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ABSTRACT

The teaching profession has been concerned within the past several years, with the preparation of traditional and alternative route teachers. Urban districts have been trying to address how effective teachers are in regards to their training and educational preparation.

The purpose of this study was to examine the differences in beginning teachers (those who have taught between one and three years) who chose the traditional route of teacher education and teachers who pursued an alternative route of teacher preparation in terms of educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experience, and career adaptability and the relationship to job satisfaction and intention to leave their current job. A correlational research design was implemented in this investigation. Using a purposive sampling procedure, the sample was accessed from a list of 1-3 years beginning teachers in an urban school district in New Jersey. Participants \( (N = 89) \) completed self-reporting questionnaires developed by the researcher about their educational backgrounds, personal characteristics, school characteristics, job satisfaction, and intent to leave their current jobs. The Career Mastery Inventory (CMAS) (Crites, 1978) and the Alleman Mentoring Activities Questionnaire (AMAO) (Alleman & Clarke, 2000) ascertained information about participants’ career adaptability and mentoring experiences.

One research question was answered and two related hypotheses were tested. Data analyses consisted of descriptive statistics, confirmatory factor analysis, chi-square, t-tests for independent samples, and multiple regression. The researcher-developed scales of school characteristics, job satisfaction, and intention to leave were determined to have
good reliability and construct validity. The standardized instrument, the Alleman Mentoring Activities Questionnaire was also determined to be highly reliable and valid for the sample of beginning teachers, who also had average mentoring experiences.

Findings indicated that the teachers in this study had significantly higher levels of career adaptability as measured on the Career Mastery Inventory than the average adult. There were no significant differences in educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experience, career adaptability, job satisfaction, and intention to leave in beginning teachers relative to teacher preparation. Highest educational level achieved and school characteristics were significant explanatory variables of job satisfaction accounting for 14% of the variance. Specifically, as educational achievement increased, job satisfaction decreased. Favorable school characteristics were associated with increased job satisfaction. School characteristics were a significant explanatory variable of intention to leave the current job accounting for 11% of the variance. Favorable school characteristics were related to decreased intentions to leave the current job.

Among all the variables of interest in this study, the common denominator influencing teacher job satisfaction and retention was school characteristics. Themes assessed by the school characteristics instrument included degree of support teachers perceived for staff development programs, feeling appreciated, administrative support of innovative teaching and learning ideas, teamwork, and maintaining discipline. Based upon the current study, if school administrators can focus their efforts on improving these key areas, they will improve teacher job satisfaction and retention rates.
Recommendations for future studies include replicating the study with a larger sample size. This study might be expanded to other school districts within the state of New Jersey and to other states. Future studies should also incorporate the additional variable of pay to increase the explanatory power of the models tested, which seek to explain teacher job satisfaction and retention rates within the context of teacher preparation.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Introduction

The teaching profession has historically suffered from high rates of attrition, particularly among new entrants. Ingersoll and Kralik (2004) estimated that some 40% to 50% of new teachers leave the profession within their first five years on the job. Inman and Marlow (2004) noted that beginning teachers leave the profession mainly because of employment factors, such as large class sizes, approaches to teaching that differ substantially from those of their colleagues, lack of administrative support, and lack of prestige of the education profession. Attrition rates for new teachers, especially those in their first year of teaching, are particularly high in economically disadvantaged schools (Darling-Hammond, 2003). Among veteran teachers, a wave of retirements heightens the problem of staffing American schools and a large portion of the teaching force will be lost to retirement by 2010 (Goldhaber & Anthony, 2003).

There is some controversy over the extent of an actual teacher shortage, although there is general consensus that the number of teachers entering and remaining in the teaching profession is not keeping up with growing enrollments in public elementary and secondary schools (Ingersoll & Smith, 2004; U.S. Department of Education, 2004). Some authors maintain that the problem is not so much numbers of teachers, but disproportionately high attrition rates especially in low-income schools where students require qualified teachers the most (Darling-Hammond, 2003; Haberman, 2005).

Research continues to suggest that teacher quality is the most important factor in predicting student outcomes; students may experience as much as one grade level of
academic growth in a single year (Davis, 2006; Goldhaber & Anthony, 2004; Hanushek, 1997; Haskins & Loeb, 2007; Keller, 2007; Sanders & Rivers, 1996). The No Child Left Behind Act [NCLB] (2002) makes direct reference to providing all students with highly qualified teachers. As defined by policy makers, highly qualified teachers must have three key attributes: “a baccalaureate degree, full state certification or licensure, and demonstrated competency in their respective subject area” (U.S. Department of Education, 2004, p. 3). The focus is on credentials rather than on ability.

An observation made by Goldhaber and Anthony (2004) about teacher quality is most relevant to the present study:

While researchers tend to agree that teacher quality is an important determining factor in influencing student outcomes, there is little consensus about the relationship between specific teacher credentials (e.g., experience and degree level) and characteristics (e.g., age, race, and ethnicity) and teacher effectiveness (p.5).

Klagholz (2001) described the courses offered by typical state-certified teacher education programs as “academically unchallenging.” Due to their focus on "soft" social sciences, they provide inadequate preparation for future job success. Additionally, requisite certification courses supplant liberal arts courses, further attenuating the quality of course offerings. According to Klagholz (2001), the structure of teacher education programs discourages high achievers, “including many sincerely interested in teaching” (p.34) because of such programs’ questionable academic reputation and inadequate preparation of students for the competitive job market outside of teaching. As a result, teacher education programs are disproportionately composed of academically weaker
students (Levine, 2006). Clearly, teacher quality is not simply about credentials or student outcomes; rather, defining and evaluating teacher quality becomes a more complex issue of isolating those characteristics and behaviors that together comprise teacher quality and that contribute to teachers’ job satisfaction and intention to stay in teaching.

Research (Allen, 2003; Beck, Kosnick, & Roswell, 2007; Chambers, 2002; Rosenberg, Boyer, Sindelar, & Misra, 2007) points to the need for ongoing behavioral research relative to teacher retention, particularly with respect to whether teachers have pursued a traditional route of teacher education or an alternative route of teacher preparation. Such research must consider the relationships among personal and school characteristics, educational background, mentoring experiences, career adaptability, job satisfaction, and intention of beginning teachers to stay in teaching. Theories of career development, mentoring, job satisfaction and retention, and teacher preparation can explain these relationships, and a further examination of these theories and results of empirical studies are needed.

**Purpose**

This study will examine the differences in beginning teachers (those who have taught between one and three years) who chose the traditional route of teacher education and teachers who pursued an alternative route of teacher preparation in terms of educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experience, salary compensation, and career adaptability and the relationship to job satisfaction and intention to leave their current job. Furthermore, this study will identify areas for future scholarly research and empirical study. This descriptive analysis study
will answer one research question and examine two hypotheses using descriptive
statistics and ANOVA.

Definition of Terms

Babbie (2003) explained that the dependent variable (DV) is the variable that is
hypothesized to be influenced by the independent variable (IV). This study will have five
independent variables and two dependent variables. These are described below.

Independent Variables

Independent Variable #1: Traditional Teacher Preparation

Theoretical Definition

Traditional teacher preparation models emphasize providing pre-service teachers
with educational theory, skills, procedures, and practical teaching experience. In
traditional models teaching is viewed as a matter of applying theory to classroom
situations along with a set of pedagogical skills learned in a teacher preparation program.
This model is based on the assumption that teachers must not only teach what they know
(i.e., one subject or discipline), but that they must be taught pedagogical skills to
effectively convey what they know (Carr, 2003).

However, teaching is a complex intellectual endeavor that must consider the dynamic
context of a particular classroom (Korthagen & Kessels, 1999) and the knowledge and
skills needed for other subjects (Lederman, Lederman, & El Khalick, 2007).

Operational Definition

The traditional route to teacher licensure involves participation in a four-or-five
year program offered by colleges and universities (Brannan & Reichardt, 2002).

Typically accredited and granted by the state, the programs provide the requisite
coursework and field experience needed for licensure; thus, graduates automatically earn a teaching license upon satisfactory completion of program requirements. In this study, alternative routes to teacher preparation programs are those in the classification system developed by the National Center for Education Information (NCEI), which uses the letters from A through K to denote the various approaches to alternative certification adopted by the states (NCAE, 2004). These range from models in which individuals with college degrees in areas other than teaching teach under a trained mentor while receiving formal instruction in education theory and practice during the school year, and in some cases during summers (Classes A and B); a review of academic and professional background and transcript analysis (Classes C and D); post-baccalaureate programs based at an institution of higher education (Class E); issuance of emergency teaching certificates (Class F); programs for persons who have few requirements left to fulfill before becoming certified through the traditional approved college teacher education program route (Class G); routes that enables a person who has some “special” qualifications, such as a well-known author or Nobel Prize winner, to teach certain subjects (Class H); lack of alternatives to the approved college teacher education program route for licensing teachers (Class I); and Class J, elimination of emergency routes; rather, individuals who do not meet basic requirements become qualified to enter an alternate or traditional route leading to teacher licensing (Feistritzer, & Chester, 2001).

The difference between Classes A and B is that Class B programs are generally limited to addressing shortages, secondary grade levels, or specific subject areas while Class A programs have no such restrictions (NCAE, 2004).
Independent variable #2: Personal Characteristics

Theoretical Definition

Super (1957) introduced the concept of career maturity to denote “the place reached on the continuum of vocational development from exploration to decline” (p. 153). Super postulated that career maturation proceeds along five dimensions: Orientation to Vocational Choice, Information and Planning, Consistency of Vocational Choice, Crystallization of Traits, and Wisdom of Vocational Preferences (Super, Savickas, & Super, 1996). Billingsley (1993, as cited in Billingsley, 2003) developed a schematic representation of the range of external, employment, and personal influences on teachers’ career decisions. The center of this model focuses on employment factors, such as professional qualifications; work conditions and rewards; and commitments to school, district, teaching field and teaching profession.

Operational Definition

In this study, personal characteristics will refer to maturity of beginning teachers who have taught from one to three years. These characteristics will be measured by the Career Maturity Inventory (CMI) developed by Crites (1978).

Independent Variable #3: School Characteristics

Theoretical Definition

According to Arnold (1993), new teachers compare their working conditions with those of other teaching and non-teaching careers, and they evaluate their expectations about teaching against the realities of the classroom (Arnold, 1993). If they find that an adequate support system is not available to them, many new teachers will look for it elsewhere (Arnold, 1993).
Operational Definition

In this study the variable school characteristics encompasses the level of professionalism, collegiality, and administrative support.

Independent Variable #4: Mentoring Experiences

Theoretical Definition

Kram's (1983, 1980, 1985) research on mentoring relationships used the earlier research on Dalton, Thompson, and Price (1977), Kanter (1977), and Levinson (1977) to explore in more depth the characteristics of the mentoring relationship and the range of functions of mentors and benefits received by mentees. Kram (1983) identified nine separate functions that are provided by mentors and divided these in two categories—career functions and psychosocial functions. Career functions include sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging work assignments. Psychosocial functions include role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship.

Operational Definition

In this study, mentoring is defined as the activity where appropriately qualified and experienced teachers assist, by example and facilitation, beginning teachers to learn new skills, adopt new behaviors, and acquire new attitudes.

Independent variable #5 Career Adaptability

Theoretical Definition

Super's (1957) theory of career stages uses a life-span approach to describe how individuals evidence their self-concept through vocational choices. Super proposed that the process of choosing an occupation that permits maximum self-expression occurs over
time and along four dimensions. Two of these dimensions are cognitive in nature and are concerned with knowledge about occupations and careers and knowledge about principles and practices of career decision making (Savickas, 1997). Super’s theory can provide a framework for explaining career adaptability of beginning teachers.

**Operational Definition**

In this study, career adaptability will refer to the level of flexibility of beginning teachers in responding to the school environment and to the teaching profession. This will be measured by the Career Maturity Inventory (CMI) developed by Crites (1978).

**Dependent Variables**

**Dependent Variable #1: Job Satisfaction**

**Dependent Variable #2: Intention to Leave**

**Theoretical Definition**

Three conceptual frameworks emerge in the literature on job satisfaction: content theory, process theory, and situational theory. Content theory suggests that individuals who achieve growth and self-actualization are satisfied with their jobs. Process theory attempts to explain job satisfaction in terms of the extent to which the job meets individuals’ expectations and values. According to situational theories, job satisfaction depends on the fit between an individual’s personal characteristics and organizational characteristics (Robbins, 2002).

Job satisfaction theories can explain both retention and intention to leave a job. For instance, according to Maslow’s (1968) theory, individuals in jobs that allow growth and acquisition of higher level needs are more likely to be satisfied. If individuals are not satisfied with their jobs, they are more likely to leave. Equity and expectancy theories
can also explain retention or intention to leave, if, as Adams (1965) and Vroom (1982) suggested, individuals feel satisfied at work when the input or contribution to a job and the resulting outcome are equal to those of co-workers, they are more likely to remain. If they are dissatisfied and perceive that they are being treated inequitably when compared to their co-workers, they are likely to leave. Relative to the present study, content and process theories are potentially more explanatory with respect to job satisfaction and retention than situational theories. This conclusion is based on the existing research that contends that teachers will leave teaching if the work environment is not favorable (Billingsley, 2003).

**Operational Definition**

In this study, job satisfaction is defined as beginning teachers’ satisfaction with school characteristics and mentoring experiences resulting in a decision to remain in teaching after completion of one year of teaching experience. Intention to leave is defined as a teacher’s decision to leave the teaching profession after completing one year of teaching experience. These will be measured by a survey questionnaire created by the researcher.

**Other Operational Definitions**

*Alternative route teacher:* a teacher prepared for the teaching profession via a nontraditional alternative teacher certification program whereby the curriculum is designed according to the academic background of the student and usually requires 1 to 2 years additional education beyond the baccalaureate degree. Alternative route teachers in nontraditional alternative certification programs are prepared in a smaller amount of time,
with similar academic content, rigor, and outcomes as traditional programs (Stoddart & Floden, 1995).

Formal mentoring: structured programs that match mentor and mentee, have defined requirements (e.g., minimum frequency of meetings, procedure for evaluating the mentee’s performance and potential), and that are administered in-house (Murray, 2001).

Informal mentoring: spontaneous mentoring that arises as individuals interact during normal professional activities (Murray, 2001).

Practical knowledge: knowledge acquired only through experience (Eraut, 1994).

Professional knowledge: the combination of both technical and practical knowledge (Eraut, 1994).

Provisional certificate: a 2-year temporary certificate issued to candidates who have met the requirements for initial employment (holder of a CE or CEAS). They are employed and enrolled as part of a district training program approved by the New Jersey Department of Education (alternate route or traditional route).

Standard certificate: a permanent certification that is issued to a candidate who has met all the requirements under the New Jersey Department of Education Guidelines.

Student outcomes: outcomes that indicate that students meet designated criteria for grade level performance as assessed by academic tests aligned with state standards and as mandated by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) (U.S. Department of Education, 2004).

Teacher competence: a strong subject content knowledge and strong knowledge of pedagogy that contributes to student learning and produces positive student outcomes (Eraut, 1994).
Teacher quality: “a teacher’s quantifiable ability to produce growth in student achievement rather than by the individual qualifications or attributes a teacher brings to the classroom” (Goldhaber & Anthony, 2003, p.6).

Technical knowledge: codified (“what”) information obtained largely through classroom lecture (Eraut, 1994).

Traditional route teacher: a teacher who has completed a formal professional education teaching training program usually based on a fixed curricula, pedagogical study, and classroom experience. Teachers in traditional programs are typically supervised by faculty in a higher education institution (Baker, Shi, & Trummer, 2004).

Justification

High levels of attrition, particularly among beginning teachers and in urban schools, add to the shortage of qualified teachers. Although a growing number of candidates are entering the education profession from other professions, they do not often remain in teaching (Darling-Hammond, 2003).

Empirical studies of teacher retention have addressed experiences, mentoring, attrition, retention, job satisfaction, and professional development of beginning teachers (Tellez, 1992; Zepeda & Ponticell, 1996). Other studies (Billingsley, 2003; Chapman, 1984; Chapman & Green, 1986) found that the personal characteristics of the teacher, the nature of teacher training and early teaching experiences, the degree to which the teacher is socially and professionally integrated into the teaching profession, the satisfaction a teacher derives from the career, and external environmental influences impinging on the teacher’s career impact a teacher’s decision to stay in or leave teaching. However, no studies have been found in the literature that examine empirically the relationships among
educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experience, and career adaptability to beginning teachers’ job satisfaction and intention to leave their current job. Unlike previous studies, this research will explore the relationships of these variables for teachers who have pursued a traditional route of teacher education compared to teachers who have pursued an alternative route of teacher preparation. The results of this study may help schools and school districts retain greater numbers of beginning teachers.

The topic of this study is researchable because all variables, research questions, and hypotheses can be measured by standardized questionnaires and statistical analysis. This investigative study is also feasible because it can be implemented with reasonable time and cost limits.

**Research Question and Hypotheses**

The research question for this study is:

1. Are there differences in the educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experience, career adaptability, job satisfaction, and intention to leave in beginning teachers (those who have taught for one to three years) who have pursued a traditional route of teacher preparation, compared to those teachers who have pursued an alternative route of teacher preparation? The research hypotheses are:

   H1: Educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experiences, and career adaptability of beginning teachers are significant explanatory variables of job satisfaction (total sample combined).
H2: Educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experiences, career adaptability, and job satisfaction of beginning teachers are significant explanatory variables of intentions to leave the current job.

H2_a: Educational background, personal characteristics, mentoring experiences, career adaptability, and job satisfaction of beginning teachers are significant explanatory variables of intentions to leave current job (total sample combined).

Delimitations and Scope

This study will have the following delimitations, which may affect the generalizability of the study to larger populations:

1. The research will focus on teachers who have become certified either through a traditional teacher preparation program (i.e., a four-or five-year program offered by colleges and universities) or through alternative programs, such as Troops for Teachers, Teach for America, and so on.

2. The research will focus on full-time, beginning teachers (teachers who have taught for one to three years) in grades K-12 in an urban school district in New Jersey.

3. This study will examine the relationship of educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experience, and career adaptability to beginning teachers’ job satisfaction and intention to leave their current job for teachers who have pursued a
traditional route of teacher education compared to teachers who have pursued an alternative route of teacher preparation. However, the results of this study may not be generalize to the larger population of first-year teachers because each school district and each school has its own organizational culture, leadership characteristics, levels of job satisfaction, and demands on beginning teachers, and so on. However, the results of the study will still provide direction for future research in these areas.

