# The Alternate Route Teachers' Transition to the Classroom: Preparation, Support and Retention

**Christopher J. Nagy**

**UPPER FREEHOLD REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**Ning Wang**

**WIDENER UNIVERSITY**

An earlier version of this article was presented at the 2006 annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Christopher J. Nagy at cjn2005@comcast.net.

**The Alternate Route Teachers' Transition to the Classroom: Preparation, Support and Retention**

The United States Department of Education (2002) predicts that one million kindergarten to twelfth grade teachers will retire over the next five to six years. According to the National Center for Educational Information (Feistritzer, Harr, Hobar, & Scullion, 2005), 2.2 million teaching positions will need to be filled within the next ten years. Given the demand for classroom teachers, as of 2006, forty-eight states and the District of Columbia have created alternate route (AR) teaching certification programs to recruit individuals who have earned college degrees and worked in their chosen fields, but had no prior training in teaching (Feistritzer, Harr, Henry, & Ulf, 2006). Instead of requiring participants to have the traditional teacher preparation, AR certification programs move candidates directly into classrooms and provide simultaneous mentoring and support.

In 1984, New Jersey became one of the first states that created an AR teaching certification program to attract those who had degrees and careers in a specific area such as mathematics or science, but had no credentials to teach in the classroom (Klagholtz, 2001). This new certification program, in essence, preempted the emergency certification process in New Jersey. Currently, twenty-four percent of teaching positions in New Jersey are filled with AR candidates (Feistritizer, Harr, Hobar, & Losselyong, 2004). Forty percent of teachers hired in New Jersey during the 2005 to 2006 school year earned their teaching certificates through an AR program (Feistritzer, Harr, Henry, & Ulf, 2006). On many occasions, in fact, an applicant pool for certain teaching positions is small and as a result, principals are faced with a situation where AR teachers outnumber the traditionally trained teachers who apply for those same teaching positions (Feistritzer, 2005).

Despite having met the prerequisites of the federal *No Child Left Behind Act* (U.S. Department of Education, 2002b) for being highly qualified regarding credentials relative to content knowledge, AR teachers generally do not have proper teaching preparation before entering the classroom (Adams & Krockover, 1997). Most AR teachers lack an understanding of pedagogy, instructional strategies, classroom management, and

students' social and academic development issues. Their positive transition to the classroom depends upon the extensive and efficient support provided by principals, mentors, and districts (Nakai & Turley, 2003). Therefore, principals are often reluctant to hire AR teachers because of the amount of work and support required, and problems that these teachers may have regarding discipline, lesson planning, student interaction, assessments, and instructional strategies in their first one to two years in the classroom (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Hayes-Jacobs, 2004). On the other hand, school administrators are generally not sufficiently trained to mentor, guide, and support new AR teachers; as a result, the supervision of AR teachers is lacking (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Hayes-Jacobs, 2004). Often, after being hired, the AR teachers are left to fend for themselves without proper support, mentoring, and personal contact with school administration.

Policymakers and teacher educators have recognized the need to provide AR teachers with proper skills and enough support to succeed in the classroom (e.g., Miller, McKenna & McKenna, 1998; Jorissen, 2002). Still, limited research has been conducted to identify the factors that support AR teachers' positive transition to the classroom and their professional growth after the transition. Questions, such as to what extent AR teachers are trained to teach; and what type of support school/district should provide to assist AR teachers and to retain AR teachers, are left to be answered.

The major purpose of this study is to identify some issues related to the AR teachers' transition process in the following three phases: 1) preparation before entering the classroom; 2) support provided by schools/districts during the process; and 3) retention in the teaching profession. By surveying high school principals and their AR teachers in New Jersey, this study attempts to provide suggestions that support AR teachers' positive and effective transition to the classroom and their continuous development and positive experience in the teaching profession.

## Methods

### Survey Instruments

Two survey questionnaires were developed in this study, one for AR teachers, and the other, for their principals. In addition to the demographic information requested in

the first part of each survey, there were 35 questions in the teacher's survey and 34 questions in the principal's survey. Some of them were multiple-choice questions, some of them used a 5-point Likert type rating scale (e.g., not satisfied at all, not satisfied, neutral, satisfied, and very satisfied), and others were open-ended questions.

