

**Influence of Secondary Organizational Socialization on How PETE Program Coordinators
Execute Their Administrative Roles and Responsibilities**

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of secondary organizational socialization on how physical education teacher education (PETE) program coordinators execute their administrative roles and responsibilities. Two female program coordinators located within the United States were individually interviewed and provided documentation for analysis. Data analysis was conducted using analytic induction and constant comparison techniques. Both participants acted as *customizers*, *persuaders*, and *interpreters*. The factors influencing the socialization of PETE coordinators were department faculty, college administration, student enrollment data, and cooperating teacher feedback. Although working at very different institutions, the roles, responsibilities, and socialization influences for both participants were similar. In addition, and despite the prevalence of low enrollments and the educative teacher performance assessment (edTPA), program coordinators appeared to negate these issues and were effective in executing their administrative roles and responsibilities. These findings would be of interest to those interested in and/or currently maintaining administrative positions in PETE.

Keywords: Occupational socialization, higher education, physical education, undergraduate enrollment, cooperating teachers

Influence of Secondary Organizational Socialization on How PETE Program Coordinators
Execute Their Administrative Roles and Responsibilities

Lawson's theory of occupational socialization (Lawson 1983a, 1983b) has been used to good effect to study physical education teachers' acculturation (e.g., the influence of childhood physical education and sport experiences), professional socialization (e.g., the influence of undergraduate education) and organizational socialization (e.g., the influence of the school cultures and conditions) (Russell et al., 2016). However, over the same period, research investigating physical educators who transition into roles within higher education has been less prominent (Casey & Fletcher, 2017; McEvoy et al., 2017). In the last decade, some scholars have deployed this theory to investigate the influence of secondary professional socialization (e.g., the impact of master's and doctoral studies) and secondary organizational socialization (e.g., the impact of the university cultures and conditions) on physical education teacher education (PETE) faculty members' ability to deliver PETE (Russell et al., 2016). Physical education teacher educators are acknowledged as playing important roles in the renovation and reproduction of physical education pedagogy (Kirk & Macdonald, 2001). Research suggests that PETE faculty typically share the ideology that the overarching goal of physical education is to contribute towards lifelong physical activity (McEvoy et al, 2017). It is suggested that early career PETE faculty also share concerns about the marginalization, state, and future of the field (Alfrey et al., 2017). In the North America context, early career PETE faculty are heavily socialized by the 'tenure track' process, where they demonstrate their teaching, research, and service skills and promote their value to the academic institution, often at the expense of a work life balance (Alfrey et al., 2017; Casey & Fletcher, 2017). Pre-tenure PETE faculty are typically expected to make the transition from doctoral students who determined their own research

agendas, to academics whose research agendas are guided by the pressure to obtain external grant funding (Alfrey et al., 2017; Casey & Fletcher, 2017). Mentoring from colleagues and former doctoral advisors appear to play an important role in helping early career faculty understand ‘the rules of the game’ in academia (Alfrey et al, 2017; Enright et al., 2017). These works have considered the standard research and teaching aspects of the job, however, little attention has been paid to the administrative roles that mid-career teacher educators might take on, including program coordinator, department chair, and college dean.

The research described in this paper was our attempt to build on only a handful of studies presently available that are focused on this final phase (Brunsdon & Curtner-Smith, 2022a, 2022b; Merrem & Curtner-Smith, 2018; Park & Curtner-Smith, 2018; Richards et al., in press). Specifically, the purpose of our study was to investigate the influence of secondary organizational socialization on how PETE program coordinators executed their administrative roles and responsibilities. A PETE program coordinator is the faculty member in charge of overseeing the undergraduate physical education teacher certification program, that is typically housed within a kinesiology or education department/college. The limited research to date suggests that PETE faculty administrative roles and responsibilities may include curriculum redevelopment, student recruitment, and completing accreditation reports (Solmon et al., 2020). Our overarching aim was to fill knowledge gaps in the field of occupational socialization because despite a significant body of research investigating faculty members teaching and research practices, little has been done to investigate how PETE coordinators execute their administrative roles. The research questions we attempted to answer were: (a) What roles and responsibilities do PETE program coordinators execute? (b) How do PETE program coordinators

execute these roles and responsibilities? and (c) What socialization factors influence how PETE program coordinators execute these roles and responsibilities?

Theoretical Framework

Secondary organizational socialization occurs when an individual accepts a faculty level position at an academic higher education institution. PETE faculty in the United States typically enter higher education having obtained an advanced degree (Russell et al., 2016) and depending on their duration in the profession they can be classified as early (less than 7 years' experience), mid- (7-15 years), or late career (over 15 years). Prior research on faculty socialization indicates that the university cultures and conditions (e.g., see Brunsdon & Curtner-Smith, 2022a, 2022b; Casey & Fletcher 2017) are significant to faculty members' experiences in higher education institutions. Key components of the university culture acting to assist and/or hinder PETE faculty include the ethos of the university (e.g., research or teaching), senior colleagues, administrators, and students (Brunsdon & Curtner-Smith, 2022a; 2022b; Casey & Fletcher, 2012, 2017; Richards et al., in press). In addition, role ambiguity between research and teaching objectives as informed by the focus of the institution are also prevalent at universities that maintain 'business-like' cultures (i.e., universities that base program success on metrics only, and attempt to eradicate programs with low student enrollments, and/or programs that are not 'financially worthwhile') (Enright et al., 2017; Richards et al., in press; Solmon et al., 2020; Sparkes, 2021).

