



Influence of occupational socialization on beginning teachers' interpretation and delivery of sport education

Matthew D. Curtner-Smith , Peter A. Hastie & Gary D. Kinchin

To cite this article: Matthew D. Curtner-Smith , Peter A. Hastie & Gary D. Kinchin (2008) Influence of occupational socialization on beginning teachers' interpretation and delivery of sport education, Sport, Education and Society, 13:1, 97-117, DOI: [10.1080/13573320701780779](https://doi.org/10.1080/13573320701780779)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573320701780779>



Published online: 10 Dec 2007.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 2573



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 118 View citing articles [↗](#)

Influence of occupational socialization on beginning teachers' interpretation and delivery of sport education

Matthew D. Curtner-Smith^{a*}, Peter A. Hastie^b and Gary D. Kinchin^c

^a*The University of Alabama, USA;* ^b*Auburn University, USA;* ^c*University of Southampton, UK*

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which newly qualified teachers employed the Sport Education (SE) model. In addition, we attempted to discover factors that led to and facilitated beginning teachers employing the model and those that did not. Participants were six American and four British beginning teachers. Data were collected by formally interviewing each teacher. Analysis procedures employed were analytic induction and constant comparison. Occupational socialization was the theoretical framework that guided data collection and analysis procedures. The results indicated that teachers interpreted and delivered SE in one of three different ways: *full version*, *watered down version* and *cafeteria style*. Moreover, the teachers' acculturation, professional socialization and organizational socialization largely explained why teachers interpreted and delivered SE as they did.

Keywords: *Beginning teachers; Sport education; Occupational socialization*

Sport Education (SE) (Siedentop, 1994; Siedentop *et al.*, 2004) is one curriculum model that has captured the interest of a growing number of physical education (PE) teachers and teacher educators in both the United States and the United Kingdom. The goals of SE are to produce sportspeople who are *enthusiastic*, *competent* and *literate*. To achieve this, teachers present units as sports *seasons* which are usually longer than traditional blocks of work. Pupils develop a sense of *affiliation* by playing on the same team for a whole season or even across seasons involving different sports. Considerable energy is put into creating a *festive atmosphere*. Seasons are organized around *formal competition*, involve a good deal of *record keeping*, and lead to a *culminating* event. Game forms are often modified, small-sided or conditioned. During the course of a season, pupils are required to perform a number of roles apart from player and teachers make every effort to switch from employing more direct, teacher-centered teaching styles to those which are more indirect and pupil-centered. The aim here is to increasingly give more responsibility to the pupils and for the teacher to gradually shift from instructor to facilitator.

*Corresponding author. Department of Kinesiology, The University of Alabama, Box 870312, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0312, USA. Email: msmith@bamaed.ua.edu

SE in PETE

Although there has been a great deal of research carried out assessing the impact of SE on inservice teachers and pupils (see Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Kinchin, 2006 for recent reviews of this research), there have been few studies of how preservice teachers (PTs) learn, interpret and deliver SE during their physical education teacher education (PETE) programs (Kinchin *et al.*, 2005). Crucially, two studies (Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Sofo & Curtner-Smith, 2005) have suggested that PTs are attracted to SE because it is often congruent with their occupational socialization, value orientations, and beliefs about what teaching PE should entail. Moreover, these studies suggested that some PTs realize that SE is, in many ways, culturally and structurally superior to other curricular models. Furthermore, other research has suggested that PTs' understanding of and ability to deliver SE are improved when PTs are required to teach prescribed mini-units and design and teach their own units during early field experiences (EFEs) throughout their programs as opposed to merely reading or being told about the model during classroom-based lectures (Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Jenkins, 2004).

Unfortunately and understandably, research has also shown that PTs have difficulty adjusting to the model when they first try it (Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; McCaughtry *et al.*, 2004; Parker & Curtner-Smith, 2005; Sofo & Curtner-Smith, 2005). Some PTs, for example, have problems keeping their pupils sufficiently active, designing appropriate games for pupils to play during competitive phases of the season, and teaching both skills and strategies within game play. Perhaps most importantly, some PTs fail to comprehend the model completely and, therefore, misinterpret it badly. Specifically, some PTs are selective about which components of SE they are willing to utilize. These PTs often embrace the principle of including more formal competition. Conversely, they tend to reject the principles of providing their pupils with more freedom to make decisions as the SE season progresses or asking pupils to take on roles other than player and, instead, stick with tried and trusted direct styles of teaching. Furthermore, they may avoid record keeping, posting information, and the use of less conventional but more authentic evaluation techniques.

In line with the concerns of Alexander and Luckman (2001), other PTs may go further and use the model to justify or camouflage employing what Crum (1993) referred to as a 'non-teaching perspective.' These PTs, then, merely organize, direct, and officiate uneducational 'sporting' tournaments in the name of SE and make no serious attempts to facilitate learning of any kind.

Purpose

Given that there is now a cadre of young inservice teachers who learned SE as part of their PETE but that, to date, no research has been completed which examines whether these neophyte teachers actually use the model and, if they do, how they interpret and deliver it, the purpose of this study was twofold. In the first instance, we

sought to determine the extent to which newly qualified teachers employed the SE model. Second, we attempted to discover factors that led to and facilitated beginning teachers employing the model and those that did not.

Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework which drove this research was occupational socialization (see Lawson, 1983a,b, 1986; Templin & Schempp, 1989; Schempp & Graber, 1992; Stroot, 1993; Curtner-Smith, 2001). This perspective was defined by Lawson (1986) as ‘all kinds of socialization that initially influence persons to enter the field of physical education and later are responsible for their perceptions and actions as teacher educators and teachers’ (p. 107). It consists of acculturation, professional socialization and organizational socialization.

Acculturation

Acculturation, begins at birth and appears to be the most potent type of socialization experienced by PE teachers. Interest in sport, often nurtured by parents, draws prospective PE teachers to the profession. Interactions with PE teachers and coaches and experiences of school life and PE and sport, during what Lortie (1975) termed the ‘apprenticeship of observation,’ shape views on what constitutes good pedagogical practice.

