

**PEDAGOGY OF CONTENTMENT:
A MULTI-CASE STUDY OF GRADUATE
ASSISTANT TEACHERS**

by

Jon Richard Poole

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

**Curriculum and Instruction:
Physical Education Pedagogy**

APPROVED:



Dr. George Graham, Chairman



Dr. Mike Metzler



Dr. Gail Webster



Dr. Don McKeon



Dr. Jan Nespor

July, 1991

Blacksburg, Virginia

PEDAGOGY OF CONTENTMENT:
A MULTI-CASE STUDY OF GRADUATE ASSISTANT TEACHERS

by

Jon Richard Poole

Committee Chairman: George Graham
Curriculum and Instruction:
Physical Education Pedagogy

(ABSTRACT)

Four case studies of graduate assistant (GA) teachers were completed to examine the impact of a teaching induction program on GA teaching, planning, and content selection. Data collection methods included interviews, field notes, videotape records, and questionnaires. Based on a qualitative data analysis, each GA's unique perspective about the effective teaching of their subject and a lack of follow-up teaching support provided by faculty supervisors, appeared to influence teaching toward a "pedagogy of contentment." That is, the four GAs did not consistently teach as the induction program suggested, rather they appeared content with their own teaching without considering the need for improvement. It was expected that the induction program would inspire a "pedagogy of dissonance" or dissatisfaction with teaching. That is, the GAs would have been encouraged to ask questions about teaching, experiment with various teaching methods, and seek support from faculty supervisors. Instead, the GAs reported contentment centered on their belief that they already knew

the different strategies, methods, and routines of how their particular subject was supposed to be taught. These beliefs about the effective teaching of their subject appeared to be the most powerful influence on their teaching. The influence of the induction program, designed to encourage the use of an effective teaching model endorsed by the department, was minimal. It was the goal of the induction program that all GAs, with help from faculty supervisors, would consistently incorporate some of the teaching strategies suggested. Instead, the GAs in this study appeared to dismiss a majority of the effective teaching model as incompatible with their own perspectives. While a teaching induction program suggesting effective teaching strategies may be necessary to enhance GA teaching, it appears not to be adequate alone. The GAs in this study did not consistently use the department's suggested model of effective teaching, in part, due to their reliance on their own perspective about effective teaching and a lack of follow-up teaching support provided by faculty supervisors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. George Graham, my advisor and committee chairman, for his dedication, guidance, support, encouragement, and inspiration. Dr. Graham was chiefly responsible for my attending Virginia Tech to pursue my doctorate, and it was he who knew when to provide a pat on the back, or kick on the backside, to make this challenging process attainable.

I would also like to thank Drs. Mike Metzler, Gail Webster, Jan Nespor, and Don McKeon, the other members of my committee, for their support and advice. A special thanks goes to Dr. Don Sebolt, the Director of the Basic Instructional Program, for allowing me to serve as Assistant Director and allowing me to try new things, fail, and then try something else.

In addition, the fellow graduate students I've come to know over the past years at Virginia Tech are special people who were always there to provide a bit of laughter and support during our common struggle. Of special note include: Mark, Peter, Ron, Christine, Rosie, Steve, Tim, Jim, Wendy, Kathy, Laura, Cheryl, Tom, John, Bob, and especially Bill and Kathleen.

Further, I would like to thank my family, both the Pooles and the Palmes for their encouragement: My sisters, Kelly and Lisa, my brothers, Mark, Jeff, Guy, and Stephen, my nieces Melissa and Kristin, and finally, my parents, Jim

and Sue Poole, and Marian Palmes. But, without Kathleen, my new bride, this degree would mean much less and my life would be currently unfulfilled. Her love, support, encouragement, understanding, and ability for always knowing the right thing to say were so invaluable and necessary that I married her.

Finally, I look forward to a stay at my parents house and answering the phone call that asks for Dr. Poole, and replying: "Well, there's two of us now. Which one do you want?"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE	1
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF PURPOSE	5
INITIAL GUIDING QUESTIONS	5
RESEARCH HYPOTHESES	6
DEFINITIONS OF TERMS	7
BASIC ASSUMPTIONS	7
LIMITATIONS OF STUDY	8
SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY	8
DESIGN OF DOCUMENT	10
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	11
INTRODUCTION	11
LEARNING TO TEACH	11
TEACHING AS A GA	25
BARRIERS IMPEDING TEACHING IMPROVEMENT	27
ENHANCING GA TEACHING	29
GAs TEACHING COLLEGE PHYSICAL EDUCATION COURSES ..	36
QUALITATIVE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	38
CHAPTER CONCLUSION	40
CHAPTER III: JOURNAL MANUSCRIPT	41

ABSTRACT	42
INTRODUCTION	44
STATEMENT OF PURPOSE	51
METHODS	51
RESULTS	60
DISCUSSION	94
CONCLUSIONS	100
IMPLICATIONS	102
FUTURE STUDY	106
TABLES 1-5	108
REFERENCES	118
CHAPTER IV: SUMMARY OF IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS .	126
INTRODUCTION	126
SUMMARY OF IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS	130
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	131
CHAPTER CONCLUSION	133
CHAPTER V: LITERATURE CITED	135
APPENDIX A: DETAILED METHODOLOGY	149
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW QUESTIONING GUIDES	170
APPENDIX C: TEACHING OBSERVATION GUIDE	177
APPENDIX D: CLASSROOM NARRATIVE GUIDE	178
APPENDIX E: GA TEACHING BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE	179
APPENDIX F: SCHEDULE FOR PRESEMESTER WORKSHOP	180
VITA	181

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: Teaching Skills Associated with Effective Teaching Model..... 108

TABLE 2: Teaching Profile of Paul Relative to the Effective Teaching Model 110

TABLE 3: Teaching Profile of Danny Relative to the Effective Teaching Model 112

TABLE 4: Teaching Profile of Patty Relative to the Effective Teaching Model 114

TABLE 5: Teaching Profile of Doris Relative to the Effective Teaching Model 116

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Over the past decade, many questions concerning the teaching effectiveness of our nation's public school teachers have been raised (Carnegie Task Force, 1986). A group of teachers in higher education, graduate assistants (GAs), have also had their competence challenged (Chism, 1987; Sage, 1984). Unlike public school teachers, however, GAs are typically not career-oriented toward teaching, and generally have little or no teaching experience or teacher preparation as part of their background. Many are in the teaching role primarily as a means to finance their own graduate degree, as they are typically full-time graduate students (Chism, 1987). Sage (1984) noted that with enlarged graduate programs came the practice of turning over freshmen- or entry-level courses to GAs. He further noted that GAs are typically the least experienced teachers within a department, and their highest priority is, justifiably, their own education.

Physical education GAs were the focus of this study. This introductory chapter presents the statement of purpose, initial guiding questions, research hypotheses, definitions of terms, basic assumptions, limitations, significance of this study, and design of the document. Further, this chapter briefly examines (a) GA teaching competence, (b) teaching induction programs designed for GAs, and (c) GAs

teaching college physical education activity courses.

GA Teaching Competence

GAs constantly walk a tightrope between being a teacher and being a student (Gething, 1987). Chism (1987) suggested that the conflict associated with simultaneously being a part-time teacher and full-time student can hinder quality instruction. As students, GAs enroll at an institution to obtain a degree. As teachers, they are an academic "underclass" (Eble, 1987, p. 9) responsible for teaching courses typically unpopular and unwanted by faculty, but without the same resources as faculty.

In an earlier pilot case study, Poole (1989) studied one member of this academic underclass who had no prior teaching experience. Teaching was reported as the third priority behind graduate research and course work, and seen as primarily a financial resource. This typical placement of teaching below research and course work may force GAs to spend less time preparing for their teaching assignments (Wilson & Stearns, 1985), not unlike the junior faculty member who must publish research, not necessarily teach well, to acquire tenure (Cheney, 1990). Given this situation, essentially a juggling of time burdens, it is easy to understand why GA teaching competence has been questioned.

Teaching Induction Programs Designed for GAs

In fact, concern about the teaching competence of GAs

has precipitated the staging of several national conferences at The Ohio State University (1986), Syracuse University (1988), and the University of Washington (1989). Further, the University of Texas will be hosting a fourth national conference in the Fall of 1991. These conferences brought together several hundred faculty and GAs from across the nation and were designed to specifically address and enhance GA teaching effectiveness. Chism (1987) noted a number of recommendations to improve GA teaching performance presented at the 1986 First National Conference on the Training and Employment of Teaching Assistants at The Ohio State University.

Recommendations included:

- * Using teaching handbooks and newsletters,
- * Offering courses on effective college teaching,
- * Providing formative feedback from peers,
- * Providing group workshops on effective teaching,
- * Developing incentive and award programs,
- * Using videotape teaching analysis, and
- * Establishing faculty/GA mentor programs. (pp. 126-128)

Based on these recommendations, teaching induction programs (i.e., in-service teaching effectiveness programs) appear to have sufficient information to guide their development. According to Carroll (1980), however, induction program developers too often concern themselves

with providing "innovating ways of conducting such programs" (p. 176), rather than systematically assessing the results of the program. Further, in a recent review of teaching induction programs, Abbott, Wulff, and Szego, (1989) declared, "Teaching assistant training programs are being developed and modified without adequate attention to good research" (p. 121). Thus, the need for extended study of induction programs clearly exists. Additionally, given the unique teaching demands of college physical education activity courses, GAs assigned to teach those courses require induction programs developed from informed research.

GAs Teaching College Physical Education Activity Courses

Teaching college physical education has its own unique demands because, in general, physical education instructors do not rely on lecture methods to present course material. Most induction programs reviewed by Abbott et al. (1989), and presented at the 1989 Second National Conference on the Training and Employment of Teaching Assistants at the University of Washington, dealt with GAs primarily teaching through lecture or class discussion methods. Physical education GAs, in contrast, must be able to select and sequence appropriate motor skill practice tasks, and provide instructional feedback while students are engaged in physical activity.

Physical education GAs typically teach activity courses in a department's basic instructional (or physical activity)

program. Activity programs regularly consist of one-hour courses aimed at teaching the basic skills needed to pursue physical activity, fitness, and lifetime sports participation. These programs are essentially the only physical education programs designed for all university students, not only physical education majors. At most larger institutions, GAS teach the majority, if not all, of the activity courses (Miller, Dowell, & Pender, 1989).

Given the preponderance of GAS, and the juggling of time burdens they face in providing quality instruction, adequately developed teaching induction programs need to address the experiences, beliefs, and attitudes about teaching that GAS bring into their instructional roles (Poole, 1989; Rosenberg, 1990). While a plethora of research has explored how beginning teachers learn to teach (Reynolds, 1989), GAS have been studied infrequently.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of a teaching induction program on the teaching, planning, and content selection of four GAS teaching college physical education activity courses, with a focus toward applying the findings to enhance GA teaching induction programs.

Initial Guiding Questions

Specifically, five questions concerning GA teaching guided this study:

1. What is the impact of a teaching induction program

on the GAs use of a model of effective teaching presented as part of a presemester week-long workshop?

2. What are the major factors influencing how these GAs teach?

3. What are the teaching similarities, and differences, between these four GAs?

4. What are the planning similarities, and differences, between these four GAs?

5. What are the similarities and differences between the ways these four GAs decide on the content of their lessons?

Research Hypotheses

Based on a review of literature, and earlier pilot work, several research hypotheses were examined in the course of this study. These hypotheses included:

1. The GAs, when provided regular follow-up teaching support from faculty supervisors, would tend to plan and teach incorporating various aspects of the effective teaching model presented during the presemester workshop.

2. The GAs, when provided with little follow-up teaching support from faculty supervisors, would tend to plan and teach an activity the same way they learned it as a student or taught it during previous self-reported teaching experience.

3. The GAs, when provided with little follow-up teaching support from faculty supervisors, would tend to

select the content for their lessons based on their own self-reported past experiences.

Definitions of Terms

The following definitions are provided to clarify and highlight the differences between the teaching induction program and the presemester workshop:

1. Teaching Induction Program - defined as the comprehensive year-long in-service teaching effectiveness program; the induction program included the presemester workshop, assignment of the faculty supervisors, as well as any follow-up teaching support provided.

2. Presemester Workshop - defined as the single week-long workshop conducted prior to the beginning of the semester; the workshop presented both administrative policies and the teaching skills suggested as part of the effective teaching model endorsed by the department.

Basic Assumptions

The basic assumptions underlying this study were:

1. Through the efforts of the principal researcher to make the participants feel comfortable talking with him, it was assumed that interview responses were honest and represented the participants true beliefs.

2. Through questioning of the four GAs and their students, it was assumed that the lessons observed by the principal researcher were representative of other lessons taught throughout the semester.

Limitations of Study

The following limitations restrict the generalizability of the results of this study:

1. The study was completed in the department of physical education at one university during one semester. Global generalizations to other universities or departments are not possible.
2. The four participants were chosen by the investigator to represent two experienced and two inductee GAs. Global generalizations to other GAs are not possible.
3. Due to the nature of qualitative research and specifically case studies, insights into the four GAs represent a limited view of the impact of the teaching induction program on GA teaching, planning, and content selection.

Significance of Study

This study was conducted to examine the impact of a teaching induction program on GA teaching, planning, and content selection. Its intent was to provide insights that may lead to a better understanding of, and perhaps even influence, the quality of GA teaching in physical education. Hoffman and O'Neal (cited in Reif, 1990) noted that "the success of our efforts to improve teaching in classrooms hinges, in large part, on our understanding of the forces that shape, and either directly or indirectly constrain, teaching practices" (p. 13).

Additionally, there is an evident need for this kind of research. Rosenberg (1990) stated that it cannot be assumed that teachers will "discard dysfunctional views formed from many years of being a student merely because they are exposed, for a relatively short period, to educationally advantageous principles and practices" (p. 37). While GA teaching induction programs are in existence at many universities in some form, Parrett (1987) reported a lack of empirical findings related to these programs. As noted previously, Abbott et al. (1989) reported that too often induction programs are developed without "adequate attention to good research" (p. 121). Thus, this study provided additional research to better develop and implement GA teaching induction programs.

While there is already an existing knowledge base focusing on beginning teachers (Reynolds, 1989), recent studies reported by Poole (1989) and Rosenberg (1990) question the validity of generalizing findings reported for beginning teachers to GAs. GAs live and teach in a very different environment as they are often in the teaching role primarily as a means to finance their own graduate degree. Because GAs do not share common backgrounds with beginning teachers, it appears more reasonable to categorize them as a distinct group of teachers. Therefore, this study expanded the present knowledge base about the teaching of GAs, and more specifically, the teaching of physical education GAs in

basic instructional (or physical activity) programs.

Design of Document

The first chapter serves as an introduction to this study. The second chapter contributes a literature review focused on learning to teach, GAs as teachers, and the impact of teaching induction programs. Chapter three follows with a journal manuscript complete with introduction, methods, results, and discussion. In an effort to present a comprehensive, yet concise, manuscript, much of the material submitted in chapter one and two is also presented in chapter three. Chapter four follows with a summary of implications for practitioners and recommendations for future research. Chapter five offers the literature cited and Appendix A details the research methodology employed in this study that was not presented in chapter three.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

Introduction

In order to better understand the impact of the teaching induction program and the major influences on GA teaching, planning, and content selection, the literature review focuses on the following topics: (a) learning to teach, (b) teaching as a GA, (c) barriers impeding teaching improvement, (d) enhancing GA teaching, and (e) GAs teaching college physical education courses. This chapter concludes with a brief discussion supporting the use of qualitative research methods employed in this study.

Learning To Teach

The forces that impact the way teachers learn to teach have received an extensive amount of study (Berliner, 1989; Clark, Smith, Newby, & Cook, 1985; Emmer, 1986; Feiman-Nemser, 1983; Goodman, 1988; Grossman, 1989; Grossman & Richert, 1988; Hoste, 1982; Hoy, 1968; Lacey, 1977; Lawson, 1988; Lortie, 1975; May, 1986; Reif, 1990; Ross, 1988; Smylie, 1989; Stephens, 1969; Templin & Schempp, 1989). According to Feiman-Nemser (1983), two major sources of influence, informal and formal teaching knowledge, impact one's learning to teach. Informal teaching knowledge is acquired through one's experiences as a student and observing or talking with other teachers. Formal teaching knowledge, on the other hand is acquired through one's

completion of an undergraduate teacher preparation degree. In order to better understand how teachers learn to teach, this section separates learning to teach into (a) learning from the past (including influence of experience, teacher socialization, and undergraduate teacher preparation), and (b) learning from on-the-job training (including the five stages of teacher development).

Learning from the past. As with other teachers, it is sensible to think of GAs as possessing a wealth of knowledge about teaching, albeit a teaching knowledge based on observations as students of past teachers, rather than an understanding of research on effective teaching (Lortie, 1975). Schempp (1989) reported that the memories that prospective physical education teachers have of their elementary and secondary physical education were powerful determinants of their positive or negative beliefs about teaching physical education in the future.

Influence of Experience

In addition to past memories and experiences as a student, it is expected that teachers would cite current teaching experience as a powerful determinant of their future teaching. Rosenberg (1990) examined the teaching of two physical education teaching assistants and reported that, in addition to using past experience as a guide, the teachers practiced "do-it-yourself pedagogy," or teaching learned from on-the-job-training (p. 38). Rosenberg noted

that "a strong case can be made for the notion that prospective teachers' values and dispositions [teaching perspective] are significantly influenced by their own years of schooling" (p.1).

Teacher Socialization

The shaping of a teaching perspective, or the process of teacher socialization, includes the informal teaching knowledge one acquires from exposure to school, teachers, and parents across one's life. A person's desire, for example, to correct others based on past experiences with parents and teachers is a source of teaching knowledge (Stephens, 1969). Stephens cited the case of observing children playing and correcting each other during their play as an example. As an influence on teaching knowledge, the experiences we all have as children (i.e., being corrected by teachers and parents) help define the role of a teacher as one who corrects student behavior. Similarly, Wright and Tuska (1968) construe teaching as one's modeling of teaching behavior experienced as a child or student. In these cases, the positive role of a teacher is equated with the desire to mirror a significant other. In support of this, both Lawson (1988) and Templin and Schempp (1989) reported that prospective physical education teachers were often influenced by the desire to mirror past teachers or coaches. Experiences as a student operate as an "apprenticeship of observation" where valuable informal teaching knowledge is

gained simply by observing teachers (Lortie, 1975).

Past experience as a student can be compared to being in a theater audience (Rosenberg, 1990). The audience at a theater see only the final product, the well-organized and well-choreographed production. They miss the extensive planning and rehearsal needed to perform well. Similarly, students see the teacher's presentation, hear the teacher's lecture, or complete the teacher's examination. They, too, miss the extensive planning the teacher must complete to prepare for each class. Regardless, this teaching knowledge acquired through observation appears to have a powerful impact on teachers.

Teaching knowledge acquired through observation includes experiences all students have had during their years in school. By the time they reach college, they have endured countless hours of both good and poor teaching. These models of good and poor teaching provide a powerful source of teaching knowledge that account for a teacher's "marvelous [teaching] repertoire, subconsciously developed over a lifetime of observing one's own teachers and awakened in student teaching and activated in the first year of teaching. From then on, it is modified through further experience" (Clark et al., 1985, p. 53). Clark et al. observed 71 student teachers and first-year teachers through systematic observation. Teachers were asked to describe the perceived origin of their teaching behaviors and their "own

ideas" were the self-reported most influential source of teaching knowledge impacting their teaching behavior (p.52).

In further support of Clark et al., both May (1986) and Reif (1990) reported that a teachers' own thoughts and ideas about teaching were the dominant guides that teachers reported using in their teaching. May (1986) noted that a lack of follow-up teaching support for beginning teachers often left them to "quickly learn to rely on their own resourcefulness" (p. 9). A teacher's memory of his/her life as a student provides a powerful influence on his/her knowledge of teaching and appears to be used to construct a "practical" philosophy about teaching which "emerges from an individual's personal experiences and is used as a [teaching] guide for one's actions" (Goodman, 1988, p. 121).

These memories and experiences, shaping what Adler (1984) and Graham (1991) identified as a teaching perspective, can be thought of as one's internalized beliefs about effective teaching, that is, one's own personal philosophy, ideas, behaviors, and beliefs about how a specific subject should be taught. Lacey (1977) declared about the reliance of teachers on their teaching perspective (cited in Ross, 1988):

As a result of their experiences as pupils, prospective teachers are familiar with the values, attitudes, and milieu associated with teaching. To become a teacher, then, does not require the acquisition of previously

unknown values as much as it requires a change in the individual's own relation to the classroom situation.
(p. 102)

That is, the student simply models the role of teacher he/she has observed throughout his/her years as a student. In his own study, Ross (1988) examined 21 students enrolled in an undergraduate teacher preparation program, using primarily interviews to collect data. Ross employed qualitative research methods in an attempt to "construct a story of the development of each individual as a teacher" (p. 103). He reported that each teacher's perspective about effective teaching was the result of interaction between the following elements: (a) socializing factors (i.e., apprenticeship of observation as a student and teacher preparation experiences); (b) personal backgrounds (i.e., prior beliefs, religious experiences, values, etc.); and (c) individual adaptations to the role of teacher (i.e., role-playing and selective role-modeling). The impact of the undergraduate teacher preparation program was minimal when compared to one's experiences as a student and individual adaptations during teaching. Despite findings such as these, which support the powerful impact of socialization, research has continued its attempt to legitimize the influence of an undergraduate teacher preparation degree.