4. Since job satisfaction and intention to leave are sensitive issues to both schools and teachers, data will be collected anonymously so that participants will be as honest and candid as possible. This also means that it will not be possible to identify participants for future research.

5. The accessible population will be limited to 249 beginning teachers who have either taken a traditional route or alternative route to teacher education in grades K-12 in an urban school district in New Jersey.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The teaching profession has historically been construed as a career track with a lifelong commitment to teaching, a concept now considered obsolete and unrealistic (Goldhaber & Anthony, 2003). Such a career track with lifelong commitment may no longer be possible, given an ever increasing mix of diverse student ethnic school populations making teaching more difficult and continuing low salaries that cannot keep up with economic inflation and rising cost of living expenses. A common standard for retention in teaching is now considered remaining in the teaching profession for five years or more (Feistritzer, 2005b; Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004).

While there is some controversy over whether there is actually a teacher shortage, there is general consensus that the number of teachers entering and remaining in the teaching profession is not keeping up with growing enrollments in public elementary and secondary schools (Ingersoll & Smith, 2004; NEA, 2003; U.S. Department of Education, 2004). Some authors maintain that the problem is not so much numbers of teachers, but disproportionately high attrition rates especially in low-income schools where students require qualified teachers the most (Darling-Hammond, 2003; Haberman, 2005). Ingersoll (2001) found that “low salaries, inadequate support from the school administration, student discipline problems, and limited faculty input into school decision-making all contribute to higher rates of turnover, after controlling for the characteristics of both teachers and schools” (p. 3). Although a growing number of
candidates are entering the education profession from other professions, poor retention in teaching is evident among them (Darling-Hammond, 2003).

Research of job satisfaction among teachers (Buckley, Schneider, & Shang, 2005; Wei-Chang, Ellsworth, & Hawley, 2008) shows that job satisfaction is a major concern, especially among beginning teachers, and that job satisfaction affects attrition rates. A number of factors influence job satisfaction, and attrition (Inman & Marlow, 2004; Howe, 2006). These factors are perceptions among teachers as to how well their job provides things they deem as most important (Howe, 2006; Walters, 2004); pay, integration, instrumental communication, formal communication, and centralization (Dove, 2004; Inman & Marlow, 2004; Price, 2004); degree of autonomy and feedback from the job itself and influence over school policy (Inman & Marlow, 2004); and challenging work (Buckley et al., 2005).

The purpose of this literature review is to examine theoretical and empirical literature related to the effectiveness of alternative routes to teacher certification in producing qualified teachers and promoting successful career transitions (with specific focus on teacher retention). The first section provides an overview of traditional and alternative routes to teacher certification, followed by a discussion of the effectiveness and selected models of alternative routes and comparisons of traditionally prepared teachers and alternate route teachers in terms of in terms of preparation, demographic characteristics, approach to learning and teaching, student achievement, and retention. Theories of job satisfaction, turnover, and career development are then discussed. The discussion includes Holland’s (1985) career typology and Super’s (1957) life span theory.
Finally, the relationship of personal and school characteristics and mentoring to job satisfaction and intention to stay in the teaching profession is presented.

**Teacher Preparation**

Traditional and alternate route teachers are similar in that both must possess a college degree from an accredited college or university. The defining measure of significant difference is that a traditional teacher will have completed a formal professional education teaching training program while an alternate route candidate will need the support of on the job training and professional evaluation (US Teach and New Jersey Department of Education, n.d.). Typically accredited by the state, traditional teacher education programs provide the requisite coursework and field experience needed for licensure; thus, graduates automatically earn a teaching license upon satisfactory completion of program requirements (Haberman, 2005). Alternative certification programs, however, differ from traditional programs and from each other in terms of nature and length of professional training (Bradshaw, 1998). In the sections that follow the differences between traditional and alternative teacher preparation are discussed.

**Traditional Teacher Preparation**

The majority of teachers in the U.S. still enter teaching through four-year, five-year and fifth-year university-based programs (Spellings, 2006). These traditional programs have been the subject of much criticism for many years. According to Klagholz (2001), the structure of teacher education programs discouraged high achievers, “including many sincerely interested in teaching” (p. 34) as a consequence of their questionable academic reputation and inadequate preparation for the competitive job market outside of teaching. As a result, teacher education programs were
disproportionately composed of academically weaker students. According to Levine (2006), more than 50% of teacher education graduates come from universities with poor programs, low graduation standards, and low admissions. Also, faculty members who engage in teaching are sometimes much older than the students and thus more removed from the actual classrooms. As a result, those who graduate from such schools are poorly prepared to start their teaching careers (Levine, 2006). Berry, Montgomery, and Snyder (2008) concurred with Klagholz (2001) and Levine (2006), noting that many traditional university-based teacher preparation programs have difficulty attracting high academic achievers and teacher candidates of color, offer too few opportunities for prospective teachers to be taught by exemplary classroom teachers, fail to meet shortage area needs in subjects such as math, science, special education, and English Language Learners, do not provide adequate induction support for their graduates in a systematic way once they begin teaching, and lack a system to evaluate the effectiveness of graduates and hold them accountable.

This increasing criticism has raised questions about the effectiveness of college and university-based teacher education (Darling-Hammond, Holtzman, Gatlin, & Heilig, (2005). Former U.S. Secretary of Education Rod Paige (2002) recommended that teachers be hired on how well they know a subject and their verbal ability. Further, education courses should be optional and student teaching should be eliminated (Paige, 2002).

An address made by then-Boston Public School Superintendent Tom Payzant at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in 2004 was entitled “Should teacher preparation take place at colleges and universities?”
These critiques have sparked the growth of alternatives to traditional teacher education programs (Baines, 2006a),

**Alternate Route Teacher Preparation**

Alternative routes to traditional teacher preparation are commonly defined as anything other than a four or five-year undergraduate program in a college or university (Zeichner & Conklin, 2005). Alternative certification that does not require completion of a traditional teacher education program has been viewed as a means of entry into the teaching profession (Bradshaw, 1998).

For the purpose of clarity in data reporting and analysis, the National Center for Education Information (NCEI) developed a classification system for alternative route teacher preparation programs. The system uses the letters from A through K to denote the various approaches to alternative certification adopted by the states (NCAE, 2004). Class A is the designation for programs designed to attract talented individuals with a bachelor's degree to a formal program of instruction, and mentor supervision with no requirement as to subject area need of shortage of teachers. Class K is the designation for avenues to certification that accommodate specific populations for teaching, such as Teach for America and Troops to Teachers (NCAE).

Class A and Class B programs were devised specifically to draw talented individuals with non-education backgrounds into the teaching profession. The NCEI considers these classifications the only true alternative routes to teacher certification (NCAE, 2004). Most programs created under recent legislation reflect the original model and are defined by the following characteristics:
1. The program has been devised to recruit, prepare, and credential talented teacher candidates who already have a bachelor’s degree.

2. The candidate must pass rigorous screening protocols such as passing exams, interviews, and demonstrating content mastery.

3. The programs are field-based.

4. Candidates engage in coursework or equivalent experiences in professional education before and during teaching.

5. Teacher candidates work closely with mentor teachers.

6. Candidates must meet high performance standards for program completion.

Since 1983, the number of alternative programs that certify teachers rose from 12 to 485 in 2006 (Honawar, 2007). In addition, in school year 2004-05, states issued teaching certificates to approximately 50,000 candidates who had entered teaching through alternative routes. This number represented a third of all new teachers hired (Honawar, 2007). Brannan and Reichardt’s (2002) review of literature on alternative models of teacher education revealed an increasing array of organizations, including community colleges, school districts, and state boards of education, offering teacher education programs, historically the domain of colleges and universities. These programs offer innovations such as flexibility in course offerings and scheduling, more diverse approaches to candidate selection, more rapid transition to teaching, and more relevance to the “real world” experiences teachers confront on the job. A defining characteristic of these programs is their focus on real world experience over classroom coursework. The overriding emphasis is on “extensive, closely monitored, and closely mentored field experience” (Brannan & Reichardt, 2002, p. 25). This focus on real world experience is
absent from the conventional model of teacher education and is not “user friendly” for working adults interested in transitioning to a teaching career (Hoepfl, 2001).

In the mid-1980s, the National Center for Education Information (NCEI) began tracking the development of alternative teacher preparation programs (NCAE, 2004). From a scant few programs, the number of states offering some form of alternative pathway to teacher licensure steadily rose. By 2003, 43 states and the District of Columbia reported having some type of alternative program in place. An estimated 200,000 teaching candidates have been credentialed through these programs (NCAE, 2004).

The literature on alternative programs and pathways to the teaching profession indicates that alternative routes to certification come in various forms (Baines, 2006b). More importantly, the research shows that graduates of alternative programs do as well as graduates of traditional programs in terms of student achievement and instructional knowledge and skills, and teaching competence (Baker et al., 2004).

Standards of teaching competence reflect a teacher’s commitment to student and student learning and call for teachers to:

- Act on the belief that all students can learn.
- Possess deep subject matter knowledge regarding the substance and structure of their discipline.
- Effectively manage and monitor student learning, identify learning goals and select teaching styles to meet these goals.
- Reflect on their teaching and evaluate their decisions and experiences to adapt their teaching.
- Become part of a larger community composed of school staff, parents, and the broader local community (Laczko-Kerr & Berliner, 2002).

These principles are also consistent with the tenets of high quality professional development (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995). They are embedded in the pedagogical philosophies of many alternative teacher preparation programs, particularly those designed to bring minority candidates into teaching and staff high demand subject areas and communities. The program Troops for Teachers, for example (discussed later in this chapter), exemplifies these principles (Feistritzer, 2005a). The issue for alternative programs is demonstrating that they can translate their underlying principles into action that enhances the quality of the learning experiences for teachers thereby raising teacher retention and producing positive student outcomes.

**Effectiveness of Alternative Routes to Training Teachers**

As noted by Humphrey and Wechsler (2007), the effectiveness of traditional teacher education programs is currently under scrutiny. At the same time, alternative teacher preparation programs are becoming more comprehensive and sophisticated. As explained by Humphrey and Wechsler in more detail:

Alternative teacher certification has become an increasingly popular strategy for addressing both teacher quality and teacher shortages. However, there is little agreement about what constitutes alternative certification, and there is little known about the types of programs that prepare highly qualified teachers. The debate over alternative certification has fueled a variety of assumptions about participants and programs that are based on opinion or the limited research base (p. 483).
Humphrey and Wechsler (2007) examined alternate route preparation by gathering data on seven alternative certification programs: the Teacher Education Institute in Elk Grove (CA) Unified School District, Milwaukee’s Metropolitan Multicultural Teacher Education Program, North Carolina’s NC Teach, the New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program, the New York City Teaching Fellows Program, Teach for America, and the Texas Region XII Education Service Center’s Educator Certification Program. The programs were chosen to represent a broad spectrum of approaches and the authors collected information from the programs and their participants.

Demographically, Humphrey and Wechsler (2007) found some contradictions to conventional assumptions about alternate teacher certification candidates. The alternative programs in their study did not attract significantly more males into teaching. According to Humphrey and Wechsler’s (2007) data, among elementary school teachers, men accounted for 13% of the alternate route teachers, only slightly higher than 11.5% for all elementary school teachers. At the high school level, the figure was 39% for the alternate route teachers, marginally lower than 40.5% for all high school teachers. The picture for ethnic composition is more complex. Many alternative programs are designed specifically to recruit minority candidates. Overall, the proportion of minority teachers in the alternative programs was 40%, much higher than the 14% cited for alternative route teachers in the nation in general. However, the composition of teachers from the alternative programs tends to reflect the ethnic composition of all teachers in the district.

The most intriguing finding was that most program participants were not involved in midlife career transitions, but had either been students prior to entering the program or had educational backgrounds (Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007). In fact, many participants
entered the programs with previous classroom experience in roles such as classroom teacher, substitute teacher, or classroom aide. For five of the seven programs, 60% of teachers had such experience. In view of their prior experience, it is not unexpected that the majority of participants cited a long-time desire to teach as their primary motivation for entering the program. Sizable percentages, reaching 50% or higher in five of the programs, said they expected to be teaching in 10 years.

Given the prevalence of prior classroom experience, the participants were satisfied with the relative brevity of classroom coursework compared to traditional programs. What surfaced as most important for their development was the support they received on the job. Humphrey and Wechsler (2007) contrasted the experiences of teachers in two schools, one where new teachers received negligible classroom management or instructional support and the other where the teachers were immediately assigned to a mentor. The teachers in the school with the mentorship program were highly satisfied with the support and assistance they received to enhance their classroom efficacy. The teachers in the school that did not have the mentorship program demonstrated weak teaching skills and found teaching difficult. In theory, all of the programs provide mentoring as an integral part of teacher preparation. However, there is substantial discrepancy in the degree it is actually carried out on the job. A flaw in the design of some programs, according to Humphrey and Wechsler (2007), is lack of training for mentors and/or monitoring of the quality of their mentorship. Overall, both observation and interview data found a cumulative effect for the interaction of individual and environmental characteristics. Alternate route teachers with good teaching skills who
are given a reasonable assignment and receive high quality mentoring will most probably succeed as teachers.

Nakei and Turley (2003) found similar profiles and perceptions in teachers trained and hired through California's emergency certification program. The elementary school teachers in this program had all completed traditional teacher education courses; roughly half had worked as classroom aides, substitute teachers, or regular classroom teachers with no student teaching. Although most states are working to eradicate emergency certification, the experiences of the teachers have relevance to all teachers, including, those who are traditionally prepared. More than 80% of the group reported outstanding district support in terms of mentoring, release time for professional activities, and resources. Virtually all sources agree on the benefits of these supports for all new teachers (Inman & Marlow, 2004; Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007; Nakei & Turley, 2003; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004a, 2004b).

Models of Alternative Routes to Teacher Preparation

Despite the expansion alternative routes to teacher preparation, the existing research about the effectiveness of different teacher training strategies is still inconclusive. The increased variation in teacher preparation approaches of traditional and alternative teacher preparation programs suggests that a focus on the effect of different components on teacher performance needs further exploration. Four models of teacher preparation programs were selected for review. These models are Troops to Teachers, Teach for America, Transition to Teaching, and New Pathways to Teaching in New Jersey. They were chosen because there is sufficient available research that has established these models as having the following important components: (a) supportive
and extensive clinical practice, (b) careful recruitment of teacher candidates, (c) an emphasis on strong academic preparation, (d) a strong vision grounded in an understanding of the affect of teaching on student learning, and (e) ongoing assessment and research.

**Troops to Teachers**

One of the programs recommended in Title II of the NCLB (2002) is Troops to Teachers, which was authorized in 1994 as a partnership between the Department of Education and the Department of Defense (Feistritzer, 2005a). The program offers military personnel opportunities for second careers in public school teaching; the majority of program graduates credit their military experience with preparing them to be effective teachers (Feistritzer, 2005a). Both objective data and graduates’ subject perceptions indicate that the program is successfully meeting the needs of education by bringing more men and minorities into teaching and providing teachers for high demand communities (urban inner cities) and high demand subject areas. The program also produces teachers who are well-educated, competent, believe all children can learn, place high standards on themselves and their students and are committed to the teaching profession and remaining in it (Feistritzer, 2005a).

Owings et al. (2006) assessed teacher quality of teachers in the Troops to Teachers program. The survey included 2,103 teachers and their respective administrators. Assessment was based on four effective classroom management strategies (those related to student achievement) and 21 research-based instructional practices. The purpose was to evaluate the effectiveness of traditionally prepared teachers as opposed to alternate prepared teachers who attended and completed the Troops to Teachers program.
The researchers found that those who completed the Troops to Teachers were significantly more effective in classroom management, student discipline, and class instruction as opposed to their traditional counterparts. In addition, they had a positive influence on student achievement.

The Troops to Teachers program teachers fill teaching positions in areas of high demand. Nearly half (47%) are employed in high schools, with 33% teaching in middle or junior high schools. More than half (55%) teach in urban schools (Feistritzer, 2005a). Additionally, remarkably high percentages of Troops teachers teach mathematics, science, or special education, including classes for students with emotional disorders. There is an acute shortage of qualified teachers for students with emotional disorders (Katsiyannis, Zhang, & Conroy, 2003).

The Troops to Teachers program teachers are very well educated; 62% hold a graduate or postgraduate degree (Feistritzer, 2005a). They also feel competent in their ability to teach and nearly unanimous in their perceptions of competence. All respondents described themselves as competent in their subject areas, with responses ranging from 97% to 99% on measures relating to ability to motivate students, manage time, manage the classroom, maintain classroom discipline, organize instruction, deal with colleagues, and deal with administrators. Teaching out of field is a ubiquitous problem in K-12 classrooms (Darling-Hammond, Berry, & Thoreson, 2000; Goldhaber & Anthony, 2003; Goldhaber & Brewer, 2000; Laczko-Kerr & Berliner, 2002; U.S. Department of Education, 2004). Therefore, it is notable that only 8% of the Troops teachers deem it problematic to be asked to teach outside of their primary subject areas (Feistritzer, 2005a).
Fifty-eight percent of the Troops teachers believe that all children can attain high achievement levels regardless of their socio-economic backgrounds (Feistritzer, 2005a). Although this figure does not differ substantially from the 50% of overall K-12 teachers who profess to believe that all children can learn, the literature suggests that many teachers give lip service to the idea without translating it into practice (Feistritzer, 2005a). Given their socio-demographic characteristics and disproportionate placement in urban schools, as well as their high level of self-reported competence, the Troops to Teachers program teachers may be more likely to act to ensure that all children do learn. A higher proportion of Troops teachers than in the general teaching force favor standardized testing and stringent promotion and graduation requirements, which may reflect their military backgrounds or their high achievement standards or both (Feistritzer, 2005a).

Not surprisingly, the proportion of Troops to Teachers program teachers who favor recruiting persons from other careers into teaching to improve the educational system and into school administration far outweighs that of the general teaching force (92% versus 58% and 90% versus 31%, respectively). In view of their high satisfaction with teaching, it is noteworthy that 59% of the Troops to Teachers program teachers said they would not have entered teaching if the program were not available, while 20% were not sure (Feistritzer, 2005a). Nearly all (97%) said they would recommend the program to others. Most declared intentions to remain in an educational field for the next five years (78%), with 61% expressing the desire to continue teaching while the remainder expected to remain in education in a non-teaching post.
As revealed by Owings et al.'s (2006) study, the responses of the Troops to Teachers program teachers are consistent with the principles of successful career transition such as the person-fit environment (Holland, 1985). Even more striking, they strongly reflect the characteristics of effective teachers in urban schools (Haberman, 2005). Feistritzer (2005a) noted that the military has a large pool of individuals who have retired from service and have a bachelor’s degree. The pool increases with the addition of National Guard and Reserve members who have a bachelor’s degree plus 10 or more years of active service, making them eligible for the Troops to Teachers program. In view of the size of the military, the number of Troops to Teachers graduates is actually relatively low. Roughly, 3,500 applicants register annually and 1,200 nationally embark on a teaching career. The program has documented success and ample room for expansion.

