

RECRUITMENT INTO THE ROLE OF
PROFESSOR OF TEACHER EDUCATION
IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

By

MURRAY F. MITCHELL

B.ED., THE UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA, 1978

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

IN

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
(THE SCHOOL OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION)

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

MARCH 1984



Murray F. Mitchell, 1984

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of PHYSICAL EDUCATION

The University of British Columbia
1956 Main Mall
Vancouver, Canada
V6T 1Y3

Date

March 1984

ABSTRACT

Research on teacher educators in physical education has been the exception, rather than the rule, despite their importance in teacher preparation programs. Fifteen teacher educators possessing a doctoral degree and experience in public schools were selected as subjects from four universities in an effort to launch systematic inquiry in this area of scholarly need. Structured interviews were used to gain information about their recruitment into their professorial roles and their current role orientations. Among the findings was a lack of consensus among them regarding the ideal teacher, physical education program, teacher educator, and teacher education program, a dominant socialization pattern in which biography emerged as more important than formal education, and personal work priorities that often conflict with institutional reward systems. Five conclusions and their attendant implications emerged from the related findings and signal future research directions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT		ii
LIST OF TABLES		vii
LIST OF FIGURES		viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT		ix
CHAPTER ONE	INTRODUCTION	1
	Teacher Education	2
	A three stage model	2
	Biography over education	4
	Education or training	5
	Wash out	8
	Graduate education	10
	Statement Of The Problem	12
	Definitions of Terms	13
	Significance Of The Problem	14
CHAPTER TWO	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	17
	Occupational Choice	18
	Psychological perspective	19
	Sociological perspective	21
	Career Change	23
	Attractors to change	28

CHAPTER TWO (continued)

	Facilitators of change	28
	University Professors	29
	Perceptions of the role	30
	Attractors to the role of professor	31
	Facilitators to the role of professor	33
	Additional characteristics	34
	Implications	37
CHAPTER THREE	METHODOLOGY	42
CHAPTER FOUR	FINDINGS	44
	Public School Teaching	44
	Background biographies	44
	Role orientation	46
	Role preparation	46
	Personal performance perceptions	49
	Summary	50
	Career Change	51
	Leaving public school teaching	51
	Pursuit of the professorate	52
	Pursuit of the doctorate	54

CHAPTER FOUR (Continued)

	Feelings about the decision to change	55
	Summary	56
	The Role of Professor	57
	Pre-doctoral perceptions	57
	Post-doctoral perceptions	58
	Role performance impact on role perceptions	58
	Retrospective evaluation of preparation	59
	Specific role component perceptions	
	Student teacher supervision	61
	Teaching experience	62
	Role description	62
	Role satisfaction	63
	Evaluation of role performance	64
	Perceived ideals	65
	Summary	67
CHAPTER FIVE	CONCLUSIONS	73
CHAPTER SIX	SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	76
REFERENCES		79
APPENDIX 1:	Certificate of Approval	88

APPENDIX 2: Letter of Introduction	89
APPENDIX 3: Questionnaire Preamble	91
APPENDIX 4: Questionnaire	92

LIST OF TABLES

	PAGE
TABLE 1: Possible Attractors to the Role of Professor of Teacher Education in Physical Education	38
TABLE 2: Possible Facilitators to the Role of Professor of Teacher Education in Physical Education	39
TABLE 3: Additional Characteristics of the Role of Professor of Teacher Education in Physical Education	41
TABLE 4: Attractors, Facilitators, and Additional Characteristics of the Role of Professor of Teacher Education in Physical Education	72

LIST OF FIGURES

	PAGE
FIGURE 1: Typology of Career Changers	25

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Through the research and writing of this thesis I have come to realize that a great number of people have contributed to this final product. The vast majority of these people are doubtless unaware of their contributions for two main reasons. First, few of us are aware of the impact we may have on others. Second, few of the people who have had impact upon me would have suspected such a product from me. I hope that at least some might read it with satisfaction.

More specifically, I wish to express appreciation to all of the subjects who participated in this study. Each subject shared bits of their life with me and in return I hope that I have done them a service and justice.

Lastly, I wish to thank my committee members for sharing their time and expertise. Dr. Gary Sinclair and Dr. Robert Morford have each contributed to a project that I hope we can all look on with pride. Finally, and most importantly, my advisor Dr. Hal Lawson has been particularly influential in his contributions to my thesis and to my career direction--he has done a remarkable job with the very raw material presented to him.

Those who can, do.

Those who can't, teach.

Those who can't teach, teach teachers.

Anonymous.

This quotation is used to introduce the ensuing investigation because it points to the professor of teacher education. The professor occupies a significant position in teacher education programs, i.e., in what students of the profession would call the induction process for new teachers. The position of professor allows some control over entry and exit requirements, course content, and the evaluation of prospective teachers. In other words, the professor may be particularly significant for the degree and kind of training received by prospective teachers. Yet, our understanding of the potential and actual impact of teacher educators remains limited. Locke and Dodds (1981) observe that "Teacher educators have been remarkably nonintrospective as a professional group" (p. 15), and their lament is also an indication of need.

Clearly, all physical education professors involved with teacher education have some impact upon prospective teachers, and more information about them is warranted. Some professors in this area, however, may be more important than others. Of specific interest in this study is the group twice-implicated in the opening quote: namely, former-teachers-turned-professors. Not only is this group portrayed as unable to perform generally,

but more specifically, unable to teach.

While putting aside the issue of this witticism's accuracy, it does raise important questions about these professors. Were they effective teachers? Are they effective teacher educators? What were their motives when they opted for such a vocation? These are just a few of the questions which may be raised about this group of professors in physical education.

More questions follow when the focus is on recruitment into the role of teacher educator. After all, these professors receive at least three waves of socialization. Beginning with initial socialization into the role of teacher, these individuals next move to the schools to be organizationally socialized, and finally go through socialization into the role of professor as part of their graduate education. Questions abound regarding the separate and related effects of these three waves of socialization on recruitment into, and subsequent performance in, the role of professor. These questions become clearer as each of these waves is previewed under two main headings: teacher education and graduate education.

TEACHER EDUCATION

A Three Stage Model

The process of teacher education has been conceptualized in terms of three related stages. Such a framework is generally

based on analyses of the more classic professions of medicine and law. Specifically applied to physical education, Pooley (1972, 1975), and Lawson (1983) have referred to: recruitment or anticipatory socialization, university training and professional education, and finally, entry into the work force (Lawson, 1983, p.5). A suggestion underlying this framework is that professional education is the stage at which individuals come to understand, accept and embrace the norms and values of the profession. Aspiring professionals are then prepared to make what is presumed to be a more congruous step from this professional education into the realities of practice.

When this three stage model is applied to teacher education, however, more questions surface. A presumed incongruity between recruitment and professional education does not appear in samples of education subjects (Lortie, 1975, p. 81). In other words, teacher education programs may not act as expected to change the orientations of recruits. That this may occur can be attributed not only to different perceptions of teacher education programs, but also, to differences among these programs.

These observations are important to the present investigation for three reasons. First, teachers-turned - professors, unless from the same institution, have doubtless received different types of training. Second, even the same program may have differential impacts because of equally different commitments and perceptions among would-be teachers.

The third point of interest resides in the relationship between teacher education and entry into the school, and this point merits more discussion.

There are in fact three kinds of interpretations regarding the specific role of teacher education programs in relation to school entry. Each of these kinds of interpretations of teacher education contributes to the study of teachers who become teacher educators. Although important on their own, these points become crucial when considered in terms of their contribution to final role performance as teachers and teacher educators. Of specific interest in this investigation is the extent to which the subjective warrants for teaching remain intact after teacher education programs and graduate education.

Biography Over Education

This first interpretation of teacher education programs suggests that a student's understanding of the role of teacher is shaped largely by experiences as a student in the schools (Lortie, 19975). The approximately twelve years spent prior to university, it is suggested, are more influential than the five years of specific education and training. Lortie (1975) suggests that this schooling period contributes to the formation of a "subjective warrant" (p. 39), an individual's perceptions about a given role.

Accepting the existence of such perceptions leads to two crucial points raised by Lawson (1983). First is the point that,

page4

whether held by a single person or a group, the subjective warrant "is often riddled with error" (p. 6): the second important point is that such a perceptual base, whether accurate or mistaken, "nonetheless provides the basis for career choice" (p. 6). The crucial questions are then: To what extent do the subjective warrants for teaching remain intact after teacher education programs? After graduate education?

Education Or Training

The second interpretation of the role of teacher education programs relates to the relationship between the university and actual teaching. Perceptions of this relationship may be viewed on a continuum. At one end of the continuum, the role of the university is seen as leading and informing teaching in the schools through theory and research. In this perspective, would-be teachers are made aware of, and indeed forced to ask questions of what and why in regard to teaching and program development. Such an orientation has been identified by Lawson (1983a) as a problem-setting perspective. At the other end of the continuum, the role of the university is seen as reflecting and reinforcing actual teaching practices currently employed in the schools. Students from this background are more commonly aware of, and ask questions of how and how best, in regard to program development. Such an orientation has been identified by Lawson (1983a) as a problem-solving perspective.

These perceptions are presented as a continuum for ease of
page5

analysis, but need not be mutually exclusive as program components. Nevertheless, training in only the "how-to's" has been singled out for criticism. An exclusive orientation to problem-solving is apparently what Morford (1972) sees as a major step toward training for a craft, rather than the education for a profession. Moreover, Dewey (1904) described such an orientation as apprentices learning what their masters did such that technique becomes an end in itself. The suggestion from both of these authors is that teaching involves more than mere technique of presentation, and thus, requires an understanding of why's in addition to how's. Teachers with this background are potentially more aware of repercussions of what they do and why they do it. Relying upon more than blind faith these teachers are grounded in the theoretical underpinnings of both the demands and potential outcomes of their programs.

So, the question is: Are teachers educated, trained, or both? Tabachnick, Popkewitz and Zeichner (1980) cite observations contrasting official university statements with actual expectations. Prospective teachers initially prompted to develop individual teaching styles and to experiment with teaching methodologies are subsequently pressed to fit in smoothly with ongoing procedures. Such a scenario appears to be one of introducing students to the existence of problem-setting at the theoretical level, with a decided emphasis on problem-solving at the applied level. Therefore, it is possible to offer

a competing explanation for the effectiveness of teacher education programs. Rather than being ineffective, the university experience may be quite effective in reinforcing existing attitudes and behaviors in schools, even though this outcome is contrary to teacher educators' espoused theories of purpose in the culture of the university (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981).

Here, too, then are clues to the importance of teacher educators, their own socialization, and their orientations toward teacher education and school practice. Immediately, questions of interest crystallize. What were the perceptions of teachers-turned-professors during their teacher education? What effect, if any, did these perceptions have on their subjective warrants for the role of teacher educator? How did these subjective warrants change as roles changed from student to teacher and to graduate student? What types of things in teacher education were deemed important; which were unimportant? Questions such as these may be central to the understanding of the professor of teacher education.

For example, assuming that their own teacher education program was of little value, some professors may hold a missionary vision of the importance of their role, one in which teaching experience is more important than theory and research. The central questions for individuals with a missionary orientation will differ from those of individuals who choose the

role of professor merely to escape from teaching. Different also will be the central questions for the individuals seeking upward social mobility, freedom for personal research, or perhaps other motivations. In any case, an understanding of perceptions of a role must inform the study of, and indeed, the actual performance in, the role of professor of teacher education.

