiu, 2011; Pfitzner-Eden, 2016; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2016). Self-efficacy is closely related to the motivational construct which has an “underpinning to occupational commitment” (Canrinus, Helms-Lorenz, Beijaard, Buitink, & Hofman, 2012, p. 120). Chesnut and Burley (2015) also found that motivational factors were closely tied to self-efficacy beliefs among teachers, which in turn can lead to negative self-efficacy beliefs and create potential stressors, which is one reason teachers leave the profession (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2016). Although Hughes (2012) reported a need for more data among the correlation between retention and self-efficacy, she also reported that intrinsic (motivation, personal teaching efficacy, job satisfaction) and extrinsic (time off, schedule, retirement) were also variables related to self-efficacy and retention among teachers. One significant extrinsic factor affecting retention and self-efficacy is student achievement. Hughes (2012) reported that approximately 6% of teachers leave the profession because of the perceived lack of influence on students. Student success and the use of best practices in the classroom increase teacher self-efficacy and in turn increase the likelihood of retention in the

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

classroom (Hughes, 2012; Klassen & Chiu, 2011; Pedota, 2012). When teachers feel that they are making a difference, self-efficacy can potentially increase creating a perpetuation of increased motivation and job satisfaction. Among the significant number of teachers that leave within the first five years of teaching, many have weaker self-efficacy beliefs (Hong, 2012; Klassen & Chiu, 2011; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2016). By increasing self-efficacy, more positive experiences can potentially occur for classroom teachers, supporting teacher satisfaction with the occupation, in hopes that they will stay.

Self-Efficacy

Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2010) ground self-efficacy in social cognitive theory, claiming that it is “an exercise of human agency-- that people can exercise some influence over what they do” (p. 1059). Extensive literature defines self-efficacy as the beliefs an individual encompasses regarding their ability to complete an action successfully (Bandura, 1997; Klassen & Chiu, 2010; Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). Hoy and Spero (2005) describe self-efficacy as a “future-oriented judgment that has to do with perceptions of competence rather than actual level of competence” (p. 344). An individual who has a high sense of self-efficacy generally visualizes success outcomes before a task is completed (Bandura, 1993). In general, higher the sense of self-efficacy, the higher the commitment to task and goals set by and individual (Bandura, 1993). When a high sense of self-efficacy exists, resiliency with difficult tasks generally increases, and effort and activity choice is affected (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010). However, a low sense of self-efficacy can cause individuals to “shy away from difficult tasks which they perceive as personal threats” (Bandura, 1993, p. 144). These individuals typically focus on “personal deficiencies” and have low commitment to goals (Bandura, 1993, p. 144). Rather than consider their failures

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

as a lack of knowledge or attainable attributes, those with a low sense of self-efficacy determine that their failure is because of a personal deficiency (Bandura, 1993).

Sense of self-efficacy is a cyclical process (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). A high sense of self-efficacy generally leads to success outcomes which then in turn, continue to increase self-efficacy. (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). This same process can occur with a low sense of self-efficacy. As self-efficacy is lowered, efficiency of outcomes decreases, thus continuously lowering an individual's sense of self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). It is important to recognize, however, that self-efficacy is only a perception of ability. This perception can often be an "overestimate or underestimate" of actual ability (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Bandura (1997) argued that perception of capability is "only as good as its execution" (p. 35). Poor execution can lead to negative outcomes, therefore affecting an individual's sense of self-efficacy. The solution here, is then to develop a sense of self-efficacy that is concrete. Once a strong sense of self-efficacy is developed, it is less likely to be weakened, or changed, especially over time (Klassen, 2010; Tuchman & Isaacs, 2011).

Research shows that a high sense of self-efficacy is an "important influence on human achievement in a variety of settings" (Klassen & Chiu, 2010, p. 741). Once a sense of self-efficacy is formed, "beliefs contribute significantly to the level and quality of human functioning" (Bandura, 1993, p. 145). Self-efficacy, while in its earlier stage, can be influenced by environment (Klassen & Chiu, 2010). Leaders within the workplace have the ability to use persuasion and modeling in order to affect self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997; Klassen & Chiu, 2010). However, just because one possesses self-efficacy, does not mean that they can "use it well under taxing conditions" (Bandura, 1993, p. 119). Depending on self-efficacy thinking and the

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

workplace environment, “a person with the same knowledge and skills may perform poorly, adequately, or extraordinarily depending on fluctuations in self-efficacy thinking” (Bandura, 1993, p. 119). In order to exercise control over their lives, individuals must develop a sense of self-efficacy that is resilient, no matter the context.

Teacher self-efficacy. According to Bandura’s (1997) definition, self-efficacy is context specific. Opposite of Rotter’s (1966) locus of control, Bandura (1997) clarifies self-efficacy as a belief about the ability to produce certain actions rather than whether those actions affect outcomes (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). However, Brown et al. (2015) argued that “teachers’ self-efficacy is one of the few individual characteristics that reliably predict instructional practice and student outcomes” (p. 79). Although self-efficacy is focused on ability to produce rather than effect of outcomes, it is important to recognize that researchers have found positive outcomes such as: student achievement, teacher motivation, feelings of preparation, and resiliency, related to a high sense of self-efficacy in teachers (Bandura, 1993; Bandura, 1997; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010; Swackhamer, Koellner, Basile, & Kimbrough, 2009; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

Based on social cognitive theory mentioned previously, teacher self-efficacy is best conceptualized as teachers’ “beliefs in their own ability to plan, organize, and carry out activities that are required to attain given educational goals” (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010, p. 1059-1060). Bandura (1993) suggested that a higher sense of self-efficacy among teachers results in a classroom environment more conducive to learning. Typically, teachers with a high sense of self-efficacy “devote more classroom time to academic learning, provide students who have difficulty learning with the help they need to succeed, and praise them for their accomplishments” (Bandura, 1993, p. 140). Teachers who lack a sense of self-efficacy tend to undermine students

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

and limit their cognitive development by providing less mastery experiences (Bandura, 1993). If this occurs within the classroom, student achievement is likely to decrease. If student achievement levels fall, it is likely that a teacher will correlate the lack of results to failure, thus lowering self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). If teachers continue to perceive their teaching as failure, their self-efficacy is lowered (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). However, the more a teacher experiences success, the more likely they are to believe “that future performances will likely be proficient” (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007, p. 945). This cyclical idea is crucial when teachers are analyzing current performance to predict future performance.

Research shows that when teachers assess their future performances, they “often consider variables such as availability of resources, time constraints, quality of instructional materials, and student characteristics” (Siwatu, 2011, p. 359). Although Siwatu (2011) suggested that these appraisals might be “unrealistic” (p. 359), Bandura (1997) suggested “that it is most fruitful when teachers slightly overestimate their actual teaching skills, as their motivation to expend effort and to persist in the face of setbacks will help them to make the most of the skills and capabilities they do possess” (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007, p. 946). This overestimation might build resiliency, and possibly affect teachers’ ability to set attainable goals, experimentation with new instructional tools and teaching techniques, as well as motivation (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

Teacher efficacy beliefs affect aspiration levels, investment, goal setting, willingness to experiment, and time spent teaching (Hoy & Spero, 2005; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010). A high sense of self-efficacy in teachers can ultimately affect feelings of preparedness, general feelings toward the profession, and instructional practices (Bandura, 1993; Darling-Hammond et al.,

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

2002). Darling-Hammond et al. (2002) found that feelings of preparedness are “significantly related to teachers’ sense of efficacy and their confidence about their ability to achieve teaching goals” (p. 296). With the support of Darling-Hammond’s (2002) study, Brown et al. (2015) suggested that “it is worthwhile to investigate how preservice teachers feel about how prepared they are...” (p. 80). In order to increase teacher retention, reduce burnout rates, and heighten teacher preparedness, it is important to determine which factors in teacher preparation programs are predictors of self-efficacy.