Teach for America

Teach for America stands with Troops to Teachers as one of the alternative route programs recommended under Title II of the NCLB Act (Mikulecky, Shkodriani, & Winer, 2004). Teach for America recruits graduates from top universities for immediate placement in rural or poor inner city school districts (Laczko-Kerr & Berliner, 2002). A strong point of the program is that it recruits talented and intelligent individuals to staff schools in high demand areas.

Laczko-Kerr and Berliner (2002) examined the effectiveness of Teach for America teachers and other alternately certified teachers on the performance of students in several school districts in Arizona. The study involved 232 teachers, both traditionally and alternately certified based on matching pairs. The student data were derived from
Scholastic Aptitude Test, Level 9 (SAT 9) scores of students in grades three through eight. Bias was evident in the choice of “under certified” as the term used to denote the nontraditionally prepared teachers. Nonetheless, the data revealed significant differences in student performance, favoring the traditionally certified teachers (Laczko-Kerr & Berliner, 2002).

Specifically, for the 1998-99 school year, the reading and language scores of students with traditionally certified teachers were significantly higher than those for students with alternate route teachers. For math, the difference was not significant, although it was in the same direction. The scores for 1999-2000 followed the same pattern. The only distinction was that the difference in mathematics scores did reach statistical significance. Thus, students with traditionally certified teachers outperformed their peers with alternate route teachers in all three subject areas (Laczko-Kerr & Berliner, 2002).

A weakness for which the program is often criticized is that the new teachers are provided with minimal preparation and support. Darling-Hammond (2003) is one of the program’s toughest critics, denouncing it for placing insufficiently trained teachers with students who require the most help. Xu, Hannaway, and Taylor (2007), however, did not agree. Xu et al. examined the effectiveness of Teach for America teachers compared to traditionally prepared teachers from the standpoint of student achievement. They focused on Teach for America teachers in secondary schools in the areas of math and science in North Carolina. Using individual level student data linked to teacher data in North Carolina, Xu et al. found that based on student performance on standardized tests, Teach
for America teachers are more effective than traditional teachers. In addition, the results suggested that Teach for America teachers are more effective than experienced secondary school traditionally prepared teachers. Contrary to Darling-Hammond's (2003) view Xu et al. argued that the growth of the Teach for America program suggests it is addressing the need to staff the nation’s schools in high poverty areas. However, Xu et al. acknowledged that the curriculum for Teach for America is criticized as being less academically demanding and more abbreviated than traditional teacher preparation curricula and that Teach for America only requires a 2-year teaching commitment, and the majority of Teach for America teachers leave at the end of that commitment.

**Transition to Teaching**

The purpose of the Transition to Teaching program is to recruit and retain highly qualified mid-career professionals and paraprofessionals and teachers who have used alternative routes to teacher certification to teach in high-need schools, including recruiting teachers. In addition, the program encourages developing and expanding alternative routes to certification under state approved programs that reduces the time necessary for qualified individuals to become eligible for teacher certification. The program provides five-year grants to state and local educational agencies and for-profit organizations, non-profit organizations, or institutions of higher education that collaborate with state or local educational agencies. Grant recipients develop and implement comprehensive approaches that must meet relevant state certification or licensing requirements to train, place, and support teacher recruits Grant recipients ensure that program participants are placed to teach in high-need schools and districts and
support participants, who serve in these placements for at least three years (USDOE, 2008).

A report by Ludwig, Bacevich, Wayne, Hale, and Uekawa (2007) on one year’s performance of the Transition to Teaching program and grantees found in 2002 that three key NCLB (2002) policy issues were addressed: (a) increasing the pool of highly qualified teachers by recruiting candidates outside of traditional teacher preparation programs, (b) bringing increased flexibility to the teacher preparation system by encouraging the creation and expansion of alternative routes or pathways to teacher certification and lowering barriers of time and cost of preparation, while raising standards and program rigor, and (c) improving the retention rate of new teachers by supporting strong mentoring programs and induction and including a three-year teaching commitment in high-need schools in high-need districts as part of the program requirements. Transition to Teaching program 2002 grantees set targets to hire nearly 4,000 teachers and reported receiving applications from 14,000 prospective candidates. Approximately one-third of the awards were provided to entities seeking to build on existing programs (under state-approved alternate routes) and approximately two-thirds of the awards went to entities initiating new programs. Thus, the Transition to Teaching program has built on alternate routes in states. Available retention data for first two groups of teachers hired in 2002 and 2003 show that despite some attrition, the retention rate is relatively high. Seventy-four percent of those who entered the project in 2002 were still teaching in 2004. Ludwig et al. (2007) compared this rate to national estimates from SASS data in 1999–2000, which indicated that 29 percent of first-time teachers either changed schools at the end of the year (15%) or left teaching (14%) (Smith & Ingersoll,
2004a, as cited in Ludwig et al., 2007). These analyses also found that beginning teachers in high-need areas, compared to the Transition to Teaching teachers, were less likely than their counterparts in medium-poverty schools to move after a year; however, 16% of the teachers represented in the SASS data were more likely to leave teaching compared to 9% of Transition to Teaching teachers.

**New Pathways to Teaching in New Jersey (NPTNJ)**

In 1985, New Jersey became the first state to organize a formal program for credentialing teachers through an alternative route to traditional teacher education (Klagholz, 2001). Rather than being fueled by a shortage of teachers, programs such as the New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program were developed in response to concern over typically low admission criteria and lack of rigorous coursework that characterize many teacher education programs (U.S. Department of Education, 2004).

Originating from the Provisional Teacher Program, NPTNJ is a consortium between New Jersey City University and 19 New Jersey community colleges (*New Pathways to Teaching in New Jersey*, 2009). The program is open to candidates who hold a bachelor’s degree outside the field of education, and NPTNJ has several distinguishing features. First, NPTNJ includes summer pre-teaching preparation, integrating classroom management strategies with on-site classroom observations. Second, NPTNJ offers graduate level coursework with the option of graduate credit or certification only. Third, NPTNJ is available throughout the state at local community colleges. As with most new alternate route programs, graduates are required to demonstrate mastery and to fulfill specific requirements to be granted a provisional license. At the end of first year of teaching, candidates who fulfill program requisites may earn a permanent license.
Research on the NPTNJ Program is scarce. An empirical case study by Reagan (2007) sought to identify the positive and challenging aspects of the NPTNJ Program. Ten teachers in their second or third year of teaching K-12 system and who had completed their teacher certification program at one community college and nine administrators who worked with the teachers participated in the study. Data were gathered from participant interviews, teacher observations, document review, and field notes. The focus of the study was to examine the experiences of participants in the NPTNJ Program and their administrators in relation to the program’s coursework and classroom teaching requirements, the Program’s strengths and weaknesses, challenges faced while in the program, administrators; description of their role in the NPTNJ Program, and whether participants and their administrators believed there were any differences of teachers prepared in traditional or alternative route teacher preparation programs. An analysis of content was performed on the data to identify recurrent themes and subthemes. Among the components participants in the NPTNJ Program identified as contributing significantly to preparation for the teaching profession were included (a) open discussions held at the beginning of the NPTNJ classes that allowed teachers to receive immediate feedback on how to manage problems and prevent them from continuing; (b) course assignments that focused on real-life classroom situations, lesson planning, and assessment methods; and (c) the program coordinator, who served as a connection between the theory of the NPTNJ curriculum and the real-life situations in the classroom. Participants identified the following challenges: (a) lack of availability and quality of summer observations required of the NPTNJ Program; (b) an overwhelming number of students with IEPs and 504s, along with a belief that they were
unable to accommodate these students successfully; (c) excessive behavioral problems; and (d) difficulty developing appropriate grade-level curricula. Reagan (2007) recommended replicating this study with additional NPTNJ teachers and their administrators who were prepared at different community colleges in the state and focusing on grade level and discipline.

Traditionally Prepared Teachers Compared to Alternative Route Teachers

Traditional teachers can be compared to alternative teachers in terms of preparation, demographic characteristics, approach to learning and teaching, and student achievement. When comparing alternative route programs to traditional programs, Adcock and Mahlios (2005) found that traditional programs are almost four times as likely to require an internship as alternative route programs. More traditional programs require human development and student teaching courses compared to nontraditional alternative programs.

Candidates for alternative route programs are required to hold a bachelor’s degree in some subject matter field. They may be recommended by principals or other school administrators and sometimes must meet other criteria, such as having a GPA above 2.5 (Adcock & Mahlios, 2005). In alternative preparation programs, participants receive on-the-job training in full-time teaching jobs where they are observed by mentor teachers. Candidates are usually screened for subject matter competence before being accepted into an alternative route program. The programs often focus on teaching methods and classroom management, and teachers going through these programs are typically required to do more hours of supervised field experience than students in traditional certification programs. Teachers in alternative preparation programs usually receive teacher
certificates after they have finished their training. The teaching internships of alternative route teachers are typically more intense than the student teaching completed by traditionally certified teachers. Alternatively certified teachers generally take their educational coursework during their on-the-job training and take fewer education courses than traditionally certified teachers. The education courses that they do take are usually shorter and cover content different from that in courses taken by traditionally certified teachers (Adcock & Mahlios, 2005).

Humphrey and Wechsler (2005) found that although alternative certification programs often place participants into classrooms more quickly than traditional teacher preparation programs, the participants do not earn full certification any faster than participants in traditional programs. The results of their study also revealed that the training environment plays a part in how teachers develop, whether alternatively prepared or traditionally prepared. Those teaching in supportive environments have more opportunity to develop into strong professionals, while those in dysfunctional environments have few opportunities to learn and may develop negative attitudes about teaching.

In terms of demographics, there is far more in the literature about the demographic and background characteristics of alternative route teachers than traditional route teachers. Humphrey and Wechsler (2005) described alternative route teachers as a diverse group of both young and older individuals, predominantly male, and reflective of the racial composition of local labor markets. Some are highly educated and others have significant experience working in schools and in their communities. Alternative route teachers are likely to have recently been full-time students or employed in as education-
related field; only a small number are mid-career switchers from the fields of mathematics and science. According to the National Center for Education Information [NCEI] (2005), 70% of individuals entering teaching through alternate routes are older than 30 years of age, 38% are male, 30% are non-white, and 46% are teaching in a large city. Nearly 50% were working in a non-education occupation the year prior to entering an alternative route program.

Not only do alternative route teachers differ in age, gender, and race, but they also differ in their approach to learning to teach. Because of their age, as well as other career experiences and maturity, they bring a greater variety of experience into the classroom. Their reasoning, listening, and management skills are better, and they are able to more fully concentrate on their studies (Adcock & Mahlios, 2005). Alternative route teachers tend to remain in their own communities after certification, and they have a better knowledge of the community (Adcock & Mahlios, 2005). Haberman (2005) noted that when teachers come from similar community backgrounds as the students they teach, they are able to relate to the real life experiences of their students and thus become more effective teachers. Studies also indicate that alternative route teachers bring positive dispositions toward teaching in urban schools, a characteristic not commonly found in traditionally prepared teachers (Haberman, 2005).

Some studies have attempted to assess the effectiveness of alternatively prepared teachers compared to traditionally prepared teachers relative to student achievement. For example, Constantine et al. (2009) conducted a 2-year study of alternative credential (AC) and traditional credential (TC) teachers' impact on student achievement for 2600 students in 63 schools in 20 districts, as measured by student outcomes (i.e., measures on
tests and observation of classroom instruction). Schools that had at least one eligible AC and one eligible TC teacher in the same grade, in kindergarten through grade 5, were included in the study. Within each school, students in the same grade were randomly assigned to either an AC teacher or a TC teacher. Both the AC and the TC programs with teachers in the study were diverse in the total instruction they required for their candidates. In addition, there were no statistically significant differences between the AC and TC teachers in their average scores on college entrance exams, the selectivity of the college that awarded their bachelor’s degree, or their level of educational attainment. In each school grade, the outcomes of students who were randomly assigned to an AC classroom were compared to the outcomes of students who were assigned to a TC classroom. Constantine et al. (2009) found that there was no statistically significant difference in performance between students of AC teachers and those of TC teachers. Further, there was no evidence that greater levels of teacher training coursework were associated with the effectiveness of AC teachers in the classroom.

**Traditionally Prepared and Alternative Route Teacher Retention**

There are numerous studies (Billingsley, 2003; Chapman, 1984; Chapman & Green, 1986; Darling-Hammond, 2003; Haberman, 2005; Ingersoll, 2001; Tellez, 1992; Zepeda & Ponticell, 1996) of traditionally prepared teachers and retention. Ingersoll and Kralik (2004) estimated that some 40% to 50% of new teachers leave the profession within their first five years on the job. Banks and Necco (1987) studied teacher retention and attrition among 203 special education teachers in West Virginia and found that longevity was related to initial preparation specifically in the area of special education. Further, Banks and Necco found a relationship between length of training and attrition,
using highest degree earned as a proxy for length of training; longevity of teachers with master's degrees was 3 years greater than that of teachers with bachelor's degrees. Miller, Brownell, and Smith (1999) also found a significant difference in the proportion of fully certified teachers among what they termed "stayers" ($p = 88\%$) and "leavers" ($p = 79\%$). However, their study was focused on certification status and not on the nature of teachers' initial preparation as Banks and Necco's (1987) study was.

Neither Banks and Necco (1987) nor Miller et al. (1999) addressed longevity of teachers outside of the special education field and their results are provided as examples of retention studies based on teacher preparation and certification. There are few studies, however, that have addressed retention and alternative route teachers. According to a report issued by the Education Commission of the States (2003), there is little or no data about long-term retention rates for teachers prepared in alternative route programs because alternative route programs are relatively new. It does appear, however, that alternatively prepared teachers may not have as strong a long-term commitment to the profession as traditionally prepared teachers. Nonetheless, research on retention of alternatively prepared teachers is inconclusive (Education Commission of the States, 2003).

**Theories of Job Satisfaction, Turnover, and Career Development**

*Job Satisfaction and Turnover*

Theories of job satisfaction utilizing Maslow's (1954, 1968) hierarchy of needs as a foundation orient the present study and helps to explain the problem of intention to remain in teaching and attrition among beginning teachers. According to Inman and Marlow (2004), job satisfaction is essentially a positive emotional state resulting from the
appraisal of one’s job. Such satisfaction is a result of perceptions among teachers as to how well their job provides those things which are viewed as being most important (Howe, 2006; Walters, 2004). Job attitude surveys among teachers generally reveal that job satisfaction continues to be a major concern, especially among beginning teachers and has a decided bearing on turnover rates (Buckley et al., 2005). Educational researchers have found that there are a number of factors and circumstances that influence job satisfaction, and thus teacher turnover (Howe, 2006; Inman & Marlow, 2004).

The early work of Mobley, Homer, and Hollingsworth (1978) provided the basis for turnover theory as related to job satisfaction. They identified factors that connected job attitudes to actual turnover behavior in the turnover process and hypothesized that job attitudes had a direct relationship on turnover behavior. The important predictor of turnover was intention to leave the educational facility. Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Meglino’s (1979) work implied that low job satisfaction led to thinking about leaving; such thinking guided the way to intentions to seek another job, the possibility of finding a viable alternative directed an intention to leave, and the intention led to the actual realization – that is, the turnover.

Mobley and colleagues’ (1978, 1979) model of turnover linking the relationship between leaving the job and job satisfaction is supported in the literature (Price, 2004). However, according to Price (2004), five antecedents need to be first considered: pay, integration, instrumental communication, formal communication, and centralization. These five antecedents influence the level of satisfaction. The level is therefore the
outcome of a balance between satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the antecedents (Inman & Marlow, 2004).

Much of the literature since that time has focused on the role of job satisfaction in explaining teacher turnover. Preconditions of job satisfaction include such characteristics of the job as safety, pay, and benefits [factors cited by Maslow’s (1968) hierarchy of needs], as well as characteristics of employees. There are five job dimensions that represent important characteristics of a job about which teachers have affective responses. These influence their level of satisfaction and include the following: amount of pay and benefits, co-workers (the work group), the work itself, supervision, straightforward and clear rules, rewards, and promotional opportunities. In the view of Dove (2004), major variables of influence that cause turnover among teachers include: “salary, quality of teacher preparation, working conditions, and conditions that affect service” (p. 8).

There are several important dimensions to job satisfaction. First, it is an emotional response or state to a work situation. It is not a characteristic that can be viewed; therefore, only inferences can be made. Second, job satisfaction is often determined by how well outcomes meet or exceed teacher expectations. If teachers feel they are working significantly harder than others in the organization but are receiving fewer rewards, they will probably have a negative attitude toward the work, their school administrators, and their co-workers (Dove, 2004). They will be dissatisfied. If the opposite is true, teachers will be most satisfied and have positive attitudes.

Pay is a major factor influencing job satisfaction and thus turnover, especially for new teachers (Dove, 2004). Income from work not only helps teachers attain their basic
needs, but is instrumental in providing upper-level needs satisfaction. Dissatisfaction leads to turnover. Teachers often see pay as a reflection of how school management views their contribution to the educational facility. Also influential are fringe benefits. While this form of pay is not quite as important, it still influences job satisfaction. As explained by Inman and Marlow (2004):

Administrators, retirement incentives, the community, availability of jobs outside of teaching as well as other teaching jobs, and salary comprise the external aspect of the beginning teacher support system. These factors are categorized based on their lack of relationship to personal interests and aspects of working within a school or district. The degree to which beginning teachers perceive support from or by the components which comprise external factors directly relate to their comfort level and their desire to remain in the profession (p. 610).

The composition of the work itself also has a major impact on job satisfaction which, in turn, influences turnover. The more important job-related motivational factors are autonomy and feedback from the job itself, as well as influence over school policy (Inman & Marlow, 2004). Challenging work is a most important ingredient (Buckley et al., 2005). The extent to which the job provides the teacher with the chance to accept responsibility, opportunities for learning, and interesting tasks are additional factors that impact the work itself.