Favorable and unfavorable components of the university conditions consist of access to quality facilities and equipment, the amount of time in PETE, the quality of cooperating teachers and school placements, edTPA and national and state standards (Baxter & Sinelnikov, 2022; Merrem & Curtner-Smith, 2018; Parkes et al., 2022; Parkes & Weimer, 2020; Woods & Ayers, 2019). In addition, conditions such as the number of faculty lines, low student enrollment in

PETE programs, and to a lesser degree faculty workloads are also suggested to impact faculty members' perspectives and practices (Blankenship & Templin, 2016; Park & Curtner-Smith, 2018). Unlike most of the research on the initial organizational phase (Russell et al., 2016), studies indicate that university faculty are more likely to have positive experiences and are often supported when attempting to deliver the kinds of PETE they espouse. In this way, PETE faculty are likely to experience an "institutional pull" (Brunsdon & Curtner-Smith, 2022a) compared to an "institutional press" (Zeichner and Tabachnik, 1981). That is, instead of faculty members' perspectives and practices being "pressed" out of them by their program and already established cultures and conditions, their beliefs and actions regarding PETE are supported, accepted, and "pulled" from them in ways that complement the program as well as the creation of new cultures and conditions (Brunsdon & Curtner-Smith, 2022a). Some examples of "institutional pull" include working with supportive faculty who value their colleagues' personal philosophies, diverse approaches, and contributions towards the future of PETE (Brunsdon & Curtner-Smith, 2022a).

Of course, not all faculty experience the 'pull' and are often required to deploy coping strategies when the cultures and conditions are perceived as negative and unfavorable (Brunsdon & Curtner-Smith, 2022a, 2022b; Casey & Fletcher, 2012, 2017). These strategies include fully complying with the cultures and conditions that are seen as positive and favorable, strategically complying with and/or attempting to redefine components that were negative and unfavorable, and finding a new position when the cultures and conditions were most hostile. (Lacey, 1977; Park & Curtner-Smith, 2018). Research indicates that early career faculty are more likely to strategically comply when learning the 'ins and outs' of the institution while mid-career faculty are more likely to redefine their cultures and conditions upon receiving tenure and promotion and

after entering leadership positions (Brunsdon & Curtner-Smith, 2022a, 2022b; Casey & Fletcher, 2017). Unlike the initial organizational phase, there also appears to be little evidence indicating that faculty members' perspectives and practices toward PETE become 'washed out' during this secondary phase (Casey & Fletcher, 2012), although they can become 'watered down' (Park & Curtner-Smith, 2018).

Method

Methodology

This constructivist-interpretive research study underpinned by a subjective epistemology and relativist epistemology (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011), attempted to critically examine how two PETE program coordinators executed their roles and responsibilities and those factors that influenced such practices. The use of a qualitative double-participant case study was utilized (Yin, 2013), which would allow the researchers to gain multiple sources of rich, in-depth data (Creswell, 2013).

Participants and Settings

A combination of convenience and purposive sampling was used in the selection of participants. Convenience sampling was used to identify participants who were easily accessible and willing to participate (Teddlie & Yu, 2007). Purposive sampling was used to select experienced participants who had the potential to provide detailed information (Patton, 1987). Participants were two mid-career PETE faculty members who had worked at universities in the United States for between 8-15 years. Charlotte and Rosie (pseudonyms) were purposefully recruited because they were PETE program coordinators at two universities that varied in terms of focus, size, and location in the United States. At the time of data collection, both participants identified as female and Caucasian. Charlotte was aged between 35-39, had worked in PETE for

11 years at a large state funded university in the Northeastern region of the country, and had been a program coordinator for eight years. Charlotte is responsible for managing three full-time PETE faculty, who along with her are all non-tenure track instructors on 12-month fixed term contracts. In recent years the traditional PETE program at Charlotte's university had been eliminated due to low enrollments, and she had played a big part in redeveloping a new PETE program. Rosie was aged between 45-49, had worked at a medium sized public university in the Southeastern region of the country for 14 years, had been a program coordinator for three years. Rosie is an associate professor who is responsible for managing one full-time PETE colleague who is a tenure-track assistant professor, an adjunct instructor, and an adjunct student teaching supervisor. The Carnegie classification of Charlotte's and Rosie's universities were "Very High Research Activity" and "High Research Activity" respectively. A detailed list of their administrative roles and responsibilities as program coordinators can be found in Table 1.

Data Collection

Two types of documentation were submitted as evidence. First, participants were asked to submit a list of all the roles and responsibilities they felt they executed as PETE program coordinators (see Table 1). Second, participants were asked to submit any documentation related to their program that would help the researchers to better understand the program and the roles and responsibilities they execute. Examples of program documents that were submitted included graduation plans for the PETE major, student teaching supervisor guidelines, student disposition rubrics, entry to the PETE major criteria, and course/curriculum development documentation. All documents were obtained and reviewed by the research team prior to the interviews taking place.