Teacher self-efficacy in first year teachers. Bandura’s theory of self-efficacy suggested that self-efficacy is most malleable in the early years of teaching (Hoy & Spero, 2005). As teachers gain experience, their sense of efficacy is more likely to become “firmly established” (Klassen, 2010, p. 741). Reality can be shaken as a first-year teacher is faced with “all the role demands, and expectations encountered by experienced teachers” (Hoy & Spero, 2005, p. 346). Research shows that some of the most powerful experiences for increased self-efficacy in first-year teachers were student teaching experiences and their induction year (Fox & Peters, 2013; Protheroe, 2008; Tuchman & Isaacs, 2011). Fox and Peters (2013) suggested that time spent in field placements would help build self-efficacy among preservice teachers. If self-efficacy is developed early in the preservice teaching phase, it is likely that novice teachers will continue to gain self-efficacy characteristics early on in their careers (Klassen & Chiu, 2010). Research shows that once teachers enter the field, mentoring, collaboration, availability of instructional resources, and frequent observations by a school leader, support self-efficacy growth (Siwatu, 2011). By coupling student teacher experiences with proper support and development, schools can attempt to eliminate the first-year disillusionment that most teachers experience. This

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

“unrealistic optimism” results in lower self-efficacy (Tuchman & Isaacs, 2011, p. 416) and can ultimately lead to burnout and teachers leaving the profession (Siwatu, 2011).

The development and support of self-efficacy growth in new teachers is critical with regard to student achievement, teacher retention, and teacher performance (Fox & Peters, 2013). Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998) found that novice teachers with a high sense of self-efficacy are more likely to stay in the field, “experience greater satisfaction in teaching...and experience less stress” (p. 236).

Eventually, there is a possibility that self-efficacy will plateau at some point, becoming more concrete. However, by focusing on self-efficacy beliefs in first year teachers, perception to do well, ability to perform, motivation to continue work in the field, and resiliency, preparation factors and retention rates could possibly be positively impacted.

Teacher Attributes

Many attributes have the potential to effect teacher self-efficacy. By focusing on these attributes, researchers can draw conclusions about what attributes could potentially positively effect programmatic changes.

Demographics. Research shows that age, race, and gender (fixed factors) are ultimately not predictive of self-efficacy in teachers (Darling-Hammond et al., 2002). However, Perera, Calkins, and Part (2019) found that females generally have higher teacher self-efficacy level than males. With regard to males and females perceiving success differently.

Level of degree. Tuchman and Isaacs (2011) found that teachers with a higher degree obtainment were more likely to have a “strong belief in their own teaching efficacy” (p. 415). In correlation with degree level, researchers also found that years of experience produced higher

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

self-efficacy for teachers in their early and mid-years (Darling-Hammond et al., 2002; Klassen & Chiu, 2010). As teaching experience increases, after the mid-years, however, self-efficacy levels tend to decrease (Klassen & Chiu, 2010; Perera, Calkins, Part, 2019; Yoo, 2016).

Current teaching position. Perera, Calkins, and Part (2019) as well as Yoo (2016) support the idea that grade level is associated with teaching self-efficacy. Elementary teachers tend to have higher self-efficacy than middle and high school teachers. However, in Perera, Calkins, and Part's (2019) study the authors found that the lower the grade level (kindergarten) in elementary, the higher the self-efficacy, yet in secondary, as grade levels increase, so does self-efficacy in teachers.

Career satisfaction and professional development. Klassen and Chiu (2010) found that there is a relationship between job satisfaction and teacher self-efficacy. As job satisfaction increases, there is a self-efficacy increase in teachers.

Yoo (2016) found that professional development has a positive correlation with self-efficacy. As teachers gain new knowledge, especially in the early years, self-efficacy tends to increase (Yoo, 2016).

Preservice program quality. Tuchman and Isaacs (2011) report that preservice experiences are one of the greatest factors in predicting teacher self-efficacy. In connection with Bandura's (2007) theory that self-efficacy is more malleable in the early years, Tuchman and Isaacs (2011) found that in the developing years, teacher self-efficacy is more easily influenced.

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Chapter 3: Methods

In this chapter, the purpose of the study is reiterated, followed by data collection, measures, data analysis, and reliability and validity.

Purpose of the Study

The goals of this study were twofold: (1) to investigate which factors of teacher education programs have an effect on teacher preparation in first year teachers and (2) to determine if type (traditional versus alternative) of teacher preparation program has an effect on teacher self-efficacy in first year teachers. Specifically, the study addressed the following research questions:

1. What factors (current teaching position, views of teaching, career satisfaction, preservice program quality) of teacher education programs have an effect on teacher self-efficacy in first year teachers?
2. Does the type of teacher preparation program (alternative certification versus traditional certification) have an effect on teacher self-efficacy in first year teachers?

Data Collection

Before collecting data, a pilot test of survey items was completed. To measure factors predictive of self-efficacy in novice teachers, first year teachers from elementary, middle, and secondary schools from two districts in Northeast Florida participated in the study. The researcher requested for participation with a third school district in Northeast Florida and the district declined to participate due to the opinion that the results would not be generalizable for populations within the school district. The data were collected during the early winter month, at

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

the second quarter of the school year using a digital survey in Qualtrics. The response rate of the survey data is listed below (see Table 1).

Table 1

Response Data

| | <i>n</i> | <i>Percentage</i> |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| <u>Race</u> | | |
| White, Non-Hispanic | 21 | 81 |
| Hispanic | 3 | 12 |
| American Indian or Alaskan | 1 | .03 |
| Other | 1 | .03 |
| <u>Highest Level of Degree</u> | | |
| Bachelor's Degree | 21 | 81 |
| Master's Degree | 5 | 19 |
| <u>Area of Certification</u> | | |
| Elementary Education Certification | 8 | 31 |
| Math Certification | 5 | 19 |
| English Certification | 3 | 12 |
| Science Certification | 2 | .08 |
| Other Certification | 8 | 31 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Table 1. Continued

| | <i>n</i> | <i>Percentage</i> |
|-----------------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| <u>School Level</u> | | |
| K-5 Teacher | 10 | 38 |
| Middle School/Junior High Teacher | 7 | 27 |
| High School Teacher | 9 | 35 |
| <u>School Type</u> | | |
| Public School Teacher | 25 | 96 |
| Private School Teacher | 1 | .03 |
| <u>Community Type</u> | | |
| Suburban Setting | 15 | 58 |
| Urban Setting | 2 | .08 |
| Small Town/Rural Setting | 4 | 15 |
| Town Setting | 4 | 15 |
| Inner City | 1 | .03 |
| <u>School Size</u> | | |
| Less than 300 Students | 4 | 15 |
| 300 to 599 Students | 3 | 12 |
| 600 to 899 Students | 6 | 23 |
| 900 to 1,200 Students | 2 | .08 |
| More than 1,200 Students | 11 | 42 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Measures

The questions that were used in the teacher self-efficacy scale operated as the dependent variable for this study. All self-efficacy questions were derived from Bandura's *Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale* (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). All of the teacher self-efficacy items are domain focused. The domains included: decision making, school resources, instructional self-efficacy, disciplinary self-efficacy, parental involvement, community involvement, and positive school climate. These domains were treated as one factor. Items are measured on a 9-point scale anchored with the notations "nothing, very little, some influence, quite a bit, and a great deal". The independent variables were measured by asking respondents questions related to factors of their teacher preparation program. All factor related questions were derived from specific portions of the *National Survey of Teacher Education Program Graduates* (Loadman, Freeman, Brookhart, Rahman, & McCague, 1999). Factors included: current teaching position, views of teaching, career satisfaction, preservice program quality, and certification type.