Career Development

Holland’s (1985) career typology and Super, Osborne, Walsh, Brown, & Niles’ (1992) life span, life space model are two of the most influential models of career
development that can help explain why beginning teachers will or will not remain in the educational environment. Both theories employ a different conceptual approach. In Holland’s (1985) model, the focus is on personality and environment, which interact to predict career choice and satisfaction. In contrast, Super et al. (1992) conceived a developmental model outlining career stages throughout the life span. Super’s Life Career Rainbow “portrays the development of unfolding of the life career of a person from birth until death” (Super et al., 1992, p. 74). Proponents of Super et al.’s (1992) approach emphasize its remarkable adaptability to environmental, socio-cultural, and individual changes and contexts (Blustein, 1997; Nevill, 1997; Savickas, 1997).

Originally presented in The Psychology of Careers, published in 1957, Super continually refined his model as attitudes changed toward traditional gender roles, work values, work-life balance, and career transitions.

The Life Career Rainbow, in itself an evolution of Super’s (1957) theory, is a foundation of the Career Development Assessment and Counseling model (C-DAC), specifically designed to address the complexities of career decision making in an environment of constant cultural and economic flux (Super et al., 1992). The C-DAC may be especially valuable for facilitating successful career transitions among beginning teachers as it captures all elements of the person’s life roles and development.

Holland’s (1985) model is widely used in vocational counseling, and Super et al. (1992) credited Holland with pioneering the use of assessment tools for matching individuals with careers. Holland’s (1985) emphasis on person-environment fit may be particularly pertinent for designing mentoring or induction programs for new teachers, or from a broader perspective, creating school cultures to attract and retain teachers with
diverse career and cultural backgrounds. Perhaps beginning teachers should assess their person-environment fit with the job to determine whether to stay or leave the job.

**Personal Characteristics, School Characteristics, and Mentoring: Relationship to Job Satisfaction and Intent to Leave**

Researchers have attempted to investigate causal reasons for beginning teacher attrition rates. Research by Chapman (1984) proposed a teacher retention model to outline his findings about beginning teachers chose to persist or leave the profession. He reported on five variables that influenced this decision: the personal characteristics of the teacher, the nature of teacher training and early teaching experiences, the degree to which the teacher is socially and professionally integrated into the teaching profession, the satisfaction a teacher derives from the career, and external environmental influences impinging on the teacher’s career. Further work on the model yielded a sixth attribute, initial commitment to teaching (Chapman & Green, 1986). Chapman and Green’s research was able to empirically link each attribute to teacher retention.

Billingsley (2003) proposed a conceptual model to give insight into factors influencing attrition and retention of teachers. Although Billingsley’s focus was on special education teachers, these models apply to teachers in all disciplines. Billingsley (1993, as cited in Billingsley, 2003) developed a schematic representation of the range of external, employment, and personal influences on teachers’ career decisions. The center of this model focuses on Employment Factors, such as professional qualifications; work conditions and rewards; and commitments to school, district, teaching field and teaching profession). Billingsley (1993, cited by Billingsley, 2003) posited that teachers leave teaching for a host of reasons (i.e., personal, social, economic) and that if the work
environment is not favorable, teachers are likely to receive less reward and thus exhibit less commitment.

Berry and Darling-Hammond (2006) argued that to provide all students with highly qualified teachers, as mandated by the NCLB (2002), a number of issues must first be resolved. Berry and Darling-Hammond noted: “An unfinished task in American education is to create conditions for better support of new teachers, including protected initial assignments, mentoring and improved evaluation to help novices grow” (p. 3). Berry and Darling Hammond indicated that about 30% of new teachers leave within five years; the rates are much higher for teachers who enter with less preparation and those who do not receive mentoring. They advocated new teacher support programs at the national level that provide for mentor training and time for accomplished teachers in relevant teaching fields to work with appropriately paired beginning teachers. These support programs could be funded through a targeted, matching grant program that supports effective state and local induction practices.

A more recent study, however, conducted by the Institute of Education Sciences of the U.S. Department of Education (Glazerman et al., 2008) did not support the contentions of these researchers. Glazerman et al. (2008) investigated whether investing more resources in new teacher induction and mentoring programs would help school districts attract, develop, and retain beginning teachers. Specifically, the study examined the effect of comprehensive teacher induction on the types and intensity of induction services teachers receive compared to the services they receive from the districts’ current induction programs, the impact of such programs on teachers’ classroom practices, student achievement, teacher retention, and composition of the district’s teaching
workforce. The study used an experimental design in which elementary schools within the 17 participating districts were randomly assigned to a treatment group (teachers exposed to comprehensive teacher induction) and a control group (teachers who received the district’s usual set of induction services). Surveys, classroom observations, and school records were used to measure and compare outcomes of the two groups. The final sample size consisted of 418 schools: 210 treatment schools and 208 control schools. Criteria for eligibility for participation in the study included (a) taught in an elementary grade (K-6), (b) were new to the teaching profession, and (c) were not already receiving induction support from a teacher preparation or certification program. Participating teachers received their teacher training in both traditional and alternative certification programs. The induction program for the experimental group consisted of trained full-time mentors; a curriculum of intensive and structured support for beginning teachers; opportunities for novice teachers to observe experienced teachers; and formative assessment tools for ongoing practice evaluation that require observations and constructive feedback. Each mentor was assigned to 12 beginning teachers, though mentor caseloads ranged from 8 to 14 teachers over the course of the year that the study took place. Correlational analysis revealed statistically significant differences between the treatment and control groups in the amount, types, and content of induction support teachers reported having received. Treatment teachers reported receiving more mentoring, being more likely to participate in specific induction activities, and spending more time participating in certain professional activities than control teachers. However, mentoring had no statistically significant impact on teacher practices in the beginning of teaching, no positive impact on student test scores, no impact on teacher retention, and no impact on workforce composition. The
researchers did, however, note that a limitation of the study was that it focused on the beginning of study findings only and suggested that a more longitudinal study be undertaken.

Over a decade ago Feiman-Nemser (1996) cautioned that while there is much enthusiasm about mentoring novice teachers, there is not enough clarity about the purpose of mentoring or enough empirical research about empirical research on the efficacy of mentoring. Question of what mentors should do, what they actually do, and what novices learn as a result need to be answered. In addition, mentor teachers do not have much with the core activities of mentoring—observing and discussing teaching with colleagues (Feiman-Nemser, 1996). A teacher mentoring and induction program in the state of Delaware illustrates Feiman-Nemser’s concerns and has attempted to answer these questions and address the issue of mentor training.

A report by Raffel et al. (2007) described the benefits of the induction program and some of the challenges that the program needs to overcome. The Delaware New Teacher Mentoring/Induction Program (Raffel et al., 2007) provides mentoring and an induction process to support new teachers and help them improve teaching performance during their first three years of teaching. Interviews with more than 130 program participants revealed overall positive results with the program; however, the areas of mentor training, opportunities for teacher observation of other classrooms, and providing meeting times for mentors and protégés were identified in the interviews as needing improvement. Raffel et al. (2007) found that, overall, the new program was viewed as a major improvement over previous mentoring efforts, particularly because it provides support for new teachers by helping them with classroom management issues and to
reflect on their own pedagogy. Program leaders lead by holding regular meetings with the lead mentors and mentors; informally communicating with and responding to questions of those who report to them through ongoing e-mail, visits, and face-to-face informal conversations; and providing training. Most mentor-protégé matches work well, especially those where there is proximity of space, grade level, and subject area. However, the implementation of the plan was not consistent and varied according to a site’s administrative and organizational structure, leadership, and extent of implementation. While the program was compatible and aligned with district and charter school goals, it was generally not well integrated with other professional development programs. None of the sites conducted any formal evaluations of the new mentoring/induction program, although one district keeps an ongoing tally of teacher retention. The nature of mentor training also varied greatly across the sites; no two sites took the same approach, and the training “depended on the person who was running it” (p. 36). Most mentors were trained by lead mentors over a schedule of three or four meetings after school throughout the school year. Some mentors noted that even after the training, they did not fully understand their roles and even some basic program requirements. There was also frustration with Pathwise, a commercial product available from the Educational Testing Service (ETS) that is a component of the induction program. Pathwise was viewed by new teachers and mentors as often complicated and confusing, with too much paperwork and redundancy. Mentors stated that they did not want more training; rather, they wanted training that was clearer, more consistent, and relevant to various grade levels and specialty areas.
Conclusions

The effectiveness of traditional teacher education programs is currently under scrutiny (Berry et al., 2008; Darling-Hammond et al., 2005; Klagholtz, 2001; Levine, 2006). As a result, alternatives to traditional teacher education programs have grown as a strategy for preparing qualified teachers who will remain in the profession (Baines, 2006a; Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007).

Both alternative and traditional teacher preparation programs have drawn upon vocational psychology as a framework for understanding career patterns (Kersaint, Lewis, Potter, & Meisels, 2007). Recruitment and retention must be understood in the context of the changing nature of career paths and the multiple life roles individuals assume over their life span (Buckley et al., 2005; Howe, 2006; Inman & Marlow, 2004; Walters, 2004). Job satisfaction theory, turnover theory and vocational psychology, in particular Holland’s (1985) career typology and Super et al.’s (1992) life span theory, offer a valuable framework for exploring the experiences of alternately certified teachers with the objectives of enhancing commitment and job satisfaction. Holland’s (1985) model focuses on personality and environment, which are predictors of career choice and satisfaction. Super et al.’s (1992) model outlines career stages throughout the life span.

There is limited empirical support in the literature for the assumption that alternative route programs produce teachers who perform as well or better than traditionally prepared teachers and have the same or higher retention rates (Allen, 2003). Investigating the experiences of alternate route teachers can be greatly enhanced through a synthesis of quantitative and qualitative research.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODS

Previous chapters introduced the subject of the proposed study and reviewed the literature pertinent to the study's major variables. This study examined the relationship of personal and school characteristics, educational background, and mentoring experience to teachers' job satisfaction and feelings about leaving the job for teachers who have pursued a traditional route of teacher education compared to teachers who have pursued an alternative route of teacher preparation. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research design, instrumentation, data collection and analysis procedures.

Research Design

A correlational research design was used to examine the relationships among educational background, personal characteristics (i.e., maturity), school characteristics, mentoring experiences, job satisfaction, and intentions to leave the current job in 1-3 years beginning teachers who have pursued a traditional route of teacher preparation compared to an alternative route of teacher preparation. The present study examined the hire rates of teachers and retention and attrition rates of teachers in one school district. The sample was accessed from a list of 1-3 years beginning teachers in an urban school district in New Jersey, and a sample was selected using purposive sampling methods.

Data for the proposed study were obtained from the Career Maturity Inventory (CMI) (Crites, 1978) and the Alleman Mentoring Activities Questionnaire (AMAO) (Alleman & Clarke, 2000). Potential participants received an explanation of the purpose of the research, procedures, and anticipated outcomes of the study. To ensure that data could not be tracked while preserving confidentiality, names or other identifiers were not
recorded. A corresponding number for each participant was assigned and the surveys contained that numeric identifier; participants' names did not appear on the survey document. The researcher collected the data by mail. If this researcher did not receive appropriate numbers of responses by mail, he attempted to personally contact the participant by telephone and gather information. Data analysis included only summary information and quotations.

The dependent and independent variables are shown in Table 3-1 below for each of the study hypothesis as follows:
Table 3-1

Dependent and Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Hypothesis</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₁. Educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experiences, and career adaptability of beginning teachers are significant explanatory variables of job satisfaction. (total sample combined).</td>
<td>job satisfaction</td>
<td>Educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experience, career adaptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂. Educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experiences, career adaptability, and job satisfaction of beginning teachers are significant explanatory variables of intentions to leave the current job.</td>
<td>job satisfaction, intention to leave</td>
<td>Educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experience, career adaptability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CMI measured personal characteristics (i.e., maturity). The AMAQ measured mentoring experience. The demographics portion of the survey questionnaire measured educational background (i.e., teachers who have pursued a traditional route of teacher preparation and teachers who have pursued an alternative route of teacher preparation).
Job satisfaction, and intention to leave was measured by survey questionnaires created by the researcher and verified by peer review.

**Population, Sample, and Setting**

In this section other portions of the research design are discussed. Specifically, the following sections describe the general population, target population, sample, and setting of the research study.

**General Population**

The target population consists of 2459 teachers from 39 K-12 schools in an urban school district in New Jersey. The majority are male (59%); 41% are female. The average age of a teacher is between 30 and 39. Thirty percent of teachers are between 30 and 39 years of age and nineteen percent are between the ages of 21 and 29. Teachers come primarily from three ethnic backgrounds. White makes up the largest percentage (73%), with Hispanic/Latino and African Americans making up 11%. For the number of years working as a teacher, 50% have 10 years or more of experience. Sixteen percent have 1 to 2 years experience. Thirty three percent have 3 to 5 years experience, and 11%, have 6 to 10 years experience. Fifty percent hold bachelor’s degrees, and 44% hold master’s degrees. Six percent hold doctorates.

**Target Population**

The accessible population for this study was 249 beginning teachers who have either taken a traditional route or alternative route to teacher education. The researcher obtained a list of all beginning teachers and selected a sample from the overall total who met the inclusion and exclusion criteria (described below).
To determine the sample size, the researcher sought the assistance of a professional statistician to perform a convenience sample and a power analysis. The power analysis identified for this study indicated that the sample size needed to have a power of .80. This means that when measuring the small difference between two independent sample means at an alpha .05, a minimum sample size of 60 is required in each group. According to Green (1991), the general rule of thumb is no less than 50 participants for a correlation or regression with the number increasing with larger numbers of independent variables (IVs).

Thus, the minimum sample for this study consisted of 120 teachers. Sixty teachers represented those who pursued a traditional route of teacher education, and 60 represented those who have pursued an alternative route of teacher preparation. Random sampling was used among the general population to obtain 60 subjects in each group. When 60 was reached, random sampling was discontinued.

**Sampling Plan**

The present study utilized a judgment sample. Another name for a judgment sample is purposive sample (Babbie, 2003). A judgment or purposive sample is a type of nonprobability sample in which the researcher selects the sample on the basis of his or her own judgment about whether the sample is most representative of the population being studied. Nonprobability sampling does not involve random selection. Thus, a nonprobability sample that conforms to certain criteria is known as purposive sampling.

The advantages of purposive sampling are (a) the sample is obtained according to the discretion of someone who is familiar with the relevant characteristics of the population (Babbie, 2003) and (b) it is convenient and economical because the researcher
is the only one involved in the selection of the sample (Simon, 2003). Among the disadvantages are that the sample selected may not represent the total teaching population and may limit the generalization of the findings. In addition, there may be potential for sampling bias (Simon, 2003).

The sample chosen for the present study was a purposive sample chosen from the population of 2459 teachers in 39 K-12 schools in an urban school district in New Jersey, 249 of which are new teachers (i.e., teachers who have been teaching for 1 to 3 years) teachers. The sample for the present study was chosen from the population of 249 new in 39 K-12 schools in this school district. Specifically, the sample consisted of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Alternate (CE)</th>
<th>Traditional (CEAS)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>144</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>249</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Study Limitations**

All research studies have limitations and the proposed study is no exception. The study was limited as follows. All subjects were full-time, beginning teachers who have taught for one to three years in grades K-12. All subjects teach in one urban school district in New Jersey. No other school districts were included in the study. Also, participants became certified teachers either through a traditional teacher preparation program (i.e., a four- or five-year program offered by colleges and universities) or
through alternative programs, such as Troops for Teachers, Teach for America, or other alternative certification programs.

Study Setting

This study took place in K-12 schools in an urban school district in New Jersey. According to the U.S. Census 2000, the city population is 149,222. The racial makeup of the city is 32.90% African American, 30.77% White, 0.60% Native American, 1.90% Asian, 0.06% Pacific Islander, 27.60%, and Hispanic or Latino 50.11%. The median income for a household in the city is $32,778, and the median income for a family is $35,420. Males have a median income of $27,911 versus $22,733 for females. The per capita income for the city is $13,257. About 19.2% of families and 22.2% of the population are below the poverty line.

The school district in which this study took place serves students in kindergarten through twelfth grade. The district is an Abbott District; that is, it is covered by a New Jersey Supreme Court ruling that found that the education provided to urban school children was inadequate and unconstitutional. The court mandated that state funding for poorer school districts must equal funding for wealthier school districts. The school system has over 30,000 students who speak 25 different languages. The school system currently has fifty-two schools with over six thousand employees, with a per pupil expenditure of nearly $16,000, of which $8,148 goes towards classroom instruction.

In 1988, New Jersey became the first state in the nation to authorize its State Department of Education to take over local school districts that were failing according to an established monitoring process. In 1991, one city in this district became the second of the three troubled districts that had to cede control of its public schools to the state. The
presumption was that improvement would follow. To date, the schools in this district are still controlled by the State of New Jersey Department of Education. As such, the schools are managed by a state-appointed Superintendent and maintains a School Advisory Board that serves in an advisory capacity only.

**Instrumentation**

The survey instrument for this study has seven parts (See Appendix A):

- Educational background
- Personal characteristics
- School characteristics
- Mentoring experience
- Job satisfaction
- Intention to leave

The demographic (independent) variable of educational background was measured by a demographic profile developed by the researcher (RQ 1 and H1). The independent variables of personal characteristics and school characteristics were measured by the CMI (RQ 1 and 2). The independent variable of mentoring experience was measured by the AMAQ (RQ 1 and 2). The dependent variables of job satisfaction and intention to leave were measured by the CMI (H1 and H2). The CADI measured career adaptability (H1 and H2). These are depicted in Table 3-2.

**Part 1. Educational Background**

Part 1, Educational Background, asks participants to indicate their education level by selecting the appropriate choice provided and in dichotomous form whether they graduated from a traditional or alternative teacher preparation program. The questionnaire was designed by the researcher (see Appendix A, Part 1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Instrument Developers</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Number of Items and Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Educational Background</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Multiple Choice: Educational Scale</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dichotomous: Route to Teacher Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Personal Characteristics</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Fill in the Blank: Age</td>
<td>(6 variables)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>School Characteristics</td>
<td>Alleman Mentoring</td>
<td>Optional Choice: Race, Grade Level</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mentoring Experience</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>5-point rating</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(AMAQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guiding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Career Adaptability</td>
<td>Career Adjustment and</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development Inventory (CAREER ADI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Part I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>5-point rating</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Intention to Leave</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>5-point rating</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 2. Personal Characteristics

Part 2, Personal Characteristics, asks participants to indicate age in fill-in-the-blank form. Gender and ethnicity will be measured in dichotomous form. Race and grade level will be measured by providing choices (see Appendix A, Part 2). The questionnaire was designed by the researcher.