Wash Out

The third interpretation of the effects of teacher education programs is that the university experience has no lasting effect on students because the experience is "washed out" by the realities of the work world of schools (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). Importance is attached here to the wave of organizational socialization which accompanies teaching experience. A common finding of studies is that "students become increasingly progressive in their attitudes during the course of their college education but move in the opposite direction toward more traditional beliefs when they experience the impact of full-time teaching" (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981, p. 7). Hence, "wash out" refers to the elimination of progressive attitudes in the workplace, and highlights questions regarding the effects of this organizational socialization on a teacher's subjective warrant for the role of teacher educator.

Lortie's (1975) research lead him to an interesting suggestion which relates to the "wash out" effect and to student perceptions of professors:

The outcome is evidently frustrating; unable to reach the horizons pointed out to them, students must choose between seeing themselves as incompetent and seeing their prophets as false. They apparently lean toward the latter. (p. 69). Whether or not Lortie's suggestion is accurate, it does highlight specific areas of inquiry. For example, the perceptions which teachers-turned-professors held of their professors, and hold of themselves as professors now, may be important factors in the decision to become a professor. This is especially the case in light of the potentially low impact of such a role from their own education.

To this point, interpretations regarding the role of teacher education programs have been examined because teacher educators, themselves, experienced these programs and entry into schools. These interpretations have been focussed upon three themes which address facets of teacher education: Biography over education; education or training; and, wash out. This discussion has been aimed at uncovering pertinent questions about two waves of socialization and emphasizing the importance of the professor for this investigation. The first two waves of socialization, teacher education and organizational socialization upon entry into schools, have been presented, albeit briefly.

The next section includes a look at the third wave of socialization which affects the professor of teacher education: graduate education. Once again the purpose is to provide a

foundation by identifying pertinent questions.

GRADUATE EDUCATION

Graduate education is posed, in this investigation, as the third wave of socialization for prospective professors. Once again, the university is the agency of interest, but now, in a different light. The culture of the university, its graduate education for prospective professors, the primary functions of the university, and the relationship of these factors to recruitment into the professorship, are of interest.

Universities may be viewed as performing three main functions: teaching, research, and service. Although these may be viewed as equally important and compatible, their relative importance varies from one university to another. Their importance varies because universities, themselves, vary as functions of size, locale, sponsorship, clientele, and frequently composition. Thus, some major universities, complete with elaborate graduate programs, accord more emphasis to research, whereas smaller institutions may cater primarily to undergraduates and emphasize teaching. It follows that recruitment into the role of professor will be affected significantly by the kind of direct experiences which people have had in universities and their breadth of understanding of universities and their culture.

Glazer (1974) is among the analysts who have observed some of the dilemmas facing education faculties in university cultures. Predominant for such faculties is the dilemma of allegiance. Bonds to parent disciplines such as biology, sociology or psychology conflict with the more practically applied sub-disciplines in the field of education.

Consequently, professors of teacher education must choose a balance between the roles of strict disciplinarian researcher and practically applied teacher. The balance chosen is a mixture of individual backgrounds of professor and the demands of university cultures. Put differently, some individuals may train first as psychologists and subsequently, develop an interest in education. In an education faculty, such an individual would likely identify himself as a researcher, analyst, or psychologist with secondary responsibilities to educate others to his calling. Another individual, trained first as a teacher, who later develops interest and expertise in the psychology of education may identify different priorities. This individual is foremost a teacher, such that principles of, and research into, psychology merely supplement the primary task of teaching. Further, universities may figure prominently in the structure of the balance between researchers and teachers. The influence of the university is manifest initially in faculty designations via job descriptions and qualification requirements, and subsequently, in reward structures related to job performance.

Necessarily, as university faculties vary in composition of researchers and teachers, so must their programs of graduate education vary. In other words, there are different kinds of programs of graduate education in equally different universities. These programs affect recruitment into the professorship and performance in the role.

Important questions surface regarding the induction process of former-teachers-turned-professors. To what extent does graduate education prepare individuals to deal with the three functions of a university: teaching, research, and service? To what extent do individuals choose a university in regard to these roles? The answers to questions such as these are yet another step toward understanding initially, the process of recruitment into the role of professor of teacher education, and perhaps subsequent insight into role performance.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this investigation is to explore recruitment into the role of professor of teacher education in physical education. Specifically, why do individuals choose to become a professor? What are perceptions of what a professor does? What kinds of things should a professor do(?); not do? The suggestion to this point, is that perceptions of this role do exist prior to role occupancy, and that these perceptions include two kinds of

characteristics. As Van Maanen and Schein (1979) have observed:
All roles which are created, sustained and transmitted
by people include both content characteristics (i.e.,
what it is people should do) and process characteristics
(i.e., how it is they should do it). (p. 226).

Further, these perceptions may be important in understanding
actual performance in the role.

It is the goal of this investigation to gain insight into
these perceptions of content and process characteristics of the
role of professor of teacher education. That these perceptions
may be similar in some ways, yet different in others, may emerge
from the identification and classification of recruitment
patterns into the role.

Definitions of Terms

Professor of teacher education. For this investigation,
this title will include only former-teachers-turned-professors.
In other words, this will exclude subjects who have attained the
doctoral level with no time spent as a teacher in any pre-
university institution. Further, this title will include holders
of either the PhD or EdD degrees.

Recruitment. In this investigation, the term represents the
stage in which an individual formulates a subjective warrant to
aid in the selection of the role of professor of teacher
education.

Organizational socialization. Although related to professional socialization, this concept is also different. Not merely associated with professions, organizational socialization occurs whenever an individual enters and indeed, operates in a work setting, i.e., in an organization. Formal and informal mechanisms operate to shape attitudes and behaviors of individuals toward both intended and unintended ends, and these ends may be at odds with norms of professionalism.

Significance of the Problem

A number of authors have identified the need for research on teacher educators (Hall & Hord, 1981; Locke & Dodds, 1981; Lawson, 1981). The fact that there has been little work done in the area has already been noted. Moreover, although all authors cited call attention to the need for work in this area, only one speculates as to the significance of such inquiry. This is perhaps further testimony to both the lack of understanding and lack of information on teacher educators. Acceptance of such a scenario also speaks to the extent to which tacit assumptions guide the questions we ask. Put differently, Eisner (1979) refers to the "Null Curriculum" (p. 83). In essence the suggestion is that we come to understand our world not only through the questions we ask, but also through the questions we do not ask. Since no premium has been put on knowledge about teacher educators, we might assume either or each of two things.

First, teacher educators serve no crucial role in the teacher education process; hence, little need be known of them. Second, the role of teacher educator is of such common sense nature that we do not need further information. Both assumptions are open to suspicion, for in fact, we need to know more of the motivations, beliefs and understandings of the professor of teacher education if we are to understand better the process of teacher education generally, and the role of the professor more specifically.

Lawson (1981) frames the inquiry into teacher educators, specifically into former-teachers-turned-professors, on a backdrop of "a difficult boundary position between higher education and the field" (p. 22). He describes their competing allegiances between practical application and scholarly research, between scientific reductionism and the wholes of practice, and between educator and role model. Lawson describes such a list of role dilemmas as breeding "role stress, role strain, and role conflict" (p. 23). An understanding of what might attract individuals to such a role, as well as whether they perceive such conflicts, and, if so, how they deal with such, must be informative in understanding them. Furthermore, an understanding of what people bring to the role stands to shed light on how they perform it. Thus there is a link between this study and questions which surround the effectiveness of teacher education programs. Prior to setting, much less solving such questions about effectiveness, however, we need to know more about the

professor of teacher education. For it is difficult if not impossible to comment on the effectiveness of an individual without knowing precisely what it is that the individual perceives as relevant tasks.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Entering university work as a life career is very much like entering matrimony: everybody agrees that it is an important event but so many intangibles are involved that nobody knows exactly how it happens. (Wilson, 1942, p. 15).

The above quotation is the sentiment of a pioneer, Wilson, embarking upon a new field of inquiry, and his book, The Academic Man, (Wilson, 1942) stands as perhaps the most influential work on university professors. Our understanding of who university professors are, what they do and why they do it, has not proceeded much beyond this treatise of over forty years ago.

Work in the area remains scarce. The quality of work specifically related to physical education is noted by Locke (1982):

As a body of knowledge and a domain for inquiry in physical education, teacher education remains uneven, unpopular and largely unread. (p. i).

In an earlier paper, Locke and Dodds (1981) reviewed research published between 1960 and 1980 related to teacher education in physical education. Locke (1982) later continued this work, reviewing forty additional reports spanning the period from 1960 to 1982. In total, four dissertations were listed related to leadership characteristics. Beyond these the authors raise

questions similar to those raised throughout this study, concluding that any definitive answer "remains mostly unknown" (Locke & Dodds, 1981, p. 15).

Consequently, this review must draw upon a variety of divergent disciplines. There are strengths to this approach. Work done in other areas on related topics provides a beginning framework for investigation, providing questions to ask and areas to investigate. Further, findings from previous work promise to lend meaning to results of the present investigation. The pioneering nature of this topic must not be lost from view, however, lest there result an unmediated application of findings from areas other than physical education to this unique field.

This review is focussed around three headings. Beginning with Occupational Choice, literature is examined for insight into the career selection process. The next section, Career Change, builds on this base for more accurate information on the subjects of this investigation, former-teachers-turned-professors. The third section is the most specific, containing the literature on University Professors.

OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE

Occupational choice, as a subject of inquiry, has existed since approximately the beginning of the twentieth century. Initial investigations sought links between trait theory and

subsequent occupational choice (Cattell, 1890; Yerkes, 1919). As the knowledge base grew in regard to factors contributing to occupational choice, however, so grew the inadequacy of trait theory for a complete explanation.

The search for understanding prompted an examination of occupational choice from other vantage points. This research can be grouped under two major headings: That of a psychological perspective and that of a sociological perspective.

Psychological Perspective

Through this lens, occupational choice is viewed as the developmental process of individuals. Personal volition and factors influencing individual choice are focal. Prominent in work from this perspective is that of Ginzberg (1951), who identifies three developmental stages. Initially, children function in the fantasy period in which occupational choice or preference is based largely on stereo-typical role perceptions. In the second stage, labelled the tentative period, individuals become increasingly aware of the actual requirements of jobs. Finally, the realistic period is presented as the terminal stage in occupational choice development, occurring in late adolescence. At this point, individuals are assumed to have reached some consistency in terms of personal choice and the reality of occupational demands.

Ginzberg's work is influential in terms of occupational choice research. The contribution to this study may be minimized

somewhat by the occupational choice characteristics of university professors. As that section of this review will suggest, this occupational choice is generally made well beyond the adolescent years. Consequently, Ginzberg's work may have more to say about the initial choice of subjects in this study to teach than their subsequent selection of the university professorship.

Havinghurst (1953) and Super (1953) present theories involving six stages of vocational development. These theories are more consistent with findings in the career change literature, which suggest that occupational choice extends beyond the adolescent years. In essence, as individuals age, they change. This change-with-age process is granted time beyond adolescence by these theorists. Within this additional time frame, individuals may gain more realistic evidence to support or to undermine earlier perceptions of occupations. This period beyond adolescence is named by Super (1957) as a floundering or trial process in which a number of occupations are tried. This stage may extend as long as to the age range of 25 to 35. At this stage, Super suggests, an individual locates a career and works at advancement.