Data Analyses

This study employed a quantitative methodology to examine the factors predictive of self-efficacy in first year teachers. Data were analyzed using regression analyses in SPSS. The dependent variable used in the analysis was identified from Bandura's *Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale* (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). All independent variables were identified from Loadman et al., (1999) *National Survey of Teacher Education Program Graduates*. Data were cleaned and prepared for the statistical analysis through a multi-step process. First, all items were coded for missing values. Pairwise deletion was used for handling missing data. Next, a reliability analysis using Cronbach's alpha item-reliability statistics was run for all multi-item

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

variables. Finally, a regression analysis was conducted using SPSS to determine the amount of variance predicted within the teacher self-efficacy model. A regression analysis was used in order to determine factors predictive of self-efficacy in first year teachers.

Reliability and Validity

In the *National Survey of Teacher Education Program Graduates* instrument development and content validity were calculated from a group of evaluators from teacher education institutions (Loadman et al., 1999). New questions were developed to “address critical areas of importance” (Loadman et al., 1999, p. 77) and a subsample was used as a draft instrument. A national panel was used to critique the draft and then a pilot study was completed. Upon completion of the pilot study, some questions were eliminated, and edits were made. The final version of the survey has been administered multiple times since 1990. Internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) was calculated for the four subscales and each subscale ranged from .31 to .57 (Loadman et al., 1999). Scales included items from 3 to 7. Informal internal consistency was measured through the use of the survey at multiple institutions over the course of several years, showing consistency but also “the ability to produce comparative data” (Loadman et al., 1999, p. 78) as results differed between institutions.

In an attempt to create consistency with the tool and clearly depict a teacher’s actual work life, Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) retained 23 items from the Bandura’s *Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale*, discarding 7 “as not being representative of frequent activities within a teachers’ work life” (p. 796). In Hoy’s (2000) study the alpha coefficients of reliability for the 30-item scale were .94, .95, and .92 across three administrations.

Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this study is to determine factors predictive of self-efficacy for first year teachers. Regression analyses were employed to answer the two research questions that guided this inquiry. The research questions are as follows:

1. What factors (current teaching position, views of teaching, career satisfaction, preservice program quality) of teacher education programs have an effect on teacher self-efficacy in first year teachers?
2. Does the type of teacher preparation program (alternative certification versus traditional certification) have an effect on teacher self-efficacy in first year teachers?

In this chapter, the results of the data analysis are presented and answers to the research questions provided. This chapter is organized into three parts. First, the steps taken to clean and code all data are included in the data preparation section. Second, the answers to the two research questions are provided in the results of analysis section. Finally, the results of the factors predictive of self-efficacy in first year teachers as well as the answers to the research questions are included in the conclusion.

Data Preparation

Several steps were taken in order to prepare data for analysis. Data were extracted from a single Qualtrics survey. Respondents who noted that they had completed only one year of teaching were included in the analysis. All other respondents (two years or higher) were removed from the data set.

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Next, all items were cleaned and coded for analysis. All items were cleaned for missing values. There were no missing cases in the analysis. Second, a reliability analysis was run for Bandura's *Teacher Self Efficacy Scale* (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Table 2 shows a list of all multi-item variables as well as their corresponding items and item reliabilities.

Table 2

Variables, items, and item reliabilities

| Variable | Items | Cronbach's Alpha |
|--|--|------------------|
| Efficacy to Influence Decision Making | How much can you influence the decisions that are made in the school? How much can you express your views freely on important school matters? | .79 |
| Efficacy to Influence School Resources | How much can you do to get the instructional materials and equipment you need? | .85 |
| Instructional Self-Efficacy | How much can you do to influence the class sizes in your school? How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students? How much can you do to promote learning when there is a lack of support from the home? How much can you do to keep students on task on difficult assignments? How much can you do to increase students' memory of what they have been taught in previous lessons? How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork? | .86 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Table 2. Continued

| Variable | Items | Cronbach's Alpha |
|---|--|------------------|
| Instructional Self-Efficacy | How much can you do to get students to work together? | .86 |
| | How much can you do to overcome the influence of adverse community conditions on students' learning? | |
| | How much can you do to get children to do their homework? | |
| Disciplinary Self-Efficacy | How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules? | .91 |
| | How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom? | |
| | How much can you do to prevent problem behavior on the school grounds? | |
| Efficacy to Enlist Parental Involvement | How much can you do to get parents to become involved in school activities? | .87 |
| | How much can you assist parents in helping their children do well in school? | |
| | How much can you do to make parents feel comfortable coming to school? | |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Table 2. Continued

| Variable | Items | Cronbach's Alpha |
|--|---|------------------|
| Efficacy to Enlist Community Involvement | <p>How much can you do to get community groups involved in working with the schools?</p> <p>How much can you do to get churches involved in working with the school?</p> <p>How much can you do to get businesses involved in working with the school?</p> <p>How much can you do to get local colleges and universities involved in working with the school?</p> | .87 |
| Efficacy to Create a Positive School Climate | <p>How much can you do to make the school a safe place?</p> <p>How much can you do to make students enjoy coming to school?</p> <p>How much can you do to get students to trust teachers?</p> <p>How much can you help other teachers with their teaching skills?</p> | .89 |

As mentioned previously, only items for respondents who completed one year of teaching ($n=26$) were included. Due to the limited sample size, items from the *National Survey of Teacher Education Program Graduates* (Loadman, Freeman, Brookhart, Rahman, & McCague, 1999) were reduced by the researcher according to factors included in research questions one and two. Factors included: current teaching position, views of teaching, career satisfaction, preservice program quality, and certification type.

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Finally, five different models were produced. Each of the five models (current teaching position, views of teaching, career satisfaction, preservice program quality, and alternative versus traditional certification) were compared to a single self-efficacy subscale derived from Bandura's *Teacher Self Efficacy Scale* (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). The self-efficacy scale included subscales: self-efficacy of decision making, self-efficacy of school resources, instructional self-efficacy, disciplinary self-efficacy, efficacy to enlist parental involvement, efficacy to enlist community involvement, and efficacy to create a positive school climate. Table 3 reports the descriptive statistics that were calculated for each dependent variable in the analysis.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics

| Construct | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|-----------|
| Efficacy to Influence Decision Making | 8.92 | 3.08 |
| Efficacy to Influence School Resources | 5.26 | 2.32 |
| Instructional Self-Efficacy | 40.24 | 10.54 |
| Disciplinary Self-Efficacy | 18.84 | 5.26 |
| Efficacy to Enlist Parental Involvement | 15.61 | 5.17 |
| Efficacy to Enlist Community Involvement | 17.73 | 6.86 |
| Efficacy to Create a Positive School Climate | 46.15 | 12.05 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Results of Analysis

The data analysis was designed to answer research question one and two: What factors (current teaching position, views of teaching, career satisfaction, preservice program quality) of teacher education programs have an effect on teacher self-efficacy in first year teachers? and Does the type of teacher preparation program (alternative versus traditional certification) have an effect on teacher self-efficacy in first year teachers? In order to effectively answer the first research question data were entered into a regression analysis. Variables including current teaching position, views of teaching, career satisfaction, and preservice program quality were run in comparison to the seven self-efficacy subscales. Based on the model regarding self-efficacy of decision making, the model was not significantly predicted. However, those who taught at a suburban school were more likely to be self-efficacious in decision making $b= 4.11$, $t(25)= 2.27$, $p=.036$ (see Table 4).