Undergraduate Teacher Preparation

While an undergraduate teacher preparation degree does

include student teaching, many of the degree requirements do not directly relate to teaching. Unfortunately, while student teaching is generally viewed as one of the most valuable experiences in teacher preparation, Hoy (1968) argued that student teaching also serves to "wash out" any progressive attitudes toward education that may have formed during the undergraduate experience. More recently than Hoy, however, Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981) stated: "We can no longer assume that the role of the university is necessarily a liberalizing one and that the schools are the only villains in the creation of undesirable teaching perspectives" (p. 10). The authors cited Lortie (1975) and Bartholomew's (1976) studies which asserted that custodial perspectives about teaching are the result of socialization and the underlying conservative nature of university-based teacher preparation respectively. Thus, undergraduate teacher preparation and student teaching are both contributors to a utilitarian perspective which focuses on keeping students busy, happy, and good (Sanders & McCutcheon, 1986; Tabachnick, Popkewitz, & Zeichner, 1978). Findings such as these add fuel to the argument that an undergraduate teaching preparation degree is not a prerequisite for acquiring teaching expertise.

Recently, however, Grossman and Richert (1988) and Reif (1990) have reported positive features associated with an undergraduate teacher preparation degree. In a study of six

prospective teachers enrolled in undergraduate teacher preparation programs, Grossman and Richert conducted interviews both before and after observing a lesson. Utilizing qualitative research methods, the investigators probed sources of teaching ideas. The investigators reported that novice teachers acquired some of their general teaching ideas and specific ideas about teaching a certain subject from undergraduate course work. Similarly, Reif (1990) studied the sources of influence on teaching behaviors of five elementary physical education teachers. Reif also reported that undergraduate teacher preparation course work had a documented influence on the teaching behavior of elementary physical education teachers.

In general, however, the belief that an undergraduate teacher preparation degree alone enables one to teach successfully is considered unrealistic because of the strong influences of socialization, the short time associated with undergraduate teacher preparation, and the continual development of teaching expertise during on-the-job training (Feiman-Nemser, 1983).

Learning from on-the-job training. On-the-job training involves the first few years of teaching, being socialized into a new teaching environment, and teaching experiences obtained throughout a teaching career. During on-the-job training, teachers grow with experience and increased expertise. The first few years of teaching, however, are

often an attempt at "survival" and trying to fit in with new colleagues (Feiman-Nemser, 1983, p. 161). As noted previously (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981), both undergraduate teacher preparation and on-the-job training can promote a custodial perspective toward teaching. The insecurity of being a new teacher at a new school and the fear that students will try to take advantage of a new teacher, both serve to encourage a "survival" mentality. Feiman-Nemser suggests other barriers to good teaching during the first year include a lack of preparation, a lack of content organization, a lack of support or advice, and potential personality conflicts with other teachers. Further, she argues that the development of teaching competence takes at least five years. This is a disturbing argument for those working with GAs because they typically only teach for two or three years.

Despite this short tenure, any efforts to help GA teaching need to be tied to the actual experience of teaching. Smylie (1989) stated that "it is likely that teachers will perceive as more effective those sources of learning [to teach] likely to convey knowledge that has direct implications or application to practice and promotion of student learning in their specific classroom contexts" (p. 550). Smylie examined survey data from the 1985 National Education Association's (NEA) Conditions and Resources of Teacher Survey completed by 1,789 teachers.

The author noted that undergraduate teacher preparation was often considered by the teachers to be too theoretical and not adequately tied to actual teaching experiences. The notion that teachers typically do not rely on undergraduate teacher preparation course work has been supported by others (Lortie, 1975; Lanier, 1985; Veenman, 1984). Smylie further reported that teachers' direct on-the-job experience, their own experimentation, and their interaction with colleagues were considered the most effective sources of learning to teach.

This interaction with colleagues has been further explored by Emmer (1986) who studied four middle school teachers participating in a teaching induction program. The induction program included the assignment of an experienced teacher who was to provide follow-up teaching support. Qualitative research methods, including observations of teaching and interviews, were employed to trace the sources of influence on teaching and content selection. Emmer reported that "direct collegial assistance," or follow-up teaching support, appeared essential to the survival of the weakest prepared teacher (p. 242). Yet, despite the support provided, considerable variation in teaching still occurred. The teachers self-reported that they continued to rely on their own perspective about effective teaching. Emmer concluded, however, that "the existence of a [follow-up teaching] support system does increase the likelihood of

significant assistance in developing a [teacher's] clear idea about how to organize and conduct instruction" (p. 243).

Learning to organize and conduct instruction are two of several goals of teaching induction programs and undergraduate teacher preparation degrees. GAs who typically do not possess an undergraduate teacher preparation degree, or who have not participated in a teaching induction program, must rely on their on-the-job experience. Grossman (1989) investigated three English teachers who did not have either undergraduate teacher preparation degrees or the benefit of a teaching induction program. Enlisting qualitative research methods, Grossman conducted classroom observations and in-depth interviews questioning the teachers' background, beliefs, and knowledge about teaching. She reported that the three teachers predominantly relied on their own perspective of effective teaching based on their memories of themselves as students. All three teachers adopted teaching strategies they had observed as students. The author concluded the following:

The teachers' experiences suggest that while they attribute much of what they have learned about teaching to the experience of teaching itself, learning from experience alone can be problematic. Learning from experience requires first that one interprets that experience. Without a framework for making sense of

student difficulties with literary interpretation, the teachers' learning is largely idiosyncratic and potentially miseducative. As the teachers are isolated in their classrooms, they are dependent on their rather narrow experience of students in making their interpretations. By and large, these teachers had no one with whom to test their interpretations of classroom experience; as a result, misleading and potentially miseducative interpretations were left unchallenged. (p. 204)

Grossman's study focused continued attention on the problem of learning to teach by experience alone (Good & Brophy, 1987; Smylie, 1989). Further, this study helped illustrate the difficulty associated with developing teaching expertise.

Stages of teacher development. A brief summary of Berliner's (1989) five stages of teacher development is presented next to illustrate how a GA (or any teacher) moves toward teaching expertise and how the GAs in this study were classified. An understanding of the sources of learning to teach and the stages of teacher development help clarify how GAs learn to teach and how they develop as teachers.

Novice Stage

Most first-year teachers and student teachers are classified as novices. Often GAs fall into this stage because they typically do not possess teaching experience or

an undergraduate teacher preparation degree. While many GAs may have strong subject matter knowledge, they often have limited teaching competency. In this study, two of the four GAs were inductees (i.e., first-year college teachers) and were therefore considered novice teachers.

Advanced Beginner Stage

Berliner classifies most second- and third-year teachers as advanced beginners. The advanced beginner has melded textbook knowledge with their on-the-job experience (Sabers, Cushing, & Berliner, 1991). Because of the short teaching time (usually 2-3 years) for most GAs, the advanced beginner stage is typically the highest stage they will reach. The other two GAs in this study had at least one year of college teaching experience and fell into this stage.

Competent Stage

Many third- and fourth-year teachers move into the competent stage when they acquire greater experience and flexibility in their presentation of content (Berliner, 1989). It is unlikely that many GAs would ever reach this stage unless they were experienced teachers before enrolling in graduate school.

Proficient Stage

After at least five years of teaching experience, some teachers move into the proficient stage. For many other teachers, the movement into the proficient stage will take

much longer. Berliner believes most teachers never progress further than the proficient stage. No GA would achieve this stage unless they came into a program with extensive teaching experience.

Expert Stage

The fifth stage is reserved for a select few. Expert teachers have the ability to respond effortlessly and appropriately to the complex demands of each teaching situation (Berliner, 1989). According to Berliner's stringent criteria, graduate schools will not likely see expert teachers enrolling as GAs. While the terms experienced and expert have been used interchangeably in other studies (Graham, Hopple, Manross, & Sitzman, 1991), in this study experienced GAs were not considered expert teachers.

Along with his five stages of teacher development, Berliner (1986) referred to teachers who possess content expertise, but no teaching background, as postulants. GAs, as self-reported content experts, are essentially the same as postulants. When compared to novice and expert teachers, postulants tend to teach more like novices despite their reported content expertise (Berliner, 1986).

This finding damages the myth that content expertise is automatically related to teaching expertise. Just as the brightest math student may not be the best math teacher, the best tennis player may not be the best tennis instructor.

The GAs selected in this study were self-reported content experts, yet, they had little teaching experience. It was anticipated that the teaching induction program and follow-up teaching support provided by faculty supervisors would help the GAs learn to teach more effectively. While acknowledging they may possess self-reported content expertise, GAs face many obstacles while learning to teach.

Teaching As A GA

The role of a GA is not confined to teaching or learning to teach. GAs are also graduate students pursuing their own degree. As noted in chapter one, Gething (1987) referred to the juggling of time burdens and the struggle between being a GA and graduate student as walking the tightrope between teacher and student. This section focuses on (a) the part-time teacher and full-time student conflict, and (b) GA teaching.

The part-time teacher and full-time student conflict. GAs constantly walk a tightrope between being a part-time teacher and a full-time student. As students, they enroll at an institution to obtain a degree. As teachers, they are responsible for teaching lower-division courses typically unwanted by faculty who would rather concentrate on upper-division and graduate-level courses (Allen & Rueter, 1990). GAs cannot spend additional time preparing for teaching assignments without a subsequent reduction in their own graduate studies and research. This is similar to a junior

faculty member who must publish research, not necessarily teach well, to acquire tenure (Cheney, 1990). Wilson and Stearns (1985) note that the implicit message is clear; research is more important to administrators than teaching and graduate students need to learn to identify with their own scholarly pursuits and treat teaching as a necessary evil. Regarding this connection, Chism (1987) asserted:

As students, teaching assistants need to reserve time for their studies and avoid overinvesting in their teaching. Somehow, though, they must at the same time not appear to be less than totally dedicated and obedient employees in order to maintain cordial relations with their employers, who may someday be sitting on their graduate committees. They would like to be able to feel confident that their support will continue through their entire program, yet they need to be willing to accept employment that may depend on course enrollments, funding, and a host of other uncertainties. As employees, they would like to exercise their rights and benefits. As students, they know that they are in a particularly vulnerable position. (p.33)

Within their own program, GAs generally have extensive course loads and research priorities demanded by major professors. The extensive juggling of time burdens placed on GAs makes their providing quality instruction difficult.

To assist GAs, many universities have attempted to enhance GA teaching.

GA teaching. Enhancing GA teaching involves focusing on an academic "underclass" (Eble, 1987, p. 9) who are responsible for teaching courses typically unpopular and unwanted by faculty, but without the same resources as faculty. In an earlier pilot case study, Poole (1989) studied one member of this academic underclass who had no prior teaching experience. Teaching was self-reported as the third priority below graduate research and graduate studies and seen as primarily a financial resource. This typical placement of teaching below research and course work may force GAs to spend less time preparing for their teaching assignments (Wilson & Stearns, 1985). Given this situation, it is easy to understand some of the barriers impeding GA teaching improvement.

Barriers Impeding Teaching Improvement

The difficulty associated with improving GA teaching is compounded by two additional factors. First, several barriers associated with teaching in higher education impede teaching improvement efforts. Second, the devalued status of teaching (as compared to research) in higher education also provides a barrier to teaching improvement.

Impeding teaching improvement. In her book Improving College Teaching, Weimer (1990), citing several sources (Gaff, 1978; LaPibus, 1987; Licata, 1986), identified three

barriers impeding the improvement of college teaching including: (a) assumptions about teaching; (b) characteristics of the profession; and (c) academic environments. First, two assumptions: Teachers are born, not made; and if you know the content, you can teach it, perpetuate the myth that teaching is somehow easy or based on a divine gift bestowed from heaven and not amenable to improvement. Second, the notion that anybody with a Ph.D. can automatically teach well tends to negate serious interest in the improvement of teaching. Finally, the academic environment of higher education, where research, not effective teaching, is used as a benchmark for promotion, minimizes rather than encourages teaching improvement efforts. Thus, the importance of research and graduate study serve to devalue teaching.

Devalued status of teaching in higher education. The devalued status of teaching in higher education places teaching induction programs in a constant uphill battle (Mauksh, 1987). While the purpose of induction programs is to enhance teaching, Boeherer and Sarkisian (1985) suggested that institutional ambivalence toward teaching signals GAs to continue focusing on their own graduate studies. If faculty emphasize publishing to the neglect of teaching, then GAs are covertly encouraged to do the same thing. As noted previously, however, several recent national conferences have directly addressed the issue of teaching in

higher education. Further, university-based centers for teaching excellence and national organizations such as the National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning (NCRIP TAL), the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and the Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network in higher education are all dedicated to improving teaching in higher education. This recent movement toward improving the status of teaching in higher education places teaching induction programs in a precarious position between underlying institutional ambivalence and a fresh new vision of teaching excellence.

Enhancing GA Teaching

Teaching induction programs and teaching coaches are both strategies designed to enhance GA teaching. The following section examines teaching induction programs and teaching coaches and presents several studies (cited in a review by Abbott, Wulff, & Szego, 1989) that have examined the success of induction programs. Support has been reported for the use of (a) student ratings of teaching performance coupled with faculty consultation, and (b) videotape consultation. Further, specific disciplines have reported success in providing GAs with discipline-specific teaching skills. Finally, several studies reviewed by Abbott et al. (1989) have described the impact of GA personal characteristics on student ratings and student achievement. Regardless of the initial approach, however,

successful induction programs appear to require regular follow-up support (Kanaga, 1979; Rodriguez, 1985).

Teaching induction programs. To promote effective teaching, teaching induction programs are typically scheduled at the beginning of the year. Many induction programs may also share an effective teaching model (as developed from teaching effectiveness literature). While simply describing an effective teaching model alone would not necessarily guarantee effective teaching, it is anticipated that teachers will at least try to use the skills associated with the model. For example, if as part of the induction program teachers are encouraged to use lecturing skills such as advanced organizers, appropriate wait time for student responses, and frequent reviews, then it is anticipated that the effectiveness of the in-service program could be determined by observing these skills in actual in-class lectures. This does not mean, of course, that lectures would be guaranteed to be effective, only that the teacher attempted to use the lecturing skills thought to be effective. Several examples of effective strategies used in teaching induction programs to influence GA teaching are presented below.

Student ratings coupled with faculty consultation.

Student ratings of teaching performance, coupled with faculty consultation, have been demonstrated to positively influence GA teaching (Bingman, 1983; McKeachie et al. 1980;

Murray & Smith, 1989). A recent study by Murray and Smith (1989) examined the impact of midterm student ratings of teaching behavior, plus instructions on how to interpret the ratings, with 60 GAs from psychology, English, and geography. In a post-term measure of student ratings of teaching behavior, the group receiving the midterm ratings and consultation achieved higher mean ratings for teaching improvement than the control group.

Videotape consultation. Additionally, Dalgaard (1982) and Hendrickson, Hawkins, Littlefield, Kleffner, Hudepohl, and Herbert (1983) reported support and positive effects from using videotape consultation to enhance GA teaching. Dalgaard provided a training group with six two-hour seminars, written guides for self-evaluation and goal-setting, and videotaped consultation. Following the consultation, the training group received a significantly higher overall rating of teaching. Hendrickson et al. (1983) observed seven pharmacy GAs and provided consultation on videotaped and classroom observed lectures. Post-rating of videotaped lectures revealed a significant increase in lecture quality for all seven GAs.

Discipline-specific teaching skills. Kanaga's (1979) study in speech communication and Ligget's (1986) study in English reported induction programs administered in specific disciplines, providing GAs with discipline-specific teaching skills. These findings highlight the need for individual

departments and colleges to provide additional training beyond university-wide programs. Teaching physical education activity courses is very different from teaching freshmen composition. These findings further support Shulman's (1987) notion that effective teaching combines an understanding of the content taught (i.e., content knowledge) and the ability to know how to explain and structure learning experiences related to this content (i.e., pedagogical content knowledge).

Impact of GA personal characteristics. While pedagogical content knowledge is imperative for effective teaching, two studies by Bos, Zakrajsek, Wolf, & Stoll (1980) and Chang, Berger, & Chang (1981) suggested that the effectiveness of an induction program may depend more on previous GA experiences and personal attributes (i.e., undergraduate degree and teaching experience) than what an induction program offers. Bos et al. (1980) studied 18 physical education GAs and reported that prior degrees earned by the GAs were positively correlated to student ratings of teacher knowledge, clarity, enthusiasm, organization, and preparation. Thus, the educational background of the GAs appears critical to success (at least as measured by student ratings). Similarly, Chang et al. (1981) investigated 12 GAs in psychology and reported that GA's empathy towards students, not necessarily specific teaching behaviors, were positively correlated with student

performance in class. This study highlights the need to address GA empathy towards student affective concerns (i.e., student feelings).

Regular follow-up support. Regardless of the initial approach, however, Kanaga (1979) and Rodriguez (1985) reported that the immediate positive effects of one-day to two-week teacher induction programs were quickly diminished without follow-up. At the same time, induction programs that include one-shot workshops followed by periodic follow-up sessions as reinforcers may be successful. Thus, to be effective, induction programs apparently need to combine both in-service workshops with regular follow-up support.

Without adequate induction programs and regular follow-up support, GAs are left to their own trial-and-error experience. As noted earlier, Rosenberg (1990) studied the process two physical education teaching assistants with no undergraduate teacher preparation degrees employed in learning to teach. Using qualitative research methods including interviews and observations, Rosenberg explored the teaching practices and sources of teaching knowledge of his two participants. In his particular university, teachers of activity courses were selected based on their athletic experience and content expertise. At the time of the study, no teaching induction program was in effect. The lack of an adequate induction program left the two teaching assistants to practice "do-it-yourself pedagogy" (p. 38), or

teaching learned from on-the-job training. Rosenberg reported mixed results from this on-the-job training and two very different teaching profiles. He stated:

As the two instructors in this study show, the highly unpredictable nature of experiential learning can yield, at best, mixed results....This is not to deny that much knowledge can be gained from the experience of teaching. When such knowledge remains unsupplemented, however, by a strong program that integrates such concepts as curriculum design, skill analysis, management, and assessment, the lessons of experience are likely to be rendered worse than useless, that is to say, do-it-yourself pedagogy is potentially counter-productive and an obstruction to effective teaching. (p. 38)

To move away from do-it-yourself pedagogy and provide periodic follow-up support, Staton and Darling (1989) reported that experienced GAs are key members of the follow-up process. Novice GAs are more likely to ask faculty members "low-risk" questions while reserving day-to-day procedural and managerial questions for experienced GAs (Staton & Darling, 1989, p. 19). To go further, Staton and Darling maintained: "Since new TAs [GAs] may be reluctant to ask professors questions, except in low-risk cases, experienced TAs can be critical sources of information about expectations, policies, procedures, and new ideas for

teaching. This finding suggests that experienced TAs should be made aware of their important role and given tools to help in mentoring new TAs" (p. 21). Therefore, any induction program promoting an effective teaching model that does not include experienced GAs as teaching coaches is missing a potential major source of influence. Puccio (1987), Stelzner (1987), and Marincovich and Gordon (1991) have reported success when using experienced GAs for teaching support.

Teaching coaches. To encourage the use of an effective teaching model, Joyce and Showers (1982) reported that improved teaching is a result of "coaching of teaching" (p. 4). The authors compared teachers to athletes, who with coaching and practice, can put new skills to use. They stated: "We [teachers], on the other hand, have often behaved as though teaching skills were so easily acquired that a simple presentation, one-day workshop, or single videotaped demonstration were sufficient to ensure successful classroom performance" (p. 8). Showers (1985) defined the three purposes of coaching as follows:

1. To build communities of teachers who continuously engage in the study of their craft (i.e., teachers who ask questions, experiment, etc.);
2. To develop a shared teaching language and set of common understandings (i.e., teachers who focus on an effective teaching model);

3. To develop a structure (i.e., a systematic and organized plan which provides opportunity for interaction) for follow-up training that is essential for acquiring new teaching skills and strategies.
(p.189)

The notion of "coaching of teaching" supports the belief that effective teaching is a skill that requires hard work, practice, and feedback. Even with "coaching of teaching," however, teaching in college physical education requires unique demands.

GAs Teaching College Physical Education Courses

As noted in the introductory chapter, teaching college physical education has its own unique demands because, in general, physical education instructors do not rely on lecture methods to present course material. This section examines the specific demands of teaching physical activity courses in college physical education departments.

Teaching physical activity courses. For those GAs teaching physical activity courses, a typical assignment involves teaching in a department's basic instructional (i.e., physical activity, service, or basic) program. The basic program consists of activity courses such as tennis, golf, racquetball, and aerobics. These programs are essentially the only physical education programs designed for all university students, not only physical education majors, and most often consist of one-hour courses aimed at

teaching the basic skills needed to pursue physical activity, fitness, and lifetime sports participation. At most larger institutions, GAs teach the majority, if not all, of the activity courses (Miller, Dowell, & Pender, 1989; Trimble & Hensley, 1984). Noting the studies of Kanaga (1979) and Liggett (1986), physical education GAs would apparently need discipline-specific teaching skills. Most teaching induction programs reviewed by Abbott et al. (1989), and presented at the 1989 Second National Conference on the Training and Employment of Teaching Assistants at the University of Washington, dealt primarily with teaching through lecture or class discussion methods. Physical education GAs, in contrast, must be able to select and sequence appropriate motor skill practice tasks, and provide instructional feedback while students are engaged in physical activities (Siedentop, 1983; Rink, 1985). Many of the teaching variables critical to learning identified in classroom research, such as the time students are engaged in learning activities and appropriate use of teacher feedback (Brophy & Good, 1986), do apply to physical education instruction. Activity courses, however, are actually more similar to chemistry or physics laboratory classes because they focus on learning physical skills and "hands on" experiences.

Activity courses taught by GAs are prevalent, as are chemistry and physics labs. Given the preponderance of GAs,

coupled with their lack of teaching experience, has encouraged the development of induction programs to promote effective teaching. As noted previously, several of the studies which examined teaching induction programs have employed case study or qualitative research methods.