Part 3. School Characteristics

Part 3, School Characteristics, asks participants to indicate on a five-point Likert scale (5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree) their extent of agreement with 10 statements. The questions were designed by the researcher (see Appendix A, Part 3).

Part 4. Mentoring Experiences

Description

The Alleman Mentoring Activities Questionnaire (AMAQ) has nine scales that measure two aspects of mentoring: the mentoring process itself (what happens in the relationship between the individuals) and the impact of the relationship on the individuals (Alleman & Clarke, 2000). The AMAQ test instrument consists of 72 items and takes 15 to 25 minutes to complete. The 72 items are designed to reflect possible events in a wide variety of work settings. The AMAQ has three scales of mentoring behavior—Guiding, Helping, and Encouraging—and ten subscales: Teach the Job, Counseling, Sponsor, Protect, Teach Politics, Friendship, Career Help, Challenging Tasks, Demonstrated Trust, and Total (Alleman & Clarke, 2000).

Scales of the AMAQ addressing Guiding activities include Teach the Job, Provide Challenge, and Teach Politics. Items in the Teach the Job scale reflect mentor behaviors...
that help protégés learn how to perform job related tasks and accomplish work related
goals. Items in the Provide Challenge scale reflect mentor behaviors that delegate and
give responsibility to protégés, encourage protégés to take risks and assume initiative,
and assign (or encourage protégés to take on) tasks that require protégés to deal with
other parts of the organization and other levels of the hierarchy. Items in the Teach
Politics scale reflect mentor behaviors that help protégés understand the behavior of
others, how to avoid pitfalls, and how to use the informal system to accomplish goals.

Scales addressing Helping activities include Career Help, Protect, and Sponsor.
Items in the Career Help scale reflect mentor behaviors that showcase protégés and help
protégés achieve career goals by providing visibility, introductions and
recommendations. Items in the Protect scale reflect mentor behaviors that show the
mentor is willing to provide a “safe place” for protégés to try out new ideas without fear
of penalty, is willing to bend the rules for protégés, and is prepared to defend protégés
when necessary. Items in the Sponsor scale reflect mentor behaviors that support
protégés’ initiatives and moves, show professional support for protégés, and publicly give
protégés the mentor’s backing.

Scales addressing Encouraging activities include Career Counseling, Friendship,
and Demonstrated Trust. Items in the Career Counseling mentor behaviors that provide
career counseling for protégés encourage protégés to develop a career plan, contribute to
protégés’ personal development, and act as a resource for protégés when problems arise.
Items in the Friendship scale reflect the amount and value of mentor behaviors that show
liking for each other, association in non-work situations, and concern for each other’s
personal welfare. Items in the Demonstrated Trust scale reflect verbal expressions of
confidence in protégés, seeking protégés’ opinion, and acts such as revealing sensitive or confidential information to protégés, and that help the protégés learn when to trust others. The Total Score scale is an estimate of the overall relationship and includes all nine scales. By comparing scores on the AMAQ with performance evaluations, turnover rates, absenteeism, or productivity measures, for example, the actual effects of mentoring relationships can be determined (Alleman & Clarke, 2000).

The AMAQ evolved from the Alleman Mentoring Scales Questionnaire [AMSQ] (Alleman, 1987), the Alleman Leadership Development Questionnaire [ALDQ] (Alleman, 1985) and the Alleman Relationship Value Questionnaire [ARVQ] (Alleman, 1986). The ALDQ questions were based on specific mentoring functions. Fifteen functions were identified. From these functions Alleman (1985) developed a list of behaviors relative to mentoring behaviors. A panel of 15 executives was selected to develop the behavior lists. Another panel of five was selected to judge the panel of 15 with respect to the reliability and validity of the mentoring behaviors. The five panel members had previously conducted mentoring research and were qualified to rate each behavior item. The internal consistency reliability (Chronbach’s alpha) for the AMAQ was .99 (Alleman & Clarke, 2000). The extent to which experts agree that items describe mentor behavior (content validity) was 86%.

One of the more notable studies that used the AMAQ is Neblett’s (2004) study of informal mentoring of minority women in a business setting. Neblett conducted the research in two phases, quantitative and qualitative. In the first phase, Neblett collected data using the AMAQ, which was converted from a paper copy to an electronic copy on the Internet. In phase two Neblett randomly interviewed 10 percent of his sample to
answer five structured qualitative questions. Alleman Associates assisted in the development of the questions, which provided the participants the opportunity to share their AMAQ responses in detail. In addition, the questions permitted the researcher to some degree the opportunity to manipulate the data.

Papalewis, Jordan, Cuellar, Gualden, and Smith (1991) reported on a mentoring program in 11 school districts in California that used the AMAQ. The AMAQ is administered to mentors, who complete form A, which describes their actions toward mentorees. Mentorees complete Form B, which describes their mentor’s actions toward them. Both mentors and mentorees receive training to familiarize them with the techniques of training and goals of the training program. The development of both mentors and mentorees was tracked using structured interviews and journals. Six months into the program mentors and mentorees took the AMAQ as a post-test. However, Papalewis et al.’s (1991) study was not completed at the time and only preliminary results were reported. It was not specified whether the pre-and post-test results were compared, and, if so, the results of that comparison.
**Validity**

Validity refers to the extent that the test measures what it is supposed to test (Babbie, 2003). In the present case, the extent to which experts agree that items describe mentor behavior (content validity) was 86%.

**Part 5. Career Adaptability**

**Description**

The Career Adjustment and Development Inventory (CAREER ADI) (Crites, 1978) was developed in response to the need for testing for career adjustment and development (Crites, 1982). The CAREER ADI assesses six areas or career developmental tasks: organizational adaptability (Org), position performance (Pos), work habits and attitudes (Who), co-worker relationships (Cor), advancement (Adv), and career choice and plans (Car). Each task is measured by 15 items, for a total of 90 items in the first part of the test. The second part of the test consists of 20 open-ended items that assess how well respondents cope with problems on the job. In this study only Part I was used.

**Reliability**

Findings from several organizations in which the CAREER ADI has been administered indicate a high degree of internal consistency reliability; the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 coefficients score was in the mid-80s. This is above the .70 established minimum (Nunnally, 1978).

Means and standard deviations and frequency distributions across organizational levels and types show a wide range of individual differences in career adaptability with sufficient “floor” and “ceiling” (Crites, 1982). Fifteen items in each scale are sufficient
for differentiating among individuals. An additional finding that is theoretically and practically important is that the scales (Org, Pos, Who, Cor, Adv, and Car) are ordered along an expected continuum of career development and career progression; that is, the individual first adapts to the organization, performs the expected tasks of the job, and develops appropriate work habits and attitudes. Then the individual establishes relationships with individuals in the organization that enhance advancement potential. This more mature individual then turns to future career plans.

Validity

The sequencing of the scales is also valid (Crites, 1982). There are three clusters of scales: Org and Pos ($r = .22$), Who and Cor ($r = .31$), and Adv and Car ($r = .65$). Their intercorrelations fit the same pattern of career adaptability to tasks as their means. In one large organization that used the CAREER ADI, the 90-item total score correlated .50 to the Hoppock Job Satisfaction (Crites, 1982; Alvi & Kahn, 1983).

Part 6: Job Satisfaction

Part 6, Job Satisfaction, asks participants to indicate on a five-point Likert scale ($5 = $ strongly agree, $1 = $ strongly disagree) their extent of agreement with 5 statements relative to satisfaction with their current job. Questions were designed by the researcher (see Appendix A, Part 6).

Part 7: Intention to Leave

Part 7, Intention to Leave, asks participants to indicate on a five-point scale ($5 = $ strongly agree, $1 = $ strongly disagree) their extent of agreement with 5 statements relative to their intentions to leave their current job. Questions were designed by the researcher (see Appendix A, Part 7). This construct of the self-report survey may have placed a
limitation on the size of the sample, however. If intention to leave numbers are too small, this construct may be eliminated.

**Ethical Considerations and Data Collection Methods**

1. The researcher used Lynn University's email to contact publishers of measurement instruments for use in this study. Permissions were obtained to use the Career Maturity Inventory (CMI) and the Alleman Mentoring Activities Questionnaire [AMAQ] (Appendices B and C).

2. Permission was obtained from administrators in an urban school district in northern New Jersey, and IRB approval. Permission for this study was obtained from beginning teachers from k-12th grade classrooms in the district (Appendix D).

3. An application and protocol to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Lynn University were submitted.

4. After Lynn University's IRB reviews the application and proposal and approved the study, data collection began. The approval date was February 22, 2010. The start date was April 6, 2010 and the end date was June 11, 2010. Data collection was no longer than one year after IRB approval.

5. The researcher obtained a list of all beginning teachers and selected a sample from the overall total who met the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the study.

6. Participants were asked to read and sign the authorization for voluntary consent. The consent form explained purpose, duration, and procedures for the
study. Returned surveys signified informed consent to participate.

Participation in this study was voluntary.

7. Each of the beginning teachers who met the criteria for this study was invited to participate in the study and received a self-addressed stamped envelope, a letter of consent, and copies of the CMI and AMAQ. After completing the surveys, participants mailed them back to the researcher.

8. The estimated time for completing the CMI was 30 minutes. The estimated time for completing the AMAQ was 15 to 20 minutes.

9. Follow-up mailings were made to the sample of individuals who had not yet responded one to two weeks after the initial mailing.

10. Participants were confidential to the researcher; there were no identifiers on the survey. A number was assigned to each survey.

11. The results of all responses were reported as grouped data.

12. The data were inputted into the SPSS 16.0 or 17.0 (student version) software program by this researcher and analyzed using frequency distributions, measures of central tendency, and ANOVA.

13. The data were stored confidentially in a locked filing cabinet or locked desk drawer and will be destroyed after five years.

14. The Lynn University IRB was notified of completion of the study.

Data were analyzed using SPSS 16.0 or 17.0 (student version). Cronbach’s alpha to determine internal consistency was calculated. According to Triola (2004), Cronbach’s alpha is most useful for multi-items scales at the interval level of measurement. Exploratory factor analysis was performed to reduce the variables to a
manageable number. Exploratory factor analysis looks for patterns among the variables
to determine if an underlying combination of the original variables, or a factor, can
summarize the original set (Minium, King, & Bear, 1998). Therefore, the use of
Cronbach’s alpha and exploratory factor analysis established convergent and discriminant
validity of all items.

The researcher used descriptive statistics, including frequency distributions,
measures of central tendency, and range and standard deviation to answer the research
question. To test hypotheses, multiple regression analysis was used to examine the
explanatory relationships between the independent variables of educational background,
personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experience, career adaptability,
and the dependent variables of job satisfaction (H1) and intention to leave (H2). The
independent variables are educational background, personal characteristics, school
characteristics, mentoring experience, and career adaptability. The dependent variables
are intention to leave and job satisfaction. There are six categorical or dichotomous
variables and six continuous variables. Of these variables, 10 are independent variables
and two are dependent.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Regression is the prediction of one variable from knowledge of one or more
(multiple) other variables. When variables are correlated, differences in one or multiple
predictor variables relate to differences in the outcome variable and this relationship can
be presented in the form of a regression equation \( Y = a + bx_1 + bx_2 + bx_3 + \ldots + e \), which
is an extension of the equation for the slope of a line. In the preceding equation, the \( Y \) is
the outcome variable; the “a” is the constant, and the \( b \) is the regression coefficient for
each independent variable. The “e” is the residual error. It is the amount of variance in Y that is unaccounted for by the equation.

In regression analysis, independent variables are often referred to as predictor variables and the dependent variables are also referred to as the outcome variables. By understanding the predictive relationships between variables, it may be possible to manipulate or control those predictors in order to increase the likelihood of obtaining a specific desired outcome. For instance, having the knowledge that specific types of teacher training programs predict job satisfaction and teacher intent to leave, suggests that more resources can be directed toward teacher preparation methods as interventions for increasing job satisfaction and teacher retention. Furthermore, if route to teacher preparation is a significant predictor of job satisfaction and/or teacher intent to leave, then teacher preparation is a significant explanatory variable of job satisfaction and/or intent to leave. The following an example of a regression equation using the variables of interest in this study:

Predicted job satisfaction = a + b (route to teacher preparation) + b (educational scale) + b (age) + b (gender) + b (ethnicity) + b (race) + b (grade level) + b (school characteristics) + b (mentoring experience) + b (career adaptability) + e.

In regression analysis, the cumulative strength of the predictors is reported by the multiple R, a value between -1 and +1. Squaring this value produces $R^2$, which is called the coefficient of determination. The coefficient of determination is the amount of variance in the dependent variable that can be explained from knowing the values of the predictor variables. If $R^2 = .56$, then 56% of the variance in job satisfaction can be explained by route to teacher preparation, for instance.
**Assumptions of Regression Analysis**

There are four assumptions of linear regression:

1) Linearity of the relationship between independent and independent variables.

2) The value of the error term for a given case is independent of the values of the variables in the model and of the values of the error term for other cases.

3) The variance of the error term is homoscedastic, constant across cases.

4) The error distribution is normally distributed.

**Screening Data for Assumptions of Regression Analysis**

A correlation matrix was generated to examine the relationships between the independent and dependent variables. A scatterplot matrix was generated to screen the data for linearity. Normality of the error distribution was examined by histograms and Normal Probability Plots. Homoscedasticity was examined by plotting the regression standardized predicted values.

**Alpha Level**

The alpha level for this study is .05, which means that the null hypothesis will be rejected at the $p < .05$ level. An alpha level of $p < .05$ means that the probability of a particular result occurring due to chance is less than 5 times out of 100. SPSS provides the significance levels for the overall regression models and also for the individual predictors within the models depending on how the variables are entered into the equations. For example, if the “enter” method is utilized, then all variables are entered into the regression model. Some variables may be significant and some variables may not be significant. If the “stepwise” entry method is selected, then variables included in the
final model will be determined statistically and those variables that are not significant predictors will automatically be excluded from the model.

*Sample Size for Regression Analysis*

For sufficient statistical power, it is usually recommended that researchers have at least 10 participants for every predictor variable in multiple regression. There are 10 proposed predictor variables for this study, which implies that a minimum sample size of 100 participants is needed.

**Evaluation of Research Methods**

*Internal Validity*

**Strengths**

1. The instruments selected (CMI and AMAQ) have been deemed reliable and valid, which contributes to the internal validity for this study.

2. The statistical procedures used to analyze the data in this study are appropriate to answer the research question, test the hypotheses, and further strengthen the internal validity of the research relative to the measurement of the variables that will be studied.

3. The study’s quantitative design will have a higher internal validity than a study with a qualitative design.

**Weakness**

1. The accessible sample size ($N = 120$) may not be large enough to conduct the statistical analysis. However, this weakness is not significant, as the population variance and dispersion is not great. Furthermore, the power analysis identified for this study indicated that the minimum sample size needed to have a power of .80. According
to Cohen (1992) the necessary N for a power of .80 when measuring the small difference between two independent sample means at an alpha .05 requires a sample size (N) = 60 in each group.

**External Validity**

**Strengths**

1. Using a purposive sampling technique in this study is appropriate because purposive sampling is a nonprobability sample that conforms to certain criteria (Creswell, 2003). In this study, the criteria for the sample are specific.

2. The target and accessible populations in this study are clearly defined.

3. The study and administration of test instruments will take place in a natural setting.

**Weaknesses**

1. The study may not generalize to a larger population because it focuses on a particular population of beginning teachers in one school district in New Jersey. This population may not be representative of all beginning teachers.

2. The final sample of the target population from which data were collected was self-selected, which has potential bias.

3. Use of purposive sampling limits the generalization of findings beyond the population in the study.

These weaknesses were minimized by the use of triangulation of data. Maxwell (2004) defined triangulation as “collecting information from a diverse range of individuals and settings using a variety of methods” (p.75). Triangulation allows stronger
support for the presence of a relationship (Creswell, 2003). In the present study data were gathered using several different instruments.

Summary

This research is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 outlines the background of the problem to be studied and the study’s purpose. Definition of terms and delimitations and scope of the study are included. In Chapter 2, the literature relevant to the dependent and independent variables of the study is reviewed. Chapter 3 details the methodology. Included is an explanation of the approach and method, sample population and data collection procedures, the test instruments, and method of statistical analysis. Chapter 4 will present and analyze the collected data to answer the research question. Chapter 5 will present the research, conclusions, interpretations, and implications of the findings. Limitations of the study are noted and recommendations for future research are also made.
CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS

This purpose of this study was to examine the differences in beginning teachers (those who have taught between one and three years) who chose the traditional route of teacher education and teachers who pursued an alternative route of teacher preparation in terms of educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experience, and career adaptability and the relationship to job satisfaction and intention to leave their current job.

The traditional route to teacher licensure involves participation in a four-or-five year program offered by colleges and universities (Brannan & Reichardt, 2002). Typically accredited and granted by the state, the programs provide the requisite coursework and field experience needed for licensure; thus, graduates automatically earn a teaching license upon satisfactory completion of program requirements.

In this study, alternative routes to teacher preparation programs are those in the classification system developed by the National Center for Education Information (NCEI), which uses the letters from A through K to denote the various approaches to alternative certification adopted by the states (NCAE, 2004). These range from models in which individuals with college degrees in areas other than teaching teach under a trained mentor while receiving formal instruction in education theory and practice during the school year, and in some cases during summers (Classes A and B); a review of academic and professional background and transcript analysis (Classes C and D); post-baccalaureate programs based at an institution of higher education (Class E); issuance of emergency teaching certificates (Class F); programs for persons who have few
requirements left to fulfill before becoming certified through the traditional approved college teacher education program route (Class G); routes that enable a person who has some “special” qualifications, such as a well-known author or Nobel Prize winner, to teach certain subjects (Class H); lack of alternatives to the approved college teacher education program route for licensing teachers (Class I); and Class J, elimination of emergency routes; rather, individuals who do not meet basic requirements become qualified to enter an alternate or traditional route leading to teacher licensing (Feistritzer, & Chester, 2001).

A correlational research design was implemented in this investigation. Using a purposive sampling procedure, the sample was accessed from a list of 1-3 years beginning teachers in an urban school district in New Jersey. Participants completed self-reporting questionnaires developed by the researcher about their educational backgrounds, personal characteristics, school characteristics, job satisfaction, and intent to leave their current jobs. Additionally, the Career Mastery Inventory (CMAS) (Crites, 1978) and the Alleman Mentoring Activities Questionnaire (AMAQ) (Alleman & Clarke, 2000) ascertained information about participants’ career adaptability and mentoring experiences.