Table 4

Results of Regression Predicting Self Efficacy of Decision Making in First Year Teachers

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|---------|-----------|
| Current Teaching Position^a | | | |
| Grade Level K-5 | 1.14 | 0.19 | 0.49 |
| Grade Level Middle School Junior High | 2.76 | 0.37 | 0.42 |
| School Building Type Public | -2.92 | -0.19 | 0.19 |
| School Building Setting Inner City | -6.84 | -0.44 | 0.19 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Table 4. Continued

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|---------|-----------|
| School Building Setting Urban | -1.22 | -0.11 | 0.27 |
| School Building Setting Suburban | -4.11* | -0.67 | 0.50 |
| School Building Setting Town | -3.99 | -0.48 | 0.36 |
| Views of Teaching | | | |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Curriculum Development | 1.69 | 0.41 | 0.75 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Theories and Principles of how Students Learn | 1.63 | 0.39 | 0.74 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Classroom Management Techniques | -0.19 | -0.05 | 0.85 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of the Subjects You Teach | 1.19 | 0.29 | 0.76 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Measurement Techniques | -1.29 | -0.30 | 0.71 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Professional Practice Pedagogy | -0.44 | -0.09 | 0.63 |
| Career Satisfaction | | | |
| Overall Level of Satisfaction with Your Current Job | 0.65 | 0.23 | 1.10 |
| Preservice Program Quality ^b | | | |
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Student Teaching Internship Experience | 0.19 | 0.14 | 2.32 |
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Field Based Experience | 0.30 | 0.15 | 1.55 |
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Cooperating/Placement Teacher (below average) | 1.11 | 0.07 | 0.19 |
| Overall Quality Average | -1.15 | -0.15 | 0.40 |
| Overall Quality Above Average | 2.15 | 0.34 | 0.49 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Table 4. Continued

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|---------|-----------|
| Alternative Versus Traditional Certification ^c | | | |
| Highest Level of Education You have Attained | 1.49 | 0.18 | 0.37 |
| Major Field of Study During Your Degree | | | |
| Major Field Other | -2.99 | -0.39 | 0.40 |
| Major Field Elementary Education | -0.49 | -0.07 | 0.45 |
| Major Field English | 0.76 | 0.08 | 0.33 |
| Major Field Math | 1.50 | 0.20 | 0.40 |
| Major Field Sciences | 0.56 | 0.05 | 0.27 |
| Percentage of Teaching Assignment is the Grade(s) or Subject Areas in which You were Endorsed (25 percent) | -0.98 | -0.10 | 0.33 |
| Certified Endorsed 50 percent | -1.99 | -0.18 | 0.27 |
| Certified Endorsed 75 percent | 1.83 | 0.16 | 0.27 |

^aHigh School is the reference variable, Rural is the reference variable, Private is the reference variable

^bQuality of Cooperating Placement Teacher Exceptional is the reference variable

^cMajor field of study ESE is the reference variable, Certified Endorsed 100 percent is the reference variable

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$.

Based on the model regarding self-efficacy to influence school resources, there was no significant predicting factor (see Table 5).

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Table 5

Results of Regression Predicting Self Efficacy to Influence School Resources in First Year Teachers

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|---------|-----------|
| Current Teaching Position^a | | | |
| Grade Level K-5 | 0.64 | 0.14 | 0.49 |
| Grade Level Middle School Junior High | 2.14 | 0.40 | 0.42 |
| School Building Type Public | -1.71 | -0.15 | 0.19 |
| School Building Setting Inner City | -5.42 | -0.46 | 0.19 |
| School Building Setting Urban | -1.92 | -0.23 | 0.27 |
| School Building Setting Suburban | -1.80 | -0.40 | 0.50 |
| School Building Setting Town | -2.77 | -0.44 | 0.36 |
| Views of Teaching | | | |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Curriculum Development | 0.17 | 0.01 | 0.75 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Theories and Principles of how Students Learn | 0.92 | 0.30 | 0.74 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Classroom Management Techniques | 0.70 | 0.25 | 0.85 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of the Subjects You Teach | 1.10 | 0.36 | 0.76 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Measurement Techniques | -1.23 | -0.38 | 0.71 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Professional Practice Pedagogy | -0.23 | -0.06 | 0.63 |
| Career Satisfaction | | | |
| Overall Level of Satisfaction with Your Current Job | 0.73 | 0.34 | 1.10 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Table 5. Continued

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|---------|-----------|
| Preservice Program Quality ^b | | | |
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Student Teaching Internship Experience | 0.18 | 0.18 | 2.32 |
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Field Based Experience | 0.30 | 0.02 | 1.55 |
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Cooperating/Placement Teacher (below average) | 1.19 | 0.17 | 0.19 |
| Overall Quality Average | 0.34 | 0.06 | 0.40 |
| Overall Quality Above Average | 1.35 | 0.30 | 0.49 |
| Alternative Versus Traditional Certification ^c | | | |
| Highest Level of Education You have Attained | 1.53 | 0.24 | 0.37 |
| Major Field of Study During Your Degree | | | |
| Major Field Other | -2.19 | -0.38 | 0.40 |
| Major Field Elementary Education | -0.35 | -0.07 | 0.45 |
| Major Field English | 3.74 | 0.53 | 0.33 |
| Major Field Math | 1.30 | 0.22 | 0.40 |
| Major Field Sciences | 2.60 | 0.30 | 0.27 |
| Percentage of Teaching Assignment is the Grade(s) or Subject Areas in which You were Endorsed (25 percent) | -0.70 | -0.10 | 0.33 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Table 5. Continued

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|-------------------------------|----------|---------|-----------|
| Certified Endorsed 50 percent | -2.03 | -0.24 | 0.27 |
| Certified Endorsed 75 percent | -2.20 | -0.25 | 0.27 |

^aHigh School is the reference variable, Rural is the reference variable, Private is the reference variable

^bQuality of Cooperating Placement Teacher Exceptional is the reference variable

^cMajor field of study ESE is the reference variable, Certified Endorsed 100 percent is the reference variable

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$.

There were also no significant predictors found in the model regarding factors compared to instructional self-efficacy (see Table 6).

Table 6

Results of Regression Predicting Instructional Self Efficacy in First Year Teachers

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|---|----------|---------|-----------|
| Current Teaching Position^a | | | |
| Grade Level K-5 | 7.80 | 0.37 | 0.49 |
| Grade Level Middle School Junior High | 7.02 | 0.29 | 0.42 |
| School Building Type Public | 1.51 | 0.03 | 0.19 |
| School Building Setting Inner City | -16.71 | -0.31 | 0.19 |
| School Building Setting Urban | -5.70 | -0.15 | 0.27 |
| School Building Setting Suburban | -7.72 | -0.37 | 0.50 |
| School Building Setting Town | -1.84 | -0.06 | 0.36 |
| Views of Teaching | | | |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Curriculum Development | 3.83 | 0.27 | 0.75 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Table 6. Continued

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|---------|-----------|
| Knowledge and Understanding of Theories and Principles of how Students Learn | 2.71 | 0.19 | 0.74 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Classroom Management Techniques | 4.15 | 0.33 | 0.85 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of the Subjects You Teach | 2.40 | 0.17 | 0.76 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Measurement Techniques | -2.08 | -0.14 | 0.71 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Professional Practice Pedagogy | 0.92 | 0.06 | 0.63 |
| Career Satisfaction | | | |
| Overall Level of Satisfaction with Your Current Job | 2.25 | 0.24 | 1.10 |
| Preservice Program Quality ^b | | | |
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Student Teaching Internship Experience | 1.36 | 0.30 | 2.32 |
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Field Based Experience | -1.74 | -0.26 | 1.55 |
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Cooperating/Placement Teacher (below average) | 6.75 | 0.13 | 0.19 |
| Overall Quality Average | 0.85 | 0.03 | 0.40 |
| Overall Quality Above Average | 2.46 | 0.11 | 0.49 |
| Alternative Versus Traditional Certification ^c | | | |
| Highest Level of Education You have Attained | -6.10 | -0.21 | 0.37 |
| Major Field of Study During Your Degree | | | |
| Major Field Other | -11.08 | -0.42 | 0.40 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Table 6. Continued

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|---------|-----------|
| Major Field Elementary Education | 6.24 | 0.27 | 0.45 |
| Major Field English | 4.38 | 0.14 | 0.33 |
| Major Field Math | 7.43 | 0.28 | 0.40 |
| Major Field Sciences | 4.78 | 0.12 | 0.27 |
| Percentage of Teaching Assignment is the Grade(s) or Subject Areas in which You were Endorsed (25 percent) | 4.45 | 0.14 | 0.33 |
| Certified Endorsed 50 percent | 0.85 | 0.22 | 0.27 |
| Certified Endorsed 75 percent | -4.72 | -0.12 | 0.27 |

^aHigh School is the reference variable, Rural is the reference variable, Private is the reference variable

^bQuality of Cooperating Placement Teacher Exceptional is the reference variable

^cMajor field of study ESE is the reference variable, Certified Endorsed 100 percent is the reference variable

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$.