Each survey is comprised of five components. These components are demographic and background information, planning and preparation, professional responsibilities, classroom environment, and instruction. Questions in the first component include educational background, gender, ethnicity, age range, former occupation, teaching experience, reason for transitioning to the teaching profession, and future professional plan. The other four components of the survey questions are organized according to Charlotte Danielson's four domains of professional teacher evaluation (1996). Questions in the second component focus on planning and preparation before entering the classroom, including the time of the year when the AR teacher is hired, participation in a university teacher preparation program, support provided by the school district, the existence of pre-service or induction programs, formal assignment of mentors, frequency of contact with mentors, usefulness of mentors, contact with other teachers within the school, professional development, level of satisfaction, suggestions to increase effectiveness, and advice to those who are contemplating the same type of transition. Questions in the third component are used to address issues related to professional responsibilities. These include the understanding of parent contact, parent involvement, students with disabilities, special educational plans, as well as involvement in extracurricular activities, committee work, and student advisement. Questions in the fourth component focus on the methodology used within the classroom. And finally, questions in the fifth component include instructional strategies, classroom modeling, and incorporation of technology in classroom teaching.

Subjects

In May 2005, the survey questionnaires were distributed to 155 AR teachers in 33 high schools and 36 high school principals (two principals/assistant principals were asked to respond to the survey in three schools) throughout the state of New Jersey. The high schools were selected from various geographic regions in New Jersey with varying sizes

of school population, and among various socio-economic areas. The number of schools sampled (n=33) represented seven percent (n=470) of the total number of public high schools in New Jersey. After an initial phone call to each of the school principals and several follow-up phone and email contacts with the principals, 35 high school principals and 142 AR teachers responded to the surveys resulting in a response rate of 97% for principals and 91% for AR teachers.

## Results

Preparation before Entering the Classroom

Table 1 presents the frequency distribution of the AR teacher participants' gender, age, ethnicity, education level, and the number of years in teaching. It is noted that 61% of the 142 AR teachers are between 26 and 44 years old and 33% of them are between 45 and 65 years old. In comparison, 49% of the 142 AR teachers are in their first year of teaching, 16.2% in their second year, 8.5% in their third year, 9.2% in their fourth year, 4.2% in their fifth year, and only 12.7% have been in teaching more than five years. This indicates that 94% of the 142 AR teachers are between 26 and 65 years old and with this range of age, most of them (about 87% of the142 AR teachers) just began their teaching career in the past five years.

An analysis of the survey responses indicates that many AR teachers teach subjects that are similar to their undergraduate majors; but still, 25 of the 142 AR teachers (about 18%) teach subjects that are outside of their undergraduate majors. Furthermore, the crosstabulation analysis between subject areas taught and respective graduate majors indicates that, of the 72 AR teachers who have graduate degrees, 31 (43%) teach in a field outside of their majors. In addition, Table 2 presents the crosstabulation between the former occupations of the survey participants and subjects currently teaching. It is found that, of the 142 AR teachers, 87 (61%) teach in a field outside of their previous occupations.

Table 3 presents the reasons that AR teachers made the transition to the classroom. Among the four choices given in the survey, the primary reason was to make a difference in students' lives (81.7%), followed by the attractiveness of flexible schedule, summers off, and benefits (49.3%).

Table 4 displays the reasons why teachers selected the school in which they are currently working. Among the 13 given choices, The top six percentages of the AR teachers' ranking are AR friendly schools, location, know someone in the school, the first job offered, working conditions, and the reputation of the school. Table 4 also provides the result for the principal perceptions of why teachers decided to work in their schools. The reasons provided by the principals are ranked in the following order: working conditions, AR friendly school, reputation of the school,and location of the school.

When asked whether the AR teachers were provided instruction on how to work with students with an educational or physical disability, more than half (84 out of 142 which is 59.2%) AR teachers answered "No" and only 58 out of 142 teachers (40.8%) indicated that they received some type of instruction related to educational or physical disabilities. In the meanwhile, 127 out of the 142 AR teachers indicated that they were familiar with the terms IEP or 504 plan that are used to support students with disabilities. Principals, on the other hand, have a different perspective regarding instruction given to teachers for students with educational or physical disabilities. All principals except for one indicated that teachers received this instruction.

