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Abstract

Because teacher attrition has a negative influence on the educational system, providing resources to move teachers in positive career progressions is critical to their professional success and development. Identifying challenges and creating proactive strategies for successful induction are key components for informing the professional preparation processes and promoting increases in teaching effectiveness. Though research has been conducted regarding the assimilation of induction teachers into the teaching profession, the development and socialization of physical educators is unique; therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the transition of physical educators into and throughout their first year of teaching. A series of qualitative and quantitative methods, including formal and informal interviews, questionnaires, surveys, and systematic teaching observations, were combined to characterize the nature of challenges, enhancers, and teaching effectiveness at strategic points during the academic year. During data analysis, quantitative data were used to triangulate emergent, qualitative themes. Results revealed positive acculturation experiences and unity regarding the teachers’ views of the purpose of physical education. Challenges were noted as family and personal crises, role conflict, isolation, marginalization, classroom management, and difficulties developing positive relationships with stakeholders. Enhancers were identified as positive interactions with students and colleagues, as well as favorable individual dispositions. Levels of teaching effectiveness, as measured by quality of task presentations and use of class time, were comparable to those generated by veteran physical educators (Gusthart, Kelly, & Rink, 1997; Rhoades & Woods, 2012). The presence of strong professional preparation and favorable personal, professional, and environmental factors positively affects both the assimilation process and development of effective teaching strategies in induction physical educators.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Each year, over 100,000 prospective teachers enter the field of education infusing schools with optimism, energy, new ideas, and the willingness to promote change (Kane, Rockoff, & Staiger, 2006). Quickly, though, reality often brings under-resourced classrooms, growing dissatisfaction with perceived levels of support, and a desire to leave the profession. In fact, teacher attrition rates for beginning teachers, those with less than five years of experience, stand at 41% (Perda, 2013), and longitudinal data indicate a steady increase in that trend (Ingersoll, Merrill, & Stuckey, 2014). Rural and urban areas in the public school system experience even higher percentages, and the estimated yearly cost of attrition averages seven billion dollars (Barnes, Crowe, & Schaefer, 2007). Coupling the significant number of demands on the novice teacher and the lack of available resources, the educational system promotes an environment of failure for these newcomers (Gagen & Bowie, 2005). Evidence of this trend is indicated in current attrition statistics and forms a significant barrier to improving the status of the educational system.

Overall, there are numerous reasons that beginning teachers leave the field, but in general, dissatisfaction may result from lack of support in the teaching environment, unrealistic workloads, and a failure to develop effective teaching strategies (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). In survey data compiled by Ingersoll and Smith (2003), school staffing actions, personal reasons, and pursuing better jobs or other careers were listed as significant causes for attrition, however, nearly 80 percent of those leaving cited poor salary as the primary impetus. Clearly, the working environment can, and does, impact this decision-making process.
In addition to the aforementioned issues, beginning physical educators often face unique challenges such as isolation (Shoval, Erlich, & Fejgin, 2010), marginalization (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009), reality shock (Veenman, 1984), and role conflict (Hushman & Napper-Owen, 2012). Professionally, challenges stem from issues such as managing the classroom (Gagen & Bowie, 2005), and a lack of instructional expertise and experience can create issues during lesson instruction and the transfer of knowledge (Shoval et al., 2010). In addition, the teaching environment itself can pose significant barriers. For induction teachers perceiving low levels of support from colleagues, students, and administrators, this can lead to negative outcomes (Hushman & Napper-Owen, 2012). Diverse populations and a lack of resources, such as space and equipment, can detrimentally impact positive assimilation into the profession (Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013).

These challenges are just one facet of the reality facing first-year teachers. In the teaching profession, including physical education, scores of new teachers enter the field each year with a desire to impact students, some believing the profession requires a moral obligation to facilitate positive development (Fullan, 1999). As a whole, first-year physical educators demonstrate high motivation toward success, innovation, and willingness to promote development (Erlich, Talmor, Nabel-Heller, & Eldar, 2001). This intentionality positively impacts the quality of the learning environment as these teachers work to engage students (Todorovich, 2009). Even with this influx of constructive energy, however, the content and delivery of the physical education curriculum has remained relatively unchanged in recent years (Keay, 2009). Engaging students in physical activity remains a primary curricular goal, but the objectives and curricular models for delivery of programming can vary widely (Chow, McKenzie, & Louie, 2009). The more traditional approaches of sport- and skill-centered
physical education are proving to be less relevant for an increasingly diverse body of students (McCaughtry, Tischler, & Flory, 2008). In addition, Keay (2009) indicates difficulties in the process of training and developing physical educators. In order to protect the profession of physical education, meaningful change must occur through providing appropriate teaching methods, demonstrating student achievement, and helping the community at large understand its unique and essential role (Doolittle, 2007).

In the midst of such challenges, however, some beginning teachers maintain positive attitudes and perspectives (Lux & McCullick, 2011). Grace, an elementary physical educator for nearly 30 years, was described in a case study by Lux and McCullick (2011). Despite teaching in a marginalized environment for many years, she remained motivated and positive. Even when her class sizes were increased and colleagues consistently diminished her accomplishments, she persisted in focusing on her students. She learned to create close bonds and diplomatic relationships with those in her work environment and independently acquired the resources she needed for effective instruction. She remained in the profession because of her personal characteristics and ability to successfully navigate the existing environment throughout her career cycle (Lux & McCullick, 2011).

Similarly, in a longitudinal study by Woods and Lynn (2001), six teachers’ progression through their career cycles was examined for positive and negative influences. Of the six teachers, three remained in the field of physical education through at least nine years, while the other three departed during earlier years. The findings indicated that the current physical education teachers, even though all of the teachers experienced similar circumstances along the career paths, were able to better negotiate the challenges in their environments. As a group, they intentionally nurtured collegial relationships and displayed characteristics such as flexibility,
independence, optimism, and a sense of personal control, similar to those found in resilient youth (Woods & Lynn, 2001). In fact, one teacher from this study, Everett, has persisted in the field of physical education for over 26 years. His longevity is directly attributable to his personal disposition, his perceived level of adequate support from his school and community, and the positive impact of his professional training as he continues to participate in a partnership with his undergraduate institution (Woods & Lynn, 2014).

Because the assimilation of teachers into the field of physical education is a dynamic but often unpredictable process, an abundance of strategies for informing Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) curricula have appeared in the body of literature (Richards, Gaudreault, & Templin, 2014; Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013) and in many cases, have been implemented across PETE programs (Ayers & Housner, 2008). To improve K-12 physical education practice, Rink (2013) outlined the issues surrounding the appropriate measurement of teachers’ effectiveness and demonstrated the complexity of quantifying and qualifying outcomes in a dynamic environment. Even given the barriers and challenges that exist with measuring effectiveness, a need remains for all teachers, including first-year teachers, to be held accountable for student outcomes. This is a necessary step toward legitimizing physical education as a core subject (Rink, 2013). A logical starting point in such accountability begins with a teacher’s entry into the profession.

Ultimately, the result of professional education should be to develop effective teachers who are willing to persevere in the field. This pursuit requires the capacity for challenging existing norms and creating dynamic instructional environments in all classrooms, and rests on the following four core capacities as identified by Fullan (1993): (a) thorough understanding and frequent revisiting of one’s personal vision for teaching; (b) formation of one’s personal purpose...
in the context; (c) knowledge of one’s environment and mastery of pertinent skills; and (d) ability to collaborate effectively. Furthermore, the process of teacher development at the individual level requires challenging existing beliefs and a willingness to change (Pajares, 1992). This is where the role of Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) may exert a considerable influence. Induction teachers, those with little formal experience, must understand how schools work and how they can become agents of change in cultures in which change may not be valued. Proactively identifying challenges and providing the necessary skills, learning experiences, and strategies for navigating the tumultuous teaching environment should be necessary components of PETE curricula (MacPhail & Tannehill, 2012), and this aligns with Fullan’s third capacity, knowledge of one’s environment and mastery of pertinent skills (Fullan, 1993).

**Purpose and Rationale**

In the end, the overall dilemma of teacher attrition and its negative influence on the educational system still exists. Providing resources to move teachers in a positive career progression is critical to their professional success and development. Identifying challenges and creating proactive strategies for successful induction are key components for informing the professional preparation processes for future teachers. Though research has been conducted regarding the assimilation of induction teachers into the teaching profession, the development and socialization of first-year physical educators is unique. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the transition into the first year of teaching. Utilizing a case-study approach, rich data collection contributed specific information to the body of research in physical education related to changes in teaching effectiveness and development over the first year of teaching. Using these results to identify areas for potential improvements in undergraduate curricula, instruction, and fieldwork will help strengthen the professional socialization process and more
realistically prepare preservice teachers to enter the physical education field. By characterizing the nature of the barriers encountered by first-year teachers, increasingly effective and proactive assimilation strategies can be purposefully incorporated into the transitional induction methods currently employed in many the K-12 school systems. Until this occurs, Ingersoll and Smith (2003) liken the current process to pouring water into a bucket filled with holes. To this end, the study will employ the following three guiding questions:

1. What personal, professional, and environmental expectations do preservice physical educators have for their induction year of teaching?

2. What personal, professional, and environmental factors enhance or constrain the career cycle and socialization process of physical educators during their first year of teaching?

3. What is the nature of the physical educators’ effectiveness throughout the first year of teaching as measured by QMTPS, ALT-PE, and SETEQ-PE?
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Chapter 2

Navigating the Realities of the Induction Years:
Exploring Strategies for Supporting Beginning Teachers

Abstract

Because significant challenges continue to exist in the retention of teachers, the need for an infusion of proactive assimilation strategies, especially as related to the induction phase, is becoming a mandate in physical education. Beginning teachers face a multitude of potential hurdles. From marginalization, role conflict, and teaching diverse student populations to reality shock and limited resources, the effects of organizational socialization and the realities of the day-to-day workload can be powerful influences on a teacher’s effectiveness and desire to persist. Creating meaningful mentoring relationships, providing opportunities for purposeful professional development, and timely feedback can serve to help propel induction teachers through their transition into the field. Acquiring the necessary skills to navigate the school culture and provide effective instruction has benefits for all educational system stakeholders. The purpose of this paper is to examine the factors that enhance or constrain beginning teachers’ induction processes and offer recommendations for supporting physical educators as they assimilate into the field.

Keywords: physical education, socialization, retention, assimilation, teaching
Each year, over 100,000 prospective teachers enter the field of education infusing schools with optimism, energy, new ideas, and the willingness to promote change (Kane, Rockoff, & Staiger, 2006). Quickly, though, reality often brings under-resourced classrooms, growing dissatisfaction with perceived levels of support, and a desire to leave the profession. In fact, teacher attrition rates within the first five years of entering the profession are greater than 41% (Perda, 2013), and longitudinal data have indicated a steady increase in that trend for roughly the last quarter of a century (Ingersoll, Merrill, & Stuckey, 2014). Rural and urban areas in the public school system experience even higher percentages, and the estimated yearly cost of attrition averages seven billion dollars (Barnes, Crowe, & Schaefer, 2007).

Coupling the often significant number of demands on the novice teacher and the lack of available resources, the educational system often promotes an environment of failure for these newcomers (Gagen & Bowie, 2005). Evidence of this trend is indicated in current attrition statistics and forms a significant barrier to improving the status of the educational system. A significant need exists for developing effective, proactive assimilation strategies, and until this occurs, Ingersoll and Smith (2003) liken current processes to pouring water into a bucket filled with holes. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to examine the factors that enhance or constrain beginning teachers’ induction processes and offer recommendations for supporting induction physical educators.

The Issue of Teacher Retention

Overall, there are numerous reasons beginning teachers leave the field, but in general, dissatisfaction often results from lack of support in the teaching environment, unrealistic workloads, and a failure to develop effective teaching strategies (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). In survey data compiled by Ingersoll, Merrill, and Stuckey (2014), school staffing actions, personal
reasons, pursuing better jobs or other careers, and overall dissatisfaction were also listed as primary causes for attrition, with the last factor accounting for over 45% of those leaving the field. Clearly, the working environment can, and does, impact the decision-making process to stay or leave.

Teacher retention issues, nevertheless, are just one small facet of the reality facing first-year teachers. In the teaching profession, including physical education, scores of new teachers enter the field each year with a desire to impact students, some believing the profession requires a moral obligation to facilitate positive development (Fullan, 1999). As a whole, first-year physical educators demonstrate high motivation toward success, innovation, and willingness to promote development (Erlich, Talmor, Nabel-Heller, & Eldar, 2001), but even with this influx of positive energy, the content and delivery of the physical education curriculum has remained relatively unchanged in recent years. Difficulties arising in the process of training and developing physical educators are abundant (Keay, 2009).

In the midst of the aforementioned challenges, however, some beginning teachers maintain positive attitudes and perspectives. Grace, an elementary physical educator studied by Lux and McCullick (2011) taught for nearly 30 years and worked in a marginalized environment for many years but remained motivated and positive. Even when her class sizes were increased and colleagues consistently diminished her accomplishments, she persisted by focusing on her students. She learned to create close bonds and diplomatic relationships with those in her work environment and independently acquire the resources she needed for effective instruction.

Similarly, in a longitudinal study by Woods and Lynn (2001), six teachers’ progression through their career cycles was examined for positive and negative influences. Of the initial cohort, only three remained in the field of physical education through at least nine years. Those
who persisted were able to better negotiate the challenges in their environments by intentionally nurturing collegial relationships and displaying characteristics, such as flexibility, independence, optimism, and a sense of personal control. In fact, one teacher from this study, Everett, has persisted in the field of physical education for over 26 years. His longevity is directly attributable to his personal disposition, his perceived level of adequate support from his school and community, and the impact of his professional training as he continues to participate in a partnership with his undergraduate institution (Woods & Lynn, 2014).

Even in light of these positive scenarios, the overall dilemma of teacher attrition and its negative influence on the educational system still exists. Providing resources to move teachers in a positive career progression is critical to long-term professional success. Identifying challenges and creating proactive strategies are key components in creating meaningful change. Though previous research has been conducted regarding the assimilation of beginning teachers, the socialization of first-year physical educators is unique. Developing a more thorough comprehension of the circumstances surrounding the induction years, the first three to five years of employment (Fessler & Christensen, 1992), may help provide a better understanding of why some teachers, such as Grace (Lux & McCullick, 2011) and Everett (Woods & Lynn, 2014), find long-term success and many others do not may.

The Role of Socialization in Teacher Development

The theoretical model of teacher socialization describes the foundational process of becoming an educator. According to Lawson (1988), the concept of occupational socialization encompasses all of the potential influences on candidates, both before and after they enter the
profession. The process itself is lengthy, spanning the years from the beginning of the educational experience to one’s exit from the profession (Keay, 2009), and is unique to each individual, as each person encounters a different array of life experiences, circumstances, and conditions (Schempp & Graber, 1992).

In Lawson’s framework, all professions, including physical education, attempt to socialize their members, and the process itself, while not automatic, presents a problem as the various forms of socialization compete against one another in an effort to form lasting influences on an individual’s ideologies (Lawson, 1983a). Recruits who identify with a group will embrace the characteristics and values of that group (McGarty, Yzerbyt, & Spears, 2002). They become active agents in the process as their orientations position them as custodial, innovative, or fence-sitting (Lawson, 1983a).

In the first phase of socialization, acculturation, the preservice teachers’ experiences in kindergarten through twelfth grades may impact a beginning teacher’s ability to persist. The same holds true for the effects of the second phase, the professional socialization occurring during teacher education training. In contrast to professional socialization, the last phase of occupational socialization, organizational socialization, can be profoundly influential. During this process, teachers are assimilated into the real work of teaching and the culture of the school environment (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Some new teachers face “reality shock” as characterized by “the collapse of the missionary ideals found during teacher training by the harsh and rude reality of the classroom” (Veenman, 1984, p. 143). The reality of learning the process of everyday teaching impacts all new teachers as the profession exerts a powerful influence on the passing of ideals and practices to the next generation (Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011). Zeichner and Tabachnik (1983) described this “institutional press” created by colleagues, administrators,
and the reality of everyday school life as a major contributing factor to the “wash-out effect” that erases the innovative practices instilled during professional training. Most experts, in fact, agree that the impact of Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) programming or other professional training may be “washed out” as candidates enter the induction years due to the power of organizational socialization (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979; Zeichner & Tabachnik, 1981). From a professional development standpoint, positive organizational socialization is absolutely critical to the teacher’s ability to promote change (Laker & Jones, 1998).

Factors Affecting the Socialization Process

Even though each individual follows these three distinct phases (acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization), each teacher’s first year is unique, primarily because the factors affecting socialization are broadly variable. In general, the following four classifications have been proposed for categorizing these influential induction elements: (a) political and economic factors; (b) organizational workplace factors; (c) situational factors; and (d) personal-social factors (Lawson, 1989). All have the ability to shape, either positive or negatively, a beginning teacher’s socialization into the field. The first, political and economic factors, includes curricular standards as well as economic constraints. The second category, organizational workplace factors, describes influences such as the goals for the program, how resources are allocated, assessment of teacher performance, and the support
network present within the school (Lawson, 1989). Standardized testing, high-stakes assessment, busy teaching schedules, new methodologies, access to technology, and changes in expectations all present significant challenges and add to the traditional teaching concerns of classroom management, school procedures, and physical space (Chow, McKenzie, & Louie, 2009).

A third category, situational factors, refers to workplace conditions (Lawson, 1989). In this realm, colleagues, curriculum, administrators, and students all serve as socializing agents (Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011). Beginning with placement experiences and carrying through into induction, new teachers have been found to alter teaching practices to mirror those of colleagues in the teaching environment (Sirna, Tinning, & Rossi, 2008). Similarly, the influence exerted by the subculture of the students can be a powerful determinate of either a positive or negative induction experience (Gold, 1996) so much that teachers may feel limited in their curricular presentations by what they believe students will permit. This directly impacts what they are willing to design or implement (Lawson, 1986).

The last proposed category is personal-social (Lawson, 1989). These factors include influences focused on a teacher’s personal beliefs. These views represent the ideas formed through personal experience (acculturation) and preservice placement (professional socialization). For better or worse, when other factors directly influencing socialization are lacking, a teacher’s personal beliefs provide the foundation for instructional behaviors and values regarding the outcomes of student learning (Xiang, Lowy, & McBride, 2002), perceptions of appropriate scope and sequence of activities (Langley & Woods, 1998), and curricular goals (Kulinna, Brusseau, Ferry, & Cothran, 2010).
Challenges Facing Induction Teachers

The challenges facing beginning teachers are both numerous and complex. In 1993, Stroot, Faucette, and Schwager outlined four main issues occurring during socialization of physical educators as: (a) marginalization; (b) role conflict; (c) reality shock; and (d) wash-out. While these issues do continue to occur, the problems facing beginning teachers have changed over time. In research conducted by Hill and Brodin (2004), 132 K-12 certified physical educators in Washington rated the difficulty of issues facing first-year physical educators on a scale of 1-5 (1 = no difficulty, 3 = undecided, 5 = extremely difficult). The top five areas rated by the survey respondents as either “moderately difficult” or “extremely difficult” (4 or 5 on the scale) were lack of facilities or equipment, issues with discipline, dealing with students with special needs, schedule interruptions, and personal fatigue (Hill & Brodin, 2004). In addition, other issues, such as limited contact with students, large class sizes, and physical/emotional isolation, can and do exist, especially for elementary physical educators (Lynn & Woods, 2010).

To better describe the process of professional development, Vonk (1995) created a three-dimensional model, including personal, professional, and ecological or environmental dimensions, to aid the facilitation of the transition process for induction teachers. The first dimension, personal, focuses on issues that relate to becoming mature and learning more about oneself. The knowledge and skills, or professional dimension, describes the acquisition of content and pedagogical knowledge along with classroom management and teaching skills. The last dimension, ecological or environmental, encompasses issues related to the specific school context such as school culture, colleagues, and parents (Vonk, 1995). Utilizing the framework of these three dimensions of professional development (personal, professional, and environmental),
the specific challenges that induction teachers face will be examined. Later, the focus will shift to strategies and recommendations for assisting induction teachers as they make the transition from the classroom into the workforce.

**Challenges in the Personal Dimension**

This content focuses on the feelings of isolation that are common among induction teachers. As the often close-knit community of PETE cohorts gives way to a more independent environment, especially for most elementary physical educators, and as frustrations with the transition mount, many teachers feel that their needs are not fully understood (Shoval, Erlich, & Fejgin, 2010). The root cause of feelings of isolation for the majority of teachers stems from teachers spending more time interacting with students rather than adults (Stroot et al., 1993). Because gym space tends to be out of the general path of other classrooms, physical educators are exceptionally vulnerable to being withdrawn and separate from the usual collegial culture of the school environment (Todorovich, 2009).