Lawson (1983a,b) hypothesized that the apprenticeship of observation produced two types of recruits who entered PETE. The first of these was mainly focused on coaching school teams and teaching PE was a ‘career contingency.’ Recruits with a ‘coaching orientation’ were more likely to be male, have participated in a high level of school sport, and attended schools in which sport was prioritized over PE. Moreover, those recruits who were committed to an extremely high level of sport were unlikely to internalize and adopt the values and practices of quality PETE programs, while those who had participated in sport at this level but were not totally committed to it were likely to be partially influenced by their PETE programs at best.

According to Lawson (1983a,b), the second type of recruit viewed coaching extracurricular sport as a career contingency and prioritized teaching PE. This type of recruit, he hypothesized, was more likely to be female, have taken part in physical activities other than traditional sport, and attended schools with high class PE. Furthermore, recruits with ‘teaching orientations’ were likely to take on the beliefs espoused by PETE faculty with enthusiasm.

Professional socialization

Professional socialization refers to the impact of PETE on PTs and was defined by Lawson (1983a) as ‘the process by which ... teachers acquire and maintain the values, sensitivities, skills, and knowledge that are deemed ideal for physical

education teaching' (p. 4). Research indicates that PETE is generally the weakest form of socialization experienced by PE teachers. Many programs appear to have no influence on their charges' values and behaviors at all and some confirm and strengthen faulty beliefs with which recruits enter. PETE has more chance of influencing PTs positively when faculty have specialist qualifications in sport pedagogy and do not coach, have an innovative orientation to the subject, are credible, challenge faulty beliefs, supervise EFEs closely, and agree on a professional ideology and what Lortie (1975) termed a 'shared technical culture' (i.e., the skills and knowledge essential for PE teaching).

Organizational socialization

Van Maanen and Schein (1979) explained that organizational socialization referred to the influence of the workplace and defined it as 'the process by which one is taught and learns the ropes of a particular organizational role' (p. 211). The 'teaching' in this process occurs when one generation of teachers passes on its culture to the next through what Zeichner and Tabachnik (1983) termed the 'institutional press.' This press tends to encourage the status quo. Indeed, Lawson (1983a,b) theorized that beginning teachers who had been inducted by quality PETE and possessed innovative teaching orientations at odds with those in the prevailing school culture were likely to be in for a difficult time. He also suggested that this type of beginning teacher would be committed to teaching PE well and strive to use practices thought to be effective.

In addition, Lawson (1983a,b) suggested that innovatively oriented beginning teachers would attempt to transform low-quality PE programs and support high-quality programs. Conversely, he noted that if schools had a particularly conservative culture, beliefs about teaching gained during PETE which were not congruent with this culture could be 'washed out' (Zeichner & Tabachnik, 1981). Etheridge (1989) explained that this process might begin with a period during which beginning teachers 'strategically adjusted,' that is, lowered their expectations and standards in order to survive. In time, however, the 'adjustment' would become permanent.

Similarly, Lacey (1977) noted that some beginning teachers might 'strategically comply' or go along with poor practice and thinking for the sake of survival while teaching in congruence with their true beliefs when they got the opportunity to do so without being detected. Other innovatively oriented beginning teachers faced with conservative school cultures, Lacey (1977) suggested, would attempt to 'strategically redefine' low-quality programs by challenging poor practice.

Following the work of Van Maanen and Schein (1979) on socialization tactics, Lawson (1983a,b) also hypothesized that innovatively oriented beginning teachers who worked in schools in which their socialization involved investiture (new beliefs and practices were encouraged) and was individual (completed alone), random (occurred in an irregular order), disjunctive (mentoring did not take place), and informal would be encouraged to teach as they had been trained. Conversely, those

employed in schools in which their socialization involved divestiture (new ideas and practices were rejected) and was collective (with others), sequential (occurred in a regular order), serial (experienced mentors were assigned), and variable (took place during an unspecified time period) were likely to 'impression manage' and strategically comply with their more experienced colleagues.

In contrast, Lawson (1983a,b) suggested that coaching-oriented beginning teachers who had been untouched by innovative PETE or had had their beliefs reinforced by custodial PETE were unlikely to use effective teaching practices. These teachers, he argued, would support low quality and undermine high-quality PE.

Method

Participants

The participants in this study were 10 beginning teachers in either their first or second years of employment purposefully selected because it was thought likely that they would attempt to teach SE. Six (five males and one female) of the teachers were American and taught in schools in the southeastern United States. Four (two males and two females) of the teachers were British and taught in schools in the south of England. All these participants had graduated from PETE programs within research universities that had included instruction on the SE model. The American teachers ranged in age from 23 to 39 years. Five of them were Caucasian while one male was African American. One of the American teachers taught in an elementary school, three in middle schools, and one in a high school. All the British teachers were Caucasian. They ranged in age from 25 to 27 years and taught in secondary schools.

Data collection and analysis

All 10 teachers were formally interviewed by one of the authors. Interviews lasted approximately 90 minutes and were audiotaped and transcribed for analysis. The interview script and protocol (see Appendix A) was semi-structured (Patton, 1990), in that it required all the teachers to be asked the same set of primary questions but permitted the authors to follow up with multiple prompts once the teachers had provided their initial answers.

The initial phase of analysis involved examining data collected from each teacher. During this process, data which indicated how teachers interpreted and delivered SE were identified as were data which suggested why teachers interpreted and delivered SE as they did. Data were then coded and categorized across teachers using analytic induction and constant comparison (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Codes and categories were based primarily on concepts from the literature on occupational socialization. Trustworthiness was assured by completing a thorough search for negative and discrepant cases (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

Results and discussion

Interpretations and delivery of SE

Data revealed that one of the teachers in the study chose not to employ SE at all in his elementary school. Mark¹ (US) explained that ‘this was because he didn’t think that, honestly, it would be as valuable or as advantageous to [his pupils] at this time in their lives.’ Our data also suggested that the remaining nine teachers interpreted and delivered SE in one of the three different ways: *full version*, *watered down version* and *cafeteria style*.

