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ABSTRACT

Occupational socialization (OS) research has assisted in training preservice and developing inservice mainstream physical education teachers. Study one examined OS’s influence on the practices and perspectives of adapted physical educators (APEs). Qualitative data were analyzed using analytic induction and constant comparison. The APEs possessed traditional or progressive teaching orientations having been indirectly attracted to a career as an APE through participation in sport and physical activity and interactions with persons with disabilities. High quality adapted physical education teacher education (A-PETE) appeared to exert a powerful influence on their values and pedagogies. School cultures and conditions experienced upon workforce entry served to either support or negate their programs. Several hypotheses are provided regarding the influences of acculturation, professional socialization, and OS on inservice APEs’ teaching.

The second study described OS’s impact on nine Korean teachers’ reading and delivery of PE. Qualitative data were analyzed by analytic induction and constant comparison. Findings showed the teachers underwent a unique pattern of OS resulting in seven of them possessing teaching orientations, one being coaching oriented, and one having a non-teaching orientation. The teachers’ acculturation led to a high proportion of them being teaching oriented on entering PETE where traditional PETE reinforced this orientation. Innovative school cultures offset and compensated for the weak PETE experienced by some teachers. Suggestions for future research in this line were made.
The third study examined OS’s influences on 11 international sport pedagogy faculty members’ (FMs) perspectives and practices regarding physical education teaching and PETE. Data sources (formal and informal interviews and documents illustrating the FMs’ practices) were analyzed using constant comparison and analytic induction. FMs’ current perspectives and practices did not differ from those espoused by native-born FMs and there were few differences between perspectives and practices of FMs from different regions of the world. The acculturation, primary professional socialization, and primary OS of most FMs had been positive leading to them possess strong traditional teaching orientations early in their careers. FMs’ secondary professional socialization generally impacted their development of progressive ideas about physical education and PETE. FMs’ secondary organizational socialization was also largely supportive of these progressive beliefs.
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INTRODUCTION

Occupational socialization (OS) research has assisted in training preservice and developing inservice mainstream physical education teachers. Following Lawson’s (1983a, 1983b) early theoretical work, research examining the occupational socialization of mainstream physical education teachers in the last 33 years has provided much important information that helps to explain why physical education teachers think and act in the ways that they do (Curtner-Smith, 2009; Templin & Richards, 2014). This research has been extremely useful in terms of providing a basis for both training preservice teachers and developing inservice teachers. Specifically, it has given physical education teacher education (PETE) faculty strong clues as to how to go about deconstructing faulty ideas and values, reconstructing good ones, and improving practice (Vollmer & Curtner-Smith, 2016).

Little is known about the OS of adapted physical educators (APEs), Korean physical educators, and international sports pedagogy faculty members (FMs). Therefore, the study one examined OS’s influence on the practices and perspectives of APEs. The second study described OS’s impact on nine Korean teachers’ reading and delivery of PE. The third study examined OS’s influences on 11 international sport pedagogy faculty members’ perspectives and practices regarding physical education teaching and PETE. Data sources (formal and informal interviews and documents illustrating the FMs’ practices) were analyzed using constant comparison and analytic induction.
CHAPTER I

INFLUENCE OF OCCUPATIONAL SOCIALIZATION ON THE PERSPECTIVES AND PRACTICES OF ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

Abstract

Occupational socialization research has been helpful in terms of providing a basis for training preservice and developing inservice mainstream physical education teachers. The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of occupational socialization on the practices and perspectives of nine American adapted physical educators (APEs). Data were collected through six qualitative techniques and analyzed by using the techniques of analytic induction and constant comparison. At the time the study was conducted, the APEs’ possessed traditional or progressive teaching orientations and were committed to their field. They had been indirectly attracted to a career as an APE through their participation in sport and physical activity and interactions with persons with disabilities, and had gone through a process in which they eliminated alternative careers. The quality of adapted physical education teacher education (A-PETE) the APEs received varied, but high quality A-PETE appeared to exert a powerful influence on their values and pedagogies. The school cultures and conditions in which the APEs worked on entry into the workforce either served to support or negate their programs. We conclude the paper by providing several hypotheses regarding the influences of acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization on inservice APEs’ teaching.

Key Words: occupational socialization, adapted physical education
Introduction

Following Lawson’s (1983a, 1983b) early theoretical work, research examining the occupational socialization of mainstream physical education teachers in the last 33 years has provided much important information that helps to explain why physical education teachers think and act in the ways that they do (Curtner-Smith, 2009; Templin & Richards, 2014). This research has been extremely useful in terms of providing a basis for both training preservice teachers and developing inservice teachers. Specifically, it has given physical education teacher education (PETE) faculty strong clues as to how to go about deconstructing faulty ideas and values, reconstructing good ones, and improving practice (Vollmer & Curtner-Smith, 2016).

Research of mainstream physical education teachers’ occupational socialization has focused on three sub-phases of socialization: acculturation (the impact of biography prior to PETE), professional socialization (i.e., the influence of PETE), and organizational socialization (i.e., the influence of the school culture on inservice teachers). Acculturation has been shown to have a profound influence on future physical education teachers’ thinking and practice (Curtner-Smith, in press). Key individuals who influence future physical educators during this period are family members, peers, and coaches of youth sport (Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin, 2008; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009). Of prime importance, however, is the “apprenticeship of observation” (Lortie, 1975) prospective teachers experience during their own schooling (Schempp, 1989). Specifically, the interactions prospective recruits have with physical education teachers, extracurricular sport coaches, and teachers of other subjects during their childhood and youth both attract them to the profession and shape their views about teaching in general and teaching physical education in particular (Curtner-Smith et al. 2008; Flory & McCaughtry, 2014). Moreover, these views become part of recruits’ “subjective warrants” (Lortie, 1975) when
they decide if they have the ability and ambition to carry out the role of physical education teacher as they perceive it (Dewar & Lawson, 1984).

Research indicates that recruits are often attracted to a career in physical education because of their success in and enjoyment of the subject, sport, and physical activity, and their desire to remain engaged and fit (Capel, Hayes, Katene, & Velija, 2011; Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011). Conversely, some recruits recall themselves and others being inactive, overweight, and unhealthy when younger and suffering a particularly negative experience during physical education. These recruits opt for their chosen career path because they are motivated to help children and youth facing a similar predicament (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009; Wright, 2001). Other attractors to a career in physical education teaching include the opportunity to aid the local community, the prospect of working with young people, congruence with middle class values, and lengthy holidays (Hutchinson, 1993). Furthermore, some recruits decide on a career in teaching relatively early and others relatively late (Lortie, 1975). “Late deciders” to a career in physical education appear to be more committed to the subject than “early deciders” and so are more likely to take notice of their PETE (Doolittle, Placek, & Dodds, 1993).

Crucially, research has confirmed Lawson’s (1983a, 1983b) original hypotheses that the acculturation period produces two broad types of PETE recruit (Curtner-Smith, 1999; Richards, Templin, & Graber, 2014). Recruits with coaching orientations view teaching curricular physical education as a “career contingency” and are likely to adopt a “non-teaching perspective” (Crum, 1993) to the subject, employ poor and outdated pedagogies, or avoid teaching at all. These recruits are primarily interested in working with talented students during extracurricular sport practices and competitive games. They tend to be male, have played a relatively high level of mainstream competitive sport themselves, and attended schools in which teachers also gave
priority to extracurricular sport and made little effort to provide quality curricular physical education (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008).

Conversely, recruits with teaching orientations view coaching extracurricular sport as a career contingency and are committed to providing high quality curricular physical education programs. These recruits tend to be female; have participated in non-sporting physical activity (e.g., fitness activities), relatively low levels of traditional team sport, or relatively high levels of minor sport; and attended schools in which administrators and teachers prioritized curricular physical education over the provision of extracurricular sport (Curtner-Smith, 1999, 2001; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009).

During the professional socialization phase, PETE, regardless of its quality, has generally been shown to have little or no impact on recruits with “hard core” coaching orientations (Sofo & Curtner-Smith, 2010). High quality PETE, however, can change the perspectives and practices of recruits with moderate coaching orientations and have a profoundly positive impact on those recruits with teaching orientations (Curtner-Smith, 1997; 2001). Conversely low quality PETE deters teaching-oriented recruits from continuing in their programs (Smith, 1993) and reinforces the views of those recruits with coaching orientations (Stroot & Ko, 2006).

Research has revealed high quality PETE to be staffed by faculty with specific qualifications in sport pedagogy who model a teaching orientation (e.g., do not coach university sports teams), are credible in the eyes of preservice teachers, and focus on overtly changing recruits’ faulty ideas about practice for the better. Moreover, these faculties agree philosophically and have a “shared technical culture” (Lortie, 1975) (i.e., espouse the same pedagogies and models of instruction). In addition, they oversee programs in which early field experiences and the culminating student teaching internship are tightly controlled and supervised so as to protect
recruits from the influences of coaching-oriented elements in the schools they visit. Finally, these faculties go to great lengths to find cooperating teachers with teaching orientations and train them to act as supervisors for their preservice teachers (Curtner-Smith, 1996; 2009).

The influence of organizational socialization on newly graduated physical educators is also very potent (Smyth, 1995). The school culture is generally conservative and operates as “institutional press” (Zeichner & Tabachnik, 1983). For physical education teachers, this press comes in the form of more senior coaching-oriented physical education teachers who espouse poor practice and administrators who support them, as well as parents and students (Curtner-Smith, 1997, 2001; Schempp & Graber, 1992). Specifically, the press tends to squeeze the pedagogical life out of neophyte innovative physical educators with teaching orientations and support those beginning teachers with coaching orientations (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). This means that the perspectives and practices acquired by some teaching-oriented physical educators are quickly “washed out” (Zeichner & Tabachnik, 1981) once they enter the world of work. Washout occurs when teachers protect themselves by “strategically complying” (Lacey, 1977) with or “strategically adjusting” (Etheridge, 1989) to the conservative cultures with which they are faced, reasoning that they will revert to employing the pedagogies they were trained to use during PETE when conditions become more favorable (Curtner-Smith, 1997). If the school culture does not change, however, in time this compliance and adjustment solidifies and the innovative pedagogies and ideas with which the teachers began their careers are lost. Conversely, some teaching oriented-teachers fight back against the prevailing culture and attempt to “strategically redefine” (Lacey, 1977) their departments by refusing to bow to the status quo and, instead, continuing to espouse and employ the practices that they were trained to use (Curtner-Smith, 2001). Sometimes such action can be defiantly overt. More often it is covert and involves
teachers engaging in “guerilla teaching” (Curtner-Smith, 1997); that is, employing practices not supported by senior teachers and administrators when they cannot be detected. Finally, those schools staffed by innovative and progressive administrators and teachers are likely to produce a culture that encourages beginning physical educators with teaching orientations to teach as they were trained (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). On the downside, coaching-oriented neophytes employed in such schools may strategically comply, adjust to the prevailing culture, or attempt to strategically redefine their physical education departments’ practices and perspectives for the worse (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b).

Little is known about the occupational socialization of adapted physical educators (APEs), the subset of physical education teachers who cater specifically to the 13% of students with disabilities in the United States (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). Given that there is some evidence indicating that the pattern of socialization for another subset of physical educators—those concerned with adventure education—differs from mainstream physical education teachers (Zmudy, Curtner-Smith, & Steffen 2009), it may well be that there are also marked departures from these traditional patterns of socialization for APEs. For example, it would be useful to find out if APEs have different orientations to their subject matter, which elements of their Adapted PETE (A-PETE) are most and least effective, and how school culture and conditions affect their work.

Direct research of APEs’ acculturation or professional socialization is scant. There is, however, some evidence indicating that female faculty members training APEs in universities were originally attracted to the role when working with persons with disabilities in their youth. This attraction was strengthened while taking the A-PETE course offered within most PETE programs (Yang & Elliott, 1999). In addition, results of studies not directly investigating
occupational socialization suggest that APEs’ organizational socialization is problematic, conservative, oppressive, and unlikely to encourage those with innovative orientations to their subject matter. Specifically, inservice APEs have expressed concerns about poor facilities and equipment, lack of curricular time, having to work within large class sizes and with large caseloads, and being marginalized by administrators and other teachers (Hodge & Akuffo, 2007; Jesinova, Spurna, Kudlacek, & Sklenarikova, 2014). In contrast to regular physical education teachers, APEs have also noted that they feel under considerable pressure to provide high quality programs from the parents of their students (Chaapel, Columna, Lytle, & Bailey, 2013).

The purpose of the current study was to build on this previous work and directly examine the influence of occupational socialization on the practices and perspectives of one group of American APEs. Specifically, the goal was to describe the APEs’ acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization and how these three phases of socialization interacted.

Method

Participants

Participants were nine inservice APEs working in the public schools of three American states in different regions of the country. In congruence with university regulations on research with human subjects, each APE signed a consent form before participating in the study (see Appendix A).