Qualitative Research Methodology

The decision to employ qualitative research methods was based on the purpose of this study to better understand the impact of the teaching induction program and to assess the major factors which influenced the GA's teaching. Thus, it was determined by the principal researcher that a quantitative design, while allowing for a greater number of participants, would not have been conducive for the in-depth interviews and observations required to understand the origin of each participants perspective about effective teaching and the impact of the induction program on that perspective. In this connection, Goodman (1988) explained:

The rationale behind choosing one methodology over another is connected to the nature of the subject being studied and the underlying goal(s) of the research....This methodology [qualitative field studies] was used because it is free to combine a variety of data gathering methods, and it allows for the generation of analysis grounded in recorded data concerning the professional perspectives of teachers.

(p. 122)

In this study, a similar approach, a multi-case study design, was used to create four separate descriptive case studies. The multi-case study approach was believed to be more useful than a single-subject case study because it provided a broader range of information (Borko & Livingston, 1988; Placek, 1984; Rosenberg, 1990). While the inclusion of four subjects provided greater generalizability than a single-subject case study, the results of this study do not necessarily generalize to other departments, institutions, or GAs.

Use of the four participants allowed a cross-case analysis where each is built as a comprehensive case in itself. Then each case was compared with the others to establish a greater range of generality of the findings (Miles & Huberman, 1984). The intention was to build a general explanation that would fit all the cases even though each was different. To increase the validity and reliability of the conclusions, multiple data collection methods, or data triangulation, were used (Denzin, 1970). The four data collection methods (a) interviews, (b) field notes, (c) videotape records, and (d) questionnaires were intended to discourage biases resulting from reliance on any single method. A complete description of the design, data collection procedures, and data analysis completed in this study can be found in Appendix A.

Chapter Conclusion

Based on the information presented above, teachers appear to possess plenty of teaching knowledge acquired through an apprenticeship of observation. This teaching knowledge, representing a perspective about effective teaching, is shaped from beliefs, ideas, values, dispositions, and one's own personal philosophy. Further, this perspective appears slow to change even with the best of induction programs. In a recent case study of physical education GAs, Poole (1989) reported that the examination of influences on the teaching of GAs should also include the influence of athletic experience and each GA's own teaching ideas. Rosenberg encouraged further study of teaching assistants with no formal training to gain insight into the teaching knowledge that novice teachers bring into new instructional roles. Thus, to better understand the impact of the teaching induction program and the major influences on the teaching of these GAs, this study addressed each participant's perspective about effective teaching and the influence of regular follow-up teaching support.

CHAPTER III
Journal Manuscript

**Pedagogy of Contentment: A Multi-Case Study of
Graduate Assistant Teachers**

Jon R. Poole

**Division of Health and Physical Education
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University**

Abstract

Four case studies of graduate assistant (GA) teachers were completed to examine the impact of a teaching induction program on GA teaching, planning, and content selection. Data collection methods included interviews, field notes, videotape records, and questionnaires. Based on a qualitative data analysis, each GA's unique perspective about the effective teaching of their subject and a lack of follow-up teaching support provided by faculty supervisors, appeared to influence teaching toward a "pedagogy of contentment." That is, the four GAs did not consistently teach as the induction program suggested, rather they appeared content with their own teaching without considering the need for improvement. It was expected that the induction program would inspire a "pedagogy of dissonance" or dissatisfaction with teaching. That is, the GAs would have been encouraged to ask questions about teaching, experiment with various teaching methods, and seek support from faculty supervisors. Instead, the GAs reported contentment centered on their belief that they already knew the different strategies, methods, and routines of how their particular subject was supposed to be taught. These beliefs about the effective teaching of their subject appeared to be the most powerful influence on their teaching. The influence of the induction program, designed to encourage the use of an effective teaching model endorsed by the

department, was minimal. It was the goal of the induction program that all GAs, with help from faculty supervisors, would consistently incorporate some of the teaching strategies suggested. Instead, the GAs in this study appeared to dismiss a majority of the effective teaching model as incompatible with their own perspectives. While a teaching induction program suggesting effective teaching strategies may be necessary to enhance GA teaching, it appears not to be adequate alone. The GAs in this study did not consistently use the department's suggested model of effective teaching, in part, due to their reliance on their own perspective about effective teaching and a lack of follow-up teaching support provided by faculty supervisors.

Pedagogy of Contentment:
A Multi-Case Study of
Graduate Assistant Teachers

Introduction

Questions of teaching competence, many raised over the past decade, have challenged the effectiveness of our nation's public school teachers (Carnegie Task Force, 1986). A group of teachers in higher education, graduate assistant teachers, also referred to as teaching assistants (TAs), teaching fellows, and graduate assistants (GAs) have also had their competence questioned (Chism, 1987; Dawson & Clinton, 1989; Ellis, 1988; Hilsenburger, 1989; Kollock & O'Brien, 1989; Sell & Chism, 1989). Unlike public school teachers, however, GAs are typically not career-oriented, and generally have little or no teaching experience or teacher preparation as part of their background. Many are in the teaching role primarily as a means to finance their own graduate degree, as they are typically full-time graduate students (Chism, 1987). In a recent pilot case study, Poole (1989) examined a single GA with no prior teaching experience. Teaching was self-reported as the third priority below graduate research and graduate studies and seen primarily as a financial resource. Chism (1987) suggested that this conflict associated with simultaneously being a part-time teacher and full-time student can hinder quality teaching.

The Part-Time Teacher And Full-Time Student Conflict

GAs constantly walk a tightrope between being a part-time teacher and a full-time student. As students, they enroll at an institution to obtain a degree. As teachers, they are an academic "underclass" (Eble, 1987, p.9) responsible for teaching lower-division courses typically unpopular and unwanted by faculty who would rather concentrate on upper-division and graduate-level courses. Sage (1984) noted that with enlarged graduate programs came the practice of turning over freshmen- or entry-level courses to GAs. He further noted that GAs are typically the least experienced teachers within a department, and their highest priority is, justifiably, their own education. Thus, GAs cannot spend time preparing for their teaching assignments without a subsequent reduction in time allotted for their graduate studies and research. This is not unlike the junior faculty member who must publish research, not necessarily teach well, to acquire tenure (Cheney, 1990). Wilson and Stearns (1985) note that the implicit message is clear; research is more important than teaching and graduate students need to learn to identify with their own scholarly pursuits and treat teaching as a necessary evil. Treating teaching as a necessary evil and being a part-time teacher and full-time student both provide barriers to the improvement of college teaching.

Teaching improvement barriers. In her recent book

Improving College Teaching, Weimer (1990) citing several sources (Gaff, 1978; LaPridus, 1987; Licata, 1986), identified three barriers impeding the improvement of college teaching including: (a) assumptions about teaching; (b) characteristics of the profession; and (c) academic environments. First, two assumptions about teaching: teachers are born, not made; and if you know the content, you can teach it, perpetuate the myth that teaching is somehow easy or based on an innate endowment that practice or experimentation cannot help. Second, the profession of college professor devalues teaching and implies it is not amenable to improvement. The notion that anybody with a Ph.D. can automatically teach well, and the evolution of satisfactory, not necessarily good, past teaching experiences, tend to erode serious interest in the improvement of teaching. Finally, Weimer noted that the academic value system of higher education, where research, not effective teaching is used as a benchmark for promotion, minimizes rather than encourages teaching improvement efforts. If faculty emphasize publishing to the neglect of teaching, then GAS are covertly encouraged to do the same thing. Boehrer and Sarkisian (1985) suggested that institutional ambivalence toward teaching signals GAS to continue focusing on their own graduate studies. Thus, the importance of research and graduate study serve to devalue teaching.

Devalued status of teaching in higher education. The devalued status of teaching in higher education place teaching induction programs (i.e., in-service teaching effectiveness programs) in a constant uphill battle (Mauksh, 1987). Nonetheless, issues related to induction programs and GA teaching have precipitated the staging of three national conferences at The Ohio State University (1986), Syracuse University (1988), and the University of Washington (1989). Further, the University of Texas will be hosting a fourth national conference in the Fall of 1991. The purpose of induction programs and the national conferences is to enhance GA teaching. Teaching activity courses is somewhat unique in the university setting because, in general, GAs do not rely on lecture methods to present course material.

Teaching College Physical Education Activity Courses

GAs teaching college physical education primarily teach activity courses within the physical education basic instructional program to students who are non-physical education majors. The physical education basic instructional program (i.e., physical activity, service, or basic) consists of physical activity courses such as tennis, golf, racquetball, and aerobics. These activity courses are designed to promote fitness and learning of lifetime sports skills.

Most teaching induction programs reviewed by Abbott, Wulff, and Szego (1989), and presented at the 1989 Second

National Conference on the Training and Employment of Teaching Assistants at the University of Washington, dealt primarily with teaching through lecture or class discussion methods. Physical education GAs, in contrast, must be able to select and sequence appropriate motor skill practice tasks, and provide instructional feedback while students are engaged in physical activities. Many of the teaching variables critical to learning identified in classroom research, such as the time students are engaged in learning activities and the appropriate use of teacher feedback (Brophy & Good, 1986), do apply to physical education instruction. Activity courses, however, are actually more similar to chemistry or physics laboratory classes because they focus on learning physical skills and "hands on" experiences.

Activity courses taught by GAs are prevalent, as are chemistry and physics labs. At many large research institutions, GAs teach the majority, if not all, of the activity courses (Miller, Dowell, & Pender, 1989; Trimble & Hensley, 1984). This preponderance of GA teaching, coupled with their lack of teaching experience, has encouraged the development of induction programs to promote effective teaching.

Teaching Induction Programs

To promote effective teaching, teaching induction programs typically schedule a workshop a week or two prior

to the beginning of a term. These workshops often suggest an effective teaching model (variously defined by literature on teaching effectiveness) endorsed by a department or college. While simply using an effective teaching model alone would not guarantee effective teaching, program planners anticipate that teachers will at least try to use the skills associated with the model. The same expectations can be found with an in-service program addressing classroom lecturing. For example, if teachers are encouraged to use a teaching model with skills such as advanced organizers, appropriate wait time for student responses, and frequent reviews, then the effectiveness of the in-service program is usually determined by observing these skills in actual in-class lectures. This does not mean, of course, that lectures are guaranteed to be effective, only that the teacher has attempted to use the effective teaching model.

To encourage the use of an effective teaching model, Joyce and Showers (1982) advocate "coaching of teaching." The authors compared teachers to athletes, who with coaching, can put new skills to use. They stated, "We [teachers] have often behaved as though teaching skills were so easily acquired that a simple presentation, one-day workshop, or single videotaped demonstration were sufficient to ensure successful classroom performance" (p. 186). The notion of "coaching of teaching" supports the belief that effective teaching is a skill that requires hard work,

practice, and feedback. Even with "coaching of teaching," however, many teachers continue to rely on past experience as a student to guide their teaching (Feiman-Nemser, 1983).

Influence of experience on teaching. As with other teachers, it is sensible to think of GAs as having knowledge about teaching, albeit a teaching knowledge based on observations as students of past teachers, rather than an understanding of research on effective teaching (Lortie, 1975). Schempp (1989) reported that the memories that prospective physical education teachers have of their elementary and secondary physical education teachers were powerful determinants of their positive or negative beliefs about teaching physical education. These beliefs formed from being a student shape what Graham (1991) identified as a teaching perspective (i.e., one's own philosophy, ideas, and beliefs about how a subject should be taught).

Rosenberg (1990) noted that "a strong case can be made for the notion that prospective teachers' values and dispositions [teaching perspective] are significantly influenced by their own years of schooling" (p.1). Rosenberg examined two physical education teaching assistants and reported that the lack of an adequate induction program left them to practice "do-it-yourself pedagogy" (p. 38), or teaching learned from on-the-job training. This "do-it-yourself pedagogy," coupled with one's own philosophy, ideas, values, and beliefs about

teaching, appears to shape a teaching perspective that can be a very powerful influence on teaching and may be slow to change even with the best of induction programs.

Adequately developed induction programs appear to need to address these perspectives about teaching that GAs bring into their instructional roles (Poole, 1989; Rosenberg, 1990). While a plethora of research has explored the major teaching influences on beginning teachers (Feiman-Nemser, 1983; Grossman, 1989; Reif, 1990; Reynolds, 1989), GAs have been studied infrequently.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of a teaching induction program on the teaching, planning, and content selection of four GAs teaching college physical education activity courses, with a focus toward applying the findings to enhance GA teaching induction programs.

Methods

This study was conducted at a large state university. Two GAs with college physical education teaching experience (experienced) and two GAs without college physical education teaching experience (inductees) were chosen as participants. Experienced and inductee GAs were chosen to examine the influence previous teaching experience may have had on the impact of the induction program. In addition to past experience as a student, experienced teachers were expected to rely on past teaching experience as a guide for their

current teaching. A growing body of research supports differences in teaching as a result of experience and expertise (Berliner, 1986; Borko & Livingston, 1989; Graham, Hopple, Manross, & Sitzman, 1991).

As noted above, a teaching induction program was designed to enhance GA teaching and encourage the use of an effective teaching model endorsed by the physical education department. One of the principal developers of the teaching induction program was also the researcher conducting this study.

Teaching Induction Program In This Study

In this study, the induction program employed six components including: (a) a presemester week-long workshop; (b) assignment of faculty supervisors; (c) a written handbook; (d) a resource library; (e) early teaching assignments; and (f) periodic follow-up meetings. The combination of six components was based on the belief that any single component was not as effective as a combination of resources. Yet, the components were also designed to be flexible enough to allow faculty supervisors to explore several options for providing teaching support to the GAs. The written handbook covered both instructional and administrative concerns and was distributed during the presemester workshop. The resource library included instructional videotapes, textbooks, previous lesson plans, syllabi, and tests from past instructors. This library of

instructional information was kept in the GA office and available at any time. Unfortunately, many of the teaching assignments were not made early enough to allow advanced preparation. The future plan is to dispense teaching assignments early in the summer to allow the GAs advanced course planning time. Follow-up meetings were intended to promote continued discussion related to effective teaching. The only follow-up meeting provided, unfortunately, could not be scheduled until late in the semester. The future plan is to schedule follow-up meetings during the first few weeks of the semester.

The two key components of the induction program were thought to be the presemester workshop and the assignment of faculty supervisors. During the presemester workshop, GAs attended a series of sessions devoted to both administrative and instructional practices. The effective teaching model, as developed from various sources of the teaching effectiveness literature (Brophy & Good, 1986; Rosenshine, 1983; Siedentop, 1983), endorsed several teaching skills including the provision of: (a) high amounts of activity time, (b) interesting and stimulating beginnings to classes, (c) explanations that are both helpful and understandable within the context of the lesson being taught, (d) teaching only one cue at a time, (e) individual, specific, and congruent feedback, and (f) interesting and stimulating endings to classes. Table 1 outlines the effective teaching

model endorsed by the department.

Insert Table 1 about here

GAs were provided the relevant teaching information and given "hands on" practice related to the effective teaching model. At the end of the week, all GAs were required to teach a brief lesson of their choice to their peers. As noted previously, understanding the effective teaching model alone was not thought to guarantee effective teaching. It was expected, however, that the GAs would at least try to use the teaching skills associated with the model and the effectiveness of the induction program could be determined by observing various aspects of the teaching model in actual classes. It was the goal of the induction program that all GAs, with help from faculty supervisors, would consistently incorporate some of the teaching skills suggested during the workshop. The effective teaching model was developed to be general enough to cover all physical activity courses with specific-subject applications of the teaching skills decided upon by the GAs and faculty supervisors.

To encourage usage of the teaching model, each GA was assigned a faculty supervisor. These faculty members were the key follow-up teaching support personnel and were assigned based on their subject-matter expertise. It was expected that periodic follow-up meetings, initiated by

supervisors and GAs alike, would occur regularly during the semester to discuss teaching concerns, observe actual teaching and provide feedback, or simply to share thoughts about teaching. Unfortunately, as the semester progressed, it became clear to the researcher that regular follow-up meetings were not occurring and GAs were generally left unsupervised. Possible reasons for this deterioration in the induction program are presented in the conclusions section. The following section briefly describes the design of the study.

Design of Study

A multi-case study approach (Borko & Livingston, 1988; Placek, 1984; Rosenberg, 1990) was employed to create four separate descriptive case studies. The use of a qualitative approach provided insights into individual interpretations of the events in the GAs unique environment (Zeichner, 1981). While the inclusion of four subjects provided greater insight than a single-subject case study, the results of this study do not necessarily generalize to other departments, institutions, or GAs.

Researcher's role. The researcher conducting this study served two roles in the physical education department. One, he was one of the principal developers of the teaching induction program, and two, he was the assistant director of the physical activity program and tennis teaching supervisor.

In the role of supervisor, the researcher was able to study first-hand the impact of his direct supervision. Acknowledging the potential reactive effects from conducting both this study and serving as a supervisor, the researcher attended several classes taught by each GA at the beginning of the term in order to better establish a relationship with both the students and teachers. Further, both teachers and students were questioned about the impact of the researcher attending classes with a videotape camera. In all cases, both the presence of the researcher and the camera were reported as insignificant. When conducting observations, the researcher employed a passive participant observation strategy through watching, listening, and recording in as much detail as possible (Tousignant & Siedentop, 1983). To minimize personal bias of the researcher, multiple data collection methods including; (a) interviews, (b) field notes, (c) videotape records, and (d) questionnaires were used to discourage biases resulting from reliance on any single method. This data collection process is known as data triangulation (Denzin, 1970).

Data Collection

Data were collected from several sources including: (a) the two experienced and two inductee GAs; (b) three faculty supervisors; (c) three peer GAs (i.e., GAs teaching similar courses as the participants); and (d) eight students (i.e., two students from each GA's class). The use of several data

sources enhanced the descriptive nature of the findings, since any of the data sources alone would limit the accuracy and amount of information collected (Placek, 1984).

Interviews. Interview data provided a description of self-reported impact of the induction program, the major influences on teaching, and insights into the day-to-day teaching life of the four GAs. Each GA was interviewed ten times (i.e., once before the semester, prior to and following four lessons, and once at the semester end). The consecutive planning/observation/reflection cycles promoted analysis of the influences of class events and post-teaching reflections on subsequent planning and teaching (Borko & Livingston, 1988). All interviews were audiotaped and later transcribed.

In addition to the ten GA interviews; students, faculty supervisors, and peer GAs who taught similar courses were interviewed to assess their perceptions of the impact of the induction program and the major influences on each GA's teaching. While interview data served to provide an inside perspective (i.e., from those directly involved), observations were intended to provide an outside perspective and record of events not easily discussed in interviews (Merriam, 1988).

Field Notes. Each GA was observed four times over the fifteen week semester. One lesson of each GA was observed, and videotaped, during the third, sixth, ninth, and twelfth

week of the semester. This schedule allowed the researcher to observe any differences across the semester. During each observation, detailed field notes were recorded by the researcher documenting teaching and content selection. Further, field notes were recorded of informal interaction between the researcher and the four GAs. With both the researcher and the participants sharing an office with sixteen other graduate students, there was ample opportunity for informal conversation and observation. Initial contact between the researcher and GAs occurred during the presemester workshop and a schedule of interviews and lesson observations was discussed.

Videotape records. Four lessons were videotaped for each GA. The camera was focused on the teacher throughout the lesson and a wireless microphone was used to record the teacher's speech. Videotaped lessons served as permanent records of teaching and were used to construct a teaching profile that documented each GA's teaching relative to the effective teaching model.

Questionnaires. In addition to interviews, field notes, and videotape records, GAs were asked to complete a personal history questionnaire which assessed their athletic participation and teaching experience (Rosenberg, 1990). Questionnaires were completed during the presemester workshop and used to document potential influences on teaching.

Data from audiotaped transcripts, narrative field notes, and questionnaires were grouped by each GA to develop chronological case records. This was accomplished with sequential recording of data from the beginning of the study (i.e., the initial interview and questionnaire) through the post-semester interview.

Data Analysis

Qualitative data analysis of chronological case records consisted of what Merriam (1988) termed an "inductive comparative strategy." It was anticipated that the analysis would generate a grounded theory concerning the impact of the induction program and how physical education GAs decide to teach, plan, and determine the content of their lessons. Glaser and Strauss (1967) defined a grounded theory as one that is generated from collected data and derived from its close correspondence with reality (i.e., what "makes sense" from the collected data).

Data analysis involved the following eight steps: (a) compiling a case record of all data for each GA; (b) reducing the data through selection of specific major topics within the case record; (c) condensing the notes taken from the case record reduction to determine a category system; (d) coding the data by categories; (e) cutting and pasting to manage the data by categories; (f) accepting/rejecting assertions based on initial hypotheses regarding the impact of the teaching induction program; (g) developing individual

case study profiles of each GA based on the apparent impact of the teaching induction program and the apparent major influences on their teaching; and (h) making comparisons across cases. Results of the data analysis are reported in the following section.

Results

The results section begins with a biographical sketch of each GA. A teaching profile follows which documents, in table form, their teaching relative to the model of effective teaching suggested during the presemester workshop. As noted previously, it was expected that the effectiveness of the induction program could be determined by observing the various teaching skills of the effective teaching model in actual classes. The teaching profiles were constructed from videotape records and represent a generalized view of each GA's teaching. Given the idiosyncratic nature of teaching, however, certain individual lessons did not conform to the profile and are noted within the text. Following the teaching profiles, individual-case analyses discuss (a) the impact of the induction program, (b) major influences on each GA's teaching, and (c) some of the assumptions about teaching that each GA appeared to hold. In order to preserve the integrity of each case and dramatize their contrast, individual cases are reported first followed by a summary discussion (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1986). Names of the

four participants were changed to protect anonymity.

PAUL

Biographical sketch of Paul. One experienced GA, Paul, taught two beginning tennis classes for approximately seventy-five minutes, two times a week. As the only pedagogy graduate student (i.e., the study of effective teaching) in the study, Paul had extensive insight into research on effective teaching and the goals of effective instruction. He had an undergraduate degree in physical education, high school teaching experience, and college teaching experience from other universities and from teaching the previous summer in the basic instruction program. Concerning his undergraduate physical education degree, Paul noted, "I can't even remember what I learned as an undergraduate about how to teach; it was probably relevant, but having had no experience, it made it irrelevant" (Paul, #1, 147-152).