Full version. The two Americans (Dwayne and Fred) and two Britons (James and Ray) who used the full version of the model delivered units that were congruent with the spirit of Siedentop’s (1994) intentions. For example, they taught within seasons that were as long as ‘24 lessons,’ attempted to build camaraderie within teams so that pupils would ‘support and help each other,’ ‘posted notes and scores’ and conducted ‘pre-season polls.’ Moreover, they were particularly vocal about the extent to which ‘organized competition,’ culminating events such as ‘Big Friday,’ and the ‘awards ceremony at the end’ increased their pupils’ ‘enthusiasm,’ and ‘motivated’ them:

The positive was the playoffs and just the anxiety when they look up on the board and see who they’re playing and you hear them say, “Oh man, Marvin’s good, we got to get on him,” and, “we might have to play zone.” Fred (US)

These teachers were also quick to explain that they had required their pupils to take on ‘jobs’ and ‘roles,’ including ‘captain,’ ‘coach,’ ‘warm-up leader,’ ‘cool-down leader,’ ‘equity board member,’ ‘media coordinator,’ ‘newspaper reporter’ and ‘official,’ and that games were ‘modified’ in terms of field size, ‘getting into small teams’ and ‘rules.’ They also emphasized the part their ‘points system’ had played in holding pupils accountable. Furthermore, they revealed their commitment to indirect teaching, which increased ‘social responsibility,’ ‘peer teaching’ and ‘cooperative work,’ and noted that they asked coaches or captains to ‘be in charge’ and ‘coordinate everything.’ Finally, these teachers noticed ‘more learning,’ ‘better performances and participation,’ that their pupils ‘came together and began to think tactically,’ and, as illustrated by the following extract, they understood the structural advantages of SE and how it ‘made life easier’:

I know it [i.e., SE] works and the students really enjoy it and then as a teacher its beneficial for you too because once everything is in place . . . the class runs itself and gives you time to maybe speak to individual students and give feedback more [instead of] just explaining a task and then not having that much time. Fred (US)

Watered down version. The three teachers who employed the watered down version of SE were American and (mis)interpreted the model in a similar way to some of the PTs in previous studies. They organized around formal competition primarily because they perceived doing so was a ‘good management strategy,’ but failed to

include many of the other elements that transform traditional sporting units into SE seasons. For example, Bruce (US) taught 'a few basic skills' in his 'two-week' volleyball and flag football seasons and then noted that the remainder of his content consisted of 'a whole lot of game playing.' Moreover, only 'anti-PE people' were required to take on peripheral roles further away from the action in Bruce's units, such as 'board member,' while more central roles, including 'coach' and 'captain,' were reserved for the 'best athletes.' Similarly, when Carol (US) 'attempted to do ultimate frisbee,' she 'taught the skills' and 'got them on teams' so they 'competed against each other' but 'didn't go as far as scorekeepers [or any other roles] because it was just so hard.' In addition, Will (US) noted that in his weight training season he 'didn't have a lot of roles, mostly just the teams' and that 'when [the pupils] did competitions that helped out.'

Cafeteria approach. The two teachers who took a cafeteria style approach to the model were British and merely 'incorporated parts of SE' within what appeared to be well-taught traditional sporting units. They were, then, reluctant to 'go too far' and do the 'whole thing.' Kate (UK), for example, noted that SE was 'not the main focus of [her version of] PE' 'because you have to be more in control of their skill learning and practice.' For Kate, elements of SE served as 'a tool to improve communication skills and organization.' Consequently, she merely divided her pupils into teams and asked some to take on roles during 'mini tournaments' within her traditional units as she 'could see good value in the fact that the enthusiasm for the kids accelerated when they had responsibilities' but 'not much more.' Like Bruce (US), she also noted that, when she borrowed from SE, it was she who 'selected the captains for teams from the people [she] knew on the hockey² and netball [school] teams.' Similarly, Mandy (UK) 'used some elements of the roles and responsibilities' because she 'really [liked] the way it [developed] individuals' but was adamant that she couldn't 'see [herself] going much further than using a few features.'

Factors influencing teachers' interpretation and delivery of SE

Extrapolating from Gore's (1990) concept of 'pedagogy as text' provides an understanding of why teachers can interpret (and therefore deliver) the same curriculum model in different ways. Gore noted that 'multiple readings' of pedagogy were possible and that teachers' sociocultural histories strongly influenced how they read a pedagogical text (in our case, the SE model). In the current study, the beginning teachers' acculturation, professional socialization and organizational socialization help to explain why they interpreted (read) and delivered SE as they did.

Acculturation.

Initial attraction. In congruence with previous literature, all the participants were initially attracted to a career in PE because they 'liked sports,' 'enjoyed being active,' 'loved kids,' and assumed they would also 'love teaching PE.' For all but Fred (US),

this love of sport had been nurtured by their parents who were mostly 'quite sporty' and 'encouraged' participation in sport 'from an early age.' Little wonder, then, that all the teachers were at least somewhat enthusiastic about SE.

Orientations. Three of the teachers who employed the full version of SE entered their PETE programs with teaching orientations and were open to new ideas. The routes by which they arrived at this position, however, were somewhat different and not always consistent with the occupational socialization literature.

Fred (US) 'played high school football³ and baseball' and competed in athletics.⁴ His elementary PE was 'supervised recess' and his high school PE involved 'just lifting weights' while his teachers 'read the paper.' The set of socializing agents which countered this unpromising history and seemed responsible for Fred's teaching orientation were his memory of being 'heavy' and 'inactive' as a young child; his 'great middle school PE teacher, who introduced [pupils] to different sports and taught' [Fred's emphasis]; his perceptions that many of his coaches were 'awful' because they were 'too intense,' 'yelled,' and 'tried to live vicariously through [their players]'; and the successful battle he had had with cancer just before entering PETE which led to him 'finally understanding that health was vital' and being 'happy [that he] could pass this on to [his pupils] so maybe they could have healthy lifestyles also.'

Similarly, Dwayne's (US) acculturation appeared more likely to nurture a coaching orientation. He suffered through PE that had involved 'just playing' at the elementary level, 'boys playing basketball every day for three years' in middle school while 'females mostly sat in the bleachers, and basically being on your own' with 'no instruction' at the high school. In addition, Dwayne had played football at a high school that was a 'real sporting power' and had won several 'championships.' The factors that offset this set of experiences and appeared responsible for Dwayne's teaching orientation were his 'English and biology teachers' who were 'very good,' his participation in an 'unofficially segregated' basketball league outside school with which he had been uncomfortable, and the fact that he recognized that his coaches were 'negative' and 'not much good,' despite their success in terms of wins and losses. Consequently, Dwayne noted that he was determined 'to go into a [school PE program] and do some teaching, add teaching. [He] just didn't know how' prior to PETE.