Support during the Transition Process

The finding of the study revealed that, for the districts sampled in the study, the induction or inservice programs had a duration of one to eight days for the districts that offered such a program. The programs addressed issues such as behavior modification, brain based learning, classroom management, instructional theory, multiple intelligences, cooperative learning, and a review of district policies.

Some districts provided opportunities for AR teachers to be long-term substitute teachers in training while others provided AR teachers opportunities to take Advanced Placement course training. Furthermore, some districts offered one or two weeks of behavior modification training and others offered Instructional Teacher Practices Program (ITIP) training.

The study also surveyed what materials AR teachers were provided by the district at the beginning of their first year teaching, the result indicated that: 87% of AR teachers received student handbooks, 85% received staff handbooks, 80% received emergency

plans, 65% received copy of the observation form, 56% received instruction on classroom management, 56% received instruction of mentoring process, 55% had visits by a mentor during the first week.

The study also found that there were different perceptions between AR teachers and their principals with respect to mentor assignments. Fifty-one percent of the AR teachers indicated that they did not have a mentor formally assigned. For the teachers who had assigned mentors, 61% of them did not mutually agree upon with the assignment. In contrast, 88% of the principals responded that a mentor was formally assigned to each teacher.

The role of the principal is essential to the development of a new teacher. Forty-six percent of the AR teachers surveyed in the study indicated that the principals visited their classrooms a few times a month.

To capture the degree to which mentors and principals are helpful to the AR teacher during the first year of teaching, a number of categories such as development of lesson plans, classroom assessments, level of immediate feedback, visits to the classroom and classroom management were surveyed using a Likert scale from 0 to 5 where a 5 is extremely helpful, 4 is somewhat helpful, 3 is helpful, 2 is neutral, 1 represents not helpful, and 0 means does not apply. On average, the principals and mentors were considered helpful to somewhat helpful with lower mean scores for the principals than the mentors across the categories.

Principals can be helpful to teachers by providing opportunities within the building to develop collegial contact for support or assistance to AR teachers. In the survey teachers indicated that the principal provided them opportunities to meet with their colleagues. Among AR teacher respondents, 90% indicated that they were given opportunities to meet within their departments, and also 81% indicated who were given opportunities to meet with new teachers within the building.

Retention in Teaching Profession

Table 5 shows the crosstabulation between the time of year hired and the desire to stay in teaching It is found that 88 % of the AR teachers who were hired in spring would remain in teaching and 90% of the AR teachers hired in summer would remain in

teaching; whereas only 79% of the AR teachers who were hired in winter would remain in teaching. This result implies that the time of the year would make a difference for AR teachers' retention. Those who were hired during the school year are more likely to leave as compared to the AR teachers who were hired over the summer. This may be due to the reason that AR teachers who were hired during summer had more opportunities to be prepared for teaching such as going through induction or inservice programs than those who were hired during the school year.

Table 6 presents the crosstabulation between the years taught by an AR teacher and the desire to stay in teaching. It is found that 89% of the AR teachers who are in their first year teaching would remain in teaching; 87% of the teachers who were in their second year would remain in teaching; 92% of the teachers in their third year of teaching would remain; 69% of the teachers who had four years of experience indicated that they would remain; 83% of all teachers with five years of experience said that they would remain while 89% of those with six or more years of experience would remain in teaching. This result indicates that the highest percentages of teachers who indicated that they would remain in teaching are either the AR teachers who are in their first two years of teaching or those with more than six years of experience. Of the 142 AR teachers surveyed in the study, 13% indicated that they would not remain in teaching.

Table 7 presents frequencies for seven areas of instruction that teachers received prior to entering the classroom. In the order of the frequencies from the highest to lowest, 61% of the teachers received instruction on classroom management, 61% had training on instructional strategies, 59% on lesson planning, 49% on pedagogy, 48% on teacher observations, 42% on inclusion instruction, and the least, only 36% of them received instruction on content-method staff development. Results indicated that about half of the new AR teachers did not receive training in some of the key areas of preparation for a successful transition to the classroom.

Table 8 presents the relationship between the satisfaction level of support given by principals to the AR teachers and the probability of whether or not the teachers would remain in teaching. Ninety percent of the AR teachers who were very satisfied with the principal level of support planned to remain in teaching; 89% of the teachers who were moderately satisfied would remain in teaching; 89% of AR teachers who were neutral for

the support would remain in teaching; while only 62% and 83% of the teachers who were either not satisfied or not satisfied at all planned to remain in teaching.