**Marginalization.** Isolation, in turn, can breed feelings of marginalization, characterized by lack of respect for the profession or the individual teacher. The struggle of legitimizing one’s profession or subject area can impact teachers’ willingness to apply knowledge and principles learned during professional training and ultimately, increases wash-out (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009). In addition, feelings of marginalization also drive decreased perceptions of teacher effectiveness, decreased program quality, taint interactions with students (Sparkes, 1990), and lead to lower student learning expectations (Schempp & Graber, 1992). Ultimately, lack of respect can result in a number of undesirable outcomes. Physical education is often viewed as an expendable subject, making it acceptable to remove children from the gym for
other academic (or non-academic) matters. Other negative outcomes include physical education space and resources used for other school functions during the regular school day and the expectation that physical educators manage large numbers of children without assistance from support staff (Hushman & Napper-Owen, 2012).

**Reality Shock.** When teachers work in environments where they feel devalued, the new responsibilities accompanying employment can present a formidable challenge. Recruits have developed strong expectations for what their future job will entail, and when these expectations do not align with the actual experience, reality shock can occur (Veenman, 1984). Assuming one’s role within the culture of the school is no easy task, and many first-year teachers are expected to adhere to the same workloads and standards as veteran teachers. When confronted with the reality of the workplace, induction teachers may feel underprepared by their formal training (Hebert & Worthy, 2001). Lack of authentic preparation, especially in terms of field experiences, increases the potential for reality shock (McGaha & Lynn, 2000). In cases in which this occurs, beginning teachers may return to more traditional teaching strategies (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009), and left unaddressed, such issues may create enough pressure to cause first-year teachers to leave the profession (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).

**Role Conflict.** Another significant challenge within the personal dimension is role conflict. During the induction years teachers often come to realize that the profession involves extensive work both inside and outside the classroom. It requires planning, evaluation, extracurricular tasks, classroom management, and so much more (Stroot et al., 1993). Beyond that, conflict may occur as teachers are expected to fulfill various roles such as: mentor, friend, leader, authority figure, coach, and counselor (Hushman & Napper-Owen, 2012; Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013). Balancing the important duties of both roles requires experience,
and initially, one part of the role will suffer in order for the other to succeed (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009). Coaching a sport is more public in nature than teaching physical education. Certain spoken or unspoken messages, especially when communicated by administrators, may cause a teacher to believe that his or her employment is more tied to success as a coach than to success as an educator (Hushman & Napper-Owen, 2012).

**Teacher dispositions.** Other challenges facing beginning teachers from the perspective of the personal dimension involve teacher dispositions. Defined as the “attributions which summarize a trend of a teacher’s actions across similar contexts,” these characteristics are the intangible qualities that may make or break a teacher’s success in the classroom (Katz & Raths, 1986, p. 3). Because of the substantial barriers to successful induction into the teaching profession, those individuals who hold strong opinions, have independent spirits, and are energized through challenge tend to thrive during the beginning years (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009).

**Challenges in the Professional Dimension**

Turning to the context of the professional dimension, most beginning teachers face challenges in two broad categories, classroom management and transferring knowledge. The former encompasses a wide range of concerns. Administrators cite discipline as a primary challenge for induction teachers, followed by issues with student diversity, student motivation, inadequate knowledge of differentiated instruction techniques, class organization, and assessment as significant problems in the learning environment. (Veenman, 1984). Predictably most novices feel underprepared for managing the classroom, (Gagen & Bowie, 2005).
Novice teachers also function in dynamic environments in which strategies that work one day in one context may not work another day, even in the same context (Weasmer & Woods, 1998b). In the first years, many teachers lack instructional experience for the units, strategies, and contexts that they teach, and often lessons are prepared based on personal experience rather than sound pedagogical knowledge (Shoval et al., 2010). Transferring their knowledge of effective pedagogy, appropriate content, and instructional strategies can be difficult for beginning teachers (Steen, 1985).

**Challenges in the Environmental Dimension**

The last category of challenges is environmental. Influences include the level of support from colleagues, administrators, and parents and the level of diversity of student populations. Other factors may arise from the process of assimilating into the school culture and the availability of appropriate resources. Negative comments or perceived lack of support from significant sources close to the teacher negatively affect levels of stress and emotional strain (Hushman & Napper-Owen, 2012). Perceptions of pressure to conform from colleagues and administrators limit the reality of freedom within the classroom (MacPhail & Tannehill, 2012). Difficulties in dealing with parents are commonly cited as challenges for beginning teachers (Hill & Brodin, 2004; Veenman, 1984). Adding to perceptions of lack of support are the issues that may accompany increasingly diverse student populations in contemporary schools. Students are powerful socializing agents for beginning teachers (Blase & Greenfield, 1982). When students embrace the innovative activities taught by novice teachers, induction can proceed smoothly; however, when students resist the attempts to apply new strategies, concepts, and methods in the physical education classroom, novice teachers may revert to traditional programming and content (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009).
Accommodating for the needs of special populations and accounting for individual student differences are both widely cited as issues for beginning teachers (Hill & Brodin, 2004). The ability to provide differentiated instruction to accommodate learner diversity is a difficult skill to master, and learning to motivate students, especially at the secondary level, can be problematic for induction teachers (Weasmer & Woods, 1998a). To add to the environmental challenges already described, many beginning teachers are employed in schools where resources (time, space, and equipment) are limited, and the overall culture is unfamiliar. Each school contains its own unique microcosmic blend of written and unwritten standards for acceptable or unacceptable behaviors. New teachers must understand and then, learn to navigate these political complexities, all while being scrutinized by the stakeholders who allow or limit access to the inner network of the environment (Richards et al., 2013).

Strategies for Induction Teachers

Certainly, this discussion has a natural beginning with comprehensive PETE preparation of preservice teachers. A thorough listing of recommendations for preparing preservice physical educators exists in a recent article by Richards et al. (2013), and unfortunately, even though this is a valid starting point, the best education and strategies cannot fully prepare graduates for all of the challenges they will face as they enter into the field of teaching. In general, the induction years are an especially critical transitional period for a teacher, and the actions and decisions made by the teacher and for the teacher during in this stage significantly affect professional development (Joerger & Bremer, 2001).

When the challenges from any of these three dimensions, personal, professional, or environmental, are perceived as too difficult to overcome, wash-out will likely occur. Even given the magnitude of the barriers to successful induction, however, wash-out is not necessarily
an automatic consequence for beginning teachers (Lawson, 1983b). Given proper support and accountability throughout professional training and the induction years, good teachers can be developed and retained (Gagen & Bowie, 2005).

**Strategies for the Personal Dimension**

As with the previous discussion regarding challenges, the strategies for induction teachers will be outlined according to Vonk’s model of teacher development (1995). It is common for first-year teachers to carry a naïve view of the responsibilities and workload awaiting them. Beginning with the interview process and carrying over into employment, it is vitally important to ask appropriate questions regarding the duties and expectations of the job assignment (McGaha & Lynn, 2000). Even though teacher contracts are fairly explicit, it is the implicit extracurricular responsibilities that may require substantial amounts of time and detract from the new teacher’s ability to devote the necessary time to his or her classroom (Weasmer & Woods, 1998a). Proactive, clear communication regarding school policies, resources, and expectations will provide new teachers with much of the background information they will need to be successful (McGaha & Lynn, 2000; Weasmer & Woods, 1998a).

Similarly, during preservice preparation, beginning teachers were accustomed to receiving regular feedback and having open, available forums in which to discuss issues (Stroot et al., 1993). School administrators should be intentional about providing this type of atmosphere for beginning teachers. Regular contact with other teachers and staff in the building is vitally important. Beginning the year with teacher introductions, encouraging new teachers’ involvement in the school activities, and providing opportunities for mentoring relationships may
be helpful in decreasing the induction teacher’s feelings of isolation. In addition, beginning teachers should also be encouraged to maintain their relationship with their PETE instructors and peers (McGaha & Lynn, 2000).

Another major issue for induction teachers is role conflict. While preservice teachers may learn about the concept, the challenge of having dual roles cannot be fully understood without personal experience. More than ever, organizational skills play a major role. For physical educators who also coach, excellent time management and an awareness of the specific coaching duties that may be delegated to assistant coaches, parents, or volunteers may help ease the burden. While in season, teacher-coaches can minimize their stress in the classroom by proactively selecting the physical education units that are most familiar to them; this decreases the planning and preparation time required for lessons. Frequent reminders that subsequent years will, through experience, be easier may provide needed hope to a busy professional, and positioning other successful teacher-coaches in direct contact with the induction teacher-coach can provide positive role-modeling. Above all, it is important for the first-year teacher to remember that the teaching role should always take priority, and even though coaching is an important aspect of his or her job, the teacher-coach should be primarily concerned with student learning in the classroom (McGaha & Lynn, 2000).

**Strategies for the Professional Dimension**

Along with addressing personal challenges, it is also essential to provide strategies for the professional issues that beginning teachers will face. The major strategies in this dimension all focus on professional development. As in any field of employment, continuing to learn is critical. The simplest methods for growth in this area are to regularly engage in continuing education workshops, conferences, in-service trainings or seminars (Hushman & Napper-Owen,
Developing expertise in curriculum content. In addition to the strategies listed above, it is also imperative for the beginning teacher to pursue expertise as related to curriculum content. The knowledge base for teaching has been broadly defined as a “blend of subject matter and pedagogical constructs” (Shulman, 1987). Shulman (1987) categorized seven types of knowledge required for teaching: (a) content knowledge; (b) general pedagogical knowledge; (c) curriculum knowledge; (d) pedagogical content knowledge; (e) knowledge of learners and learner characteristics; (f) knowledge of educational contexts; and (g) knowledge of educational goals. These components form a critical foundation for improvements in teaching (Schempp, Manross, Tan, & Fincher, 1998). Command of the material is a necessary component for developing expertise. Without this, teachers cannot adequately provide analysis of student performance and offer the appropriate feedback for improvement (Manross & Templeton, 1997).

Similarly, teaching skills and strategies are greatly affected by a teacher’s level of development. For administrators, creating freedom for teachers to explore innovative approaches to learning can further advance the goals of education. Developing a variety of effective teaching methodologies can take place through the professional development
opportunities described above and by active experimentation on the part of the teacher. It is important for all teachers to develop multiple strategies for presenting material, and ultimately, for a teacher’s expertise to increase, including a careful examination of one’s own teaching behavior should occur (Manross & Templeton, 1997).

**Developing planning skills.** Additionally, for first-year teachers, developing effective planning skills is critical to success in the classroom; this requires practice and a thorough reflection of lessons during the revision process (Manross & Templeton, 1997). A simple strategy in the development of good planning skills is to be proactive. Stevens-Smith (2000) describes successful teaching as utilizing a “first-to-last-day” process, meaning what occurs on the first day will impact every other day in the school year. By anticipating problems and devising appropriate plans of action, the chances of creating the appropriate responses are greatly increased (Stevens-Smith, 2000).

**Teacher decision making.** When new teachers have a deepening understanding of teaching methods, planning skills, and are actively pursuing additional content knowledge, decisions about curriculum and behavior management may be somewhat easier. While decisions concerning scope and sequence are often challenging for beginning teachers, strong pedagogical and content knowledge is as influential as the students’ emotions in affecting a teacher’s decision-making process involving the inclusion and ordering of units (McCaughtry, 2004). Having an effective management system in place will help eliminate the burden of dealing with discipline problems. For those teachers facing classrooms in which student behavior is a significant deterrent from the optimal learning environment, curricular units and models that emphasize personal and social responsibility may be advantageous (Shoval et al., 2010).
Development of classroom routines. In addition, developing classroom routines at the beginning of the year creates an environment that functions smoothly, and with the day-to-day classroom tasks functioning automatically, the physical educator is afforded the freedom to emphasize other aspects of instruction and attend to the individualized needs of each student (Manross & Templeton, 1997). The “critical demandingness” cited by Graham, Holt/Hale, and Parker (2010) implies that creating an atmosphere with rules communicated clearly, simply, and concisely is useful in creating effective classroom management (Graham, Holt/Hale, & Parker, 2010).

Motivating students. Another significant issue facing induction teachers is the ability to motivate students. Unfortunately, not all students develop a love for sports or physical activity, and this can present problems for physical educators. Developing strategies to increase enthusiasm for physical education for students who are predominately extrinsically motivated or amotivated (both are common at the secondary level) is crucial. A teacher who displays a nurturing interpersonal style and provides for students’ needs for autonomy, competence, and security, for example, will likely increase student motivation levels. In turn, providing clear classroom goals, delivering appropriate feedback, and presenting tasks with appropriate levels of challenge will increase student motivation (Tessier, Sarrazin, & Ntoumanis, 2010).

Reflective teaching. After lessons are complete, effective teachers practice reflection strategies. Encouraging induction teachers to be reflective will greatly improve their ability to identify areas of strength and weakness. As a starting point, a thorough examination of instructional decisions can be easily accomplished through journaling (Hushman & Napper-Owen, 2012). Topics should include daily activities, details about interactions with students,
struggles, successes, and other insights (Manross & Templeton, 1997). Utilizing veteran teachers as role models for reflective teaching may also help younger teachers develop respect for the value of reflection (McGaha & Lynn, 2000).

**Observations and assessment.** The final strategy within the professional dimension addresses the need for regular observations and assessments of teaching. This can be a stress-filled proposition for novice teachers; however, to improve, constructive criticism and objective feedback are necessary (Weasmer & Woods, 1998a). Purposeful intervention on the part of the administrator is often necessary to accomplish this task. To lessen the stress of these observations, the administrator and induction teacher should plan a mutually-convenient time for the observation. The teacher should be informed of the focus of the visit and the criteria for evaluation well in advance (Weasmer & Woods, 2000). In cases where regular formative and summative feedback is not occurring for the induction teacher, assistance should be sought from administrators (McGaha & Lynn, 2000).

**Strategies for the Environmental Dimension**

After reviewing the strategies for induction teachers through the lens of both the personal and professional dimensions, the final category is the environmental dimension. This includes a variety of options for decreasing the marginalization of physical educators, increasing support from administrators and colleagues, developing formal induction programs, and integrating into the school culture.

**Decreasing marginalization.** First, the issue of marginalization presents a challenge for all educators but is especially formidable during induction. Encouraging first-year teachers to remain positive about their profession and discipline as they work to emphasize physical education’s important role within the school decreases perceptions of marginalization (McGaha
& Lynn, 2000). One tangible way to accomplish this end is to involve new teachers in school committees or special projects. This method provides opportunities to develop relationships with others in the school and initiates cross-curricular collaborations in a process referred to as “acquiring and managing instructional currency” (Lux & McCullick, 2011, p. 366). It is important to note, however, that a delicate balance must exist for extracurricular responsibilities to be accepted as positive factors during assimilation. Too many additional tasks, even if well-intentioned, may lead to increased feelings of reality shock (MaGaha & Lynn, 2000).

**Seeking support from colleagues.** Second, increasing support from administrators and colleagues is necessary for the positive development of induction teachers. Romano (2008) suggests that this provision begins only with a thorough understanding of the challenges these educators face. Once this knowledge is developed, the appropriate support structures can be established, and induction teachers can begin to view themselves as legitimate professionals (Swabey et al., 2010). From the start, beginning teachers require support throughout all three dimensions (personal, professional, and environmental). A proactive strategy includes close supervision from administrators (Shoval et al., 2010) who have the foresight to identify threats to the first-year teacher’s induction process (Weasmer & Woods, 2000). These individuals can provide the novice teacher with access to necessary resources (Pogodzinski, 2012) as well as guidance in school-related issues (Weasmer & Woods, 2000).

By 2012, formal induction or mentoring programs were present in more than 27 states (Goldrick, Osta, Barlin, & Burn, 2012). Costing up to $7000 per teacher, these multi-year programs include funds for professional development, assignment of mentors, and coverage for release time for induction teachers to observe veterans teachers in action (Villar & Strong, 2007). The purpose of these programs is to provide a means of socialization (Pogodzinski, 2012) and
provide a supportive network for novices (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future [NCTAF], 2005). Some of the benefits of formal induction programs include helping beginning teachers create a professional identity and developing a capacity for professional growth (Feiman-Nemser, 2001), reducing teacher attrition (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004), and providing information about school regulations and employment (Veenman, 1984). In total, analysis has determined that for every one dollar spent on induction programs, the typical five-year return on investment is $1.66 (Villar & Strong, 2007).

**Mentoring.** Perhaps the most recognizable component of formal induction programming is mentoring. Defined as “a process by which a more experienced or knowledgeable individual offers assistance to a less expert individual” (NCTAF, 2005, p.4), properly implemented programs have the capacity to improve teacher retention (Brill & McCartney, 2008). Overall, the impact can be focused on helping induction teachers manage the stressors related to their new environment (Gagen & Bowie, 2005). Utilizing experienced teachers in providing assistance for novices, creates avenues for ongoing relationships (Glickman, Gordan, & Ross-Gordan, 2007). These types of persistent relationships, when paired with other induction programs, can foster the beginnings of a potentially rewarding career (Banville & Rikard, 2009; Rikard & Banville, 2010). For the best outcomes, mentors should be aligned in the same discipline as their induction teacher (Gagen & Bowie, 2005), and the mentoring relationship should begin at the start of the school year (Pogodzinski, 2012).

The use of formal mentoring programs can also aid the induction teacher’s assimilation into the school culture. Mentors have real-life experience dealing with the school culture and can help answer induction teachers’ questions. Listening and providing empowerment are two of
the more critical tasks that mentors can fulfill. Offering reassurance through kind words and providing a sympathetic ear for discussing difficulties can be offered in a non-threatening, safe environment (Gagen & Bowie, 2005).

One last benefit of mentoring is assistance with teaching. The concept of educational mentoring involves creating formal relationships to help novices develop increasingly better teaching skills. This process emphasizes the induction teacher’s need to develop critical reflection and self-evaluation skills (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Providing assistance with the modification of activities to better fit the context of available resources is just one more of the beneficial outcomes of this type of active relationship between mentor and induction teacher (Hushman & Napper-Owen, 2012).

**Informal interactions.** Similarly, colleagues can provide necessary support for informal interactions. The interactions occurring within the context of the typical school day can prove to be valuable as induction teachers begin to understand the policies, values, and expectations of their new environments (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). These informal relationships become a place wherein new teachers can freely and frequently discuss curriculum, student issues, and strategies. While beginning teachers view these informal interactions more favorably in terms of support than the formal support systems created within the school environment, both forms of assistance ideally function as complementary components (Pogodzinski, 2012). In a case study by Richards and Templin (2011), Janet, a middle school physical educator in the induction stage, rated the informal mentoring and support she received from colleagues as more beneficial than the state-required formal mentoring program, beginning teacher seminars, a required teaching portfolio project, and the evaluation and assessment she received from her principal and formal
mentor. The support she received through these informal interactions was highly valued and positively impacted her socialization process (Richards & Templin, 2011).

**Integration into the school culture.** The last set of strategies under the environmental dimension involves integration into the school culture. Being accepted into fabric of the school environment can be difficult, and Lacey (1977) identified the three strategies, strategic compliance, internalized adjustment, and redefinition, used by most teachers entering a new environment. In the beginning, induction teachers utilize strategic compliance. In this strategy, the new teacher performs to meet the expectations of those who hold the power in the school, even though he or she may have internal reservations (Lacey, 1977). This response, the most common among induction teachers, results because of a lack of power to promote innovations or challenge beliefs (Williams & Williamson, 1998).

In the second strategy, internalized adjustment, the beliefs and practices of the novice teacher are willingly changed to match the context of the work environment. This can lead to an extremely positive outcome if the school culture values innovation; however, in environments where stakeholders embrace traditional methods, this can cause wash-out. The least utilized integration strategy is redefinition, purposeful attempts by the induction teacher to “redefine” the beliefs and practices of the veteran teachers (Lacey, 1977). This concept is by far the most challenging and may be the most costly in terms of personal and emotional energy for novice teachers (Williams & Williamson, 1998).