Both participants were interviewed using semi-structured protocols on three separate occasions, with each interview focusing on a particular area of the program coordinators'

socialization experiences. The first interview investigated the prior socialization experiences of the participants which helped to develop a participant biography. During interview two participants were asked questions that investigated how they executed their program coordinator professional roles and responsibilities. Questions for interview two were developed from the list of roles and responsibilities, additional documentary evidence, and the analysis of the data from their first interview. Example questions from interview two included, “How do you recruit and retain students?” and “How do you manage faculty workloads?” The final interview investigated the socialization factors that had influenced the participants to execute their roles and responsibilities in a certain way. Questions for interview three were developed using all previous data sources. Example questions included, “Who or what has influenced you to execute the role of interpreting program data?” and “Who or what has influenced you to execute the role of planning faculty workloads?” Each interview lasted between 60 and 90 minutes, were audio recorded, and then transcribed verbatim using Temi transcription software.

Data Analysis and Trustworthiness

Analytic induction and constant comparison were employed to analyzing the data (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). During the first stage of analysis the researchers analyzed the documentary evidence to identify the participants’ main roles and responsibilities as PETE coordinator, in addition to the biographical data obtained during interview one. The results of this analysis gave the researchers important information that would guide the questions posed during interview two. During the second round of analysis the researchers coded interview two data and began to develop themes and subthemes that identified ‘how’ the program coordinators executed their professional roles and responsibilities. During the third stage of analysis the researchers coded interview three and identified the socialization factors that had influenced participants to execute

their roles and responsibilities. During the second and third phases of analysis a table was developed that identified the major themes and subthemes. This table was then compared to the entire data set (see Table 2). Data triangulation and peer debriefing techniques were employed by the research team to enhance trustworthiness (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Data triangulation consisted of using multiple data sources and validating the data by cross-checking the codes to identify themes and subthemes. Peer debriefing sessions took place after each data collection procedure and data analysis phase to ensure all three researchers were consistently checking for similarities and negative cases among the data.

Results

The participants maintained and executed many roles and responsibilities as PETE program coordinators (see Table 1). Some roles were self-identified by the participant as part of the ‘provide a list of your current program coordinator roles’ document request, with other roles being identified by the researchers through the data analysis process. These roles included but were not limited to recruiting, retaining, and advising students; organizing student teaching/early field placements; communicating with local school district personnel; managing faculty workloads; collecting and reporting assessment data; course and curriculum development; and maintaining state and national accreditation. Data suggested that participants executed their roles in three ways, as *customizers*, *persuaders*, and *interpreters*.

Execution of Coordinator Roles and Responsibilities

Customizer

Both participants acted as ‘customizers’ by specifically tailoring *curriculum development* to be marketable while also meeting students’ needs, *faculty workloads* to align with faculty members’ experience and expertise, and *field placements* to the strengths, weaknesses, and

personalities of the students and cooperating teachers. Charlotte had recently been responsible for redeveloping the PETE program at her university. Her role on the curriculum committee was to ensure the curriculum was customized to make the program “more marketable” in an attempt to better “recruit and retain students.” During this task she also focused on ensuring that the PETE program was up to date with what was happening in the field and across the local school district to “best meet the needs of the students.”

Both participants utilized empirical program data to customize curriculum course content. Charlotte collected data from students enrolled in the new PETE major, and recent graduates, to “rate the effectiveness” of the courses. The kinesiology department undergraduate degree coordinator also analyzes this data to “make sure [courses] align with certification,” which has resulted in Charlotte “tweaking and revamping some of the courses.” In a similar manner Rosie utilized the accreditation audit data collected by the college to customize PETE course content:

When I first started the data wasn’t distributed. But now with us being under the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) we have an assessment coordinator and have monthly meetings. We look at the results of those data and adjust the assignments in our methods courses or student teaching. (Rosie, Interview 2)

When it came to assigning faculty their course workloads both participants put a lot of consideration into aligning course content with faculty members’ backgrounds, degrees, and areas of expertise. Rosie stated that she does not believe in “micro-managing,” and felt that the best approach was to “put people in the right places to do their job, as people wouldn’t be in the position if they weren’t good at it.” She felt that assigning faculty to courses that aligned with their areas of expertise showed them that they were both “valued and valuable.” During the initial redevelopment of the PETE degree Charlotte took faculty expertise into consideration

stating that “basically it was me thinking about what faculty best align and have the expertise in the curriculum design.” Now that the degree program was established, she felt that it was important to not overwhelm faculty with new courses that required “a ton of new prep, “and tried to ensure that a faculty member’s workload “doesn’t change too much.” However, just like Rosie, her primary focus was on trying to place faculty where they would be best suited to teach. As well as considering faculty expertise she also analyzed student and graduate survey data to ensure faculty were teaching in the most suitable courses, and had no issues reassigning faculty to new courses if it was the best option for the program and the students:

Academic workloads are based on specialty areas. We look at what courses need covered, and what faculty best match the course content. We have changed around who has been teaching certain courses to see if that can make a difference by assigning it to an instructor with a specialization for that content. (Charlotte, Interview 2)

When organizing early field experiences and student teaching internships both participants customized this role by taking into consideration the personality, professionalism, and pedagogical expertise of both the student and the cooperating teacher who will provide supervision. Charlotte discussed how she considers the students’ “strengths and weaknesses,” and then matches them to the most appropriate teacher available. She gave specific examples of pairing “students interested in fitness with cooperating teachers also interested in fitness,” and “student personalities with cooperating teacher personalities.” Charlotte and Rosie discussed the importance of developing strong relationships with cooperating teachers by spending time in the schools and getting to know their personalities. Both participants allow students to select three schools of “preference’ for early field experiences and student teaching. However, they both clearly stated that there were no guarantees students would be placed there. They felt that it was

more important to consider the quality of the teacher at that school and not just the geographical location of the school. Those decisions were often based on students' feedback of cooperating teachers

Persuader

Rosie and Charlotte both executed the role of *persuader of students* and displaying a *persuasive approach to help ensure job security*. They attempted to strategically convince potential PETE recruits into joining their PETE programs to “keep our jobs” Both participants were fully aware of the declining enrollment issues that have been negatively impacting PETE programs in recent years (see Parkes & Weimer, 2020), with Charlotte witnessing it first-hand when “low enrollments” led to the closing of her institution’s old PETE program. As a result of declining enrollments in recent years both participants felt the recruitment and retention of PETE students was the primary responsibility of the program coordinators, adding that their PETE faculty colleagues also have an important role to play. During interview two Charlotte stated, “I am the main recruiter for our program.” However, she also felt that “all other health and physical education faculty members should participate in recruitment.” When asked if recruitment should be her responsibility Rosie’s response matched that of Charlotte:

I know a lot of people say no, but I think it is because of the state that we are in right now nationally with low numbers of students. I wish I didn’t have to recruit, but I feel it’s part of my responsibility. (Rosie, Interview 2)

Both participants made purposeful efforts to engage with students as early as possible during their degree programs in attempt to persuade them to enter the PETE major. Charlotte discussed the recruitment strategy of “[making] sure myself and the physical education faculty are teaching enough of these courses where we are in front of these [prospective] students.” She

felt this was especially important during the introductory kinesiology courses which are typically taken early on in a student's program of study. In a similar manner, Rosie stated that "hitting students early on," and reaching out to students "who are not sure what they want their major to be" was a recruitment tactic she employed. Both Rosie and Charlotte explained that they attempted to influence students' decisions to enter the PETE major by selling the value of the program to the student.

Rosie and Charlotte displayed a *persuasive approach to help ensure job security* by attempting to strategically sustain their own positions, in addition to advising colleagues on how to best retain their professional positions. During interview one, Rosie and Charlotte both stated that they had been working in their departments for around 12 years. During this period, they had identified ways they and their colleagues could better protect their positions and obtain tenure, especially during the current period of declining PETE enrollments (Woods & Ayers, 2019). Charlotte's persuasive approach was related to keeping the teacher certification program around when the old PETE program was closed due to low enrollments. During interview two, she discussed how she fought for the future of the program by "having a strong voice in terms of how to develop and save a health and physical education certification program," because she wanted to retain her own job. She was successful in bringing PETE back as part of a new major, and did this by conducting research into the field, widening the recruitment pool, and selling the program to her colleagues and department chair. Rosie's persuasive approach to job security was for faculty to teach courses both inside and outside of PETE, meaning that you remained an asset to the department if the PETE program was ever closed due to low enrollments, "I have tried to protect our faculty numbers by having us teach some of the larger courses that exercise science

majors take. Some of our methods courses are smaller, and so credit hour production can affect us.”

In contrast to Charlotte’s PETE program, which was taught by non-tenure track instructors, Rosie’s program included tenured and tenure-track faculty. Her strategy for obtaining tenure included persuading faculty to link teaching, research, and service responsibilities, and advising faculty to avoid student teaching supervision courses to protect research time. She felt that combining teaching, research, and service opportunities together by conducting research in schools proved to be less of a “burden.” Once Rosie took over the role of program coordinator, she assigned the student teaching supervision responsibilities to part-time adjunct instructors. Her reasons for doing this was that she rarely received any financial or course release compensation, and it took away from valuable research time, stating “I think I have maybe been paid for student teachers once,” and “there is a lot of work associated with it.”

Interpreter

Both participants executed the role of ‘interpreter’ of data by collecting, analyzing, reporting, and applying data to make improvements to their PETE programs based on empirical evidence. It was evident most of this data was related to the programs’ CAEP accreditation and/or the states’ Department of Education certification requirements. Both participants frequently discussed the collection of accreditation data, which primarily evaluated students’ planning, teaching, and assessment practices during field placements and student teaching. This data was compared against accreditation standards, and according to Charlotte was used to “identify the strengths and weaknesses of the current program where students are falling short or excelling in terms of their actual teaching in a K-12 setting.”