A regression analysis was conducted on certain survey question responses to explore possible factors that would predict teachers' satisfaction. The results of these analyses identified four factors as being significant predictors of teacher satisfaction. These factors were: 1) the degree of importance the principal or mentor placed upon certain elements when teaching a lesson, where the regression analysis indicated that 10.7% of the variation of teacher satisfaction can be predicted by the variation on this factor; 2) the degree of importance the principal or mentor placed upon the AR teacher regarding the inclusion of certain elements within the classroom environment, where the analysis indicated that 12.1% of the variation of teacher satisfaction can be predicted by the variation from this factor; 3) the frequency the mentor or principal made contacts with the AR teachers, where the results indicated that 12.2% of the variation of teacher satisfaction can be predicted by the frequency that the mentor/principal contacted with the AR teachers; and 4) the level of helpfulness the mentor and principals placed upon the AR teacher during his/her first year, where the analysis indicated that 36.3% of the variation of teacher satisfaction can be predicted by this factor. A stepwise regression analysis indicates that the principals/mentors' helpfulness level is the best predictor and the variable itself can predict 36% of the variation on teachers' satisfaction.

In addition, based on the AR teachers' experiences, they provided the following suggestions to principals and to current and prospective AR teacher candidates to enhance the transition process to the classroom:

- Spend 5-10 minutes in class each week for informal feedback for all teachers and provide the feedback after leaving the classroom.
- Have experienced subject area teachers review the curriculum with new teachers.
- Provide class preparation time that overlaps with others within the same department.
- Make sure a certified teacher is in the classroom for 20 days when the AR teacher enters the classroom for the first time.
- Mentors and principals should visit classrooms more often during the first few weeks of the AR teachers' first year of teaching.

AR teachers were asked to indicate what advice they would give to a person who was contemplating teaching through the alternate route. The following were the most frequent suggestions:

- Select a very supportive school.
- Observe different teachers' classrooms to learn personal styles, approaches to classroom management, planning and instructional strategies.
- Make sure to participate in a teacher preparation program before teaching.
- Be patient with yourself.
- Before teaching, start substituting to get a sense of classroom experience.
- Like students in addition to the subject matter.
- Read the book by Harry Wong, *The First Days of School*.
- Do effective self-reflection.
- Do not be surprised that you will work over 60 hours a week.
- Staff development is the key to transitioning into teaching.

Referring to the principal survey, the principals were asked to indicate the strengths and weaknesses of the AR teachers based on their professional experiences with AR teachers. The principals identified the following strengths of AR teachers:

- Knowledgeable about subject matter
- Exhibit enthusiasm and are willing to learn
- Want to get involved in the school life
- Willingness to accept suggestions
- Real world experiences
- Maturity, work ethic and expertise
- Have a good sense of team
- Organized and technology efficient

The principals identified the following weaknesses of the first year AR teacher:

- Lack deep understanding of classroom management
- Teaching strategies and teaching methodology are lacking
- Adjustment to differences in procedures from corporate life to teacher environment

- Lack of experience working with teenagers
- Not familiar with how to differentiate instruction
- Understanding child developmental stages
- Candidates lack teaching experience, i.e. student teaching
- Lesson planning and pacing

Principals identified factors as to why AR teachers remain in the classroom. The following are the most frequent responses:

- Support from the staff, administration and school district
- Level of staff development to support classroom expectations
- Peer coaching opportunities
- Intrinsic rewards and the joy of working with teenagers
- Steady pay, benefits, security
- Feel that they are making a difference in the life of children

The principals also provided written responses as to why they feel that AR teachers decide to leave the classroom. The following are the most possible reasons:

- Teaching is a tough job
- Job is frustrating and time consuming to complete lesson plans and correct papers
- School setting, salaries, perks and bonuses are unlike those in corporate world
- Not mentored well and need a lot of support
- Lack of preparation to teach
- Do not understand the teenager
- Do not understand school law
- Unrealistic view of the teaching profession
- Lack of support during the first year

## Discussion

Good teachers need to be nurtured and developed (Covey, 1997; Hawkey, 1997). Some individuals who are interested in the teaching profession are prepared to follow traditional teacher training while others work in other professions first and then decide to

teach. Both bring valuable knowledge and experience to the classroom, but each has a unique need for professional support. What a district offers for one group does not necessarily meet the needs of the other (Chesley, Wood, & Zepeda, 1997). This study explores issues related to preparation, support and retention of AR teachers through experiences of principals and AR teachers, and practices in school districts.