**Moving Forward**

The strategies employed must be meaningful for the individual teacher, and for positive effects to occur, the first-year teacher must develop an understanding of the students, school environment, and teaching environment (Woods & Lynn, 2001). Once the novice teacher gains
a foundational understanding of the culture of the school, the capacity to build relationships with the students will follow. Being able to relate to students’ life circumstances and show empathy are both parts of developing the emotional understanding necessary for providing relevant learning opportunities (McCaughtry, 2004). As teachers begin their careers, the desire to establish a professional identity is critical to long-term satisfaction, but the process is complex. Beginning teachers need collegial support in order to enhance their induction and inhibit wash-out (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009; Christensen, 2013). A workplace offering effective communication and a warm atmosphere plays a positive role in aiding the induction process (Keay, 2005). In the end, it’s important to note that all of these recommendations for induction teachers will function best when supported by purposeful intentionality at both ends of its continuum. Strong PETE preparation prior to induction and resourceful networks of support during subsequent career stages are absolutely necessary for best outcomes.
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Chapter 3  
Entering the Field of Physical Education Teaching:  
From Preservice into Induction  

Abstract  
This study examined the personal, professional, and environmental expectations that 15 beginning physical educators had for their induction year as well as the factors that enhanced or constrained their first year of teaching. Using Lawson’s (1988) theory of occupational socialization as a guide, data from demographic surveys, a series of formal interviews with participants at the beginning, middle, and end of the school year, and one formal interview with each participant’s corresponding Physical Education Teacher Education faculty member were inductively analyzed to produce qualitative themes. Results revealed positive acculturation experiences and unity regarding the purpose of physical education as preparing students to be fit for a lifetime. Barriers were noted as family and personal crises, role conflict, isolation, marginalization, issues with classroom management and discipline, and difficulties developing positive relationships with stakeholders. Enhancers were identified as positive interactions and rapport with students, colleagues, and administrators and favorable individual dispositions. Implications indicate a need for purposeful Physical Education Teacher Education training to proactively address these factors during professional preparation as well as the creation of additional support systems for beginning teachers.  
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With over 100,000 new teachers entering the field each year, the educational system is infused with an abundance of new energy and a palpable sense of optimism wrapped around a willingness to bring change (Kane, Rockoff, & Staiger, 2006). Often, though, within short order those ideals and expectations clash with a full-blown dose of the reality that new teachers encounter in their day-to-day experiences. During the first five years of employment, it is likely that more than 41% of these individuals will leave the profession (Perda, 2013), a trend that has been slowly increasing for the last twenty-five years (Ingersoll, Merrill, & Stuckey, 2014). In urban or rural educational settings, the percentages are often higher (Barnes, Crowe, & Schaefer, 2007), presenting a significant barrier for overall improvement of the educational system.

Beginning physical educators face unique challenges such as isolation (Shoval, Erlich, & Fejgin, 2010), marginalization (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009), reality shock (Veenman, 1984), and role conflict (Hushman & Napper-Owen, 2012). Professionally, challenges often stem from issues with managing the classroom (Gagen & Bowie, 2005), and a lack of instructional expertise and experience can create issues during lesson instruction and the transfer of knowledge (Shoval et al., 2010). In addition, the teaching environment itself can pose significant barriers. For induction teachers perceiving low levels of support from colleagues, students, and administrators, this can lead to negative outcomes (Hushman & Napper-Owen, 2012). Diverse populations and lack of resources, such as space and equipment, can detrimentally impact the positive assimilation into the profession (Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013).

In spite of these circumstances, newly-minted professionals usually arrive with a genuine desire to make an impact on students, believing that teaching carries a moral obligation for positively developing students (Fullan, 1999). Even with this this optimistic energy, physical
education curricula remain relatively unchanged from a historical perspective (Keay, 2009). Engaging students in physical activity remains a primary curricular goal, but the objectives and curricular models for delivery of programming vary widely (Chow, McKenzie, & Louie, 2009). The more traditional approaches of sport-and skill-centered physical education are proving to be less relevant for an increasingly diverse body of students (McCaughtry, Tischler, & Flory, 2008).

In addition, difficulties in developing effective physical educators remain a primary concern for improving the field (Keay, 2005). In order to protect the vitality of the profession, meaningful change must occur through providing appropriate teaching methods, demonstrating student achievement, and helping the community at large understand physical education’s unique and essential role (Doolittle, 2007). Given the significant challenges facing today’s physical educators, the purpose of this study was to examine the expectations of induction teachers and identify the factors enhancing or constraining their assimilation into the field during their first year. The body of knowledge regarding teachers’ transition from their undergraduate training into the profession is broad. For the purposes of this research, the primary focus was to examine a diverse sample of first-year physical educators to (a) describe the positive and negative influences that enhance or constrain the career cycle and the socialization process; and (b) identify expectations and potential challenges upon entry into the profession.

The Career Cycle

Fessler and Christiansen (1992) proposed an eight-stage model describing the characteristics of teachers at various stages along their career paths (Figure 1). In supportive environments, teachers navigate a rewarding, dynamic progression during their professional development, but in negative environments, the career path can be adversely affected (Lynn & Woods, 2010; Weasmer, Woods, & Coburn, 2008; Woods & Lynn, 2001). To add complexity to
the process, each individual is influenced by a variety of unique personal and organizational factors. From a personal environment, level of support from family, encountering positive critical incidents and/or crises, acquiring life experience, the presence or absence of avocational outlets, and an individual’s disposition all play a role. In the organizational environment, unions, school district regulations, style of management, level of public trust, societal expectations, and membership in professional organizations positively or negatively influence the career cycle (Fessler & Christensen, 1992). The relationship between and among these variables is illustrated in Figure 1.
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**Figure 1.** Fessler & Christensen’s (1992) Career Cycle Model with stages and influences.

**The career cycle stages.** The career cycle begins with the preservice stage during which the individual is in his or her undergraduate professional training. In this period, preparation for teaching is provided through Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) coursework and field experiences. Induction represents the formal entry point for teachers into the profession. Throughout this stage, usually the first few years of formal employment, the teacher is socialized into his or her new role. Acceptance by students, colleagues, and administrators, learning the day-to-day work of teaching, working through conflicts, and finally, gaining a level of security
are hallmarks of this phase (Fessler & Christensen, 1992). The experiences encountered during this formative time help to not only shape the skills of the new teacher but also affect the attitudes and beliefs that will be present long-term (McGaha & Lynn, 2000; Schempp & Graber, 1992). Overall, this transitional period between preparation and complete assimilation is often characterized by conflict between a strong work ethic with high levels of motivation and the difficulties of a persistently heavy workload and feelings of isolation (Shoval, et al., 2010). Huberman (1989) described a teacher’s induction stage as a struggle to “survive” the complex nature of classroom and professional obligations and discover oneself as a teacher and colleague.

In order to maintain a positive career path, the teacher must develop intentionality toward making a professional contribution to his or her field. Unresolved issues and exasperation are indicative of a teacher’s entry into the career wind down and career exit stages. While the former signals a desire to leave the profession, the latter occurs when the perceived costs outweigh perceived benefits, and the teacher formally exits the field (Fessler & Christensen, 1992).

It is critical to note, however, that each teacher’s journey is unique. Progression through the career cycle does not proceed uniformly, but rather, the factors, both personal and organizational, create dynamically diverse influences on each individual as he or she experiences some or all of the stages (Woods & Lynn, 2001). Together, these factors can exert either a positive or negative effect on a teacher’s career progression.

**Occupational Socialization**

The same factors that affect the induction physical educator’s career cycle have the potential to affect assimilation into the profession of teaching. Occupational socialization, connected to P.E. by Lawson (1988), describes the array of influences that shape a teacher. This lengthy process uniquely unfolds for each individual as he or she encounters certain experiences
and circumstances (Schempp & Graber, 1992). Every profession exerts an influence on its members, and new recruits must make decisions to position themselves somewhere along the continuum of protecting culture and traditions or innovating toward change in the profession (Lawson, 1983). Over time, the socialization cycle can lead to formation of beliefs and assumptions about teaching strategies, the ability of students to learn, and the scope and sequence of the curriculum (Timken & McNamee, 2012). In all, the process of socialization is constantly evolving as each teacher develops experience and training and is influenced by the various contextual factors (Lawson, 1988).

**Acculturation.** During acculturation, the K-12 years, individuals acquire beliefs and expectations about physical education (Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin, 2008). This “apprenticeship of observation” includes influences from over 13,000 hours of contact with teachers as well as countless interactions with parents, siblings, peers, coaches, and extracurricular activities that work concurrently to internalize expectations of the work of teaching (Lortie, 1975; Lawson, 1986). As students begin to develop filters for what teaching should entail, subsequent messages are analyzed against their value orientations and either embraced or rejected (Richards et al., 2013). By observing what teachers do and how teachers teach, students internalize information, usually unconsciously, about the routines and rituals associated with the profession (Lortie, 1975) and in turn, learn what it means to be a physical educator (Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009) and what constitutes best practices (Stroot & Whipple, 2003).

The recruitment of candidates through the process of acculturation is called subjective warrant. Certain individuals are drawn to the profession specifically because of the events encountered during the years leading up to professional preparation. Often, physical educators
cite a love of sports or positive experiences with sport as their primary reason for entering a PETE program (Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009). Buoyed by positive feedback from parents, coaches, and others, an individual’s perception or his or her skills are matched against the backdrop of those required for the formal role (Schempp & Graber, 1992). These subjective warrants, formed during the pre-professional years, are extremely powerful and resistant to change, making professional training, the next phase, a difficult and less effective process (Lortie, 1975).

**Professional socialization.** Professional socialization, the second stage, begins upon entry into a professional PETE program and ends upon graduation (Lawson, 1986). Because of similar state-by-state requirements for licensure and endorsements, the components in PETE curricula tend to be fairly uniform. For the most part, students value their undergraduate preparation, with 86% of students agreeing that their PETE program aided their development (Laker & Jones, 1998). PETE graduates tend to rate classes focused on methods, sports skills, management, and lesson planning as most relevant (Hill & Brodin, 2004). Even so, abundant evidence points to the professional socialization phase as exerting the weakest influence within the occupational socialization model (Hastie, Curtner-Smith, & Kinchin, 2005).

**Organizational socialization.** The last phase of occupational socialization is organizational socialization, and unlike professional socialization, it can be extremely influential. This is where the real “work” of teaching begins, and the induction educator must learn the process of navigating the day-to-day reality of the profession (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). In some cases, an “institutional press” is created between personal, professional, and environmental influences, and the values or ideals acquired during professional training simply “wash out” (Zeichner & Tabachnik, 1983). In other cases, physical educators positively assimilate into the
field and have lengthy, productive careers (Lux & McCullick, 2011; Woods & Lynn, 2014). To examine the effects of organizational socialization on first-year physical educators, this study employed the following guiding questions:

1. What personal, professional, and environmental expectations do preservice physical educators have for their induction year of teaching?

2. What personal, professional, and environmental factors enhance or constrain physical educators during their first year of teaching?

Method

Participants and Settings

A total of 15 first-year, full-time physical educators, eight females and seven males selected from a convenience sample of recent graduates from both Midwestern and Southwestern public and private universities, consented to participate for a period of one academic year. The mean age of participants was 25.87 (SD = 4.24) years, and all self-identified as Caucasian. In total, the participants were heterogeneous in their marital status, school level, geographical location, and school setting, as noted by percentage of the student population eligible for free of reduced lunch (FRL). The participants’ demographic data is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

Participant Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>School Setting (% FRL)</th>
<th>Amount of P.E. Time per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Southwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1-50 min. period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>School District</td>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Married with children</td>
<td>Southwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5-50 min. periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Midwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5-50 min. periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cohabiting</td>
<td>Southwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1-50 min. period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Midwestern Private</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2-30 min. periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Midwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5-50 min. periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jess F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Midwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5-50 min. periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Midwestern Private</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3-30 min. periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Midwestern Urban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>5-50 min. periods for two 9 week-sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Midwestern Urban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2-45 min. periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Southwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1 or 2-35 to 50 min. periods dependent on grade level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Midwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1-40 min. period. No P.E. for K level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Class Periods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Southwestern Rural Public</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-50 min. periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Midwestern Rural Public</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-50 min. periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Cohabiting</td>
<td>Southwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-30 min. periods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Primary = grades K-8. Elementary = grades K-5 or K-6.*

Table 1

Data Collection

After obtaining IRB approval for the project and consent from each participant and school district, data collection was conducted in four distinct phases. Phase I occurred near the beginning of the academic year. Using a formal interview and demographic survey, baseline data were gathered to establish the participants’ backgrounds. Within two months of the participants’ employment, Phase II data were collected. The focus of this stage was to establish participants’ impressions of employment and describe the realities of the classroom environment. Data were collected through formal interviews and field notes acquired during site visits. Phase III, near the semester break, continued with the same protocols and focus as the previous stage. Phase IV data collection occurred near the end of the academic year and utilized the same collection strategies with an emphasis on reflection of the first-year teaching experience and expectations for the next school year.

A variety of methods of data collection were employed including formal interviews with participants and PETE faculty members. In order to decrease variation and establish continuity of questioning across each of the participants and throughout the data collection period, formal interview guides, shaped by the theoretical framework, were utilized. Questions proceeded in a
uniform manner as directed by Patton (2014), and pertinent follow-up questions were posed as needed. In addition to the aforementioned process with the first-year teachers, a PETE faculty member familiar with each of the participants during their professional training was interviewed. Each formal interview lasted approximately thirty to forty-five minutes. Interviews were conducted in person whenever possible, and all interviews were audio recorded for later transcription. Teachers also completed a demographic survey that was disseminated online. The survey elicited details pertaining to age, gender, race/ethnicity, self-reported scores for GPA during undergraduate coursework, and background information regarding employment.

Data Analysis

Each participant was given a pseudonym, and all interview data were transcribed verbatim. The establishment of themes proceeded with inductive analysis through Huberman and Miles’ four-step process (1994) of data collection, data reduction, organization of themes, and comparison of themes to the theoretical model.

Trustworthiness. In order to enhance the trustworthiness of this research, techniques consistent with those outlined by Lincoln and Guba (1985) were utilized, including creation of an audit trail, informal and formal member checking after transcription to verify the accuracy, use of participant quotes, intentional cross-checking for negative cases, and constant comparison. In addition, periodic meetings with experienced peer debriefers were conducted to assist with the development of interpretations of the data. Establishing a high level of integrity through the use of these multiple techniques increased the credibility, transferability, dependability, and overall trustworthiness of the data (Patton, 2014).
Results

The overall themes of this research are organized within the framework of the career cycle sectors of personal and professional environments and categorized by their appearance during the academic year (beginning, midpoint, and end). For continuity in reporting results, all themes described in the following sections were identified by a majority of participants unless otherwise indicated.

Beginning of the School Year

At the start of the school year, an initial interview was conducted to gather details about participants’ background, expectations, and goals for the year. A second interview followed near the time participants began their employment. The data generated from these two interviews were consolidated to form the basis of themes for the beginning of the school year.

**Personal Environment.** Physical education during the acculturation years was a positive experience for eleven of these fifteen teachers, and those interactions have continued to shape them as teachers. In fact, this influence, for most, was a primary impetus in their subjective warrant. For Eleanor, this was especially true. She stated, “Having those special teachers who made a difference in my life made me want to go and make a difference in the others’ lives.”

As a whole, this group self-identified individual dispositions toward a strong work ethic, verified through PETE faculty interviews and demographic surveys (mean undergraduate GPA = 3.68, \(SD = 0.25\)). Many of these first-year teachers, Jess included, believed they had something to prove. She explained, “I want to show the school district that even though I’m a first-year teacher, I’m also an excellent teacher. I want to prove that…I can be effective and make a difference in the students.” The primary goals for these first-year physical educators were to develop a routine for classroom management and a working discipline plan. Zach stated, “I just
want to make sure my classes are managed. That way, we will have smoother transitions and more activity time. If I’m spending all of my time managing, it’s taking away from the students being active.”

On a more individual level, a local elementary school encountered an unforeseen personnel vacancy, and about two weeks into the school year, Chad was hired. Paul and Marie were both married during the preceding summer, providing significant changes to their personal environments, and Jordan was employed in another career for over three years before seeking her first teaching placement, consigning her to the self-reported condition of “learning to teach all over again.”

**Organizational Environment.** In the school environment, several predominant themes emerged at the beginning of the year. First, before school started, participants were united in their beliefs about the purpose and outcomes of physical education. Educating students to be fit for a lifetime and providing the skills to be physically active for a lifetime were the primary responses from thirteen of the fifteen participants, and those beliefs were paired with fundamental teaching philosophies identifying a desire to help students apply physical education knowledge and skills to real life. Sarah expressed her goal in the following statement: “I want them to understand that they can be active in their own way and be healthy in a variety of ways.” She went on to explain, “I want them to be able to enjoy and understand the basic concepts of it [being healthy]. If one of them has a basketball, they can play over the summer and stay active and have fun with it.”

In terms of the workplace, eleven of fifteen teachers, expected a supportive and welcoming environment from colleagues and administrators, and after a few weeks of employment, most believed their experiences had been positive so far. Jess summed up her
environment with these words: “It’s a very friendly teaching atmosphere. My coworkers are very open and willing to talk. They like to play jokes on each other which is perfect because I like to do that kind of stuff, too.” In fact, not one first-year teachers described initial interactions that were purely negative. A few teachers, such as Carla, did not have any personal interaction with their administrators during these first few weeks of the school year. She expressed frustration over her unmet expectation with the following words: “I actually didn’t get to meet my principal when I interviewed. I remember thinking on the first day of school that I was going to work, and I had never met my boss before. That was a little crazy.” Conversely, four of these first-year teachers were finding additional support in the form of administrators who were former physical educators. Paul stated, “My principal is a former P.E. teacher himself. He understands the importance of P.E. and helps me out the best that he can.” Marie had a similar experience with the Dean of her school who was also a former P.E. teacher. She said, “He can give me an example of how it was when he was teaching. He can tell me how to fix things. That helps a lot…I’m very fortunate to have someone working here who used to be in my position.”

Ten of the fifteen participants had better than expected experiences related to student interactions. These first-year teachers, even those who had classes predominantly filled with students learning the English language, specifically noted that students were more cooperative and better behaved than they expected. For most, it was easy to relate to their students and the relationships were having a positive effect on the teachers’ experiences. Zach described his student population with the following words: “When they play football at lunch, the kids come together at the end. I didn’t orchestrate this, but they all want to say something nice about another person. That’s not something you would really ever see…The kids are great.”
As the year began, however, some teachers, including Nicole, struggled with student interactions and creating an effective discipline plan. She expressed the following sentiments:

I thought that the students would be more receptive to discipline. The school I’m at is very rough and a lot of the students do not respond to discipline. They don’t care as much if they get in trouble. They don’t care if I call their parents. They don’t care if I write them up, so that has been different. I just think I’m dealing with a very different population than what I’m used to, so that has kind of thrown me a little bit.

For management, all first-year teachers employed a tiered warning system with lower-level consequences for first offenses and higher-level consequences for subsequent offenses. Nicole found this aspect to be challenging as well and struggled with students who were disrespectful toward her rules and routines. As a strategy, she took a very structured approach with her elementary school students. She explained,

First, they get a nonverbal warning, and I told them that means I will either look at you or walk closer. That means that I see what you are doing, and I don’t like it. If they continue, they go down to the next consequence which is a verbal warning. If they still continue, they’ll get a time-out for a minute. When they feel they can come back in and follow the rules, they can come back into the activity. If I have to talk to them one more time, then they have to see me after class. At that point, I would usually give them a referral or an assignment, or I would give them a choice between the two.

In contrast to expectations, some participants admitted to underestimating the amount of work involved in a typical day, especially related to non-teaching responsibilities. Adrian, particularly, was disenchanted with the amount of work outside the classroom. He expressed,
The teaching part, it’s only like ten percent of the job. There’s a whole heck of a lot more, and the teaching part is the easy part. I didn’t expect all of the emails, the meetings, all of the little side committees that you have to be on. I totally forgot about duty. I thought I would just show up at school, get my cart and equipment ready, set it up in my gym, and be ready to go.

The first-year physical educators projected changes that might occur between the beginning of the year and the midpoint of the school year. Better classroom management and less discipline issues with students were the primary responses from eight of the fifteen beginning teachers. The participants perceived initial behavioral issues among students stemmed, in part, from their lack of pedagogical experience dealing with a variety of skill levels. Luke echoed the sentiments of several other first-year teachers when he stated, “My behavioral issues are coming from those kids who get it right away, get bored, and want to move ahead to the next thing.” Similarly, Daniel expressed his concerns with the following statement: “Having all of the grades [K-8] is different than what I expected…It’s a lot more difficult designing good lessons for all of those different grades.”