In the state where Rosie was employed the edTPA was now a requirement for program certification and graduation. Initial edTPA passing rate scores were low, which drew some attention from the dean of the college, which she described a “disappointing and embarrassing,” stating, “[the dean] sat down with me, asked what we were doing, and what was happening.” She believed the low scores were a result of “the retirement of the former program coordinator as we were going in the phase in process of edTPA.” While trying to hire a replacement faculty member there were “a number of adjuncts teaching, and I do feel like that that hurt or hindered the message that our students were getting.” More recently the passing scores had improved, and Rosie stated that “we had great success last year in the fall with edTPA success rates.” However, she still had some concerns about edTPA scores, “that’s an area that I still think is an outlier that we need to get better at.”

In addition to accreditation and state certification data, additional anecdotal data was also collected for the purpose of self-evaluating components of the PETE program. This data was shared with other stakeholders, including PETE faculty members, department chairs, college deans, and the students within the program. As Rosie discussed during interview three, “as program coordinator you provide that information to not only your program faculty, but the students you serve.”

The data suggested that Charlotte’s ‘interpreter’ focus included PETE student recruitment and retention figures due to the declining enrollments that had negatively impacted her program. The trend of declining PETE enrollments within her program meant Charlotte had to look closely at student recruitment and retention data because enrollment numbers were constantly under the microscope. During interview two Charlotte stated, “from 2012 to 2014/2015 we saw a drastic decrease in enrollments, so we knew we needed to change the whole programming.” However,

she believed recent enrollment data looked more promising after the PETE program had been revised, with the program projected to increase enrollments from 20 students total in the major in 2015, to around 18 incoming students a semester, “we went from three [students] to 10 this past year, and I believe we are admitting 18 for the fall, so a very large increase.”

Rosie did not appear to worry about enrollment numbers as much as Charlotte. The data suggested that enrollment numbers were less of a problem within her program. However, Rosie was aware of the national trend in declining enrollments and made it a key part of her ‘interpreter’ role to track the recruitment and retention of students, understanding it could become a problem in the future:

Factors Influencing How Program Coordinators Executed Their Roles/Responsibilities

In congruence with the faculty in a similar study (Brunsdon & Curtner-Smith, 2022a, 2022b; Casey & Fletcher 2017), the university cultures and conditions significantly impacted how Rosie and Charlotte executed their roles and responsibilities as PETE faculty members. Three primary factors, department faculty/ college administration, enrollment data and cooperating teacher feedback influenced the faculty to act as *customizers*, *persuaders*, and *interpreters* as PETE program coordinators.

Department Faculty and College Administration

In alignment with prior studies, both Charlotte and Rosie had been strongly influenced by their faculty colleagues, department chair, and college dean (Brunsdon & Curtner-Smith, 2022a, 2022b; Merrem & Curtner-Smith, 2018; Park & Curtner-Smith, 2018). When it came to executing the role of *customizer* of curriculum and course content both participants had been influenced by their faculty colleagues. Charlotte had primarily been influenced by her current colleagues. They had witnessed the PETE program being eliminated several years prior, and

many of them had a vested interest in the success of the revised program that was being proposed. When serving on the curriculum committee responsible for proposing the new PETE program she worked closely with her committee colleagues to develop the program stating, “it was 75% me putting the program together, and 25% the committee helping to develop the program.” Charlotte also sought out the feedback of colleagues not serving on the committee stating, “they wanted to see the new program be sustainable and prosper, and I had their support.” In contrast, Rosie had been influenced to customize curriculum and course content by two former colleagues. These faculty members, who had since retired, both served as PETE program coordinators prior to Rosie and influenced her because they “had a very good ability to take the information they were given and customize it to what we needed to do with the students to get them on board and make them successful.” (Interview 3).

Their department chairs and college deans influenced both participants when executing the roles of *customizers*, *persuaders*, and *interpreters*. Rosie had been influenced by two former department chairs when customizing faculty workloads recalling:

They both had similar philosophies and thought processes about pairing individuals with courses that matched their areas of expertise. I think real life experience means you are more able to relate to the students. A lack of expertise could negatively impact student learning (Rosie Interview 3)

Both participants had been influenced by the department chair and/or college dean when executing the role of *persuader*. Charlotte’s department chair and college dean had influenced her to act as a persuader or recruiting students by focusing on the importance of the program enrollment numbers. In a similar manner, Rosie had also been influenced to act as a persuader of recruiting students by her college dean, who also has background in teacher education. During

interview one she discussed how “from a dean perspective, [enrollment] numbers mean keeping our jobs.” Although the program Rosie managed was not under immediate threat of being eliminated, she knew that she needed to sustain the current programs numbers to keep it from becoming an issue. She discussed how faculty from other departments who had often questioned why the PETE program could “get away” with such low numbers. However, during interview two she stated, “our dean supports what we are doing, although we may not have the large numbers that other programs do. She has always supported our program, even with lower numbers.”