The APEs were given fictitious names in order to protect their anonymity (see Table 1). All the APEs in the study were able bodied. Three were women and six men. Their ages ranged from 25 to 48 years and their teaching experience from 3 to 16 years. Eight of the APEs were peripatetic teachers traveling to a number of different schools. Conversely, Tiffany was
Table 1

APEs’ Socialization Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biographical Data</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>Hardin: 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James: 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa: 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tiffany: 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandy: 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill: 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travis: 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cindy: 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brad: 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experiences (years)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandy: 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travis: 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cindy: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brad: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade levels taught</td>
<td>Pre K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current orientation to teaching</td>
<td>Progressive Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progressive Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progressive Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalist Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progressive Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalist Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalist Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progressive Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progressive Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with person with disabilities prior to A-PETE</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientations prior to A-PETE</td>
<td>Traditionalist Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalist Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalist Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalist Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalist Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalist Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of A-PETE</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>Biographical Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s (PETE)</td>
<td>Hardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s (APE)</td>
<td>James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State APE Credential,</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s (PETE)</td>
<td>Tiffany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s (PETE)</td>
<td>Mandy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s (PETE)</td>
<td>Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s (PETE)</td>
<td>Travis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s (PETE)</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s (PETE)</td>
<td>Brad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s (PETE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State APE Credential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State APE Credential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State APE Credential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State APE Credential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s (Kinesiology),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State APE Credential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State APE Credential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Orien- | Progressive Teaching | Progressive Teaching | Progressive Teaching | Moderate Coaching |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Character entering workforce    | Progress             | Progress             | Moderate            |
| Satisfying                      | Positive/            | Positive/            | Moderate            |
| Conditions                      | Negative/            | Negative/            | Moderate            |
|                   | Unfavorable          | Unfavorable          | Moderate            |
|                   |                      |                      | Strategic           |
|                   |                      |                      | Compliance          |
|                   |                      |                      | Redefinition        |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping strategy</th>
<th>Strategic Compliance</th>
<th>Strategic Compliance</th>
<th>Found New Position</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
<th>Strategic Redefinition</th>
<th>Strategic Redefinition</th>
<th>Strategic Redefinition</th>
<th>Strategic Redefinition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Note: * Denotes participants teaching adults with disabilities
employed in a special school that catered solely to children with special needs in kindergarten through 12th grade (ages 4 to 18 years). Lisa, Bill, Travis, Cindy, and Brad also taught in schools catering to children and youth in kindergarten through 12th grade. James and Mandy taught children in kindergarten through eighth grade (ages 4 to 14 years). Hardin taught children and adolescents in pre-kindergarten (ages 3 to 4 years) through 12th grade. Bill and Brad also worked with adults with disabilities from their communities as part of their teaching loads.

The eight peripatetic teachers taught alongside general physical education teachers and worked with students who were integrated in regular physical education classes or in self-contained classes. None of the APEs had coaching duties as part of their loads, although Bill coached basketball and track and field to able bodied youth in his spare time. All of the APEs were qualified to teach through certification within their bachelor’s degrees. Lisa and Hardin had completed master’s degrees in adapted physical education and Brad had completed a master’s degree in Kinesiology. In addition, six of the APEs had gained the mandatory and additional APE credential from their state boards of education and Hardin had gained a national APE credential.

**Data Collection**

Data were collected using six qualitative techniques. Each participant was formally interviewed three times. During the first interview, APEs provided pertinent demographic data, explained their current perspectives and practices regarding teaching students with disabilities, and described their acculturation. During the second and third formal interviews, APEs discussed their professional socialization and organizational socialization. The formal interviews were semi-structured (Patton, 1990). APEs were asked the same lead questions but multiple follow-up prompts were permitted. Formal interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim.
Fieldwork was carried out during which Tiffany was informally interviewed and observed teaching, and the researcher took copious notes describing her pedagogies. The remaining APEs supplied film of their teaching and notes were made describing the pedagogies employed in these films. All APEs also supplied documents that illustrated their current perspectives and practices. Finally, the APEs provided a one-page fictional description of the ideal physical education lesson from an APE’s perspective.

**Data Analysis**

Initially, data were sorted into four subsets: perspectives and practices, acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization. Subsequently, each data subset was coded and categorized by employing the techniques of analytic induction and constant comparison (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Categories were collapsed into meaningful themes the goal of which was to explain how the various phases of the APEs’ occupational socialization had influenced their perspectives and practices. Trustworthiness and credibility of the analysis procedure was established by searching for negative cases, member checking, and triangulating findings with the six qualitative techniques (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

**Results and Discussion**

APEs’ Perspectives and Practices

In congruence with the literature on mainstream physical educators (Richards et al., 2014), the APEs’ acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization had significant but varying impacts on their paths into the profession and the ways in which they thought about and delivered their programs. Some of the patterns of influence and interactions among these different forms of socialization were similar to those for mainstream physical education teachers (Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011), while others were rather different.
Acculturation. Unlike mainstream physical education teachers (Vollmer & Curtner-Smith, 2016), the participants in this study were not directly attracted to a career as an APE during their acculturation. Nevertheless, their general interest in the field was shaped during this period by their experiences of sport and physical activity, interactions with persons with disabilities, and the process by which they eliminated competing careers.

Sport and physical activity. In a similar vein to mainstream physical education teachers (Capel et al., 2011; Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011), seven of the APEs in the current study could trace their initial interest in a career in the field primarily to their love of and heavy engagement in physical activity, physical education, and sport. The remaining two APEs, Mandy and Cindy, also noted that their participation in sport and physical activity had a strong secondary impact on their career choice. The following extract is illustrative of the role sport and physical activity played in the APEs’ career choice:

I liked to move and I was athletic. I felt that if I became an APE teacher, I could do more than just teaching games. I could actually educate students about their bodies, mechanics, health. . . . I wanted to bring the educational piece to it. (Lisa, progressive, formal interview 1)

Also consistent with the literature on physical educators’ occupational socialization (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008), the APEs’ interest in sport and physical activity was, in turn, kindled by family members and friends who were active or taught physical education. Tiffany, for example, noted that her “parents taught PE for 40 years and . . . so [she] grew up in a school, around school, and sports [her] whole life.” Similarly, Travis explained that,

Everyone was very physically active because of the nature of where we were living. There was no phone or TV. I got to play with my friends a lot. . . . I would rather go play in the park, in a game with a friend, or climb a tree than sit and watch TV. I was really drawn to physical activity. (Travis, traditionalist, formal interview 1)
In addition, the three traditionalists had taken part in relatively high levels of organized conventional competitive team sport which they enjoyed and became an attractor:

I played sports from the time I was 5. . . . I played baseball, basketball, and soccer from the time I was 5 to 8. Then I quit playing soccer and started playing football all the way through junior high, and continued to play in high school. (Bill, traditionalist, formal interview 1)

In contrast, progressives described participating in a relatively good standard of physical education and had fewer experiences in competitive sport:

I felt like PE was something fun during the day and I was very athletic. I just enjoyed being there. . . . We got into competitive sports. That’s where I learned volleyball and kind of fell in love with that. We were learning to play as teams. We were learning all sorts of sports—basketball, soccer, softball. Also, doing all that fitness testing. (Hardin, progressive, formal interview 1)

**Interactions with persons with disabilities.** APEs were categorized as having high, moderate, or low levels of interaction with persons with disabilities prior to entering their PETE programs (see Table 1). The low interactors (Bill and Travis) noted that they “had not had much exposure to people with disabilities at all.” In contrast, APEs classed as moderate interactors had witnessed “APEs in action” during their own schooling or “volunteered to work with people with disabilities” within the “Special Olympics” and “best buddies” programs. These experiences were secondary attractors to the profession for this group.

For the two high interactors, and in line with APEs studied by Yang and Elliott (1999), experiences with persons with disabilities were the primary factor leading to their decision to enter the field. Mandy, for example, explained that she had lived with her niece who was born with cerebral palsy and emphasized that this experience had been instrumental in her becoming an APE:

My niece had a hard time getting to know and trust people. . . . When her physical therapist was seeing her, she wouldn’t let her touch her. I was there to help and the therapist was guiding me in proper techniques. . . . I decided when I was 13 that I wanted
to work with individuals with disabilities somehow and having that experience . . . with my niece kind of sparked that interest. (Mandy, progressive, formal interview 1)

Similarly, Cindy, had chosen to return to college to retrain as an APE at the age of 43, after her own children were diagnosed with disabilities and she had observed and worked with the APE who taught one of them:

One of my kids was in a special class. And I started seeing this APE and wondered what she did. And then I started investigating it . . . Then I volunteered with the APE at my kids’ school . . . and then I decided to go back to school to become an APE. (Cindy, progressive, formal interview 2)

**Eliminating alternative careers.** In line with previous research of both regular physical education teachers and APEs (Doolittle et al., 1993; Yang & Elliott, 1999) and the fact that they possessed teaching orientations, all of the participants in the current study decided to embark on a career as an APE relatively late and after entering or leaving college. Moreover, illustrating how subjective warrants (Lortie, 1975) for various careers compete with each other, all of the APEs arrived at this career choice having dismissed other possibilities. Hardin, for example, had initially considered “being a biology teacher,” Mandy had focused on “getting into PT [physical therapy] school,” Bill “wanted to be a sports agent,” and Tiffany originally planned on becoming a veterinarian:

I was hoping to get into [the] veterinarian program, and I actually went to the university and spoke to [an admissions officer] about getting in—like what the process was, that kind of thing. They pretty much told me I was going to have to take a few courses over again because my grades weren’t high enough. (Tiffany, traditionalist, formal interview 1)

**Professional socialization.** All of the APEs enrolled in regular PETE programs. At this stage of their careers, six of them had teaching orientations and three had coaching orientations (see Table 1). Their undergraduate A-PETE consisted of one course with a related “clinical experience” within their PETE programs. Those who gained their state’s APE credential did so
directly after working on their undergraduate degrees. Studying for these state credentials involved completing 16 to 21 hours of additional state-approved college courses. The master’s degrees completed by Hardin and Lisa included additional coursework on “special education” in general, and A-PETE courses focused on “inclusion practice,” “strategies for working with other professionals,” “research methods,” and extensive opportunities to teach children and youth with disabilities in the field. Moreover, Hardin and Lisa noted that they were required to teach the undergraduate A-PETE course at their respective institutions as part of their master’s work. Brad’s master’s degree in kinesiology did not include any courses in adapted physical education.

In contrast to studies of mainstream physical education (Richards et al., 2014), high quality A-PETE was shown to exert a particularly powerful influence on those APEs who received it (see Table 1). This appeared to be because the APEs in the current study had not experienced a sustained, in-depth apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975) focused specifically on adapted physical education during their own schooling. Moreover, to a large extent the APEs divorced their experiences of regular physical education from their limited experiences of adapted physical education because they were “dissimilar.” This meant that they entered PETE with few preconceived and hardened notions about what the role of an APE entailed and so were receptive to the values and pedagogies espoused in the A-PETE component of their programs.

*Characteristics of high quality A-PETE.* Six of the APEs received high quality A-PETE (see Table 1). These programs involved coursework that was relevant to the “real world” and was “related to” and “useful for” clinical experiences. Material that the APEs found helpful included “a vast amount of information on different disabilities,” “adapted equipment,” and “assessments;” explanations and demonstrations of how to “modify” and “adapt” sports and
physical activities for students with disabilities, and, to a lesser extent, “laws” pertaining to
disability. In addition, this level of A-PETE was taught by “passionate,” “knowledgeable,” and
“professional” instructors.

According to the APEs, however, the most important component of their A-PETE was
the clinical experience. During these experiences, APEs recalled “observing APEs,” “trying out”
pedagogies, “connecting” with students, and “learning to be creative.” James, for example,
explained that:

Lecture class was accompanied by a clinical class where we got to work with kids with
disabilities from the community once a week, every week. And we got to actually apply
different modifications and different teaching methods with a variety of students with
disabilities. . . . One of my favorite things . . . was that I got to work with a student with a
disability in an APE clinic and feeling that connection that we had. . . . He [i.e, the
student] really wanted to get to know me and it was a pretty cool connection. (James,
progressive, formal interview 2)

In addition, three APEs noted that clinicals in which they worked “one-on-one” with
students were preferable to “group settings.” This was because they could make “better
connections” with their charges and this format helped them understand that students were
“unique” and had “individual needs.” All six of the APEs also explained that being “mentored”
by high quality cooperating teachers during clinical experiences was crucial to their improved
ability to “handle stress,” “confidence,” and pedagogical skill.