The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (U.S. Department of Education, 2002b) federal legislation requires that all teachers be highly qualified in core academic subjects by the end of the 2005-2006 school year. Furthermore, almost 35% of teachers hired each year in New Jersey come through the AR certification program (Feistritzer, 2005). Given the large placement of AR teachers within schools in New Jersey, attention must be given to AR teachers regarding their preparation before entering the classroom, support during their transition process and retention in the classroom.

The results of this study provide a number of discussion points to examine. When looking at the preparation of AR teachers, what is clear is that the AR teachers in the study did not have the same experiences prior to entering a school district. While in the school district, practices to support AR teachers differed. If preparation for teaching is a key factor as claimed by Darling-Hammond and Youngs (2002), districts, principals, and mentors need to make better efforts to assist AR teachers in their transition to the classroom. More than half of the AR teachers in this study did not experience a preservice or induction program. Furthermore, though 25% of AR teachers in the sample went through an alternative AR preparation program, others were not exposed to the curriculum of such programs (New Jersey Department of Education, 2006).

When examining the data related to undergraduate and graduate majors and subjects being taught, this study found that a number of AR teachers are responsible to teach subjects in which they do not have an undergraduate or graduate degree or any work experience. Though not the majority, the fact that 40% of the AR teachers were teaching in subject areas that may not be related to a major or field of former occupation is a point of concern. Research indicates that teachers' knowledge in the subject area has significant impacts on students' learning. One benefit that AR teachers bring into the classroom is their expertise in the subject areas in which they have an educational degree or experience in this field. If an AR teacher were not assigned to teach in the area that is

related to his/her expertise, the advantage of using the AR teacher in the classroom for the enhancement of student learning would not be fully realized.

Given the results in this study, there was a disconnection between the perceptions of principals and AR teachers. In many cases throughout the study, principals did not agree with the perceptions of the AR teachers. AR teachers indicated that communication is an important factor to improve their understanding of roles and responsibilities in the classroom. As indicated by Huberman (1995), consideration must be given to improve communication between AR teachers, principals, mentors, and school districts.

When examining the support of AR teachers during their transition process, this study clearly indicated that to some degree support systems were in place. Still, preservice training or induction varied in scope and length from district to district. Professional development and teacher preparation are key factors within the teaching profession and are indications of future growth and achievement of the students (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Goldhaber & Brewer, 2000). Actions must be taken to assure equal access to these professional supports. The finding of this study indicated that 50% of the AR teachers received staff development in key areas such as classroom management and lesson planning, yet, the other 50% were not exposed to such support.

Another support to the AR teacher examined in this study was the mentor. Thompsen and Gustafson (1997) recognized the important role that the mentor plays in the personal and professional life of a teacher. Once again, only 50% percent of the AR teachers were exposed to a formal mentoring process. Also, the AR teachers indicated that the mentors were more helpful than the principals. Yet, in many cases noted in the study, principals provided opportunities for AR teachers to plan, meet with mentors, or meet with fellow colleagues.

Attrition is a concern for AR teachers. Given that, in national average, 30% of AR teachers leave the classroom over the first three years (Ingersoll, 2003), attention must be given to what districts, principals, and mentors do to keep AR teachers in the profession. The participants in this study indicated a similar attrition rate to the national average of 8-12% attrition per year (Feistritzer, 2005).

After extensive review of the data and discussion of various findings within the study, it can be concluded that districts, principals, mentors, and educational institutions that support the AR teacher do prepare, support, and retain AR teachers. This study found that districts should provide established preservice, induction, and staff development programs that consider the professional background and personal histories of AR teachers. Consideration should also be given to consistency among programs, and there should be better communication between principals, mentors and AR teachers.