Holland's (1959) work centres more on this final choice stage. At this time, an individual seeks consistency or balance between their occupational identity and the occupational environment. Put differently, the interaction between the environment and individual identity continues and has a

significant influence on occupational choice, even after the choice has been made. The influence of Holland's work will be further examined when motivations for career change are discussed.

In summary, the psychological perspective illuminates a number of factors contributing to occupational choice. Timing of choice may begin as early as childhood or as late as the age range from 25 to 35 years of age. Further, clues as to the motivations behind occupational choice may be found in the perceptions individuals hold both of themselves and of the roles they seek to perform.

Sociological Perspective

Through this perspective, factors beyond the immediate control of the individual, which impinge upon occupational choice, are examined. Such factors as social class, gender, education level, culture, family and peer influences may be integral in the eventual occupational selection. While the role of the individual as an active agent in the process of occupational selection is not ignored, it is not focal. Rather, the factors surrounding the choice are selected for explanation and prediction.

Particularly significant to this investigation, from the sociological perspective, is work on professional socialization. As noted earlier, work on this concept in education (both teacher education and physical education) is minimal. Existing research

and models are based largely upon the medical and legal professions. Consequently, these works mark a beginning point for investigation. Their significance lies not so much in their findings about lawyers and doctors, but rather in the structure of their investigations.

For example, Rogoff (1957), Theilens (1957) and Helfrich (1975) all identify differences among individuals, within given professions, in terms of occupational choice patterns. Differences in timing of choice associated with related differences in significant factors influencing the eventual choice. In another light, these findings point to the conclusion that more than one avenue exists leading to any occupation. Put differently, individuals may have different reasons for, and goals in, choosing to become professors of teacher education in physical education.

Lortie (1975) refers to two factors of importance in the occupational selection process, attractors and facilitators. Attractors are defined as "the comparative benefits proffered would-be entrants" (Lortie, 1975, p. 26). Specifically for teaching, Lortie identifies both material benefits, such as money, employment, security, social mobility, and psychic or symbolic attractors, such as prestige, power, and satisfaction. Within this framework, a number of themes aimed at explaining the occupational choice of teaching are presented.

Facilitators, on the other hand, represent the "social

mechanisms which help move people into a given occupation" (Lortie, 1975, p. 26). For teaching, important facilitators identified are such things as the influence of others, an absence of occupational alternatives, and a subjective warrant. These factors are presented as facilitators which may act individually or in combination to shape an individual's eventual occupational choice.

To summarize the sociological perspective, then, is to outline factors extraneous to the individual that relate to occupational choice. Specifically, two major contributions are made by the research from this perspective. First is the realization of the existence of multiple pathways leading to any given occupational role. Second is the employment of the constructs of attractors and facilitators as a means for describing and comparing these pathways.

The decision to become a professor of teacher education in physical education after serving as a teacher is not just a career choice; it is also an occupational change. Consequently, research on this topic has been reviewed, albeit briefly, for possible insights for the present investigation.

CAREER CHANGE

Research on career change is incomplete, often inadequate, and occasionally contradictory, but it must be reviewed for

its potential contribution in furthering the theoretical framework for understanding the recruitment of former-teachers-turned professors.

Research on white-collar career change suggests that the choice is typically a voluntary decision (Thomas, 1980, p. 173). Investigation into more precisely why the decision is made, however, is less conclusive. In fact, Thomas suggests that the number of motives for change are almost as varied as the number of subjects one is willing to study (1980, p. 177). Figure 1 illustrates an interesting typology of career changers, developed by Thomas.

This classification scheme draws attention to a pair of significant considerations in the study of career change. First is the realization that motivations or pressures to change may arise internally, externally and/or in combination. Second, as an extension of this realization, is the insight that to describe career change as one category may mask significant underlying factors. Tentatively then, this typology stands as an attempt at such differentiation.

As indicated in Figure 1, Thomas has identified four categories of white-collar mid-life career changers. Beginning with the "drift-out" category, very little is known about these individuals. Beyond the lack of any apparent pressure to change, motivations of individuals in this category exist as more enigmatic than explained.

FIGURE 1

TYPOLGY OF CAREER CHANGERS

		Pressure From Self To Change	
		LOW	HIGH
Pressure From Environment To Change	LOW	"DRIFT-OUT"	"OPT-OUT"
	HIGH	"FORCE-OUT"	"BOW-OUT"

Source: Thomas, 1980, p. 178.

The "opt-out" category marks a group with high internal pressure to change. Prominent in this pressure is a drive for harmony between personal values and work. The pursuit of this harmony is most likely to utilize formal education--more likely than in any of the other quadrants. In addition, individuals classified here are highly likely to be in the same position five years hence and are the most satisfied with their change when compared to individuals in other clusters.

High initial education and a high motivation to achieve are the distinguishing characteristics of individuals in the "bow-out" group. Perhaps related to these factors is the likelihood that as a group these changers select the least radically different career from their initial position.

Lastly in the "force-out" designation, subjects most closely resemble patterns identified in studies on blue-collar workers. As a group, these individuals begin with the least education for their initial career, are least likely to resort to formal education in preparation for their change, are least motivated by desires for greater achievement and make the most radical changes of environment when they change. In contrast to "opt-outs", this final group are least concerned with the harmony of their personal values and the work setting.

The factor of harmony or person-environment congruence may have different explanatory value for different individuals. The basic concepts of congruence theory were developed originally

by Holland (1959) in an attempt to explain occupational choice. The application of this theory extended beyond mere occupational choice to include career change.

As is the lot for most theory applied to unintended phenomena without modification, Holland's work was shown to have shortcomings (Robbins, Thomas, Harvey and Kandefer, 1978). In an apparent effort to combat such criticism, Holland expanded his concepts beyond his initial personality type and occupational type conflict, stating:

People change jobs because other workers wish them to leave, and for other personal and environmental reasons: better climate, physical disability, dissatisfied relatives, more money and other influences. (Holland & Godfredson, 1976, p. 21).

This restatement differs substantially from initial propositions. The specificity of the occupational type variable has virtually been abandoned. There is no longer any attempt at precise identification of elements involved in the decision to change careers. More accurately, the indication is that people change careers because of a variety of personal and individual reasons.

Further analysis of the career change literature may be aided by a subdivision into two subheadings--specifically, the concepts identified by Lortie (1975) as attractors and facilitators.

Attractors To Change

Attractors may be seen as potential benefits. These may take the form of either or both of material benefits and/or psychic or symbolic benefits. In specific reference to reasons for change, a number of attractors have been identified. A few of these are: seeking better salary (Hiestand, 1971; Thomas, 1980); seeking personal intellectual growth, self-improvement, mere pursuit of interest in a subject field, and/or power (Hiestand, 1971); probability of another job leading to valued outcomes (Snyder, et al., 1978); greater job security, being laid off, health reasons, for more time with the family, more recreation time, and/or for a better locale to live in (Thomas, 1980); general intrinsic rewards (Hiestand, 1971; Neapolitan, 1980); and, the pursuit of person-environment congruency (Holland & Godfredson, 1976; Neapolitan, 1980; Thomas, 1980; Vaitenas & Wiener, 1977).

Facilitators Of Change

Facilitators have been identified as social mechanisms which help move people to a certain end. A number of facilitators have been identified in relation to occupational change. These include: the availability of opportunities which were not present at a younger age, instability at work, forced relocation, disruption of family life, availability of funds, and eligibility for leave from the present job leading to a return to education (Hiestand, 1971). In a related vein is a belief in further

education for its life enhancing power (Hiestand, 1971; Sarason, 1977; Vandermeulen, 1974)--at least in part through the credentials to be acquired (Hiestand, 1971). Further facilitators to change have been identified in the form of perceived ease of leaving one occupation and the perceived probability of success elsewhere (March & Simon, 1958); a fear of failure and general life-style doubts (Vaitenas & Wiener, 1977), and a desire to seek a redefinition of present status, develop new skills and attain new job assignments or experiences (Snyder et al., 1978). In specific reference to teachers, facilitators for change have been identified as a dissatisfaction with what they were doing (Kahnweiler, 1980; Sarason, 1977), and the result of frustration, boredom or a psychologically regressive orientation (Beam, 1981).

To summarize, there are attractors and facilitators that help to explain career change. The use of these concepts provides insight into the reasons why teachers become professors, and more insight can be derived from the literature on university professors.

UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

Since there is little relevant work on physical education professors, the more general literature must be reviewed. In this way, tentative penetration may be gained into particular facets of the role.

Perceptions Of The Role

Light (1974) identifies three classic models of the academic man. The first is the Oxbridge Model in which mental discipline is emphasized. Here, the professor is viewed as an intellectual and moral teacher with subject matter a secondary and less important factor. The second is the Scottish Model, in which the professor is viewed as a subject teacher first and foremost. The ascribed role here is one of imparting knowledge to any who desire it. Finally, the German Model views the professor as a scientist who also teaches, emphasizing the establishment of new knowledge through research. Each of these models may be useful as a means for classifying perceptions of the role of professor as will be shown in a summary of relevant findings.

Studies of how professors view themselves and assign priorities to the roles they perform are revealing. Most prominent is the teaching function, but with some qualification. For example, teaching may merely occupy the greatest amount of time in a professor's work life (Gustad, 1959; Stecklein & Eckert, 1958); or the university system is viewed as primarily oriented to teaching (Bess, 1977; Fulton & Trow, 1974). Yet professors cite teaching as the most important function, followed by character development and then research (Eckert, Stecklein, Sagen, 1959; Gilliland, 1974; Kelly & Hart, 1977; Ladd & Lipsett, 1975b). In a study in physical education, professors rate teaching over research, publication or coaching (Rog, 1979).

Another work showed that the older the respondent, the greater the attraction to teaching over research (Baldwin, 1979). Lastly, greater freedom in the planning of work and less constant appraisal from above was found by Wilson (1942) to be an important priority.

Interestingly, each of the studies cited above may fit quite accurately under either the Scottish Model or the Oxbridge Model. In both models the orientation is towards teaching, but from slightly different perspectives.

Attractors To The Role Of Professor

Surveys of attractors to the role of professor have identified a number of perceived benefits. The most often cited factor is the opportunity to work with college age students (Brown, 1965; Gustad, 1959; Ness, 1958; Stecklein & Eckert, 1958; U.S. DOHEW, 1958; Vandermeulen, 1974; Yager, 1964). Next, is the opportunity to perform research (Gustad, 1959; Ness, 1958; Stecklein & Eckert, 1958), but with the added suggestion that this attraction decreases over time (Baldwin, 1979). After these attractors is an extensive list of less frequently cited factors. These include the opportunity for intellectual stimulation and challenge (Ness, 1958; Stecklein & Eckert, 1958; U.S. DOHEW, 1958); the opportunity for association with colleagues (Gustad, 1958; Stecklein & Eckert, 1958); the opportunity to observe young people's growth and success (Brown, 1965; Stecklein & Eckert, 1958); freedom and independence (Gustad, 1959; Riesman, 1959;

Stecklein & Eckert, 1958; Wilson, 1942); work with special types of students--especially graduate students (Baldwin, 1979; Stecklein & Eckert, 1958); the opportunity to pursue a deep interest in a specific subject (Ness, 1958; U.S. DOHEW, 1958); the availability of a job offer (Eckert et al., 1959; Ness, 1958; U.S. DOHEW, 1958); the opportunity to continue study, to help young people, social usefulness, to influence, mould and inspire youth (Stecklein & Eckert, 1958); the salary (Blau, 1974; Gustad, 1959); college counsellor's encouragement (Ness, 1958); the contribution to society (Eckert et al., 1959; Ness, 1958); the opportunity to share knowledge (Brown, 1965); the chance to work in specialized fields (Blau, 1974); job conditions such as secure tenure, avoidance motivations, pleasant work and surroundings (Wilson, 1942); and finally, public esteem (Wilson, 1942), also referred to as fame (Brown, 1965). This list may not be exhaustive, but it does provide some initial insights into the reasons why individuals might choose to become a professor.