The model regarding disciplinary self-efficacy yielded results that showed that views of teaching predicts 54.1% of the variance in disciplinary self-efficacy. Knowledge and understanding of classroom management techniques and procedures significantly predicted disciplinary self-efficacy, $b = 3.72$, $t(25) = 3.02$, $p = .007$ (see Table 7).

Table 7

Results of Regression Predicting Disciplinary Self Efficacy in First Year Teachers

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|---------|-----------|
| Current Teaching Position ^a | | | |
| Grade Level K-5 | 4.52 | 0.43 | 0.49 |
| Grade Level Middle School Junior High | 0.81 | 0.07 | 0.42 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Table 7. Continued

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|---------|-----------|
| School Building Type Public | -2.93 | -0.11 | 0.19 |
| School Building Setting Inner City | -5.87 | -0.22 | 0.19 |
| School Building Setting Urban | -8.58 | -0.44 | 0.27 |
| School Building Setting Suburban | -4.08 | -0.39 | 0.50 |
| School Building Setting Town | -0.09 | -0.07 | 0.36 |
| Views of Teaching | | | |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Curriculum Development | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.75 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Theories and Principles of how Students Learn | 1.34 | 0.19 | 0.74 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Classroom Management Techniques | 3.72** | 0.60 | 0.85 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of the Subjects You Teach | 1.79 | 0.26 | 0.76 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Measurement Techniques | -0.16 | -0.02 | 0.71 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Professional Practice Pedagogy | -2.07 | -0.25 | 0.63 |
| Career Satisfaction | | | |
| Overall Level of Satisfaction with Your Current Job | 1.04 | 0.22 | 1.10 |
| Preservice Program Quality ^b | | | |
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Student Teaching Internship Experience | 0.29 | 0.13 | 2.32 |
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Field Based Experience | -0.85 | -0.25 | 1.55 |
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Cooperating/Placement Teacher (below average) | -1.44 | -0.05 | 0.19 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Table 7. Continued

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|---------|-----------|
| Overall Quality Average | 0.48 | 0.04 | 0.40 |
| Overall Quality Above Average | 1.01 | 0.09 | 0.49 |
| Alternative Versus Traditional Certification ^c | | | |
| Highest Level of Education You have Attained | 2.96 | 0.21 | 0.37 |
| Major Field of Study During Your Degree | | | |
| Major Field Other | -3.71 | -0.28 | 0.40 |
| Major Field Elementary Education | 1.78 | 0.15 | 0.45 |
| Major Field English | 1.18 | 0.07 | 0.33 |
| Major Field Math | 0.31 | 0.02 | 0.40 |
| Major Field Sciences | 3.06 | 0.16 | 0.27 |
| Percentage of Teaching Assignment is the Grade(s) or Subject Areas in which You were Endorsed (25 percent) | 2.09 | 0.13 | 0.33 |
| Certified Endorsed 50 percent | -6.95 | -0.36 | 0.27 |
| Certified Endorsed 75 percent | -0.12 | -0.06 | 0.27 |

^aHigh School is the reference variable, Rural is the reference variable, Private is the reference variable

^bQuality of Cooperating Placement Teacher Exceptional is the reference variable

^cMajor field of study ESE is the reference variable, Certified Endorsed 100 percent is the reference variable

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$.

The model comparing efficacy to enlist parental involvement with quality of student teaching experience resulted as a significant predictor, $b = 1.22$, $t(25) = 2.87$, $p = .009$. All other

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

factors did not result as significant predictors compared with efficacy to enlist parental involvement (see Table 8).

Table 8

Results of Regression Predicting Efficacy to Enlist Parental Involvement in First Year Teachers

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|---------|-----------|
| Current Teaching Position ^a | | | |
| Grade Level K-5 | 2.43 | 0.23 | 0.49 |
| Grade Level Middle School Junior High | 4.59 | 0.39 | 0.42 |
| School Building Type Public | -2.53 | -0.10 | 0.19 |
| School Building Setting Inner City | -4.06 | -0.15 | 0.19 |
| School Building Setting Urban | 1.09 | 0.06 | 0.27 |
| School Building Setting Suburban | 1.98 | 0.19 | 0.50 |
| School Building Setting Town | -0.12 | -0.01 | 0.36 |
| Views of Teaching | | | |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Curriculum Development | 2.69 | 0.39 | 0.75 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Theories and Principles of how Students Learn | 1.29 | 0.18 | 0.74 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Classroom Management Techniques | -0.62 | -0.10 | 0.85 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of the Subjects You Teach | 1.67 | 0.25 | 0.76 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Measurement Techniques | 1.67 | 0.23 | 0.71 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Professional Practice Pedagogy | -2.62 | -0.32 | 0.63 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Table 8. Continued

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|---------|-----------|
| Career Satisfaction | | | |
| Overall Level of Satisfaction with Your Current Job | 1.62 | 0.35 | 1.10 |
| Preservice Program Quality ^b | | | |
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Student Teaching Internship Experience | 1.23** | 0.55 | 2.32 |
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Field Based Experience | 0.27 | 0.08 | 1.55 |
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Cooperating/Placement Teacher (below average) | -5.89 | -0.22 | 0.19 |
| Overall Quality Average | 1.70 | 0.13 | 0.40 |
| Overall Quality Above Average | 0.34 | 0.03 | 0.49 |
| Alternative Versus Traditional Certification ^c | | | |
| Highest Level of Education You have Attained | 2.07 | 0.15 | 0.37 |
| Major Field of Study During Your Degree | | | |
| Major Field Other | -1.57 | -0.12 | 0.40 |
| Major Field Elementary Education | 2.87 | 0.25 | 0.45 |
| Major Field English | -1.78 | -0.11 | 0.33 |
| Major Field Math | 4.99 | 0.39 | 0.40 |
| Major Field Sciences | -6.26 | -0.33 | 0.27 |
| Percentage of Teaching Assignment is the Grade(s) or Subject Areas in which You were Endorsed (25 percent) | | | |
| Certified Endorsed 50 percent | -3.07 | -0.16 | 0.27 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Table 8. Continued

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|-------------------------------|----------|---------|-----------|
| Certified Endorsed 75 percent | 7.52 | 0.40 | 0.27 |

^aHigh School is the reference variable, Rural is the reference variable, Private is the reference variable

^bQuality of Cooperating Placement Teacher Exceptional is the reference variable

^cMajor field of study ESE is the reference variable, Certified Endorsed 100 percent is the reference variable

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$.

Finally, the last two models compared factors with efficacy to enlist community involvement and efficacy to create a positive school climate. The model did not show that factors were a significant predictor of efficacy to enlist community involvement. However, the model showed that knowledge of classroom management techniques and procedures was a significant predictor of efficacy to create a positive school climate $b = 6.15$, $t(25) = 2.19$, $p = .041$ (see Table 9) and that knowledge of the subjects you teach is a significant predictor of efficacy to create a positive school climate $b = 7.98$, $t(25) = 2.15$, $p = .044$ (see Table 10).