A number of James' (UK) early life experiences and perceptions also seemed more likely to result in his possession of a coaching orientation. Specifically, he had 'played a hell of a lot of football, up to semi-professional standard,' been on the 'athletics team also at county standard,' 'played a good standard of tennis,' and recalled a primary PE program with 'limited facilities' and little instruction. Trumping all these experiences, however, was the heavy influence of the contrast he made between two of his teachers. The first was a 'good PE teacher' at his middle school who 'knew his stuff,' was 'structured,' 'very command style,' and taught a variety of sports but was 'quite frankly boring.' The second was a 'very good high school teacher who gave you a chance to learn, gave the less able a chance to learn' and was 'a younger sort of

teacher' in that 'he let [pupils] sort of teach each other' and 'find things out for themselves.' On entering PETE James recalled that he had

Wanted to give back what I got from my high school teacher. Someone who really gave me enjoyment in sport and, being sporty myself, I felt I could give a lot back to children and their learning. It is a fantastic job. You come away with a sense of achievement.

Ray (UK), the fourth teacher who used the full version of SE, entered PETE with a moderate coaching orientation. That is, although he was not averse to teaching PE, he was mainly motivated by the prospect of working with extracurricular school teams. A key factor shaping this orientation was Ray's extensive and successful sporting background in 'cricket, football and athletics.' Moreover, he recalled not enjoying his primary school PE which was 'more music, dance and art driven' with 'an emphasis on non-competitiveness,' and noted that his middle school PE was 'not overly structured' and 'about getting a bit of fresh air.' In addition, he was heavily influenced by two of his male high school PE teachers with whom he had 'had a good relationship.' According to Ray, these teachers were 'old school,' 'had strong discipline,' 'divided their lessons rigidly into stages' but 'knew the best ways to teach things.' Furthermore, 'they sort of fiddled the curriculum to coordinate with their main [extracurricular] sports.' Consequently, male pupils at Ray's high school 'did a lot of rugby' and there was 'a big emphasis on hockey.' Finally, one of Ray's 'professional cricket coaches' also had a significant impact on him. Ray recollected that this coach 'was always watching you, seeing you develop and gave a lot of constructive feedback.'

Of the three American teachers who watered down SE, two entered PETE with moderate coaching orientations while one possessed a teaching orientation. Carol's (US) teaching orientation was a product of a close relationship with 'one good high school teacher' who *taught* [Carol's emphasis] in her PE classes,' focused 'on health-related fitness,' 'proper sport units,' and 'skills' and 'was the only [PE] teacher [she] experienced that actually did anything.'

Bruce (US) and Will's (US) moderate coaching orientations appeared to be the result of similar patterns of acculturation. Both recalled having poor PE at all levels of schooling. For example, Bruce noted that his elementary PE consisted of 'play' and remembered being taught by 'a guy who was a legendary football coach but wasn't much of a PE teacher.' Similarly, Will explained that his high school PE teacher 'rolled out the ball,' and that the curriculum involved 'nothing organized' and 'no assessment.' Conversely, both Will and Bruce had fond memories of playing on the 'big three' school teams (baseball, football and basketball) and those that coached them. Bruce, for example, noted that his school had been ranked the 'number 1 team as far as basketball' in the state and that 'football and baseball went to the semi-finals' of the state competition one year. In addition, both Bruce and Will were complimentary of their coaches' abilities and noted that they were 'very knowledgeable.'

Finally, the main factors that promoted moderate coaching orientations in the two British women who took a cafeteria approach to SE were their extensive participation in sport at a fairly high level, their close relationship with the teachers and coaches who worked with their teams, the fact that the PE curricula at their secondary schools had mainly consisted of teaching traditional sport units, and their work in sport prior to PETE. Kate (UK), for example, had competed in 'gymnastics, dance, athletics, cross country, netball and swimming' and 'ran a gymnastics club' prior to entering PETE. Mandy (UK) had been a fairly accomplished 'ice skater,' 'played netball,' and 'worked in sport development' before training as a teacher. Kate emphasized that she was still 'very good friends' with one of her PE teachers who had 'an ability to stretch advanced kids' and that two athletics coaches who 'worked on [her] sprinting technique' had been positive role models while Mandy recollected she had been taught by 'colorful characters' with whom she had 'a good rapport.'

Professional socialization. All the teachers went through PETE programs staffed by faculty who were specifically trained to prepare PE teachers. The British teachers had graduated from three-year degree programs prior to PETE, which involved completing an intensive one-year Post-Graduate Certificate of Education (PGCE) course. The American teachers had enrolled in traditional degree programs during which they took coursework over a period of four or five years. The institutions from which the teachers graduated prepared teachers to use the SE model by employing different packages of similar methods. Each of these packages produced teachers who taught the full version of the model on graduating.

British PETE for SE. The British teachers described six pedagogical techniques by which they had been trained to deliver SE. These were the provision of a series of 'articles' and 'handouts all about SE,' 'several lectures' on the model, watching 'a video' of the model in action at a local school which was presented by the teacher in the video who also 'gave [the PTs] her experiences of SE,' 'observing at a school' in which the model 'had been put into practice' by 'pioneering teachers,' and participating in a SE season themselves which was taught by one of their lecturers and during which they 'had to give [their] team a name, did a poster, and assigned [themselves] roles.'

Opportunities for actually using the model during their two teaching practice placements were limited for the British teachers. Mandy, for example, noted that she decided not to do SE at her first placement because the school was situated 'in a poor area' and attended by 'deprived kids.' Similarly, Ray recalled that he 'couldn't do [SE]' because his cooperating teachers 'chopped and changed' the content of his units 'all the time.' James explained that he 'tried SE' during his first placement 'but it kept breaking down so [he] went with their [i.e., the school's] system.' Finally, Kate recollected trying the model at both her teaching practice placements in a 'very basic' form that included 'dividing the kids into teams' and 'choosing a name' but noted that she 'didn't bother with lots of paperwork.'