On a related theme, a number of studies have attempted to identify specific detractors to the role of professor. Among these are the following: poor salary; class load that is too heavy; too many routine duties, i.e., duties which could be performed by a secretary (Eckert et al., 1959; Stecklein & Eckert, 1958; U.S. DOHEW, 1958); too many demands outside teaching (Stecklein & Eckert, 1958); indifference or negative attitudes of students (U.S. DOHEW, 1958); fear of an intellectual

rut (Ness, 1958); and fear of ivory tower detachment (Ness, 1958).

Interestingly, there are differences among the attractors to the role and perceptions of the role of professor. Some of these differences are mentioned in the list of detractors. Perceptions of the job largely favor the teaching aspect while attractors appear split between this function and research. It is possible for each of these components to coexist within the role of professor. At the same time, a conflict of theoretical orientations may be at issue. Whether or not this conflict is even perceived by teacher educators in physical education, however, remains to be explored.

Facilitators To The Role Of Professor

There are fewer studies of facilitators than of attractors. The available findings point to the following facilitators: high intelligence (Gustad, 1959; Wilson, 1979); middle class background and the implied value system associated therewith; a developed preference for intellectually stimulating and essentially solitary activities (Gustad, 1959); and classroom teaching experience (Shultz, 1975). Some of these facilitators have been previously identified as attractors because in some instances attributes of a particular occupation may fit both categories. For instance, dilatory inclinations, avoidance motivations (Wilson, 1942); the mere offer of a job, deep interest in a specific subject area (Eckert et al., 1959; Ness,

page33

1958; U.S. DOHEW, 1958); and assorted other factors which might initially make an individual aware of the existence of the role of professor and subsequently facilitate the motivation to pursue the lengthy trail leading to the professorship.

Additional Characteristics

Presented in this section are factors which have not yet been covered with specific reference to professors. In many cases, it is unclear as to whether the factors are facilitators to the role or merely descriptors. This is the kind of question which this and other investigations must explore.

The first additional characteristic relates to work surrounding the attractors to, detractors from, and perceptions of, the role of professor. Studies suggest that differences exist in actual job performance in relation to the type of institution studied (Fulton & Trow, 1974; Gilliland, 1974; Ladd & Lipsett 1975b). Put differently, awareness of the individuality of background experience in the form of differing role models witnessed, and subsequent role perception differences must be acknowledged. This factor gains importance in light of the finding that a majority of faculty come from an institution different from the one at which they have completed their doctoral work (Wilson, 1979). The ramifications of this finding may be realized by stepping beyond the scope of this investigation, briefly, to examine a performance characteristic:

The prestige of the educator is primarily dependent

upon his students, that of the scholar is independent of his students. (Wilson, 1942, p. 194).

Where a professor finds and perhaps more importantly where a professor looks for reinforcement must figure prominently in role selection, role performance and occupational satisfaction. A logical assumption, therefore, might be that individuals would be well informed about the position to which they aspire. This apparently is not the case (Brown, 1965; Wilson, 1942, 1979). In fact, beyond salary, rank and teaching load, new recruits are "relatively poorly informed on the more subtle aspects" of the job (Brown, 1965, p. 255).

The majority of professors are males (Creager, 1971; Huffman, 1968; Ladd & Lipsett, 1976; Willie & Stecklein, 1982). Even though many females pursue graduate study, the majority apparently do so on nondegree oriented programs (Sharp, 1966). Another factor which might contribute to the underrepresentation of female faculty members, is the finding that older male academics (in positions of power) hold negative attitudes toward women academics (Jones & Lovejoy, 1980). The proposition that, for women who enter the ranks of academia, it is a process of acculturation rather than merely socialization (Jensen, 1982), is yet another possible explanation of male domination. Clearly, the male-female issue merits further investigation.

Data on the timing of the decision to become a professor points to a later decision than that of people in other

professions--beginning service five to ten years later (Eckert et al., 1959; Stecklein & Eckert, 1958). Moreover, this decision often is not made before graduate school (Eckert et al., 1959; Ness, 1958; Stecklein & Eckert, 1958; U.S. DOHEW, 1958; Vandermeulen, 1974; Yager, 1964), and the decision is often characterized in a number of ways. These include: "dilatatory inclinations" (Wilson, 1942); "more by accident than by deliberate design" (Stecklein & Eckert, 1958); and a process described as "drift" (Gustad, 1959). In other words, "the majority of faculty had not consciously selected the academic career nor formally prepared themselves for its teaching function" (Wilkerson, 1977), nor had they received preparation to teach at the college level (Yager, 1964).

Overall satisfaction with the decision to become a university professor is high--as measured by the response to an "if you could start again" type of question (Ladd & Lipsett, 1975a; Willie & Stecklein, 1982; Yager, 1964). Related to this career decision satisfaction is the feeling of success found by Ladd & Lipsett (1975a) in 93 per cent of their national sample of university professors.

The last characteristic of the background of professors noted in this review is in regard to the parents. Most commonly, people who become professors have parents with comparatively less schooling (Stecklein & Eckert, 1958).

IMPLICATIONS

The answers to questions surrounding the issue of why people, particularly former teachers, choose to become professors of teacher education in physical education are not readily available. Theories about how and why people choose occupations, change careers and select a university professorship form a relevant framework for the pursuit of these answers. From investigations forming the basis for these theories, variables pertinent to this study emerge in the form of a portrait of attractors, facilitators and other related characteristics.

This portrait, coloured by factors from divergent origins, presents a new and unique image. Although incomplete, here is the most comprehensive picture yet available of the subjects for this investigation.

Table 1 illustrates a compilation of attractors. In recognition of the existence of different perceptions of the role of professor, the classic models of this role, described earlier as the Oxbridge Model, Scottish Model and German Model, are employed for classification purposes. These models are joined by a fourth category of attractors which are not already accounted for.

Table 2 is a presentation of facilitators which have been identified. Presented simply as a list, these factors are the extent of what is currently known of the possible facilitators to the role of professor of teacher education in physical education.

TABLE 1

POSSIBLE ATTRACTORS TO THE ROLE OF PROFESSOR
OF TEACHER EDUCATION IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

<u>OXBRIDGE MODEL</u>	<u>SCOTTISH MODEL</u>	<u>GERMAN MODEL</u>	<u>OTHER</u>
Observe young peoples' growth and success	Share knowledge	Research	Associate with college age students
Social usefulness		Intellectual stimulation and challenge	Job offer
Help young people		Association with colleagues	Salary
Influence, mould, and inspire youth		Freedom and independence to continue study	College counselor's encouragement
Make a contribution to society		Work in specialized fields	Secure tenure; being laid off
		Esteem Or Fame	Pleasant surroundings
			Health reasons
			Power
			Probability of attaining value outcomes
			Increased personal time
			Intrinsic rewards
			Better locale to live in
			Pursuit of person-environment congruency

TABLE 2

~~POSS~~IBLE FACILITATORS TO THE ROLE OF PROFESSOR
OF TEACHER EDUCATION IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

High intelligence
Middle class background
Middle class values
Opportunities not present in youth
Instability at work
- Dissatisfaction with present position
Frustration with present position
Boredom
Forced relocation
Job offer
Perceived ease of leaving present position
Perceived probability of success elsewhere
Fear of failure
General life-style doubts
Desire to seek a redefinition of status
Desire to develop new skills and attain new job assignments
Desire for new experiences
Preference for essentially solitary work
Classroom teaching experience
Dilatory inclinations
Avoidance motivations
Deep interest in a specific field
Psychologically regressive orientation

Table 3 represents additional characteristics of the role of professor which do not fit, as yet, into the previous categories. Investigations such as the present one may serve to further illuminate the place of these elements.

These tables of attractors, facilitators and additional characteristics form a base for the framework of this investigation. Now, meaningful questions can be posed that have a foundation in the reality of previous research findings. In this way, the present investigation stands as an important step towards better understanding of former-teachers-turned-professors of teacher education in physical education.

TABLE 3

ADDITIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ROLE OF PROFESSOR
OF TEACHER EDUCATION IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Majority are male

Decision to become a professor made late

Decision characterized as:

Due to dilatory inclinations

Accidental

Drift

Unconscious selection

Personally and formally unprepared to teach

More educated than parents

Not employed at the institution granting the doctorate

Knows little about the role at the time of employment

Satisfaction with this career selection

Feelings of success

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The subjects selected for study were former teachers holding a doctorate degree and involved with university courses in curriculum, instruction and other courses related to pedagogy and school programs in physical education.

In total, 18 subjects meeting the above criteria were located and contacted. Of these potential subjects, two refused to participate and one was preparing to leave the country and hence was unable to be involved. This left 15 subjects, four females and 11 males, who consented to be interviewed.

These subjects were identified through their association with specified courses identified in the most recently available university calendars at four local institutions. These institutions were selected on the basis of proximity and their reputations as different types of schools: one American school, one of international repute, one known as a teacher training centre and lastly an experimental institution.

Where appropriate, the department chairperson was contacted with a letter of introduction and a list of qualifying faculty members. Subsequently, permission for appointments and data collection was obtained.

Data for this investigation was collected by means of a

structured interview format. After reviewing relevant literature, specific attractors, facilitators and other important factors surrounding the decision to become a teacher educator in physical education have been identified. Organized into an interview format, these questions were then field tested and revised prior to actual data collection.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Findings in this chapter are presented under three main event labels: Public School Teaching, Career Change, and The Role of Professor. These events represent three distinct phases in the career evolution of the subjects selected for this investigation and facilitate a coherent presentation of the wealth of information gathered on these individuals.

Public School Teaching

Background Biographies

The literature suggests that the majority of university professors are males (Creager, 1971; Huffman, 1968; Ladd & Lipsett, 1976; Willie & Stecklein, 1982). Somewhat surprisingly, this gender dominance is evident in each institution except the American school at which females are dominant--as mentioned earlier, the sample for this study is composed of 11 males and four females. This gender dominance difference is surely tied to separate, unique histories of American and Canadian higher education. All of the 15 subjects interviewed came from middle class backgrounds, a finding that is consistent with Gustad's work (1959).

Consistent with Stecklein and Eckert's (1959) findings, parents of subjects in this study had comparatively less formal education--the majority neither graduating from, nor even attending, university.

The decision to become a physical education teacher in public schools was made for a variety of reasons and only one subject could not recall when or where this decision was made. Two subjects decided when they were still in elementary school, six subjects became convinced while high school students and the remaining six subjects did not decide until enrolled in their undergraduate program. Subjects generally cited more than one reason for this career decision and the following factors were named by more than one subject: An enjoyment of physical activity generally, by three subjects; involvement at the "Y", by three subjects; and the enjoyment of high school physical education classes, again by three subjects. The following factors were mentioned, each by two subjects: liked sports, peer influence, and a desire to emulate a teacher role model.