Midpoint of the School Year

During the midpoint of the year the participants explained the current nature of the challenges, barriers, and successes as well as the congruency of their realities to initial expectations. These data provided valuable insights into the socialization process.

Personal Environment. With a semester of teaching complete, several individual critical incidents began to surface. Chad declined to continue participation in the study due to overwhelming personal issues, including the birth of his first child. Similarly, Brady, who encountered severe relational issues within his immediate family, admitted that personal factors
outside of school began to affect his teaching and participated sporadically in the study for the remainder of the year. Another newly-married participant, Paul, undertook the process of buying his first home, and the following thoughts expressed his increased level of stress:

There’s a lot going on in my personal life. I will admit that this week, my focus has been on that. In this year since I graduated from college, I’ve gotten married, started coaching football, I’m buying a house, and I’m taking on coaching baseball this upcoming season… If I can stay focused through this, I can probably manage just about anything. Similarly, Marie was anxiously anticipating the start of her Master’s degree training the following semester.

As a whole, nine of thirteen participants continued to perceive their ability to develop rapport with students as a primary strength, and positive experiences were occurring because of those relationships. Zach commented on one such significant critical incident with a student, “He’s going through a hard time…So, I had lunch with him every other day for a while, and his teacher said how thankful she was that I was doing that—that I was a positive role model for him.” Mixed with the overwhelmingly positive perspectives were a few critical incidents resulting in negative effects. Before the semester break, in her role as a mandated reporter, Kate was forced to contact her state’s office for child protective services. After the incident, she said, “That was really hard, having to see things I’ve never experienced before…Other teachers will tell me that there is nothing I can do, but I feel bad because I want to help those kids. Hearing that…breaks me down.”

In assessing their initial goals, every participant believed that he or she was making positive progress. Even though the diverse school environment had initially been difficult for Carla, by the midpoint of the year, she felt energized. She stated, “I think I’ve done a whole 180
on the comfort level [her original goal]. It’s like my school now.” Kate, too, was determined to make a difference. She expressed, “I think I’m focused on reaching those kids who everyone else says are unreachable—the kids that everyone else has decided are not worth saving.”

**Organizational Environment.** In the organizational environment, several of the initial interview themes continued. Seven of thirteen participants still felt their school environment, including relationships with colleagues and administrators, was positive. Luke expressed, “I really enjoy the people I work with. If it wasn’t for that, I would probably really be struggling right now…I think they respect PE, too…I know that doesn’t always happen at every school.” While Luke’s sentiments matched those of the majority of his cohort, a few were navigating more difficult organizational environments. Eleanor was disappointed with her current situation. She stated, “If you’re a new teacher, you haven’t ‘earned your stripes’ yet. We don’t get to have some of the privileges that some of the other teachers who have been there longer get.”

Similarly, Kate felt marginalized at times and described the following sentiments:

Being a first-year teacher, I get looked at like I don’t really have much knowledge, and I don’t get much say in things. My ideas get pushed to the side. I’m the low person on the totem pole. I’ll create these great lesson plans and show him [her coworker], and he’s like, ‘well, we’re just going to do this [my way’].

In addition to the positive school environment, the strength of the rapport with students and colleagues, including administrators, continued to positively impact the induction year. Luke, in particular, expressed that his administrator was providing a great deal of accountability. “She’s pushing me pretty hard, but that doesn’t bother me at all. She told me again this morning that she expects a lot from me. I’m fine with that,” he said. Likewise, Zach explained,
I just think that coming in as a first-year teacher, you get nervous about the school you’re at, the people you’re going to be working with, about the administrator and whether he supports you or not…Teachers are taking notice [of physical education] in a positive way. They’re getting excited and giving me all this good feedback. I have positive relationships with the kids…They say how much fun they had and how much they learned….That’s been great.

Also continuing the pattern from the beginning of the year, the tiered warning system for discipline remained employed in most, nine of thirteen, classrooms. Adrian, a first-year teacher with a military background, began the year emphasizing discipline and student accountability for behavior in his classroom. When asked about his strengths as a physical educator, he quickly answered,

Management…What I did early on is paying off now. It’s allowing me to get to know the kids and their personalities…Now [during class], it’s management, have some fun with them, manage them again, start the lesson, teach, have some fun with them in the lesson, and more management if I need to…It’s not management, management, management like it was in the beginning of the year.

Conversely, a few others considered their ability to manage the classroom and provide discipline a work-in-progress. Jess described her uphill battle:

There’s definitely some individuals in my class that have made the lessons very frustrating [sic]. They are just not trying, or they’re going out of their way to do deceitful things. They’ll try to see if they can get away with things without me noticing. Just figuring how to work with those negative behaviors has just been draining on me.
Also at mid-year, contrasts to initial data regarding the delivery of lesson content and lesson preparation began to appear. These perceived weaknesses were not verbalized during the initial interviews, and for teachers such as Adrian, the learning curve was an issue. He stated, “The more you teach, the more you see what is out there that needs to be done as a teacher. Every week, there is something new…It’s a lot.” Similarly, Eleanor expressed her frustration with her lesson delivery when she stated, “I tend to over plan things and squeeze too much into the lesson…I end up rushing things at the end and don’t really close out the lesson very well.” Also, at this point in the year, the typical workday was quite a bit longer for seven of the thirteen teachers due to additional coaching responsibilities. Sarah admitted to struggling with her dual roles. She explained, “There are some days where I feel everything is kind of jumbled…It’s all happening so fast, and there’s so much that has to be done. It kind of gets overwhelming at times.”

End of the School Year

During the final interview, participants addressed the cumulative experiences of the first year and expressed goals and expectations for the second year. These data provided additional insights into the summative nature of the year-long assimilation process.

**Personal Environment.** At the end of the year, participants continued to feel empowered and full of energy. Kate echoed the sentiments of her cohorts when she stated the following: “I’m still on the top of my game. I’m still ready to come to work every day.” Similarly, Adrian commented, “I still love being a P.E. teacher. It’s a lot of fun.” The vast majority, twelve of thirteen, affirmed themselves as “agents of change” and felt their initial goals were at least partially fulfilled. Going forward, all except one of these first-year teachers indicated a personal goal of proactive preparation over the upcoming summer months. Zach
described his approach to the second year as two-fold, a combination of reflection and planning, when he stated, “I will go back through my lesson plans and the notes I took…and see what worked and what didn’t. If it didn’t work, I know I need to meet with someone to help resolve the issue.”

In contrast to information gathered at the beginning of the year, almost all, eleven of thirteen, participants coached a sport during the school year, a total nearly double the number who had expected to coach. Balancing the demands of both coaching and teaching led to several documented cases of role conflict. In the most blatant example, Paul acknowledged that he felt an emphasis on his ability to coach rather than teach. He explained,

That’s where there’s job security…I asked [my administrator] how it works with me coming back next year. When I won my first football game, he said that they would keep me around for another week. Every win…bought me another week. When I got a grant for baseball, he [the administrator] was like, ‘you just bought yourself two more weeks.’ I am pretty sure it’s only a joke.

Even with the self-described challenges in balancing teaching and coaching, all participants with secured teaching positions for the following school year fully expected to coach during their second year.

A number of critical incidents arose in the period between the midpoint and the end of the school year. First, continued personal issues within his immediate family forced Brady to take a leave of absence from work, and he did not complete the semester. Second, three other first-year teachers resigned from their positions. Carla cited a lack of a collegial environment with other staff as the primary impetus for leaving her job but was considering applying for teaching
positions in neighboring school districts. Jordan, expecting her first child in the fall, made the decision to leave the workforce at the end of the school year, and Paul, due to his wife’s job transfer, was moving out of state and was not sure if he would seek another teaching job or return to school to pursue another career path.

Organizational Environment. In the organizational environment, one common theme persisted. Eleven of thirteen teachers continued to feel that their school environments and relationships with colleagues and administrators were positive. Jess felt strongly about the cohesion among her colleagues. She described her environment: “We have a younger staff here, and I think that puts us all on the same page. We’re all just striving to get the students to that higher level…Everyone’s working to better themselves.” Similarly, Paul shared this sentiment: “That’s one thing I think I’ve done really well. I don’t think there is anyone here on campus I don’t get along with.”

Despite the overall consensus of positivity at this point during the year, challenges with isolation and marginalization did occur in nearly every setting during the school year. Five participants specially cited feelings of disconnectedness from the rest of their colleagues, and ten participants recalled issues with marginalization. The former stemmed primarily from personality or age differences and the physical location of the gym space while the latter appeared in the form of disrespectful attitudes, comments, or specific actions or lack of action by colleagues or administrators. Participants noted that these challenges decreased the level of camaraderie they felt within their school environment but did not deter them from continuing to pursue improvement in their effectiveness as teachers.
During the second semester, the teachers’ perceived quantity of positive student experiences decreased, and a primary challenge cited by nine of the thirteen participants was issues with student behavior, a factor that had been cited as a positive influence earlier in the year. Common complaints mentioned were increases in off-task behavior and lack of engagement related to end-of-the-year student malaise. These concerns, in turn, influenced the teachers’ perceived ability to continue to develop a rapport with students, a strength during the first semester. Sarah summarized her cohorts’ feelings by saying,

I didn’t expect the kids to be so crazy coming to the end of the school year. Their excuse is that school is almost over. I tell them that they still have to behave. They still can’t bring their cell phones [to class]. They still can’t ask me out. They still can’t refuse to participate…It’s gotten crazy.

Even with the aforementioned year-end behavioral and discipline issues, the majority believed they would use the same type of discipline and management in their classrooms in the upcoming school year. Kate felt strongly about keeping her “three strikes” policy, and Marie indicated she would use the same plan but add a goal to be more consistent.

Lastly, employment status changed for three of the participants. Brady, Jess, and Nicole were part of their districts’ Reduction in Force (RIF) initiatives and were not offered contracts for the upcoming school year; however, at the time of the final interviews, both Jess and Nicole had already secured new teaching jobs, the former in physical education and the latter in health. At the end of the school year, Brady was still actively seeking employment.

In all, these teachers weathered significant personal, professional, and environmental challenges. Some were anticipated. Some were unexpected. Overall, most embraced the process
with a receptive attitude and positive spirit. The combination of factors that enhance or constrain the assimilation process will shape these teachers as they continue on their unique journeys through the career cycle.

Discussion

In light of the themes and trends highlighted in the previous section, it is important to note that while each of the participants’ journeys contained unique facets, the purpose of this research was to examine the common influences during the process of organizational socialization. In the personal environment, family, crisis, and individual disposition appeared to be the most significant factors. For example, several teachers described changes in their immediate support structures. Recent marriages for two of the physical educators, severe familial relational issues for a third, and a new baby for a fourth certainly added complexities to a sometimes already overwhelming level of stress. These outside-the-classroom factors have the potential to directly affect teaching proficiency inside the classroom. In this case, two of the physical educators were not able to appropriately cope with the demands placed on them, requiring one to withdraw from the study and the other to request a leave of absence from work.

It is important to note that crisis, in some manner or form, occurred during every participant’s academic year. For the majority, the crisis was minor, such as losing gym space or dealing with personal sickness, and those teachers were able to navigate through the incidents. In Brady’s case, personal crisis within his immediate family required his attention to be turned to matters outside the classroom. In total, three of these fifteen teachers voluntarily resigned their teaching positions for an attrition rate of 20%. This is considerably lower than the percentages cited by current literature (Barnes
et al., 2007; National Center for Education Statistics, 2011; Perda, 2013). Developing the skills and experience to deal with the day-to-day challenges that occur during the “normal” course of teaching is a critical component of teacher retention, and longitudinal studies of physical educators support the connection of factors within the personal environment to career longevity or attrition (Lynn & Woods, 2010; Woods & Lynn, 2001; Woods & Lynn, 2014).

Another major factor influencing the level of success during the first year for these physical educators was role conflict. For this cohort, the majority of stress related to this issue stemmed from individual dispositions. The individual dispositions of this group were indicative of high-achieving, self-confident individuals who historically had been able to meet the demands of the challenges facing them. At the beginning of the year, less than half of the participants indicated a desire to coach or displayed a coaching orientation (Lawson, 1988). By the end of the year, nearly all of the participants had coached at least one sport, with many coaching two or more sports. For the first time, some of these beginning teachers struggled with the conflict of balancing all the demands placed upon them. They indicated a desire to consistently give their best and felt enormous pressure to be successful. In most cases, this was self-imposed, but Paul felt internal and external pressure to “prove himself” as both a high-quality educator and successful coach. In such cases, one role may take priority with the more valued role, usually coaching, finding success at the expense of the other role (Hushman & Napper-Owen, 2012; Locke & Massengale, 1978; Richards & Templin, 2012; Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013). For induction teachers with strong coaching orientations, the values of PETE programming may be easily discarded as they adopt custodial teaching approaches in physical education (Richards & Templin, 2012). Specifically, among these participants, the majority demonstrated a high degree of fidelity to the models and programming instilled during their
professional education. Additional conversations during PETE about the nature of balancing the
demands related to the dual role of teacher/coach and examinations of how role orientation
affects a teacher’s identity may provide a good starting point in forming more realistic
expectations among first-year teachers (Sofo & Curtner-Smith, 2005).

In the organizational environment, the challenges facing induction teachers in the areas of
classroom management and discipline are well-documented (Gagen & Bowie, 2005; Veenman,
1984). This cohort was no exception. Even the teachers who were extremely consistent in their
protocols struggled at times to manage student behavior. Many insisted that their place of
employment was vastly different (more diverse) than they experienced during professional
education. Learning how to navigate the complexities of the school environment and culture
requires time and experience. PETE programs, outside of student teaching and clinical
experiences, are generally limited in their scope to provide an accurate view of the day-to-day
reality of beginning teachers, and often, the transition can be especially challenging (Curry,
Jaxon, Russell, Callahan, & Biscais, 2008). Professional education programming that provides
an abundance of realistic opportunities may provide a mediating effect (Christensen, 2013).

The ability to navigate the school’s organizational environment and build quality
personal relationships was important part of the positive outcomes for many of these physical
educators, and in some cases, even helped to decrease feelings of marginalization and isolation.
Developing rapport with students and colleagues appeared to be an easy task for the majority
within this cohort; however, some participants’ experiences lacked meaningful interactions with
administrators or colleagues. In cases such as these, isolation can ultimately breed feelings of
marginalization. When individuals feel either personally or professionally disrespected, a
struggle to create legitimacy often ensues. This, in turn, directly impacts the willingness of
teachers to apply the principles from professional training (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009), and may lead to decreased expectations for student learning (Schempp & Graber, 1992). Maintaining communication with cooperating teachers and PETE faculty as well as professional organizations can be a potential starting point for decreasing feelings of isolation and marginalization (Lux & McCullick, 2011; Woods & Lynn, 2014), and plenty of options exist for increasing the support for induction teachers. Seminars, mentoring, building an effective support network, and providing teacher accountability are foundational to teacher retention and development (Banville & Rikard, 2009). Similarly, support from administrators, especially those who espouse congruent values regarding student learning, can provide critical support in curbing wash-out (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009).

In addition to isolation and marginalization, many expressed feelings of inadequacy in their ability to build relationships with other stakeholders such as parents and community partners. Existing literature notes this as a significant barrier in the assimilation process (Hill & Brodin, 2004; Veenman, 1984). Two main factors contributing to this barrier were lack of parental support and language barriers among diverse populations. All of these teachers self-identified as Caucasian; however, nearly half were employed in settings in which they were minorities. Teachers successfully navigated issues in the classroom and were consistently able to build strong rapport with students, but difficulties were expressed regarding the access to necessary translators for parental communication. Parents, and other key stakeholders, can play a significant role in the support of induction teachers. If beginning teachers perceive a lack of support or confidence from these groups, difficulties can arise in establishing and maintaining quality relationships (Veenman, 1984).
In all, addressing challenges in the organizational environment can be daunting even for experienced teachers. The “institutional press” of expectations created by those with the organizational environment can be a contributing factor to wash-out (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979; Zeichner & Tabachnik, 1981), and in this study, participants teaching as part of a team or department displayed more evidence of this. Several cited their low standing as first-year teachers as a reason to accept or comply with the teaching philosophies and values of colleagues. This strategic compliance and internalized adjustment, as identified by Lacey (1977), are common outcomes for induction teachers who hold a relatively low status within the school environment (Williams & Williamson, 1998). Additionally, the socializing effect of the student population on beginning teachers can be powerful (Blase & Greenfield, 1982; Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011). If students embrace the strategies and content provided by the novice teacher, a smooth induction process can occur; however, when student resistance is present, wash-out may occur as the novice teacher reverts to more traditional pedagogy (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009).

**Moving Forward**

These results are representative of the experiences of these particular first-year physical educators, and while diverse across geography, gender, and school setting, the study was homogeneous across race and ethnicity of participants. As a whole, these participants demonstrated individual dispositions with a strong work ethic and above average academic preparation as evidenced by data collected during interviews and surveys. These individuals voluntary participation in the current study indicated a strong level of self-confidence in their
abilities as physical educators. In addition, the presence of periodic interviews requiring reflection and forecasting, and a positive, ongoing relationship with the researchers may have provided a socialization experience differing from that of a typical first-year physical educator.

Across the body of literature, relatively few longitudinal studies of physical educators exist (Banville, 2015; Lynn & Woods, 2010; Woods & Lynn, 2001; Woods & Lynn, 2014). Adding additional research to this area would benefit the field as a whole by better informing PETE curricula and programming, increasing awareness of potential challenges within the socialization process for induction physical educators and administrators, and providing the impetus for increasing support during what can often be a tenuous process at best. Recent journal articles have offered an abundance of practical strategies for improving the assimilation process for beginning teachers (Richards, Gaudreault, & Templin, 2014; Richards et al., 2013) and sparked the potential for conversations among various stakeholders. Many opportunities exist for promoting significant positive changes in the structure of current induction systems and in turn, promoting significant positive changes in physical education.
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Chapter 4

The Teaching Effectiveness of First-Year Physical Educators

Abstract

This study examined the teaching effectiveness of 13 first-year physical educators. Using Rink’s (2002) essential teaching tasks for effective instruction as a framework, data were collected through a series of systematic observations, questionnaires, surveys, and interviews. Constant comparative methods were used to identify emergent themes. Systematic observations of teaching collected via Academic Learning Time-Physical Education revealed a mean score of 36% motor appropriate activity, while the mean score on the Qualitative Measures of Teacher Performance Scale was 67.25. Scores on the Self-Evaluation of Teacher Effectiveness in Physical Education questionnaire indicated that participants felt they were usually employing effective teaching methodologies. Themes included the prominence of classroom management and discipline policies in overall effectiveness, the importance of developing a strong rapport with students, and the professional benefits of projecting a positive individual disposition. Implications signify the need for continued research regarding effective Physical Education Teacher Education preparation and assimilation practices.

Keywords: induction, systematic observation, self-assessment
It is no secret that the assimilation of teachers into the field of physical education can be dynamic but often unpredictable. The nature of that process and the challenges associated with the socialization experience has been well-documented in recent years (Richards, Templin, & Graber, 2014). In turn, an abundance of strategies for informing Physical Education Teacher Education curricula have appeared in the body of literature (Richards, Gaudreault, & Templin, 2014; Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013) and in many cases, implemented across Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) programs (Ayers & Housner, 2008). To improve K-12 physical education practice, Rink (2013) outlined the issues surrounding the appropriate measurement of teachers’ effectiveness and demonstrated the complexity of quantifying and qualifying outcomes in a dynamic environment. Even given the barriers and challenges that exist with measuring effectiveness, a need remains for all teachers, including first-year teachers, to be held accountable for student outcomes. This is a necessary step toward legitimizing physical education as a core subject (Rink, 2013). A logical starting point in such accountability begins with a teacher’s entry into the profession; therefore, the purpose of this research is to examine the nature of physical educators’ effectiveness throughout the first year of teaching.