American PETE for SE. Two of the American teachers, Will and Fred, trained at the same institution and explained that they were taught how to deliver SE through ‘discussions in class,’ ‘reading articles and sample lessons,’ ‘demonstration lessons’ taught by their professor in which they were the pupils, and being required to design seasons. Although they ‘never applied [the model] in a school setting’ during EFEs, importantly, they taught full seasons during student teaching with some success. For example, Fred noted that the ‘dirt poor kids’ in the middle school at which he was placed ‘responded well to the order, the structure.’

The remaining four American teachers were trained at another institution where there was some ‘talk about’ the model in the classroom, and they had been required to read ‘the orange book’ [i.e., Siedentop, 1994] but the main mode by which they learned the model was ‘by doing it.’ Specifically, during two EFEs at different middle schools they taught 10-lesson mini-seasons of ‘soccer, volleyball, track and field and tennis’ and then, during student teaching, they were required to teach at least three full SE seasons to middle school children for the duration of the placement. During the EFEs, the teachers had ‘team-taught’ seasons written and prescribed by a professor. During student teaching, they had been responsible for designing their own seasons based on a template provided by a professor. Importantly, they were ‘closely supervised’ and ‘given a lot of help’ by faculty from the university during both their EFEs and student teaching.

Perceptions and effects of PETE for SE. All the teachers were positive about their PETE in terms of the technical gains they had made. Typical of their comments were those made by James (UK) who hadn’t known ‘what to expect’ prior to starting his PETE but gained an ‘understanding of kids’ and ‘how to break things down.’ Importantly, however, although teaching orientations appeared to be strengthened by PETE, moderate coaching orientations were softened rather than changed. For example, Fred (US), who had entered PETE with a fairly strong teaching orientation already, noted that when he was looking for a job ‘I didn’t ask them [i.e., the school district’s administration] if I would coach. I didn’t even tell them I had played any sports. I thought it was pretty irrelevant.’ Similarly, James (UK) explained that ‘to start off with [coaching extracurricular sport] did not cross [his] mind because [he] knew a lot of work would be needed for [his] first year of teaching.’ Conversely, although Ray (UK), who had entered PETE with a moderate coaching orientation, emphasized that he was looking for a job at a ‘teaching school,’ he also explained that he ‘was “keen” on the “extracurricular stuff” and “was quite keen to get [his] own team, establish training patterns, [his] ideas.’

Organizational socialization. Three main factors served to facilitate or frustrate attempts made by the teachers to implement SE once they were employed. These were colleagues, pupils and accountability.

Influence of colleagues. The PE teachers with whom the neophyte Americans worked often made teaching SE very difficult. Most had ‘no goals’ other than ‘management,’

operated within a 'weak multi-activity model,' did little teaching in their 'lessons,' and a few attempted to dissuade the new teachers from trying SE. Dwayne, for example, relayed that the senior male PE teacher in his department told him that

I've been doing this for 30 years and I'm trying to tell you you're wasting your time. The kids are not going to appreciate this. Just let them play. You'll live longer and it's less stressful on you ... I'm not going to work any freakin' harder than what I should ... I'm just a highly paid babysitter.

A few of the American teachers' colleagues made some effort to be 'supportive,' by suggesting that the whole department pool their classes and team-teach SE seasons but, in actual practice, were more of a hindrance than a help. Fred, for example, noted wryly that 'support only goes so far when I look over and they're all sitting on their butts and I'm the one that's trying to collect the records, the win/loss stuff.' Similarly, Carol explained that her three colleagues 'watered down everything I had done so they could turn it in as their lesson plan ... They just wanted to look good on paper.'

Moreover, the American cohort received very little help from their assigned mentors. Typical of their experience was that of Fred who noted

I have a supervising observer, mentor—I guess you could call her that. She had to make five observations during the year. She made one and then it cut into her planning period, so she just came in for 15 minutes and had me sign her sheet saying she was there ... She's never even given me advice.

By contrast, the British teachers received a good deal of support from the other PE teachers in their departments for whatever version of the model they proposed. A primary reason for this appeared to be that SE was compatible with their main goals which were 'learning sports' and 'developing sportspeople' so pupils would be 'more active.'

James, for example, explained that he had 'helped install the idea of SE, really tried to drive it forward' and that while some of the 'older teachers were set in their ways,' found SE 'hard to install, and [felt] they [needed] full control,' his 'younger' colleagues were all 'interested' and 'encouraged' him. Similarly, Ray recalled that

I said this [i.e., SE] is something I am interested in doing and another school was doing it so they [i.e., his colleagues] said, "why don't you go down there and watch a bit, get some information talk to some people, and when you feel confident, put it into practice." Which is what I did.

In addition, the British teachers were very positive about the mentoring they had received. They described their mentors as 'good role models' and recalled 'constructive meetings' following 'official' and 'unofficial observations,' and being given 'written feedback and set written goals.' Perhaps the most positive testimony was given by Ray:

I can't speak highly enough ... From the word go, taking me to the side and saying if there were any problems, and making me feel completely comfortable and "this is what you will be doing, is that OK? If you need any support and if you feel that you

are struggling with any class or individual lesson or individuals then come and see me and we'll work around it." We had a meeting every week for an hour where she would go through my lessons . . . She would give me ideas of what I could try.

Pupils. Pupils' responses to SE also served to encourage or discourage the teachers' use of the model. In the American context, the influence of pupils was initially mainly negative. All the American teachers who tried some form of SE landed jobs in schools attended by large proportions of 'low-income' pupils from deprived urban or 'poor rural' areas with 'large behavior disorder populations.' The teachers described their pupils' 'behavior' as 'generally terrible' and noted that this, coupled with the fact that they taught 'large classes' with as many as '60 kids' in them, made 'teaching hard.' Carol, for example, explained that she did not teach in a 'controlled atmosphere,' that 'violence was always just beneath the surface,' and described how the 'police came to PE and arrested two [of her pupils] for murder.' She also noted that it was 'hard to teach anything when some [pupils] could just care less about school and were not interested.' In order to teach any form of SE, the American cohort had to overcome a fair amount of resistance. As Fred noted, there was a 'need to be persistent because the kids will fight it [i.e., SE] off if they are not familiar. And they'll just say "no" right to your face, probably cuss. The key is you can't give up.' On the upside, once the teachers had battled through the initial resistance to the model, they found that the responses of many pupils improved considerably. For example, Will explained SE 'really gets them trying to do something instead of just playing around and complaining,' Carol described her pupils as 'really receptive,' and Dwayne recalled 'kids coming and asking to be in my class because [their PE teacher] was not doing anything.'