When it came to executing their role of *interpreters*, the dean, department chair and college faculty members responsible for accreditation, certification and assessment had the biggest influence on the participants. Charlotte’s department chair and Rosie’s college dean had an influence when it came to executing the role of interpreter of accreditation and certification data, with both participants also being heavily influenced by College of Education faculty responsible for assessment. Both participants discussed the need to report program data to the College of Education assessment faculty who would hold them accountable to reporting deadlines. As well as holding her accountable, Rosie also felt that the assessment coordinator helped her to better understand edTPA data, which had been an issue when it was initially implemented. She felt the assessment coordinator “has gotten us to dive into the edTPA. I know that we have an overall passing score, and we have both noted that we haven’t done as well as we would like.”

With the declining enrolment issues in Charlotte’s program, it was no surprise that enrolment data was high on her interpretation agenda. The college dean and department chair

both had the biggest influence on how she interpreted and responded to enrolment data. When asked why these two individuals had been so influential, she responded:

If you don't have the numbers, you don't have the program. Both of those people are very data driven, so the biggest influencing factor is that we need the numbers. Numbers are important because faculty are getting paid on salary, so they want to make sure the classes are filled. They want the biggest bang for their buck. It comes down to the department and college budget. (Charlotte, Interview 3)

Enrolment Data

In line with recent research, the data suggested that both participants were heavily influenced by student enrollment data (Brunsdon & Curtner-Smith, 2022b; Parkes & Weimer, 2022; Solmon et al., 2020; Woods & Ayers, 2019). Both participants executed the role of 'interpreter of recruitment and retention data', and this appeared to influence them to act as 'persuaders of student recruitment'. However, the reasons for being influenced by enrollment data differed slightly between each participant. Rosie was primarily influenced by the national trend of declining enrollments more than the actual number of students enrolled within her program. She was not overly concerned that her enrollment numbers would be evaluated by the dean or that her program would be at risk of being eliminated. However, she was fully aware that declining PETE enrollments are a trend of significance within the field and had been for several years (Blankenship & Templin, 2016). She felt that even though it may not be an issue now, that it was something that could become a potential issue in the future. Rosie made sure she tracked all PETE student enrollment and retention data because that could have a negative impact on the job security of her and her program faculty in the near future.

Charlotte's reasons for being influenced by enrollment data were primarily down to witnessing the elimination of the former PETE program at her institution. She was fully aware of the national trend of low enrollments, but mainly referred to her firsthand experience of the negative impact declining PETE enrollments had on her program, "our program enrollments were super low, and we closed that program." She felt that because low enrollments had closed the previous PETE program that the newly developed program was constantly under the microscope in terms of enrollment figures. In a similar manner to Rosie, job security was also something that Charlotte was concerned with when it came to declining enrollments. Charlotte spoke proudly about the enrollment turnaround the newly developed PETE program she coordinates was experiencing, "our retention rate since 2016 is 100%, and we are seeing a very large increase with the new programming."

Cooperating Teacher Feedback

In congruence with prior research, the quality of schools and cooperating teachers was significant to how the faculty executed their administrative roles and responsibilities (Brunsdon & Curtner-Smith, 2022a, 2022b; Richards et al., in press). When strategically placing students and cooperating teachers together for early field experiences and student teaching internships both participants relied on the feedback of the cooperating teachers they had used in the past. Both participants acted as customizers of organizing field placements by consulting the feedback received when communicating with cooperating teachers, in addition to things they had observed in the school when visiting the teachers in the school setting. Charlotte felt that she valued the feedback of the cooperating teachers she utilized and felt that it was important to keep a positive working relationship with cooperating teachers. She felt that she purposefully "listened to cooperating teachers in the public school. What have been the strengths and weaknesses of the

students? How can we create an even higher quality teacher candidate?” She also stated that previous feedback from cooperating teachers had resulted in her making decisions that would aim to keep both cooperating teachers and students happy during field placements.

I draw on past experiences that were both positive and negative coming from the cooperating teachers. There is a fine line where you want to keep them happy, and you want to keep the student happy. They are an influencing factor. (Charlotte, Interview 3)

In a similar manner Rosie also relied on cooperating teacher feedback when making decisions in relation to assigning students to cooperating teachers. She felt that this feedback was important to ensure the student was placed in the best possible environment.

Summary and Conclusions

This study investigated the influence of secondary organizational socialization on how PETE program coordinators executed their administrative roles and responsibilities. Prior research suggests that PETE faculty **members'** administrative roles and responsibilities may include curriculum redevelopment, student recruitment, and completing accreditation reports (Solmon et al., 2020). University cultures and conditions appear to significantly impact PETE faculty **members'** experiences, especially research expectations, senior colleagues, administrators, and students (Brunsdon & Curtner-Smith, 2022a; 2022b; Casey & Fletcher, 2012, 2017; Richards et al., in press). Our overarching aim was to fill knowledge gaps in the field of occupational socialization because despite a significant body of research investigating faculty **members'** teaching and research practices, little has been done to investigate how PETE coordinators execute their administrative roles. The rationale for this study was that it is important to understand how PETE faculty successfully execute their administrative roles and responsibilities during a period of difficulty where decreased enrollments, financial

sustainability, edTPA, and program elimination are nationwide concerns. It is also considered valuable for stakeholders including colleagues, department chairs, and college deans to understand the role they play in helping or hindering PETE program coordinators during this difficult period, because they are often involved in making final decisions regarding the elimination or survival of PETE programs.