Subjects in this study did all or most of their public school teaching at the secondary level. Six subjects taught there because they were unaware of any opportunities for university graduates to work as specialists at the elementary level. Four subjects believed secondary level students to be more skillful than younger students, yet still teachable. Two subjects took jobs at this level for the opportunity to coach

this age group. One subject admitted to a lack of money at that time, seeking any job opening. Of the two remaining subjects, one taught equally at the elementary and secondary levels to acquire experience at both levels, expecting to move on, and the final subject perceived the secondary level to be better than the elementary level at that point in time.

Role Orientation

In response to a probe of the perceived goals individuals held for themselves as physical education teachers, subjects had a variety of answers. Only two subjects had no recollection whatsoever. Six subjects were aiming at skill development in their students, and two admitted to merely wanting to work at a job they liked. Individual responses included a desire to have some impact upon the profession, to enhance the respect of the profession, to maximize participation, to create "astonishment" and thereby facilitate the need to learn more as an individual's responsibility. Lastly, only one subject mentioned any major name in the field as an influence: J.F. Williams and the concept of education through the physical.

Role Preparation

No obvious consensus appeared in regard to either strengths or weaknesses of the undergraduate education in terms of preparation for the job of physical education teacher. Only five subjects cited their methods preparation as a program

strength, another three subjects defined the self-confidence they acquired as a strength and a good balance between theory and practice was named by two subjects. Four subjects recalled no weaknesses in their preparation while three others felt the theory component was weak. The theory was not adequately linked to practice for two subjects and two others did not get an adequate science background. Other strengths and weaknesses appeared to be idiosyncratic to only one program or was at least identified by only one subject.

When describing what was missing from the undergraduate program, in addition to rectifying weaknesses already mentioned, four subjects could think of nothing that would have better prepared them for their role as a teacher. Three subjects felt more practicum time would have helped them and others described individual courses in areas of personal interest.

Subjects were asked when they felt that they had acquired their skills as a physical education teacher. Generally more than one time and place was credited with this skill acquisition and out of the 15 subjects only six cited their teacher training and student teaching experience. Experiences in the community, particularly at the "Y" was cited by five subjects; from high school teachers (as a student), was offered by three subjects; and on the job, actually performing as a teacher was also named by three subjects. Two subjects acquired their teaching skill through their coaching experiences, one subject was self-taught

through reading books and periodicals and lastly one subject stated, "You're born with it. You teach with your personality".

Perceived Ideals

Subjects were asked to express their views of the characteristics of an outstanding physical education teacher. From the responses given, no clear picture emerges. As descriptors of an outstanding physical education teacher, the ability to help all students to improve was mentioned by four subjects and the following factors were mentioned, each by three subjects: shows teaching ability, instills a desire to participate, shows empathy and concern for students, and has a good breadth of knowledge. Enthusiasm was mentioned by two subjects and one subject felt the concept was too complicated to give an adequate, brief summary.

These characteristics can be divided into two categories: traits of individuals and goal perceptions. The traits can further be divided into innate characteristics including enthusiasm, empathy and concern, and the learned characteristics of breadth of knowledge and teaching ability. The remaining responses are more accurately goal perceptions in helping all students to improve and to instill a desire to participate.

Subjects in this study expressed differences in their perceptions of outstanding school physical education teachers. Differences in both degree and kind. Similarly, characteristics of an outstanding physical education program were not seen

page48

uniformly. The most popular comment was the provision of a good variety of experiences, mentioned by five subjects. Facilitating the skill development for all students was mentioned directly by three subjects and the following components were named, each by two subjects: teaches an active lifestyle, allows for individuality, motivates students to participate, includes fitness and health components and lastly, two subjects merely cited the British Columbia Curriculum Guide.

The differences expressed above in regard to an outstanding physical education program are differences in degree more than kind. Underlying the majority of these suggestions is the concept of skill development. For example, variety refers to a variety of skills, the active lifestyle is achieved through a strong base of skills to draw upon, individuality of skill presentation, and so on.

Personal Performance Perceptions

Subjects generally found what they expected in the public school system and they were all happy at that time of their life in the role as a public school physical education teacher. Consistent with Lortie's (1975) suggestion of personal history being more influential than professional preparation, one subject suggested that the school system held "pretty much what I'd grown up with", and another subject stated that, "I was never out of school, so really, I always knew what went on".

In assessing their performance as public school teachers,
page49 .

two subjects could not answer because they felt they had no accurate way to measure themselves. Of the remaining subjects, two felt that they were not outstanding at all, while six others believed that they were not comfortable to describe themselves as outstanding but could agree to having been good to well above average. Lastly, five subjects felt quite comfortable with the adjective outstanding in description of their public school teaching experience. These successful teachers generally looked to more than one place for signs of their success--most common, however, (cited by seven subjects), was the respect of peers. Also mentioned was feedback from and respect of students, community and parents. Promotions on the job, student success and maximum student participation were also cited.

Summary

Details about the Public School Teaching phase for subjects in this study have been outlined. Their background, role orientation, preparation for teaching, views of the ideal and recollections of their performance in this role have been examined. When appropriate, findings from this investigation are linked to works reviewed earlier. In general, findings reflect a broad range of individuality, quite consistent with previous works.

Now the focus moves to the phase identified for subjects: Career Change.

Career Change

The decision to change careers, for subjects in this investigation, can be identified by two separate but related decisions. First is the decision to leave teaching in the public school system and next is the decision to pursue a position as a university professor. The ordering of these two decisions for presentation here is organizational and not necessarily chronological.

Leaving Public School Teaching

The decision to leave teaching at the public school level was made by four subjects while still in their undergraduate program. The remaining 11 subjects made this decision either during or shortly after their master's degree education. The subjects were split in terms of length of teaching experience, nine with five years or less and six subjects with more than five years of experience in the public school system.

The most common response to why the decision was made to leave teaching at the public school level, given by eight subjects, was the result of the offer of a job--an offer which was unsolicited by seven of these eight subjects. This pattern is most closely represented in Thomas' (1980) typology as the "drift-out" category in which there is low pressure to change both from within and from the environment. The remaining explanations for this decision were cited less frequently.

Three subjects sought increased mental challenge in another job, two subjects simply could not find any appropriate positions in the public school system and one subject was after a position with greater social impact and greater impact upon the profession. Hiestand (1971) found similar attractors to change in the study of career changers. Lastly, the encouragement of a university advisor was cited as an explanation for leaving teaching at this level by one subject. Such influential advice was reported earlier by Ness (1958) in work on university professors.

For the subjects in this investigation, the reasons cited for leaving public school teaching are contrary to facilitators for change cited earlier, in studies on teachers. As mentioned, these subjects were happy and generally satisfied rather than dissatisfied (Kahnweiler, 1980; Sarason, 1977). Further, they were generally successful and found what they had expected in the school system rather than being frustrated and bored (Beam, 1981).

Pursuit of The Professorate

The decision to become a professor was made, in the majority of cases, either during or shortly after completing the master's degree. Four subjects did not make the decision until they were involved in their doctoral program, and two subjects made the decision to become a professor after holding temporary appointments at the university level--originally expecting to

return to the public school system. Lastly, one subject had the role of professor targeted while still an undergraduate--the only subject to fit Ginzberg's (1951) theory of timing of occupational choice. Otherwise, the timing of this decision for subjects in this study was consistent with other work on university professors (Eckert et al., 1959; Ness, 1958; Stecklein & Eckert, 1958; U.S. DOHEW, 1958; Vandermeulen, 1974; Yager, 1964).

For the subjects in this study, reasons cited for leaving teaching were very closely related to their motives for choosing to become a professor. A number of reasons were cited for the selection of this role. The most prominent explanation was the mere offer of a job, the story of seven subjects in this study. This finding is consistent with the work of Ness (1958) and also the U.S. DOHEW (1958). Less frequently mentioned was the advice of a professor--also found by Ness (1958)--given by two subjects and the perceived impact on students from having something to offer them--consistent with the findings of Stecklein & Eckert (1958)--also given by two subjects. The remaining explanations were cited individually. One subject admitted to blocked aspiration to another career alternative. Also cited was the need for money, job security and stability associated with a professorship, as well as upward mobility--findings mentioned by Wilson (1942). An interest in the profession and the intellectual challenge of work at the university level were also

mentioned, reasons supported by Ness (1958), Stecklein & Eckert (1958) and the U.S. DOHEW (1958). Lastly, the prestige of the role of the professor was mentioned as a contributing factor to the decision to become a professor--a finding described by Brown (1965) and by Wilson (1942).

Pursuit of The Doctorate

Interestingly, with the subjects in this investigation, decisions surrounding the doctorate appeared to have little influence over the decision to pursue a position at the university level. In fact, seven subjects decided to pursue the doctorate after having held a position in a university for a number of years. Another seven decided during or shortly after their master's degree and one subject made the decision prior to attending university, as a high school student.

Four responses appeared most frequently as to why subjects did pursue the doctoral degree. Four subjects held the perception that the doctorate was necessary to advance and maintain job security at the university level. Equally important was a thirst for knowledge, expressed by four subjects. These explanations were followed closely by the expectation of a wider range of job options, given by three subjects, and the advice and encouragement of a spouse, peers and/or a university advisor, again mentioned by three subjects. Also mentioned, by individual subjects, were comments to the effect that the doctorate was necessary to perform the job adequately, a love for university

life, to become a change agent in society and to participate in research.

The most common reason for choosing the institution at which the doctorate was completed was the reputation of the program; offered by nine subjects. Other reasons cited were the desire to work with specific professors (three subjects), the availability of money and the mere proximity of the school. Eleven of the subjects applied to one school only. In addition to the selection of the school, subjects showed a trend in terms of the type of a doctorate acquired. Eleven subjects hold PhD's while three hold the EdD and one subject holds a DEd.

All subjects report generally high grades in both their master's and doctoral degree work--a finding consistent with the suggested facilitator of high intelligence, mentioned by both Gustad (1959) and Wilson (1979).

Consistent with Wilson's (1979) findings, the majority of faculty members obtained their doctorate at institutions other than their place of current employment. Only one subject in this study works at the same institution as where the doctorate was obtained.

Feelings About The Decision To Change

All of the subjects in this investigation suggested that they are generally pleased with their decision to leave the public school system and satisfied in their position now at the university level. This satisfaction with the decision to become

a university professor was supported by a number of studies cited earlier (Ladd & Lipsett, 1975a; Willie & Stecklein, 1982; Yager, 1964). Beyond this overall satisfaction, a number of qualifications were added. One subject suggested dissatisfaction with the comparatively low pay associated with the role--noted earlier by Eckert et al., (1959), Stecklein & Eckert, (1958), and the U.S. DOHEW (1958). Another subject commented on personal shortcomings in the performance of the job, as well as a lack of congruence between personal perceptions and the opinions of decision-makers with respect to a job description.

Summary

Factors surrounding the decision to change careers have been presented around the separate but related decisions to leave the public schools, to pursue the professorate, and to obtain a doctoral degree. These decisions are then joined by views on the overall decision to change careers.