Chapter four is organized according to the layout of the survey. The reliability and validity of the instruments were also examined. Cronbach’s alpha investigated the reliability of School Characteristics, Job Satisfaction, Intent to Leave, and the nine scales of the AMAQ. Confirmatory factor analysis examined the validity of the constructs (School Characteristics, Job Satisfaction, Intent to Leave, etc.). The reliability and validity of the CMAS for the sample could not be determined because there was no
scoring manual available. Participants’ scores on the CMAS were transferred from paper surveys to an online site, which automatically scored the instrument and provided the standard scores (Vocopher, 2010). Dr. Glavin, the Vocopher Administrator, informed this researcher that he did not have a test manual, only a scoring key and that he does not give the scoring key to anyone because that would allow others to replicate the instrument (personal communication, 2010). AMOS 17.0 confirmed the factor constructs for the variables of interest in this study. After survey results are provided, the research question and related hypotheses are discussed. Multiple regression explored the research question and associated hypotheses. SPSS 15.0 was utilized for data analysis. Data on 89 teachers were used in this study. The following provides a discussion of the survey results.

**Part 1. Educational Background**

Sixty-nine percent of participants (N = 61) had bachelor’s degrees; 28.1% (N = 25) had master’s degrees, 2.2% (N = 2) had Doctor of Philosophy degrees (Ph.D.) and 1.1% (N = 1) had an Educational Doctorate (Ed.D.). The type of teacher preparation programs were approximately equally distributed among participants. Specifically, 51.7% (N = 46) had traditional teacher preparation (completion of formal teaching program at an accredited college or university) and 48.3% (N = 43) had alternative preparation (completion of a bachelor’s degree from an accredited or university in a field other than education). Fifty-five percent (N = 49) of teachers were certified in Elementary Education; 30.3% (N = 27) were certified in Secondary Education, and 14.6% (N = 13) did not respond to this question on the survey.
Part 2. Personal Characteristics

Seventy percent of teachers \((N = 62)\) were females and 30.3% \((N = 27)\) were males. Participants’ ages ranged from 22-60 \((M = 35.99, SD = 9.73)\). Subject area is presented in Table 4-1.

Table 4-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual/ESL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Physical Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Social-Studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts/Reading</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty-nine percent \((N = 35)\) of teachers taught at the elementary grade level; 19.1% \((N = 17)\) taught exclusively at the middle school level; 12.4% \((N = 11)\) taught at the K-8 grade levels; 22.5% \((N = 20)\) were high school teachers; and 6.7% \((N = 6)\) taught at the K-12 levels. In terms of race, 61.8% \((N = 55)\) were white, whereas 24.7% \((N = 22)\) were black or African Americans; 4.5% \((N = 4)\) were Asians; 1.1% \((N = 1)\) were American Indian or Alaska Natives; and 7.9% \((N = 7)\) did not respond.
Relative to ethnicity, 42.7% \((N = 38)\) were “other,” 30.3% \((N = 27)\) were not Hispanic or Latino; and 27% \((N = 24)\) were Hispanic or Latino. A cross-tabulation of ethnicity and race revealed that 82.4% \((N = 14)\) of Hispanics or Latinos were white; 11.8% \((N = 2)\) of Hispanics or Latinos were black or African Americans; and 5.9% \((N = 1)\) of Hispanics or Latinos were American Indian or Alaskan Native.

**Part 3. School Characteristics**

Part 3 of the survey assessed positive school characteristics. Scores ranged from 12-48 \((M = 33.39, SD = 7.94)\). Cronbach’s alpha for school characteristics = .87. Confirmatory factor analysis indicated that the 10 questions formulated to assess the construct of positive school characteristics were statistically valid, \(X^2(23, N = 89) = 32.58, p = .09\). See Figure 4-1. Confirmatory factor analysis is a special type of path analysis in which a path diagram is utilized to show the relationships between observed and latent (unobserved) variables. In path analysis, observed variables are indicated by squares or rectangles and latent variables are indicated by circles or ovals. The model asserts that the 10 questions (Q1SC – Q10SC) are related to an unobserved variable called “school characteristics.” However, other influences not listed elsewhere in the model may also be related to school characteristics. These other influences are indicated as error terms \(e1\) to \(e10\) in the path diagram. The error term “e1” for instance, represents the error of measurement in Q1SC. The unobserved variable *school characteristics* is also called a “common factor.” The path coefficients leading from the common factor to the observed variables are sometimes called “factor loadings.” Factor loadings are also called “regression weights,” which measure the strength of the relationships between the common factor and the observed factors. In the following path diagram, the regression
weights range from .24 to .81. The double-headed arrows in the path diagram indicate covariance or correlation, which is another name for covariance. The error term for Q1SC (e1) is correlated with the error term for Q2SC (e2), for example, and the correlation coefficient is .38, which is indicated on the path diagram. A p-value of .089 means that there is no significant difference between the data and the diagram for the path model, which means that the path model is an acceptable fit for the data. Thus, the 10 questions are valid for the construct of school characteristics.
Total mentoring scores on the AMAQ ranged from 10.43-75.48 ($M = 45.28$, $SD = 14.89$). Scores falling into the range of 0-29 are considered non-mentoring levels of behavior. Scores of 30-40 are considered limited mentoring activities. Typical activities score in the range of 40-60. Scores above 60 are considered high levels of mentoring. Therefore, scores in the current study ranged from non-mentoring behavior to high levels of mentoring, and the mean score of 45.28 is consistent with average levels of mentoring behavior. A histogram for mentoring scores is presented in Figure 4-2. A histogram is a
bar graph showing the general shape of a frequency distribution. The bars are drawn so that adjacent bars touch other because the data are from an interval scale of measurement. The touching bars produce a continuous figure, which emphasizes the continuity of the variable. For a histogram, vertical bars are drawn above each score so that the height of the bar corresponds to the frequency, and the width of each bar extends to the real limits of each score. In Figure 2, the histogram takes the shape of a normal distribution. A normal distribution has a characteristic, symmetric bell-shaped form. Therefore, a normal curve has been superimposed over the histogram to emphasize this observation. Since the mentoring scores are normally distributed, a number of inferences can be made about the values of the scores. In a normal distribution, for instance, 68% of the scores fall within one standard deviation of the mean and 95% of the scores fall within two standard deviations of the mean. A normal distribution is an assumption of many inferential statistical tests such as t-tests, for instance.
Cronbach’s alpha for the nine scales on the AMAQ ranged from .89 for “assign challenging tasks” to .97 for “demonstrated trust” with an overall reliability of .984. Reliability coefficients are presented in Table 4-2.
Table 4-2

Reliability Coefficients for the Alleman Mentoring Activities Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teach the job</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign challenging tasks</td>
<td>9-16</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach politics</td>
<td>17-24</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career help</td>
<td>25-32</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>33-40</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>41-48</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career counseling</td>
<td>49-56</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>57-64</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated trust</td>
<td>65-72</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1-72</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confirmatory factor analysis of the nine scales on the AMAQ confirmed the presence of three unique factors (guiding activities, helping activities, and encouraging activities). The comparative fit index (CFI) for the model = .98. CFI values close to 1 indicate a very good fit for the data. See Figure 4-3. The path model in Figure 4-3 asserts that the three observed variables (teach the job, provide challenge, teach politics) depend on an unobserved variable called “guiding activities.” Factor loadings for guiding activities range from .61 to .86. The observed variables (career help, protect, sponsor) depend on an unobserved variable called “helping activities.” Factor loadings for helping activities range from .89 to .92. The observed variables (career counseling, friendship, trust) depend on an unobserved variable called “encouraging activities.” Factor loadings
for encouraging activities range from .69 to .92. The variable guiding activities is correlated with helping activities \( (r = .91) \) and encouraging activities \( (r = .87) \). The variable helping activities is correlated with encouraging activities, \( r = .95 \). There are nine inter-correlations of error terms. For instance, \( e1 \) is correlated with \( e2 \) \( (r = .56) \). Again, error terms represent measurement error or the unexplained influences on the observed variables.

![Figure 4-3. Confirmatory factor analysis for the Alleman Mentoring Activities Questionnaire](image)

\( CFI = .975 \)

Figure 4-3. Confirmatory factor analysis for the Alleman Mentoring Activities Questionnaire
Part 5. Career Mastery Inventory (CMAS)

Scores on the CMAS ranged from 52-75 ($M = 67.54$, $SD = 6.18$). The normed mean for the CMAS = 50. Therefore, the group mean of 67.54 was higher than the normed mean. A one-sample t-test indicated that this difference was statistically significant, $t(80) = 25.56$, $p < .001$, two-tails. Therefore, the teachers in this study had significantly higher levels of career adaptability than the average adult.

Part 6. Job Satisfaction

Scores on the job satisfaction scale of the instrument ranged from 6-23 ($M = 13.80$, $SD = 3.53$). Cronbach’s alpha for job satisfaction = .317. Confirmatory factor analysis confirmed that the five questions developed to assess job satisfaction were statistically valid, $X^2(5, N = 89) = 9.2$, $p = .10$. See Figure 4-44. According to Figure 4, the observed variables of Q1JS to Q5JS depend on an unobserved variable called “job satisfaction.” Factor loadings for job satisfaction ranged from .36 to .77. A $p$-value of .101 means that there is no significant difference between the data and the diagram for the path model.

![Job Satisfaction Diagram](image)

Chi-Square = 9.199  
$df = 5$  
$p = .101$

Figure 4-4. Confirmatory factor analysis for job satisfaction
Part 7. Intention to Leave

Scores on the Intention to Leave scale of the instrument ranged from 5-25 ($M = 11.80$, $SD = 6.18$). Cronbach’s alpha for Intention to Leave = .594. As illustrated in Figure 4–5, confirmatory factor analysis of Intention to Leave confirmed that the five questions developed to assess this construct were statistically valid, $X^2(4, N = 89) = 1.72$, $p = .79$. The path diagram in Figure 5 asserts that the observed variables Q1IL to Q5IL depend on an unobserved variable called “Intention to leave.” Factor loadings for intention to leave range from .71 to .93. The error term for Q2IL (e2) is correlated with the error term for Q4IL (e4); $r = .45$ (Q2IL = A different kind of career has become more appealing to me; Q4IL = I will leave teaching after the present school year is over.)

A p-value of .79 means that there is no significant difference between the data and the path diagram.

Figure 4–5. Confirmatory factor analysis of intention to leave

Research Question

Are there differences in the educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experience, career adaptability, job satisfaction, and
intention to leave in beginning teachers (those who have taught for one to three years) who have pursued a traditional route of teacher preparation, compared to those teachers who have pursued an alternative route of teacher preparation? The chi-square statistic examined differences in educational background and personal characteristics relative to teacher preparation.

**Educational Background and Teacher Preparation**

There was no significant difference in educational background relative to teacher preparation, $X^2(3, N = 89) = 6.13, p = .11$. Educational background and teacher preparation are presented in Table 4-3.

Table 4-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Education Level Achieved</th>
<th>Ph.D</th>
<th>Ed.D</th>
<th>Bachelor's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Type of Teacher Preparation Program</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Alternative | Count | 25 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 43 |
| % within Type of Teacher Preparation Program | 58.1% | 39.5% | 2.3% | .0% | 100.0% |
| % of Total | 28.1% | 19.1% | 1.1% | .0% | 48.3% |

Total Count | 61 | 25 | 2 | 1 | 89 |
Table 4-3 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Education Level Achieved</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's % within Teacher</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation Program % of Total</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal Characteristics and Teacher Preparation**

There was no significant gender difference relative to teacher preparation, $X^2(1, N = 89) = 1.86, p = .17$. Gender and teacher preparation are presented in Table 4-4.

Table 4-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender and Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Teacher Preparation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Type of Teacher</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Count</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Type of Teacher</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Count 27 62 89

% within Type of Teacher Preparation Program % of Total 30.3% 69.7% 100.0%
There was no significant difference in grade level relative to teacher preparation, $X^2(4, N = 89) = 4.73, p = .32$. Grade level and teacher preparation are presented in Table 4-5.

### Table 4-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Teacher Preparation Program</th>
<th>Traditional Count</th>
<th>% within Type of Teacher Preparation Program</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no significant racial difference relative to teacher preparation, $X^2(3, N = 82) = 3.14, p = .37$. Race and teacher preparation are presented in Table 4-6.
Table 4-6

Race and Teacher Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Teacher Preparation Program</th>
<th>Traditional Count</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Indian or Alaska Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Type of Teacher Preparation Program</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Type of Teacher Preparation Program</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Type of Teacher Preparation Program</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total N = 82 because seven participants did not provide their race.
There was no significant difference in ethnicity relative to teacher preparation, \(X^2(2, N = 89) = 2.09, p = .35\). Ethnicity and teacher certification are presented in Table 4-7.

Table 4-7

Ethnicity and Teacher Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Teacher Preparation Program</th>
<th>Traditional Count</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Type of Teacher Preparation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Type of Teacher Preparation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Type of Teacher Preparation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T-tests for independent samples examined differences in school characteristics, mentoring experience, career adaptability, job satisfaction, and intention relative to teacher preparation. Group means are presented in Table 4-8.
Table 4-8

**Group Means for Teacher Preparation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Type of Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Characteristics Total</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33.63</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33.17</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Total Score</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43.36</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47.08</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAS Total Score</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67.45</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>67.63</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction Total Score</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent to Leave Total Score</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School Characteristics and Teacher Preparation**

There was no significant difference in teachers’ ratings of school characteristics relative to teacher preparation, \( t(87) = .268, p = .789 \), two-tails. Teachers who completed traditional preparation programs rated their school characteristics the same as teachers who completed alternative preparation programs.

**Mentoring Experiences and Teacher Preparation**

There was no significant difference in teachers’ mentoring experiences relative to teacher preparation, \( t(87) = -1.18, p = .24 \), two-tails. Teachers who completed traditional preparation programs had similar mentoring experiences as teachers who completed an alternative preparation programs.
**Career Adaptability and Teacher Preparation**

There was no significant difference in career adaptability relative to teacher preparation, $t(79) = -0.13, p = .89$, two-tails. Teachers who completed traditional preparation programs had similar career adaptability as teachers who completed alternative preparation programs.

**Job Satisfaction and Teacher Preparation**

There was no significant difference in job satisfaction relative to teacher preparation, $t(87) = 0.04, p = .97$, two-tails. Teachers who completed traditional preparation programs were equally satisfied with their jobs as teachers who completed alternative teacher preparation programs.

**Intention to Leave and Teacher Preparation**

There was no significant difference in teachers' intentions to leave their current job relative to their type of preparation program, $t(87) = 1.12, p = .27$, two-tails. Teachers who completed traditional preparation programs did not differ in their intent to leave their current jobs as teachers who completed alternative preparation.

**Hypothesis Testing**

$H_1$ stated that educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experiences, and career adaptability of beginning teachers are significant explanatory variables of job satisfaction. Multiple regression investigated $H_1$. Variables were entered into the regression model using the stepwise entry method.

Stepwise regression is designed to find the most parsimonious set of predictors that are most effective in predicting the dependent variable. Variables are added to the regression equation one at a time, using the statistical criterion of maximizing the $R^2$ of
the included variables. The process of adding more variables stops when all of the available variables have been included or when it is not possible to make a statistically significant improvement in $R^2$ using any of the variables not yet included. In $H_1$, the predictor variables are educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experiences, and career adaptability. The criterion variable is job satisfaction. A final regression model for $H_1$ was generated in two steps. The ANOVA for the final step of the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 66) = 59.43, p = .006; R^2 = .14$. Highest education level achieved was a significant, negative predictor of job satisfaction, $b = -1.89, t = -2.61, p = .01$. As teacher education increased, there was a corresponding decrease in job satisfaction. Favorable school characteristics were significantly, positively associated with job satisfaction, $b = .12, t = 2.24, p = .03$. Age, type of teacher preparation program, gender, grade level, mentoring experiences, and career adaptability were statistically excluded from the regression model because they did not make any significant contributions to job satisfaction. An $R$-square value of .14 means that 14% of the variance in job satisfaction can be explained by highest education level achieved and school characteristics. Regression coefficients are presented in Table 4-9.
Table 4-9

Regression Coefficients for Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.56</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest Education Level Achieved</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.94</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest Education Level Achieved</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Characteristics Total Score</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction Total Score

$H_2$ stated that educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experiences, career adaptability, and job satisfaction of beginning teachers are significant explanatory variables of intentions to leave the current job. A regression model was produced in one step. The ANOVA for the model was statistically significant, $F(1, 67) = 8.65, p = .004; R^2 = .11$. Favorable school characteristics were a significant, negative predictor of intention to leave the current job, $b = -.27, t = -2.94, p = .004$. As teachers’ ratings of their school characteristics became more favorable, their intentions to leave the current job decreased. See Table 4-10.
Table 4-10

*Regression Coefficients for Intentions to Leave*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>20.94</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dependent Variable: Intent to Leave Total Score
Table 4-11 provides a summary of the research question and hypotheses results.

Table 4-11

**Summary of Research Question and Hypotheses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question/Hypotheses</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there differences in the educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experience, career adaptability, job satisfaction, and intention to leave in beginning teachers who have pursued a traditional route of teacher preparation, compared to those teachers who have pursued an alternative route of teacher preparation?</td>
<td>There were no significant differences in educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experience, career adaptability, job satisfaction, and intention to leave in beginning teachers relative to teacher preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H₁:</strong> Educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experiences, and career adaptability of beginning teachers are significant explanatory variables of job satisfaction.</td>
<td>Stepwise multiple regression determined that highest educational level achieved and school characteristics were significant explanatory variables of job satisfaction accounting for 14% of the variance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H₂:</strong> Educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experiences, career adaptability, and job satisfaction of beginning teachers are significant explanatory variables of intentions to leave the current job.</td>
<td>Stepwise multiple regression determined that school characteristics were a significant explanatory variable of intention to leave the current job accounting for 11% of the variance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Findings

The researcher-developed scales of school characteristics, job satisfaction, and intention to leave were determined to be both reliable and valid. Furthermore, the standardized instrument, the Alleman Mentoring Activities Questionnaire was also determined to be highly reliable and valid for the sample of beginning teachers, who also had average mentoring experiences. The teachers in this study had significantly higher levels of career adaptability as measured on the Career Mastery Inventory than the average adult. There were no significant differences in educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experience, career adaptability, job satisfaction, and intention to leave in beginning teachers relative to teacher preparation. Highest educational level achieved and school characteristics were significant explanatory variables of job satisfaction accounting for 14% of the variance. Specifically, as educational achievement increased, job satisfaction decreased. Favorable school characteristics were associated with increased job satisfaction. School characteristics were a significant explanatory variable of intention to leave the current job accounting for 11% of the variance. Favorable school characteristics were related to decreased intentions to leave the current job.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine the differences in beginning teachers (those who have taught between one and three years) who chose the traditional route of teacher education and teachers who pursued an alternative route of teacher preparation in terms of educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experience, and career adaptability and the relationship to job satisfaction and intention to leave their current job.