Again, by contrast, the British teachers all taught in relatively affluent areas and in schools which catered to 'high ability' pupils. Faced with fewer and less substantial behavior problems and little or no resistance, 'installing' SE was not nearly as problematic as it was for the Americans. Not surprisingly, this state of affairs and the 'very positive' responses of the pupils once they had engaged in SE, encouraged the British cohort no end.

Accountability. The accountability system that operated in the schools in which the American teachers were employed also did them no favors. The teachers explained that their principals 'didn't know anything about PE' and that their actions and communications did much to undermine any efforts to teach SE or anything else. Carol, for example, recalled her principal telling her to 'just to keep everything civilized' and that the purpose of 'PE was for [pupils] to relieve stress.' Dwayne, on the other hand, didn't think that his principal realized that his colleagues 'were not doing what they were supposed to be doing.' At the departmental level, the teachers explained that there was 'no one in charge' and that there were 'no specific objectives' and 'nothing' in terms of a 'formalized' 'written curriculum.' Consequently, teachers 'mostly [did] their own thing' having asked 'what are we doing today?' In addition, there was no reference by administrators or senior teachers to the

state or local school district PE curriculum. Although this situation provided the beginning teachers with considerable flexibility, it also inhibited them greatly since it permitted and even promoted non-teaching by most of their colleagues and nurtured low expectations for the subject by many of their pupils.

The accountability system operating in the British schools was a 'double edged sword' in terms of the degree to which it encouraged the beginning teachers to employ the SE model. On the upside, it promoted teaching in PE. On the downside, it was constraining in terms of the content teachers could include and the pedagogies they could employ. Head teachers expected PE departments to 'focus on delivering the national curriculum' and heads of department clearly felt under considerable pressure to make sure that this happened. Consequently, there was no question of non-teaching and, although heads of department were ultimately accountable for what occurred in their departments, they encouraged the teachers in their charge to 'make decisions together' and 'work as a team.' In this environment, it was not surprising that James recalled himself and each of his colleagues running 'sessions after school on how to teach the respective sports' in their curriculum or that 'each person had two schemes of work⁵ to write' at Ray's school. All this meant that heads of department and other teachers were supportive of SE as long as they thought it was compatible with the national curriculum and, as alluded to above, in most instances this was the case. In a very few, however, it was not and heads of department were quick to discourage the use of the model. Mandy's head of department, for example, was not convinced SE was good idea because 'seasons would last too long' thus thwarting efforts to 'cover other areas.'

School socialization tactics and beginning teacher counter strategies. Following Van Maanen and Schein (1979), the socialization tactics operating in the American schools generally stifled innovatively oriented beginning teachers. Although the socialization of the beginning teachers in these schools was individual, random and informal, unfortunately it also involved divestiture and was serial and variable. Conversely, the tactics operating in the British schools were relatively liberal and supported innovatively oriented beginning teachers to varying degrees. On balance, although the socialization of beginning teachers in these schools was serial, it also involved investiture and was individual, random and informal.

Faced with these tactics, all the beginning teachers with moderate coaching orientations appeared to strategically adjust to their situations and were happy to employ a version of SE which was 'safe' and 'worked.' In most cases, this meant that the teachers employed the watered down version of SE or took a cafeteria approach to the model. The relatively favorable socialization tactics faced by Ray (UK), however, meant that he was able to teach the full version of the model safely.

Of the four teachers with teaching orientations, James (UK) obviously had the easiest situation. Like Ray (UK), his school's socialization tactics made it safe for him to use the full version of SE. For the three Americans, it was a different story. Faced with extremely conservative and unsupportive cultures, however, both Fred (US)

and Dwayne (US) attempted to strategically redefine their situations. Dwayne, for instance, explained:

I tried to change it. . . . I said, "We got to do sport ed. If you don't want to do this, I'll do it with my kids" and, at first, they didn't wanna do it so I put my stuff up on the wall and the kids came looking at it and saw this team versus this team. And they saw me teaching them all this kind of stuff and then other classes were saying, "We want to do that also."

Carol (US), the fourth teacher with a teaching orientation, probably faced the most daunting situation. Consequently, she coped by strategically complying. Although she employed the watered down version of SE, she was not happy about doing so and was on the lookout for ways she could do more.

Conclusions

The findings of our study and extrapolations from the literature on occupational socialization and previous studies of SE in PETE led us to a number of hypotheses about which types of beginning teachers will decide to attempt SE and which will decide not to attempt the model, the versions of SE beginning teachers will decide to employ, and the reasons for these decisions. These hypotheses, we hope, will aid other researchers interested in studying beginning teachers' use of SE. Moreover, these hypotheses might be adapted to examine beginning teachers' use of other curriculum models. The hypotheses are shown in matrix form in Figure 1.

Figure 1 suggests that three different types of recruit enter PETE programs due to the differing effects of their acculturation. These are recruits with a hard core coaching orientation who are totally committed to sport, those with a moderate coaching orientation, and those with a teaching orientation.⁶ In addition, Figure 1 indicates that, in terms of learning how to teach SE, PTs can either receive high-quality PETE, during which they get plenty of exposure to and supervised practice of the model during EFEs and teaching practices, or low-quality PETE, during which they get little exposure to or supervised practice of the model. Furthermore, Figure 1 suggests that once beginning teachers enter the workforce they either encounter a custodial school culture which discourages the employment of SE or an innovative school culture which encourages the use of the model.

Regardless of the quality of their professional socialization or the type of school culture they encounter on entering the workforce, Figure 1 indicates that we hypothesize that recruits who enter PETE with a hard core coaching orientation will not attempt to use the SE model.