Encouragingly, those APEs who received high quality A-PETE were particularly
confident in their ability to teach on graduating:

I was just ecstatic. I felt like I had a Ph.D. I felt so confident. I felt that I could teach. I
felt like the program prepared me well and I was knowledgeable enough to cover some of
the professors’ classes. I had the feeling that I was going to change the world. (Lisa,
progressive, formal interview 2)

**Characteristics of low quality A-PETE.** Three of the APEs received low quality A-PETE
(see Table 1). Classroom-based coursework within these programs included material on
“different disabilities” and “basic accommodation or modifications to sports and physical activities.” Pedagogical training and inspired mentoring, however, were “minimal,” and a good deal of time was spent on topics the APEs considered peripheral such as “the history of adapted physical education.” Furthermore, low quality programs included fewer opportunities to engage in clinical experiences and the standard of such experiences was relatively poor in terms of “supervision,” quality of “placements,” and the amount of time allocated for “actual teaching.” Consequently, APEs graduating from these programs considered themselves “overwhelmed,” “underprepared,” and “incompetent.”

Organizational socialization. Six of the APEs began their teaching careers with progressive teaching orientations (see Table 1). Tiffany, Travis, and Bill started out with their coaching orientations intact even though they had no official coaching duties to perform. Like regular physical education teachers (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008), the APEs encountered a variety of cultures and conditions in the workplace. Some elements of these cultures and conditions were positive and favorable and others were negative and unfavorable (see Table 1).

School cultures. The school cultures in which the APEs worked were created by administrators, teachers of other subjects, paraprofessionals, regular physical education teachers, other APEs with whom they taught or encountered as they moved from school to school, and, to a lesser extent, parents and students. The greater the number of these adult personnel who “valued” what the APEs did, the better the APEs’ working environments. The fewer the number of adult “supporters” the APEs had from among these groups and the lower their “expectations” for adapted physical education, the more “out of the loop,” marginalized, and “frustrated” the APEs felt:

I wanted to teach them basketball and, honestly, it’s my first year so I didn’t have the money to buy a portable basketball hoop. So I asked the [regular] PE teachers if I could
use one hoop so I could teach my kids basketball; and they came back to me and said, “No we've got more kids than you and we need all of them.” . . . I went to the principal . . . and he wouldn’t do anything. (Mandy, progressive, formal interview 3)

The paraprofessionals that I had to work with followed the classroom teachers and they didn’t have any respect for me. They saw how I was treated by their classroom teachers. . . . They didn’t recognize me as a teacher. . . . My speculation is that traditional PE was lowest on their scale and we [i.e., APEs] were the least important. They didn’t take us seriously. (Lisa, progressive, formal interview 3)

The most important personnel the study APEs came into contact with, however, were clearly other more experienced APEs. Strong and supportive APEs could, to a large extent, offset the more negative and less helpful attitudes of other colleagues. Specifically, they provided “lots of advice” and “feedback” and buoyed those study participants who began work with progressive teaching orientations, but who encountered unfavorable conditions:

[An experienced APE] would observe me . . . and we'd have lots of conversations. I am still very close with her even today. She was the only one that gave me guidance. I didn’t know exactly what I was getting myself into and the administration, who you would think would be the ones helping, were not doing anything. . . . We would meet at least couple of times a week and we would discuss what I was doing. . . . She gave me a lot of ideas to target skills in fun way. . . . I knew she wasn’t going to go anywhere and I knew she wouldn’t judge me. She was amazing. (Mandy, progressive, formal interview 3)

In addition, the “mentoring” provided by more experienced APEs, coupled with the “high expectations” and “support” for their programs shown by parents, helped Tiffany, Bill, and Travis shift from the coaching perspective they began their careers with to a traditional teaching orientation:

I was fortunate enough to work with a guy who had been teaching a year before me. He’s probably the best person I’ve come across as far as just working in the field. . . . I learned everything just from talking to this guy. . . . We just bounced ideas off each other a lot. (Bill, traditionalist, formal interview 3)

Conversely, when already isolated, teaching-oriented study participants encountered more experienced APEs who did not share their values and beliefs, they felt particularly “frustrated” and “alone.”
Students also lifted the demeanor of the APEs when they “learned new skills” and “achieved their IEP [individualized educational program] goals.” Conversely, the APEs suffered from “culture shock” and “struggled” when teaching students with more severe disabilities than they had witnessed during their A-PETE:

My experience with students with disabilities [during A-PETE] was on the higher end. . . . I mean, I did have some lower ability experience but not so much in an all-day every day kind of situation . . . [and] within a group high ability students. . . . I didn’t know what to do with them. (Tiffany, traditionalist, formal interview 3)

**Working conditions.** Apart from Tiffany, who had her own gym, “fitness area,” and “plentiful” equipment, and in agreement with previous research (Jesinova et al., 2014), the APEs worked in “undesirable” conditions. For example, their caseloads were heavy and ranged from 75 to 120 students. Moreover, the peripatetic APEs often had to purchase equipment and were provided with little space in which to store it. In addition, “interruptions” when teaching were common and gym space was often “limited” or “lost” completely because it was being used for other purposes. These working conditions served to negate the quality of the programs delivered by all the APEs that encountered them.

**Coping strategies.** The APEs adopted one of four strategies to cope with the cultures and working conditions they encountered on entering the workforce (see Table 1). Tiffany complied fully with the positive culture she encountered because her working conditions were also favorable. Conversely, Lisa, who came up against the most negative culture and least favorable conditions, decided to “move on” and find a new position explaining that she “couldn’t take another year of that.”

The remaining seven APEs who also faced unfavorable conditions adopted one of two strategies. Bill, Travis, and Brad encountered positive cultures and worked with administrators and other teachers to strategically redefine (Lacey, 1977) their working conditions. Conversely,
Hardin and James encountered negative cultures and strategically complied (Lacey, 1977) with their “situations,” admitting that they were not “not totally happy with how things were going,” explaining that they “maintained their professionalism,” and hoping that “things would improve.” There was no indication, however, that beliefs and pedagogies were washed out (Zeichner & Tabachnik, 1981). Finally, Mandy and Cindy fought back against the negative cultures and unfavorable conditions they encountered by employing a more combative form of strategic redefinition:

I’ve been called a bitch because I fight for my kids. . . . That has helped push me to make sure that these kids are getting the best that they can. And I will fight for them and I’m fine with being called a bitch because I’m doing the right thing by them. (Mandy, progressive, formal interview 3)

Conclusions

By combining the results of our study with extrapolations from the theoretical work pertaining to regular physical education teachers’ occupational socialization (Curtner-Smith et al. 2008; Lawson, 1983a, 1983b) and previous research that indirectly described APEs’ training and work conditions (Hodge & Akuffo, 2007; Jesinova et al., 2014), we developed several tentative hypotheses about the occupational socialization of APEs. These hypotheses are concerned with the types of preservice physical education teachers that will be attracted to a career as an APE, the quality of A-PETE they are likely to experience, the school cultures and conditions they will encounter on graduating, and the types of programs they will deliver in those schools (see Table 2). With these hypotheses, we hope to stimulate more research of APEs’ occupational socialization and to provide a theoretical base from which this work can begin.

Table 2 indicates that two different types of preservice physical education teacher will be attracted to a career as an APE—those with moderate coaching orientations and those with
Table 2

Hypotheses Regarding the Influence of Acculturation, Professional Socialization, and Organizational Socialization on Inservice APEs’ Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Preservice Teachers Shaped by Acculturation and Entering A-PETE</th>
<th>Professional Socialization</th>
<th>Organizational Socialization</th>
<th>Type of A-PETE Program Delivered in schools/standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Moderate coaching orientation</td>
<td>High quality A-PETE</td>
<td>Positive culture/conditions</td>
<td>Progressive/high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low quality A-PETE</td>
<td>Positive culture/conditions</td>
<td>Traditional/moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High quality A-PETE</td>
<td>Negative culture/conditions</td>
<td>Traditional/moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low quality A-PETE</td>
<td>Negative culture/conditions</td>
<td>Traditional/low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Traditional teaching orientation</td>
<td>High quality A-PETE</td>
<td>Positive culture/conditions</td>
<td>Progressive/high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low quality A-PETE</td>
<td>Positive culture/conditions</td>
<td>Traditional/moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High quality A-PETE</td>
<td>Negative culture/conditions</td>
<td>Progressive/moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low quality A-PETE</td>
<td>Negative culture/conditions</td>
<td>Traditional/low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
traditional teaching orientations. We suggest, then, that preservice physical education teachers with hard core coaching orientations are unlikely to be attracted to adapted physical education.

Furthermore, Table 2 suggests that preservice APEs will receive either high or low quality A-PETE, and that on graduating they will work in schools with positive and nurturing cultures and conditions or negative and unfavorable cultures and conditions. In addition, the figure indicates that inservice APEs will deliver either a traditional or a progressive program and that these programs will be of varying standards.

Specifically, we suggest that preservice APEs who begin their training with moderate coaching orientations, experience high quality A-PETE, and work in positive cultures and conditions will deliver high quality progressive programs. In contrast, APEs who enter A-PETE with moderate coaching orientations will deliver traditional programs of a moderate standard when they have experienced low quality A-PETE but work in favorable conditions, or received high quality A-PETE but work in negative cultures. Moreover, individuals who begin their teacher preparation with moderate coaching orientations, receive low quality A-PETE, and work in unfavorable conditions, we suggest, will provide their students with low quality traditional instruction.

Table 2 also indicates that we expect the interactions of acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization to have the same influences on preservice teachers who enter A-PETE with traditional teaching orientations as they have on those who enter with moderate coaching orientations with one exception. Since APEs who enter A-PETE with traditional teaching orientations are likely to be more committed to teaching in general and adapted physical education in particular, we theorize that when they receive high quality A-PETE they are likely to attempt to deliver progressive programs even when faced with
unfavorable conditions. These conditions, however, will mean that they are only moderately successful.
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CHAPTER II
IMPACT OF OCCUPATIONAL SOCIALIZATION ON SOUTH KOREAN TEACHERS’ READING AND DELIVERY OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Abstract

Understanding how physical education (PE) teachers in a particular culture are socialized into the profession can lead to improvements in PE teacher education (PETE) and professional development. The purpose of this study was to describe the impact of occupational socialization on nine Korean teachers’ reading and delivery of PE. Data were collected with five qualitative techniques and analyzed by employing analytic induction and constant comparison. Key findings were that the teachers underwent a unique pattern of occupational socialization which resulted in seven of them possessing teaching orientations, one being coaching oriented, and one having a non-teaching orientation. The teachers’ acculturation led to a high proportion of them being teaching oriented on entering PETE. Traditional PETE was more potent than other forms of PETE and reinforced the teaching orientations of those who experienced it. Innovative school cultures offset and compensated for the weak PETE experienced by some teachers. Suggestions for future research in this line are made.

Key Words: Occupational socialization, physical education, South Korea
Introduction

In the last 35 years, research in the areas of occupational socialization (Curtner-Smith, 2009; Richards, Templin, & Graber, 2014; Templin & Richards, 2014) and theory building (Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin, 2008; Lawson, 1983a; 1983b) has revealed how physical education (PE) teachers develop beliefs and values about their subject. These beliefs and values, in turn, influence how teachers read and deliver their subject matter and different models of instruction (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009; Vollmer & Curtner-Smith, 2016). Consequently, this line of research has proven useful for those designing and teaching within undergraduate PE teacher education (PETE) programs or conducting professional development courses for inservice teachers.

The research carried out in this line to date has mainly focused on PE teachers’ acculturation (i.e., influences of pre-PETE biographies), professional socialization (i.e., the effects of PETE), and organizational socialization (i.e., the impact of the culture) (Curtner-Smith, 2009). Although it is an unequal contest that favors institutions and culture, this research has revealed that occupational socialization is a dialectical process in which individual teachers can push back against prevailing views and practices and, as a result, change both “the system” and themselves (Schempp & Graber, 1992).

During the acculturation period, research has indicated that recruits into PETE develop a “subjective warrant” (Dewar & Lawson, 1984) for PE. This consists of a set of beliefs and values about the subject’s objectives, pedagogies, and demands on teachers coupled with a self-assessment as to whether the individual has the aptitude, ability, and ambition to carry out the role of PE teacher. Potential recruits also form subjective warrants for other professions and
jobs and these compete with their subjective warrants for PE (Lawson, 1983a). Career choice, then, involves comparing and contrasting subjective warrants for multiple occupations.

Interest in PE as a career is often sparked by a love of physical activity and sport which is nurtured by active and sporting parents, relatives, and peers (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008), and experiences in organized youth sport (Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009). In addition, relatives already in the teaching profession act as role models (Curtner-Smith, 1998). The attraction to the profession strengthens when recruits consider its compatibility with middle-class perspectives, and the potential to enjoy lengthy holidays, contribute to local communities, and work with young persons (Hutchinson, 1993).

Key in the development of recruits’ subjective warrants is the “apprenticeship of observation” (Lortie, 1975) they receive during their own schooling (Schempp, 1989). Specifically, recruits’ beliefs about the subject are shaped by their experiences in PE, extracurricular sport, and other school subjects as pupils; and by their PE teachers, school sport coaches, and teachers of other subjects (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009). Collectively, these experiences and individuals are usually perceived very positively. Some recruits, however, appear to be at least partially motivated to become PE teachers in order to improve on the substandard programs they or their peers endured (Curtner-Smith, 2001).