The traditional route to teacher licensure involves participation in a four-or-five year program offered by colleges and universities (Brannan & Reichardt, 2002). Typically accredited and granted by the state, the programs provide the requisite coursework and field experience needed for licensure; thus, graduates automatically earn a teaching license upon satisfactory completion of program requirements.

In this study, alternative routes to teacher preparation programs are those in the classification system developed by the National Center for Education Information (NCEI), which uses the letters from A through K to denote the various approaches to alternative certification adopted by the states (NCAE, 2004). These range from models in which individuals with college degrees in areas other than teaching teach under a trained mentor while receiving formal instruction in education theory and practice during the school year, and in some cases during summers (Classes A and B); a review of academic and professional background and transcript analysis (Classes C and D); post-baccalaureate programs based at an institution of higher education (Class E); issuance of
emergency teaching certificates (Class F); programs for persons who have few requirements left to fulfill before becoming certified through the traditional approved college teacher education program route (Class G); routes that enable a person who has some “special” qualifications, such as a well-known author or Nobel Prize winner, to teach certain subjects (Class H); lack of alternatives to the approved college teacher education program route for licensing teachers (Class I); and Class J, elimination of emergency routes; rather, individuals who do not meet basic requirements become qualified to enter an alternate or traditional route leading to teacher licensing (Feistritzer, & Chester, 2001).

A correlational research design was implemented in this investigation. Using a purposive sampling procedure, the sample was accessed from a list of 1-3 years beginning teachers in an urban school district in New Jersey. Participants completed self-reporting questionnaires developed by the researcher about their educational backgrounds, personal characteristics, school characteristics, job satisfaction, and intent to leave their current jobs. Additionally, the Career Mastery Inventory (CMAS) (Crites, 1978) and the Alleman Mentoring Activities Questionnaire (AMAQ) (Alleman & Clarke, 2000) ascertained information about participants’ career adaptability and mentoring experiences.

Chapter five consists of the summary of findings for this dissertation study. As such, Chapter five is comprised of the conclusions, limitations, recommendations for future research, and implications for practice.
Conclusions

Sixty-nine percent of participants \((N = 61)\) had bachelor’s degrees; 28.1% \((N = 25)\) had master’s degrees, 2.2% \((N = 2)\) had Doctor of Philosophy degrees \((\text{Ph.D.})\) and 1.1% \((N = 1)\) had an Educational Doctorate \((\text{Ed.D.})\). The type of teacher preparation programs were approximately equally distributed among participants. Specifically, 51.7% \((N = 46)\) had traditional teacher preparation \((\text{completion of formal teaching program at an accredited college or university})\) and 48.3% \((N = 43)\) had alternative preparation \((\text{completion of a bachelor’s degree from an accredited or university in a field other than education})\). Seventy percent of teachers \((N = 62)\) were females and 30.3% \((N = 27)\) were males. Participants’ ages ranged from 22-60 \((M = 35.99, SD = 9.73)\). In terms of race, 61.8% \((N = 55)\) were white, whereas 24.7% \((N = 22)\) were black or African Americans; 4.5% \((N = 4)\) were Asians; 1.1% \((N = 1)\) were American Indian or Alaska Natives; and 7.9% \((N = 7)\) did not respond. Relative to ethnicity, 42.7% \((N = 38)\) were “other,” 30.3% \((N = 27)\) were not Hispanic or Latino; and 27% \((N = 24)\) were Hispanic or Latino. A cross-tabulation of ethnicity and race revealed that 82.4% \((N = 14)\) of Hispanics or Latinos were white; 11.8% \((N = 2)\) of Hispanics or Latinos were black or African Americans; and 5.9% \((N = 1)\) of Hispanics or Latinos were American Indian or Alaskan Native.

The target population for this study consisted of 2,459 teachers from 39 K-12 schools in an urban school district in New Jersey. The majority are male \((59\%); 41\%\) are female. The average age of a teacher is between 30 and 39. Thirty percent of teachers are between 30 and 39 years of age and nineteen percent are between the ages of 21 and 29. Teachers come primarily from three ethnic backgrounds. White makes up the largest
percentage (73%), with Hispanic/Latino and African Americans making up 11%. For the number of years working as a teacher, 50% have 10 years or more of experience. Sixteen percent have 1 to 2 years experience. Thirty three percent have 3 to 5 years experience, and 11%, have 6 to 10 years experience. Fifty percent hold bachelor's degrees, and 44% hold master's degrees. Six percent hold doctorates.

Teacher gender in the current study did not match teacher gender in the target population. In the current study, female teachers outnumbered male teachers, whereas in the target population, male teachers outnumbered female teachers. This difference may have emerged due to the sampling procedure employed. The sample was accessed using a purposive sampling procedure rather than a random selection of study participants.

In other personal characteristics, however, the sample was consistent with the target population. For instance, the mean age of the target population was between 30 and 39, and the mean age of the sample was 36. Likewise, the predominant race for both the sample and target populations was Caucasian. Hispanics were slightly overrepresented in the sample in comparison to the target population. Eleven percent of the target population was Hispanic whereas 27% of the sample was of Hispanic ethnicity.

The researcher-developed scales of school characteristics, job satisfaction, and intention to leave were determined to be both reliable and valid. Reliability is a measure of consistency. Validity is the extent to which an instrument measures what it purports to measure. Cronbach’s alpha for school characteristics = .87. Confirmatory factor analysis indicated that the 10 questions formulated to assess the construct of positive school characteristics were statistically valid, $X^2(23, N = 89) = 32.58, p = .09$. 
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Cronbach’s alpha for job satisfaction = .32. Confirmatory factor analysis confirmed that the five questions developed to assess job satisfaction were statistically valid, $X^2(5, N = 89) = 9.2, p = .10$. Cronbach’s alpha for Intention to Leave = .594. Confirmatory factor analysis of Intention to Leave confirmed that the five questions developed to assess this construct were statistically valid, $X^2(4, N = 89) = 1.72, p = .79$.

Furthermore, the standardized instrument, the Alleman Mentoring Activities Questionnaire was also determined to be highly reliable ($\alpha = .98$). Confirmatory factor analysis of the nine scales on the AMAQ confirmed the presence of three unique factors (guiding activities, helping activities, and encouraging activities). The comparative fit index (CFI) for the model = .98. CFI values close to 1 indicate a very good fit for the data for the sample of beginning teachers. Total mentoring scores on the AMAQ ranged from 10.43-75.48 ($M = 45.28$, $SD = 14.89$). Scores falling into the range of 0-29 are considered non-mentoring levels of behavior. Scores of 30-40 are considered limited mentoring activities. Typical activities score in the range of 40-60. Scores above 60 are considered high levels of mentoring. Therefore, scores in the current study ranged from non-mentoring behavior to high levels of mentoring, and the mean score of 45.28 is consistent with average levels of mentoring behavior.

Scores on the CMAS ranged from 52-75 ($M = 67.54$, $SD = 6.18$). The normed mean for the CMAS = 50. Therefore, the group mean of 67.54 was higher than the normed mean. A one-sample t-test indicated that this difference was statistically significant, $t(80) = 25.56, p < .001$, two-tails. Therefore, the teachers in this study had significantly higher levels of career adaptability than the average adult. The higher the
score, the more mature participants are in mastering the career developmental tasks of the Establishment Stage, from occupational entry to mid-life (first 90 items of the CMAS).

The Establishment Stage of career development is from the age of 25 to 44 (Super, 1996). This is the main stage in the career of a person. In the beginning of this stage, some people have found their suitable jobs and these helped them have long and settled standings in their career lines. As usual, people pursue their original career choices, but there are still many people considering that this stage is only a trial period to continually test their skills and incentives for advancement in career. The Establishment Stage includes three periods; the trial period, the stable period, and the mid-career crisis period.

The trial period is from the age of 25 to about 30 (Super, 1996). In the trial period, people work primarily to find out whether the career choice they made is suitable or not. The stable period is normally from the age of 30 to 40. In the stable period, people often have identified their own career goals and have specific plans to decide what should continually be done to reach those goals. There are two tendencies; continuing the path chosen or turning to another job career. The mid-career crisis period lasts from mid thirties to mid forties. During the mid-career crisis period, people often compare what they have tried to pursue, the difficulties in the careers they have, what they have to sacrifice, the losses they have endured to follow their career paths as well as their career ambitions with the achievements they have accomplished in their careers such as position, salary, etc.

Based on the mean age of teachers ($M = 36$) in the current study, and due to the fact that teachers had significantly higher levels of career adaptability than the average
adult, the majority of the teachers were likely in the stable period of the Establishment Stage. Revisiting the types of teacher preparation makes this conclusion highly plausible. Teachers with alternative certifications have already determined that their previous careers were not suitable, which may be why they left their previous occupations and became teachers. Traditionally certified teachers have spent at least four to five years in college completing the prerequisite coursework and field experiences specifically for teaching, which increases the likelihood that they will have already surpassed the trial period of the Establishment Stage of career development.

Surprisingly, there was no significant difference in career adaptability between traditional ($M = 67.63, SD = 6.05$) and alternative ($M = 67.45, SD = 6.38$) certified teachers $t(79) = -.13, p = .39$, two-tails. This is a strong indication that traditional and certified teachers in the current study were at the same stage of career development.

As there was no significant difference in career adaptability between traditional and alternative certified teachers, there were also no significant differences in educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experience, job satisfaction, and intention to leave in beginning teachers relative to teacher preparation.

Seventy-eight percent of traditionally certified teachers had bachelor's degrees compared to 48.3% of teachers with alternative certification. However, this difference was not statistically significant, $X^2(3, N = 89) = 6.13, p = .11$.

*Personal characteristics* in this study consisted of gender, race, ethnicity, and grade level. There was no significant gender difference relative to teacher preparation, $X^2(1, N = 89) = 1.86, p = .17$. Twenty-four percent of males had traditional teacher
certification compared to 37% of males with alternative certification. There was no significant racial difference relative to teacher preparation, $X^2(3, N = 82) = 3.14, p = .37$. Seventy-one percent of traditionally certified teachers were white compared to 62.5% of alternative certified teachers who were white. There was no significant difference in ethnicity relative to teacher preparation, $X^2(2, N = 89) = 2.09, p = .35$. Twenty-four percent of Hispanic teachers had traditional certification versus 30.2% of Hispanic teachers with alternative certifications. There was no significant difference in grade level relative to teacher preparation, $X^2(4, N = 89) = 4.73, p = .32$. For instance, 41% of traditionally certified teachers had elementary certifications, whereas 37% of alternative certified teachers had elementary certifications.

There was no significant difference in teachers’ ratings of school characteristics relative to teacher preparation, $t(87) = .268, p = .789$, two-tails. Teachers who completed traditional preparation programs rated their school characteristics the same as teachers who completed alternative preparation programs.

There was no significant difference in teachers’ mentoring experiences relative to teacher preparation, $t(87) = -1.18, p = .24$, two-tails. Teachers who completed traditional preparation programs had similar mentoring experiences as teachers who completed an alternative preparation programs.

There was no significant difference in job satisfaction relative to teacher preparation, $t(87) = .04, p = .97$, two-tails. Teachers who completed traditional preparation programs were equally satisfied with their jobs as teachers who completed alternative teacher preparation programs.
There was no significant difference in teachers’ intentions to leave their current job relative to their type of preparation program, $t(87) = 1.12, p = .27$, two-tails. Teachers who completed traditional preparation programs did not differ in their intent to leave their current jobs as teachers who completed alternative preparation.

Highest educational level achieved and school characteristics were significant explanatory variables of job satisfaction accounting for 14% of the variance. Specifically, as educational achievement increased, job satisfaction decreased. Favorable school characteristics were associated with increased job satisfaction. School characteristics were a significant explanatory variable of intention to leave the current job accounting for 11% of the variance. Favorable school characteristics were related to decreased intentions to leave the current job.

**Limitations**

Data on 89 teachers were used in this study. The sample population was accessed from a list of 1-3 years beginning teachers in an urban school district in New Jersey, utilizing purposive sampling methods. A purposive sample is a type of nonprobability sample in which the researcher selects the sample on the basis of his or her own judgment about whether the sample is most representative of the population being studied. Nonprobability sampling does not involve random selection. Therefore, the study may not generalize to a larger population because it focuses on a particular population of beginning teachers in one school district in New Jersey. Specifically, this population may not be representative of beginning teachers in other school districts in New Jersey or beginning teachers in other states. The final sample of the target population from which data were collected were self-selected, which has potential bias.
The chi-square test was used to measure differences in teacher preparation relative to educational background and personal characteristics. In some instances, expected group (cell) sizes were less than five. When using the chi-square test, expected cell sizes of less than five can yield spurious results. Therefore, the non-significant chi-square test results need to be interpreted with caution relative to educational background and teacher preparation; grade level and teacher preparation; and race and teacher preparation since they had subgroup counts of less than five.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Highest educational level achieved and school characteristics were significant explanatory variables of job satisfaction accounting for 14% of the variance. This means that 86% of the variance in job satisfaction remains unexplained. Similarly, school characteristics were a significant explanatory variable of intention to leave the current job accounting for 11% of the variance, which leaves 89% of unexplained variance in intention to leave the current job. Evidently, this is an area where more research is needed.

If this study were replicated, a larger sample size is recommended. This study might be expanded to other school districts within the state of New Jersey and to other states. The scales of school characteristics, job satisfaction, and intention to leave, which were developed by the researcher were determined to be both reliable and valid. These instruments may be of benefit to other researchers interested in investigating similar areas of inquiry.
Implications for Practice

As a result of the findings from this study, several implications for practice emerge. The teachers in this study had significantly higher levels of career adaptability as measured on the Career Mastery Inventory than the average adult. However, career mastery was not a significant predictor of job satisfaction and intent to leave the current job, and there was no significant difference in career adaptability relative to teacher preparation. Similarly, Baker et al. (2004) found that graduates of alternative programs do as well as graduates of traditional programs in terms of teaching competence. Therefore, type of teacher preparation should not influence administrative hiring practices for teachers.

Highest educational level achieved and school characteristics were significant explanatory variables of job satisfaction. Specifically, as educational achievement increased, job satisfaction decreased. This finding may be due in part to teacher pay, although it was not directly measured in this study (Price, 2004). Significant pay increases for teachers are often out of the control of administrators and require legislative changes. Rather than lobbying for increased teacher pay, school administrators may need to find meaningful ways to acknowledge their teaching staff for their teaching efforts and make teachers feel valued. Perhaps some of the teachers who had decreased job satisfaction and higher educational achievement did not receive personal recognition for their educational accomplishments particularly if they obtained their advanced degrees after beginning teaching such as through an alternative certification program. Favorable school characteristics were associated with increased job satisfaction, and there were
survey questions on the school characteristics instrument that assessed teachers’ perceptions of feeling appreciated by administration.

Another possibility that teachers with higher educational achievement reported lower job satisfaction may be due to greater teaching demands placed upon them by school administration than their less educated coworkers. Equity and expectancy theories can also explain retention or intention to leave, if, as Adams (1965) and Vroom (1982) suggested, individuals feel satisfied at work when the input or contribution to a job and the resulting outcome are equal to those of co-workers, they are more likely to remain. School characteristics were a significant explanatory variable of intention to leave the current job. Favorable school characteristics were related to decreased intentions to leave the current job.