Ultimately, the result of professional education should be to develop effective teachers who are willing to persevere in the field. This pursuit requires the capacity for challenging existing norms and creating dynamic instructional environments in all classrooms, and rests on the following four core capacities as identified by Fullan (1993): (a) thorough understanding and frequent revisiting of one’s personal vision for teaching; (b) formation of one’s personal purpose in the context; (c) knowledge of one’s environment and mastery of pertinent skills; and (d) ability to collaborate effectively. Furthermore, the process of teacher development at the individual level requires challenging existing beliefs and a willingness to change (Pajares, 1992).
This is where the role of Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) may exert a considerable influence. Induction teachers, those with little formal experience, must understand how schools work and how they can become agents of change in cultures in which change may not be valued. Proactively identifying challenges and providing the necessary skills, learning experiences, and strategies for navigating the tumultuous teaching environment should be necessary components of PETE curricula (MacPhail & Tannehill, 2012), and this aligns with Fullan’s third capacity, knowledge of one’s environment and mastery of pertinent skills (Fullan, 1993).

**Effective Instruction**

Historically, induction teachers have been assessed by the same standards for effective instruction as veteran teachers. While this may not seem equitable, in an administrative system in which measureable student outcomes are emphasized, first-year teachers may be expected to produce results analogous to their more-experienced colleagues. However, most beginning teachers do not demonstrate the same teaching capabilities as their veteran counterparts. Shoval, Erlich, and Fejgin (2010), made the argument that beginning teachers should not be judged according to the same standards as experienced teachers. The essence of this claim is that new teachers should be afforded the freedom to make mistakes, have time to reflect on their efforts, and then, demonstrate an ability to learn from those mistakes (Shoval et al., 2010).

Complicating the issue of effective teaching for beginning physical educators is the considerable disagreement among professionals about the ultimate purpose of the subject. In fact, physical education is often marginalized because of the lack of consensus regarding appropriate student outcomes. In addition, students display diversity in skill and fitness levels, and program time is severely limited in many cases (Rink, 2013). Nonetheless, most experts agree that experience does not automatically translate to effective teaching (Griffey & Housner, 1991).
Research indicates, however, that teachers and their actions are absolutely critical for the presence or absence of student learning outcomes (Castelli & Rink, 2003). While experts may not agree on a singular definition or set of standards in physical education, it is clear that effective teaching results in intended learning (Rink, 2003) and student achievement (Rink, 2013). With this in mind, the discussion now turns to developing effective teachers.

**Functions of Effective Teaching**

Because so many factors affect the socialization process of beginning teachers, the teaching functions of physical educators may be de-emphasized. Rink (2002), however, identified seven essential teaching tasks for effective instruction in physical education: (a) identify intended outcomes for learning; (b) plan learning experiences to accomplish those outcomes; (c) present tasks to learners; (d) organize and manage the learning environment; (e) monitor the learning environment; (f) develop the content; and (g) evaluate the effectiveness of the instructional-curricular process. Although these teaching functions are applicable to all teachers, differences exist in the various skill levels exhibited by novices and experts in the field (Griffey & Housner, 1991; Housner & Griffey, 1985; Manross & Templeton, 1997; Tan, 1996).

The first teaching function is the ability to identify intended outcomes for learning (Rink, 2002). Effective teachers have a vision for their programs. Explicit goals are clearly communicated to their students, and the vision is defined to provide a concrete determination of success (Rink, 1994). In physical education settings, this requires the teacher to outline the developmentally-appropriate tasks students are able to competently achieve at each grade level. Once established, goals and expectations can then be clearly communicated to students.

The second teaching function identified by Rink (2002) is planning learning experiences to meet intended outcomes. During professional education students receive extensive training on
the development of lesson plans; nonetheless, in the field, practitioners view these systematic plans as necessary only for administrators, substitute teachers, and beginning teachers (McCutcheon, 1980). This “plan independence” stems from the ability of veteran teachers to anticipate potential situations and develop contingency plans; this is an area where novices generally lack such ability (Griffey & Housner, 1991). During the planning process, expert teachers ask more questions (Housner & Griffey, 1985), and then proceed to plan lessons for student mastery. Expert teachers use reflection in which they are mindful of students’ skill levels to develop plans. Novices may find the actual writing of formal lesson plans provides organization and structure in their preparation (Manross & Templeton, 1997).

Another factor related to planning learning experiences in physical education is allocation of time. Developing a realistic scope and sequence is enhanced with experience. In order to create mastery, the scope of activities offered may have to be reduced (Rink, 2003). Even though the lesson content can seem reasonable on paper, the allocation of time and activities within each class can challenge beginning teachers. Students in the classes of inexperienced teachers spend twice as much time wasted in silence, confusion, or waiting. In fact, these teachers are often judged to be filling time instead of fulfilling instructional goals. In contrast, experienced teachers tend to present lessons that are highly-structured, contain purposeful allocation of time, and appropriate pacing for students (Griffey & Housner, 1991).

Along with identifying outcomes and planning learning experiences, the third teaching function is to present tasks to learners. The ability of the teacher to communicate tasks to learners is critical. Off-task behavior almost always results from lack of clear communication or inappropriate task presentations (Rink, 2003). Creating effective task presentations is associated with the following guidelines: (a) instruction is explicit; (b) content is useful; (c) content is
structured; and (d) signals are created to attract students’ attention. In addition, the physical educator should summarize information, check for student understanding, create a positive learning environment, offer accountability, and provide accurate information. Overall, the hallmark of effective task presentations is on-task student behavior (Graham, 1998; Rink 2013).

Another critical component of task presentations is choosing the most appropriate teaching strategy. Effective teachers have mastered a variety of teaching methods (Freiberg & Driscoll, 2000), including those that require allowing some degree of student control in decision-making (Rink, 2003). Experts make almost twice as many decisions regarding instructional strategies than novices (Griffey & Housner, 1991), and demonstrate a greater degree of flexibility in using equipment during instruction. Student diversity within the classroom requires effective teachers to employ methods for differentiated instruction. Novices tend to present tasks to their classes as a whole rather than to meet the needs of individual learners (Housner & Griffey, 1985). Expert teachers have the capacity to address differences in needs and abilities (Manross & Templeton, 1997), and these specialists are also able to pinpoint learning difficulties and devise individualized remedies (Schempp, Manross, Tan, & Fincher, 1998). Ultimately, appropriate teacher behavior is driven by student behavior and conduct (Rink, 2013).

The fourth function is the ability to organize and manage the learning environment (Rink, 2002). Effective instruction requires effective management, and lack of organization detracts from the teacher’s ability to provide meaningful content (Rink, 2003). Berliner (1988) found differences between experts and novices in terms of management with the former focused on instruction, and the latter focused on management. Clearly, expert teachers develop a level of automaticity that beginners do not yet possess (Berliner, 1994).
In addition, effective teachers are better able to recognize bias during instruction. Novices experience difficulty in providing differentiated instruction to individual students. The novice might, for example, provide focus on girls rather than boys or on students who respond actively rather than those who respond passively. Expert teachers employ strategies to organize the learning environment for equitable (Gagen & Bowie, 2005) and optimum amounts of student engagement (Rink, 2003). Delivering appropriate practice requires establishing environments in which students manage themselves successfully. This includes structuring classes for maximum practice time (Rink, 2003). While quantity of practice alone does not guarantee positive student learning outcomes, it is likely that without adequate practice, learning will not occur. Ultimately, quality practice time and effective management are directly interconnected (Rink, 2013).

The teacher’s ability to monitor the learning environment is an element of effective teaching. Novice teachers tend to be more spontaneous, democratic (let students choose activities), more easily manipulated by students, and have classrooms that are characterized by student defiance (Griffey & Housner, 1991). Prevention of injuries is often the primary impetus for novice teachers’ need to control the classroom environment. Expert teachers tend to focus on students’ needs and instructional strategies (Tan, 1996), and are likely more adept at creating supporting, nurturing learning environments than novice teachers (Jones, Jones, & Jones, 2003).

Along with appropriate monitoring of the learning environment, appropriate feedback to learners is also important. Feedback is effective when students are able to integrate the information to achieve learning objectives. Providing feedback in the form of information about performance is called augmented feedback (Rink, 2013), and is an essential skill for effective teachers. Augmented feedback is used not only to identify and correct errors, but also to
reinforce what students are doing correctly (Tan, 1996). Experienced teachers demonstrate more intentionality in providing appropriate feedback designed to improve the acquisition of skill in their students (Griffey & Housner, 1991).

Content development, another characteristic of effective teaching, involves a deep understanding of the subject matter. Overall, it is a complex process that begins with relaying clear instruction and providing changes to the level of complexity then ends with refinement and application (Rink, 2002). To that end, elaborate knowledge of developmental levels (Griffey & Housner, 1991), principles related to pedagogy, and knowledge related to curriculum development are all present in expert teachers (Rink, French, Lee, Solmon, & Lynn, 1994). The ability to understand alternative strategies for presenting content is also characteristic of effective teachers (Manross & Templeton, 1997). With a deeper base of knowledge, the expert is able to personalize instruction (Griffey & Housner, 1991) and use knowledge about students from the lesson planning phase through to post-lesson reflection (Reynolds, 1992).

When the teacher acquires knowledge of student populations, the ability to provide progressions and extensions for learners during the development of content becomes an easier task. Familiarity of the complex variables within the instructional environment promotes effective teaching behaviors (Griffey & Housner, 1991), and in turn, the teacher’s actions are a critical component of appropriate student outcomes (Castelli & Rink, 2003). This knowledge is especially relevant to the area of content development. Experts understand how to break down and present tasks. An important teaching skill is understanding the amount of information students need and when that information should be provided (Rink, 2003). Novice physical educators often teach to the highly-skilled students in their classes, and tend to move on to more advanced material before adequate learning occurs for all students (Rink, 2013). Experienced
teachers, in contrast, focus on practices designed to promote student improvement (Tan, 1996) by providing resources to aid the acquisition of motor skills (Griffey & Housner, 1991). Consequently, with effective content development, students experience more success (Rink, 2013).

The final teaching function is the ability to successfully evaluate the effectiveness of the instructional-curricular process (Rink, 2002). Assessment with high standards can inspire increased effort in students (Rink, 2013), and generally, assessment in physical education is related to skill performance. Expert teachers place emphasis on student improvement rather than past skill performance (Tan, 1996). Novice teachers, conversely, struggle with effectiveness in improving the achievements of students (Boyd, Lankford, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2005). Two systematic observational instruments, Academic Learning Time Physical Education (ALT-PE) and Qualitative Measures of Teaching Performance Scale (QMTPS) are well-known in the assessment of physical education teaching effectiveness. ALT-PE, a valid and reliable tool for predicting teacher effectiveness (Silverman, Devillier, & Ramirez, 1991), measures teachers’ use of class time, specifically the amount of time students spend engaged in appropriate tasks for skill learning. The other tool, QMTPS, developed by Rink and Werner (1989), is used to evaluate task presentation in physical education. Given the concerns regarding novices as related to the seven functions of teaching, the purpose of this research was to examine the nature of the effectiveness of first-year physical educators.

Method

Participants and Settings

Throughout one academic year, thirteen first-year physical educators from a convenience sample consented to participate in the study. Eight females and five males, all Caucasian, with a
mean age of 24.77 (SD = 5.66) years were employed as first-year, full-time physical educators. In total, the participants represented eleven public school districts and two private schools. Five teachers were employed at the elementary level (K-6), three at the primary level (K-8), two at the middle school level (6-8), and three in high school settings. Nine schools were located in the U.S. Midwest, and four in the Southwest. School settings represented diverse teaching environments with five schools reporting low-income rates, as measured by free and reduced lunch (FRL), greater than 80%, and seven schools reporting rates greater than 40% for FRL (GreatSchools, 2015). All participants were licensed, full-time, K-12 physical educators with no previous formal teaching experience. Participant information is listed in Table 2.

Table 2

Participant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>School Setting (% FRL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Southwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Midwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Midwestern Private</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Midwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jess</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Midwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Midwestern Private</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Midwestern Urban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Midwestern Urban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Southwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Midwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Southwestern Rural Public High</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Midwestern Rural Public High</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Southwestern Suburban Public Elementary</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instruments

**Interviews.** Formal interview guides were employed to establish continuity and consistency with questioning during each of the four phases. As directed by Patton (2014), all interviews were conducted in a uniform manner, and each lasted approximately thirty to forty-five minutes. Most of the interviews were conducted on-site, usually in the teacher’s office. Telephone interviews were conducted when on-site interviews were not feasible. All interview data were recorded and later transcribed.

**Questionnaires and Surveys.** Participants completed a demographic survey with background questions regarding age, gender, and race/ethnicity as well as academic preparation and contextual information regarding the participants’ places of employment. Additionally, at three points during the year, each participant completed a Self-Evaluation of Teacher Effectiveness in Physical Education (SETEQ-PE) questionnaire. This valid and reliable questionnaire contained twenty-five items across six physical education teaching domains presented in a Likert-type format through an online survey tool. Participants rated their perceived teaching effectiveness in each the six following areas: (a) learning environment; (b) student and teacher assessment; (c) application of the content of Physical Education; (d) use of technology; (e) teaching strategies; and (f) lesson implementation with the scale as follows:
This provided a critical component in establishing each teacher’s level of knowledge and understanding of teaching along with his/her motivational level and attitude regarding the profession (Kyrgiridis, Derri, Emmanouilidou, Chlapoutaki, & Kioumourtzoglou, 2014).

**ALT-PE.** The ALT-PE instrument was employed to examine the overall use of class time by assessing the amount of time students spent engaged in certain activities at both the contextual level and the level of learner involvement. The contextual level measures time spent in transition, management, warm-up, and break, time as well as time spent in receiving instruction related to technique, strategy, rules, background, skill practice, social behavior, fitness, and game or scrimmage. For learner involvement, activities were coded according to the following two general categories, motor-engaged and non-motor-engaged. The former includes three subcategories: (a) motor appropriate (MA): the student is engaged at a task level that leads to a successful outcome; (b) motor inappropriate (MI): the student is engaged, but the task level is too easy or too hard; and (c) motor supporting (MS): the student is engaged in a task that is supporting another’s student’s pursuit of success. The latter includes five subcategories: (a) interim; (b) waiting; (c) cognitive; (d) off-task; and (e) on-task (Siedentop, Tousignant, & Parker, 1989). For the purpose of these formal, live coding observations during each lesson, the interval recording technique for at least three students at various skill levels was utilized. The researchers alternated between observing male and female students, and coding occurred in ten-second, alternating intervals of observation with data being gathered continuously throughout the entire class period. In addition to the task data, the context of the interval and level of
involvement for each of the observed students were also recorded. The literature points to a wide range of motor appropriate values from 23% to 40% of class time in urban or suburban settings (Ko, 2008) and 15% to 25% of class time in public school settings (Parker, 1989).

**QMTPS.** To further measure teaching effectiveness, the QMTPS instrument was employed to measure task presentations in physical education by focusing on four major categories; these included the type of task, how the task is presented, how the student responds, and the congruency of the teacher’s feedback. Observations of task presentations also provided information related to clarity, demonstration, and cueing (Rink & Werner, 1989). For each category, a percentage of success for the specific variable was calculated to create an overall score. Scores of 55 or more on this valid and reliable observational tool have been linked to student improvement in some motor skills (Gusthart, Kelly, & Rink, 1997).

**Field notes.** Lastly, to add richness, copious field notes were recorded during each of the systematic observations. Pertinent details regarding the participant, school environment, or context were noted. When multiple researchers were present during systematic observations, field notes were compared and combined. During initial analysis, field notes were inserted into the transcript database to allow for in-depth comparison during the process of identifying themes.

**Procedure**

The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board. Consent to participate was gathered from each teacher and his/her administrative leader. Data collection proceeded through four distinct phases. At the beginning of the school year in Phase I, demographic and background data were gathered through the use of an online survey and formal interview. In the next phase after the first two months of employment, a second formal interview was paired with systematic observations and descriptive field notes. For each participant, a minimum of two classes were
analyzed using the ALT-PE and QMTPS instruments. To add further depth to the data, teachers also completed an online SETEQ-PE survey during this time. Phase III, near the semester break, congruently progressed in method and procedure similarly to Phase II. During Phase IV, near the end of the school year, final measures were gathered along the same protocols as the previous two phases. In total, data were gathered from a total of 13 demographic surveys, 39 SETEQ-PE surveys, 52 formal interviews, and 172 systematic observations.

Data Analysis

Quantitative analysis of QMTPS, ALT-PE, and SETEQ-PE data was performed using SPSS 22. A descriptive statistical analysis was conducted on the information collected from the demographic and SETEQ-PE surveys and the QMTPS and ALT-PE classroom observations. To test for the presence of differences in levels of teacher effectiveness, as reported through SETEQ-PE, ALT-PE, and QMTPS throughout the data collection period, one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tests were conducted. When the outcomes of the ANOVA calculations revealed any differences, the appropriate Tukey’s Post-Hoc tests were generated to identify differences between specific groups in circumstances analyzing more than one group per category. In addition, all variables were examined for possible correlations. Overall, due to the small sample size, these quantitative statistics were used primarily to triangulate qualitative themes regarding the effectiveness of these first-year physical educators. All observation and survey data were examined as individual lessons (N=85) using dummy coding for variables such as gender, school level, and school setting. For data collected qualitatively through formal interviews and field notes, the establishment of themes proceeded through a four-step process, as outlined by Huberman and Miles’ (1994), of data collection, data reduction, organization of themes, and comparison of themes to the theoretical model.
**Trustworthiness.** Ensuring both validity and reliability during the data collection process was a primary focus. To that end, all quantitative data were collected through the use of validated research instruments. The observers engaged in a multi-step training process to establish intra-observer and inter-observer reliability with an expert who had vast experience with the QMTPS and ALT-PE instruments. After training to gain an understanding of the coding procedures and coding categories, the researchers practiced coding videotaped lessons. The process continued until the observers established consistent inter-observer agreement with the expert of at least 80% (Shute, Dodds, Placek, Rife, & Silverman, 1982). During the course of the data collection period, inter-observer agreement averaged 93% and 85% for ALT-PE and QMTPS, respectively, and intra-observer agreement averaged 95% for both ALT-PE and QMTPS.

Next, the recommendations for reliable observations of teaching effectiveness by Rink (2013) were followed. First, the observers had ample knowledge of the content area. Second, the observations considered both teacher and student behaviors as well as the context of the content being presented. Third, at least three observation periods were conducted for each participant during the academic year. Fourth, observations lasted for the duration of the entire class period (Rink, 2013). In addition, all data collection proceeded in a uniform manner for all participants. Care was taken to disseminate materials in a consistent manner. Formal observations and interviews were conducted with the same protocols and time frames for all participants. Lastly, to further increase trustworthiness, Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) techniques of using multiple methods of analysis during triangulation, creating an audit trail, formal and informal member checking, and the use of participant quotes were utilized.
Results

Quantitative Results

Two instruments were employed for systematic observations of physical education lessons, and the results were recorded and grouped by: (a) overall mean; (b) gender; (c) school setting (< 40% FRL and > 40% FRL); (d) observation or survey number (1\textsuperscript{st}-3\textsuperscript{rd}); and (e) school level for teaching episode (elementary, middle, and high). First, ALT-PE was used to examine the nature of students’ engagement. Motor appropriate activity levels averaged 36\% (SD = 13.90) during classes. Positive factors across all participants, including practice time, game play, and time devoted to technique, averaged 21\% (SD = 11.32), 13\% (SD = 10.25), and 6\% (SD = 6.91), respectively. Notable negative factors measured by ALT-PE determined that students spent significant time waiting, 12\% (SD = 6.84), and engaged in management episodes, 11\% (SD = 4.87). Very little motor inappropriate, 1\% (SD = 1.01), or off-task, 4\% (SD = 2.89) behavior was observed. As a group, significantly different results were confirmed for ALT-PE scores of motor appropriate activity for both gender and school setting. Female teachers recorded significantly higher ALT-PE scores in overall mean, $F(1,78) = 5.44, p = .02, \alpha = .05$, while schools reporting less than 40\% FRL obtained significantly higher ALT-PE scores, $F(1,78) = 4.82, p = .03, \alpha = .05$. No significant differences existed between observation number or school level.

The QMTPS instrument was used to measure the effectiveness of participants’ task presentations. As a whole, these first-year teachers demonstrated high-quality teaching characteristics with an overall mean score of 67.25 (SD = 13.00). After decreasing from the beginning of the academic year to the semester break, QMTPS mean scores rebounded to significantly higher levels near the end of the school year with mean scores of 67.83 (SD =
11.07), 62.53 (SD = 13.32), and 71.09 (SD = 13.46), respectively. In relation to school level, elementary lessons rated significantly higher than high school lessons at $F(2,84) = 8.27$, $p = .001$, $\alpha = .05$. By category, the highest overall mean score averaged across all participants was in clarity at 99.70 (SD = 0.67), and the lowest overall mean scores were in the areas of demonstration and specific congruent feedback at 36.38 (SD = 17.69) and 37.77 (SD = 13.95), respectively. In analysis of school settings, a significant difference existed with QMTPS scores in schools with less than 40% FRL significantly higher than those scores recorded for schools with greater that 40% FRL, $F(1,85) = 7.49$, $p = .008$, $\alpha = .01$. Additionally, a weak, negative correlation, $r(78) = -.24$, $p < .05$, existed between these QMTPS scores and the ALT-PE measure of percent motor appropriate. No significant gender differences were found.