The apprenticeship of observation produces two broad types of recruits who enter PETE programs (Curtner-Smith, 1999; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Lawson, 1983a; 1983b). Teaching oriented recruits are committed to delivering a high standard of curricular PE and view coaching extracurricular sports teams as a “career contingency.” They are more likely to be female and to have participated in minor competitive sports, a low level of major competitive sport, or non-competitive physical activity. In addition, they are likely to have experienced high quality PE
programs taught by effective teachers in schools in which the importance of extracurricular sport, in terms of competing and winning, was downplayed. In contrast, coaching oriented recruits view teaching curricular PE as a career contingency and are focused on working with the “athletes” playing on extracurricular sports teams. They are more likely to be male and to have experienced low quality PE programs delivered by teachers with a “non-teaching perspective” (Crum, 1993) in schools where winning in extracurricular school sport was viewed as important. In addition, they are more likely to have participated with some success in a relatively high level of major sport.

Research has also revealed that professional socialization is the least potent of the three forms of socialization that influence PE teachers (Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011). High quality PETE programs, however, have been shown to strengthen the beliefs and values of teaching oriented preservice teachers and change those of preservice teachers with “moderate coaching orientations” for the better. Unfortunately, they have little impact on preservice teachers with “hard core” coaching orientations (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Sofo & Curtner-Smith, 2010). Conversely, low quality programs can drive disillusioned teaching oriented preservice teachers from the profession (Smith, 1993) and reinforce the beliefs and values of those with coaching orientations (Doolittle, Dodds, & Placek, 1993; Stroot & Ko, 2006). Moreover, there is some evidence to suggest that those who make the decision to enter PETE relatively late are more likely to be influenced by high quality programs than those who make this decision relatively early (Doolittle et al., 1993). This may be because late deciders are older, have thought through their career choice more carefully, and are more certain about what they wish to achieve (Curtner-Smith, 1997).
The quality of PETE programs has been shown to be determined by several factors. The degree to which faculty are prepared to try and change the misconceptions with which coaching oriented preservice teachers enter PETE is crucial (Curtner-Smith, 1998; Schempp & Graber, 1992; Vollmer & Curtner-Smith, 2016), as is the extent to which they agree on a teaching philosophy and the technical skills and models they will attempt to train their charges to use (Lortie, 1975). In addition, higher quality programs are staffed by non-coaching faculty with specialist credentials in sport pedagogy who provide close supervision of preservice teachers when they engage in practice teaching in local schools (Curtner-Smith, 1996).

Organizational socialization research has indicated that school cultures are generally conservative and serve to transmit current views, values and pedagogies from one generation of teachers to the next (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b). Key individuals responsible for this transmission include senior teachers, administrators, pupils, and parents (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Schempp & Graber, 1992; Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, 2015). Collectively, they serve to support the views and practices of PE teachers who start work with coaching orientations intact (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). Conversely, they act as an “institutional press” (Zeichner & Tabachnik, 1983) which crushes or “washes out” (Zeichner & Tabachnik, 1981) any innovative views and pedagogies with which teaching oriented PE teachers begin their careers. This process begins when teaching oriented teachers suffer “reality shock” (Veenman, 1984), lose confidence in what they learned during PETE, and “strategically comply” (Lacey, 1977) with the inhospitable conditions they find themselves facing. Often this is achieved by employing “strategic rhetoric” (Sparkes, 1987) that outwardly supports the school’s current practices, while inwardly retaining considerable reservations about them. Over time, if conditions fail to improve these teachers “strategically adjust” (Etheridge, 1989) to their new environment and adopt the views and values
of their colleagues permanently (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). On the upside, some beginning teaching oriented physical educators attempt to change the programs they work in for the better. Those working in the most difficult and oppressive conditions do this covertly by engaging in “guerilla teaching,” (Curtner-Smith, 1997), that is using good practice when they are not being observed and cannot be discovered. Those working in less daunting environments, however, may use the tactic of “strategic redefinition” (Lacey, 1977) and openly challenge what they consider to be poor values and practice (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Wright, 2001).

The bulk of the research on PE teachers’ occupational socialization has been carried out in the United States and Britain (e.g., Blankenship & Coleman, 2009; Curtner-Smith, 1999; Meek & Curtner-Smith, 2004; Richards & Templin, 2011). Studies in this line completed in other countries include those conducted by Wright (2001) (Singapore), Volkmann (2008) (Germany), Zounhia, Chatoupis, Amoutzas and Hatziharistos (2006) (Greece), and Mordal-Moen and Green (2014) (Norway). Findings of this work are largely congruent with the American and British literature. We believe that this may not be the case for countries in which different systems of PE and school sport exist. The purpose of this study, therefore, was to describe the impact of occupational socialization on South Korean (henceforth Korean) teachers’ reading and delivery of PE.

**PE and Sport in Korean Schools**

Education is one of the main cornerstones of modern Korea in general and the Korean economy in particular (Lee & Cho, 2014). Korean pupils achieve relatively more in terms of academic success than those in other countries and retention rates through Korean high school are extremely high (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2015). Conversely, high pressure to do well academically evidently causes a great deal of stress among
Korean pupils (Song, 2011; Statistics Korea, 2014). In addition, the focus on academic subjects, particular science, mathematics, and languages in the Korean educational system means that so-called practical subjects like PE are marginalized, perhaps to a greater extent than in most western cultures (Cho, 2001).

The national curricula for all Korean school subjects are controlled by the central government, although the most recent versions of these curricula provide teachers with considerably more autonomy than in the past (Lee & Cho, 2014; Yoo & Kim, 2005). Nevertheless, the Korean National Curriculum for PE (KNCPE) provides guidance in terms of objectives, content, methods and evaluation for elementary and secondary schools (Ministry of Education, 2015).

In grades 1 and 2 at the elementary level, (ages 6 to 8 years), PE is combined and integrated with art and music to provide a holistic experience for pupils known as “pleasant life.” Key goals of this program are to develop creativity and expression through movement, the inference being that indirect teaching styles should be employed. During grades 3 to 6 (ages 8 to 11 years), the focus shifts to developing fundamental movement skills; fitness; and proficiency in sports, games, and rhythmic expression (Ministry of Education, 2015).

During both middle school (ages 12 to 15 years) and high school (ages 16 to 18 years) the major goals of the subject include creativity; leisure education, health and wellness, and skill acquisition in a number of sports, games, and physical activities. No curricular models or pedagogies are mandated but the implication is that the multi-activity and health-related fitness models will be those primarily employed and that teachers will use a range of direct and indirect teaching styles (Ministry of Education, 2015).
Evaluation of PE in Korean schools is mandated to take place annually. Teachers are encouraged to use a variety of methods including performance and written testing to assess within six domains of activity. These are health, challenges, competition, expression, leisure, and safety (Ministry of Education, 2015).

While much of the KNCPE is similar to those curricula prescribed or mandated in Western cultures, there are some notable differences. For example, at a time when Western curricula appear to be becoming ever more narrowly focused on health, and in some cases have been reduced to merely accruing minutes of physical activity, the model developed recently by Choi (2002) for Korean children and youth known as “Hanaro” focuses on the development of the whole child and is a something of a throwback to the philosophy of Hirst and Peters (1971). Most notably, this model includes a component designed to enhance pupils’ spirituality. Another somewhat unique aspect of Korean elementary and secondary school PE is that the teaching of the national martial arts of Tae Kwon Do and Taekyon is strongly supported (Ministry of Education, 2015).

Given what we know about the orientations of PE teachers in Western cultures, of potentially great significance is the radically different system for the provision of extracurricular school sport that exists in Korea. Historically, this provision has been limited or non-existent in most regular schools due to the focus on academic standards (Korean Institute of Sport Science, 2009; Lee & Cho, 2014). More recently, elementary and secondary schools have been encouraged to provide extracurricular programs in the form of clubs focused on traditional team and individual sports (Ministry of Education, 2013). Where they exist, these programs are usually managed by PE teachers or sports instructors hired specifically for the purpose. Importantly, the goals of these programs are to promote participation in physical activity among
all pupils as opposed to providing competitive sport for the more physically gifted (Cha, Huh, & Kim, 2015; Ministry of Education, 2013). In addition, the number of inter-school matches played between sports teams representing regular schools has been growing in Korea. Such contests, however, are seen as an extension of PE curricula and sports club programs and relatively little importance is attached to their results (Yoon, Kim, & Kim, 2014).

In contrast, there are a few secondary schools known as “PE sports schools” which employ specialist sport coaches and recruit particularly high-skilled and talented children and youth. These pupils participate in intensive sport development programs with the goal of becoming elite level athletes (Kang, Jeon, Kwon, & Park, 2015).

Another contrast with many Western cultures is that teaching in Korea remains a prestigious profession (Kim & Han, 2003). Like those in many Western cultures, the core of Korean PETE programs consists of courses focused on methods and the learning of content and pedagogical content knowledge. There are, however, relatively few opportunities for preservice teachers to engage in early field experiences prior to their culminating student teaching internship (Yoo, 2000). In addition, all preservice teachers, including those in PE, who wish to teach in elementary schools are trained at 1 of 13 universities that specialize in elementary education (Ministry of Education, 2006).

Although research of the working lives of Korean PE teachers is scarce, there is some positivistic evidence to suggest that a considerable portion suffer from burnout and that coping with relatively large class sizes contributes significantly to this state of affairs (Ha, King, & Naeger, 2011). There are also some data indicating that PE teachers who also administrate extracurricular school sport struggle due to considerable role strain and overload (Ha, Hums, & Greenwell, 2011).
Method

Participants

Nine PE teachers working in southeast Korea were purposefully selected for this study based on recommendations from local PETE professors. Prior to data collection, each of the teachers signed a consent form indicating their willingness to participate in the study (see Appendix B). The teachers were given fictitious names so as to protect their identities.

Demographic data for these teachers are shown in Table 3. The figure indicates that two of teachers were female and seven male. Their ages ranged from 27 to 58 years and the number of years they had been teaching ranged from 3 to 30 years. Five teachers worked in state schools and four in private schools. Two of the teachers worked at the elementary school level, five at the middle school level, and two at the high school level.

Data Collection

Data were collected with five qualitative techniques. Each teacher completed three formal interviews. During the first formal interview, they were asked to supply demographic information, to explain how they read PE, and to describe the curricula they delivered. In addition, they were asked to discuss their acculturation. During the second and third formal interviews, the teachers were asked about their professional and organizational socialization. Formal interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. Follow-up informal interviews were completed to confirm initial findings and solidify emerging trends and themes. Notes on the contents of these interviews were made as or directly after they occurred. Document analysis was used on materials developed and supplied by the teachers which illustrated their reading and delivery of their subject matter. In addition, four teachers supplied short film snippets of themselves in action with a short, written explanation of what was occurring. Finally, the
Table 3

*Teachers’ Socialization Profiles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biographical Detail</th>
<th>Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Su Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience (years)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of School</td>
<td>Elementary/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Orientation</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Duties</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of decision to enter PETE</td>
<td>Early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientations prior to entering PETE</td>
<td>Weak Teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (con’t)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biographical Detail</th>
<th>Su Man</th>
<th>Gi Yoon</th>
<th>Ho Jun</th>
<th>Myung</th>
<th>Sang Woo</th>
<th>Min Ji</th>
<th>Hyun Su</th>
<th>Gi Chur</th>
<th>Young Hee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of PETE</td>
<td>Within Specialist Elementary University</td>
<td>Post-Graduate</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Post-Graduate</td>
<td>Within Specialist Elementary University</td>
<td>Combined with A-PETE</td>
<td>Combined with A-PETE</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of PETE</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak but Positive Internship</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak but Positive Internship</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation on graduating from PETE</td>
<td>Weak Teaching</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>Strengthened Teaching</td>
<td>Strengthened Teaching</td>
<td>Strengthened Teaching</td>
<td>Weak Teaching</td>
<td>Non-Teaching</td>
<td>Strengthened Teaching</td>
<td>Strengthened Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Culture</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to school culture</td>
<td>Full Compliance</td>
<td>Full Compliance</td>
<td>Strategic Redefinition</td>
<td>Strategic Compliance</td>
<td>Strategic Compliance</td>
<td>Full Compliance</td>
<td>Full Compliance</td>
<td>Full Compliance</td>
<td>Strategic Redefinition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teachers wrote short *fictional curriculum outlines* in which they described their ideal PE curriculum in terms of Tyler’s (1949) rational planning components (i.e., objectives, content, methods, and evaluation), facilities, equipment, support, and pupil-teacher ratios.