Among all the variables of interest in this study, the common denominator influencing teacher job satisfaction and retention is school characteristics. Themes assessed by the school characteristics instrument include degree of support teachers perceive for staff development programs, feeling appreciated, administrative support of innovative teaching and learning ideas, teamwork, and maintaining discipline. Based upon the current study, if school administrators can focus their efforts on improving these key areas, they will improve teacher job satisfaction and retention rates.
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Appendix A

Instrument
**PART 1. Educational Background**

1. Highest education level achieved
   - Assoc. Degree
   - Bachelor's
   - Master's
   - Ph.D.
   - Ed.D.
   - Does not apply

2. Type of teacher preparation program
   - Traditional (completion of formal teaching program at an accredited college or university)
   - Alternative (completion of a bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university in a field other than education)

3. In what area are you certified?

**PART 2. Personal Characteristics**

1. Gender
   - Male
   - Female

2. Subject Area

3. Grade Level

4. Race
   - American Indian or Alaska Native
   - Asian
   - Black or African American
   - Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
   - White
   - American Indian or Alaska Native

5. Ethnicity
   - Hispanic or Latino
   - Not Hispanic or Latino
   - Other
### PART 3. School Characteristics

**DIRECTIONS:** Please select the one response that most closely indicates your view according to the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5=Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Undecided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I often experience frustration at the degree of support the school provides for teachers.
2. I am often frustrated at the degree of support that staff development programs provide for each school district.
3. I am appreciated by school administration for my teaching efforts.
4. There is a spirit of collegiality among the teachers at my school.
5. I am encouraged to interact with other colleagues to obtain fresh teaching and learning ideas.
6. Teachers have a positive attitude toward teaching and learning at my school.
7. Maintaining discipline in the classroom is a challenge for me.
8. School administration encourages innovative teaching and learning ideas in the classroom.
9. My input is solicited in designing new academic programs and curricula.
10. There is a spirit of teamwork and collaboration among teachers at my school.
### PART 4. Mentoring Experiences

**DIRECTIONS:** Respond to each item below by using the rating scale on the right to rate how often each action would occur:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Provide informal feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Help turn failures into learning experiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Point out and encourage study of a variety of successful work styles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Provide clear, specific, accurate information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Give important information at the time it is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Coach in sidestepping entanglements and avoiding trouble.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Teach ways around obstacles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Allow or expect to work out solutions to problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Consult about whether assignments are challenging enough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Encourage to take initiative and seek greater responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>School administration encourages innovative teaching and learning ideas in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Provide more challenge and opportunity for the protégé than for others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Encourage to try high risk situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Give (or encourage to take) a tough job that is something the protégé needs to learn professionally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Give (or encourage to take) a tough job that will increase self-confidence and contribute to personal development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Explain how actions and strategies fit with business objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Discuss undercurrents, hidden agendas and body language after meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Instruct about potential political pitfalls.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Help anticipate and allow for the reactions and responses of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Provide key political tips that are clear, specific, and accurate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Warn of and suggest ways for dealing with ineffective or hostile superiors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Discuss &quot;What if...&quot; situations and various possible scenarios.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Teach strategies for dealing with ineffective or hostile superiors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Use available power and resources to help the protégé reach career goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**PART 4. Mentoring Experiences (cont’d)**

**DIRECTIONS:** Respond to each item below by using the rating scale on the right to rate how often each action would occur:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Recommend to a friend who is considering hiring someone with the protégé's qualifications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Contact friends in a position to offer the protégé an advantageous position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Recommend (even push) for a promotion or desirable lateral move when the protégé is ready.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Give effective, well-timed help in making career moves that are appropriate for the level of competence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Help make career moves that are in the right direction and advise what &quot;dead end positions&quot; to avoid.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Use available power and resources to help accomplish key tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Help seek assignments outside the area of specialty to gain broader experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Defend the protégé when criticized by the mentor's own superiors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Deviate from policy or bend the rules for the protégé in work related matters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Take personal risks to defend/protect the protégé in work related matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Provide an opportunity to defend ideas, try them out, and evaluate results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Defend the protégé when criticized by the mentor's colleagues and peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Provide a safe, protected environment for development of new and potentially controversial ideas, carefully timing exposure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Provide protection that does not restrict the chance to learn from mistakes, but prevents disasters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Give appropriate, effective protection when needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Support actions, plans, ideas to higher levels in the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Offer to participate jointly in organization activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Co-author articles or make joint presentations at professional meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### PART 4. Mentoring Experiences (cont’d)

**DIRECTIONS:** Respond to each item below by using the rating scale on the right to rate how often each action would occur:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Recommend as a speaker for a seminar or meeting outside the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Recommend for key committees, special projects, community assignments, or professional organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Send documentation of accomplishments to personnel file and/or upper management or administration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Encourage to write articles for professional journals or present papers at professional meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Effectively showcase potential or accomplishments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Help define personal careers goals and develop strategies to reach them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Help recognize probable future directions of own and related fields.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Help assess the value of learning experiences and how they fit with the real world.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Help understand risk and its relationship to growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Engage in informal counseling on an ongoing basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Show clear understanding of the protégé's situation when counseling him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Help to develop self understanding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Help to understand how career development works in the particular organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Choose for a close friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Invite the protégé to the mentor's home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Have occasional lunch, dinner, coffee, or drink with the protégé only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Help with personal needs such as locating housing or finding financial assistance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Invite to a social, cultural, or recreational event.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Value the friendship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Show friendship that is warm and strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Form a bond of friendship that is personal as well as professional.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### PART 4. Mentoring Experiences (cont'd)

**DIRECTIONS:** Respond to each item below by using the rating scale on the right to rate how often each action would occur:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65. Consciously try to make the protégé feel like a valued member of the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Verbally express confidence in the protégé.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Believe statements of and use information provided by the protégé.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Relax around the protégé.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Trust the protégé.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Increase the protégé's self-confidence by showing trust and confidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Inspire to want to deserve the trust shown toward the protégé.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. By example, help learn when to trust others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MENTORING OUTCOMES SECTION

MENTORING is a relationship between two people in which the person with greater rank, experience, and/or expertise teaches, counsels, guides and helps the other to develop both professionally and personally.

PARTIAL MENTORING involves a relationship in which the person with greater rank, experience, and/or expertise either provides SOME BUT NOT ALL of the mentor functions OR provides them SOMETIMES BUT NOT CONSISTENTLY.

73. Based on the above definitions, how would you label the relationship you described?
MENTORING OUTCOMES SECTION (cont’d)

74. The mentor’s (or superior’s) influence on the protégé’s (or direct report’s) career has been:
   - 1=Negative
   - 2
   - 3=Neutral
   - 4
   - 5=Beneficial

75. The mentor’s (or superior’s) influence on the protégé’s personal development has been:
   - 1=Very Low
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5=Very High

76. I would rate the protégé’s (or direct report’s) or career satisfaction as:
   - 1=Unimportant
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5=Highly Valued

77. Overall, I think the protégé (or direct report) would rate this relationship as:

78. Length of the association: _____ years _____ months.

79. The association with this person: (choose one)
   - ○ is continuing.
   - ○ is new
   - ○ ended in a friendly way.
   - ○ ended in an unfriendly way.
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**Part 5. Career Mastery Inventory (CMAS)**

**DIRECTIONS:** Respond to each item below by using the rating scale on the right:

1. The job I'm doing is the only one I really know anything about.  
2. I try to do the best I can.  
3. I'd rather my supervisor told me what to do than plan my work.  
4. Besides my immediate supervisor, I have little idea of who runs the organization.  
5. I think I'm in the best work for me.  
6. I often think about changing my job.  
7. I feel confident most of the time about how well I can do my job.  
8. I don't know if I'm in the right job for me.  
9. Getting ahead on the job is mostly a matter of chance.  
10. Even if my job changes, I feel I can go along with it.  
11. I feel close to the people and organization where I work.  
12. I know who to go to for something I want at work.  
13. I don't think of myself as part of the organization.  
14. I like to set up and schedule my own work.  
15. I always seem to be doing something that's against organizational policy and procedures.  
16. I have a plan for where I want to be in my job five years from now.  
17. I want my job to stay the same.  
18. I only work because I have to.  
19. I seldom talk to others at work.  
20. It is important for me to continually seek opportunity.  
21. Doing a good job is important to me.  
22. I seldom think about what I'll be doing in the future.  
23. I eat lunch with friends at work.  
24. I pretty much go along with what the organization expects of me.  
25. I only do what's expected of me - nothing more.  
26. I have a pretty good idea of how much organization makes a year.  
27. I have friends where I work.  
28. I have little or no idea of what I have to do to get promoted.  
29. I do as well as I have to on my job to keep it.  
30. I don't know my way around where I work.  
31. I look for opportunities within the organization.
### Part 5. Career Mastery Inventory (CMAS) (cont’d)

**DIRECTIONS:** Respond to each item below by using the rating scale on the right:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I don't know what's expected of me socially on the job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I plan to take additional training so I'll have a better chance of developing myself for future opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Some of my best friends are at work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Work is important to me as a way of life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I often question whether I have the ability to get ahead in my work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>I only work to get the things I want.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I like to be left alone at work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>I've discussed with my supervisor/superior what I have to do to get promoted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I go out with my friends from work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>I try to find out what my organization's policies and procedures are.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>I may get promoted but there's not much I can do about it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>As far as I'm concerned, it's either the organization or me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>I get into arguments with others at work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>I feel good when I do my work well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>I look forward to seeing my friends at work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>I feel that others think I do a good job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>I wish I had more friends at work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>I feel I have what it takes to get ahead in my job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>It's difficult for me to change what I'm doing even when told to.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>I really want to know everything I can in my job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>I feel I don't know how my job fits into the &quot;big picture.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>I think I'm as good as others who have been promoted at my level in the organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>I usually have to ask someone where things are and how to use them in my job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>If I have a problem on the job, I know who to see about it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>I use what I learned in school on my job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>I'll probably be doing the same job twenty years from now.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>The training I'm getting doesn't seem to have anything to do with my job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>I feel others like me where I work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>I admit mistakes I make in my work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>I feel that others at work don't like me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>I know what to do, and how to do it, to be promoted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>I can see how my work fits into what the organization is doing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DIRECTIONS: Respond to each item below by using the rating scale on the right:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64. I feel &quot;left out&quot; of what's going on where I work.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. It is important to me to be as good as I possibly can in my job.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. I feel I chose the wrong line of work.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. I often feel others have it in for me where I work.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Sometimes it's seniority rather than performance that results in promotion.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. It upsets me when they change the work I'm supposed to do.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. I feel the organization has the right to expect me to behave in certain ways on the job.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. I have difficulty doing the best I can in my job.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. I feel pretty good about the career I chose for myself.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. I enjoy having friends at work.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. I'm confused about what I have to do to advance in the organization.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. If I didn't work, I don't know what I'd do with myself.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. I don't think my organization cares about me, or how I get along.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. What I learned in school has helped me to do well on my job.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. I wish I knew where I was headed in my career.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. I try to avoid others where I work.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. You have to do the right things to get ahead.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. I feel like I'm part of the organization where I work.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. If something goes wrong on the job, it's usually somebody else's fault.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. I have a good idea how I can advance in this his organization and what the opportunities are.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. I don't understand what my on-the-job training has to do with my work.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's not what you know but who you know that is important in getting ahead in this organization.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. I get along with others where I work.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. My career plans for the future are uncertain.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. I try as hard as I can to learn my job.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. I like to plan my own work.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. I feel lost where I work.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### PART 6. Job Satisfaction

**DIRECTIONS:** Please select the one response that most closely indicates your view according to the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1=Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5=Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. At the end of a work day, I feel that I have been productive.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If students do not meet achievement standards, teachers are always the first to be blamed.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My job would be easier if I did not have to contend with so many discipline problems.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. At the end of a teaching day, I feel exhausted.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would be happier in my job if my salary were higher.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PART 7. Intention to Leave

**DIRECTIONS:** Please select the one response that most closely indicates your view according to the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1=Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5=Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have considered leaving teaching.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A different kind of career has become more appealing to me.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If I were choosing a career again, I would choosing teaching.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I will leave teaching after the present school year is over.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I often think about pursuing another career.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Permission Letter From Mark Savickas for Use

of the Career Adjustment and Development Survey (CADI)
----- Forwarded Message ----
From: Mark Savickas
To: JEROME BOYD
Sent: Mon, October 13, 2008 9:55:17 AM
Subject: RE: Permission

I grant permission to Mr. Jerome Boyd to use the Career Adjustment and Development Inventory in his research.

Mark Savickas

From: JEROME BOYD [mailto:Jerome.Boyd@company.com]
Sent: Monday, October 13, 2008 1:58 AM
To: Mark Savickas
Cc: Kevin Glavin; Kevin Glavin
Subject: Permission

Dr. Savickas,

Please read attachment.

Jerome Boyd
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Permission From Diana L. Clarke to Use

The Alleman Mentoring Activities Questionnaire (AM AQ)
Jerome R. Boyd

Phone: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Dear Jerome,

You have my permission to use the Alleman Mentoring Activities Questionnaire for your dissertation titled: "First-year Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Intention to Remain in Teaching: A Comparison of Traditionally Prepared Teachers and Teachers Prepared by Alternative Methods". According to my records you purchased 10 (ten) instruments. If additional copies are needed please let me know.

If you are using on line administration, please provide the site and sign in information to verify use. You may pay for the number of additional AMAQ's you use after the testing. Please notify me when you are done collecting data and the number of uses.

The cost of scoring is $5 each, and $10 per group scoring graph. Individual graphs or comparison graphs for mentor and protégé are $3 each. You must send the file in excel format. You may email the file.

Best regards,

Diana L. Clarke, Ph. D.
President
Silverwood Associates
4627 Ridge Rd. Wadsworth, Ohio 44281
(330) 239-1646

October 13, 2008
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TO: Dr. Donnie Evans, Superintendent of Paterson Public Schools
FROM: Aubrey Johnson, Director of Assessment, Planning and Evaluation
DATE: December 22, 2009
RE: Research Request

In accordance with district policy 9550, I have reviewed the research request application for the applicant/project referenced below and have determined that the request meets the criteria to conduct research within the Paterson Public School District.

This document is being provided for your signature and if you would like to view the request in more depth a copy of the application is being provided as well.

Researcher/Applicant Name: Jerome R. Boyd (Vice Principal, School #30)
Project Title: Beginning Teachers’ Job Satisfaction and Intention to remain teaching
Institutional Affiliation: Lynn University

I hereby authorize Jerome R. Boyd, student of Lynn University, to use the Paterson Public School premises to conduct a study entitled Beginning Teachers’ Job Satisfaction and Intention to remain teaching.

I hereby authorize Jerome R. Boyd, student of Lynn University, to recruit subjects for participation in a study entitled Beginning Teachers’ Job Satisfaction and Intention to remain teaching.

Signature
Donnie W. Evans, Ed.D.
State District Superintendent

1/7/10
Paterson Public Schools  
Office of Curriculum & Instruction  
Division of Assessment, Planning, & Evaluation  

District Research Request Application

In accordance with district policy 9550, all educational research must be approved in advance by the Superintendent and Board. To obtain such approval, a written application must be submitted to the Division of Assessment, Planning, & Evaluation for review and final recommendation to the Superintendent.

NOTE: Approval will only be granted to those projects that will serve the interest of pupils and the educational programs of Paterson Public Schools. Therefore upon completion of the research project, a copy of the findings must be provided to the Division of Assessment, Planning and Evaluation. Furthermore, approval will not be granted to projects that will impede or disrupt an instructional program. Strict standards of anonymity and confidentiality must be observed.

Beginning Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Intention to Remain in Teaching: A Comparison of Traditionally Prepared Teachers and Teachers Prepared by Alternative Methods

Project Title: Beginning Teachers’ Job Satisfaction and Intention to Remain in Teaching: A Comparison of Traditionally Prepared Teachers and Teachers Prepared by Alternative Methods

Researcher/Applicant Name: Jerome Romell Boyd

Phone Number: [Redacted]  
Email Address: [Redacted]  
Institutional Affiliation: Lynn University located in Boca Raton, Florida.

Signature: Jerome Romell Boyd  
Date: December 10, 2009  
(My signature confirms that this application accurately represents the planned research, and that I will supervise this research project.)

1. Purpose of the research project and explain why the study is being done.

   The researcher study will examine the differences in beginning teachers (those who have taught between one and three years) who chose the traditional route of teacher education and teachers who pursued an alternative route of teacher preparation in terms of educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experience, salary compensation, and career adaptability and the relationship to job satisfaction and intention to leave their current job. Furthermore, this research study will identify areas for future scholarly research and empirical study.

2. Indicate who the subjects are and note whether they include minors and/or members of physically, psychologically or socially vulnerable populations.

   The participants included in the study will be full-time, beginning teachers who have taught for one to three years in grades K-12. Also, participants will have become certified teachers either through a traditional teacher preparation program (i.e., a four- or five-year program offered by colleges and universities) or through alternative programs, such as Troops for Teachers, Teach for America, or other alternative certification programs. Minors and or members of physically, psychologically or socially vulnerable populations will not be included within the research study.

3. The estimated duration of the project

   The time span for the project will be 3 to 7 weeks.
4. **Where the study will take place.** If permission will be required to use any facilities, indicate those arrangements.

   1. Each of the beginning teachers who meet the criteria for this study will be invited to participate in the study and will receive a self-addressed stamped envelope, a letter of consent, and copies of the Career Maturity Inventory and Alleman Mentoring Activities Questionnaire. After completing the surveys, participants are to mail them back to the researcher. Facilities within the Paterson School District will not be used to conduct the research study.

5. **The person(s) who will conduct the research and their relevant affiliations.**

   The person who will conduct the research will be Jerome Romell Boyd. The research is being conducted as part of my dissertation with Lynn University.

6. **Indicate the means by which the subject’s personal privacy is protected and how the districts anonymity and confidentiality will be observed.**

   Participants will be confidential to the researcher, as well as the general population and there will be no identifiers on the survey. The Paterson School District will be identified as an urban school district located in the State of New Jersey.

7. **Discuss the benefits of the research to students and/or Paterson Public School District.**

   This study will examine the relationship of educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experience, salary, and career adaptability of beginning teachers who have taught for one to three years to job satisfaction and intention to leave their current job. Specifically, teachers who have pursued a traditional route of teacher education will be compared on these variables to teachers who have pursued an alternative route of teacher preparation. This study will assist the Paterson School District in observing ways in which teachers are trained and their ability to teach children of all ages.
November 30, 2009

Donnie Evans, Ed.D.
State District Superintendent of Paterson Public Schools
90 Delaware Avenue
Paterson, New Jersey 07503

Re: Approval of Dissertation Research

Dear Dr. Evans,

My name is Jerome R. Boyd, Vice Principal of Dr. Martin L. King Jr., Educational Complex. Presently, I am attending Lynn University where I am a candidate to receive my doctoral degree in Global Leadership with a Specialization in Corporate and Organizational Management.

I am writing requesting permission to complete my research study within the Paterson School District. The title of my dissertation is "Beginning Teachers Job Satisfaction with Intention to Remain in Teaching: A Comparison of Traditionally Prepared Teachers and Teachers Prepared by Alternative Methods". My study will examine the differences in beginning teachers (those who have taught between one and three years) who chose the traditional route of teacher education and teachers who pursued an alternative route of teacher preparation in terms of educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experience, salary compensation, and career adaptability and the relationship to job satisfaction and intention to leave their current job. Furthermore, my study will identify areas for future scholarly research and empirical study.

I would greatly appreciate your consent to my request. If you require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me. I can be reached at the address and telephone number as listed above.

Educationally yours,

Jerome R. Boyd
Vice Principal
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to Participate in the Study
March 29, 2010

Dear Fellow Educators,

Please allow me to introduce myself. My name is Jerome R. Boyd a Ph.D. candidate at Lynn University in Boca Raton, Florida. I am a former teacher of the Paterson School District. Presently, I serve in the capacity of Vice Principal at the Martin L. King Jr. Educational Complex (School #30) in the city of Paterson. I am writing asking you to participate in my research survey. The title of my dissertation is “Beginning Teachers’ Job Satisfaction and Intention to Remain in Teaching: A Comparison of Traditionally Prepared Teachers and Teachers Prepared by Alternative Methods”.

The purpose of my study will be to examine the differences in beginning teachers who chose the traditional route of teacher education and teachers who pursued an alternative route for teacher preparation in terms of educational background, personal characteristics, school characteristics, mentoring experience, career adaptability and the relationship to job satisfaction and intention to leave their current job. Furthermore, my study will identify areas for future scholarly research and empirical study.

Please be aware that your identification will remain anonymous. Enclosed you will find a self-address envelope in order for you to submit your survey. I would greatly appreciate your assistance in completing this survey at your earliest convenience.

In closing, this survey will benefit and assist our school district in hiring future employees. Thanking you in advance for all of your assistance.

Educationally Yours,

Jerome R. Boyd
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