In addition to systematic observations, participants also completed three SETEQ-PE surveys over the course of the school year. The overall mean score was 111.91 (SD = 18.91), resulting in a mean response rating between “sometimes” and “usually” on the instrument’s descriptive scale for the teachers’ self-evaluated ability to accomplish each of the six factors of teaching effectiveness. Scores peaked at the middle school level with significant differences between middle school teachers and their elementary and high school counterparts $F(2,84) = 5.65$, $p = .005$, $\alpha = .05$. Within the scoring details, the highest ratings were recorded for the lesson implementation category at a mean response of “very frequently”, and the categories of learning environment and application to content rated between “usually” and “very frequently.” Student and teacher assessment ratings indicated a perceived competency between “occasionally” and “sometimes” while the lowest rated category was technology with an average response between “rarely” and “occasionally” on the scale. While no significant differences existed for gender (males recorded higher values), school setting (teachers at schools with more
than 40% FRL recorded higher values, or survey number (last survey had the highest values), overall means for SETEQ-PE did increase slightly from the beginning of the school year when compared to surveys administered near the end of the school year. This indicated a rise in teachers’ perceived effectiveness. In addition, a weak, positive correlation of $r(85) = .35, p < .01$, existed between school setting, less than or greater than 40% FRL, and SETEQ-PE. The primary quantitative results are listed in Table 3.

**Table 3**

**Quantitative Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Observation or Survey Number</th>
<th>School Setting (% FRL)</th>
<th>School Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALT-PE % Motor Appropriate</strong></td>
<td>Males: 32.02</td>
<td>1: 38.56</td>
<td>&lt; 40% FRL: 39.27</td>
<td>Elementary: 33.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: 37.71</td>
<td>&gt; 40% FRL: 32.39</td>
<td>Middle: 38.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females: 39.11</td>
<td>3: 31.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>High: 40.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QMTPS</strong></td>
<td>Males: 65.84</td>
<td>1: 67.83</td>
<td>&lt; 40% FRL: 70.63</td>
<td>Elementary: 71.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: 62.53</td>
<td>&gt; 40% FRL: 62.26</td>
<td>Middle: 58.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females: 66.30</td>
<td>3: 71.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>High: 58.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SETEQ-PE</strong></td>
<td>Males: 113.15</td>
<td>1: 108.07</td>
<td>&lt; 40% FRL: 107.22</td>
<td>Elementary: 108.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: 112.86</td>
<td>&gt; 40% FRL: 111.48</td>
<td>Middle: 123.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females: 110.80</td>
<td>3: 114.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>High: 108.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Results**

From data gathered during interviews, three predominant themes emerged related to teacher effectiveness. First, the majority of participants identified effective classroom management and discipline policies as primary components of effective teaching. Second,
developing a strong rapport with students was a valued characteristic among these participants and viewed as a trait common to effective physical educators. Third, an effective teacher has a positive disposition, including the ability to demonstrate empathy toward his or her students.

**Effective Classroom Management and Discipline**

At the end of the school year, the majority of participants, seven of thirteen, identified having effective classroom management and discipline policies as the top characteristics of effective teachers. In fact, the total number of participants citing this attribute was more than twice the number of participants who had previously identified this during the initial interview, and over the course of the study, eleven of the thirteen teachers mentioned a desire to improve their own discipline and management. Many of the first-year teachers, however, still struggled to develop successful discipline plans in environments that were vastly different than those they had experienced during their preservice education. Paul’s sentiments summed up the feelings of those first-year teachers who expressed struggles with management:

I remember that during student teaching there was one student in my 3rd hour class [who was a management challenge], and I was so stressed out over this one student. Now, I would give anything to have a class where there was only one bad student. Having five or six of those types of students per class is tough. It can’t really be replicated. Learning how to deal with them. How to reach them. How to get them to respect me. How to get them to listen to me. That’s tough.

Similarly, Nicole implemented a variety of strategies in teaching difficult students. “I have one student I’m trying to have sit in a hula hoop. I talk to him, but if someone touches him, he freaks out . . . I’ve learned not to confront certain students because that makes the situation worse.”
Other teachers, however, were extremely consistent with their classroom procedures. Zach expressed,

I think my management is right where it needs to be. It’s consistent. Students know what to expect. There’s no tricks [sic]. If students don’t follow the rules, they know what the consequences are. Like I said, the management is number one for first-year teachers, and that’s something I’m really trying to continue to work on.

The ability to be an effective teacher begins with good management, and the ability of a teacher to provide effective instructional techniques requires a certain amount of control within the classroom environment. Increased control affords both teachers and students the opportunity to explore cooperative learning strategies designed to enhance the learning experience (Rink, 2003). These teachers recognized the importance of classroom management, even though some struggled to implement consistently effective techniques.

**Strong Rapport**

Each beginning teacher must establish a professional identity, and this requires balancing the demands of building rapport and demonstrating authority. Previous experiences combine with future goals to form an exemplar in every teacher’s mind (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Without fail from the beginning and throughout the year, the majority of participants, eleven of thirteen, described effective teachers as individuals who could relate to students. To these teachers, building a strong rapport meant creating relationships and taking the time to better understand the needs of their students. Even in diverse environments with students who spoke little or no English, participants weathered the difficulties of language barriers and focused on building strong rapport with students. Eleanor stated, “I’ve been able to create a lot of relationships with the students, and that helps with behavior management and class participation. An effective
teacher relates what they are teaching to the kids and makes it valuable to them.” Similarly, Luke acknowledged the importance of building a rapport,

It’s important to relate to the students. I have to have compassion for knowing what they go through at home. A lot of them don’t want to go home. They don’t want to get on the bus. Understanding that is huge. Classroom management is huge. It’s great if you know a ton about what you’re teaching, but if you know a ton about what you’re teaching and can’t relate to kids and manage them to keep them somewhat in line, I don’t think you’ll get much accomplished anyway.

Understanding how students’ past experiences shapes their perceptions and efficacy levels related to a particular task, game, or sport will continue to provide insight for teachers into creating high levels of engagement for their students (Rink, 2003). For these participants, rapport was noted as an unflatering strength throughout the course of the entire academic year. Clearly, this was a primary value present regardless of the nature of the challenges and contextual factors present in the personal or organizational environment.

Positive Dispositions

Dispositions, intangible personal qualities, characteristics, or attributions, often determine how a teacher will act in a given context and can be a strong determinant of a teacher’s success in the classroom (Katz & Raths, 1986). Those individuals who are highly independent and energized by challenge tend to thrive during the induction years of teaching (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009). The ability of a teacher to adapt and meet challenges can maximize students’ learning (Todorovich, 2009). Such dispositions were addressed over time. Seven of the thirteen participants consistently (and others occasionally) spoke of the importance of bringing a positive
attitude to the classroom environment as well as a spirit of empathy, compassion, and caring. As Zach candidly expressed,

I try to come in every day and be positive. I put a smile on, and if I can change a kid’s day or change the attitude of an entire class, then, so be it. I’m going to be who I am, and that’s positive. I hope other people follow my lead.

For teachers such as Marie, positivity extended beyond physical education. “While the kids may not always give me their best, I want to give them my best and show them that I really care not only about what I’m doing, but that I also care about them.” Other teachers, such as Adrian felt that effective teachers brought an attitude of caring and enthusiasm to their classroom. In fact, he believed that a teacher’s positive disposition directly correlated to effective management and discipline. Regarding his level of energy and enthusiasm, he stated, “If I [act] like I don’t want to be here, I think the kids feed off of that. They’ll act out more and aren’t as good. When I’m energetic and having fun, class goes by with zero problems.” In light of his students’ response, he focused on bringing high energy and enthusiasm into his classroom.

Discussion

Circling back to Rink’s (2003) analysis of teacher effectiveness in physical education, several critical variables exert an influence on a physical educator’s ability to produce intended learning outcomes. The discussion of the effectiveness of these first-year physical educators will be framed through the variables of quality practice, learning environment, and communication. Individually, these variables may produce positive outcomes, but synergistically, the total product can be an influential factor in student learning (Rink, 2003).
Quality Practice

Students need sufficient practice time at appropriate levels in game-like situations to learn motor skills. During engagement in tasks, finding the right balance between too little or too much challenge can be difficult, especially for novice teachers. The standard benchmark for the physical educator is to provide a challenge that can be met through some degree of effort (Rink, 2003). The ALT-PE instrument measures the amount of time students spend engaged in motor appropriate activity or in other words, engagement in the type of practice appropriate to acquiring skill. In the current study, the mean ALT-PE scores signify that these teachers provided enough quality practice time to allow students the opportunity for skill acquisition, but a disparity between genders and school settings did exist as both female teachers and school settings with less than 40% FRL had significantly higher ALT-PE scores. While the reasons for these findings may be complex, the differences in ALT-PE scores among school settings are likely due to differences in management within the classroom. Of the six schools reporting less than 40% FRL, two were private schools and three had the fewest students per class. Regarding gender, of the six schools reporting significantly higher ALT-PE scores, four employed female teachers.

Similarly, SETEQ-PE results for the category of teaching strategies indicate that these first-year teachers believe that they are “usually” using the right types of methods for delivering content. Furthermore, practice and learning can exhibit a strong, positive relationship (Werner & Rink, 1989). As appropriate practice time increases, learning has the potential to increase. For these first-year physical educators, students spent nearly 40% of their class time engaged in tasks, such as practice, game play, and learning technique, all variables that can ultimately
promote learning. Overall, learning requires time, and the literature urges educators to purposefully select unit lengths designed to produce mastery (Rink, 2003).

Even though in terms of quality practice time these teachers demonstrated effectiveness, some struggled with the ability to differentiate instruction, especially those teachers employed in elementary or K-8 settings. The ability of a teacher to provide the appropriate amount of challenge for each student requires a certain degree of expertise gained primarily through experience. For example, Luke spent most of the first semester attempting to gauge the developmental levels of his students, and he determined that many were below grade-level targets. He responded by increasing practice opportunities and continuing to develop his ability to provide appropriate levels of challenge during tasks. His circumstance is similar in nature to results generated by Banville (2015) wherein twenty-one beginning physical educators observed for a period of two years had notable difficulties designing tasks to meet the needs and skill levels of students. Specifically, those induction teachers were more focused on navigating the contextual factors than creating dynamic instructional programming (Banville, 2015). In the end, the ability to provide quality practice is a necessary component for student learning, and beginning teachers have to learn to navigate the various contexts associated with diverse student populations and school settings to make that a reality.

**Quality Learning Environment**

A second variable, creating a positive environment for learning, begins with a well-managed classroom and a climate that promotes focus and motivation. The SETEQ-PE results indicate these first-year physical educators felt competent in their ability to provide a quality learning environment with an overall mean score between “usually” and “very frequently” on their self-assessment of providing effective teaching. Finding ways to promote accountability
for the students’ responsibility for their personal behavior (Freiberg & Driscoll, 2000) and
developing a rapport with students in order to better understand particular needs can be difficult
to balance against the demands of the curricular goals (Rink, 2003). Jess, in particular,
categorized her philosophy of teaching as “very student-centered” and provided many
opportunities for her students to demonstrate personal responsibility. The relatively low
percentage of off-task behavior further demonstrates the competency of these teachers’ abilities
to manage their classrooms.

Marie and Adrian both created methods to positively impact their students. Marie,
especially viewed her role as a motivator and took a special interest in improving her students’
confidence in their abilities. Similarly, Adrian approached his teaching with a same type of
student-centered philosophy and developed camaraderie with his students by participating during
certain activities. He believed that this tactic increased the students’ respect for him and
subsequently decreased misbehavior.

In addition, creating a positive learning setting involves developmentally-appropriate
content development. This includes not only providing information about how the skill should
be performed but also having the ability to modify the task to provide the appropriate degree of
challenge. Once these conditions are satisfied, the effective physical educator is able to continue
to refine each student’s performance and help provide a link between the skill and real-life
application (Rink, 2003). Measuring motor appropriate time, with ALT-PE, is an indicator of
how effectively the teacher provides the appropriate level of challenge for students. During the
study, students were typically engaged in motor appropriate rather than motor inappropriate
behaviors. Both the mean for motor appropriate and motor inappropriate activity were comparable to the mean values recorded for six National Board Certified Teachers over eight to eleven observations (Rhoades & Woods, 2012)

In the end, creating a quality learning environment is related to effective management. Time spent in management protocols often decreases potential learning time. Students of these first-year teachers spent an average of 11% of the lesson engaged in management. Curbing off-task and distractive behaviors, while creating clear expectations promoting student compliance, provides the most conducive opportunities for a positive learning experience in physical education (Rink, 2003). When describing what they would change between the semester break and the end of the school year, Sarah projected that it would be important for her to establish smoother transitions in order to increase time spent in physical activity. This intent to improve the flow of the lesson was stated repeatedly by nearly every teacher in the study and provided a clear indication of these physical educators’ understanding of the primary role that management and discipline play in effective lesson implementation.

**Quality Communication**

Along with creating purposeful opportunities for practice and a conducive environment for learning, the foundation of effective teaching is also built on the educator’s ability to provide quality communication. Appropriate communication during task presentations requires thorough, accurate demonstrations, highly descriptive verbal cues, and the use of specific feedback (Rink, 2003), all of which are measured through the QMTPS instrument. Clarity during instruction for these teachers was high, and this provides for a strong relationship between the appropriate actions of students and the intent of the teacher (Rink, 2010). These physical educators demonstrated a high level of competency in their task presentations with a QMTPS
overall mean above the benchmark of 55 points necessary to promote skill development (Gusthart, Kelly, & Graham, 1995). This resonates with similar values recorded during a recent study of fifteen preservice teachers who scored QMTPS values above 55 on 76% of the lessons analyzed (Hall, Heidorn, & Welch, 2011). Similarly, the participants’ SETEQ-PE scores indicated values near “very frequently” for their perceived ability to implement a quality lesson. While most beginning teachers struggle with providing the appropriate information students need to acquire skill competency (Housner & Griffey, 1985), these teachers demonstrated the capacity to make the right types of decisions during teaching. Combined with a strong base of content knowledge, a high degree of pedagogical knowledge is critical to the instructional process (Solmon & Lee, 1991).

Even with the literature providing insight into best practices, the reality of the first-year teacher’s classroom may prove challenging in terms of communication. For Luke, employed in a diverse, urban school district, class sizes were an issue. He believed his “maxed out” classes had a detrimental effect on his ability to provide individual feedback while maintaining order in his classroom. Other teachers struggled with language barriers in their diverse student populations. Kate explained that she worked around that difficulty by deliberately placing at least one fluent English-speaking student in each task group. Overall, the cues teachers receive from their environments have a strong influence on the decision-making process and teacher feedback, and with increased experience, teachers are better able to interpret the cues of the environment and provide augmented feedback (Tan, 1996). The issue regarding the difficulties of providing feedback to diverse student populations may have provided some influence on the scores for the category of specific congruent feedback being among the lowest recorded for QMTPS.
Implications, Limitations, and Future Studies

The general themes and data generated may be approached as indicative of the experiences some first-year educators in a variety of school settings and school levels. Certainly, the teachers’ participation in a year-long research venture may have influenced the outcomes recorded. Further research, including longitudinal research, would allow for comparison and contrast of these experiences across additional contexts and through the career cycle. Continued examination of these variables as related to the assimilation of physical educators into the field has the potential to provide significant additions to the body of literature and inform preparation practices during PETE instruction.
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Chapter 5

Summary

Because significant challenges continue to exist in the retention of teachers, the need for an infusion of proactive assimilation strategies, especially as related to the induction phase, is becoming a mandate in physical education. Beginning teachers face a multitude of potential hurdles. From marginalization, role conflict, and teaching diverse student populations to reality shock and limited resources, the effects of organizational socialization and the realities of the day-to-day workload can be powerful influences on a teacher’s effectiveness and desire to persist (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Creating meaningful mentoring relationships (McGaha & Lynn, 2000), opportunities for purposeful professional development (Hushman & Napper-Owen, 2012), and timely feedback (Weasmer & Woods, 1998) can serve to help propel induction teachers through their transition into the field. Acquiring the necessary skills to navigate the school culture and provide effective instruction has benefit for all educational system stakeholders (Richards et al., 2013). To this end, the purpose of this research was to examine the factors that enhance or constrain the assimilation and development of first-year physical educators.

Results from the first study, an examination of common influences during the process of organizational socialization, indicate that family, crisis, and individual disposition appeared to be the most significant factors affecting the personal environment. These outside-the-classroom factors have the potential to directly affect teaching proficiency inside the classroom. It is important to note that crisis, in some manner or form, occurred during every participant’s academic year. For the majority, the crisis was minor, such as losing gym space or dealing with personal illness, and those teachers were able to navigate through the incidents. In total, three of
these fifteen teachers voluntarily resigned their teaching positions, an attrition rate of considerably lower than the percentages cited by current literature (Barnes et al., 2007; National Center for Education Statistics, 2011; Perda, 2013). Developing the skills and experience to deal with the day-to-day challenges that occur during the “normal” course of teaching is a critical component of teacher retention, and longitudinal studies of physical educators support the connection of factors within the personal environment to career longevity or attrition (Lynn & Woods, 2010; Woods & Lynn, 2001; Woods & Lynn, 2014).

A second major factor influencing level of success during the first year for these physical educators was role conflict. For this cohort, the majority of stress related to this issue stemmed from individual dispositions. The individual dispositions of this group were indicative of high-achieving, self-confident individuals who historically had been able to meet the demands of the challenges facing them. For the first time, some of these beginning teachers struggled with the conflict of balancing all the demands placed upon them. They expressed a desire to consistently give their best and felt pressure to be successful both as teachers and coaches. In such cases, one role may take priority with the more valued role, usually coaching, finding success at the expense of the other role (Hushman & Napper-Owen, 2012; Locke & Massengale, 1978; Richards & Templin, 2012; Richards, Templin, & Gaudreault, 2013). For induction teachers with strong coaching orientations, the values of PETE programming may be easily discarded as they adopt custodial teaching approaches in physical education (Richards & Templin, 2012).

Specifically, among these participants, the majority continued to demonstrate a high degree of
fidelity to the models and programming instilled during their professional education. Additional conversations during PETE about the nature of balancing the demands related to the dual role of teacher/coach and examinations of how role orientation affects a teacher’s identity may provide a good starting point in forming more realistic expectations among first-year teachers (Sofo & Curtner-Smith, 2005).

In the organizational environment, even the teachers who were exceptionally consistent in their protocols struggled at times to manage student behavior. Learning how to navigate the complexities of the school environment and culture requires time and experience. PETE programs, outside of student teaching and clinical experiences, are generally limited in their scope to provide an accurate view of beginning teachers’ day-to-day reality, and often, the transition can be especially challenging (Curry et al., 2008). Professional education programming that provides an abundance of realistic opportunities may provide a mediating effect (Christensen, 2013).

The ability to navigate the school’s organizational environment and build quality personal relationships was important part of the positive outcomes for many of these physical educators, and in some cases, helped to decrease feelings of marginalization and isolation. Developing rapport with students and colleagues appeared to be an easy task for the majority within this cohort; however, some participants’ experiences lacked meaningful interactions with administrators or colleagues. In cases such as these, isolation can ultimately breed feelings of marginalization. Maintaining communication with cooperating teachers and PETE faculty as well as engagement in professional organizations can help to decrease feelings of isolation and marginalization (Lux & McCullick, 2011; Woods & Lynn, 2014), and many options exist for increasing the support for induction teachers. Seminars, mentoring, building an effective support
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network, and providing teacher accountability are foundational to teacher retention and development (Banville & Rikard, 2009). Similarly, support from administrators, especially those who espouse congruent values regarding student learning, can provide critical support in curbing wash-out (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009).