**Data Analysis**

Raw data were collected in the Korean language. Data analysis, however, was completed in English. Korean-to-English translations were made carefully to ensure teachers’ intent and meaning were accurately conveyed. Translated data were sorted into four subsets concerning the teachers’ reading and delivery of PE, acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization. Each subset was reduced to key themes by employing analytic induction and constant comparison (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Credibility and trustworthiness were ensured by member checking during the follow-up informal interviews, triangulation between the five data collection techniques, and searches for negative cases (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

**Results and Discussion**

**Teachers’ Reading and Delivery of PE**

Seven of the teachers in the study possessed fairly conservative teaching orientations at the time data were collected. In contrast, Gi Yoon possessed a coaching orientation, and, following Crum (1993), Hyun Su possessed a “non-teaching orientation” (see Table 3).

**Teaching oriented teachers.** None of the seven teaching oriented teachers had extracurricular coaching responsibilities and so were totally focused on delivering “quality PE.” Key beliefs of this group were that pupils should acquire “movement” and “sports skills,” “participate in physical activity” so as to “increase . . . their health-related fitness,” and come to “appreciate lifelong leisure activities.” In addition, they believed that PE played a part in “all pupils”’ personal and social development, stressing that they learn how to “cooperate,” be able to
“interact positively” with peers, and understand the principles of “fair play.” There was, however, no mention of enhancing cognitive development or creativity through physical education by this group.

Three models dominated the curricula the teaching oriented teachers constructed. These were “movement education” at the elementary level and the traditional multi-activity model and health-related models at all levels of schooling. Content taught within movement courses for younger pupils included “space awareness” and gymnastics skills such as “rolling,” “tumbling,” and “vaults.” Sports, games, and physical activities taught to older elementary pupils included “net/wall games,” “invasion games,” and “traditional dance.” Health-related fitness and wellness at the elementary level focused on “strength, endurance, and stretching;” “personal hygiene;” “weight management” “cigarette smoking prevention.”

The secondary teachers selected what they termed “lifetime sports” for their pupils such as “badminton” and “hiking.” They taught health-related fitness through a mixture of activity and classroom lessons. The health content covered included “muscular strength and endurance,” “flexibility,” “school violence prevention,” and “game addiction prevention.” The main methods by which teachers at all levels evaluated their pupils were “direct observation” and the completion of “checklists.”

All of the teaching oriented teachers noted that they were aware of other curricular models that they could have utilized, but explained that they were not confident in doing so because they “lacked in-depth knowledge,” and consequently “were not confident” in their ability to use them. Moreover, data from interviews, filmed snippets, and fictional accounts indicated that the teachers relied predominantly on direct teaching styles:

First, I . . . inform pupils about what we are going to do. Then I provide instructions and demonstrations and let the pupils practice in groups while I go around the class to provide
feedback. When everyone is familiar with the skill, I generally move on to a different skill or a small-sided and modified game. (Sang Woo, formal interview 1)

**Coaching and non-teaching oriented teachers.** Gi Yoon and Hyun Su delivered similar and low level PE programs with little or no planning, instruction, or evaluation, and that were, at best, “recreational.” Both noted that PE was relatively “unimportant” in Korean culture and emphasized the cathartic effect the subject could have on pupils stressed by the demands of their academic studies. Moreover, they were concerned that their pupils would be “bored” and “turned off” the subject and resent their teacher if they taught “properly.” Providing they were “well behaved,” therefore, both teachers generally allowed their pupils to “play” the sport of their choice while they “supervised.”

I believe PE should provide a setting in which pupils can socialize and participate in activities altogether. PE class provides opportunities for pupils to unwind and relieve stress they get from academic classes. If I were to teach a formal PE lesson, pupils would dislike the lesson and me as a teacher. (Gi Yoon, formal interview 1)

In contrast, Gi Yoon appeared to put a good deal of effort into the extracurricular Judo program he organized and coached. Specifically, he was interested in his charges “training” and “competitiveness.”

**Factors That Influenced Teachers’ Reading and Delivery of PE**

**Acculturation.** Six of the teachers were relatively early deciders and chose to become PE teachers while they were in high school (see Table 3). Gi Yoon, Sang Woo, and Min Ji were relatively late deciders. Gi Yoon and Sang Woo decided to train for the profession having completed undergraduate degrees in coaching and kinesiology. Min Ji switched to PETE having abandoned her initial undergraduate program in social work.

All of the participants explained that for them the main attractor to teaching in general was the “stability” of the profession: “My father suggested that I become a teacher. During my
adolescence, my family was going through some financial difficulty, and both my parents always encouraged me to find a stable profession” (Su Man, formal interview 1).

In addition, the teaching oriented teachers and Hyun Su, the non-teacher, explained that they were first attracted to the subject because they “enjoyed” participating in “informal” physical activity and sport with their “families and friends.” Five of the teaching oriented group (Su Man, Ho Jun, Myung, Sang Woo, Gi Chur) and Hyun Su also recalled enjoying their PE greatly. Despite having these positive experiences, however, the teaching oriented teachers noted that, in retrospect, the instruction they received had often been “unstructured,” consisted of “free play,” and had not facilitated “learning”:

The focus of the class was to have fun. . . . My teacher separated pupils into teams and we played soccer for the entire class time. We really had fun but, now that I think of it, we didn’t learn anything from the class. (Gi Chur, formal interview 1)

Hyun Su did not make this distinction, and the pedagogies he now employed appeared to mirror those of his own teachers.

The remaining teaching oriented teachers (Min Ji, Young Hee) recalled having negative experiences during PE that included a “limited number of activities,” allowed for “minimal participation,” and taught by “strict teachers” with “little enthusiasm” for the subject in “substandard facilities:”

We didn’t have a gym and I hated going outside for PE on hot or cold days. . . . My elementary school PE teachers didn’t care about the class because they were too busy teaching other subjects. Most teachers used PE classes as their break time while letting boys play in team sports such as soccer. . . . Secondary school PE was similar. . . . Girls were often excluded while boys participated in games. (Min Ji, formal interview 1)

Members of this sub-group suggested that they were motivated to enter PETE both because they enjoyed physical activity and sport and because they thought they could improve on the efforts of their own teachers.
I wanted to provide a better experience for my pupils than I had. I wanted to provide an exciting class environment where pupils with different abilities could participate and learn. (Young Hee, formal interview 1)

By contrast, Gi Yoon, the coaching oriented teacher, was primarily drawn to a career in PE through his experiences of competing at a high level in judo at the middle and high sports schools and university to which he was recruited. These institutions he explained were committed to “developing elite athletes” and once his “dream of becoming an Olympian” was over, he was determined to replicate the same kind of program for his own pupils.

**Professional socialization.** As shown in Table 3, the seven teaching oriented teachers entered PETE with weak teaching orientations unsure of what they were going to learn. Gi Yoon began his PETE with a strong coaching orientation and Hyun Su with a non-teaching perspective. The figure also indicates that the teachers were enrolled in four different types of PETE programs. These were traditional undergraduate PETE, a combined undergraduate PETE and adapted PETE (A-PETE) program, PETE within a specialist elementary university, and post-graduate PETE.

**Composition and influence of the different forms of PETE.** The traditional PETE program followed by Ho Jun, Myung, and Young Hee included coursework in general education, the kinesiological sub-disciplines, content (i.e., “sports and games”), one methods course, and five weeks in a student teaching internship. There were no early field experiences. Hyun Su and Gi Chur’s combination PETE and A-PETE program was similar except time spent on studying the scientific sub-disciplines was increased, “there was less emphasis on pedagogy,” and content courses were focused on “how to play, not how to teach.” Similarly, although the PETE experienced by Su Man and Min Ji in specialist elementary universities included “a lot of content courses” and discussions of “how to modify lessons to make them more and less challenging,” it
was considerably diluted because they were taught to teach all the subjects in the curriculum, mostly through “peer teaching,” and “did not get to teach PE” during their internship. Moreover, the university-based component of the post-graduate programs in which Gi Yoon and Sang Woo enrolled consisted of “numerous” classroom-based “education classes . . . not related to PE,” but very few content or sub-disciplinary courses.

Not surprisingly, the traditional programs taught by “caring” specialist PETE faculty proved to be particularly potent and strengthened the teaching orientations of Ho Jun, Myung, and Young Hee considerably (see Table 3). In contrast, the other three types of program were largely ineffective and had little or no impact on the perspectives and practices of Su Man, Min Ji, Hyun Su, and Gi Yoon. In congruence with those participants enrolled in traditional PETE, however, Gi Chur and Sang Woo had extremely positive student teaching internships which also served to strengthen their teaching orientations:

I always thought about my own PE experiences, and I thought that was the way to do things. However, observing my cooperating teacher . . . was quite surprising and I realized that this was the legitimate way to teach PE. My cooperating teacher was passionate and always planned ahead. After my teaching, he provided me with a lot of feedback . . . and that really motivated me to become a teacher like him. . . . When pupils were enjoying and learning from my lessons—that was rewarding. I realized that this is what PE should be all about. (Gi Chur, formal interview 2)

Organizational socialization. After completing their degrees and passing the national teaching certification examination (state school teachers) or successfully negotiating “interviews” and “demonstrating” their pedagogical “competence” (private school teachers), all nine teachers moved into their first positions as inservice teachers. Here they found cultures that were either conservative, and served to negate efforts at effective PE teaching; innovative, and encouraged teaching oriented teachers; or mixed (see Table 3).
**Conservative cultures.** Schools with conservative cultures were staffed by administrators and senior teachers who “did not value PE”, “marginalized” the subject, and viewed it as “unimportant.” For example, pupils were taken out of PE so as to have “additional time” to study for the “college entrance examination.” In addition, senior PE teachers either possessed non-teaching orientations and “made no effort” to teach effectively, or had coaching orientations and focused on the provision of extracurricular programming.

Both Gi Yoon and Hyun Su worked in schools with conservative cultures and were “quite happy” to comply with them (see Table 3). This meant that their coaching and non-teaching orientations were reinforced. Conversely, faced with similar conservative cultures, Sang Woo and Myung taught as they wished in their own classes and strategically complied (Lacey, 1977) with the practices of their senior colleagues:

> Honestly, I do not consider our school’s PE to be high quality. . . . If I try to change it, the senior teacher would consider me disloyal. I do not really like the way things are but I can’t change the system. . . . It’s not really worth making a fuss about it. I am just waiting for him to retire so that I can run the program my way. (Sang Woo, formal interview 3)

**Innovative cultures.** The innovative cultures in which Gi Chur, Min Ji, and Su Man worked were staffed by supportive administrators and senior teachers who encouraged their younger colleagues to “try new ideas.” Moreover, the senior PE teachers in these schools mostly modeled good practice themselves and emphasized “learning,” and “quality” instruction. This kind of culture was crucial to strengthening the teaching orientations of all three teachers, particularly Min Ji and Su Man, who had experienced weak PETE:

> I am currently working in a large school in an affluent part town. . . . The administrators and other teachers are very supportive of PE at our school and always helpful. Parents of the pupils also value the importance of PE and PE is pupils’ favorite class. (Su Man, teaching, formal interview 3)
**Mixed cultures.** Ho Jun and Young Hee both taught in mixed cultures in that some elements of their schools were supportive of high class PE teaching and some unfavorable. Specifically, Ho Jun encountered administrators who were particularly “unsupportive” but worked closely with more senior PE teachers who had strong teaching orientations and argued their case with these administrators. Similarly, Young Hee, had some departmental colleagues who were “excellent” PE teachers and others who were “unprofessional.” In these kinds of environments both Ho Jun and Young Hee attempted to strategically redefine (Lacey, 1977) their subject:

Months before the college entrance exam, the principal told us to not to hold our PE classes or to teach “PE” in a classroom so that the pupils could study [for the exam]. All of the PE teachers were insulted and we had some serious discussion with the administrators. . . . We fought back and told them taking an hour away from their studying time would not hurt their exam results. (Ho Jun, in formal interview 3)

**Conclusions**

The nine Korean PE teachers in this study underwent a unique and subtly different occupational socialization when compared to teachers from Western cultures (Richards et al., 2014). Initially, the teachers’ acculturation led to a higher proportion of them being teacher oriented on entering PETE than has been the case in other countries. This appeared to be because there was no competition between curricular PE and extracurricular sport in the schools that they attended. In addition, those teachers who entered PETE with teaching orientations had little or no experience with competitive sport outside school. Another key difference with many Western cultures was that, regardless of their orientation, the teachers in the current study were attracted to the teaching profession in general because of its stability.

Second, traditional PETE in the current study appeared to provide a more potent professional socialization than similar programs in some Western cultures (Curtner-Smith, 1999;
Again, key to this effectiveness was the fact that the teachers who experienced this form of PETE entered with teaching orientations that were compatible with, rather than in opposition to, the perspectives and practices being espoused in their programs. Conversely, the postgraduate PETE, and PETE within specialist elementary programs or combined with A-PETE, experienced by some of the teachers in this study was relatively ineffective unless it included high quality internship placements.

Third, while many of the administrators and senior teachers of other subjects in the schools in which the participants worked were not supportive of their subject matter, the relative glut of teaching oriented PE colleagues meant that three of the participants’ organizational socialization was incrementally more positive than that experienced by many Western PE teachers (Curtner-Smith, 1999, 2009). In addition, in two cases, innovative and supportive school cultures managed to offset and compensate for the weak PETE experienced by teachers in the study.