During the study, Paul was also teaching physical education and health at a nearby community college. The busiest of the four participants, his two teaching jobs, school work, and personal life constantly fought for his time. Paul believed the juggling of these time burdens was a significant problem. While he wanted to plan well, as time burdens such as his own school work, personal life, and teaching demands increased, he found, "it's like you're wandering around stomping out fires and the whole forest is

burning down around you" (Paul, #10, 361-364). His planning became based on "the tyranny of the urgency" (Paul, #13, 199-200). Thus, whatever was the most important at any one time (i.e., the most urgent), became his chief planning concern. His planning became reactive. He was no longer planning ahead, only trying to keep his head above water. With less planning, Paul's teaching became more impulsive. He noted:

A lot of it becomes spontaneous while I'm teaching because there are so many factors, plus I find that if I do detailed plans they just seem to fall apart anyway...(#4, 236-240)...the time factor has definitely hurt my teaching and I don't think I'm doing a good job. (Paul, #9, 88-99)

Paul struggled with these time burdens. As the semester continued, Paul showed the stress of increased time burdens. Trying to do everything well, he noted:

Eventually [I] become apathetic about everything, then teaching fails as does other things based on the priority you give it, so we are overburdened because everyone has an expectation of us...(#10, 347-352)... I don't think you can prioritize one over another [teaching, personal life, graduate student responsibilities, etc.], I think it's a juggling game based on the time of day, day of the week, and whatever else. (Paul, #7, 189-194)

Unfortunately, similar to some junior faculty members, who must publish research, not necessarily teach well, to acquire tenure (Cheney, 1990), Paul found himself having to choose between teaching and his research and graduate studies. Despite trying to shift his priorities daily and provide good teaching, Paul acknowledged losing the battle at the end of the semester and focusing more time on his own graduate studies. With his previous teaching experience and informal discussions the researcher and Paul had concerning effective teaching, it was expected that Paul would incorporate a majority of the skills associated with the effective teaching model.

Teaching profile of Paul. Using videotaped records and field notes, Paul's teaching is profiled in Table 2.

 Insert Table 2 about here

As can be seen in Table 2, Paul initially began the semester with students waiting during roll call. During a visit to Paul's class in the second week of the semester, before videotaped observations began, the researcher as the tennis supervisor and Paul discussed options for beginning class. After this meeting, Paul began to use a more active warm-up the remainder of the term. Paul's warm-up activity was typically followed by a brief (3-5 minutes) lecture to the whole class stressing the focus of the day's lesson and a

drill to use for practice. The 20-25 students then paired themselves, walked to an empty court, and began practicing. Unfortunately, one of the biggest problems students had included tossing the ball to their partners. Instructed to toss the ball so that their partner could practice a certain stroke, the students often threw the ball so poorly that practice was compromised.

With the students were spread among 12-13 courts, Paul walked around and provided feedback to each student and helped explain the drill to those students who were not doing it correctly. Tennis was not his preferred subject and his content selection was based on his limited previous tennis teaching experience and the skills the students needed to pass the skills test. Paul was very talkative during student practice. Essentially he questioned and probed students to guide them to answers. He rarely told a student directly what he or she had done wrong. Rather, he led the student through questions such as, "So where did the ball go?"; then "Okay, so how must your racquet have been facing for it to go there?"; then "Now, where should it be facing?" When asked about his teaching style, Paul noted:

I guess that's formally called the dialectic method of teaching. I'm intrigued with that and believe that if you ask the right questions than they [students] will provide you with the proper responses...I like people to discover answers. Because in discovery learning, if

you discover something yourself, you are more likely to make that a more permanent part of memory. I think that's more effective than telling what they're doing wrong a hundred times. (Paul, # 3, 124-143)

As shown in Table 2, Paul's feedback was inconsistent. He did use specific feedback on occasions, but other times his feedback statements were general comments such as "Good job" or "That's better." After individual practice, the last part of the class (usually 10-15 minutes) was reserved for competitive game-playing. During the first lesson observed Paul provided a review at the end of class which reminded students of the cues involved in serving. He did not, however, consistently provide a review at the end of the other three classes observed. At the end of his other classes he provided more of a preview of upcoming events, rather than an actual review of the day's lesson. The basic pattern of (a) warm-up, (b) group instruction, (c) individual practice with feedback, (d) additional group or individual instruction, (e) competitive play, and (f) review was followed throughout the semester.

On the last observed lesson, however, Paul was administering the tennis skills test. A cold, windy day, Paul sat bundled up on top of the bucket he used to carry the balls to class and recorded scores of individual strokes as students completed the test one at a time. Because of the length of the test, he was only able to completely

evaluate five students per day. The remainder of the students in class, about 15 students this day, participated in competitive games. Unfortunately, Paul noted that this was a typical class day during the last few weeks of the term. Increased time burdens in his professional and personal life, and the need to complete the skills test, relegated Paul's tennis classes to an open recreation situation and relegated Paul to more of a bookkeeper than teacher.

Impact of teaching induction program on Paul's teaching. As profiled in Table 2, Paul generally incorporated roughly three to five of the six teaching skills presented during the presemester workshop. His activity time was high, he provided a stimulating environment, and he tried to keep his instructional time at a minimum. Paul did, however, typically lapse from the effective teaching model during his presentation of content, use of feedback, and ending of class. He did not consistently teach one cue at a time, provide specific, congruent feedback, or provide a review (Table 2). For example, when teaching the overhand serving motion, Paul used a counting sequence that was supposed to provide rhythm to the entire serve. The effective teaching model, on the other hand, suggested breaking down the components into several cues, then teaching them one at a time once students mastered the first cues. Then several cues could be

combined for the entire service motion. The result of teaching several cues at once, seemed to be confusion among students regarding the focus of the lesson. It appeared, at times, that Paul was so intent on his students learning to diagnose their own errors that he sometimes forgot about the simple joy of hitting tennis balls. When questioned about the impact of the induction program, he reported that he already knew the teaching skills associated with the effective teaching model and thus, believed the presemester workshop was basically a review for him.

Major influences on Paul's teaching. Paul did not believe the teaching induction program was a significant influence on his teaching. He appeared to already have a perspective about how he planned to teach tennis. Further, a lack of follow-up teaching supervision encouraged him to continue to rely on his own perspective. His perspective was developed primarily from his past teaching experience and his limited experience as a tennis participant.

Paul's Teaching Perspective

Paul had high expectations of his students. He expected them to learn a diagnostic and prescriptive way of thinking about the learning of motor skills. He focused on students diagnosing their own (or their partner's) performance, then prescribing a cure, if needed, for the errors. While he couldn't pin down where he learned to use this teacher questioning style, he believed it worked best

for his own learning so he figured it would work well for his students. Paul equated effective teaching with student learning. He noted:

Generally, [I try to look at] their performance; I think if they can see themselves coming along, then the happiness will come. So I don't look to see if they're happy or something; I try to concentrate more on providing them with the cues to improve their skill and then their satisfaction will come later and they'll want to get better. (Paul, #3, 198-208)

Paul believed his teaching experience allowed him the luxury to adapt his instruction to individual students, rather than adopting a strict teaching method. When asked how he was different from other GAs who did not study pedagogy or have teaching experience, Paul stated, "I still draw from those experiences [past teaching], but I filter them through what I know [from graduate study] is good teaching" (Paul, #10, 260-262). Paul used his past teaching experience to guide his current teaching, stating:

...with experience you have a repertoire to work with, not just from teaching only tennis, but teaching anything, I draw from teaching experiences in health and other areas when I go into a tennis class. I think the art of teaching becomes the backdrop and no matter what you are teaching on stage, you draw from those props and backdrops to help your teaching. (Paul, #10,

186-199)

Paul's teaching assumptions. As represented in Paul's teaching profile, he was highly concerned about teaching the cognitive aspects of motor skill acquisition. He appeared to hold the assumption that students are responsible for their own learning, and they must discover knowledge on their own. Based on that assumption, his teaching style seemed appropriate because he questioned students and lead them to state their own answers. Paul appeared to view effective teaching as much more than presenting content or modeling motor skills. He reported that teaching was a complex, ever-changing activity, and noted about his teaching:

I believe I'm relying on my repertoire of teaching skills. If I go out there and say: "This is how I'm going to teach this skill." Well, some people might not learn that way and I must expect to need other methods. I must rely on that repertoire I have under my belt coming into this class [from past teaching experience] and change my methods everyday if necessary. (Paul, #1, 234-243)

This repertoire of teaching skills also appeared to relieve Paul of the need to write lesson plans. He reported that he memorized a general plan for each day, then modified that plan during class. When asked about his planning, Paul declared, "A lot of it becomes spontaneous while I'm

teaching because there are so many factors. Plus, I find that if I do detailed plans they just seem to fall apart anyway...it just doesn't seem worth the time when they usually break down anyway" (Paul, #3, 236-244).

Follow-Up Teaching Support

Paul was familiar with the literature on effective teaching. Therefore, as noted above, much of the information provided at the workshop was review. While he felt positive about the induction program as a whole, he believed his peer GAs were more helpful than faculty for follow-up teaching support. He believed college faculty were poor role models of good teaching. He noted, "It would be nice to have more faculty involvement; I think it's an attitude that our work is only important as it affects their work. I think that attitude implies that our teaching isn't that important [compared to research]" (Paul, #10, 418-425). While Paul did implement a teaching suggestion from his supervisor focused on using an active warm-up (Table 2), his supervisor, as the researcher, was also a peer GA rather than a full-time faculty member. Yet, Paul didn't seek additional teaching support from his supervisor. When asked why he didn't ask the researcher, considered the tennis teaching expert in the department, for more help, Paul noted:

To help build my repertoire of tennis skills it would have been nice to try and have you teach for me, or

with me, but I didn't want to overburden you because I know how busy you are. I think it was good, however, that you are another graduate student. It was easier to open up to you, than some of the faculty...It would have been good to sit down at a certain point and discuss how the semester was going. What kind of help I could use; those things. But, I didn't want to impose that, not because of your position of power, but because you are overburdened as well. (Paul, #10, 378-395)

As Paul stated, he believed the researcher, as well as other GAs, were more valuable teaching resources than faculty members. But at the same time, however, he also understood that peer GAs had similar time burdens as he did. Thus, the influence of supervision was limited. Paul and his supervisor were unable to meet and discuss the teaching of tennis as often as would appear needed to observe a greater influence. Therefore, Paul was left to rely on his own perspective to guide his teaching.

DANNY

Biographical sketch of Danny. The other experienced GA, Danny, was in his second full year of teaching in the basic instruction program and was in the process of obtaining both a master's degree in sport management and an MBA. Danny taught two beginning golf classes, for approximately seventy-five minutes, two times a week, and

one weight training class, for approximately fifty minutes, three times a week. (This study, however, only focuses on his golf teaching). Danny was married and the only participant with an immediate family to consider. With an undergraduate degree in business marketing, Danny was the only participant with no formal physical education experience prior to teaching. Despite his lack of formal physical education, Danny did have the strongest athletic background of the four GAs. He had extensive participation experience in golf, basketball, and weight training.

Danny's business background heavily influenced his teaching and he stated that organization and planning were the two key ingredients to effective teaching. As Paul was the teacher most influenced by juggling time burdens, Danny was the least affected. When questioned how increased time burdens of his own graduate studies and family commitments impacted his teaching, Danny said, "it's like being a freshmen at a big university, the ones that succeed are the ones that know how to manage their time, being a good planner takes care of that [increased time burdens]" (Danny, #10, 245-250). In a nutshell, that brief statement described Danny. Because he felt well-organized and had developed what he called a "nice little program" (Danny, #3, 124-126) for teaching golf, Danny did not believe increased time burdens were a negative influence. When asked about his teaching perspective, or "nice little program," Danny

noted:

I've taught this four or five times, so I think I have a lot of the kinks ironed out; I might change something minor, but most of the major things are taken care of...(Danny, #10, 15-20)...now I think I found a nice little program that works...(Danny, #3, 124-126)...and, well this is the way I've always taught it. (Danny, #10, 78-79)

With a new baby as a recent addition to his family, Danny had additional family responsibilities not shared by the other GAs. Yet, Danny insisted: "Well, of course my family comes first, but teaching is a close second because I'm getting paid for it. My philosophy is that these classes come before my own classes" (Danny, #1, 104-107). With such a high priority given to teaching, it was not surprising that he reported not being negatively influenced by increased time burdens. At the same time, however, Danny reported doing less planning because he taught his new classes very similar to his past classes. He essentially was re-teaching much of the same content he had taught before.

Teaching profile of Danny.

 Insert Table 3 about here

Danny's teaching is profiled in Table 3. Danny had taught golf several times before and relied predominantly on his own perspective about the effective teaching of golf. His perspective had been developed from trial-and-error experience over the past year of teaching golf, his own experience playing golf competitively, and limited conversations with his faculty supervisor and peer GAs. As indicated in Table 3, Danny didn't open class by calling roll, but his students still waited for him to begin class rather than hit golf balls. When questioned by the researcher about using a more active warm-up, he commented that he didn't want them practicing on their own for safety reasons. At the first class observed, students began practicing as soon as they arrived. At the beginning of the other three classes observed, Danny presented a group lecture (usually 8-10 minutes), a demonstration that stressed the focus of the day's lesson (i.e., middle irons, chipping and putting, etc.), and the key cues he wanted the students to practice. This lecture was typically the only group instruction he gave, thus he delivered all the information he believed they would need for that day. While he moved quickly through the lecture, it often appeared to the researcher to be information overload for the students. Following this lecture/demonstration, however, Danny checked for student understanding by having the entire class model his instructions in front of him before he allowed them to

practice on their own. This group modeling gave him a chance to see how the majority of the class was performing and to identify students with specific problems.

Once he was satisfied with the group modeling, he instructed them to get into a single file line spanning the width of the practice field (roughly 130-150 yards) and to begin individual practice. Students had 8-12 golf balls each and practiced on their own the entire class period. After students had hit their 8-12 balls, they were instructed to wait for the other students around them to finish before retrieving the balls. Practicing in this manner, students attempted roughly 90-120 shots per day.

Danny walked down the line and provided individual feedback to each student. While he didn't consistently use first names, his feedback was predominantly individual because he only worked with one student at a time. Because of the distance he had to cover, Danny rarely spoke to, or saw, a student more than once during a class period. He typically saw them practice 4-6 shots before he moved to the next student. Danny demonstrated to each student individually and relied on his own ability to guide students. He typically would hit a ball or two and simply say "see?" or "do it just like that." Because he had thirty students, he had roughly two minutes to spend with each student. Sensitive to this limitation, he moved down the line quickly while occasionally telling a well-skilled

student, "You're fine, I'll leave you alone." Class was over by the time he finished seeing and speaking with each student in line. Danny did not typically provide a group review to end class. In fact, students who were at the top of the line and who Danny saw first often left early. Only on days when he finished class with a contest (i.e., a putting or chipping contest) did students stay the entire class period. Even then, students who lost early in his competition would leave for the day. When asked about his contests, Danny noted, "I think it's important and I've gotten a lot of good feedback about it. I feel it's important for them to get a prize when they perform well" (Danny, #6, 70-74). His basic pattern throughout the semester was (a) group instruction with teacher demonstration and student group modeling, followed by (b) individual practice with feedback. Both Danny's content selection and teaching style were guided by his predetermined perspective about the teaching of golf.

Impact of teaching induction program on Danny's teaching. As profiled in Table 3, Danny generally incorporated two or three of the six teaching skills presented during the presemester workshop. While his activity time was high and he provided a stimulating environment with his contests to end class, he did stray from the effective teaching model during his presentation of content and use of feedback. He did not teach one cue at a

time, provide specific, congruent feedback, or provide a review (Table 3). It appeared that Danny did not use the other teaching skills because they did not match his own teaching perspective.

Major influences on Danny's teaching. Danny did not believe the teaching induction program was a significant influence on his teaching. He reported that he already had a perspective about how he planned to teach golf. This perspective was developed from his past teaching experience, his experience as a golf participant, and interaction he had with his faculty supervisor and peer GAs.

Danny's Teaching Perspective

Danny's teaching perspective allowed him to teach in "auto-pilot." That is, he taught his new classes the same way he had taught his previous classes. The basis of his perspective was student practice. He noted trying to spend little time lecturing to his students having equated well-planned lessons and good organization with effective teaching. He noted:

I'm not one to have students sitting around and lecturing to them, so I try to have them get as much practice as possible. That's the only way for them to learn; not from me lecturing. I'm not going to spoon feed them, I want them to be practicing. (Danny, #10, 128-135)

Danny seemed to be a "reluctant participant" at times

during the presemester workshop. That is, he did not appear receptive to some of the effective teaching model recommended during the workshop and believed that golf was "just so different" from other activities, that those teaching skills wouldn't work for him. He noted:

My basic philosophy is that I'm there to demonstrate the skills. I try not to lecture too much, but rather give them time to practice, because golf is kind of unique in that it's a very complex activity...I will give them a few terms, but choose to operate more from 'watch me, then you'll do it, and do it, and so forth'.
(Danny, #1, 31-36, 46-49)

Danny's teaching assumptions. An accomplished athlete, Danny appeared to hold several assumptions which equated his ability to teach well with his ability to play a sport well. His perspective of effective teaching centered on two assumptions; if you can play a sport well, then you can teach it, and if you can provide students with an exemplary model, then they will learn by watching and copying that model. That is, his own skill inferred his ability to model and communicate how to learn it. He noted:

...you want them [the students] to know that you know what you're talking about; they need to have respect and confidence in you; you need to show them what you know, and at anytime you could take one of them on and crush them. When they know

that, you have supreme attention. (Danny, #10, 151-159)

His ability to perform the activity was Danny's sign of credibility. When asked if he believed all GAs should be excellent performers, he noted; "I think it boils down to confidence. People [students] talk in classes. They know when a teacher doesn't know what he is talking about. I don't want them talking about me like that" (Danny, #10, 162-169). Based on his assumptions, Danny's teaching style focused on his modeling of golf skills, while expecting his students to practice his model. With his strong belief in modeling, it appeared that Danny was an excellent instructor for higher-skilled students who could understand and apply the cues in his demonstration. Lower-skilled students, on the other hand, may have needed a greater break down of the golf swing and the teaching of one cue at a time (Rink, 1985).

His own ability and past teaching experience appeared to relieve Danny of the need to write lesson plans. He reported that he memorized key words which formed an outline of a single day's activities. When asked about his planning, Danny declared:

I think that comes from my business experience. Even if you don't completely know your subject that well, if you are at least well-organized and well-planned then you can make things run smoothly. Things click because you don't want to look bad in front of the class. I

spend a lot of time planning outside of class. (Danny, #10, 183-194)

Follow-Up Teaching Support

Danny, as mentioned earlier, taught in "auto-pilot." Yet, he still felt positive about the teaching support he received. He reported slowing down his presentation of content after a brief discussion with his faculty supervisor. Further, he credited his faculty supervisor with providing with many other good ideas. He commented, "I didn't see him out there watching me teach; he really spent more time up front helping me plan for the term, plus I've taught this four or five times [before] so I think he had some confidence in me" (Danny, #10, 270-275). Contradicting this statement however, Danny's supervisor noted:

My sense is that they [the golf instructors] are relying primarily on how they think golf ought to be taught, because they aren't getting it from me; they [including Danny] haven't tapped into me; with some minor changes based on limited conversations with me, but I don't think they are revolutionizing the teaching of golf. (Faculty, #2, 275-284)

This contradiction gave the impression that teaching support was not really expected, and the little Danny received was seen as positive. Thus, the limited follow-up teaching support Danny received was enough for him, because he was already using his own perspective to guide his

teaching.

PATTY

Biographical sketch of Patty. Patty, one of the two inductee GAs, taught one beginning tennis class, for approximately fifty minutes, three times a week. Patty was in her first full year of graduate school, working on a master's degree in sport management. Graduating early from high school and entering graduate school directly from college, she was younger than other graduate students and the same age as many of her students. A varsity college tennis participant from a small, liberal arts college, Patty had an undergraduate degree in sport management. Patty was a quarter-time GA assigned to teach one course for the semester. Further, she later learned that her assistantship was not to be renewed for the spring semester. An accomplished tennis player, she had recently broken her ankle and was unable to demonstrate many skills and practice with students. Keeping to herself, she spent little time socializing with other graduate students either in the office or outside of school.

While she had no formal teaching experience in schools, she had taught private tennis lessons, and coached both softball and basketball during her summers home from school. Further, she appeared very confident in her ability to teach tennis and being a past varsity participant, she knew tennis extremely well. Patty, like Paul, was negatively influenced

by increased time burdens and responded by teaching more impulsively. She commented:

I think at the beginning of the class I had time to think more about it, but then by mid-term things got crazy and I end up thinking about it on the way over to the courts...(#10, 174-180)... [my] planning time lately has been the five minute drive to the courts, it becomes spur of the moment kinds of things. (Patty, #7, 80-82)

With her planning time was reduced, however, Patty used fun-oriented group games to keep her students busy. These games included relay races, having the entire class playing on one court, and having several students playing against one student, among others. Patty had her students play one of these group games in every class observed. In fact, much of her content selection was centered on the use of the group games. A typical answer to a planning question was, "Today they're working on the serve, so I plan to use the 'five-serve game.'" This content selection did ease her planning concerns.

Teaching profile of Patty.