In addition to isolation and marginalization, many expressed feelings of inadequacy in their ability to build relationships with other stakeholders such as parents and community partners. Two main factors contributing to this barrier were lack of parental support and language barriers among diverse populations. All of the teachers in the current study self-identified as Caucasian; however, nearly half were employed in settings in which they were minorities. Teachers did, however, successfully navigate this issue in the classroom and were consistently able to build strong rapport with students, but difficulties were expressed regarding the access to necessary translators for parental communication. If beginning teachers perceive a lack of support or confidence from these gatekeepers difficulties can arise in establishing and maintaining quality relationships (Veenman, 1984).

In all, addressing challenges in the organizational environment can be daunting even for experienced teachers. The “institutional press” of expectations created by those within the organizational environment can be contributing factors to wash-out (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979; Zeichner & Tabachnik, 1981), and in this study, participants teaching as part of a team or department displayed more evidence of the loss of professional ideals Several cited their low standing as first-year teachers as a reason to accept or comply with the teaching philosophies and values of colleagues. This strategic compliance and internalized adjustment, as identified by Lacey (1977), are common outcomes for induction teachers who hold a relatively low status within the school environment (Williams & Williamson, 1998).
Results from the second study, an analysis of teacher effectiveness, identified several critical variables exerting an influence on a physical educator’s ability to produce intended learning outcomes. First, students need sufficient practice time at appropriate levels in game-like situations to develop competency in motor skills (Rink, 2003). In the current study, the mean ALT-PE scores signify that these teachers provided enough quality practice time to allow students the opportunity for skill acquisition, but a disparity between genders and school settings did exist as both female teachers and school settings with less than 40% FRL had significantly higher ALT-PE scores. While the reasons for these findings may be complex, contrasts are likely due to differences in management within the classroom and a higher percentage of female teachers in schools reporting less than 40% FRL. SETEQ-PE results for the category of teaching strategies indicate that these first-year teachers believe that they are “usually” using the right types of methods for delivering content. For these first-year physical educators, students spent nearly 40% of their class time engaged in tasks, such as practice, game play, and learning technique, all variables that can ultimately promote learning. Even though in terms of quality practice time these teachers demonstrated effectiveness, some struggled with the ability to differentiate instruction, especially those teachers employed in elementary or K-8 settings. The ability of a teacher to provide the appropriate amount of challenge for each student requires a certain degree of expertise gained primarily through experience, and induction teachers may be more focused on navigating the contextual factors than creating dynamic instructional programming (Banville, 2015).

A second variable, creating a positive environment for learning, begins with a well-managed classroom and a climate that promotes focus and motivation. SETEQ-PE results indicate these first-year physical educators felt competent in their ability to provide a quality
learning environment. The relatively low percentage of off-task behavior, as reported by ALT-PE, further demonstrates the competency of these teachers’ abilities to manage their classrooms. Although, promoting accountability for responsible personal behavior among students (Freiberg & Driscoll, 2000) and developing a rapport with students in order to better understand particular needs can be difficult to balance against the demands of the curricular goals (Rink, 2003), these first-year teachers, as a whole, successfully navigated this challenge.

In addition, creating a positive learning setting involves developmentally-appropriate content development. This includes not only providing information about how the skill should be performed, but also having the ability to modify the task to provide the appropriate degree of challenge (Rink, 2003). During the study, students were typically engaged in motor appropriate rather than motor inappropriate behaviors. Both the mean for motor appropriate and motor inappropriate activity were comparable to the mean values recorded for six National Board Certified Teachers (Rhoades & Woods, 2012).

In the end, creating a quality learning environment is related to effective management. Time spent in management protocols often decreases potential learning time. Students of these first-year teachers spent an average of 11% of the lesson engaged management. Curbing off-task and distractive behaviors, while creating clear expectations promoting student compliance, provides the most conducive opportunities for a positive learning experience in physical education (Rink, 2003). The intent to improve the flow of lessons was expressed repeatedly by nearly every teacher in the study and provided a clear indication of these physical educators’ understanding of the primary role that management and discipline play in effective lesson implementation.
Along with creating purposeful opportunities for practice and a conducive environment for learning, the foundation of effective teaching is also built on the educator’s ability to provide quality communication. Appropriate communication during task presentations requires thorough, accurate demonstrations, highly descriptive verbal cues, and the use of specific feedback (Rink, 2003). Clarity during instruction for these teachers was high, and this provides for a strong relationship between the appropriate actions of students and the intent of the teacher (Rink, 2010). These physical educators demonstrated a high level of competency in their task presentations with a QMTPS overall mean above the benchmark of 55 points necessary to promote skill development (Gusthart, Kelly, & Graham, 1995). This resonates with similar values recorded during a recent study of fifteen preservice teachers (Hall, Heidorn, & Welch, 2011). Similarly, the participants’ SETEQ-PE scores indicated values near “very frequently” for their perceived ability to implement a quality lesson. While most beginning teachers struggle with providing the appropriate information students need to acquire skill competency (Housner & Griffey, 1985), these teachers demonstrated the capacity to make the right types of decisions during teaching.

Even with the literature providing insight into best practices, the reality of the first-year teacher’s classroom may prove challenging in terms of communication. Issues with large classes had a detrimental effect on the ability of some teachers to provide individual feedback while maintaining order. Others struggled with language barriers in their diverse student populations. Overall, the information teachers receive from their environments has a strong influence on the decision-making process and teacher feedback, and with increased experience, teachers are better able to interpret the cues of the environment and provide augmented feedback (Tan, 1996). The issue regarding the difficulties of providing feedback to diverse student populations may have
influenced scores for the category of specific congruent feedback, which was among the lowest recorded for QMTPS.

In conclusion, these participants demonstrated individual dispositions with strong work ethics, many characteristics of effective teaching, and a desire for continued pedagogical improvement. While assimilation processes were generally positive for most, further research, including longitudinal research, would allow for comparison and contrast of these experiences across additional contexts and through the career cycle. Continued examination of these variables related to the socialization and professional development of induction physical educators has the potential to provide significant additions to the body of literature and inform preparation practices during PETE instruction.
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Figures and Tables

Figure 2

Career Cycle Model with Stages and Influences
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>School Setting (% FRL)</th>
<th>Amount of P.E. Time per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Southwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1-50 min. period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Married with children</td>
<td>Southwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5-50 min. periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Midwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5-50 min. periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cohabitating</td>
<td>Southwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1-50 min. period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Midwestern Private</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2-30 min. periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Midwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5-50 min. periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jess</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Midwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5-50 min. periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Midwestern Private</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3-30 min. periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Midwestern Urban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>5-50 min. periods for two 9 week-sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Midwestern Urban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2-45 min. periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Southwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1 or 2-35 to 50 min. periods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Periods</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Midwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1-40 min. period. No P.E. for K level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Southwestern Rural Public</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5-50 min. periods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Midwestern Rural Public</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5-50 min. periods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Cohabiting</td>
<td>Southwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2-30 min. periods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Primary = grades K-8. Elementary = grades K-5 or K-6.*
Table 5

Teaching Effectiveness of First-Year Physical Educators Participant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>School Setting (% FRL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Southwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Midwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Midwestern Private</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Midwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jess</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Midwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Midwestern Private</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Midwestern Urban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Midwestern Urban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Southwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Midwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Southwestern Rural Public</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Midwestern Rural Public</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Southwestern Suburban Public</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Teaching Effectiveness of First-Year Physical Educators Quantitative Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Observation or Survey Number</th>
<th>School Setting (% FRL)</th>
<th>School Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALT-PE % Motor Appropriate</td>
<td>Males: 32.02</td>
<td>1: 38.56</td>
<td>&lt; 40% FRL: 39.27</td>
<td>Elementary: 33.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: 37.71</td>
<td>&gt; 40% FRL: 32.39</td>
<td>Middle: 38.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females: 39.11</td>
<td>3: 31.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>High: 40.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMTPS</td>
<td>Males: 65.84</td>
<td>1: 67.83</td>
<td>&lt; 40% FRL: 70.63</td>
<td>Elementary: 71.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: 62.53</td>
<td>&gt; 40% FRL: 62.26</td>
<td>Middle: 58.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females: 66.30</td>
<td>3: 71.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>High: 58.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETEQ-PE</td>
<td>Males: 113.15</td>
<td>1: 108.07</td>
<td>&lt; 40% FRL: 107.22</td>
<td>Elementary: 108.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: 112.86</td>
<td>&gt; 40% FRL: 111.48</td>
<td>Middle: 123.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females: 110.80</td>
<td>3: 114.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>High: 108.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IRB Approval

Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research
Office for the Protection of Research Subjects
528 Rue Crown Street
Suite 203
Champaign, IL 61820

August 26, 2014

Amelia Woods
Kinesiology & Community Health
219 Preer Hall
906 S Goodwin
M/C 052

RE: Entering the Field of Physical Education Teaching: From Preservice into Induction
IRB Protocol Number: 15054

Dear Dr. Woods:

Thank you very much for forwarding the modifications to the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Institutional Review Board (IRB) office for your project entitled Entering the Field of Physical Education Teaching: From Preservice into Induction. I will officially note for the record that these minor modifications to the original project, as noted in your correspondence received August 19, 2014: adding recruitment in schools in Arizona; updating the performance site attachment accordingly; and making minor changes to the interview protocol to reflect that Arizona schools have already begun the academic year, have been approved. The expiration date for this protocol, IRB number 15054, is 08/14/2015. The risk designation applied to your project is no more than minimal risk.

Please note that additional modifications to your project need to be submitted to the IRB for review and approval before the modifications are initiated. To submit modifications to your protocol, please complete the IRB Research Amendment Form (see http://irb.illinois.edu/?p=forms-and-instructions/research-amendments.html). Unless modifications are made to this project, no further submittals are required to the IRB.

We appreciate your conscientious adherence to the requirements of human subjects research. If you have any questions about the IRB process, or if you need assistance at any time, please feel free to contact me at the OPRS office, or visit our website at http://www.irb.illinois.edu.

Sincerely,

Anita Balgopal, PhD
Director, Office for the Protection of Research Subjects

c: Julene Ensign
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Faculty Informed Consent and Information Sheet

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Department of Kinesiology and Community Health

Louise Freer Hall
906 South Goodwin Avenue
Urbana, IL  61801-3895

Faculty Informed Consent and Information Sheet

Entering the Field of Physical Education Teaching: From Preservice into Induction

You are invited to participate in the above entitled research study. This study is being conducted by Julene Ensign, Doctoral Student in the Department of Kinesiology and Community Health at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and Dr. Amelia Woods, Professor in the Department of Kinesiology and Community Health. This study will examine the challenges facing first-year physical educators as they make the transition from students into full-time employment.

Participation in this study is voluntary. If you give consent, one formal interview will be conducted either in person, over the phone, or over Skype (whichever is most convenient) and will last for approximately 45 minutes. With consent, the interview will be audio taped, and later transcribed for further analysis. The interview will be scheduled at the participant’s convenience. The focus will be on your perceptions of the skills, strengths, weaknesses, and other topics related to a specific graduate from your Physical Education Teacher Education Program who is now employed as a first-year teacher. The primary intention of these questions is to form a deeper understanding of the first-year teacher’s background.

Results from this study may be used for research presentations and professional journal publications. The primary benefit of this study is to provide insights into the challenges and barriers facing first-year teachers; furthermore, this information will help to provide guidelines for the preparation and support of physical education teachers during both professional training and after induction/employment.

There are no foreseeable risks for this research study. If you encounter a question you are uncomfortable answering, you may choose not to answer. You may also discontinue participation in the project at any time without prejudice. While you will not derive any direct benefits from your participation in the project, you will be contributing the growing body of knowledge regarding this subject matter. No collected or unpublished identifiable information will be provided to school administrators regarding the performance of or opinions expressed each participant. Data collected will not be used by school administrators for the purposes of job evaluations. Care will be taken to portray all individuals and circumstances in a positive manner.

Every effort will be made to keep all information confidential. The information provided by both parties will not be shared with anyone who is not an investigator involved in this study. Every effort will be made to ensure that both parties will be viewed in a positive light. Audio tapes and transcriptions will be kept in a locked filing cabinet. Data that is collected will be kept for a period no less than five years, and
will then be destroyed. Discrete typist(s) are the only individuals, other than the primary investigators, who will have access to the data.

Questions about this research can be addressed at any time by calling or writing Julene Ensign (189 East Clover Avenue, Cortland, IL 60112; 815-671-7179; pfile2@illinois.edu) or Dr. Amelia Woods (906 S. Goodwin Ave, Urbana, IL 61801; 217-333-9602; amywoods@illinois.edu). If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study or any concerns or complaints, please contact the University of Illinois Institutional Review Board at 217-333-2670 (collect calls will be accepted if you identify yourself as a research participant) or via email at irb@illinois.edu.

Sincerely,

Julene Ensign and Dr. Amelia Woods
Appendix C

Informed Consent

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Department of Kinesiology and Community Health
Louise Free Hall
900 South Goodwin Avenue
Urbana, IL 61801-3895

Informed Consent and Information Sheet

Entering the Field of Physical Education Teaching: From Preservice into Induction

You are invited to participate in the above entitled research study. This study is being conducted by Julene Ensign, Doctoral Student in the Department of Kinesiology and Community Health at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. This study will examine the challenges facing first-year physical educators as they make the transition from students into full-time employment.

Participation in this study is voluntary. If you give consent, a series of personal interviews, surveys, and journal prompts will be conducted over the course of one academic year. The interviews (4 total) will be conducted in person, over the phone, or over Skype and will last for approximately 45 minutes. Interviews will be audio taped, and later transcribed for further analysis. Interviews will be scheduled at the participant’s convenience. Surveys (8 total) will be conducted using Survey Monkey and will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Biweekly journal prompts (17 total) will be collected via Survey Monkey; these will require approximately 10 minutes of time to complete. In addition, the researcher will conduct 3 formal observation sessions of your teaching in order to determine the quantity and quality of factors related to classroom management, instructional techniques, and student engagement. Each observation session will last one full school day. During each observation session, half of the classes will be assessed using the Academic Learning Time Physical Education (ALT-PE) instrument, and the other half of the classes during that day will be assessed using the Qualitative Measures of Teaching Performance Scale (QMTPS). Each instrument utilizes an observational checklist, but will not contain any actual child names, audio/video of children being observed, or photos of children.

Results from this study may be used for research presentations and professional journal publications. The primary benefit of this study is to provide insights into the challenges and barriers facing first-year teachers; furthermore, this information will help to provide guidelines for the preparation and support of physical education teachers during both professional training and after induction/employment.

There are no foreseeable risks for this research study. If you encounter a question you are uncomfortable answering, you may choose not to answer. You may also discontinue participation in the project at any time without prejudice. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate in the investigation. While you will not derive any direct benefits from your participation in the project, you will be contributing the growing body of knowledge regarding this subject matter. No collected or unpublished identifiable information will be provided to school administrators regarding the performance of or opinions expressed each participant. Data collected will not be
used by school administrators for the purposes of job evaluations. Care will be taken to portray all individuals and circumstances in a positive manner.

Every effort will be made to keep all information confidential. You will be given a pseudonym for interview data. Identifiable information collected through email or Survey Monkey will be removed upon receipt and replaced with a pseudonym. The information provided by both parties will not be shared with anyone who is not an investigator involved in this study. Every effort will be made to ensure that both parties will not be viewed in a negative light. Audio tapes, transcriptions, and surveys will be kept in a locked filing cabinet. Data that is collected will be kept for a period no less than five years, and will then be destroyed. Discrete typist(s) are the only individuals, other than the primary investigators, who will have access to the data.

Questions about this research can be addressed at any time by calling or writing Julene Ensign (189 East Clover Avenue, Cortland, IL 60112; 815-671-7179; jensign@judsonu.edu) or Dr. Amelia Woods (906 S. Goodwin Ave, Urbana, IL 61801; 217-333-9602; amywoods@illinois.edu). If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study or any concerns or complaints, please contact the University of Illinois Institutional Review Board at 217-333-2670 (collect calls will be accepted if you identify yourself as a research participant) or via email at irb@illinois.edu.

Please read the following statements, check the appropriate box under each, and provide your signature and date at the bottom as an indication that you desire to be included in the research study.

1. I voluntarily consent to participate in this research study.
   Yes ☐ No ☐

2. I give permission for my interview to be audio recorded for the purposes of transcription.
   Yes ☐ No ☐

Name (printed): ___________________________ Date: __________________________

Name (signed): ___________________________
Appendix D

Parent/Guardian Information Letter

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Department of Kinesiology and Community Health
Louise Freer Hall
906 South Goodwin Avenue
Urbana, IL 61801-3395

Parent/Guardian Information Letter
Entering the Field of Physical Education Teaching: From Preservice into Induction

Your child's school has been selected to participate in a study examining the assimilation of first-year teachers into the physical education profession. This research is being conducted by Julene Ensign, Doctoral Student, and Dr. Amelia Woods, Professor, both from the Department of Kinesiology and Community Health at the University of Illinois in Urbana-Champaign.

The main focus of this study is to examine the challenges facing teachers as they transition from their undergraduate programming into full-time employment. In order to measure changes in teaching effectiveness throughout the academic year, observations of physical education classes will occur at three points during the academic year: (a) within the first month of the academic term; (b) near the transition between first and second semester; and (c) near the end of the academic year. During these data collection sessions, student interactions within the physical education environment will be recorded. No identifiable data will be recorded for your specific student; the focus of the observations is to identify patterns and trends in general interactions and behaviors during a typical physical education class. Your student will not be approached or asked to participate in the research study. He or she simply will participate in the physical education activities for that class while the researchers are present.

A primary benefit of this study is the positive impact on undergraduate physical education teacher preparation programs. Preparing high-quality graduates who can easily transition into the workplace requires identifying potential challenges and creating viable strategies to better prepare teachers for the dynamic environment of the K-12 school system. Data collected from this study will be utilized to inform the instruction and preparation of future physical educators.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this research, please write or email Julene Ensign (pfle2@illinois.edu) or Dr. Amelia Woods (amywoods@illinois.edu). If you have any questions about your child's rights as a participant in this study or any concerns or complaints, please contact the University of Illinois Institutional Review Board at 217-333-2670 (collect calls will be accepted if you identify yourself as a research participant) or via email at irb@illinois.edu.

If you consent for your child to participate, you need to take no further action. If you wish to decline your student's participation, please sign, date, and return this form to your child's physical education teacher, or you may contact your child's school, P.E. teacher, or the researchers directly via phone or email. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,
Julene Ensign & Dr. Amelia Woods

I do NOT wish for my child to participate in the above research project.

Printed Name: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________

Date: ____________________________

AUG 14 2015
Appendix E

Performance Site Form

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Department of Kinesiology and Community Health

Louise Freer Hall
906 South Goodwin Avenue
Urbana, IL 61801-3895

Performance Site Form

School Name: ___________________ Location: ___________________

Entering the Field of Physical Education Teaching: From Preservice into Induction

Your school has been selected to participate in a study examining the assimilation of first-year teachers into the physical education profession. This research is being conducted by Julene Ensign, Doctoral Student, and Dr. Amelia Woods, Professor, both from the Department of Kinesiology and Community Health at the University of Illinois in Urbana-Champaign.

Participation within this study will be voluntary. After all questions have been answered, participants will be asked to sign a document of informed consent. After completion of the informed consent, an initial interview will be conducted with each participant. These interviews (live, or via phone or Skype) will last for approximately forty-five to sixty minutes. Interviews will be digitally recorded, and later transcribed for further analysis. Participants may chose not to be audio recorded and still participate in the study. If participants decline to be audio recorded, detailed notes will be taken during the interview process. All interviews will be scheduled at the convenience of the participants. In addition to the interviews, other forms of data will be collected (see Table 1) including journal prompts, surveys, and observations of teaching. Data collection will occur at four points: (a) before the academic year begins; (b) within the first month of the academic year; (c) after the conclusion of the first semester; and (d) near the end of the academic year. Lesson observations will be conducted using the Qualitative Measures of Teaching Performance Scale (QMTPS) and Academic Learning Time-Physical Education (ALT-PE) to provide additional evidence of the quality of lessons and teacher effectiveness. These instruments are designed to measure teacher effectiveness by rating the quality of task presentations and utilization of time within the class period, respectively. Although lessons will be observed, no specific student information will be recorded.