In this section a number of findings worthy of note arise. The first such finding is that, contrary to what might be inferred from the literature, subjects were happy and generally satisfied with their public school position rather than being bored and frustrated. A second finding to be commented on is in regard to the timing of the decision to become a professor. While contrary to a classic theory of occupational choice, subjects choosing this career later than their age cohort is quite predictable from previous work on university professors.

The last finding worthy of expansion here is in regard to the pursuit of a doctoral degree. This degree was of little influence over the decision to pursue a position at the university level for many of the subjects in this study. This finding is doubtless an age-related phenomenon particularly with the current emphasis on the need for a doctoral degree to teach and/or be employed at the university level.

Focus now shifts to the target phase for subjects in this study; namely: the role of professor.

The Role Of Professor

Pre-Doctoral Role Perceptions

Prior to any involvement with a doctoral program, subjects expressed a number of opinions as to what the role of the professor entailed. The most prominent perception was that the professor was first a teacher who also carried on some research. Cited by seven subjects, this perception might fit either the Oxbridge or Scottish models. Three subjects felt that the professor was a researcher with some teaching responsibilities (the German Model) and another three subjects viewed the role as one exclusively as a teacher. Lastly, two subjects held no perceptions at all as to what a professor did.

Of the subjects holding opinions as to what should be

involved in the role, ten subjects felt that things were as they should be and two subjects believed that, in fact, teaching should come before research. Lastly, one subject identified different schools with different priorities, suggesting that some institutions are student centred and the student comes first while others emphasize knowledge creation and research is the first priority for faculty members.

Post-Doctoral Role Perceptions

The doctoral programs apparently had little if any impact upon perceptions of the role of professor. For 10 of the subjects, there was no change in perceptions of either what the role was or should be. Of the remaining five subjects whose perceptions did change, three attached greater importance to the research component of the role, one highlighted the significance of the professor as a role model in human relations and the last subject identified the burden of committee work to be shared unevenly among faculty members.

Role Performance Impact on Role Perceptions

Subjects were split in their estimation of the impact of the actual job experience on their role perceptions. With no institutional or gender trends apparent, eight subjects felt that their perceptions had not changed with experience and seven subjects had changed. Of those changed, three subjects reported

greater emphasis on teaching and related responsibilities to be present in the performance of their job. Two subjects commented that they did more teaching than they wanted to do and lastly, two subjects complained of increased university pressure to research and to write papers. Of these seven subjects with changed perceptions, six attributed their change to the institution at which they were employed and one subject suggested the knowledge explosion in the field to be responsible for perceptual changes.

In response to a question about the responsibilities of the job as an educator of physical education teachers, three subjects felt that their responsibilities had not changed since they had become professors. Of the remaining 11, eight subjects perceived changed responsibilities only through holding different positions beyond their role as a teacher educator, such as chairing departments and committees. Three other subjects felt they had been transformed from generalists to specialists and the one remaining subject felt the institution had redefined itself from a research institution to a teaching institution.

Retrospective Evaluation of Preparation

When asked for the main strength of their graduate training in respect to the current position held, seven subjects

identified the acquisition of skills to perform research. Beyond research skills, individuals identified the administrative orientation of their program, their association with professors, the diverse background of their program and the skills to become better thinkers. While only four subjects completed doctorates in Education and the remaining 11 subjects hold PhD degrees, only one subject suggested that the doctorate training held no strengths for the position of teacher educator, having been done in another area.

In identifying weaknesses in their graduate programs, subjects were generally very forgiving. Five subjects suggested there were no weaknesses in their doctoral education. Three subjects stated that their doctoral training was not related to their current position--suggesting this to be a point of clarification rather than a weakness of the program. Of the remaining subjects, two could identify only specific courses in an otherwise good program, not enough depth in the course work was identified by two other subjects while yet two more subjects complained of inadequate preparations for research and publishing duties.

More courses and emphasis in pedagogy and methods in physical education were identified by nine subjects as the missing components in their doctoral education that would have made them better teacher educators in physical education. The remaining six subjects held different perceptions. One subject

felt that more than one advisor should be involved in the graduate education for a less biased influence over attitudes formed. Three subjects agreed that there should be more opportunities to write and publish papers. Lastly, two subjects stated that nothing was missing from their graduate education which might have better prepared them to perform in their role now--in fact, one subject stated that "the doctorate does not train for roles--it trains one to think".

Specific Role Component Perceptions

Student teacher supervision. With regard to the supervision of student teachers, 10 subjects felt that all faculty members involved with physical education teacher education should supervise student teachers. Of these subjects, eight felt that this was one of the best methods available for professors to keep in touch with the ever changing picture of reality in the school system. The two remaining subjects felt that student teaching was just another learning setting in which it was valuable for faculty members to see their students perform. The five remaining subjects, who felt that all faculty members should not necessarily supervise student teachers, all felt this way believing not all faculty members to be qualified for such specialized duties. Faculty members were generally evenly dispersed among the institutions, except for those at the school designated with a teacher training focus. At this institution,

five of the six professors interviewed, believed that all faculty members should supervise student teachers.

Teaching experience. In response to a question about hiring a physical education teacher education faculty member, without prior teaching experience at either the elementary or secondary levels, five subjects said that they would not. The reason given was that such a person would lack credibility and be out of touch with the demands of the role of the teacher. Three subjects hedged somewhat, suggesting that they would look for some previous experience with children--though not necessarily teaching. The four remaining subjects stated that a lack of teaching experience would not block a potential faculty member due to the variety of roles available for teacher education faculty members. There was, however, general consensus that those faculty members involved directly in methods courses should have previous teaching experience.

Role description. Faced with the following role descriptors: teaching, coaching, research, and service, all subjects ranked teaching to be the most important from their own personal perspective--a finding consistent with Rog (1979). In this study, nine subjects perceived teaching alone as prime; four subjects saw research as equally important; one subject viewed teaching as tied with the role of coach and one subject viewed teaching and service as premier role descriptors.

From the perspective of the university, eight subjects

believe that research receives the highest degree of importance. Five subjects see their university's emphasis going to teaching first and research second, while two other subjects see both research and teaching emphasized equally. In all but one case, service ranked third behind the variations of teaching and research, with coaching a distant fourth if it even made it on to the scale.

Three subjects ranked these role descriptors with the same values that they perceived their institution to rank them. Each of these subjects was from a different institution. The remaining 12 subjects held personal perceptions at odds with the perceptions of their institution of employment.

Role satisfaction. In response to the opportunity to change anything about the role of teacher educator in physical education, eight subjects would change absolutely nothing. Of the remaining seven subjects, two would prefer to do more research than they do presently, three seek more depth and less breadth, preferring to be involved in fewer things, one subject would rather teach fewer classes and finally, one subject would prefer more opportunities to help public school teachers--perhaps through the offering of more in-service opportunities.

Evaluation of Role Performance

When asked to identify institutional measures of success, faculty members from the same institution were in general

agreement. The American institution rewards teaching first, research second and service third. The teacher training institution weighs teaching and research first and equally, and service is third. Lastly, the experimental institution operates with an interdisciplinary faculty, rewarding teaching and service in the Education department and looking for research and publishing from the Science faculty.

In identifying personal measures of success, however, results were somewhat different. Only one of the 15 subjects tested felt unsuccessful. This perception was based upon the measuring of the performance of former students as teachers five years into their career--the suggestion being that these former students did no better than their predecessors and generally did not employ skills or knowledge 'learned' at the university. The remaining 14 subjects perceived themselves as successful--a finding supported by the work of Ladd & Lipsett (1975a). Differences exist as to how this success is measured. Nine subjects identified course evaluations and student feedback as the main sources of their feelings of success--Wilson (1942) might identify these subjects as educators. Two subjects cited feedback from peers in the form of recognition of work done in the field and requests to present papers at conferences as signs of their success--Wilson (1942) might classify these subjects as scholars. Lastly, three subjects cited both student and peer feedback as signs of their success in the performance of their

job--these subjects, as described earlier by Lawson (1981) fill a difficult boundary position between the scholar and the educator. None of the subjects for this investigation identified these responsibilities as breeding any undue stress, strain or conflict.

Perceived Ideals

When asked for the qualifications of a successful teacher educator in physical education, public school teaching experience was mentioned by 12 subjects. A doctoral degree was less obvious, mentioned by nine subjects and two other subjects expected at least a master's degree--one looking for a degree beyond the master's (perhaps a second master's), and the other subject was not fully convinced of the need for a doctoral degree.

When asked to list the qualities of an outstanding physical education teacher educator, a number of factors were named. The lack of consensus noted in attempts to identify an outstanding physical education teacher is also characteristic of attempts to identify the ideal teacher educator. Differences exist in both degree and kind of factors identified. Subject knowledge was mentioned by nine subjects; teaching ability by eight subjects; research skills and publishing ability by five subjects; the phrase "practice what you preach", by four subjects; empathy by three subjects and the following were mentioned, each by two

subjects: leadership, rapport with students, being demanding of students, general enthusiasm, patience, having ideals, and the desire to help all students to improve. A number of other factors were also mentioned, but by only one subject in each case.

The first factors identified, subject knowledge, teaching ability, research skills and publishing ability are the only specialized talents named. In each case, these qualities are so general as to still allow a great deal of diversity. The remaining qualities named are general traits which describe a very well rounded personality.

Descriptions of an outstanding teacher education program in physical education also showed a low degree of agreement in what components belonged. Methods course work was mentioned by five subjects; the offering of theory and practice by three subjects; a strong science base, also by three subjects; and the following components were mentioned, each by two subjects: disciplinary foundations, sequential, linked ordering of tasks, teach the ability to be department head in the first year--through the skills to organize and manage.

This diversity of views is not unexpected. Alley (1982) cites results of a study of 230 departments of physical education from which the only course required in all departments was practice teaching (p. 185). Consequently, the diversity of programs in existence appears to be reflective of the equally

diverse faculty opinions.

Summary

This chapter highlights the existence of a number of dominant trends in the characteristics of former-teachers-turned-professors. Within these common trends, however, lie the roots of different motives and backgrounds.

Beginning with biographies, each of the subjects in this investigation was raised by parents with comparatively less education than themselves, in an essentially middle class background.

The decision to be a physical education teacher was made either in high school or at the university--just prior to or during the early twenties (years of age). The decision was based on a variety of reasons surrounding success and enjoyment in sport and physical activity. The goal was to teach the more skillful secondary level students, generally aiming at skill development.

Teaching was largely what was expected and a happy time. The undergraduate program had few notable strengths or weaknesses. Some methods and some theory was useful but the links between this education and actual teaching were sometimes hazy. Skills as a teacher were acquired in a variety of places, ranging from experiences as a high school student to coaching and

community instructor jobs as well as the actual teacher training program.

While generally a good teacher at this level, according to peer feedback, the characteristics of an outstanding physical education teacher are not unanimously agreed upon. There does appear to be consensus in the belief that skill development in students is the major component in an outstanding school physical education program.

These individuals have approximately five years of teaching experience at the secondary level. Either during or shortly after acquiring a master's degree, notice was taken of these individuals by university teacher education faculties and shortly thereafter a job was offered for a position at the university level. As a result of this offer, the majority of subjects left the public school system and took up positions in a university. Here, many realized the need for a doctoral degree--at least to keep the job and at best to be promoted. Others pursued the doctorate to satisfy their thirst for knowledge. The institution selected for doctoral work was selected in most cases because of the reputation of its program. Individuals are generally pleased with their decision to leave the public school system and are relatively satisfied now as university professors.