 Insert Table 4 about here

Patty's teaching is profiled in Table 4. Patty, similar to Paul, began the semester calling roll

as students waited against the fence. After meeting with the researcher, her tennis supervisor, other options to begin class were discussed and she began to have students practice while she called a silent roll. Her warm-up was followed by a group lecture (5-7 minutes) stressing the focus of the day's lesson. Her 18-24 students then paired themselves, walked to an empty court, and began practicing. Patty typically did not place students in organized drills. Instead she instructed them to "go practice forehands back and forth," or "serve five balls to each court, then switch." She commented that she didn't like "doing drills" and believed her students wouldn't like them either.

Unlike Paul, who was very talkative on the tennis courts, Patty was more of a silent monitor of practice. She believed several of her students were uncomfortable with her watching, so she instead tried to watch from a distance and did not provide much feedback. Every now and again she would comment on a shot or make small talk, but she often did that from the net rather than stand back with the students. When she did give feedback she, like Paul and Danny, often only gave general feedback such as "good backhand" or "that's the way to hit it." Her teaching style can best be categorized as monitoring and managing.

Her first group lecture was followed by individual practice and the last half of the class (usually 20 minutes) was reserved for fun-oriented group games. Patty typically

provided a review at the end of the class which served more to remind students about upcoming tests and quizzes than actually reviewing the lesson. She followed this basic pattern throughout the semester: (a) warm-up, (b) group instruction, (c) individual practice, (d) group game play, and (f) review. Like Danny, as a past varsity tennis player, she felt she already knew, before the presemester workshop, what skills students needed to be taught and how to teach those skills.

Impact of teaching induction program on Patty's teaching. As profiled in Table 4, Patty generally employed only one or two of the six teaching skills presented during the presemester workshop. While she kept her instructional time at a minimum, students were often waiting during her fun-oriented group games to benefit from increased activity time. Patty digressed from the effective teaching model during her presentation of content, use of feedback, and ending class. She did not teach one cue at a time or provide individual, specific, congruent feedback (Table 4).

Major influences on Patty's teaching. While it was expected that the workshop would provide Patty with a teaching model to follow, Patty did not teach consistent with the model. She appeared to already have a very strong perspective about how she planned to teach tennis. Further, a lack of follow-up teaching supervision with her tennis supervisor did not encourage her enough to try more of the

teaching strategies in the model. Her perspective was the dominant guide to her teaching and it appeared developed from her past experience as a tennis participant.

Patty's Teaching Perspective

Patty was simple and straightforward about her perspective of effective tennis teaching. Students should be having fun. Her logic followed:

I think that [having fun] is important, because if they don't enjoy it, then they won't want to keep playing again when they get out of class. I mean that's the whole thing, to get them interested in tennis so they'll play. (Patty, #1, 41-49)

Her emphasis on student enjoyment was evident in her fun-oriented group games curriculum. The learning value of some of the games, however, was questioned. One student commented, "I kind of wonder sometimes why we do some things, because right now with the backhands, I mean when we first learned backhands, we then played a game that had nothing to do with hitting backhands. I really wanted to practice backhands and I wasn't getting it" (Patty Student, #11, 68-79).

There appeared to be a need in Patty's class for a happy medium between skill development drills and fun-oriented group games. While every teacher wants students to enjoy the subject and learn, students also need some structured learning tasks and performance feedback (Shulman,

1987). Despite her lack of formal teaching experience, Patty had many resources as a past player that she relied upon to guide her current teaching. Playing varsity tennis in college, she had kept in touch with her college coach and used several of her coach's ideas in class. She recalled, "My old college coach laughed when I said I was teaching here. 'But you hated to practice and do drills.' She [her coach] said" (Patty, #2, 100-102). Sure enough, Patty didn't focus on drills in her teaching. She noted, "If I didn't like it [the drills], then they [my students] are not going to like it" (Patty, #1, 64-68). Rather than focus on drills which she didn't enjoy herself, Patty focused her content on the fun-oriented group games.

Patty's teaching assumptions. As represented in Patty's teaching profile, she was highly concerned about her students having fun. She appeared to hold the assumption that students will improve the most by practicing and enjoying the lesson. Similar to Danny, because of her own ability, she seemed to assume that if you can play a sport well, then you can teach it. Patty appeared to view effective teaching as keeping students busy and happy. Based on her assumptions, Patty's teaching style seemed consistent because she provided a fun environment and kept drills to a minimum. While she did not use written lesson plans throughout the semester, the amount of time she spent planning did drop as time burdens increased. Her

rationale for not using written lesson plans was simple, she believed she didn't need them. "I don't have a real formal lesson plan that I write because I won't use it anyway, I've taught so much [tennis], I wouldn't use it [a written plan] anyway" (Patty, #2, 121-124).

Follow-Up Teaching Support

Given her lack of teaching experience as a guide, it was expected that Patty would have asked more questions and inquire about alternative methods of teaching tennis. When questioned why she didn't seek more follow-up teaching support she noted, "Well nothing came up until the end there with that one girl's name was left off the final roll, so nothing really bad happened" (Patty, #10, 255-260). When asked why he thought Patty didn't seek more help or ask more questions of the veteran tennis teachers or faculty supervisor, a peer GA commented:

I think she is like one of those people who wear a suit of armor when she teaches, I don't believe anything bothers her or sinks in [through the suit of armor]; she has her own ideas [perspective] and that's that.
(Peer, #1, 613-615)

It seems apparent from the data that Patty was pleased with her teaching and did not feel a need to pursue additional follow-up teaching support. Thus teaching support appeared to only be needed for problems. Because Patty did not believe she was having any problems, there was

no need for additional support. "Nothing really bad happened" and therefore, no additional teaching support was sought.

DORIS

Biographical sketch of Doris. Doris, the other inductee, taught two modern dance classes, twice a week, for approximately seventy-five minutes. While Doris was also in her first year of teaching, she was completing the second year of her master's degree in exercise physiology and was familiar with a majority of the faculty and other graduate students. Doris was a highly outgoing, gregarious person who socialized with other graduate students both inside the office and outside of school. She had an extensive dance background from both her childhood and undergraduate college experience. In addition to her dance background, Doris was a college cheerleader and believed that experience helped her perform (i.e., teach) in front of people. Further, as an undergraduate, she had taken several courses related to effective teaching while completing her degree in exercise physiology.

Doris was in a unique situation during the semester of this study in three ways: First, she was not taking a full-load of academic graduate classes (she dropped her two graduate classes to focus on the preliminary stages of her thesis research); second, her content selection was guided by the list of dance movements on the final practical exam

(thus reducing her need to search for the content); and third, without a faculty supervisor on campus, Doris's teaching was left unsupervised. This autonomy, or rather lack of accountability, helped reduce the impact of any time burdens. As expected, she did not report time burden problems similar to Paul or Patty.

Teaching profile of Doris.

 Insert Table 5 about here

Doris's teaching is profiled in Table 5. In the four lessons observed, Doris began each class with a lengthy warm-up (30-45 minutes). Often this did not leave much time for learning the dance steps she had designed for the day. While Doris acknowledged this, she was concerned that the class not hurt themselves and build up the strength needed to dance. Her warm-up was a strict modeling activity. She stood at the front of the room and the class followed her every move. Most of the movements were similar each day so the class was familiar with the warm-up. After this lengthy warm-up, Doris gave a brief lecture (4-5 minutes) describing the ensuing dance step.

While she explained to the researcher that she taught each step in small parts, then gradually increased the complexity, the opposite appeared true during class. She often provided a high amount of information and the lower-

skilled students appeared confused and unable to perform the movements. She taught each step by first modeling the step, then commenting, similar to what Danny did, "Any questions?" or "Just do it like I am." Also similar to Danny, she thought dance was much different than other activity classes and the effective teaching model recommended at the presemester workshop did not apply to her dance classes. She believed many of these teaching skills would not work for dance because she had never seen dance taught that way. Very talkative during class, Doris was constantly directing students during both the warm-up and the dance step practice. Doris's review at the end of the class served more to remind students about upcoming tests and quizzes than actually reviewing the lesson. Her basic pattern was (a) warm-up, (b) group instruction and group practice of dance sequence, and (c) review. Doris's content selection was simple. She took the list of dance steps off the final practical exam and taught each one of them. The convenience of this is clear; Doris never had to search for her content. While her content selection was convenient for her, one of her students described it as "teaching off the list, we move so fast to complete that list we aren't really learning anything in depth" (Doris Student, #12, 54-57).

Impact of teaching induction program on Doris's teaching. As profiled in Table 5, Doris generally employed two or three of the six teaching skills presented during the

presemester workshop. While she had her students actively moving, she regressed from the effective teaching model during her presentation of content, use of feedback, and ending class. She did not teach one cue at a time or provide individual, specific, congruent feedback (Table 5). At times she seemed to confuse the low-skilled students regarding the focus of the dance steps. She reported that she already knew the teaching skills needed for dance and that some of the effective teaching model would not work with her content.

Major influences on Doris's teaching. Doris did not believe the teaching induction program was a significant influence on her teaching. She appeared to already have a perspective about how she planned to teach her dance class. Further, a lack of follow-up teaching supervision encouraged her to continue to rely on her own perspective. Her perspective was developed from her past experience as a dancer.

Doris's Teaching Perspective

Similar to Patty, Doris relied on her past experience as a student to guide her current teaching. While Patty had a faculty supervisor on campus, Doris was left to fend for herself because her supervisor was away on academic leave. She stated that she focused on student performance of the dance steps she designed. Because of a lack of an on-campus faculty role model, she compared her own teaching to that of

a dance instructor at a nearby university. Unfortunately, in her actual teaching, she struggled with giving too much information and losing control of discipline after she completed the teacher-directed warm-up. She appeared most comfortable when using teacher-directed activities such as modeling the warm-up. But, the class became disruptive and confused when she tried to teach new dance sequences. The disruptive student behavior was often followed by threats from Doris such as, "You better pay attention; you will be tested on this" (Doris, #13, 151-152). She felt confident that she did a good job teaching and defended herself on several occasions by stating, "Yea, but that's how dance is just taught" and "that's really the way dance is taught by almost everybody."

Doris's teaching assumptions. As represented in Doris's teaching profile, she was highly concerned about her own performance of the dance steps. She, like Danny and Patty, appeared to hold the assumptions that if you can play a sport (or dance) well, then you can teach it, and if you provide students an exemplary model they will learn by watching and copying that model. Thus, her teaching style seemed appropriate because she focused on modeling new dance steps and having her students follow.

Her dance experience appeared to relieve Doris of the need to write lesson plans. She taught her first lesson from a very detailed written plan. The next three lessons

were not as organized. Of course, once she memorized her warm-up activity, she did not need to use a written plan. When asked about her planning, Doris declared, "I've put all my stuff in a notebook, but I memorize the written plans I make" (Doris, #6, 40-43).

Follow-Up Teaching Support

Doris desired more follow-up teaching support than she received. With her faculty supervisor away on academic leave, and with no peer GAs available in dance, Doris was essentially left to fend for herself. When questioned about this, she noted, "Yea, it's okay because I'm able to do what I want to do, although it would be nice to have some guidance" (Doris, #7, 57-61). Luckily for Doris, she enrolled in an advanced dance class at a nearby university and was able to use the instructor as a role model. This role model and her own experiences as a student were the major influences on her current teaching. Like Danny, Doris was a "reluctant participant" in that she felt her subject was "so different than other P.E. classes" that the presemester workshop only offered her limited teaching help. The follow-up teaching support she needed and wanted was dependent upon the active involvement of her faculty supervisor, who, in fact was unavailable.

However, the one time that Doris was observed by her faculty supervisor, who was back on campus for a few days, she was encouraged to teach new dance sequences without

music. Her supervisor believed the music confused the students. Doris promptly began teaching without music the next class and continued the remainder of the semester. This finding, along with Paul's and Patty's use of the teaching advice that included focusing on using an active warm-up, suggests that supervision may have a positive influence on teaching behavior when earnestly applied. Granted these findings are limited, but they do provide promise. The following section provides a cross-case discussion focusing on the impact of the induction program and the major influences on GA teaching.

Discussion

As noted earlier, the effectiveness of the teaching induction program was to be documented by consistent observation of the various teaching skills suggested in the effective teaching model. Teaching profiles were constructed from videotape records to document teaching relative to the effective teaching model.

Impact Of The Teaching Induction Program

As represented in the teaching profiles, the GAs in this study did not consistently use the teaching skills associated with the effective teaching model recommended by the teaching induction program and suggested during the presemester workshop. The four GAs appeared to have fairly high activity time, yet none of them consistently provided appropriate feedback that was individual, specific, and

congruent, nor focused on teaching one cue at a time. Both Patty and Doris provided a review at the end of each class observed, but it was often more of a preview of upcoming class events, rather than a review of the day's lesson. While they did not consistently use the teaching model, all four believed they were teaching well. Further, faculty administrators believed the GAs were teaching as well as full-time faculty might in the same class, and student evaluations of instruction supported the GA's notion that they were teaching well. Indeed, they were not teaching poorly, they just weren't teaching consistently with the effective model. The lack of follow-up support after the workshop appeared to reduce the impact of the teaching induction program. Concerning the presemester workshop, one of peer GA commented:

I think the initial support [presemester workshop] was great, but my impression is that they [some of the GAs] just don't understand and know where to put it [the effective teaching skills information], I mean 'I don't do it that way and I've taught a whole semester; I'll do it the way it worked for me,' I think you fight that. (Peer, #3, 78-87)

Factors Influencing Teaching

It was expected by the researcher that the GAs would adopt the teaching model recommended at the presemester workshop. Data analysis revealed, however, that each GA's

perspective about the effective teaching of their subject appeared to be the major influence on GA teaching.

Individual teaching perspectives. These perspectives allowed them to teach from a "pedagogy of contentment." That is, all seemed well, the GAs weren't having any problems, students weren't complaining, and no faculty supervisors were consistently observing them. This "pedagogy of contentment" can be contrasted to a "pedagogy of dissonance" or dissatisfaction that was expected from attending the presemester workshop. GAs were expected to see problems and ask questions, have some dissatisfaction with their own teaching, pursue faculty supervisors for follow-up teaching support, and experiment with better approaches to aid student learning. The opposite appeared to be true. As a peer GA noted:

I don't hear anybody experimenting, no one asking questions; there wasn't that atmosphere that teaching is important. That is strange, because teaching always changes and you can't rely on the same stuff you've always done; you need to adapt to students. I just don't hear that kind of stuff happening; you would think if teaching is a major part of your day, then you would want to talk about it, but I don't think they [GAs] know what good teaching is, so they probably don't see a need for talking about it. (Peer, #1, 29-47)

Individual teaching assumptions. A general feeling pervading this study was the belief that somehow teaching is easy. Given some assets such as the course textbook, a syllabus to follow, and a faculty member to act as a resource, the GAs appeared to rely on their own perspective and assumptions of what constituted effective teaching of their subject. Several teaching assumptions surfaced in this study. Paul taught with his questioning style because he believed that students are responsible for their own learning and must discover it themselves. Danny and Doris taught mostly through modeling because they believed that their own skill qualified them to teach and students would learn best by watching their expert modeling. Finally, Patty taught with fun-oriented group games because she believed students needed to be having fun in order to learn. What students didn't want to do, she believed, was practice drills.

These differences in teaching style appeared to confirm the notion that the GAs taught from their own unique perspective. As noted by their Peer GA's, "I think you go back to the way you learned and use that as your basis for good teaching...(Peer, #1, 52-55)...I don't know if some of them [the GAs] understand and are able to organize the thoughts [from the induction program] into practice" (Peer, #3, 75-79) and from a faculty member, "I'm not sure how much of an impact our program has had, but in my opinion, you

tend to teach the way you were taught, the way you played" (Faculty, #3, 42-45).

As expected, the GAs in this study relied on their memory of how they themselves learned their subject. Past experience as a student (i.e., their apprenticeship of observation) provided their best guide given the lack of follow-up teaching support (Lortie, 1975; Lacey, 1977; Templin & Schempp, 1989; Graham, 1991). These past experiences were critical determinants of each GA's teaching perspective.

Coming from four different backgrounds, the GAs had different perspectives on effective teaching. Without the benefit of previous college teaching experience and lack of a degree in teacher preparation, Patty and Doris appeared to rely on past experience as students and participants to guide their current teaching and develop their perspective of effective teaching. Not surprising, actual teaching experience appeared to be the experienced GAs most significant source of information guiding their teaching; both Paul and Danny relied heavily on that experience in developing their perspectives. But while Paul adapted his instruction to his students, Danny appeared to teach in "auto-pilot." He had taught the same course several times, and was now comfortable with his set schedule and method. Danny noted, "I'm organized to the fact that when I go to teach my class everything should be ready, I should be able

to do it blind" (Danny, #1, 111-116).

The major difference between Paul and Danny can best be explained with an analogy of flying a plane. Danny's new golf classes and students follow the same flight path as his previous golf classes. Little variation was anticipated and students were expected to fit into the flight path the class was already programmed to take. Paul, conversely, used his past teaching knowledge to guide his new tennis classes' flight path. He understood the basic direction he wanted to go, and then used his experience to steer a course so that new students would become co-pilots.

Follow-up teaching support. In addition to their perspective shaped from past experiences, the four GAs were questioned about their current day-to-day experiences to assess the influence of follow-up teaching support (i.e., socialization with faculty supervisors). Unfortunately, the GAs were not predisposed toward adopting the model of effective teaching endorsed by the department. This was due, in part, to a lack of follow-up teaching support and, in the case of Doris, a lack of familiarity her faculty supervisor had regarding the teaching model. While invited to attend the presemester workshop, the majority of faculty supervisors made only brief visits or did not attend at all. Unfortunately, the lack of involvement of the faculty supervisors in this study appeared to negatively influence GA teaching. The GAs were not provided follow-up teaching

support, thus not encouraged to use the effective teaching model.

Time burden conflicts. It was presumed that being a full-time student would hinder quality teaching. Faculty interviews confirmed teaching as a secondary priority. "I think [teaching is ranked] two or three behind their own course and research, I think they see themselves mostly as students" (Faculty, #1, 146-149) and "I think I'd rank teaching second, their own academic programs would have to be number one" (Faculty, #3, 59-62). Interestingly, only Paul and Patty reported problems associated with being a part-time teacher and full-time student affected each GA very differently. The teaching experience Paul had did not help him from getting overwhelmed by time burdens. Reporting trying to memorize lesson plans, he found himself, instead, teaching impulsively as each new class began. Based on results such as these, several conclusions can be drawn about the impact of the teaching induction program and the factors influencing the teaching of the four GAs.

Conclusions

Each GA's unique perspective about the effective teaching of their subject and a lack of follow-up teaching support provided by faculty supervisors appeared to be the major influences on the teaching of the four GAs in this study. Each GA's own perspective of effective teaching emerged as the most powerful influence on their teaching.

The lack of follow-up teaching support provided by faculty supervisors appeared to constrain the GAs to rely on their own perspectives. Thus, it can be concluded that:

- 1) Rather than adopting the teaching model endorsed during the presemester workshop, each GA taught from his/her own perspective of the effective teaching of his/her subject.

- 2) GA's did not regularly receive follow-up teaching support from faculty, but instead relied on their own perspective of effective teaching.

These conclusions are consistent with Clark, Smith, Newby, and Cook (1985), Graham (1991), Reif (1990), and Smylie's (1989) findings that teachers' "own ideas" or teaching perspectives are the prime determinants of teaching behavior. Further, these conclusions support Emmer (1986), May (1986), Grossman (1989) and Rosenberg's (1990) notion that a lack of follow-up support leaves a teacher to choose teaching methods based on their own experience and own beliefs about effective teaching. As noted, faculty supervisors were not actively involved in the supervisory process. Instead, each GA's own perspective appeared to guide his or her teaching. The GAs appeared to dismiss the suggestions provided at the workshop as unnecessary or unapplicable to them, and instead relied on their own perspective. The GAs reported satisfaction with their own teaching and saw no need to change or alter anything.

Based on their reported satisfaction, the GAs in this study, as noted above, appeared to teach from a "pedagogy of contentment." That is, they weren't asking questions, experimenting, or demanding more from their supervisors. This "pedagogy of contentment" seemed to stem from an attitude that dismissed any problems in teaching a sport if they could already perform it well. In the face of the belief that they felt they already knew the "right way" to teach their subject, the induction program never had a chance to be influential. Any teaching skills suggested during the workshop that didn't match their perspective were discarded as not applicable. Questions weren't asked and experimenting wasn't attempted because the GAs felt they were already teaching well.

Implications

Based on the preceding conclusions, enhanced follow-up teaching support is needed to encourage GAs to move away from their reliance on their perspectives of effective teaching and adopt recommended effective teaching models. There appear to be, at least, three options available for follow-up teaching support: faculty mentors, peer GAs, and a teaching "coach."

Faculty mentors

In this study, faculty supervisors were the primary follow-up teaching support personnel. Kozisek (1990) reported, however, that an induction program and external

interventions still made little difference to a group of first-year teachers who, instead, relied on the school environment, peers, and students to influence their teaching. Kozisek noted that mentors (similar to faculty supervisors in this study) reported lacking time to work with beginning teachers, receiving little recognition for their work, and even lacking the desire to be a mentor. These findings are consistent with the thinking of at least one faculty supervisor in this study, who commented, "We're in a situation where, not that it isn't important, but I just don't have the time to devote to helping someone become a really good teacher in that supervisory setting" (Faculty, #2, 45-50).

This signals potential problems with sole reliance on faculty members for teaching support. Faculty supervisors in this study did not regularly attend the presemester workshop and may not have fully understood or even personally endorsed the recommended teaching model. Further, faculty commitments to research, their own teaching, and their lack of living in the same culture as GAs may have precluded them from becoming as actively involved as this study suggests need be. While faculty supervisors appeared to endorse the idea that GAs needed support, they did not feel they were able to provide the level of support needed because of time commitments and their own research obligations. Thus, teaching support was

varied and essentially non-existent in the case of Doris.