Table 9

Results of Regression Predicting Efficacy to Enlist Community Involvement in First Year Teachers

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|---------|-----------|
| Current Teaching Position ^a | | | |
| Grade Level K-5 | 6.32 | 0.46 | 0.49 |
| Grade Level Middle School Junior High | 5.57 | 0.35 | 0.42 |
| School Building Type Public | -9.19 | -0.26 | 0.19 |
| School Building Setting Inner City | -5.38 | -0.15 | 0.19 |
| School Building Setting Urban | 3.87 | 0.15 | 0.27 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Table 9. Continued

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|---------|-----------|
| School Building Setting Suburban | -2.77 | -0.20 | 0.50 |
| School Building Setting Town | 2.33 | 0.13 | 0.36 |
| Views of Teaching | | | |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Curriculum Development | 1.43 | 0.16 | 0.75 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Theories and Principles of how Students Learn | 6.50 | 0.70 | 0.74 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Classroom Management Techniques | 1.87 | 0.23 | 0.85 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of the Subjects You Teach | 1.44 | 0.16 | 0.76 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Measurement Techniques | -3.51 | -0.36 | 0.71 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Professional Practice Pedagogy | -4.34 | -0.40 | 0.63 |
| Career Satisfaction | | | |
| Overall Level of Satisfaction with Your Current Job | 0.92 | 0.15 | 1.10 |
| Preservice Program Quality ^b | | | |
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Student Teaching Internship Experience | -0.14 | -0.05 | 2.32 |
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Field Based Experience | -0.85 | -0.19 | 1.55 |
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Cooperating/Placement Teacher (below average) | 5.55 | 0.16 | 0.19 |
| Overall Quality Average | -1.50 | -0.09 | 0.40 |
| Overall Quality Above Average | 4.41 | 0.31 | 0.49 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Table 9. Continued

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|---------|-----------|
| Alternative Versus Traditional Certification ^c | | | |
| Highest Level of Education You have Attained | 3.09 | 0.17 | 0.37 |
| Major Field of Study During Your Degree | | | |
| Major Field Other | -9.99 | -0.59 | 0.40 |
| Major Field Elementary Education | -1.86 | -0.12 | 0.45 |
| Major Field English | -0.98 | -0.05 | 0.33 |
| Major Field Math | -5.32 | -0.31 | 0.40 |
| Major Field Sciences | -2.99 | -0.12 | 0.27 |
| Percentage of Teaching Assignment is the Grade(s) or Subject Areas in which You were Endorsed (25 percent) | 3.44 | 0.16 | 0.33 |
| Certified Endorsed 50 percent | -11.09 | -0.44 | 0.27 |
| Certified Endorsed 75 percent | -0.02 | -0.00 | 0.27 |

^aHigh School is the reference variable, Rural is the reference variable, Private is the reference variable

^bQuality of Cooperating Placement Teacher Exceptional is the reference variable

^cMajor field of study ESE is the reference variable, Certified Endorsed 100 percent is the reference variable

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$.

Table 10

Results of Regression Predicting Efficacy to Create a Positive School Climate in First Year Teachers

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|---------|-----------|
| Current Teaching Position ^a | | | |
| Grade Level K-5 | 5.85 | 0.24 | 0.49 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Table 10. Continued

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|---------|-----------|
| Grade Level Middle School Junior High | 4.68 | 0.17 | 0.42 |
| School Building Type Public | -16.23 | -0.26 | 0.19 |
| School Building Setting Inner City | -7.46 | -0.12 | 0.19 |
| School Building Setting Urban | 2.37 | 0.05 | 0.27 |
| School Building Setting Suburban | 2.94 | 0.12 | 0.50 |
| School Building Setting Town | 5.42 | 0.17 | 0.36 |
| Views of Teaching | | | |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Curriculum Development | 2.97 | 0.19 | 0.75 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Theories and Principles of how Students Learn | 4.73 | 0.29 | 0.74 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Classroom Management Techniques | 6.15* | 0.43 | 0.85 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of the Subjects You Teach | 7.99* | 0.50 | 0.76 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Measurement Techniques | -5.04 | -0.30 | 0.71 |
| Knowledge and Understanding of Professional Practice Pedagogy | -4.91 | -0.26 | 0.63 |
| Career Satisfaction | | | |
| Overall Level of Satisfaction with Your Current Job | 3.47 | 0.32 | 1.10 |
| Preservice Program Quality ^b | | | |
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Student Teaching Internship Experience | 1.06 | 0.20 | 2.32 |
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Field Based Experience | -0.93 | -0.12 | 1.55 |

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Table 10. Continued

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|---------|-----------|
| Rate the Overall Quality of Your Cooperating/Placement Teacher (below average) | -4.59 | -0.08 | 0.19 |
| Overall Quality Average | 6.81 | 0.23 | 0.40 |
| Overall Quality Above Average | 5.25 | 0.21 | 0.49 |
| Alternative Versus Traditional Certification ^c | | | |
| Highest Level of Education You have Attained | 3.14 | 0.10 | 0.37 |
| Major Field of Study During Your Degree | | | |
| Major Field Other | -9.81 | -0.33 | 0.40 |
| Major Field Elementary Education | 4.54 | 0.17 | 0.45 |
| Major Field English | 1.12 | 0.03 | 0.33 |
| Major Field Math | 4.17 | 0.14 | 0.40 |
| Major Field Sciences | -4.29 | -0.10 | 0.27 |
| Percentage of Teaching Assignment is the Grade(s) or Subject Areas in which You were Endorsed (25 percent) | 6.05 | 0.16 | 0.33 |
| Certified Endorsed 50 percent | 0.86 | 0.02 | 0.27 |
| Certified Endorsed 75 percent | 12.59 | 0.28 | 0.27 |

^aHigh School is the reference variable, Rural is the reference variable, Private is the reference variable

^bQuality of Cooperating Placement Teacher Exceptional is the reference variable

^cMajor field of study ESE is the reference variable, Certified Endorsed 100 percent is the reference variable

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$.

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Conclusion

This chapter presented the results of the data analysis. Findings from the analysis showed:

1. Suburban school settings are a predictive factor of self-efficacy of decision making
2. Knowledge and understanding of classroom management procedures and techniques are a significant predictor of disciplinary self-efficacy
3. Quality of student teaching experience is a significant predictor of efficacy to enlist parental involvement
4. Knowledge of classroom management procedures and techniques is a significant factor of efficacy to create a positive school climate
5. Knowledge of the subjects you teach is a significant predictor of efficacy to create a positive school climate

Included in the data were the answers to both research questions. Discussion of these findings, implications for practice, implications for future research, and delimitations and limitations are presented in chapter 5.

Chapter 5: Summary, Discussion, Conclusions

Summary of the Major Research Findings

Research has accumulated over the last several decades with regard to teachers' beliefs of their personal motivation (Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2007). Specifically, Bandura's (1977) theory that teachers' self-efficacy beliefs are related to effort, goals, and resilience in the face of setbacks. However, there is a gap in the literature regarding the specific population of first-year teachers. Studies often combine one to three years of teaching as a cohort research model in order to summarize findings related to teaching self-efficacy.

In an effort to further expand the body of research related to teacher self-efficacy, this study identified potential factors that could affect teacher self-efficacy. The purpose of this research was to test Bandura's *Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale* (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) using survey data derived from *The National Survey of Teacher Education Program Graduates* (Loadman et al., 1999). The original sample size was limited due to the smaller population of responses from teachers whom have completed only one year of teaching.

Two research questions guided this study. The first research question addressed factors predictive of self-efficacy, and the second addressed type of teacher preparation program predictive of self-efficacy. These questions were answered using a regression analysis. This study resulted in five major findings. Those findings are as follows:

1. Suburban school settings are a predictive factor of self-efficacy of decision making

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

2. Knowledge and understanding of classroom management procedures and techniques are a significant predictor of disciplinary self-efficacy
3. Quality of student teaching experience is a significant predictor of efficacy to enlist parental involvement
4. Knowledge of classroom management procedures and techniques is a significant factor of efficacy to create a positive school climate as
5. Knowledge of the subjects you teach is a significant predictor of efficacy to create a positive school climate

The remainder of this chapter includes four sections. Discussion of the findings, limitations and delimitations, and implications for practice and future research will be expanded below.

Discussion of the Findings

The first research question asked about factors predictive of self-efficacy in first year teachers. The finding that *suburban school settings are a predictive factor of self-efficacy of decision making* adds to the body of literature in teacher self-efficacy research. Bandura's (1977) theory coupled with Tschannen-Moran and Hoy's (2007) research has limited discussion concerning school setting related to self-efficacy beliefs in teachers. While this finding is not surprising, considering the nature of a suburban school setting, it is an inkling of how a school setting can be predictive of a teacher's decision-making skills.