Future research in this line should seek to ascertain the degree to which the results of this study transfer to other Korean PE teachers. In addition, in-depth studies of each phase of socialization may also prove enlightening. Furthermore, longitudinal studies examining the impact of efforts to increase the amount of extracurricular sport provided in Korean schools (Ministry of Education, 2013) on the quality of PE teaching should be useful. Collectively, this kind of research could help to improve the recruitment of preservice PE teachers in Korea, Korean PETE, the kinds of conditions in which neophyte PE teachers begin work in Korean schools, and professional development for experienced inservice Korean PE teachers. Data generated by such studies could also facilitate an improved understanding of PE by Korean administrators and more effective PE programs in their schools. Finally, further research of
Korean PE teachers’ occupational socialization may provide lessons for those in other cultures grappling with the difficulties of recruiting, training, mentoring, and overseeing PE teachers.
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CHAPTER III

INFLUENCE OF OCCUPATIONAL SOCIALIZATION ON THE PERSPECTIVES AND PRACTICES OF INTERNATIONAL SPORT PEDAGOGY FACULTY MEMBERS WORKING IN AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of the study was to examine the influences of occupational socialization on 11 international sport pedagogy faculty members’ (FMs) perspectives and practices regarding physical education teaching and PETE.

Method: Data sources were formal and informal interviews and documents illustrating the FMs’ practices. They were analyzed using constant comparison and analytic induction.

Findings and Conclusions: FMs’ current perspectives and practices did not differ from those espoused by native-born FMs. There were few differences between the current perspectives and practices of FMs who originated from different regions of the world. The acculturation, primary professional socialization, and primary organizational socialization of a significant proportion of FMs had been positive and led to them possessing strong traditional teaching orientations early in their careers. FMs’ secondary professional socialization generally played a crucial role in their development of progressive ideas about physical education and PETE. FMs’ secondary organizational socialization was also largely supportive of these progressive beliefs.

Key words: Occupational socialization, international PETE faculty
Introduction

During the 2013-2014 academic year, there were 121,914 international faculty members (FMs) working in American universities (Institute for International Education, 2014). Moreover, at approximately the same point in time, foreign-born scholars made up more than 10% of new tenure-track FMs at 4-year institutions in the United States across all subjects (Kim, Twombly, & Wolf-Wendel, 2012). The number of international FMs preparing teachers in physical education teacher education (PETE) programs and conducting research in sport pedagogy within American universities also appears to be significant and growing. Recent figures indicate that 24% of students in American sport pedagogy doctoral programs were citizens of other countries and that a little more than two-thirds of these students gained employment in American universities on graduation (Boyce, Lund, & O’Neil, 2015).

Given the sizeable proportion of international sport pedagogy FMs now training American physical education teachers, any unique or different perspectives and practices they model and espouse are likely to have a significant impact on the profession in the United States. As far as we are aware, however, no research has been published which specifically examined the perspectives and practices of international sport pedagogy FMs working in American universities and the factors that led to the formation of these perspectives and employment of these practices. Therefore, the purpose of the study was to examine the influences of occupational socialization on international sport pedagogy FMs’ perspectives and practices regarding physical education teaching and PETE. During this study, we were particularly interested in how elements of these FMs’ socialization in their homelands interacted and combined with their later socialization in the United States and how these interactions and combinations affected their perspectives and practices.
Theoretical Framework

Data collection and analysis for this study were guided by previously generated theory and research on the occupational socialization of physical education teachers (Curtner-Smith, 2009; Lawson, 1983a, 1983b; Templin & Richards, 2014) and sport pedagogy FMs (Casey & Fletcher, 2012; Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011). This is because individuals train to become physical education teachers and usually teach in schools before they undergo training for and become sport pedagogy FMs. In combination, this work has focused on the impact of five phases of socialization. These are acculturation (i.e., the influence of biography on recruits prior to entering PETE), professional socialization (i.e., the influence of undergraduate PETE on preservice teachers), organizational socialization (i.e., the influence of the school culture on physical education teachers), secondary professional socialization (i.e., the influence of graduate work in sport pedagogy on graduate students), and secondary organizational socialization (i.e., the influence of the university culture on sport pedagogy FMs).

Acculturation. During the acculturation period, research has shown that recruits are first attracted to a career in physical education by a number of factors. These include a love of physical activity and sport (Vollmer & Curtner-Smith, 2016), which is often nurtured by like-minded parents, relatives, and peers (Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin, 2008); and success in and enjoyment of youth sport (Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009). In addition, they include the opportunities to remain engaged in sport in some capacity within a middle-class profession, make a positive contribution to local communities through working with children and youth, and enjoy long holidays (Hutchinson, 1993). Other initial attractors to a career in physical education are positive portrayals of the subject by relatives in the teaching profession (Curtner-Smith, 1998) and the media (Curtner-Smith in press).
Having been attracted to the profession, potential recruits into PETE develop a “subjective warrant” (Lawson, 1983a) for it as well as a number of competing occupations. This involves them forming beliefs about what the role of a physical education teacher involves coupled with a self-assessment of their ability and inclination to carry out this role successfully (Dewar & Lawson, 1984). Key in the development of the subjective warrant for physical education is the “apprenticeship of observation” (Lortie, 1975) which teachers experience during their own schooling (Schempp, 1989). Recruits’ experiences of physical education and school sport and interactions with their physical education teachers have a major impact on their beliefs about the subject (Curtner-Smith, 1997, 1999). Generally, these are perceived as being positive and lead to recruits espousing the same values as their teachers and coaches and wishing to replicate their practices. Occasionally, they are perceived as being negative and recruits enter PETE vowing to provide physical education for students that is an improvement on their own (Curtner-Smith, 2001; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). Some recruits are also heavily influenced by excellent and dedicated teachers who taught them other subjects during their schooling (Curtner-Smith, 2001).

In American and British contexts, the apprenticeship of observation leads to recruits entering PETE with one of two broad orientations to their chosen field (Curtner-Smith, 1999; 2001; Lawson, 1983a, 1983b; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009). Those with a coaching orientation possess subjective warrants in which their focus is on working with the most athletic students who play on extracurricular school teams. For coaching oriented recruits, teaching curricular physical education is something to be endured and on which they intend to spend little time and effort. In contrast, recruits with a teaching orientation enter PETE with subjective warrants in which their focus is on delivering quality physical education programs for students of all
abilities. For teaching oriented recruits, coaching athletes on extracurricular sports teams is of secondary importance.

Coaching oriented recruits tend to be males who have participated in a high level of competitive major sport and been taught by physical education teachers with similar foci as themselves. That is, they prioritized extracurricular sport and delivered weak or non-educational versions of physical education. In contrast, teaching oriented recruits are more likely to be females who have participated in non-competitive physical activity, played a high level of non-traditional sport, or played a low level of traditional sport. Teaching oriented recruits are also likely to have been taught by like-minded physical education teachers within schools in which physical education was viewed as more important than extracurricular sport (Curtner-Smith, 1999; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Lawson, 1983a, 1983b).

**Professional socialization.** Professional socialization of physical education teachers has been shown to be relatively weak compared with acculturation and organizational socialization (Curtner-Smith, 2009). Even the strongest PETE programs, it seems, cannot change the views and perspectives of preservice teachers with “hard core” coaching orientations (Sofo & Curtner-Smith, 2010). Indeed, weak programs can serve to reinforce the misconceived ideas with which coaching oriented preservice teachers begin their programs (Stroot & Ko, 2006) and cause those with teaching orientations to become disenchanted and drop out of PETE (Smith, 1993). More positively, strong PETE programs reinforce the views and perspectives of teaching oriented recruits and encourage them to teach properly even when faced with adverse conditions (Curtner-Smith, 2001). Moreover, strong programs can win over preservice teachers who begin PETE with “moderate coaching orientations” (Curtner-Smith, 1997, 1998; Sofo & Curtner-Smith, 2010).
Strong PETE programs are taught by faculty who overtly challenge and attempt to change the perceptions and views held by coaching oriented preservice teachers and support the ideas and values of those with teaching orientations (Curtner-Smith, 1996; Schempp & Graber, 1992). These faculty are more effective when they agree philosophically on the goals of the subject and have a “shared technical culture” (Lortie, 1975). That is, they agree on the pedagogies and instructional models that preservice teachers should acquire and employ (Curtner-Smith, 1996; Graber, 1993). Faculty are also more likely to influence their charges’ perspectives and practices if they are perceived as credible. Their credibility is enhanced if they possess specialist sport pedagogy qualifications, can draw on their own teaching experiences, and are not involved in coaching extracurricular university sport (Curtner-Smith, 1996; Sofo & Curtner-Smith, 2010).

Organizational socialization. Entering the workforce can be relatively easy or difficult for newly graduated physical education teachers depending on the degree to which their orientations to the subject are congruent with the nature of the school cultures they encounter (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). Those beginning teachers with teaching orientations are encouraged and supported when they begin work in schools with progressive cultures that support innovative ideas and practices (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Lawson, 1983b). Key elements in these cultures are pupils, parents, administrators, and senior teachers (Curtner-Smith, 1997, 1999, 2001). Unfortunately, most school cultures are conservative and those individuals that dictate the nature of these cultures conspire to keep perspectives and practices as they are. This means that innovative ideas and methods espoused by teaching oriented teachers are opposed, rejected, and crushed by what Zeichner and Tabachnik (1983) described as the “institutional press.”
Faced with the press, teaching oriented teachers can employ a number of different coping strategies (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). Firstly, they can attempt to “strategically redefine” (Lacey, 1977) their schools’ perspectives and practices by overtly opposing and trying to change them. A more cautious option involves “strategically adjusting” (Etheridge, 1989) to or “strategically complying” (Lacey, 1977) with current perspectives while waiting for conditions to change in their favor so that they can implement the practices they really support (Curtner-Smith, 1997). Teachers who strategically comply with and adjust to practices they secretly oppose may also engage in “strategic rhetoric” (Sparkes, 1987). That is, outwardly and overtly pretending to support the practices they are forced to employ. They may also engage in “guerilla teaching” (Curtner-Smith, 1997) by employing the practices in which they really believe when they are certain they will not be discovered. Unfortunately, lengthy periods of strategic compliance and adjustment lead to innovative ideas and methods being “washed out” (Zeichner & Tabachnik, 1981) and replaced by the faulty ones teachers once resisted.

Newly qualified coaching oriented physical educators are, of course, supported by conservative school cultures and thrive in them. Conversely, they too are forced to employ the various coping strategies when they begin work in school with progressive cultures (Lawson, 1983b).

**Secondary professional socialization.** Students appear to be attracted to sport pedagogy doctoral programs for a number of reasons. These include escaping difficult and oppressive school conditions and becoming a university professor in general, a teacher trainer, or a researcher. In addition, some part-time sport pedagogy doctoral students are trying to find out whether they prefer a life in higher education to their existing lot as teachers in schools (Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011).
Experiences during their own PETE and master’s degree work serve as a secondary apprenticeship of observation for future sport pedagogy FMs and are obviously key in the formation of a subjective warrant for a career in higher education. It is during their doctoral programs, however, that the perspectives and practices of future sport pedagogy FMs are filled out and sharpened (Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011). Major influences on doctoral students are course content, mentoring and modeling provided by FMs and other graduate students, opportunities to supervise preservice teachers in schools, and experiences of teaching classes and conducting research (Antony, 2002; Antony & Taylor, 2001; Dodds, 2005; Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011; Weidman & Stein, 2003).

Evidence suggests that master’s and doctoral work in sport pedagogy has a much more powerful impact on graduate students’ beliefs about physical education teaching and teacher preparation than PETE does on preservice teachers’ perspectives and practices (Goc Karp, Woods, & Dodds, 2007; Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011). Already existing teaching orientations are strengthened (Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011) and few students who enter high quality master’s programs with coaching orientations exit with them intact (O’Bryant, O’Sullivan, & Raudensky, 2000). Moreover, those who do begin their doctoral studies with coaching orientations invariably have them replaced with teaching orientations. Relatively liberal perspectives on teaching and PETE, however, are more likely to be nurtured in doctoral students for whom this shift from a coaching to teaching orientation is made comparatively early (Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011).

Secondary Organizational Socialization. To our knowledge, little research has been published which has specifically examined the influence of the university culture on newly minted sport pedagogy FMs. There is, however, some evidence indicating that this phase of socialization is similar to much of what occurs during initial organizational socialization in
schools. Specifically, attitudes of undergraduate students concerning the instruction they receive has a significant impact on the beliefs of less experienced sport pedagogy FMs, as do the views of administrators and senior faculty (Casey & Fletcher, 2012; Dodds, 2005; Napper-Owen, 2012). Any differences between the perspectives and practices espoused by new FMs and institutions are likely to be subtle and relatively slight compared with those that occur in schools. Nevertheless, it seems logical to suggest that such differences may force new faculty to cope by strategically complying with or adjusting to existing practice, or attempting to strategically redefine it in the same manner as teaching oriented beginning physical education teachers working in adverse school environments.