Conversely, we expect that recruits who enter PETE with a teaching orientation and receive high-quality training in SE will attempt to use the model once employed. Those who encounter a custodial culture will either employ the full version of SE or be forced to water down the model and those who encounter an innovative culture will employ the full version of the model with few problems. On the downside, we predict that teaching oriented recruits who receive low-quality training for SE will be

Type of Recruit Produced by Acculturation	Professional Socialization	Organizational Socialization	Teach SE?/ Type of SE?
1. Hard core coaching orientation (totally committed sportsperson)	High quality SE PETE (plenty of exposure to and supervised practice of the model)	Custodial culture	No/None
	Low quality SE PETE (little exposure to or supervised practice of the model)	Custodial culture	No/None
	High quality SE PETE	Innovative culture	No/None
	Low quality SE PETE	Innovative culture	No/None
2. Moderate coaching orientation (not totally committed to sport)	High quality SE PETE	Custodial culture	Yes/Watered down version or Cafeteria approach
	Low quality SE PETE	Custodial culture	No/None
	High quality SE PETE	Innovative culture	Yes/Full version
	Low quality SE PETE	Innovative culture	No/None
3. Teaching orientation	High quality SE PETE	Custodial culture	Yes/Full version or Watered down version
	Low quality SE PETE	Custodial culture	No/None
	High quality SE PETE	Innovative culture	Yes/Full version
	Low quality SE PETE	Innovative culture	No/None

Figure 1. Hypotheses about the effects of acculturation, professional socialization and organizational socialization on beginning teachers' delivery of SE

unlikely to attempt SE units on graduating even if they land jobs in schools with innovative cultures.

Finally, we theorize that recruits who enter PETE with moderate coaching orientations, receive high-quality training for SE, and move on to jobs in schools with innovative cultures will attempt to use the full version of the model. Those recruits who have a similar acculturation and professional socialization but enter schools with custodial cultures, we predict, will attempt to use the model but only in watered down form or by taking a cafeteria approach. In addition, we hypothesize that those moderately coaching oriented recruits who receive low-quality training in SE will, again, not attempt to use the model under any circumstances.

The findings of our study also suggest that there are subtle and not so subtle differences between the occupational socialization of beginning teachers from Britain and the United States and these impact the chances of pupils being taught SE in either country. For example, the emphasis on 'winning' interschool matches in the United States and the widespread use of school sport as entertainment suggests the acculturation process will produce a greater number of American recruits entering PETE with hard core coaching orientations and fewer with teaching orientations. It also seems logical to suggest that beginning teachers in the United States will be more likely to encounter excessively custodial school cultures once they begin teaching. Conversely, given the relative freedom of American teacher educators to control, more or less, exactly what PTs do during EFEs and teaching practices, mainly due to low cohort numbers and the relative lack of any real government or other outside interference, we believe that American PTs are more likely to receive high-quality training for SE.

By contrast, despite several recent initiatives aimed at raising its profile in schools (e.g., Department for Education and Skills, 2003), we believe that the relatively low priority given to school sport in Britain and the comparatively high priority given to instruction in PE will lead to the production of more recruits with teaching orientations and moderate coaching orientations and fewer recruits with hard core coaching orientations. Moreover, these school conditions, we think, have greater potential to breed innovative cultures capable of supporting and sustaining beginning teachers intent on trying SE than those likely to be encountered by beginning teachers in the United States. On the downside, and complicating the issue in Britain, the fact that British PETE programs often deal with large numbers of PTs, have content dictated to them by central government, and are officially forced to surrender or share supervision of EFEs and teaching practices, suggests to us that even high-quality faculty might be limited in what they can actually do in terms of preparing their charges to use the SE model.

Notes

1. The names of all individuals in this paper are fictitious.
2. Throughout the paper 'hockey' refers to 'field hockey.'

3. When used in the American context 'football' refers to 'American football' or 'gridiron.' When used in the British context it refers to association football or 'soccer.'
4. Throughout the paper 'athletics' refers to track and field.
5. Schemes of work are expanded and more detailed versions of unit plans.
6. Although our small sample did not suggest that gender was a factor in determining recruits' orientations and thus interactions with PETE and school culture, like Lawson (1983a,b), we believe that men are more likely to enter PETE with coaching orientations than women in both the United States and the United Kingdom. The increasing emphasis on female sport, however, may eventually change this pattern.

References

- Alexander, K. & Luckman, J. (2001) Australian teachers' perceptions and uses of the sport education curriculum model, *European Physical Education Review*, 7(3), 243–267.
- Crum, B. (1993) Conventional thought and practice in physical education: problems of teaching and implications for change, *Quest*, 9, 339–356.
- Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2001) The occupational socialization of a first-year physical education teacher with a teaching orientation, *Sport, Education and Society*, 6(1), 81–105.
- Curtner-Smith, M. D. & Sofo, S. (2004) Preservice teachers' conceptions of teaching within sport education and multi-activity units, *Sport, Education and Society*, 9(3), 347–377.
- Department for Education and Skills (2003) *Learning through PE and sport* (Annesley, UK, DfES Publications).
- Etheridge, C. P. (1989) Strategic adjustment: how teachers move from university learnings to school-based practices, *Action in Teacher Education*, 11(1), 31–37.
- Goetz, J. P. & LeCompte, M. D. (1984) *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research* (San Diego, CA, Academic Press).
- Gore, J. (1990) Pedagogy as text in physical education teacher education: beyond the preferred reading, in: D. Kirk & R. Tinning (Eds) *Physical education, curriculum and culture: critical issues in the contemporary crisis* (London, Falmer Press), 101–138.
- Jenkins, J. M. (2004) Sport education in a PETE program, *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 75(5), 31–36.
- Kinchin, G. D. (2006) Sport education: a review of the research, in: D. Kirk, D. Macdonald & M. O'Sullivan (Eds) *The handbook of physical education* (London, Sage), 596–609.
- Kinchin, G. D., Penney, D. & Clarke, G. (2005) Sport education in teacher education, in: D. Penney, G. Clarke, M. Quill & G. D. Kinchin (Eds) *Sport education in physical education: research-based practice* (London, Routledge), 217–228.
- Lacey, C. (1977) *The socialization of teachers* (London, Methuen).
- Lawson, H. A. (1983a) Toward a model of teacher socialization in physical education: the subjective warrant, recruitment, and teacher education (part 1), *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 2, 3–16.
- Lawson, H. A. (1983b) Toward a model of teacher socialization in physical education: entry into schools, teachers' role orientations, and longevity in teaching (part 2), *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 3, 3–15.
- Lawson, H. A. (1986) Occupational socialization and the design of teacher education programs, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 5, 107–116.
- Lortie, D. (1975) *Schoolteacher: a sociological study* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press).
- McCaughtry, N., Sofo, S., Rovegno, I. & Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2004) Learning to teach sport education: misunderstandings, pedagogical difficulties, and resistance, *European Physical Education Review*, 10(2), 135–155.
- Parker, M. & Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2005) Health-related fitness in sport education and multi-activity teaching, *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 10(1), 1–18.