The research questions we attempted to answer were: (a) What roles and responsibilities do PETE program coordinators execute? (b) How do PETE program coordinators execute these roles and responsibilities? and (c) What socialization factors influenced how PETE program coordinators execute these roles and responsibilities? Despite working at vastly different institutions in terms of size, focus and location, both participants performed many of the same roles (see Table 1) and executed them in a similar manner (See Table 2). When it came to the role of *customizer* both participants executed this role in relation to curriculum/course content, faculty workload, and field placement organization. Both participants executed the role of *persuader* in relation to protecting faculty positions and recruiting students. When it came in being an *interpreter* of data both participants highlighted that accreditation data and recruitment/retention data were the two main areas of importance. Unsurprisingly, interpreting edTPA data was also a major part of Rosie's role (Baxter & Sinelnikov, 2022).

In congruence with previous literature (Parkes & Weimer, 2020; Solmon et al., 2020), student recruitment and retention responsibilities were one of the key roles executed by both participants (see Table 2). One of the most prominent issues in this field over the past decade years has been the decrease in program enrollments and the consequent elimination of PETE programs (Blankenship & Templin, 2016; Brunson & Curtner-Smith, 2022a, 2022b; Parkes & Weimer, 2020; Richards et al., in press). Despite working at two different institutions, both

participants focused heavily on enrollment, recruitment, and retention data (Blankenship & Templin, 2016; Parkes & Weimer, 2020). Charlotte more so, because her program, like several others, had been phased out due to declining enrollments, before being revamped and reestablished. Even though there was less pressure on Rosie's program enrollment numbers, she was still cautious and understood that it could still become a problem in the future.

Building on previous research, the secondary organizational socialization phase appeared to have a significant impact on PETE faculty members' perspective and practices (Brunsdon & Curtner-Smith, 2022a, 2022b; Casey & Fletcher, 2012; Merrem & Curtner-Smith, 2018; Park & Curtner-Smith, 2018; Richards et al., in press) and strongly influenced how Charlotte and Rosie executed their administrative roles and responsibilities as PETE program coordinators. The main cultural component and university conditions acting to influence these faculty were department faculty and college administration, student enrollment data, and cooperating teacher feedback. For example, Charlotte felt that the chair and the dean were always putting pressure on her in relation to low enrollment figures. However, in contrast, she felt that her department colleagues were in support of her efforts to revise and revamp the new PETE program. Additionally, Rosie felt supported by the dean and chair when it came to enrollments, and the assessment coordinator helped with accreditation and edTPA data. Former department colleagues helped her to customize the program to better meet student needs, but outside the department some college level faculty often challenged why her program was still around with such low numbers.

Furthermore, enrollment data certainly hindered Charlotte, as she had spent the past few years fighting to keep her program alive, eventually losing it and then bringing it back in a new format. In contrast, it did not have a negative impact on Rosie's role, but she was cautious that it might become a problem further down the road. Both participants had been helped by

cooperating teacher feedback which led to good working relationships that ensured students were placed in the best possible school for field placements and student teaching.

Interestingly, despite the obvious sociopolitical impact of their universities on how Charlotte and Rosie executed their administrative roles and responsibilities, socialization factors pertaining to gender were not reported in the data (Enright et al., 2017; Richards et al., in press). In congruence with previous literature, these mid-career faculty members in their capacity as program coordinators appeared to exclusively experience the institutional pull (Brunsdon & Curtner-Smith, 2022b) and be in a constant state of strategic redefinition (Lacey, 1977). Despite this circumstance, however, the impact of how they executed their roles and responsibilities seemed to carry more significance when compared to PETE faculty without administrative duties as their efforts can be the difference between program closure and survival.

More specifically, to avoid program eradication (Blankenship & Templin, 2016), it was evident that Charlotte and Rosie were required to develop and improve their current working conditions to avoid negative national trends in PETE (Brunsdon & Curtner-Smith 2022b; Woods & Ayers, 2019) and were clearly successful in redefining their programs. Further, to overcome low program enrollment and challenging accreditation policies such as edTPA, the faculty redefined their agency in terms of how they viewed enrollment, assessment, and accreditation data; employed recruitment and retention strategies; purposefully customized curriculums and field placements to meet student needs; and strategically attempted to protect faculty positions. These socialization factors primarily helped them to execute their administrative roles. The pressure that colleagues and administrators placed on enrollment numbers may hinder them through time consuming recruitment and retention tasks. However, it could be argued that this pressure helps them to keep the program alive and their jobs and colleagues' jobs intact.