Results from this study may be used for research presentations and professional journal publications. The primary benefit of this study is the positive impact on undergraduate physical education teacher preparation programs. Preparing high-quality graduates who can easily transition into the workplace requires identifying potential challenges and creating viable strategies to better prepare teachers for the dynamic environment of the K-12 school system. Data collected from this study will be utilized to inform the instruction and preparation of future physical educators. Aggregated results will be given to each school upon request, but specific results related to individual physical education teachers will be kept confidential.
No foreseeable risks exist for the participants. In the event a participant is asked to respond to a question that he or she is uncomfortable answering, the participant may choose not to answer the specific question and ask that specific observations be removed from the study. Also, participants have the right to decline the utilization of ALT-PE and QMTPS. Participants and/or schools may also discontinue participation in the project at any time without prejudice. Participants must be 18 years of age or older to participate in the investigation. While participants will not derive any direct benefits from their participation in the project, they will be contributing information that may lead to a better understanding of the transition from preschool into induction.

Every effort will be made to keep all information confidential. Participants will be given pseudonyms for all interview and observation data collected during the study. The information collected will only be shared with investigators and transcriptionists involved in this study. Any direct quotes that are deemed derogatory will not be included, and every effort will be made to ensure that all parties will be viewed positively. This should help ensure that information provided remains truly confidential. Documents and transcriptions will be secured in a locked filing cabinet. Data will be kept for a period no less than five years and then destroyed. Only the researchers listed in this form will have access data including identifiable information.

Questions about this research can be addressed at any time by calling or writing Dr. Amelia Woods, Department of Kinesiology and Community Health, 219 Louise Freer Hall, University of Illinois, 906 S. Goodwin Avenue, Urbana, IL 61801 (phone: 217-333-9602 or e-mail: amywoods@illinois.edu). If you desire additional information about participant rights, please contact the U/IUC Institutional Review Board Office at 217-333-2670 or irb@illinois.edu. Collect calls will be accepted if you identify yourself as a study participant.

Your signature and a check in the “yes” box indicate that the researchers may conduct data collection within your school. Please check “no” if you do not wish for your school to be a part of this study. Schools and participants may choose to decline participation at any time.

Superintendent/District Supervisor:
Yes:____  No:____
Printed Name: __________________________
Signature: ___________________________ Date:____________________

*****************************************************************************
Principal:
Yes:____  No:____
Printed Name: __________________________
Signature: ___________________________ Date:____________________

*****************************************************************************
Researcher
Printed Name: __________________________
Signature: ___________________________ Date:____________________
Appendix F

Script for Consent

I am a researcher from the University of Illinois examining perspectives related to first-year physical educators. The purpose of the study is to examine your transition from undergraduate student to full-time teacher in order to identify areas for improvement in both undergraduate programming and the school environment. I have obtained your contact information as a recent Physical Education graduate. I would appreciate it if you would answer some questions. If you agree to participate, the interview will last approximately 45 minutes, be audio recorded and later transcribed. You will be assigned a fictitious name and your true identity will not appear on the transcript. Once the recording is transcribed, the digital file will be destroyed. I will also email an information sheet for the study indicating that you have agreed to participate and providing additional contact information in the event you have any questions. The results will be used primarily for research presentations and publications in professional journals.

Do you have any questions?

If the person agrees to participate, begin the audio recording.

Do you agree to participate and be audio recorded?

If so, can you please provide me your name and e-mail address?

Begin the interview using questions from the interview guide
Appendix G

Script for Elementary Assent

Entering the Field of Physical Education Teaching - Script for Elementary Student Assent

Today, a student from the University of Illinois will be watching what you and your teacher during your physical education class. What the student sees today may help make many teachers better at their jobs and make your P.E. class and school more helpful for you. The person watching your class will be writing lots of notes but will not be asking you any questions. Your job is to just do what you normally do in your P.E. class—almost like pretending that this extra student isn’t even here. If you have any questions about the student or what he/she is doing in your class, you can get an information sheet from your teacher. After the school year is over, the student hopes to write a paper about all of the ways your P.E. teacher, class, and school can be a better for you.

Do you have any questions?

Begin classroom observation.
Appendix H

Script for Secondary Assent

Entering the Field of Physical Education Teaching - Script for Secondary Student Assent

Today, a researcher from the University of Illinois will be observing your physical education class. The purpose of the study is to examine the transition of your teacher from undergraduate college student to full-time teacher in order to identify areas for improvement for college coursework and in your school environment. The researcher will be recording information about your physical education lesson but will not approach you or ask any individual questions. Your job as a student is simply to participate as you normally would during your P.E. class. Any information recorded will be not identify you personally. An information sheet for the study providing additional contact information for the researchers is available through your teacher and school office. The results of this research will be used primarily for conference presentations and publications in professional journals.

Do you have any questions?

Begin classroom observation.
Appendix I

Script for Email Recruitment

Dear (Insert Potential Participant’s Name),

During the upcoming academic year, we are conducting a study entitled “Entering the Field of Physical Education Teaching: From Preservice into Induction.” The purpose of the research is to examine your transition from undergraduate student to full-time teacher in order to identify areas for improvement in both undergraduate programming and the school environment. As a first-year Physical Educator, we would appreciate your participation. The study will be conducted with a series of interviews, surveys, journal prompts and classroom observations. Data collection points (four total) will occur before the academic year begins, within the first month of employment, near the end of the first semester of employment, and near the end of the first full academic year. The interviews will not require more than 45 minutes of time. Surveys and journal prompts will require no more than 20 minutes each. Classroom observations will take place for no more than one school day during each of data collection periods. If you are willing be involved in our research project, we would welcome your prompt reply by (insert date). Thank you for your consideration.

Julene Ensign and Dr. Amelia Woods
Entering the Field of Physical Education Teaching - Script for Faculty Consent

I am a researcher from the University of Illinois examining perspectives related to first-year physical educators. The purpose of the study is to examine your transition from undergraduate student to full-time teacher in order to identify areas for improvement in both undergraduate programming and the school environment. I have obtained your contact information from a recent Physical Education graduate of your program. I would appreciate it if you would answer some questions. If you agree to participate, the interview will last approximately 45 minutes, be audio recorded and later transcribed. You will be assigned a fictitious name and your true identity will not appear on the transcript. Once the recording is transcribed, the digital file will be destroyed. I will also email an information sheet for the study indicating that you have agreed to participate and providing additional contact information in the event you have any questions. The results will be used primarily for research presentations and publications in professional journals.

Do you have any questions?

*If the person agrees to participate, begin the audio recording.*

Do you agree to participate and be audio recorded?

If so, can you please provide me your name and e-mail address?

*Begin the interview using questions from the interview guide*
Appendix K

Phase I Interview Guide for Participants

1. Tell me about your physical education experiences during elementary, middle school, and high school, and how do you believe those will impact you as a teacher?

2. Describe your work ethic.

3. What do you view as your personal and professional strengths? Why?

4. What do you view as your personal and professional weaknesses? Why?

5. What dispositional qualities do you believe you possess that will be influential during your teaching career? Why?

6. What influenced you to become a teacher?

7. What purpose do you believe P.E. should serve in the schools?

8. What do you believe are the most important outcomes of P.E.?

9. Describe your philosophy of teaching P.E.

10. What challenges do you think you will face as a physical educator?
    a. Inside the classroom?
    b. Outside of the classroom?

11. How have you been prepared to deal with the potential challenges you will face?
    a. From your PETE program?
    b. From other sources?

12. Describe your position of employment.
    a. What level will you be teaching?
    b. What will be your primary job responsibilities?
    c. Describe the school environment.
    d. Will you be coaching?

13. Describe what you believe will be a typical work day.

14. What expectations do you have for your first year of teaching?
    a. What do you most want to accomplish?
    b. How will you manage your classroom and provide discipline?
    c. What will you include in your scope and sequence?
d. Who will you approach regarding questions or concerns?

e. Who will provide you with support during your transition from student to physical educator?

15. What expectations do you have for your workplace (the school environment and other staff)?

16. What expectations do you have for your administrator(s)?

17. Do you view yourself as an agent of change? Why or why not?

18. What qualities do you believe effective teachers possess? Why?
Appendix L

Phase II Interview Guide for Participants

1. Describe your experience so far.
   a. What has been better than expected? Why?
   b. What has been exactly what you expected? Why?
   c. What has not been what you expected? Why?
2. What challenges have you encountered?
3. How have you dealt with these challenges so far?
4. What expectations do you have for your first year of teaching?
   a. What do you most want to accomplish?
   b. How are you managing your classroom and providing discipline?
   c. What are you including in your scope and sequence?
   d. Who do you approach regarding questions or concerns?
   e. Who provides you with support?
5. Describe your relationship and interactions with the other staff.
6. Describe your relationship with your administrator(s)?
7. What part(s) of your PETE program prepared you best for your job?
8. In what areas do you feel underprepared? Why?
9. What are you doing to improve your teaching?
10. What do you believe will change between now and the next interview (after the end of the first semester)?
11. What do you need to do between now and the end of the semester to reach your initial goals (insert answers from Phase I interview)?
Appendix M

Phase III Interview Guide for Participants

1. Describe your experience so far.
   a. What has been better than expected? Why?
   b. What has been exactly what you expected? Why?
   c. What has not been what you expected? Why?

2. What challenges have you encountered?
   a. Inside the classroom?
   b. Outside of the classroom?

3. How have you dealt with these challenges so far?
   a. From inside the classroom?
   b. From outside the classroom?

4. What are your strengths as a physical educator? Why?

5. What are your weaknesses as a physical educator? Why?

6. Describe your position of employment?
   a. What are your primary job responsibilities?
   b. Describe the school environment.
   c. Are you coaching now?

7. Describe a typical work day.

8. What expectations do you have for your first year of teaching?
   a. What do you most want to accomplish between now and the end of the academic year?
   b. How are you managing your classroom and providing discipline?
   c. What are you including in your scope and sequence?
   d. Who do you approach regarding questions or concerns?
   e. Who provides you with support?

9. Describe your relationship and interactions with the other staff.

10. Describe your relationship with your administrator(s)?

11. What part(s) of your PETE program prepared you best for your job?

12. In what areas do you feel underprepared? Why?

13. What are you doing to improve your teaching?

14. What do you believe will change between now and the next interview (near the end of the school year)?
15. What do you need to do between now and the end of the semester to reach your initial goals (insert answers from Phase I interview)?

16. Describe any Critical Incidents that have happened so far.
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Phase IV Interview Guide for Participants

1. Describe your experience so far.
   a. What has been better than expected? Why?
   b. What has been exactly what you expected? Why?
   c. What has not been what you expected? Why?

2. What challenges did you face as a physical educator?
   a. Inside the classroom?
   b. Outside of the classroom?

3. How did you deal with these challenges?
   a. From inside the classroom?
   b. From outside the classroom?

4. What are your strengths as a physical educator? Why?

5. What are your weaknesses as a physical educator? Why?

6. Describe your position of employment?
   a. What level did you teach?
   b. What were your primary job responsibilities?
   c. Describe the school environment.
   d. Did you coach?

7. Describe a typical work day.

8. What expectations or goals did you have for your first year of teaching (insert answers from Phase I)?
   a. Did you accomplish what you listed (refer to Phase I interview answers) as the most important outcomes of P.E? Why or why not?
   b. How did you manage your classroom and provide discipline?
   c. What did you include in your scope and sequence?
   d. Who did you approach regarding questions or concerns?
   e. Who provided you with support?

9. Describe your relationship and interactions with the other staff.

10. Describe your relationship with your administrator(s)?
11. What part(s) of your PETE program prepared you best for your job?
12. In what areas did you feel underprepared? Why?
13. What did you do to improve your teaching?
14. What are your expectations or goals for your second year of teaching?
   a. What do you most want to accomplish?
   b. How will you manage your classroom and provide discipline?
   c. What will you include in your scope and sequence?
   d. Who will you approach regarding questions or concerns?
   e. Who will provide you with support during your transition from student to physical educator?
   f. What expectations do you have for your workplace (the school environment and other staff)?
   g. What expectations do you have for your administrator(s)?
   h. Will you coach?
   i. How will you prepare for the next school year?
15. Do you view yourself as an agent of change? Why or why not?
16. What qualities do you believe effective teachers possess? Why?
Appendix O

Formal Interview Guide for PETE Faculty

1. Please describe your relationship to (insert participant’s name), including how long you’ve known each other.

2. What components of your PETE program do you feel best prepares your students to face the realities of the professional workplace? Why?

3. What do you feel will present the most significant challenges for your graduates as they enter their first year of teaching? Why?

4. What are (insert participant’s name) personal and professional strengths? Why?

5. What are (insert participant’s name) personal and professional weaknesses? Why?

6. What dispositional qualities do you believe (insert participant’s name) possesses that will be influential during his/her teaching career? Why?

7. How would you describe (insert participant’s name) work ethic?

8. What other details could you provide about (insert participant’s name) that will add depth to my understanding of (insert participant’s name)?
Appendix P

Demographic Survey

1. Name
2. Age
3. Gender
   a. Male
   b. Female
4. Race/Ethnicity
   a. White/Caucasian
   b. Black/African-American
   c. Asian
   d. Hispanic-American
   e. Hawaiian Pacific Islander
   f. American Indian/Alaska Native
   g. Other
5. Marital Status
6. From which university did you graduate?
7. What was your score on the TAP exam or ACT + Writing?
8. What was your score on the Physical Education Content Exam?
9. What was your score on the Aptitude of Professional Teaching Exam?
10. What was your undergraduate GPA?
11. In what school district is your job? (Town or number)
12. What level will you be teaching (elementary, middle school, high school)?
13. Will you be employed elsewhere outside of your teaching position during this upcoming academic year?
14. What courses other than physical education will you be teaching?
## Appendix Q
Self-Evaluation of Teacher Effectiveness in Physical Education Questionnaire (SETEQ-PE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Environment</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you individualize your teaching so that each of your students improves emotionally and socially?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you individualize your teaching so that each of your students improves kinetically?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you individualize your teaching so that each of your students improves cognitively?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is student safety (physical, emotional, social) guaranteed during your lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you modify your lesson plan to ensure motivation, progress, and safety of students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student &amp; Teacher Assessment</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Do students participate in the evaluation of your teaching (e.g. with a questionnaire)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you involve your students in the evaluation of their classmates?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do you invite your colleagues to evaluate your teaching?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do you use techniques to evaluate students cognitively and socially (e.g. multiple choice questions, rubrics)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you use other techniques (e.g. evaluation during game, evaluation scales, and rubrics) for the motor evaluation of students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application of the Content of Physical Education</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Do you teach tactics, rules, and regulations of educational and sport games?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do you integrate issues like nutrition, obesity, smoking, drugs, and tactics in your teaching?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Do your students acquire knowledge and skills from other subjects (e.g. language, mathematics, geography, and history) through your lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do you teach techniques (e.g. of skills, physical fitness, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Very Frequently</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use of Technology**

15. Do you use videos for teaching?
16. Do you make use of the computer to teach?
17. Do you assign tasks that require students to search for information on the Internet?
18. Do you use a video and voice recorder to evaluate your teaching?

**Teaching Strategies**

19. Do you employ student-centered teaching styles (e.g. exploration, problem-solving, etc.) according to learning objectives and student needs?
20. Apart from partial and whole practice, do you employ methods of group/random, constant/varying practice?
21. Do you use a wide variety of media (tables, posters, music, cards)?

**Lesson Implementation**

22. Do you inform your students about what they are going to learn?
23. Does your teaching plan involve objectives and specific movement, cognitive, and social goals for each class?
24. Do you have a teaching plan for each lesson?
25. Do you demonstrate objectives to be learned, when it is required by the course?
Appendix R

Qualitative Measures of Teaching Performance Scale (QMTPS)

Qualitative Measures of Teaching Performance Scale Instrument

(QMTPS)

Teacher: ____________________________  Coder: ____________________________

Focus of lesson: ____________________________  Lesson number: ____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Presentation of task</th>
<th>Type of task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Type of task</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>1- 2-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2- 3-</td>
<td>2- 3-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3- 4-</td>
<td>3- 4-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of task:
1 - Informing
R - Refining (quality)
E - Enlarged (variety)
Re - Repeat (repeat same task)
A - Apply self-testing

Clarity:
1 - Yes
2 - No

Demonstration:
1 - Full
2 - Partial
3 - None

Number of cues:
1 - Appropriate
2 - Inappropriate
3 - None given

Accuracy of cues:
1 - Accurate
2 - Inaccurate
3 - None given

Qualitative cues:
1 - Yes
2 - No

Student of responses:
1 - All
2 - Partial
3 - None

Specific congruent feedback:
1 - Yes
2 - Partial
3 - No

Note: From Analyzing Physical Education and Sport Instruction (p. 274) by J.E. Rink and P.H. Werner, 1989, Champaign, IL, Human Kinetics.
Appendix S

Academic Learning Time Physical Education (ALT-PE)

PURPOSE
This instrument is often used to judge teaching effectiveness in PE. Specifically, its purpose is to describe the amount of time pupils are engaged in motor activity at an appropriate level of difficulty. This is based on the assumption that pupils learn more the longer they are engaged in motor activity at an appropriate level of difficulty.

DEFINITIONS OF CATEGORIES
Four categories of activity are identified:

**Motor appropriate (MA).** The pupil is engaged in a motor activity related to the subject matter in such a way as to produce a high degree of success.

**Motor inappropriate (MI).** The pupil is engaged in a motor activity related to the subject matter, but the task or activity is either too difficult for the pupil's capabilities or so easy that practising it could not contribute to the achievement of lesson objectives.

**Motor supporting (MS).** The pupil is engaged in a motor activity related to the subject matter with the purpose of helping others to learn or perform the activity (for example holding equipment, sending balls to others or spotting the trampoline).

**Not motor engaged (NM).** The pupil is not involved in a motor activity related to the subject matter.

RECORDING PROCEDURES
There are four different methods of observation available to collect ALT-PE data about the categories above. These methods use:

- **Interval recording.** This involves alternating observing and recording at short intervals. One pupil or an alternating sample of pupils is used. The observer watches one pupil during the observing interval. During the recording interval, the observer decides whether MA, MI, MS or NM is the appropriate category. Data can be presented as a percentage of each category. This is the most common observation method used.

- **Group time sampling.** This involves the observer scanning the group for 15 seconds, every 2 minutes, and counting the number of pupils engaged at an appropriate level of motor activity (MA). Data can be presented as an average for the class.

- **Duration recording.** This involves the observer using a time line to categorise into one of the four categories (MA, MI, MS or NM), what one pupil is doing the entire period. Alternatively, the observer can measure just MA. A stopwatch is started when the pupil is appropriately engaged and stopped when the engagement stops. Total MA time for the lesson can be presented as a percentage of total lesson time.

- **Event recording.** This involves the observer counting the number of MA practice trials at an appropriate level of difficulty (the practice must include discrete trials). Trials are measured (and data presented) per minute or over longer units of time.
EXAMPLE OF ALT-PE USING THE INTERVAL RECORDING METHOD

To use this method of recording the coding format is divided into intervals. In each interval box there are two levels: a top level and a lower level.

The top level of the interval box is used to describe the context of the interval (C). There are ten choices of context from three categories: general content, subject matter knowledge and subject matter motor (see below). This decision is made on the basis of what the class as a whole is doing, for example, are they involved in warm-ups, a lecture on strategy, or skill practice?

The lower level of the interval box is used to describe the involvement of one pupil (LI). Choices are from the categories described as not motor engaged and motor engaged (see below).

The letter code for the appropriate category is placed in the appropriate part of the interval box. Typically, it is suggested that three pupils of differing skill levels are observed, alternating observation of them at every interval.

This system provides a total picture of what the class does throughout the lesson and a finely graded picture of the involvement of several pupils.

Those interval boxes marked as motor appropriate (MA) are ALT-PE intervals. Total ALT-PE is the total for the pupil during the lesson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Learner involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P = Pupil  
C = Context of the interval  
LI = Level of involvement of pupil

### Context Level (C)
- General content
- Subject matter knowledge
- Subject matter motor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General content</th>
<th>Subject matter knowledge</th>
<th>Subject matter motor</th>
<th>Not motor engaged</th>
<th>Motor engaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transition (T)</td>
<td>Technique (TN)</td>
<td>Skill practice (P)</td>
<td>Interim (I)</td>
<td>Motor appropriate (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management (M)</td>
<td>Strategy (ST)</td>
<td>Scrimmage/routine (S)</td>
<td>Waiting (W)</td>
<td>Motor inappropriate (MI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break (B)</td>
<td>Rules (R)</td>
<td>Game (G)</td>
<td>Off-task (OF)</td>
<td>Supporting (MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm-up (WU)</td>
<td>Social behaviour (SB)</td>
<td>Fitness (F)</td>
<td>On-task (ON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Background (BK)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive (C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

169