- Patton, M. Q. (1990) *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd edn) (Newbury Park, CA, Sage Publications).
- Schempp, P. G. & Graber, K. C. (1992) Teacher socialization from a dialectical perspective: pretraining through induction, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 11, 329–348.
- Siedentop, D. (1994) *Sport education* (Champaign, IL, Human Kinetics).
- Siedentop, D., Hastie, P. A. & van der Mars, H. (2004) *Complete guide to sport education* (Champaign, IL, Human Kinetics).
- Sofo, S. & Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2005) Development of preservice teachers' value orientations and beliefs during a secondary methods course and early field experience, *National AAHPERD Convention*, Chicago, IL, April.
- Stroot, S. (Ed.) (1993) Socialization into physical education [monograph], *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 12(4), 337–466.
- Templin, T. J. & Schempp, P. G. (Eds) (1989) *Socialization into physical education: learning to teach* (Indianapolis, IN, Benchmark Press).
- Van Maanen, J. & Schein, E. H. (1979) Toward a theory of organizational socialization, in: B. Staw (Ed.) *Research in organizational behavior*, (vol. 1) (Greenwich, CT, JAI Press), 209–261.
- Zeichner, K. M. & Tabachnik, B. R. (1981) Are the effects of university teacher education “washed out” by school experience? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 32(2), 7–11.
- Zeichner, K. M. & Tabachnik, B. R. (1983) *Teacher perspectives in the face of the institutional press*, paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the AERA*, Montreal, Ont., Canada, April.

Appendix A. Interview script

1. Background Information (multiple prompts allowed)

- How old are you?
- Where were you born?
- What is your race?
- What is your gender?
- What is your ethnic origin?

2. Acculturation (multiple prompts allowed)

- Would you describe your parents/guardians, siblings or any close relatives as being active or inactive in sport or physical activity? Please elaborate.
- During your own childhood and adolescence, would you describe yourself as active or inactive? Please elaborate.
- If you were active, in which sports or physical activities did you participate during your childhood and adolescence? At what level did you participate in organized sport?
- Describe your school PE programs at the elementary, middle and high school (primary and secondary) levels.
- Describe the provision of extracurricular sport and physical activity at the schools you attended.
- Describe your PE teachers and other teachers/coaches who worked with you during any extracurricular sport in which you participated.
- Describe any coaches who taught or coached you sport or physical activity outside the school setting during your childhood and adolescence.

- Describe any participation in sport and physical activity during your years in higher education.
- Do you currently participate in sport and physical activity? If yes, please elaborate.
- Why did you decide to become a PE teacher?

3. **Professional Socialization** (multiple prompts allowed)

- Describe the professors (lecturers) who taught you to teach PE during your PETE (ITE) program.
- Were you taught by professors (lecturers) who specialized in teacher education/teacher training?
- To your knowledge, did any of these professors (lecturers) coach university sports teams? If yes, please elaborate.
- Describe any methods classes which you took during your PETE (ITE).
- Describe any EFEs, internships or teaching practices in which you participated during your PETE (ITE). Were these supervised by the professors that taught you methods?
- Describe how you were trained to employ the SE model? Did you discuss the model in the classroom? Were you given written material to read including books, articles, internet sites or example units and lesson plans? Did you get any/many opportunities to practice the model in EFEs prior to student teaching (teaching practice)? If yes, did PE professors (lecturers) supervise you and provide feedback during these EFEs? Did you get an opportunity to use the model during student teaching (teaching practice)? If yes, please describe.
- When you completed your PETE (ITE) what kind of position were looking for and what were your goals as a teacher?

4. **General Organizational Socialization** (multiple prompts allowed)

- Describe the school in which you teach. How many pupils attend the school and what are their backgrounds? What type of catchment area does the school have?
- Describe the school's PE department. How many teachers are there in the department? What are their approximate ages? Approximately how long have they been at the school? What kind of facilities and equipment do you have? What are the department's main goals?
- Are there any other newly qualified PE teachers or teachers of other subjects employed at your school? If yes, how much contact do you have with them?
- Have you been assigned an official mentor or do you have an unofficial mentor within the school? If yes, please describe his/her influence on your teaching.
- Have you been given specific objectives to achieve as a newly qualified teacher? If yes, have these been ordered? Have you been given a set time period in which to achieve these objectives?
- Describe your school's PE curriculum and extracurricular sports program.

- Who makes the decisions on what is taught in the PE department?
- Who makes the decisions on how content is taught in the PE department?
- How much input have you had on content taught and curriculum models employed? Have your colleagues embraced any new ideas you have brought to the department?

5. Employment of the SE Model (multiple prompts allowed)

- Had any of the teachers in the PE department ever used the SE curriculum model before you arrived?
- Have you used the SE model since you have taught at the school?
- If yes, why?
- If yes, how many units have you tried? Please describe these units in terms of length, content and degree of success.
- If yes, were your colleagues interested and supportive?
- If yes, which components of your PETE (ITE) did you find most and least helpful in implementing the model?
- If yes, were there any particular problems you had with implementing the model?
- If no, why not—what has stopped you from using the model?
- Which other curriculum models have you employed?
- If no, are you planning on trying SE in your school in the future? If yes, why? If no, why not?

6. Other (multiple prompts allowed)

Is there anything else you want to tell me about SE and your early career in teaching PE?