Method

Participants

Eleven purposely selected international sport pedagogy FMs agreed to participate in the study. Criteria for their selection included their experience, gender, and the region from which they had emigrated to the United States. Three FMs were female and eight were male. Six FMs were European, three were Asian, one was African, and one was Australasian. The FMs’ experience of working in American universities ranged from 4 years to 33 years (see Table 4). FMs signed a consent form indicating their willingness to take part in the study and were assigned fictitious names to protect their anonymity (see Appendix C).

Data Collection

Each participant completed one to three formal interviews about their (a) current perspectives and practices regarding physical education teaching and PETE, (b) acculturation, (c) professional socialization, (d) organizational socialization, (e) secondary professional socialization, and (f) secondary organizational socialization. The interviews were semi-structured
### Table 4

**FM’s Socialization Profiles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biographical Detail</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zhang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Continent</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Teaching PETE (Years)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Orientation to Teaching/Coaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of Decision to enter PETE/Orientation</td>
<td>Early/Teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biographical Detail</th>
<th>Zhang</th>
<th>Alex</th>
<th>Lee</th>
<th>Wu</th>
<th>Ben</th>
<th>Victor</th>
<th>Janik</th>
<th>Brad</th>
<th>Usain</th>
<th>Mike</th>
<th>Jason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of PETE/Degree</strong></td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>PETE</td>
<td>Degree/ Low</td>
<td>PETE</td>
<td>Degree/ High</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>Degree/ Low</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>Degree/ Moderate</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>Degree/ High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orientation on graduating from PETE</strong></td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taught in Schools (yrs)</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (4)/</td>
<td>Yes (5)/</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (5)/</td>
<td>Yes (6)/</td>
<td>Yes (10)/</td>
<td>Yes (6) /</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture/Orientation</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Positive/ Teaching</td>
<td>Negative/ Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact of graduate work</strong></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Patton, 1990) and involved FMs being asked the same lead questions, while allowing for multiple follow-up questions to be asked. All interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. Informal follow-up interviews were also conducted as and when necessary to confirm and explore initial findings. In addition, FMs were asked to provide written documents which they had developed and which illustrated their current perspectives and practices.

**Data Analysis**

During stage 1 of the analysis, data were sorted into two broad subsets. These were (a) those which illustrated FMs’ perspectives on physical education teaching and PETE and (b) those which described the aspects of the FMs’ socialization that led to these perspectives and practices. Both subsets were reduced to key themes through the use of analytic induction and constant comparison (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Credibility and trustworthiness of the analysis was enhanced through member checking (i.e., follow-up informal interviews and the reading of an earlier draft of this manuscript), triangulation of findings from the three data collection techniques, and searches for negative cases (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

**Findings and Discussion**

**Current Perspectives and Practices**

**School physical education.** All of the FMs possessed well developed and strong teaching orientations at the time the study was conducted and none were coaching oriented (see Table 4). In congruence with most native-born PETE faculty working in American universities, the FMs were also progressive in their views as to what constituted high level teaching.

All the FMs were committed to the learning process, self-actualization, and self-responsibility value orientations (Jewett, 1994). For example, they explained that “good teachers” should aim to realize a number of cognitive and affective goals including providing
students with “knowledge about different [sporting] contexts,” “giving every child the opportunity to become physically literate,” and “learning how to work with other people.” The value orientation which the majority prioritized, however, was the disciplinary mastery perspective. For example, they argued that “effective” teachers should focus on students becoming “skillful” in a “variety” of “sports, games, and physical activities,” as well as their students appreciating the value of being “physically fit” and “active.” These goals, they suggested, should be achieved through the use of a range of “instructional models” including “multi-activity teaching,” “sport education,” “teaching games for understanding,” “health-related fitness,” “cooperative learning,” and “teaching personal and social responsibility.”

FMIs also suggested that teachers needed to use both direct and indirect “teaching styles,” be able to “assess” using a variety of “authentic methods,” and have good “pedagogical,” “content,” “pedagogical content” and “curricular knowledge.” In addition, they emphasized that “good behavior management skills” and the use of “effective teaching behaviors” were “foundational” to teachers’ “success.” Typical of FMIs’ comments regarding the pedagogies of school physical education was the following:

Probably the most important thing [for teaching to be effective] is management. Rules, routines, and expectations for equipment, space, and students. Instructional skills, an ability to provide good demonstrations. Use teaching cues, good feedback, move appropriately around the gym and monitor the learning environment. Assessment procedures, how to monitor and assess student learning in an authentic way. And, of course, appropriate progression in variety of content areas. (Brad, formal interview 2)

Six FMIs (Zhang, Alex, Wu, Ben, Janik, and Usain) also expressed support for the social reconstruction and ecological integration perspectives (Jewett, 1994). To this end, they argued that schools should also be concerned with “diversity,” “inclusive practices,” and “social issues.” Moreover, they suggested that effective teachers should employ a “critical pedagogy” in order to achieve these goals.
PETE. All the FMs were committed to high quality PETE. They emphasized that “nothing [was] more important . . . than teacher education” and defined “success” based on “how the people that left [their] programs were doing.” They were also committed to delivering PETE that they hoped would produce graduates who would hold the values and use the pedagogies that they espoused for physical education teachers. To achieve these goals, they supported practices that were congruent with Zeichner’s (1983) behavioristic and traditional/craft orientations to teacher education (see Table 4). In addition, six FMs (Zhang, Alex, Wu, Ben, Janik, and Usain) supported elements of the critical-inquiry orientation also described by Zeichner (1983). None of these practices and elements appeared to differ from those embraced by native-born PETE faculty employed in American universities.

FMs explained that the core PETE programs in which they worked included similar components prior to the “student teaching” internship. These were a “series of methods courses,” “peer teaching,” “early field experiences,” and “content courses.” Moreover, they stressed the need for preservice teachers to be “effective instructors” and be placed in schools with “good cooperating teachers.” Furthermore, Jason explained that he was training his charges to develop “C-SPAPs [comprehensive school physical activity programs] in schools” through methods courses specifically designed for the purpose.

In addition to these practices, Zhang, Alex, Wu, Ben, Janik, and Usain noted that there was a “critical” strand within their programs. This strand was embedded in core classes, early field experiences, and the culminating internship and focused on “understanding the diverse dynamics of the school culture” and its “politics,” “discussing moral, social, and political issues” related to sport and physical education:
I have a set of inclusive practices. We look at more culture responsive pedagogy. I teach critical pedagogy . . . because I believe that it is important to be added into the program. . . I feel that it is important content. (Ben, formal interview 1)

**Factors Influencing FMs’ Perspectives and Practices**

**Acculturation.** In line with previous research of future American PETE faculty (Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011), all of the FMs but Zhang were initially attracted to a career in physical education or coaching through their positive involvement in “sport” and “physical activity” in their home countries. This involvement had been encouraged by their “culture,” “peers,” and “family members” who “were very active,” “competitive in sport,” or “had been physical education teachers.” For the European and Australasian FMs, participation in formal sport had the most impact in this regard. Given that there was little or no inter-school or youth sport in their countries, for the Asian and African FMs, enjoyment of informal sport and physical activity was more influential:

It’s the nature of the community. In Africa . . . especially growing up in the 60s and 70s . . . friends would get together and parents allowed us play on the street . . . No parents wanted their child to stay at home. That was part of the culture you had to go out and play. (Usain, formal interview 1)

Five FMs (Alex, Ben, Janik, Brad, Mike) were also attracted to the profession by the positive experiences they had “teaching” and “coaching” children and youth prior to entering PETE. Ben, for instance, worked in a summer sports camp:

It was like a kind of sports camp program. And then by the time I was 18, I was in charge of the whole thing. So I ran it through the summer for about 6 to 8 weeks with anywhere from 50 to 80 kids. (Ben, formal interview 1)

Prior to deciding to enter PETE, Lee and Mike also noted that they had to “deal with” “negative stereotypes” of the subject. Lee, for instance, was initially dissuaded from entering PETE by the prevailing view in her culture that physical education was “for those who were not
academically able.” Lee’s realization that the subject was something she “enjoyed” and at which she “excelled” enabled her to “overcome” this stereotype.

Six FMs decided to go into PETE relatively early and five relatively late (see Table 4). Unlike participants in previous socialization research (Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011), however, the timing of this decision did not appear to influence their orientations to teaching and coaching. What was crucial to the development of their orientations, however, was the extent to which FMs had positive or negative apprenticeships of observation. For the eight FMs who concluded their acculturation with teaching orientations (see Table 4), these apprenticeships were extremely “positive”:

I knew pretty early on, in 2nd grade, that I wanted to become a PE teacher because the teacher I had in elementary school was “It.” He was the person that I wanted to emulate. . . . I can still picture him. He was professional, firm, business-like. . . . But he was exciting, he provided great activities, fun activities. (Jason, interview 1)

Moreover, these teaching oriented FMs also explained that while the nature of the physical education programs they experienced as children and youth was relatively traditional by current standards, non-teaching teachers were rare and the quality of teaching was comparatively “strong.” Furthermore, the European teaching oriented FMs were not adversely influenced by the kind of “professionally” focused extracurricular school sport that exists in much of the United States. Rather, they engaged in a “relatively educative” version of school sport which was “an extension of the physical education curriculum.”

The level and type of sport or physical activity in which FMs participated varied in their impact on the FMs’ orientations to teaching and coaching. Those who participated in relatively low level sport and physical activity were teaching oriented at the end of their acculturation as were some FMs who were high level sportsmen. Alex, for example, participated in “professional
cricket,” while Ben played “semi-professional soccer,” but the influences of these experiences were less powerful than the physical education they received.

Conversely, for Janik, Victor, and Zhang, participating in high level sport was crucial to the development of their coaching orientations. Specifically, Janik’s participation in “national” level gymnastics outside of school led to him aspiring to be a “gymnastics coach.” Participation in a high and “very competitive” level of soccer and basketball at “selective sports schools” had the same impact on Victor and Zhang. For Victor, this experience was positive because he bonded with an “influential” coach and was paid to play. For Zhang, it was negative and “difficult” since her father had “forced her to attend the school” so she could avoid “the life of a farmer,” and because the overly “intense training” and time “away from [her] family” led her loss of enthusiasm for sport. Nevertheless, Zhang ended her acculturation believing that she would become a high level coach because it was what she had been tracked to do.

Finally, more experienced FMs suggested that the comparatively broad range of sports they had been taught in physical education lessons and played inside and outside of school in their youth gave them “an advantage” over modern preservice and inservice teachers who were “overly specialized.” Specifically, they believed that this breadth meant they entered PETE and began their teaching careers with “stronger content knowledge.”

**Professional socialization. PETE.** FMs completed one of three types of initial training programs in their home countries aimed at producing “competent” multi-activity teachers or “sports coaches.” These were an undergraduate PETE degree, an undergraduate degree in kinesiology followed by a 1-year post-graduate PETE program, and a coaching degree (see Table 4). None of these programs were similar to the PETE programs which FMs espoused and delivered at the time the study was conducted. In addition, Alex and Ben noted that their own
PETE programs had not been “diluted” by taking courses in subject matter unrelated to teaching as required in the educational cores of many modern American universities.

The two Europeans who graduated from the post-graduate PETE course (Brad and Mike) believed that their programs had been high impact (see Table 4). By contrast, Zhang believed her coaching degree to have been low impact “in terms of preparing [her] to teach,” since much of the coursework she took was irrelevant. Victor assessed his version of a coaching degree as having had a moderate impact on shaping his practice because it included “some teaching in schools” and he gained a considerable and deep “knowledge of content.” European and African undergraduate PETE programs were rated as high impact, while similar programs in Asia and Australasia were categorized as “weak”:

[My PETE program] was pretty normal, but pitiful compared to what I know good teacher education looks like today. . . . I recognized it for what it was. . . . Really what I learned in that undergraduate degree was . . . how to handle large classes in school settings. But the actual teaching dimension was no big deal at all. (Janik, formal interview 1)

Programs classed as high impact appeared to strengthen the perspectives and practices of those FMs already possessing teaching orientations, and programs categorized as low impact had no influence on FMs’ perspectives. Consequently, Zhang and Janik’s coaching orientations remained intact. Similarly, Victor’s moderate impact program was not powerful enough to challenge and reconstruct his coaching orientation (see Table 4).