Even though this study did not compare AR teachers to traditionally trained teachers, there are related recommendations for future research. In the current practice, districts in general offer some type of preservice or induction program for new teachers. However, there is no difference in type of preservice or induction program based on whether or not the teacher is a traditionally trained or not. Even though all may be new teachers, what each individual AR or traditionally trained teacher brings to the classroom is not the same. As a result, due to a mature career path and family obligations, less socialization is sought by the AR teacher who enters the classroom at a later time in life compared to a traditionally trained teacher just starting his/her professional career. The AR teachers do not have formal training on the developmental understanding of teenagers, as do traditionally trained teachers who as part of their educational program, take educational/psychological courses that address student development. As a result, future research should be conducted to examine the preparation programs, inservices, preservices, and induction programs to accommodate for the life experiences and levels of education the AR teacher brings to the classroom.

## References


Adams, P. E., & Krockover, G. H. (1997). Beginning science teacher cognition and its origins in the preservice science teacher program. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34*, 633-653.

Chelsey, L. S., Wood, F. H., & Zepeda, S. J. (1997). Meeting the needs of alternatively certified teachers. *Journal of Staff Development, 18* (1), 28-32.

Covey, S. R. (1997). Modeling and mentoring. *Executive Excellence, 14*,3-4.

Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: a framework for teaching.* Alexandria,VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Reforming teacher preparation and licensing: Debating the evidence. *Teachers College Record, 102*, (1),28-56.

Darling-Hammond, L. & Youngs, P. (2002). Defining "highly qualified teachers": What does "scientifically-based research" actually tell us? *Educational Researcher, 31* (9), 13-25.

Feistritzer, C. E., Harr, C. K., Hobar, J. J., & Losselyong, S. E. (2004). *Alternative teacher certification: A state-by-state analysis 2004.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information.

Feistritzer, C. E., Harr, C. K., Henry, T., & Ulf, B. (2006). *Alternative teacher certification: A state-by-state analysis 2006.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information.

Feistritzer, C. E. (2005). *Profile of alternate route teachers.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information.

Feistritzer, C. E., Harr, C. K., Hobar, J. J., & Scullion, A. B. (2005). *Alternative teacher certification: A state-by-state analysis 2005.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information.

Ferraro, Joan M. (1998, December). I already have a bachelor's degree, how can I obtain a teaching license? *ERIC Education Reports:* Washington, D.C.

Goldhaber, D. D.,& Brewer, D. J. (2000). Does teacher certification matter? High school teacher certification status and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 22, 129-145.*

Hawkey, K. (1997). Roles, responsibilities, and relationships in mentoring. A literature review and agenda for research. *Journal of Teacher Education, 48,* 325-335.

Hayes-Jacobs, H. (2004). *Getting results with curriculum mapping.* Association of Supervision Development.

Henke, R., Chen, X., & Geis, S. (2000). *Progress through the teacher pipeline: 1992-93 college graduates and elementary/secondary school teaching as of 1997.* Washington DC: National Center fro Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education.

Huberman, M. (1995). Professional careers and professional development: Some intersections. In T. R. Guskey, & Huberman (Eds.). *Professional development in education, 193-224.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(3), 499-534.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2002). The teacher shortage: A case of wrong diagnosis and wrong prescription. *NASSP bulletin, 86* (631), 16-32.

Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership, 60*(8), 30-33.

Jorissen, Kathleen Topolka. (2002, Oct./Nov.) Retaining alternate route teachers: The power of professional integration in teacher preparation and induction. *High School Journal, 86* (1), 45-57.

Klagholtz, L. (2001). State policy and effective teacher certification. *Education Digest*: *67*(1), 33-37.

Miller, J. W., McKenna, M. C. & McKenna, B. A. (1998). A comparison of alternatively and traditionally prepared teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 49*(3): 165-176.

Nakai, K. & Turley, S. (Summer, 2003). Going the alternate route: Perceptions from non-credentialed teachers. *Education, 123* (4), 831-846.

National Center for Educational Information (NCEI). 2004. *Alternative Certification*: 2004. Washington, DC: Author.

New Jersey State Department of Education (2006). Retrieved January 15, 2006, from http://www.nj.gov/njded/educators/license/.

Thompson**,** S. R. & Gustafson, R. L. (1997). Turning practitioners into professors: Exploring effective mentoring. *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator, 52*, 24-32.

U.S. Department of Education (2002a). Meeting the highly qualified teachers challenge: The secretary's annual report on teacher quality. Department of Postsecondary Education, Office of Policy Planning and Innovation. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education (2002b). No child left behind act. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved January 15, 2004 from http//www.edgov.