Prior to enrolling in the doctoral program, the role of professor was perceived to be actually and ideally, one of a teacher who also researched. The doctoral education did

virtually nothing to alter these perceptions. Some variations of perceptions might exist due to the reward structure of individual institutions of employment.

It is informative to note that these professors recognize a strength of their graduate education in the acquisition of skills for researching. This skill is useful in the achievement of a work goal i.e., the attainment of refereed journal publications. These publications are integral in the evaluation by the university of job performance. The potential utility of these research skills in informing their own practice, however, was not mentioned. The precise role of research and research skills, as viewed by subjects, was not elicited in this investigation. Here lies an interesting question worthy of further study. Lastly, greater emphasis in pedagogy and teaching methods might have been beneficial, but these were not part of the type of doctorate taken--in most cases. Criteria for success in the role of professor of teacher education in physical education are generally clearly outlined by the university and understood by the faculty. There are variations among universities in regard to the emphasis upon research or teaching but by and large feelings of success in the performance of this role are measured by responses on course evaluations and general student feedback. Peer feedback also contributes to self-perceptions. This peer feedback takes the form of invitations to lecture and comments on publications, generally.

Only one subject in this investigation identified the performance of former-students-as-teachers to be a measure of the success of a professor of teacher education. This gauge for teacher educators is the mark of a professor operating under the Scottish Model, as identified by Light (1974). Subject mastery is clearly the key concept here. For others, concerned more with immediate feedback on presentation, preparedness, clarity and fairness in course work, the emphasis on subject matter is secondary and falls more accurately under the Oxbridge Model. Less prevalent in this sample are those with a primary orientation toward research--the German Model. Perhaps most accurately, the subjects of this study fit under the "Other Model". Primary motivations, or attractors, stem from a job offer and a number of other attractors previously outlined under this model.

Supervising student teaching is viewed as a skill. Subjects state that it should be undertaken by those qualified to fill the role of professor of teacher education, such that they might stay in touch with what truly happens in the school system. More specifically, those who aspire to teach "how to" courses had better have done it themselves.

The qualities of an outstanding teacher educator are seen as subject knowledge, teaching ability and research and publishing ability. Qualifications are seen as previous teaching experience and an advanced degree--probably a doctorate. Opinions vary as

to the traits of an outstanding teacher education program. These differences in opinions of ideals, notwithstanding, subjects feel that the role of the physical education teacher educator is fine as it currently exists.

At this point, selected attractors, facilitators and additional characteristics previously identified as possible may not be presented as actual attractors, facilitators and additional characteristics in relation to the recruitment of former-teachers-turned-professors of teacher education in physical education. These lists appear in table 4.

TABLE 4

page 72

ATTRACTORS

Job offer
Advice of a professor
Potential impact on students;
 "I had something to offer"
Need for money
Job security and stability
Upward mobility
Potential impact on the profession
Intellectual challenge
Prestige

FACILITATORS

Good grades
Middle class background
Job offer
Classroom teaching experience
Deep interest in a specific field
Blocked aspirations elsewhere

ADDITIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Majority are male
Decision made late
Decision:
 -accidental
 -drift
 -unconscious selection
Formally unprepared to teach at this level
More educated than parents
Not employed at the institution granting the doctorate
Little agreement in definition of an outstanding:
 -school physical education teacher
 -teacher educator
 -teacher education program
Outstanding school physical education programs are essentially
 skill based
Satisfaction with this career selection
Feelings of success

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

A number of important concluding observations can be made based on the findings of this investigation. First is the fact that many--11 of the 15 subjects in this study--having course responsibilities in curriculum, instruction, pedagogy and school programs, have no formal training in these areas.

The second conclusion worthy of note is in regard to the three waves of socialization originally hypothesized in this study. The undergraduate education, or teacher education program, organizational socialization in the school system and thirdly the graduate education may now be reconceptualized. It would appear that there exists a socialization process even earlier than the undergraduate preparation in the form of exposure to and experiences in sport and physical activity. Consistent with the findings cited earlier by Lortie (1975), it would appear that this earlier stage is indeed influential. Influential at not only the undergraduate, teacher preparation level but also reaching the graduate level. This background biography or subjective warrant is apparently more powerful than both waves of professional education. It appears to be a subjective warrant with a sport orientation to skills teaching in the schools. That is, skill teaching at the expense of other

potentially important goals in the cognitive and affective domains.

The third conclusion to be drawn from this study exists as a paradox which can be stated in two separate but related relationships. The first relationship exists between subjects of this study and their institutions of employment. Products of two levels of formal professional education, these subjects knowingly hold role orientations at odds with their institution. As an extension of this relationship, subjects would hope to impact would-be teachers in accordance with their own views but they can not agree upon a definition of an outstanding teacher educator, teacher education program or even an outstanding physical education teacher.

The fourth conclusion is a further extension of the finding that subjects' role orientations are at odds with institutionally defined role orientations. Not surprisingly, there exists some bitterness over the policies related to promotion and tenure. Consequently, questions must arise as to the likelihood of continued success in such a setting.

The fifth and final conclusion of this investigation is again tied to the role orientation of these subjects as former-teachers-turned-professors. This orientation, for themselves, as teacher education faculty members and for their students, as aspiring teachers, is of a custodial nature. They are guardians of personal traditions, both in their own roles and in their

views of successful school programs and public school physical education teachers.

CHAPTER 6

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

In the past, researchers have neglected teacher educators in physical education. Consequently, any effort toward this end is a valuable contribution. Based on the findings of this investigation, there are a number of potentially rich areas worthy of further work.

Conflicts have been detected between personal and institutional definitions of the role of professor of teacher education. Subjects have suggested that they do more research and publishing than they wish to do and that they are successful in their role as professors. They consider themselves, in many cases, to be a product of institutional pressure contrary to personal ideals. An area worthy of further study is the extent to which teacher education faculty do, in fact, do what they say they do in their work.

Another area worthy of further study is in the identification of ideal teacher education program goals and teacher educator qualities. For certainly, if teacher education programs are to be successful and effective, there must be some readily identifiable characteristics. Only then can we effectively compare programs and evaluate teacher educators. It seems reasonable to expect, particularly in times of

page 76

accountability and cost-effectiveness management, that professors of teacher education in physical education be capable of identifying what it is that they do and why they do it. Furthermore, one would expect a strong consensus of opinion and unity of purpose.

Linked to identifying optimal teacher education programs and teacher educator behaviors must be the expansion of current research underway in pedagogy to include behaviors for teacher education faculty. When what is aspired to can be more accurately described, then the means for achieving these ends can be more adequately explored.

Also of interest in the study of this population is information surrounding the questions of gender differences. An issue raised earlier, the only light to be shed on this question from the present study is support of the preponderance of males in the role. Why this is true and whether or not there are any differences between women who aspire to the role of professor and women who do not remains to be explored.

In addition, further research is needed to extend the present investigation to include more subjects from other institutions. While the present study has served to illuminate initial trends, work with larger samples from different regions and from institutions with different reputations may uncover alternate dominant trends or perhaps support those already identified. In either event, such work stands to further enhance

the understanding of perhaps the most important ingredient in any teacher education program--the professor of teacher education in physical education. Also of interest, subsequently, is the background and general description of other significant faculty members, i.e., professors without former teaching experience involved directly in the teacher education process and professors without the doctoral degree. In this fashion, teacher education faculty stand to become more introspective and effective.

REFERENCES

- Alley, L.E. (1982). Two paths to excellence. Quest, 34 (2), 99-108.
- Baldwin, R.G. (1979). The faculty career process--continuity and change: A study of college professors at 5 stages of academic career. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 689-A.
- Beam, A.L. (1981). Teacher dropouts: Their process of attraction and adult development including motivating factors in their work life and non work life. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 4209-A.
- Bess, J.L. (1977). The motivation to teach. Journal of Higher Education, 48 (3), 243-257.
- Blau, P.M. (1974). Recruiting faculty and students. Sociology of Education, 47, 93-113.
- Brown, D.G. (1965). The market for college teachers. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Cattell, J.M. (1890). Mental tests and measurements. Mind, 15, 373-381.
- Creager, J.A. (1971, October). The American graduate student: A normative description. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, Research Report.
- Dewey, J. (1904). The relation of theory to practice in

- education. The third yearbook of NSSE. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company.
- Eckert, R.E., Stecklein, J.E., & Sagen, H.B. (1959). College faculty view their jobs. American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 45, 513-528.
- Eisner, E.W. (1979). The Educational Imagination. New York: McMillan Publishing Co., Incorporated.
- Fulton, O., & Trow, M. (1974). Research activity in American higher education. Sociology of Education, 47, 29-73.
- Gilliland, G.H. (1974). Role preferences of faculties at selected universities in Texas. Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, 2719-A.
- Ginzberg, E., Ginzberg, S.W., Axelrad, S., & Herma, J.L. (1951). Occupational choice: An approach to general theory. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Glazer, N. (1974). The schools of the minor professions. Minerva, 12 (37), 346-364.
- Gustad, J.W. (1959). They march to a different drummer: Another look at college teachers. The Educational Record, 40 (3), 204-211.
- Hall, G.E., & Hord, S.M. (1981). A national agenda for research on teacher education in the 1980's. Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (2), 4-8.
- Havinghurst, R.J. (1953). Human development and education. New York: Longman and Green.

- Helfrich, M.L. (1975). Pathways into professional schools. Sociology of Work and Occupations, 2 (2), 169-181.
- Hiestand, D.L. (1971). Changing careers after thirty-five. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Holland, J.L. (1959). A theory of vocational choice. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 6, 35-45.
- Holland, J.L., & Godfredson, G.D. (1976). Using a typology of persons and environments to explain careers: some extensions and clarifications. The Counseling Psychologist, 6(3), 20-29.
- Huffman, C.J. (1968). Doctoral graduates in education: an inquiry into their motives, aspirations and perceptions of the programs. Dissertation Abstracts International, 29, 1678-A.
- Jensen, K. (1982). Women's work and academic culture: adaptations and confrontations. Higher Education, 11, 67-83.
- Jones, J.M., & Lovejoy, F.H. (1980). The perceived role of Australian female academics. The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 16 (2), 96-102.
- Kahnweiler, J.B. (1980). So you've been a teacher, now what? Counseling the teacher changing careers. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 29 (2), 164-171.
- Kelly, R., & Hart, B.D. (1971). Role preferences of faculty in different age groups and academic disciplines. Sociology of

Education, 44, 351-357.

Ladd, E.C., & Lipsett, S.M. (1975a). What professors think.

Chronicle of Higher Education, 11 (1), 2;9.

Ladd, E.C., & Lipsett, S.M. (1975b). How professors spend their time. Chronicle of Higher Education, 11 (5), 2.

Ladd, E.C., & Lipsett, S.M. (1976). Nearly all professors are satisfied with their choice of an academic career.

Chronicle of Higher Education, 12 (10), 11.

Lawson, H.A. (1981, June). Problems of physical education teachers and teacher socialization. Paper presented at the First National Conference of Canadian Teacher Educators in Physical Education, Vancouver, B.C.

Lawson, H.A. (1983a). Problem-setting for physical education and sport. Unpublished manuscript.

Lawson, H.A. (1983b). Toward a model of teacher socialization in physical education: The subjective warrant, recruitment, and teacher education. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 2 (3), 3-16.