As most of the FMs had completed their initial training before the onset of serious study of physical education or in countries where results of such research were largely unknown, they noted that there was “little in the way of pedagogical research or theory for [their] instructors to draw on” apart from “Mosston’s spectrum of teaching styles” or the “philosophy of Hirst and Peters.” Instead, all three types of programs included a considerable amount of coursework in the
“hard” and “social” exercise sciences with “motor learning” being touted as the major science underpinning instruction. The “connection” between this coursework, as well as that they took in “foundational education classes,” with physical education teaching, however, was not always “obvious” to the FMs. In addition, rather than learning pedagogy through methods courses, as the FMs themselves now advocated, the main mode by which they acquired “methodology” was within a plethora of content courses in which instructors modeled appropriate practice and attempted to improve their charges’ performance:

It [i.e., PETE] was a strong . . . in content. It was very thorough preparation . . . so I felt I had good training. Probably not much of a grounding in teaching methodology—this was 1978 to 1982. We had less literature that was related to teaching methodology at the time. But a very good grounding in content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge.

( Brad, formal interview 1)

Other components of the high impact PETE programs deemed important by the FMs included “qualified” and “enthusiastic” instructors who were “excellent [physical education] teachers” themselves, and a large number of early field experiences and student teaching opportunities in “good placements” with “strong cooperating teachers.” Low impact courses were criticized mostly for their lack of “pedagogical content” and because they included “limited opportunities to practice teaching in the field” with decent cooperating teachers.

Graduate work. In congruence with previous research on sport pedagogy graduate students (Goc Karp, et al., 2007; Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011), the FMs’ secondary professional socialization, in the form of master’s and/or doctoral work, mostly exerted a powerful influence on their perspectives and practices. Specifically, it led to a “shift” in orientations by Janik, Victor, and Zhang “from coaching to teaching” (see Table 4):

I was very influenced . . . particularly by my master’s degree. I was much more influenced by the work done at [a major American university] in pedagogy at that point. . . . Once I started my master’s degree, my focus was very much on pedagogy.

(Janik, formal interview 2)
In addition, graduate work strengthened and expanded the values and practices of those FMs who already possessed teaching orientations by introducing them to more “progressive ideas:”

I enjoyed it [i.e., the doctoral program] and learned a lot—especially about curriculum models. The only thing I knew about previously was the multi-activity approach. I learned so many different things in my doctoral program. I was also given a lot of opportunities to teach undergraduate students. (Wu, formal interview 2)

Five FMs completed their master’s work in their home countries and six in the United States. Six FMs’ master’s programs were purely pedagogical, four were largely focused on sport science, while Wu studied sport management (see Table 4). The structure of these master’s programs was similar although the international programs relied more on “conducting research” and working independently, while the American programs included more didactic coursework.

All of the FMs completed their doctoral work in sport pedagogy in the United States (see Table 4) and noted that it had been a “positive experience” and “expanded their knowledge.” Their reasons for moving to or staying in the country post-master’s degree included “adventure,” the chance to take on “new challenges,” and “increased opportunities” to “work in higher education.”

The graduate work undertaken by FMs served two main purposes regarding PETE. First, “coursework,” related “reading,” and “engaging in research” provided them with “new knowledge” about “pedagogy,” “methods,” “curriculum models,” and “teacher education.” Moreover, FMs noted that they were able to “experiment” with the new pedagogies that they learned and “enhance” their conceptions of teaching while working with children in schools, or during the time they taught undergraduate students within the basic physical education programs offered by their departments:

Having done the research on [sport education], and being heavily involved in teaching, . . . using pedagogical models—that’s probably one of the more influential things that had an impact on my teaching. And . . . seeing from the research perspective that you can
quantify and you can see the impact of the model on students. (Victor, formal interview 1)

In addition, Janik and Jason explained that the effect coursework had on their beliefs and practices was amplified by interacting with a “spectacular breed of peers” who were learning the same material:

There was just a great camaraderie amongst doctoral students and the experiences were superb. . . . We supported each other. There was a strong pay forward culture where a lot of senior doctoral students helped the novices and newbies. (Jason, formal interview 1)

Second, in congruence with previous research (Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011), the FMs’ graduate work served as a secondary apprenticeship of observation. Specifically, the FMs “observed,” “co-taught” courses with, and “learned from” the faculty teaching them as they trained undergraduate preservice teachers. Key experiences within this secondary apprenticeship of observation were also similar to those noted in past research (Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011) and included “teaching methods” and “content courses,” “supervising early field experiences” and “student teachers,” and “helping faculty provide workshops” for inservice teachers.

While nine FMs noted that their graduate work had been high impact (see Table 4), Ben and Mike were relatively muted about the impact of their doctoral programs on their ability to train teachers because the main focus of these programs had been on preparing them to be “independent researchers” rather than to “do PETE”:

My [doctoral] program didn’t hugely prepare me to be a PETE professor, a teacher educator. I didn’t get involved . . . much with . . . methods, practicum-based stuff. . . . Most of my time was spent developing knowledge on literature in our field . . . and understanding the research that goes on or could go on in pedagogy. (Mike, formal interview 1)

Organizational socialization. School teaching. Six FMs taught full-time in state-funded secondary schools in their home countries prior to beginning their graduate studies and working in higher education. Their employment in this capacity ranged from 4 to 10 years (see Table 4).
Unlike the majority of American physical educators in previous socialization research (Curtner-Smith, 2009), five of the FMs worked in positive and “supportive” cultures with which they fully complied (see Table 4). Importantly, the curricula and objectives of these schools’ physical education programs were congruent with those the teaching oriented FMs had experienced during their own schooling and that had been espoused during their PETE. That is, they were invested in “doing” “good” “multi-activity teaching.” Moreover, the FMs noted that they were “mentored” by senior teachers who were “good role models” and “managers” and relayed that they became part of a “team.” Furthermore, Mike explained that his school received additional government “funding” and this allowed him and his colleagues to “do all kinds of different things.” Not surprisingly, working in schools with this type of culture strengthened the teaching orientations of Alex, Brad, Usain, and Mike.

In contrast to most coaching oriented teachers (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008), Janik also complied fully with the positive culture and teaching methods at his school to the extent that he was “hired to train” other teachers after 3 years in the job. At this stage, however, his coaching orientation remained intact and his main priority was working with elite gymnasts.

Only Lee was employed in a school with an inhospitable culture that was staffed by “horrific [physical education] teachers” who “rolled out the ball” and delivered a program that “did not even come close to [her] vision” of the subject. To protect herself, Lee strategically complied with her colleagues while engaging in guerilla teaching when she got the opportunity. Through this process, she was able to keep her teaching orientation intact.

**Working in higher education.** At the time the study was completed, two FMs (Usain and Wu) worked in universities where teaching was the main priority, while the other nine were employed in “research-focused” universities. Jason, Zhang, Janik and Lee had worked in
multiple universities. None of the FMs had been employed in institutions of higher education outside the United States.

FMFs indicated that their higher education work cultures (i.e., secondary organizational socialization) had largely been “positive” and nurturing (see Table 4) and so enabled them to “grow” professionally and “put into practice” what they had learned about physical education teaching and PETE during their prior careers. This was because their immediate colleagues had “similar goals and objectives”; held similar views; and passed on new ideas about “physical education,” “PETE,” and “research” which enabled them to refine their own perspectives and practices. In addition, FMs explained that administrators had been “supportive,” “graduate students were great,” and the preservice teachers they worked with were “good.”

Typical of positive comments about the work culture was the following:

[My work experience has] been really good. I think part of the reason is that we have faculty that are on the same page at least in the PETE program. When I first came in we sat down and we . . . decided on our technical language. . . . We have similar goals and . . . objectives . . . that's why it's been so good. (Victor, formal interview1)

Unfortunately, the FMs also described a number of elements that negated their efforts to conduct high quality PETE. These included “difficult” colleagues, “unsupportive administrators,” a “lack of resources,” “unmotivated” preservice teachers, “non-teaching cooperating teachers,” the absence of “good field placements,” and the “tension” between subgroups of faculty working in different sub-disciplines within their departments. In addition, less experienced FMs, in particular, described the negative impact role strain had had on the quality of PETE they provided. For some, this strain was between “teaching and conducting research,” while for others, it was between teaching and the “service” and administrative tasks they were required to “carry out”:
There’s so much more you have to do in higher education [than PETE]. You have to be on committees. You have to write references, have office hours, [and do] multiple . . . other things that you don’t even have a clue about. My first year—I probably worked 60 to 70 hours a week. I worked every Sunday. . . . Even though you think you are prepared, you have no idea. . . . It was a hard year. (Ben, formal interview 3)

While most FMs insisted that these adverse conditions had not dented their resolve or led to their views about PETE being altered, Zhang noted that they had led to “lowered expectations,” the precursor to washout.

**Summary and Conclusions**

A key finding of this study was that the current perspectives and practices of the international FMs regarding physical education teaching and PETE were progressive and did not appear to differ from those espoused by native born FMs. Four of the international FMs (Zhang, Victor, Lee, Wu) had reached this point having experienced difficulty, contradiction, and dissonance during their early socialization. Each had been coaching oriented and then shifted to a teaching orientation later in their development. Janik had also been coaching oriented and shifted to a teaching orientation. For him, however, this shift was relatively seamless and occurred as he learned about and became more interested in pedagogy. The other six FMs in the study had arrived at their progressive perspectives having experienced early socialization that was relatively smooth. Specifically, their acculturation, primary professional socialization, and, if they experienced it, primary organizational socialization had been positive, congruent, and led to them possessing strong teaching orientations early in their development. The most important features of these first three phases of socialization for this latter group appeared to be that, unlike many native-born FMs (Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011), they had witnessed effective traditional physical education teaching during their own schooling, been trained to deliver the same kind of program during PETE, and on graduation had worked with teachers who shared and supported
their beliefs about the subject. Consequently, this group of FMs came to view the teaching of decent multi-activity physical education as “normal.” We suggest that having a vision of a reasonable standard of physical education being taught in most schools by most teachers may give some international FMs an advantage over other FMs (both native-born and international) working in the United States who may have witnessed relatively few teachers using effective practice, and may never have seen a school physical education department totally staffed by a group of such teachers.

Another important finding of this study was that, in congruence with the work of Lee and Curtner-Smith (2011), it indicated that FMs’ secondary professional socialization generally played a crucial role in their development of progressive ideas about physical education teaching. Specifically, it was powerful enough to overcome and change the perspectives of those FMs who began their graduate work with coaching orientations and added significantly to the foundation of traditional beliefs already held by those FMs who started their graduate courses with teaching orientations. In addition, when they gained extensive experience of working with preservice teachers during their master’s and doctoral programs, FMs’ conceptions of how to organize and deliver effective PETE were changed and blended with their unwavering belief in the importance of content knowledge. More negatively, the fact that two FMs learned relatively little about teacher training during their doctoral work highlights the need for such programs to be balanced between foci on research and conducting PETE.

As far as we are aware, the current study is the first to directly investigate the influence of secondary organizational socialization on sport pedagogy FMs of any background. In line with extrapolations from the few past studies that have examined this topic indirectly (Casey & Fletcher, 2012; Dodds, 2005; Napper-Owen, 2012), the current study indicated that key
socializing agents in operation were preservice teachers, senior faculty, and administrators. The impact of these groups on FMs was generally positive. When it was negative, however, and especially when it was combined with role strain between teaching, carrying out administrative tasks, and conducting research, the suggestion was that FMs strategically adjusted (Etheridge, 1989) to their environment. These negative findings have obvious implications for the induction and protection of early career FMs.

Finally, we should note that we found few substantial differences between the current perspectives and practices of FMs. There were, however, some significant differences in how FMs from different regions were socialized in terms of their initial attraction to the profession, type of sport in which they participated, schooling, and the sort of PETE they received. Collectively, these differences suggested that the early socialization of the Asian FMs was generally more difficult than that of FMs from other continents. Further research investigating the impact of these differences on international FMs’ perspectives and practices would be useful, as would research designed to examine whether the findings of our study transfer to other samples of international FMs.
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CONCLUSION

The APEs possessed traditional or progressive teaching orientations having been indirectly attracted to a career as an APE through participation in sport and physical activity and interactions with persons with disabilities. High quality adapted physical education teacher education (A-PETE) appeared to exert a powerful influence on their values and pedagogies. School cultures and conditions experienced upon workforce entry served to either support or negate their programs. Several hypotheses are provided regarding the influences of acculturation, professional socialization, and OS on inservice APEs’ teaching.

Findings of the second study showed the teachers underwent a unique pattern of OS resulting in seven of them possessing teaching orientations, one being coaching oriented, and one having a non-teaching orientation. The teachers’ acculturation led to a high proportion of them being teaching oriented on entering PETE where traditional PETE reinforced this orientation. Innovative school cultures offset and compensated for the weak PETE experienced by some teachers. Suggestions for future research in this line were made.

The results from the last study revealed FMs’ current perspectives and practices did not differ from those espoused by native-born FMs and there were few differences between perspectives and practices of FMs from different regions of the world. The acculturation, primary professional socialization, and primary OS of most FMs had been positive leading to them possess strong traditional teaching orientations early in their careers. FMs’ secondary professional socialization generally impacted their development of progressive ideas about
physical education and PETE. FMs’ secondary organizational socialization was also largely supportive of these progressive beliefs.
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