U.S. Department of Education Office of Innovation and Improvement. (2004). *Alternate routes to teacher certification* (USDE Publication No. ED-01-CO-0012). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education Publications Center.

Table 1

AR Teachers' Demographic Information

| | | Teacher | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | *Frequency* | *Percent* |
| AGE | | | |
| | Older than 65 | 0 | 0 |
| | 45 to 65 years old | 46 | 33 |
| | 26 to 44 years old | 87 | 61 |
| | Younger than 26 | 9 | 6 |
| | ***Total*** | **142** | **100** |
| GENDER | | | |
| | Male | 75 | 53 |
| | Female | 67 | 47 |
| | ***Total*** | **142** | **100** |
| RACE | | | |
| | African American | 8 | 6 |
| | Hispanic | 8 | 6 |
| | Black | 0 | 0 |
| | White | 120 | 84 |
| | Other | 6 | 4 |
| | ***Total*** | **142** | **100** |
| DEGREE | | | |
| | Bachelor | 73 | 51 |
| | Master | 58 | 41 |
| | Doctorate | 11 | 8 |
| | ***Total*** | **142** | **100** |
| Years in Teaching | | | |
| | $1^{st}$ | 70 | 49.3 |
| | $2^{nd}$ | 23 | 16.2 |
| | $3^{rd}$ | 12 | 8.5 |
| | $4^{th}$ | 13 | 9.2 |
| | $5^{th}$ | 6 | 4.2 |
| | $6^{th}$ or more | 18 | 12.7 |
| | ***Total*** | **142** | **100** |

Table 2

AR Teacher Former Occupation and Subject Currently Teaching

| | Subject Currently Teaching | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Former Occupation | Basic Skills | Bus./ Econ. | Consumer Science | English/ Comm. | Fine Arts | Health Phys Ed | Math/ Eng. | Science | History/ Politics/law | Special Ed. | Tech. | World Lang. | Total |
| Business/ Economics | | 2 (5.1%) | 1 (2.6%) | 6 (15.4%) | | | 13 (33.3%) | 9 (23.1%) | 1 (2.6%) | 1 (2.6%) | 1 (2.6%) | 5 (12.8%) | 39 |
| English/ Comm. | | 2 (15.4%) | | 3 (23.1%) | 1 (7.7%) | | 2 (15.4%) | 2 (15.4%) | 2 (15.4%) | | | 1 (7.7%) | 13 |
| Fine Arts | | | | | 2 (40.%) | | 1 (20.%) | 1 (20.0%) | 1 (20.0%) | | | | 5 |
| Education | | | | 2 (11.8%) | 1 (5.9%) | 1 (5.9%) | 1 (5.9%) | 5 (29.4%) | 4 (23.5%) | | 1 (5.9%) | 2 (11.8%) | 17 |
| Student | | | | 1 (14.3%) | | | | 3 (42.9%) | | 1 (14.3%) | | 2 (28.6%) | 7 |
| Military /Police | | 1 (50.0%) | | | | | | | 1 (50.0%) | | | | 2 |
| Waitress/ Bartender | | | | | | | 2 (66.7%) | | 1 (33.3%) | | | | 3 |
| Chef/ Food Industry | | | 1 (50%) | | | | | | 1 (50%) | | | | 2 |

Table 2

AR Teacher Former Occupation and Subject Currently Teaching (continued)

| | Subject Currently Teaching | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Former Occupation | Basic Skills | Bus./ Econ. | Consumer Science | English/ Comm. | Fine Arts | Health Phys Ed | Math/ Eng. | Science | History/ Politics/law | Special Ed. | Tech. | World Lang. | Total |
| Math/Eng./ Accounting | | | | 1 (12.5%) | | | 4 (50.0%) | 3 (37.5%) | | | | | 8 |
| Science | | | | | 1 (5.9%) | 3 (17.6%) | 2 (11.8%) | 10 (58.8%) | | | | 1 (5.9%) | 17 |
| History/ Politics/Law | 1 (16.7%) | | | | | | | | 4 (66.7%) | | | 1 (16.7%) | 6 |
| Technology | | 2 (11.8%) | | 1 (5.9%) | | | 7 (41.2%) | 5 (29.4%) | | 1 (5.9%) | 1 (5.9%) | | 17 |
| Secretary | | | | | | | | | 1 (50.0%) | | | 1 (50.0%) | 2 |
| No Occupation | | | | | 1 (25.0%) | | 1 (25.0%) | | | | | 2 (50.0%) | 4 |
| Total | 1 | 7 | 2 | 14 | 6 | 4 | 33 | 38 | 16 | 3 | 3 | 15 | 142 |