Lawson, H.A. (1983c). Toward a model of teacher socialization in physical education: Entry into school, teachers' role orientations, and longevity in teaching. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 3 (1), 3-15.

Light, D. (1974). The structure of the academic profession. Sociology of Education, 47, 2-28.

Locke, L.F. (1983, November). Research on teacher education for

physical education in the U.S.A., Part II: Questions and Conclusions. Paper presented at the International Symposium on Research in School Physical Education, University of Jyvaskyla, Finland.

Locke, L.F., & Dodds, P. (1981, July). Research on preservice teacher education for physical education in the U.S.A. Paper presented at the Third Seminar on the study of Teaching at the International Conference on the Association Internationale des Ecoles Superieures d'Education Physique, Rio de Janeiro.

Lortie, D.C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

March, J.G., & Simon, H.A. (1958). Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Morford, W.R. (1972). Toward a profession not a craft. Quest, 18, 88-93.

Neapolitan, J. (1980). Occupational change in mid-career: An exploratory investigation. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 16, 212-225.

Ness, F.W. (1958). The role of the college in the recruitment of teachers. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges.

Pooley, J.C. (1972). Professional Socialization: A model of the pre-training phase applicable to physical education students. Quest, 18, 57-66.

- Pooley, J.C. (1975). The professional socialization of physical education students in the United States and England. International Review of Sport Sociology. 3 (4), 97-108.
- Riesman, D. (1959). The academic career: notes on recruitment and colleagueship. Daedalus. 88, 147-169.
- Robbins, P.I., Thomas, L.E., Harvey, D.W., & Kandefer, C. (1978). Career change and congruence of personality type: an examination of DOT - Derived Work Environment designations. Journal of Vocational Behavior. 13, 15-25.
- Rog, J.A. (1979). Faculty attitudes toward teaching: A descriptive interview-based study of three departments of P.E. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40 (3), 1348-A.
- Rogoff, N. (1957). The decision to study Medicine. In R.K. Merton, G.G. Reader, & P.L. Kendall (Eds.), The student physician. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Sarason, S.B. (1977). Work, aging, and social change. New York: The Free Press.
- Sharp, L.M. (1966). Graduate study and its relation to careers: The experience of a recent cohort of college graduates. The Journal of Human Resources, 1 (2), 41-48.
- Shultz, B.E. (1975). A survey of policies and practices of colleges and state departments of education relating to classroom teaching experiences. Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 2754-A.
- Snyder, R.A., Howard, A., & Hammer, T.H. (1978). Mid-career

- change in academia: The decision to become an administrator. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 13, 229-241.
- Stecklein, J.E., & Eckert, R.E. (1958). An exploratory study of the factors influencing the choice of college teaching as a career. Minnesota: Cooperative Research Programs, U.S. Office of Education.
- Super, D.E. (1953). A theory of vocational development. American Psychologist, 8, 185-190.
- Super, D.E. (1957). The psychology of careers. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Tabachnick, B.R., Popkewitz, T.S., & Zeichner, K.M. (1980). Teacher education and the professional perspectives of student teachers. Interchange, 10, (4), 12-29.
- Theilens, T. (1957). Some comparisons of entrants to medical and law school. In R.K. Merton, G.G. Reader, & P.L. Kendall (Eds.), The student physician. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Thomas, L.E. (1980). A typology of mid-life career changers. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 16, 173-182.
- United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. (1958). Factors influencing the choice of college teaching as a career. Division of Higher Education, University of Minnesota, 1, case 22, #8515.
- Vaitenas, R., & Wiener, Y. (1977). Developmental, emotional and interest factors in voluntary mid-career change. Journal of

Vocational Behavior, 11, 291-304.

Vandermeulen, D.S. (1974). The motives, perceptions and aspirations of recent graduates of doctoral programs in higher education. Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, 7694-A.

Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E.H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. Research in Organizational Behavior, 1, 209-264.

Wilkerson, L. (1977). University teaching: A study of faculty attitudes. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 1933-A.

Willie, R., & Stecklein, J.E. (1982). A three-decade comparison of college faculty characteristics, satisfactions, activities, and attitudes. Research in Higher Education, 16 (1), 81-93.

Wilson, L. (1942). The academic man. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, L. (1979). American academics: Then and now. New York: Oxford University Press.

Yager, B. (1964). Some characteristics of women who have chosen college teaching in physical education. Dissertation Abstracts International, 24, 5182.

Yerkes, R.M. (1919). Report of the Psychology Committee of the National Research Council. Psychological Review, 26, 83-149.

Zeichner, K.M., & Tabachnick, R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education 'washed out' by school experience? Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (3), 7-11.

A number of prominent physical educators, such as Lawrence Locke, have called attention to the need for work in this area. I hope that you will agree that there is merit in this undertaking. To that end, any assistance you might be able to offer will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration in this matter. I will contact you within the week. I hope to begin shortly after receiving your approval.

Sincerely,

QUESTIONNAIRE

Preamble

You have been selected as a subject for this investigation on the basis of the following criteria:

1. You hold a doctorate degree.
2. You are a former teacher at either the elementary or secondary level.
3. At least part of your responsibilities at this university include instruction in curriculum, instruction and/or other courses related to pedagogy and school programs.

Do each of these points describe you? (If NO--Terminate the interview).

(If YES) The title of this investigation is "Recruitment into the role of professor of teacher education in physical education". Of specific interest in this study, is information surrounding the general background, professional work experience and education of former teachers-turned-professors.

All information gathered for this study will remain strictly confidential. Not even my thesis chairperson will know the identity of individual respondents or their institutions. When the data has been gathered, it will be presented in such a fashion as to further preserve your anonymity. The results will be retained for analysis in the completion of this study. After that time, the records will be destroyed to further guarantee anonymity.

If at any time I ask you a question you would prefer not to answer, please indicate this and we will move on. Further, if for any reason you choose to terminate this interview, we will stop.

I have structured specific questions to form the basis for this interview. If at any time during this interview, our discussion sparks a thought from you pertinent to this study which I have not specifically asked you, please feel free to add the comment or observation.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for consenting to participate in this investigation. We will now begin.

Code for Inst. _____

Gender M F

The first few questions are aimed at your background:

1. Did your parents:

	Mother		Father	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
a. Complete high school?	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Attend university?	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Graduate from university?	_____	_____	_____	_____

2. What were your parents' occupations during your university education?

Mother - _____

Father - _____

3. With the next question, I am interested in details surrounding each of the degrees you hold. Beginning with your baccalaureate, can you tell me:

DEGREE	INSTITUTION	COMPLETION DATE	AGE ST FIN	GRADUATING GPA

4. After completing your undergraduate degree, did you work full time at a job other than teaching at either the elementary or secondary level? YES NO

If Yes, what? _____
when? _____

Did this influence in any way your later return to become a professor?

5. Did you teach at the elementary or secondary level? E S BOTH

6. For how long? Elem. _____ Sec. _____ Total _____

The next few questions are directed to your teaching experience at the (elementary/secondary) level.

7. When did you decide that you wanted to be a physical education teacher?

Why did you decide to do this?

8. What attracted you to teaching at the (elementary/secondary) level?

9. What did you hope to accomplish as a physical education teacher?

10. Did you find what you expected in the school system?

11. Were you happy—that is, did you enjoy teaching at this level?

If No, can you comment on why not?

12. In retrospect, what were the strengths of your undergraduate education in relation to your responsibilities as a former (elementary/secondary) physical education teacher?

Why were these strengths? _____

13. Again thinking about your teaching responsibilities, what were the weaknesses of your undergraduate education? _____

Why were these weaknesses? _____

14. When and where do you feel that you acquired your teaching skill? _____

15. What, if anything, was missing from your education that you feel might have made you a better physical education teacher at the (elem/sec.) level? _____

16. Were you an outstanding physical education teacher? YES NO (If Yes, what indications did you have of this?) _____

17. What is the mark of an outstanding physical education teacher? _____

18. What are the goals of an outstanding school physical education program? _____

19. When did you decide to leave teaching physical education at the (elem./sec.) level? Why did you decide to leave? _____

The next section of questions is directed toward your decision to pursue the doctorate.

20. When did you decide to pursue the doctorate, and why? _____

21. Why did you choose...(inst. named in quest. 3) for your doctorate?

22. Did you apply else where? YES NO Quantity .

23. When did you decide to pursue a position as a professor? _____

24. Was your decision to become a professor based on reasons different from your decision to pursue the doctorate? YES NO If yes, can you comment on these reasons?

The next few questions require you to differentiate between your perceptions of the real and the ideal.

25. Before you began your doctoral program, how did you perceive the role of the professor of teacher education in physical education?

26. Is this what you believed the role should be—at that point of your career?
YES NO If No, what did you believe the role should be? _____

27. Upon completion of your doctoral program, had your perceptions of the actual role of the professor of teacher education in physical education changed?
YES NO If yes, in what ways? _____

28. Had your perceptions of what the role should be changed? YES NO
If yes, in what way(s)? _____

29. Do your perceptions of your role differ now from your immediate post-doctoral perceptions? YES NO If yes, in what way(s)? _____

If yes, can you comment on the main influence(s) of this change? _____

30. Do your perceptions of what your role should be differ now from your post-doctoral perceptions? YES NO If yes, in what way(s)? _____

If yes, can you comment on the main influence(s) of this change? _____

31. Have the responsibilities of your job changed since you began work at the university level? YES NO If yes, in what way(s)? _____

32. Are you pleased with your decision to leave teaching at the (elem./sec.) level for work at the university level? YES NO
33. Are you satisfied in your position now, as a university professor? YES NO
34. Have you always felt this way? YES NO If No, can you comment on the main influence(s) of this change? _____

35. Looking at your present responsibilities in this university, what were the strengths of your graduate education and why? _____

36. Again thinking about your current responsibilities, what were the weaknesses of your graduate education (doctorate) and why? _____

37. What, if anything, was missing from your graduate education (doctorate), that you feel might have made you a better professor of teacher education in physical education? _____

38. What are the University of (inst. of employment)'s criteria for success for teacher educators in physical education? _____
- _____
39. Are you a successful teacher educator? YES NO What signs do you have of this? _____
- _____
40. What are the specific qualities of a successful teacher educator in physical education?
41. What are the specific qualifications of a successful teacher educator in physical education?.

QUALITIES

QUALIFICATIONS

42. Do you think that all physical education teacher education faculty members should regularly supervise student teachers? YES NO Why? (or) Why not? _____
- _____
43. Would you recommend the hiring of a physical education teacher education faculty member who did not have actual teaching experience at either the elementary or secondary school levels? YES NO Why? (or) Why not? _____
- _____
- _____

44. The following descriptors are commonly used when describing the job you hold:

(self)

TEACHING COACHING RESEARCH SERVICE

(univ)

Rank these in order of importance, beginning with the most important from your own personal perspective. Now, rank them from the perspective of the University of (inst of employment).

45. Do you also coach at this university? YES NO

46. Is the role of coach compatible with the responsibilities for teaching at the elem/sec level? _____

At the university level? _____

47. What are the characteristics of an outstanding physical education teacher education program? _____

48. If you could change the role you perform now, what, if anything, would you change? _____

49. That concludes the questions that I have prepared for this study. Is there anything else that you can think of, that I have not asked, that you feel was significant in your decision to become a university professor?

(Use a separate page if necessary)

Thank you again for your time and cooperation in this study.