Peer GAs

Puccio (1987), Darling (1987), Stelzner (1987), Staton and Darling (1989), and Marincovich and Gordon (1991) suggest that peer GAs be used for teaching support because they do share the same common culture. Despite their limited experience in some cases, peer GAs provide a powerful socialization function not fully examined in this study (Staton & Darling, 1989). In fact, Paul believed peer GAs were a better source of teaching information than faculty who, he believed, were too busy with their own research. Yet, peer GAs have many of the same problems as faculty (noted previously in the conflict between being a full-time student and part-time teacher). While they may be helpful as additional support, sole reliance on peer GAs would not provide adequate "coaching of teaching." At best, peer GAs would be available for only a couple of years and each new academic year would necessitate endless training.

A teaching "coach"

To reduce endless training and provide continuity to a program, a faculty member or experienced GA hired as a teaching "coach" strictly for instructional development may be a better answer. Given the time and resources expended trying to actively involve several faculty in this current study, one person hired or given a stipend solely for instructional development may, in the long run, be quite a

bargain. Further, the use of an experienced GA would profit from the advantages noted above. The experienced GA whose interest was effective college teaching would also gain invaluable practical experience. It must be noted that several large, research-oriented universities, who maintain large GA teaching staffs, have recently sought and appointed individuals who serve as a teaching "coaches" as their primary responsibility. A teaching "coach" supports Joyce and Shower's (1982) notion that improved teaching is a result of "coaching of teaching." Showers (1985) defined the three purposes of coaching as follows:

1. To build communities of teachers who continuously engage in the study of their craft (i.e., teachers who ask questions, experiment, etc.);
2. To develop a shared teaching language and set of common understandings (i.e., teachers who focus on an effective teaching model);
3. To develop a structure (i.e., a systematic and organized plan which provides opportunity for interaction) for follow-up training that is essential for acquiring new teaching skills and strategies (p.189).

Several singular events (e.g., Paul's and Patty's changing roll-call procedures and Doris' practicing new dance steps without music) demonstrated the positive impact of "coaching" follow-up. While each GA noted some positive

effects from follow-up teaching support, the limited involvement by faculty supervisors left the GAs to rely on their own perspective of effective teaching of their subject as the dominant guide to their teaching.

Future Study

For individuals responsible for designing teaching induction programs and presemester workshops, this study supports the notion that one-time workshops, without adequate follow-up or active involvement by support personnel, are bound to fail to some extent. While designed to be a year-long induction program, the lack of follow-up supervision reduced the program similar to a one-shot workshop. This finding supports other reports of Stelzner (1987) and Sprague and Nyquist (1989) that enhanced teaching requires intensive up front support followed by continued support throughout the teaching term. Sprague and Nyquist (1989) refer to the need for "regressive supervision," where beginning teachers (i.e., inductee GAs) receive intensive supervision which is gradually reduced as teachers develop their own skills and autonomy. Unfortunately in this study, the intensive up front supervision was not provided and only limited changes in teaching behavior were observed. Left alone, GAs relied on their own perspective of effective teaching rather than adopting the teaching model recommended during the workshop. The induction program alone did not appear to be enough to alter the powerful influence of this

perspective. Allowing GAs to rely on their own perspective only encouraged the "pedagogy of contentment" displayed.

Thus, based on the minimal influence of the presemester workshop and faculty supervision, future studies need to examine induction programs that provide consistent follow-up teaching support and address teachers who are "reluctant participants" due to their powerful assumptions about teaching. The GAs' reliance on their own perspective of effective teaching in this study suggests that individuals responsible for providing instructional development must first challenge those prior beliefs. This challenge should examine the impact of "hands-on" practice in workshops, observations of appropriate role models, and greater emphasis on "coaching of teaching." The call for enhanced teaching and demand for accountability in higher education signal that the time is upon us when GAs must be actively supervised (i.e., "coached") if physical education basic instructional programs are expected to flourish and voluntarily attract students from different parts of the campus.

Table 1

Teaching Skills Associated with Effective Teaching Model**Beginning Class**1. Provide High Amounts of Activity Time.

- * Avoid students waiting for reading of roll call.
- * Have students begin class by being active; call this their warm-up and use a silent roll call or student sign-in.
- * Keep students active during class; use several short segments of instructional time, rather than one long lecture at the beginning of class.
- * Give students only enough instruction that they can use at any one time; let them practice your instructions first, then give them more information or change the practice task if needed.

2. Provide Interesting and Stimulating Beginnings to Class.

- * Focus on why each skill is important to learn and how it will help them perform better.
- * Provide an example, brief demonstration, or analogy that will help them relate to learning the new skill.

Presenting Content3. Provide Helpful and Understandable Explanations.

- * Focus on simple directions related to simple drills.
- * Keep instructional time short; provide several short mini-lectures, rather than one long lecture that presents too much information.
- * Break down the skills in the course to provide short, simple, and direct instructions.

table continues

4. Teach One Cue At A Time.

* Focus on one or two key aspects, or cues, each day; don't overload them with information they aren't ready for.

* Focus on the most important cues; don't waste time on aspects that do not substantially effect the skill.

* Use one word or a few short words to represent a cue; use terms like "side" to represent "hip and shoulder rotation so that non-racquet side of body faces the target."

* Have students repeat cues in practice, on quizzes...

Using Feedback

5. Provide Appropriate Feedback.

* Focus on providing specific, individual, and congruent feedback during skill practice.

* Students need to know exactly what they did correctly or incorrectly; don't just say "good", use specific feedback and say "good job of turning your side, George"

* Use first names; provide individual feedback because we all like to feel important and recognized.

* Focus feedback on the cues presented during instructional time; this congruent feedback will help reinforce the proper movement desired.

Ending Class

6. Provide Interesting and Stimulating Endings to Classes.

* Provide a review of the skill learned each day and the cue(s) needed for exemplary performance.

* Provide a preview of upcoming class events and new skills to be learned.

Table 2

Teaching Profile of Paul Relative to the Effective Teaching Model

Beginning Class

1. Provide High Amounts of Activity Time.

* Paul initially began the semester by calling roll while students sat against the fence. After a discussion with the researcher, who also served as his tennis supervisor, he began class by having students practice on the courts. He then used a silent roll to check attendance.

* Paul usually kept students highly active during class by keeping his instructional time low.

2. Provide Interesting and Stimulating Beginnings to Class.

* Across the observed lessons, Paul did not consistently provide students with an example or analogy concerning the lesson or the skill he wanted them to learn.

* He did, however, demonstrate often. Demonstrations were provided to both groups of students and individuals.

Presenting Content

3. Provide Helpful and Understandable Explanations.

* Paul used several mini-lectures rather than focus on one lengthy lecture at the beginning of class.

* During practice time, Paul checked for student understanding by constantly questioning the students about their performance.

* Students were expected to explain to Paul why their

table continues

errors or correct performance occurred. He expected them to be able to provide suggestions for helping themselves.

4. Teach One Cue At A Time.

* After 10-15 minutes of individual practice, Paul would call together the class, or a group within the class, for additional instruction. This second segment of instruction usually included additional cues or adaptations of drills to better match the students skill levels.

* While Paul focused on the most important aspects of a skill, he didn't consistently teach one cue at a time. Often he worked on several cues at one time.

Using Feedback

5. Provide Appropriate Feedback.

* Paul provided a high amount of feedback, but it was not regularly specific or congruent. His feedback was individual because he walked around to each student.

* While he did provide some specific feedback, too often he used general statements such as "good job" or "that's much better," instead of "that's a much better job of stepping forward."

Ending Class

6. Provide Interesting and Stimulating Endings to Classes.

* Paul provided a review the first lesson observed when students were reminded of the cues for the serve. The other three lessons, however, Paul provided more of a preview of upcoming class events.

Table 3

Teaching Profile of Danny Relative to the Effective Teaching Model

Beginning Class

1. Provide High Amounts of Activity Time.

* Danny did not call roll during class.

* He kept students active during class by keeping his instructional time low. Student practice was Danny's chief teaching concern.

2. Provide Interesting and Stimulating Beginnings to Class.

* Across the observed lessons, Danny consistently provided students with some type of example or analogy concerning the skill he wanted them to learn.

* Likewise, he also demonstrated often. His demonstrations were provided to both the entire class at the beginning of the lesson and to individual students throughout the lesson.

Presenting Content

3. Provide Helpful and Understandable Explanations.

* Because he typically only spoke to the class as a whole at the beginning of the lesson, Danny often focused on one lengthy lecture.

* He also had students model, as a group, his instructions. This appeared to serve as a check for understanding concerning his initial lecture.

* All students practiced on their own during his class.

table continues

4. Teach One Cue At A Time.

* Danny focused on the most important aspects of a skill, but he didn't consistently teach one cue at a time. Often he taught several cues of the golf swing at one time.

Using Feedback

5. Provide Appropriate Feedback.

* Danny provided individual feedback to each student. He did this by walking down the line of students and talking to each individually.

* He did not, however, regularly provide feedback that was specific and congruent. Too often he provided additional cues or reinforced aspects of the movement that he had not discussed previously.

Ending Class

6. Provide Interesting and Stimulating Endings to Classes.

* Danny had a unique ending to several of his classes observed. He provided a contest that, for example, involved putting or chipping the ball closest to the hole. He awarded prizes such as a new golf ball that he bought from the pro shop. These contests seemed to reinforce his belief in competition.

* He did not regularly focus a review on the skill learned each day and the cues needed for exemplary performance.

Table 4

Teaching Profile of Patty Relative to the Effective Teaching Model

Beginning Class

1. Provide High Amounts of Activity Time.

* Patty, like Paul, initially began the semester by calling roll while students sat against the fence.

* After a discussion with the researcher, who also served as her tennis supervisor, Patty took the suggestion of beginning class by having students practice on the courts. She then used a silent roll to check attendance.

* Patty's activity time was relatively low because the class was often participating in fun-oriented group games that required standing in line and waiting for a turn.

2. Provide Interesting and Stimulating Beginnings to Class.

* Across the observed lessons, Patty consistently provided students with an example or analogy concerning the skill she wanted them to learn.

* She did not, however, demonstrate. Because of her recent broken ankle, she was unable to demonstrate.

Presenting Content

3. Provide Helpful and Understandable Explanations.

* Patty focused the majority of her content presentation on one lecture at the beginning of class.

4. Teach One Cue At A Time.

* Patty consistently focused on the most important

table continues

aspects of a skill, but she didn't consistently teach one cue at a time.

* She did not use drills during practice time, so it was difficult for students to ever focus on specific cues.

Using Feedback

5. Provide Appropriate Feedback.

* Patty did not regularly provide feedback that was individual, specific, or congruent. She was much quieter than Paul, Danny, or Doris.

* She appeared to be a silent monitor of practice. When she provided feedback, too often she used general statements such as "good job" or "nice backhand."

Ending Class

6. Provide Interesting and Stimulating Endings to Classes.

* Patty did not consistently focus her review on the skill learned each day or the cues needed for exemplary performance. Rather, she provided a review that was typically a preview of upcoming class events and new skills to be learned.

Table 5

Teaching Profile of Doris Relative to the Effective Teaching Model

Beginning Class

1. Provide High Amounts of Activity Time.

* Doris began each class with a lengthy warm-up which she always led and the students followed her every move.

* She used a silent roll to check attendance.

* Doris kept students active during class, but a majority of class time they spent completing her warm-up, rather than learning new dance steps.

2. Provide Interesting and Stimulating Beginnings to Class.

* Across the observed lessons, Doris consistently provided students with an idea of why they were learning the dance steps.

* Doris demonstrated every movement she expected her students to learn. Further, she provided additional demonstrations to small groups of students and individuals who needed additional help.

Presenting Content

3. Provide Helpful and Understandable Explanations.

* Doris's entire class period was a combination of lecture/demonstration. She modeled each move and spoke instructions as students followed.

* After a brief discussion with her faculty supervisor,

table continues

she discontinued using music during the learning of new dance steps. Her supervisor believed the music confused the students and Doris agreed.

4. Teach One Cue At A Time.

* Doris reported teaching new dance steps with one cue for each movement. She stated she taught these cues one at a time, then combined them for the dance sequence. However, often it appeared that she was moving quickly through the dance sequence and leaving the low-skilled behind.

* While she focused on the most important aspects of the dance steps, she didn't consistently teach one cue at a time. Often it appeared she worked on several cues at one time which the low-skilled students had difficulty with.

Using Feedback

5. Provide Appropriate Feedback.

* Doris did not regularly provide feedback that was individual, specific or congruent.

* Too often she used general statements such as "good job" or "that was a better turn" without acknowledging who, or what was better about the turn.

Ending Class

6. Provide Interesting and Stimulating Endings to Classes.

* Doris did not focus her review on the dance steps learned each day and the cues needed to perform them correctly. Rather she provided a review that was typically a preview of upcoming class events and new dance steps to be learned.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, R.D., Wulff, D.H., & Szego, C.K. (1989). Review of research on TA training. In J.D. Nyquist, R.D. Abbott, & D.H. Wulff (Eds.), Teaching assistant training in the 1990's (pp. 111-123). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 39. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Berliner, D.C. (1986). In pursuit of the expert pedagogue. Educational Researcher, 15(7), 5-13.
- Boeherer, J., & Sarkisian, E. (1985). The teaching assistant's point of view. In J.D.W. Andrews (ed.), Strengthening the teaching assistant faculty. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 22. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Borko, H., & Livingston, C. (1988). Cognition and improvisation: Differences in mathematics instruction by expert and novice teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
- Brophy, J., & Good, T.L. (1986). Teaching behavior and student achievement. In M.C. Wittrock (ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.). New York: MacMillan.
- Cheney, L.V. (1990). Tyrannical Machines: A Report on Educational Practices Gone Wrong and Our Best Hopes for Setting Them Right. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities.

- Chism, N.V. (Ed.). (1987). Institutional responsibilities and responses in the employment and education of teaching assistants. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Center for Teaching Excellence.
- Clark, D.C., Smith, R.B., Newby, T.J., & Cook, V.A. (1985). Perceived origins of teaching behavior. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(6), 49-53.
- Darling, A.L. (1987). TA socialization: A communication perspective. In N.V. Chism (Ed.), Institutional responsibilities and responses in the employment and education of teaching assistants. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Center for Teaching Excellence.
- Dawson, P.J., & Clinton, B.L. (1989). The role of mentoring in the training of graduate teaching assistants. Paper presented at the 2nd National Conference on the Training and Employment of Teaching Assistants, Seattle, WA.
- Denzin, N.K. (1970). The research act. Chicago: Aldine.
- Eble, K. (1987). Defending the indefensible. In N.V. Chism (Ed.), Institutional responsibilities and responses in the employment and education of teaching assistants. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Center for Teaching Excellence.
- Ellis, M.J. (1988). The pendulum has swung far enough. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 59(3), 75-78.

- Emmer, E.T. (1986). Academic activities and tasks in first-year teachers' classes. Teaching and Teacher Education, 2(3), 229-244.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman & P. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 150-170). New York: Longman.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Graham, G., Hopple, C., Manross, M., & Sitzman, T. (1991). Novice and expert children's physical education teachers: Insights into their situational decision-making. Unpublished manuscript.
- Graham, K.C. (1991). The influence of teacher education on preservice development: Beyond a custodial orientation. Quest, 43, 1-19.
- Grossman, P.L. (1989). Learning to teach without teacher education. Teachers College Record, 91(2), 191-208.
- Hilsenburger, S.C. (1989). In my view. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 60(5), 18.
- Hunt, M. (1989). Tomorrow's professor today: Preparing the TA for written and unwritten professoriate. Paper presented at the 2nd National Conference on the Training and Employment of Teaching Assistants, Seattle, WA.
- Joyce, B.R., & Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of

- teaching. Educational Leadership, 40(1), 4-16.
- Kollock, P., & O'Brien, J. (1989). Developing a teaching self: Toward purposeful teaching. Paper presented at the 2nd National Conference on the Training and Employment of Teaching Assistants, Seattle, WA.
- Kozisek, J.A. (1990). The effects of a planned induction program on first-year teachers. Action in Teacher Education Newsletter, 24(1), 2-4.
- LaPidus, J.J. (1987). Preparing faculty: Graduate education's role. AAHE Bulletin, 39(9,10), 3-6.
- Lacey, C. (1977). The socialization of teachers. London: Methuen.
- Licata, C. (1986). Post-tenure faculty evaluation: Threat or opportunity? ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- May, W.T. (1986). Teaching students how to plan: The dominant model and alternatives. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(6), 6-12.
- Marincovich, M., & Gordon, H. (1991). A program of peer consultation: The consultants' experience. In J.D. Nyquist, R.D. Abbott, D.H. Wulff, J. Sprague (Eds.), Preparing the professoriate of tomorrow to teach. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

- Mauksh, H.O. (1987). The context of preparing teaching assistants. In N.V. Chism (Ed.), Institutional responsibilities and responses in the employment and education of teaching assistants. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Center for Teaching Excellence.
- Merriam, S. (1988). Case study research in education. St. Louis, MO: Mosby.
- Miller, G.A., Dowell, L.J., & Pender, R.H. (1989). Physical activity programs in colleges and universities: A status report. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 60(6), 20-23.
- Placek, J.H. (1984). A multi-case study of teacher planning in physical education. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 4, 39-49.
- Puccio, P. (1987). TAs help TAs: Peer counseling and mentoring. In N.V. Chism (Ed.), Institutional responsibilities and responses in the employment and education of teaching assistants. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Center for Teaching Excellence.
- Reif, G. (1990). Sources of influence on pedagogical behaviors patterns of five elementary physical education specialists. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
- Reynolds, M.L. (1989). The knowledge base for the beginning teacher. New York: Pergamon.
- Rosenberg, D.Z. (1990). Learning to teach: An examination

of non-formally trained physical education teachers.

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

- Rosenshine, B. (1983). Teaching functions in instructional programs. The Elementary School Journal, 83(4), 3-36.
- Schempp, P.G. (1989). Apprenticeship-of-observation and the development of physical education teachers. In T.J. Templin & P.G. Schempp (Eds.). (1989). Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach. Indianapolis, IN: Benchmark Press.
- Siedentop, D. (1983). Developing teaching skills in physical education. (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.
- Sell, G.R., & Chism, N. (1989). Teaching associates. Notes on Teaching Newsletter, published by the Center for Teaching Excellence, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Showers, B. (1985). Teachers coaching teachers. Educational Leadership, 42, 43-48.
- Smylie, M.A. (1989). Teachers' views of the effectiveness of sources of learning to teach. The Elementary School Journal, 89(5), 543-558.
- Sprague, J., & Nyquist, J.D. (1989). TA supervision. In J.D. Nyquist, R.D. Abbott, & D.H. Wulff (Eds.), Teaching assistant training in the 1990's (pp. 15-22). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 39. San

Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Staton, A.Q., & Darling, A.L. (1989). Socialization of teaching assistants. In J.D. Nyquist, R.D. Abbott, & D.H. Wulff (Eds.), Teaching assistant training in the 1990's (pp. 15-22). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 39. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stelzner, S.L. (1987). Peer training in a teacher improvement program for TAs. In N.V. Chism (Ed.), Institutional responsibilities and responses in the employment and education of teaching assistants. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Center for Teaching Excellence.

Templin, T.J., & Schempp, P.G. (Eds.). (1989). Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach. Indianapolis, IN: Benchmark Press.

Trimble, R.T., & Hensley, L.D. (1984). The general instruction program in physical education at four-year colleges and universities: 1982. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 55(5), 82-89.

Weimer, M. (1990). Improving college teaching: Strategies for developing instructional effectiveness. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Wilson, T., & Stearns, J. (1985). Improving the working relationship between professor and TA. In J.D.W. Andrews (Ed.), Strengthening the teaching assistant faculty. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no.

22. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Zeichner, K.M. (1981). Reflective teaching and field-based experience in teacher education. Interchange: A Quarterly Review of Education, 12(4), 1-22.

CHAPTER IV

Summary of Implications for Practitioners

Recommendations for Future Research

Introduction

This chapter looks back at the original guiding questions posed in the first chapter. This chapter presents the findings related to GA teaching, planning, and content selection, as well as offering the researcher's view as to how the findings on the impact of the teaching induction program and the major influences on GA teaching can be applied to educators interested in improving GA teaching. In addition, the recommendations for future research section will specifically address the perspective of effective teaching so prevalent in the four GAs. Because results of this study have previously been reported in the journal manuscript; this chapter will not attempt to duplicate results and conclusions already reported, rather it will attempt to look to the future and go beyond the limited "future study" section of the journal manuscript.

GA Teaching

Based on the apparent limited influence of the induction program, educators must examine their reliance on inservice workshops, one-day guest lectures, effective teaching newsletters, and other "quick fixes." While mass distribution of teaching resources such as The Teaching Professor newsletter must be applauded, if that is the

extent of "coaching of teaching" then failure would appear imminent. The GAs in this study had access to several teaching resources including: (a) experts in pedagogy; (b) subject-specific experts; (c) various instructional video tapes; (d) various instructional textbooks; (e) previous GA's lesson plans, syllabi, tests, and class handouts; (f) and several experienced GAs who had taught similar classes. Despite these resources, the GAs in this study appeared to rely on their own perspective of effective teaching to guide themselves. Instead of experimenting and asking questions, the four GAs appeared to be "reluctant participants" in the induction process (due, in part, to their strong personal beliefs about how to teach their subject, past experience as a student, and past athletic experience among others).

While these data were specific to GAs, future research should closely re-examine GAs in other disciplines, classroom teachers, or public school teachers of any subject. There is no reason to believe that teachers outside of physical education would somehow teach differently from their perspective of effective teaching. The "pedagogy of contentment" displayed by the teachers in this study may be even more common among older teachers who already have tenure and are not held accountable for teaching improvement. While a plethora of research has examined teacher socialization, and the formation of perspectives of effective teaching, the possession of an

undergraduate teacher preparation degree would not appear to automatically alleviate a "pedagogy of contentment."