Table 3

Reasons to Enter Teaching

| | ***Frequency*** | ***Percent*** |
|---|---|---|
| To Make a Difference | 116 | 81.7 |
| Personal Influence of a Friend or Family Member | 44 | 31.0 |
| Flexibility, Summer and Benefits | 70 | 49.3 |
| Seem to Be Happy/ Good Environment | 25 | 17.6 |

Table 4

Reasons Selected to Work in Current School

| | Teacher Perspective | | Principal Perspective | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Frequency* | *Percent* | *Frequency* | *Percent* |
| First Offered | 41 | 28.9 | 7 | 20 |
| Technology | 15 | 10.6 | 9 | 25.7 |
| Working Conditions | 41 | 28.9 | 21 | 60 |
| Staff Development Opportunities | 19 | 13.4 | 10 | 28.6 |
| Principal | 27 | 19 | 9 | 25.7 |
| Alternate Route Friendly School | 76 | 53.5 | 20 | 57.1 |
| Know Someone There | 44 | 31 | 8 | 22.9 |
| Reputation of the School | 34 | 23.9 | 19 | 54.3 |
| Location | 74 | 52.1 | 16 | 45.7 |
| Pay Scale | 22 | 15.5 | 7 | 20 |
| Mentoring Program | 6 | 4.2 | 8 | 22.9 |
| Diversified Student Body and School culture | 25 | 17.6 | 5 | 14.3 |

Table 5

Time of Year Hired and Desire to Stay in Teaching

| | Plan to Stay in Teaching | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | No | Yes | Total |
| Time of Year Hired | | | |
| Spring | 3 (11.5%) | 23 (88.5%) | 26 |
| Summer | 8 (10.3%) | 70 (89.7%) | 78 |
| Fall/Winter | 8 (13.4%) | 30 (78.9%) | 38 |
| *Total* | 19 (13.4%) | 123 (86.6%) | 142 |

Table 6

Years Taught and Desire to Stay in Teaching

| | Plan to Stay in Teaching | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | No | Yes | Total |
| Years Taught | | | |
| 1 | 8 (11.4%) | 62 (88.6%) | 70 |
| 2 | 3 (13.0%) | 20 (87.0%) | 23 |
| 3 | 1 (8.3%) | 11 (91.7%) | 12 |
| 4 | 4 (30.8%) | 9 (69.2%) | 13 |
| 5 | 1 (16.7%) | 5 (83.3%) | 6 |
| 6 or more | 2 (11.1%) | 16 (88.9%) | 18 |
| ***Total*** | **19 (13.4%)** | **123 (86.6%)** | **142** |

Table 7

Areas of Instruction Received Prior to Entering the Classroom

| | *Frequency* | *Percent* |
|---|---|---|
| Classroom Management | 86 | 60.6 |
| Teacher Observations | 68 | 47.9 |
| Inclusion Instruction | 59 | 41.5 |
| Lesson Planning | 83 | 58.5 |
| Content Method Staff Development | 51 | 35.9 |
| Instructional Strategies | 86 | 60.6 |
| Pedagogy | 69 | 48.6 |

Table 8

Degree of Satisfaction of Principal Support and Desire to Stay in Teaching

| | Plan to Stay in Teaching | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | No | Yes | Total |
| Degree of Satisfaction | | | |
| Very Satisfied | 5 (9.8%) | 46 (90.2%) | 51 |
| Moderately Satisfied | 3 (10.7%) | 25 (89.3%) | 28 |
| Neutral | 4 (10.5%) | 34 (89.5%) | 38 |
| Not Satisfied | 5 (38.5%) | 8 (61.5%) | 13 |
| Not Satisfied at All | 2 (16.7%) | 10 (83.3%) | 12 |
| ***Total*** | **19 (13.4%)** | **123 (86.6%)** | **142** |