Additionally, this study found that *knowledge and understanding of classroom management procedures and techniques are a significant predictor of disciplinary self-efficacy*. This finding is also not surprising, however, directly relates to the importance of classroom

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

management techniques and procedures being taught in teacher preparation programs with fidelity. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2007) directly relate teacher self-efficacy to the accomplishments of students (p. 945). This belief system first begins at the management level within a classroom. As students are consistently adhering to policies and procedures in the classroom, teachers are then able to exercise more control over their classroom- resulting in an increase of personal agency, which according to Bandura (1993) is the most central and pervasive mechanism.

In addition to school settings and classroom management procedures and techniques, other findings were more surprising. *Efficacy to enlist parental involvement was predicted by knowledge of classroom management procedures and techniques* adding to the belief that a well-functioning classroom can certainly build the confidence of a first-year teacher to seek out parental support for the classroom. *Knowledge of classroom management procedures and techniques as well as knowledge of the subjects you teach* were both significant predictors of a positive school climate. These predictors show a need for instructional expertise and classroom management techniques before entering a classroom.

The second research question focused on type of teacher preparation program and predictiveness of teacher self-efficacy. The knowledge of highest degree attained, major field of study, and percentage of teaching assignment in which the participant was certified/endorsed did not result in any significance. However, it should be noted that due to limited sample size ($n=26$) a larger study is warranted to see if these findings correlate with the use of a larger scale.

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Limitations and Delimitations

A few limitations arose during and prior to the analyses. Delimitations are included as well. First, there was a lack of variability within the teacher population. Teachers who left the profession after one year were not included in the study and it is possible that the first-year teachers who were surveyed have an inflated perception of their knowledge and expertise due to lack of exposure to the profession. There was also a limit in type of preparation program represented. Specific sampling was not used in order to include types of preparation program participants (including Teach for America, Induction Programs, etc.) therefore, mentoring programs were not included.

One limitation is the limited sample size from Northeast Florida. This limited the variability in response. The lack of sample size (and lack of participation from the urban school district) caused heavy participation from teachers within suburban school districts. Despite these limitations and delimitations, five findings were accurately tested and derived from the study.

Implications for Practice and Future Research

The purpose of this study was to identify potential factors related to self-efficacy in order to recruit and retain teachers who are more resilient, more likely to stay in the field of teaching, and more likely to set goals with effort involved. The analysis indicated that there were five relationships between teacher self-efficacy and predictive factors- all of which can be addressed at the teacher preparation level. In summary, findings indicated that current teaching position is more related to self-efficacy than program quality. A larger sample size is needed to determine more specific relationships between self-efficacy and program quality.

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Implications for practice. Findings from this study have several practical implications for educational stakeholders. Specifically, at the higher education level, it is important to include classroom management techniques and procedural courses in order to allow for mastery of these skills within program candidates. Not only should there be a level of mastery regarding classroom management, but also knowledge of subject area expertise. Although there is a disconnect between position of an educator once hired and the coursework taken, special attention should be paid to instructional practices that are known to produce educational expertise. In order to demonstrate mastery of classroom management and instructional expertise, it would be warranted to have students participate in field experiences earlier on in their educational career.

At the k-12 level, administrators and district personnel should take the time to review transcripts thoroughly to understand the level of expertise in which a candidate is entering the teaching field (based on coursework) before placing in a specific setting. Hiring processes should include interview questions about essential high knowledge areas (curriculum, classroom management, etc.). Candidates should be given the opportunity to demonstrate instructional expertise before a setting is selected by the hiring committee. Furthermore, once a candidate is hired it is important to add to the professional development of a teacher's specific teaching assignment so that they are set up to experience self-efficacy increases. Those professional development sessions should include induction processes for first year teachers. It would be wise for administrators and school districts to form relationships with local preparation programs, so as to agree on what defines an effective beginning teacher. The Florida Department of Education requires a relationship between preparation programs and school districts; however, a deeper

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

more specific relationship is warranted. Those relationships should then transfer to the mentor and mentee relationship between first year and seasoned teachers. Seeking out and hiring better teachers can possibly result in lower attrition and higher levels of competence, of teachers and the students who are direct beneficiaries of competent teaching.

Implications for future research. In addition to practice, this study has implications related to future research. One of the major findings of this study was that school setting plays a particular role in self-efficacy of decision making. It is warranted to extend this study to a larger, more varied sample in order to dive deeper into setting related to self-efficacy. Future researchers should consider a much larger sample size, continuing to focus on first-year teachers, in order to gain a deeper understanding of factors predictive of self-efficacy within this specific population. The lack of diversity within the model could certainly be addressed in future studies. Using a larger sample size might indicate different predictive factors regarding to teacher preparation program type and add to the body of literature.

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

References

- Ball, D.L. & Forzani, F.M. (2010). What does it take to make a teacher? *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(2), 8-12.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory, *American Psychologist*, 44, 1175-1184.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28, 117-148.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Brown, A.L., Lee, J., & Collins, D. (2014). Does student teaching matter? Investigating pre-service teachers' sense of efficacy and preparedness. *Teaching Education*, 26, 77-93.
- Bullough Jr., R.V., Young, J., Erickson, L., Birrell, J.R., Clark, D.C., Egan, M.W., Berrie, C.F., Hales, V., & Smith, G. (2002). Rethinking field experience, partnership teaching versus single-placement teaching, *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53, 68-80.
- Burstein, N., Czech, M., Kretschmer, D., Lombardi, J. & Smith, C. (2009). Providing qualified teachers for urban schools: The effectiveness of the accelerated collaborative teacher preparation program in recruiting, preparing, and retaining teachers, *Action in Teacher Education*, 31, 24-37.

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

- Canrinus, E.T., Helms-Lorenz, M., Beijaard, D., Buitink, J., & Hofman, A. (2012). Self-efficacy, job satisfaction, motivation and commitment: exploring the relationships between indicators of teachers' professional identity, *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 27*, 115-132.
- Chesnut, S.R., & Burley, H. (2015). Self-efficacy as a predictor of commitment to the teaching profession: A meta-analysis, *Educational Research Review, 15*, 1-16.
- Clark, S.K. (2012). The plight of the novice teacher, *The Clearing House, 85*, 197-200.
- Cole, A.L., & Knowles, J.G. (1993). Teacher development partnership research: A focus on methods and issues. *American Educational Research Journal, 30*, 473-495.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2003). Keeping good teachers: Why it matters, what leaders can do, *Educational Leadership, 8*(6), 7-13
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*, 35-47.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Chung, R., & Frelow, F. (2002). Variation in teacher preparation: How well do different pathways prepare teachers to teach? *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*, 286-302.
- Daugherty, R.F. (2003). Reflections from first-year teachers: Responses from Sallie Mae award winners, *Education, 123*, 458-461.

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

- Dellinger, A.B., Bobbett, J.J., Olivier, D.F., & Ellett, C.D. (2008). Measuring teachers' self-efficacy beliefs: Development and use of the TEBS-self. *Teacher and Teacher Education, 24*, 751-766.
- Donaldson, M. & Johnson, S. (2011). Teach for America teachers: How long do they teach? Why do they leave? *Phi Delta Kappan, 93*(2), 47-51.
- Duggan, M.A., Carlson, D.L., Jordan, M.E., Gaias, L., Abry, T., Granger, K. (2017). "Dear Diary": A qualitative examination of the phases of first-year teaching, *Teacher Education & Practice, 30*, 16-37.
- Evans, E.D., & Tribble, M. (1986). Perceived teaching problems, self-efficacy, and commitment to teaching among preservice teachers, *Journal of Educational Research, 80*, 81- 85.
- Fantilli, R.D., & McDougall, D.E. (2009). A study of novice teachers: Challenges and supports in the first years, *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*, 814-825.
- Florida Department of Education (FLDOE). (2018, June). Educator preparation institute (EPI) programs initial program approval standards' technical assistance for each criterion. *Florida Department of Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7502/urlt/TechAssist-EPIRequire.pdf>
- Florida Department of Education (FLDOE). (2018, June). Initial teacher preparation programs (ITP) Initial program approval standards' technical assistance for each criterion. *Florida Department of Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7502/urlt/TechAssist-ITPRequire.pdf>
- 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), 1-16.