GA Planning

The same perspective of effective teaching that promoted the "pedagogy of contentment" drove GA planning as well. In general, GAs were content with their knowledge of teaching and their subject, and thus, did not consistently write daily lesson plans. Each had a semester instructional outline which served to give the course its focus. At any one time, each GA had a general idea of the direction the class was going.

It appears, however, that these GAs did not take further initiative to elaborate on or modify the general ideas. Rather than explicitly plan for daily lessons, each GA appeared to begin class with general ideas that were reshaped as the day progressed. While it can be argued that this style of planning allows for greater spontaneity and adjustment to student needs, it also served as a excuse for not writing lesson plans. None of the four GAs were required to write daily plans for their supervisors and none volunteered. While a lack of written plans did not signal poor teaching, it did signal the belief that written plans were somehow not needed even by novice teachers or not a high priorities as the researcher had hoped. Curiously, neither Paul nor Danny used written lesson plans. Both veteran GAs reported memorizing key words or concepts that

directed their lessons. In contrast however, Paul admitted to spontaneous teaching based on interaction with his students, while Danny taught from his "program" where students were expected to adapt to his instruction.

Comparable to the veteran GAs, neither Patty nor Doris consistently used written lesson plans. Doris used a detailed written plan during her first observed lesson, but did not continue to use a written plan the remaining three observations. Doris and Patty's unique approaches to content selection helped counteract increased time burdens across the semester, with additional group games selected by Patty and additional dance steps selected by Doris.

GA Content Selection

The GA's powerful reliance on their own unique perspective of effective teaching also guided their content selection. All former athletes with varied experience in their particular subjects, content selection typically was an extension of their own competitive experience. The GAs were comfortable with the skill progressions and practice tasks used by their former coaches. Patty was the most notable GA with regard to content selection. As noted in the journal manuscript, she did not like repetitive tennis drills for her own practice, so she figured her students wouldn't like them either. At the same time, however, no evidence could be found that she ever asked her students how they felt about playing her fun-oriented group games.

Summary of Implications for Practitioners

For individuals developing teaching induction programs, the results of this study support the belief that one-time workshops, without adequate follow-up and active involvement by teaching support personnel, are of limited value. The success of the induction program, and rationale for allocating resources for its development, was dependent upon the regular observation of teaching that was consistent with the effective teaching model. Designed to be a year-long induction program, faculty follow-up supervision was minimal and the program was thus reduced to the equivalent of a one-time workshop.

The reliance on faculty supervisors in this study was also not fruitful because they had their own concerns and time burdens (as noted in the journal manuscript). Not all faculty supervisors regularly attended the presemester workshop and therefore may have been unaware of the effective teaching skills presented as part of the workshop. Yet, it seems possible that "regressive supervision" could have been accomplished; where inductee GAs would have received intensive up front supervision, which was gradually reduced as the teachers developed their own skills and autonomy.

More generally, a similar induction program with enhanced follow-up teaching support could provide an excellent vehicle for research on the effect of "coaching of

teaching." The question arises whether the goals of the induction program could have been achieved if the department had mandated that faculty attend the presemester workshop and rewarded them for their supervision? Further, what benefits could have been realized if the supervisors had spent a few hours of the first few days of the semester collaborating with the GAs? Then, as the semester progressed, what results would have been obtained if the supervisors had kept office hours a couple times a week specifically for GAs, or should more responsibility be given to the GAs? Perhaps the faculty supervisors were not the problem. If the GAs were already teaching from a "pedagogy of contentment," why should faculty supervisors expect a visit during those office hours? The answers to these questions are not known, but they do provide a spark for future research.

Recommendations for Future Research

How does one learn to teach? What does it mean to become a teacher? What skills are needed to be a teacher? How can a university allow graduate students with no teaching experience and little training to teach undergraduate students? The answers to these questions are complex and not readily agreed upon. Based on the results of this study, much of the teaching information that these four GAs thought they needed for teaching was already stored in their head. Through the many hours of being a student,

they had accumulated enough information about teaching to form a perspective of effective teaching that was unique for each GA. In a similar study of teaching perspectives, Ross (1988) stated:

To achieve the goal of building an active and reflective cadre of teachers, course work in teacher education should attempt to make preservice teachers more aware of their own past experiences and preconceived beliefs about teaching in order to subject them to scrutiny. The goal would not be to disprove the relevancy of past experiences, but simply to expose individual beliefs to critical examination and discourage "personalized" versions of pedagogical knowledge. (p. 107)

To help make beginning teachers more aware, McGill and Shaeffer (cited in Menges & Rando, 1989) noted that although few treat pedagogy as a discipline of study, teachers generally love to talk about teaching. Providing opportunities to talk about teaching may bring to some level of awareness a teacher's perspective of effective teaching. Once these perspectives, and the past experiences, beliefs, ideas, and behaviors associated with it, are better understood, intervention strategies can begin to reinforce or attempt to alter them. This study supports the need to investigate learning to teach from a dialectical approach (Goodman, 1988).

Goodman notes that a dialectical approach "recognizes the way in which individuals exercise freedom to manipulate their professional situations while at the same time being constrained by them" (p. 133). Similarly, the GAs in this study were active participants in their socialization and their learning to teach. They picked and chose what they considered appropriate role models from their past based on their own notions of what constituted effective teaching. The four GAs held different views of effective teaching, and those views appeared to be a powerful influence on their perspectives. Future induction efforts must foster an atmosphere that allows open expression of perspectives. While suggesting an effective teaching model based on teaching effectiveness literature seems legitimate (as attempted during the week-long induction workshop), the "reluctant participation" in this study supports the notion that perspectives are stronger than externally suggested models. Thus, future teaching enhancement efforts must focus on individual strategies aimed at addressing existing perspectives.

Chapter Conclusion

The conclusion to this section is simple: as good teaching is complex, so is the enhancement of teaching. This study provides a "jumping off spot." Insights into some strategies that worked well, not so well, or not at all have been provided. These insights provide knowledge that

will enhance future induction programs and, hopefully, promote more effective teaching in college physical education activity programs. But, what this study really provides is just another piece in the puzzle. Through additional quality research, better induction programs, and better supervision, GA teaching will be enhanced which will better serve our college student clients and better promote a physically active, health lifestyle.

CHAPTER V

LITERATURE CITED

- Abbott, R.D., Wulff, D.H., & Szego, C.K. (1989). Review of research on TA training. In J.D. Nyquist, R.D. Abbott, & D.H. Wulff (Eds.), Teaching assistant training in the 1990's (pp. 111-123). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 39. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Adler, S. (1984). A field study of selected student teacher perspectives toward social studies. Theory and Research in Social Education, 12, 13-30.
- Bartholomew, J. (1976). Schooling teachers: The myth of the liberal college. In G. Whitty and M. Young (Eds.), Explorations in the politics of school knowledge. Drifferton, England: Nafferton.
- Berliner, D.C. (1986). In pursuit of the expert pedagogue. Educational Researcher, 15(7), 5-13.
- Berliner, D.C. (1989). Implications of studies of expertise in pedagogy for teacher education and evaluation. New Directions for Teacher Assessment: Proceedings of the 1988 ETS Invitational Conference. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Bingman, R.M. (1983). Use of student evaluations to improve instruction. Paper presented at the annual forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Toronto, Canada.
- Boeherer, J., & Sarkisian, E. (1985). The teaching assistant's point of view. In J.D.W. Andrews (Ed.),

- Strengthening the teaching assistant faculty. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 22. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. (1982). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Borko, H., & Livingston, C. (1988). Cognition and improvisation: Differences in mathematics instruction by expert and novice teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
- Bos, R.R., Zakrajsek, D.B., Wolf, V., & Stoll, S. (1980). Teaching assistant traits: Their influence on student ratings. Improving College and University Teaching, 28(2), 179-185.
- Brophy, J., & Good, T.L. (1986). Teaching behavior and student achievement. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching, (3rd ed.). New York: MacMillan.
- Carnegie Task Force on Teaching (1986). A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. New York: Carnegie.
- Carroll, J.G. (1980). Effects of training programs for university teaching assistants. Journal of Higher Education, 51(2), 167-183.
- Chang, A.F., Berger, S.E., & Chang, B. (1981). The relationship of student self-esteem and teacher empathy

- to classroom learning. Psychology, A Quarterly Journal of Human Behavior, 18(4), 21-24.
- Cheney, L.V. (1990). Tyrannical Machines: A Report on Educational Practices Gone Wrong and Our Best Hopes for Setting Them Right. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities.
- Chism, N.V. (Ed.). (1987). Institutional responsibilities and responses in the employment and education of teaching assistants. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Center for Teaching Excellence.
- Clark, D.C., Smith, R.B., Newby, T.J., & Cook, V.A. (1985). Perceived origins of teaching behavior. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(6), 49-53.
- Dalgaard, K.A. (1982). Some effects of training on teaching effectiveness of untrained university teaching assistants. Research in Higher Education, 17(1), 39-50.
- Darling, A.L. (1987). TA socialization: A communication perspective. In N.V. Chism (Ed.), Institutional responsibilities and responses in the employment and education of teaching assistants. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Center for Teaching Excellence.
- Dawson, P.J., & Clinton, B.L. (1989). The role of mentoring in the training of graduate teaching assistants. Paper presented at the 2nd National Conference on the Training and Employment of Teaching Assistants,

Seattle, WA.

- Denzin, N.K. (1970). The research act. Chicago: Aldine.
- Eble, K. (1987). Defending the indefensible. In N.V. Chism (Ed.), Institutional responsibilities and responses in the employment and education of teaching assistants. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Center for Teaching Excellence.
- Ellis, M.J. (1988). The pendulum has swung far enough. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 59(3), 75-78.
- Emmer, E.T. (1986). Academic activities and tasks in first-year teachers' classes. Teaching and Teacher Education, 2(3), 229-244.
- Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.). New York: MacMillan.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman & P. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 150-170). New York: Longman.
- Gething, T. (1987). Employee or student: Walking the tightrope. In N.V. Chism (Ed.), Institutional responsibilities and responses in the employment and education of teaching assistants. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Center for Teaching Excellence.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.

- Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Goetz, J.P., & LeCompte, M.D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. Orlando, FL: Academic.
- Good, T.L., & Brophy, J.E. (1987). Looking in classrooms (4th ed.). Cambridge: Harper & Row.
- Goodman, J. (1988). Constructing a practical philosophy of teaching: A study of preservice teachers' professional perspectives. Teaching and Teacher Education, 4(2), 121-137.
- Graham, G., Hopple, C., Manross, M., & Sitzman, T. (1991). Novice and expert children's physical education teachers: Insights into their situational decision-making. Unpublished manuscript.
- Graham, K.C. (1991). The influence of teacher education on preservice development: Beyond a custodial orientation. Quest, 43, 1-19.
- Grossman, P.L. (1989). Learning to teach without teacher education. Teachers College Record, 91(2), 191-208.
- Grossman, P.L. & Richert, A. (1988). Unacknowledged knowledge growth: A re-examination of the influence of teacher education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 4(1), 53-62.
- Hilsenburger, S.C. (1989). In my view. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 60(5), 18.
- Hoffman, J. & O'Neal, S. (1985). Beginning teaching and

- changes in self-perceived sources of influence on classroom teaching practices. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
- Housner, L.D., & Griffey, D.C. (1985). Teacher cognition: Differences in planning and interactive decision-making between experienced and inexperienced teachers. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 56, 45-53.
- Hoste, R. (1982). Sources of influence on teaching practice in the evaluation of courses in teacher education. Journal of Education for Teaching, 8, 252-261.
- Hoy, W. (1968). The influence of experience on the beginning teacher. School Review, 76, 312-328.
- Hunt, M. (1989). Tomorrow's professor today: Preparing the TA for written and unwritten professoriate. Paper presented at the 2nd National Conference on the Training and Employment of Teaching Assistants, Seattle, WA.
- Joyce, B.R., & Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teaching. Educational Leadership, 40(1), 4-16.
- Kanaga, K.R. (1979). The evaluation of a training program for undergraduate teaching assistants. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Conference, Philadelphia.
- Kollack, P., & O'Brien, J. (1989). Developing a teaching self: Toward purposeful teaching. Paper presented at

- the 2nd National Conference on the Training and Employment of Teaching Assistants, Seattle, WA.
- Kosisek, J.A. (1990). The effects of a planned induction program on first-year teachers. Action in Teacher Education Newsletter, 24(1), 2-4.
- LaPidus, J.J. (1987). Preparing faculty: Graduate education's role. AAHE Bulletin, 39(9,10), 3-6.
- Lacey, C. (1977). The socialization of teachers. London: Methuen.
- Lanier, J.E. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.). New York: MacMillan.
- Lawson, H. (1988). Occupational socialization, cultural studies and the physical education curriculum. Journal of Teaching Physical Education, 7(4), 265-288.
- Leinhardt, G., & Greeno, J.G. (1986). The cognitive skill of teaching. Journal of Educational Psychology, 78, 75-95.
- Licata, C. (1986). Post-tenure faculty evaluation: Threat or opportunity? ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Liggett, S.L. (1986). Learning to grade papers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, New Orleans.
- Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of

Chicago Press.

- May, W.T. (1986). Teaching students how to plan: The dominant model and alternatives. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(6), 6-12.
- Marincovich, M., & Gordon, H. (1991). A program of peer consultation: The consultants' experience. In J.D. Nyquist, R.D. Abbott, D.H. Wulff, J. Sprague (Eds.), Preparing the professoriate of tomorrow to teach. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Mauksch, H.O. (1987). The context of preparing teaching assistants. In N.V. Chism (Ed.), Institutional responsibilities and responses in the employment and education of teaching assistants. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Center for Teaching Excellence.
- Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- McKeachie, W.J., Lin, Y.G., Daugherty, M., Moffett, M.N., Neigler, C., Nork, J., Walz, M., & Baldwin, R. (1980). Using student ratings and consultation to improve instruction. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 50(2), 168-174.
- Menges, R.J., & Rando, W.C. (1989). What are your assumptions? Improving instruction by examining theories. College Teaching, 37(2), 54-60.
- Merriam, S. (1988). Case study research in education. St.

- Louis, MO: Mosby.
- Miller, G.A., Dowell, L.J., & Pender, R.H. (1989). Physical activity programs in colleges and universities: A status report. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 60(6), 20-23.
- Murray, H.G., & Smith, T.A. (1989). Effects of midterm behavioral feedback on end-of-term ratings of instructor effectiveness. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- O'Hair, H.D., & Babich, R.M. (1981). The evaluation and prediction of affective response to graduate teaching assistants' classroom communication. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Anaheim, CA.
- Parrett, J.L. (1987). A ten-year review of TA training programs; Trends, patterns, and common practices. In N.V. Chism (Ed.), Institutional responsibilities and responses in the employment and education of teaching assistants. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Center for Teaching Excellence.
- Patton, M.Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Placek, J.H. (1984). A multi-case study of teacher planning in physical education. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 4, 39-49.

- Poole, J.R. (1989). Tending the sidebar: A case study portrait of Mickey. Unpublished manuscript.
- Puccio, P. (1987). TAs help TAs: Peer counseling and mentoring. In N.V. Chism (Ed.), Institutional responsibilities and responses in the employment and education of teaching assistants. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Center for Teaching Excellence.
- Reif, G. (1990). Sources of influence on pedagogical behaviors patterns of five elementary physical education specialists. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
- Reynolds, M.L. (1989). The knowledge base for the beginning teacher. New York: Pergamon.
- Rink, J.E. (1985). Teaching physical education for learning. St. Louis, MO: Times Mirror/Mosby
- Rodriguez, R.N. (1985). Teaching teaching to teaching assistants. College Teaching, 33(4), 173-176.
- Rosenberg, D.Z. (1990). Learning to teach: An examination of non-formally trained physical education teachers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
- Rosenshine, B. (1983). Teaching functions in instructional programs. The Elementary School Journal, 83(4), 3-36.
- Ross, E.W. (1988). Becoming a teacher: The development of preservice teacher perspectives. Action in Teacher Education, 10(2), 101-109.

Sabers, D., Cushing, K.S., & Berliner, D.C. (in press).

Differences among expert, advanced beginner, and novice teachers in a task characterized by simultaneity, multidimensionality, and immediacy. American Educational Research Journal.

Sage, G.H. (1984). The quest for identity in college physical education. Quest, 36, 115-121.

Sanders, D., & McCutcheon, G. (1986). The development of practical theories of teaching. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 2(1), 50-67.

Schempp, P.G. (1989). Apprenticeship-of-observation and the development of physical education teachers. In T.J. Templin & P.G. Schempp (Eds.). (1989). Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach. Indianapolis, IN: Benchmark Press.

Seidal, J.V., & Clark, J.A. (1984). The Ethnograph: A computer program for the analysis of qualitative data. Qualitative Sociology, 7, 110-125.

Seidentop, D. (1983). Developing teaching skills in physical education. (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

Sell, G.R., & Chism, N. (1989). Teaching associates. Notes on Teaching Newsletter, published by the Center for Teaching Excellence, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Sharp, G. (1981). Acquisition of lecturing skills by

- university teaching assistants: Some effects of interest, topic relevance, and viewing a model videotape. American Educational Research Journal, 18, 491-502.
- Showers, B. (1985). Teachers coaching teachers. Educational Leadership, 42, 43-48.
- Shulman, L.S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 1-22.
- Smock, R., & Menges, R.J. (1985). Programs for TAs in the context of campus policies and priorities. In J.D.W. Andrews (Ed.), Strengthening the teacher assistant faculty (pp. 21-33). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 22. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smylie, M.A. (1989). Teachers' views of the effectiveness of sources of learning to teach. The Elementary School Journal, 89(5), 543-558.
- Spradley, J. (1980). Participant observation. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Sprague, J., & Nyquist, J.D. (1989). TA supervision. In J.D. Nyquist, R.D. Abbott, & D.H. Wulff (Eds.), Teaching assistant training in the 1990's (pp. 15-22). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 39. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Staton, A.Q., & Darling, A.L. (1989). Socialization of teaching assistants. In J.D. Nyquist, R.D. Abbott, &

- D.H. Wulff (Eds.), Teaching assistant training in the 1990's (pp. 15-22). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 39. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stelzner, S.L. (1987). Peer training in a teacher improvement program for TAs. In N.V. Chism (Ed.), Institutional responsibilities and responses in the employment and education of teaching assistants. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Center for Teaching Excellence.
- Stephens, J. (1969). The processes of schooling. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Tabachnick, B.R., Popkewitz, T., & Zeichner, K.M. (1978). Teacher education and the professional perspectives of teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Canada.
- Taylor, S.J., & Bogdan, R. (1984). Introduction to qualitative research methods, (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Templin, T.J., & Schempp, P.G. (Eds.). (1989). Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach. Indianapolis, IN: Benchmark Press.
- Tousignant, M., & Seidentop, D. (1983). A qualitative analysis of task structures in required secondary physical education classes. Journal of Teaching Physical Education, 3(1), 47-57.

- Trimble, R.T., & Hensley, L.D. (1984). The general instruction program in physical education at four-year colleges and universities: 1982. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 55(5), 82-89.
- Weimer, M. (1990). Improving college teaching: Strategies for developing instructional effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wilson, T., & Stearns, J. (1985). Improving the working relationship between professor and TA. In J.D.W. Andrews (Ed.), Strengthening the teaching assistant faculty. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 22. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wright, B., & Tuska, S. (1968). From dream to life in the psychology of becoming a teacher. School Review, 253-293.
- Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research, 54(2), 143-178.
- Zeichner, K.M. (1981). Reflective teaching and field-based experience in teacher education. Interchange: A Quarterly Review of Education, 12(4), 1-22.
- 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.

APPENDIX A

Detailed Methodology

The methodology section begins with a description of the setting, selection of participants, and potential subject reactivity. An in-depth discussion of the study's design, methods used in data collection, and steps in the data analysis follow.

Setting

This study was conducted at a large state university with graduate programs offering both master's and doctoral degrees. Similar to other departments on campus, the Division of Health and Physical Education offers teaching assistantships to graduate students. Assistantships are awarded based on the Division's teaching needs, financial needs of students, and other needs of the Division (i.e., research or lab assistants). Assistantships are often awarded, however, to graduate students who have no teaching experience, may not be adequately prepared to teach, or may not necessarily be interested in teaching. The assistantship is seen primarily as a financial resource. GAs are typically assigned to teach in the basic instruction program, which consists of physical activity classes taught as introductions to various activities such as tennis, golf, racquetball, and aerobics. These courses are designed to promote fitness and learning of lifetime sports skills.

GAs in this study were given full responsibility for the planning, teaching, and evaluation of students. For

teaching support, each GA was assigned a faculty supervisor who served as a resource person, content area expert, and supervisor. A detailed description of the GAs is provided below.

Selection of Participants

The researcher was interested in observing, understanding, and describing GA's day-to-day teaching life (i.e., their teaching, planning, and content selection). Participants were not informed of the exact purpose of the study because that may have influenced their teaching (Placek, 1984). Selection of the four participants was based on purposeful sampling (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). Experienced and inductee GAs were chosen to examine any hypothesized differences that might have existed as a result of previous college teaching experience. A growing body of research supports differences in teaching as a result of experience and expertise (Berliner, 1986; Borko & Livingston, 1989; Graham, Hopple, Manross, & Sitzman, 1991; Housner & Griffey, 1985; Leinhardt & Greeno, 1985).

Experienced Graduate Assistants

Two experienced GAs were selected based on previous experience teaching college physical education. One teacher, Paul (names of participants have been changed to protect anonymity), had substantial college teaching experience and an undergraduate degree in physical education pedagogy. While the other, Danny, was in his second year of

teaching in the basic instruction program.