These findings will hopefully be of interest to individuals currently executing similar roles or faculty who are interested in becoming PETE program coordinators in the future because many of the issues faced by Charlotte and Rosie are nationwide trends. Charlottes and Rosie's stories would also be of potential interest to department chairs and deans interested in training early, mid-, and late career faculty interested that are in pursuing administrative positions for similar reasons. We hope PETE faculty can utilize these findings to make 'moderatum generalizations' (Williams, 2002) by recognizing and implementing the findings and recommendations that most closely reflect the roles and responsibilities they execute at their institutions. In the context of limited empirical data on the occupational socialization within higher education we suggest that future research be conducted on individuals who have made the transition from PETE faculty into administrative leadership positions such as department chair and college deans.

References

- Alfrey, L., Enright, E., & Rynne, S. (2017). Letters from early career academics: The physical education and sport pedagogy field of play. *Sport, Education and Society*, 22(1), 5-21.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2016.1242479>
- Baxter, D. S., & Sinelnikov, O. A. (2022). PETE faculty's perspectives of edTPA: The change of change. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 41(1), 60-67.
<https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2020-0133>
- Blankenship, B. T., & Templin, T. J. (2016). The decline and elimination of PETE: Implications for doctoral education. *Quest*, 68, 383-393.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2016.1229201>

- Brunsdon, J. J., & Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2022a). ‘We’re trying to produce serious educators’: Impact of secondary organizational socialization on mid-career faculty members’ delivery of PETE. *Sport, Education and Society*. Advanced online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2022.2030700>
- Brunsdon, J. J., & Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2022b). “My methods courses feel like Walmart”: Influence of secondary organizational socialization on early career faculty members’ implementation of PETE. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*. Advanced online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2021-0213>
- Casey, A., & Fletcher, T. (2012). Trading places: From physical education teachers to teacher educators. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 31(4), 362-380. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.31.4.362>
- Casey, A., & Fletcher, T. (2017). Paying the piper: The costs and consequences of academic advancement. *Sport, Education and Society*, 22(1), 105-121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2016.1168795>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed method approaches*. Sage.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1–19). Sage.
- Enright, E., Alfrey, L., & Rynne, S. B. (2017). Being and becoming an academic in the neoliberal university: A necessary conversation. *Sport, Education and Society*, 22(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2016.1259999>

Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. Academic Press.

Kirk, D., & MacDonald, D. (2001). The social construction of PETE in higher education: Toward a research agenda. *Quest*, 53(4), 440–456.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2001.10491757>

Lacey, C. (1977). *The socialization of teachers*. Methuen.

Lawson, H. A. (1983a). 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(1), 3-15.

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

McEvoy, E., Heikinaro-Johansson, P., & MacPhail, A. (2017). Physical education teacher educators' views regarding the purpose(s) of school physical education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 22(7), 812-824.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2015.1075971>

Merrem, A. M., & Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2018). Occupational socialization of sport pedagogy faculty: Two German case studies. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 37(2), 154–163. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2017-0071>

Park, C. W., & Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2018). Influence of occupational socialization on the perspectives and practices of internationally born sport pedagogy faculty members working in American universities. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 37(4), 397-406. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2017-0228>

- Parkes, C., Holden, S. L., O'Leary, N., & Brunsdon, J. J. (2022). "I Can Help Them Become Better Teachers, But I Can't Help Them With Educative Teacher Performance Assessment": Cooperating Teachers' Knowledge and Experience of the Educative Teacher Performance Assessment in Physical and Health Education. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*. Advanced online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00315125221095933>
- Parkes, C., & Weimer, A. (2020). Dual-pathway PETE/PHETE majors: The future of our profession? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 91(6), 21-29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2020.1768179>
- Patton, M. Q. (1987). How to use qualitative methods in evaluation. Sage.
- Richards, K. A. R., Kinder, C. J., Shiver, V. N., Woods, A. M., & Cushing, C. L. (in press). Disciplinary marginalization and sociocultural politics: The U.S. PETE pre-tenure experience. *Sport, Education and Society*.
- Russell, J., Gaudreault, K. L., & Richards, K. A. (2016). Doctoral student socialization: Educating stewards of the physical education profession. *Quest*, 68(4), 439-456. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2016.1234963>
- Solmon, M. A., Graber, K. C., Woods, A. M., Williams, N. I., Templin, T. J., Price, S. L., & Weimer, A. (2020). Physical education teacher education in kinesiology: Past, present, and future. *Kinesiology Review*, 9(4), 305-312. <https://doi.org/10.1123/kr.2020-0047>
- Sparkes, A. (2021). Making a spectacle of oneself in the academy using the h-index: From becoming an artificial person to laughing at absurdities. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 27, 1-13. [10.1177/10778004211003519](https://doi.org/10.1177/10778004211003519)
- Teddlie, C., & Yu, F. (2007). Mixed methods sampling: A typology with examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 77-100.

Woods, A. M., & Ayers, S. F. (2019). Chapter 1: PETE recruitment and retention: Current state of affairs. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 38(1), 1-3.

<https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2018-0208>

Williams, M. (2002). Generalization in interpretive research. In T. May (Ed.), *Qualitative research in action* (pp. 125–143). Sage.

Yin, R. (2013). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Sage.

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

[doi:10.1177/002248718103200302](https://doi.org/10.1177/002248718103200302).