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

- Fry, S.W. (2009). Characteristics and experiences that contribute to novice elementary teachers' success and efficacy, *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 36, 95-110.
- Good, T.L., McCaslin, M., Tsang, H.Y., Zhang, J., Wiley, C.R.H., and Bozack, A.R. (2006). How well do 1st-year teachers teach; Does type of preparation make a difference?, *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57, 410-430.
- Grossman, P., Hammerness, K., & McDonald, M. (2009). Redefining teaching, re-imagining teacher education, *Teachers and Teaching*, 15, 273-289.
- Guo, Y., Justice, L.M., Sawyer, B., & Tompkins, V. (2011). Exploring factors related to preschool teachers' self-efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 961-968.
- Harris, S., Camp, W., & Adkison, J. (2003, January). New structures and approaches for teacher preparation: Do they make a difference in teacher retention? In, *Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA*.
- Hasselquist, L., Herndon, K., & Kitchel, T. (2017). School culture's influence on beginning agriculture teachers' job satisfaction and teacher self-efficacy. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 58, 267-279.
- Heirdsfield, A.M., Walker, S., Walsh, K., & Wilss, L. (2008). Peer mentoring for first year teacher education students: The mentors' experience, *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 16, 109-124.
- Hong, J.Y. (2012). Why do some beginning teachers leave the school, and others stay? Understanding teacher resilience through psychological lenses, *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 18, 417-440.

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

- Hoy, A.W. (2000). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching. In, *Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.*
- Hoy, A.W., & Spero, R.B. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching: A comparison of four measures. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 343-356.
- Hughes, G.D. (2012). Teacher retention: Teacher characteristics, school characteristics, organizational characteristics, and teacher efficacy, *Journal of Educational Research, 105*, 245-255.
- Huling, L. (1998). Early field experiences in teacher education. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education*, Washington DC, 1-7.
- Ingersoll, R., Merrill, L. & May, H. (2014). What are the effects of teacher education and preparation on beginning teacher attrition? *CPRE Research Reports*. Retrieved from https://repository.upenn.edu/cpre_researchreports/78
- Jacobs, S. (2019). Florida teacher preparation programs: A summary and analysis of program performance. *Education Counsel*, 1-170.
- Jorissen, K. (2002). Retaining alternate route teachers: The power of professional integration in teacher preparation and induction. *High School Journal, 86*, 45-56.
- Kee, A.N. (2012). Feelings of preparedness among alternatively certified teachers: What is the role of program features? *Journal of Teacher Education, 63*, 23-38.
- Klassen, R.M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102*, 741-756.

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

- Klassen, R.M., & Chiu, M.M. (2011). The occupational commitment and intention to quit of practicing and pre-service teachers: Influence of self-efficacy, job stress, and teaching context, *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 36, 114-129.
- Korthagen, F.A.J. (2001). *Linking practice and theory: The pedagogy of realistic teacher education*. Mahwah, N.J.: Routledge.
- Loadman, W.E., Freeman, D.J., Brookhart, S.M., Rahman, M.A., & McCague, G.J. (1999) Development of a national survey of teacher education program graduates. *Journal of Educational Research*, 93, 76-89.
- Lortie, S. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marable, M.A. & Raimondi, S.L. (2007). Teachers' perceptions of what was most (and least) supportive during their first year of teaching, *Mentoring & Tutoring*, 15, 25-37.
- Martin, J.J., McCaughtry, N., Hodges-Kulinna, P., & Cothran, D. (2008). The influences of professional development on teachers' self-efficacy toward educational change. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 13, 171-190.
- McFarland, J., Hussar, B., Zhang, J., Wang, X., Wang, K., Hein, S., Diliberti, M., Forrest Cataldi, E., Bullock Mann, F., and Barmer, A. (2019). *The Condition of Education 2019* (NCES 2019-144). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved [2019, August 25] from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2019144>.
- Moir, E. (1999). The states of a teacher's first year. In M. Scherer (Ed.), *A better beginning: Supporting and mentoring new teachers* (p. 19-23). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

- Ng, J.C., & Peter, L. (2010). Should I stay or should I go? Examining the career choices of alternatively licensed teachers in urban schools, *Urban Review*, 42(2), 123-142.
- O'Brian, M., Stoner, J., Appel, K., & House, J.J. (2007). The first field experience: Perspectives of preservice and cooperating teachers, *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 30, 264-275.
- Pajares, N. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings, *Review of Educational Research*, 66, 543-578.
- Pedota, P.J. (2015). How can student success support teacher self-efficacy and retention? *Clearing House*, 88, 54-61.
- Perera, H.N., Calkins, C., & Part, R. (2019). Teacher self-efficacy profiles: Determinants, outcomes, and generalizability across teaching level, *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 58, 186-203.
- Pfitzner-Eden, F. (2016). I feel less confident so I quit? Do true changes in teacher self-efficacy predict changes in preservice teachers' intention to quit their teaching degree? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 55, 240-254.
- Protheroe, N. (2008). Teacher efficacy: What is it and does it matter? *Principal*, 87(5), 42-45.
- Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80, 1-28.
- Seiforth, B., & Samuel, M. (1979). The emergence of early field experiences, *Peabody Journal of Education*, 57(1), 10-16.
- Shilder, L., & Fedor, K. (2010). Teacher to teacher: The heart of the coaching model. *Young Children*, 4, 70-75.

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

- Siwatu, K.O. (2011). Preservice teachers' sense of preparedness and self-efficacy to teach in America's urban and suburban schools: Does context matter? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*, 357-365.
- Skaalvik, E.M., & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of relations. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*, 1059-1069.
- Skaalvik, E.M., & Skaalvik, S. (2016). Teacher stress and teacher self-efficacy as predictors of engagement, emotional exhaustion, and motivation to leave the teaching profession, *Creative Education, 7*, 1785-1799.
- Smith, T.M., & Ingersoll, R. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(3), 681-714.
- Swackhamer, L.E., Koellner, K., Basile, C., & Kimbrough, D. (2009). Increasing the self-efficacy of inservice teachers through content knowledge. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 36*(2), 63-78.
- Swan, B.G., Wolf, K.J., & Cano, J. (2011). Changes in teacher self-efficacy from the student teaching experience through the third year of teaching. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 52*, 128-139.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. & Hoy, A.W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education 17*, 783-805.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A., & Hot, W.K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68*, 202-248.

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

- Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A., (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*, 944-956.
- Tuchman, E., & Isaacs, J. (2011). The influence of formal and informal formative pre-service experiences on teacher self-efficacy. *Educational Psychology, 31*, 413-433.
- Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 54*, 143-178.
- Washburn-Moses, L. (2018). An analysis of conditions and trends in student teaching in the United States, *Teacher Development, 22*, 703-716.
- Yoo, J.H. (2016). The effect of professional development on teacher efficacy and teachers' self-analysis of their efficacy change, *Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability, 18*, 84-94.
- Yost, D.S. (2006). Reflection and self-efficacy: Enhancing the retention of qualified teachers from a teacher education perspective, *Teacher Education Quarterly, 33*, 59-76.
- Zeichner, K., & Tabachnik, B.R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education washed out by school experiences? *Journal of Teacher Education, 32*, 7-11.
- Zhang, G., & Zeller, N. (2016). A longitudinal investigation of the relationship between teacher preparation and teacher retention, *Teacher Education Quarterly, 43*, 73-92.