Paul

Paul was in his first full-time year of the doctoral program and taught two beginning tennis classes for approximately seventy-five minutes, two times a week. He had extensive college teaching experience from previous work at other universities and from teaching the previous summer in the basic instruction program. Paul was the oldest GA and the one with the most varied background. During the study he was also teaching at a nearby community college and he had previously taught at the high school level and coached soccer. Paul tended to be the busiest of the four GAs. His two teaching jobs, school work, and personal life constantly fought for his time. As the only pedagogy (i.e., teacher preparation) graduate student in the study, Paul had extensive insight into research on effective teaching and the goals of effective instruction.

Danny

Danny was in his second full year of teaching in the basic instruction program and was in the process of obtaining both a master's degree in sport management and an MBA. Danny taught two beginning golf classes, for approximately seventy-five minutes, two times a week, and one weight training class, for approximately fifty minutes, three times a week. Danny was the only GA married and the only participant with an immediate family to consider. With

an undergraduate degree in business marketing, Danny was the only GA with no formal physical education experience prior to graduate study. Despite his lack of formal physical education, Danny did have the strongest athletic background of the four GAs. He had extensive playing experience in golf, basketball, and weight training. Danny's business background heavily influenced his professional life. He felt organization and planning were the two key ingredients to good teaching.

Inductee Graduate Assistants

Two inductees were selected based on their lack of teaching experience and lack of an undergraduate teacher education degree. Inductee GAs were graduate students in their first full year of teaching.

Patty

One of the inductees, Patty, taught one beginning tennis class, for approximately fifty minutes, three times a week. Patty was in her first full year of graduate school and working on her first year of a master's degree in sport management. Graduating early from high school and entering graduate school directly from college, she was younger than the other graduate students and the same age as many of her own students. A varsity college tennis player from a small, liberal arts college, Patty had an undergraduate degree in sports management. Patty was a quarter-time graduate assistant assigned to teach one course for the semester.

Further, she later learned that her assistantship was not to be renewed for the spring semester. An accomplished tennis player, she had recently broken her ankle and was still unable to demonstrate many skills and hit with students. Keeping to herself, she spent little time socializing with other graduate students either in the office or outside of school. In addition, Patty's parents lived less than an hour from campus and she often went home to her parent's when she wasn't teaching. While she had no formal teaching experience in schools, she had taught private tennis lessons during summers and at sports camps. She had also coached both softball and basketball during her summers home from school.

Doris

Doris, the other inductee, taught two modern dance classes, twice a week, for approximately seventy-five minutes. While Doris was also in her first year of teaching, she was completing the second year of her master's degree in exercise physiology. Doris was an outgoing, gregarious person who socialized with other graduate students both inside the office and outside of school. Being on campus the previous year, Doris was familiar with a majority of the faculty and other graduate students. She had an extensive dance background from both her childhood and undergraduate college experience. In addition to her dance background, Doris was a college cheerleader and felt

that helped her perform (i.e., teach) in front of people. While an undergraduate, she had taken several courses related to effective teaching. As a graduate from a large state university in the midwest, she had an undergraduate degree in exercise physiology.

Being a graduate student himself, and having an office space alongside of the four GAs in the graduate student office, the researcher had ample opportunity to informally interact with the participants. Within the basic instructional program, the researcher assumed the title of Assistant Director. As a chief proponent of good teaching in the basic instruction program, the researcher's role and the potential reactive effects of that role are discussed below.

Subject Reactivity

Within the role of Assistant Director, the researcher was responsible for supervising and conducting pre-semester teaching induction workshops, monitoring student evaluation of instruction, and conducting supervisory conferences related to student evaluations. In attempting to minimize any potential reactive effects of his position, the researcher attended several classes taught by each GA at the beginning of the term in order to better establish a relationship with both the students and teachers. When conducting teaching observation sessions, the investigator employed a passive participant observation strategy through

watching, listening, and recording in as much detail as possible (Tousignant & Siedentop, 1983).

Design of Study

A multi-case study approach (Borko & Livingston, 1988; Placek, 1984; Rosenberg, 1990) was used to create four separate descriptive case studies. The multi-case approach was believed to be more useful than a single-subject case study because it provided a broader range of information. The use of a qualitative approach provided insights into individual GA's interpretation and assigned meaning of their teaching environment (Zeichner, 1981). While the inclusion of four subjects provided greater generalizability than a single-subject case study, the results of this study do not necessarily generalize to other departments, institutions, or other GAs.

Use of the four participants allowed a cross-case analysis where each case is built as a comprehensive case in itself. Then each case is compared with the other cases to establish a greater range of generality of the findings (Miles & Huberman, 1984). The intention was to build a general explanation that would fit all the cases even though each case was different.

To increase the validity and reliability of the conclusions, data triangulation (i.e., multiple data collection methods), were used in this study (Denzin, 1970). The four data collection methods (a) interviews, (b) field

notes, (c) videotape records, and (d) questionnaires were intended to discourage biases resulting from reliance on any single method.

The following section provides a detailed discussion of the (a) data collection methods, (b) data analysis, (c) and reporting of results. A more detailed account of interview scripts, videotaping protocol, and the guide used for taking field notes can be found in appendix B, C, and D respectively.

Data Collection Methods

Data were collected from the following four data sources (a) experienced and inductee GAs, (b) faculty supervisors, (c) peer GAs, and (d) students. These different sources of data provided an opportunity to validate findings against other data. That is, an assertion revealed in a student interview may have been strengthened or repudiated by examining GA or faculty interviews. As explained below, data collection methods included interviews, field notes, videotaped records, and background questionnaires. A discussion of each method follows.

Interviews

The purpose of collecting interview data was to provide a vivid description of the self-reported major influences on teaching. All interviews were audiotaped and later transcribed. A description of each interview follows.

Graduate assistant interviews. Each GA was interviewed

ten times (i.e., once before the semester, prior to and following four lessons, and once at the semester end). While basic questions guided each interview (found in appendix B), a rigid script was not followed to allow the researcher to probe particularly salient topics.

The initial pre-semester interview was conducted prior to the beginning of the semester and served as a chance for the researcher and GA to become familiar with each other as well as discuss the schedule for teaching observations and subsequent interviews. Further, this interview served to assess each of their teaching backgrounds.

Pre- and post-teaching interviews were conducted prior to and following observations during the third, sixth, ninth, and twelfth weeks of the semester. These interviews probed teaching, planning, and selection of content of the lesson and how that lesson fit into their overall plan for the semester. Further, these interviews sought to gain an understanding of the GA's reflections about their lesson. The consecutive planning/observation/reflection cycles promoted analysis of the influences of class events and post-teaching reflections on subsequent planning and teaching (Borko & Livingston, 1988).

The final interview, the post-semester interview, was conducted following the end of the semester and served as a wrap-up for the study. This interview probed possible reactive effects the GAs may have had working with the

researcher as well as their thoughts concerning the completion of the course.

Interviews with other sources. In addition to these ten GA interviews, faculty supervisors, peers who taught similar courses, and students from their classes were interviewed. Similar to the GA interviews, a script of these interviews can be found in appendix B.

Faculty and Peer Graduate Assistant Interviews

In addition to students, three faculty supervisors who had direct supervisory contact with the GAs and three peer GAs who taught similar courses were interviewed to assess their perceptions of the teaching, planning, content selection, and major influences on teaching for the participant they were most familiar with. These interviews provided a greater description of the day-to-day teaching life of each participant.

Student Interviews

Two student interviews were completed to gain an increased understanding of the class activities and the student's evaluation of the teacher. Two students of various skill levels (as determined by the researcher's experience with observing physical education) were chosen from the third and ninth week teaching observations and asked to participate in an informal interview immediately following the class to assess how different students viewed the teacher.

Observations

While interview data served to provide an inside perspective (i.e., from those directly involved) of GAS, observations were intended to provide an outside perspective and record of events not easily discussed in interviews (Merriam, 1988). GAS were observed four times over a fifteen week semester.

Field notes and videotape records. One lesson of each was observed, and videotaped, during the third, sixth, ninth, and twelfth week of the semester. This schedule allowed the investigator to observe, describe, and analyze any differences across the semester. The observation videotaping guide can be found in appendix C. Field notes of the lessons taught by each GA were completed, reviewed, and expanded to document the teaching process and serve as a guide for interview questions and as a descriptive account of teacher actions, student actions, contextual factors, as well as the researcher's ideas, hunches, and reflections (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). The observation field notes guide can be found in appendix D.

Questionnaires

To further document influences on teaching, participants were asked to complete a personal history questionnaire which assessed their athletic participation and teaching experience (Rosenberg, 1990). The questionnaire was piloted during the summer before data

collection began and is found in appendix E.

Data from audiotaped transcripts, narrative field notes, and questionnaires were grouped by each GA to develop chronological case records. This was accomplished with a sequential recording of data from the beginning of the study (i.e., the initial interview and questionnaire) through the post-semester interview. The following section describes the data analysis of these chronological cases.

Data Analysis

Data analysis of the chronological cases consisted of what Merriam (1988) called an "inductive comparative strategy." This section describes this strategy while also discussing (a) the eight steps associated with building a case record, (b) determining a category system, (c) coding data, and (d) developing case study profiles for comparison. An hour-glass shape will serve as an illustration of the process undertaken to analyze the data.

It was anticipated that the analysis would generate a grounded theory of how physical education GAs decide how to teach, plan, and determine the content they will teach. Glaser and Stauss (1967) defined a grounded theory as one that is generated from collected data and derived from its close correspondence with reality (i.e., what "makes sense" from the data).

The "inductive comparative strategy" included using both inductive analysis and constant comparison methods.

Inductive analysis is the strategy for identifying patterns, categories, and themes from the data (Patton, 1980).

Constant comparison is the strategy allowing constant comparison of identified categories across instances of occurrences (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). In other words, as data are analyzed, each incident is coded and compared to the emerging (i.e., emerging from concurrent data analysis) categories of data, or the existing (i.e., predetermined from research hypotheses) categories of data. Merriam (1988) provided a wonderfully straightforward illustration of this process:

Consider the task of sorting two hundred food items found in a grocery store. By comparing one item with another, you could classify the two hundred items into any number of categories. Starting with a box of cereal, for example, you could ask whether the next item, an orange, is like the first. Obviously not. There are now two piles into which the next item may or may not be placed. By this process you can sort all the items into categories of your choice. One scheme may separate the items into fresh, frozen, canned, or packaged goods. Or you could divide them by color, weight, or price. More likely, you would divide the items into common grocery store categories: meat, dairy, produce, canned goods, and so on. These categories would be fairly comprehensive classes, each

of which could be further subdivided. Produce, for example, includes fruits and vegetables. Fruits include citrus and noncitrus, domestic and exotic. All these schemes emerge logically from the data, that is, the food items. (p. 132)

Steps In The Data Analysis Process

The data analysis process essentially involved eight steps which can be related to the shape of an hour-glass. The following discussion concerning building a case record, determining the category system, coding data, and developing case study profiles for comparison is associated with the development of grounded theory and taken from several sources including Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Erickson, 1986; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Merriam, 1988; Patton, 1980; Spradley, 1980; Taylor & Bogdan, 1984.

Building a case record. First, similar to the large top of the hour-glass, data for each of the four GAs were gathered together. This first step of gathering data, included organizing interview transcripts and field notes of observations to produce a case record for each GA. This case record was essentially a large stack of paper detailing the major influences on their teaching.

Reducing the data. The second step, similar to moving toward the smaller section of the hour-glass, involved reading completely through each of the four case records while taking notes and recording hunches. Goetz and

LeCompte (1984) refer to this stage as "the researcher virtually holding a conversation with the data, asking questions of it, making comments, and so on" (p. 191). This is known as reducing the data because the process involved selection of specific major topics within the large case record.

Determining a category system. The third step, similar to moving into the smaller section of the hour-glass, involved condensing the notes taken from the case record reading. This condensing formed a rough outline of a category system to classify the data. The researcher searched for regularities and patterns in the data. In the constant comparison method, data are compared to emerging and/or existing categories. The categories were designed around "internal homogeneity," where data belong and hold to a certain category (Patton, 1980). At the same time, categories were designed to have "external heterogeneity," where differences between categories are clear (Patton, 1980). The data were categorized by concepts, explicit statements made by the GAs, and hypothesized themes posited by the researcher. Additional methods used to inform selection of the categories were frequency of similar and unique responses from GAs and themes established to reflect the purpose of the study.

Coding the data. Based on the category system explained above, the fourth step involved the actual coding

of the data. Similar to the smallest section of the hour-glass, coding involved the constant comparison of new and existing data with an eye toward category construction. This process involved reading completely through each case record and assigning codes to "units of data" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). These "units of data" included sections (i.e., sentences or paragraphs) of interview transcripts, field notes, and questionnaire data.

Cutting and pasting. The fifth step, similar to staying in the smallest section of the hour-glass, involved using The Ethnograph an automated coding, search and retrieval computer software package (Seidal & Clark, 1984). Transcripts of audiotaped interviews, narrative field notes, videotaped records, and questionnaires were entered into a computer in their original form. The Ethnograph was then used as an automated "cut and paste" tool to manage and manipulate the data. Coded data were collected for each assertion (i.e., themes and hypotheses from the data).

Accepting/rejecting assertions. In the sixth step, to expedite the data analysis process, four artists sketch pads (i.e., one 18" X 24" pad for each GA) were used to act as a story board for the cutting and pasting. Following procedures outlined by Graham et al. (1991), separate pages were used for each assertion. The sketch pads provided an easily read accumulation of evidence for each assertion or group of assertions. Based on the interviews, field notes,

videotape records, and questionnaires, eleven initial assertions were made regarding teaching, planning, and content selection employed by the veteran and inductee GAs. Through continual analysis, six assertions remained after elimination, confirmation, and combination of the initial eleven assertions.

Developing case study profiles. The seventh step, moving toward the large bottom section of the hour-glass, involved developing individual case study profiles of each GA based on the major themes and assertions generated from the data. Case study profiles for each teacher were developed from the data provided on the sketch pads.

Comparisons across cases. The eighth and final step, similar to the bottom large section of the hour-glass, involved the comparison of similarities and differences across the four GAs. Based on the purpose of this study and the data generated from analysis, cross-case comparisons were made based on the accumulated evidence on the sketch pads. Case studies were compared across all four teachers to develop more generalized conclusions (Miles & Huberman, 1984).

Data Reporting

In reporting the data, common themes, assertions, and unusual deviations between the four GAs were reported to help explain the major influences on teaching and better describe the teaching process for each GA. Erickson (1986)

suggested several potential categories areas of data reporting including, answers to comparable questions, interesting observed behaviors, quotes from field notes, and quotes from interviews to serve as areas of discussion.

As mentioned previously, data from audiotaped transcripts, narrative field notes, videotaped records, and questionnaires were grouped by instructor to develop chronological case records. The sequential recording of data from the beginning of the study through the post-semester interview allowed the analysis of events, by instructor, over time.

In addition to chronological case records, all data sources were used to arrange responses according to global assertions generated from the data analysis and each major research question specified prior to data analysis. More specifically, in order to answer:

1. What is the impact of a teaching induction program on the GAs use of a model of effective teaching presented as part of a presemester week-long workshop?

Data were searched for key codes such as influences, supervision, experience, and students. Responses were searched through all data sources allowing a vivid description of the potential impact of the teaching induction program.

To address question number two:

2. What are the major factors influencing how these

GAs teach?

Data were searched for key codes such as influences, teaching, experience, and students. Responses were searched through all data sources allowing a vivid description of the potential influences on GA teaching.

To address question number three:

3. What are the teaching similarities, and differences, between these four GAs?

Data were searched for key codes such as teaching, students, and organization. These searches provided data specific to the teaching of each GA.

To address question number four:

4. What are the planning similarities and differences, between these four GAs?

Data were searched for key codes such as planning, resources, and organization. These searches provided data specific to the planning of each GA.

5. What are the similarities and differences between the ways these four GAs decide on the content of their lessons?

Data were searched for key codes such as content, students, and experience. These searches provided data specific to the content selection of each GA.

Because data were displayed on the large spiral-bound sketch pads, original data were able to be continually reviewed and refined. Further, assertions, along with the

original coding were continuously cross-checked against all other data sources to search for confirming evidence and disconfirming evidence based on the global assertions generated from the data. Through analysis of field notes and personal hunches, as well as openness to the fact that the initial research hypotheses served as assertion guides, not defensible truths, several areas not originally identified (i.e., time burdens and definitions of good teaching) emerged as powerful assertions as the study unfolded. The approach employed in this study, starting with a broad array of problems and interests and then "see how it goes" had the advantage of allowing the researcher to stay away from a "psychological set," where one closes off their mind to divergent thinking and imposes a rigid structure to the study (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This study was intended to remain open to new and unique relationships that only the data could reveal.

Summary

Use of four data sources in this study enhanced the descriptive nature of the findings as well as provided a stronger basis for validity. Any of the data sources (i.e., veteran and inductee GAs, faculty supervisors, peer GAs, and students) alone would limit the accuracy and amount of information collected (Placek, 1984). The data analysis focused on interviews, field notes, videotape records and questionnaires assessed observed teaching and the underlying

influences on teaching. This study sought to vividly describe the day-to-day teaching life of four GAs teaching in a university physical education basic instruction program.

Appendix B

Pre-Semester Interview Guide

This initial interview was conducted one time for each GA by the researcher prior to the beginning of the semester and during the GA induction program. This interview served as a chance for the researcher and GAs to become familiar with each other as well as provide the opportunity to discuss the schedule for teaching observations and subsequent interviews. Whenever appropriate, I used non-directive probes (i.e., anything else?, can you tell me more about that?) following each of the initial questions. The intent of these probes was to help the participant expand on his/her answers without putting ideas in their head. In most cases, you'll find these non-directive probes with the specific probes in the interview protocol.

The following questions guided the pre-semester interview:

1. As you know, I will be observing you four times throughout the semester. Is four times enough to get an adequate picture of how you teach?
2. Tell me about the way you will teach this course?

Probes: (USE THE FOLLOWING APPROPRIATE PROBES)
 How does your previous teaching/coaching experience influence your teaching?
 How does your undergraduate teacher preparation degree influence your teaching?
 How does your athletic experience influence your teaching?
 What other factors influence your teaching?
 How?

3. How important, considering your other responsibilities, is teaching in your graduate life?

Probe: How would you prioritize teaching related to your graduate coursework, research, and family life?
 How does that influence your teaching?
 Why do you say that?

4. How will you determine the content you plan to teach?

Probes: What resources do you plan to use to help you determine the content to be taught?
 Have you spoken with other GAs or faculty members?

5. How will you plan for the semester/lesson?

Probes: What resources will help you as you plan?
 Who was responsible for a majority of the
 information you used in planning for this
 course?
 What about other GAs or faculty members?

6. What other factors haven't we discussed do you believe influence the way you will teach?

Probe: How?

Pre-Teaching Interview Guide

The pre-teaching interview was conducted with each GA prior to observing classes taught in the third, sixth, ninth, and twelfth weeks of the semester. The goal of these interviews was to gain as complete an understanding as possible of the GA's planning and organization of the subsequent lesson and how that fit into their plan for the semester.

The following questions guided the pre-teaching interview:

1. What will be happening in the lesson I'm observing today?

Probes: What will the students be doing?
 What will you be doing?

2. Tell me about the way you planned for today's lesson?

Probes: What do you think the biggest influences are on your planning?
 Why?
 Do you have a written lesson plan for today?
 May I have a copy of it?
 How will you use that plan?

3. How does today's lesson fit into the overall semester?

Probes: Have your plans changed since your initial planning?
 How?
 Why do you think they've changed?
 Did the last class session influence your planning for today?
 How?

4. How did you determine the content you plan to teach today?

Probes: How did your thinking about the students influence the content you selected?

What resources did you use to select the content?

Why did you use these resources?

How did you use them?

How did you find out about these resources?

How often have you previously taught this content or a similar content?

5. Is there anything or anybody else you can think of that influenced your planning for today's lesson?

Probes: What about talking with other GAs or faculty members?

Post-Teaching Interview Guide

The post-teaching interview was conducted following each teaching observation. The goal of this interview was to gain as complete an understanding as possible of GA's reflections about the lesson.

The following questions guide the post-teaching interview:

1. Did you do anything differently today than you had planned?

Probes: What? Why?

2. What impact did the students behavior have on your teaching?

Probe: Why?

(FOR THE NEXT SERIES OF QUESTIONS: THE OBSERVER RECORDS AND ASKS QUESTIONS REGARDING EXAMPLES, ACTIVITIES, GROUPINGS, TEACHING BEHAVIORS, STUDENT BEHAVIORS, CLASS PATTERNS, CONTENT TAUGHT, ETC.)

3. I noticed you did _____ (BLANK FILLED IN BY OBSERVER FROM FIELD NOTES), I was wondering why you did that?

Probes: Where did you learn to do that?
How do you know when to do that?

4. How well did the lesson go?

Probes: Why do you say that?
What factors influence your decisions concerning a good or bad lesson?

5. How will today's lesson affect how you teach tomorrow, if at all?

Probe: Why?

6. If you were able to go back and teach this lesson over again, what would you change?

Probes: Why?

Post-Semester Interview Guide

This last interview was conducted one time for each GA following the end of the term. The goal of this interview was to gain as complete an understanding as possible of any reactive effects the GAs may have had working with the researcher.

The following questions guide the post-semester interview:

1. Did your participation in this research project, in general, have any effect on your teaching or planning?

Probes: What exactly was affected?
Why do you think that is?

2. Did my presence as the researcher in your class have any effect on your teaching or planning?

Probes: How exactly were you affected?
Why do you think that is?

3. How was your teaching influenced by the pre-semester workshop that the Division provided?

Probes: Why?
What specifically did you find helpful?
What specifically did you find to be not very helpful?

4. Looking back, what were the biggest influences on your teaching this semester?

Probes: Why?
What about other GAs and faculty members?

5. Looking back, what were the biggest influences on what you taught this semester?

Probes: How?
What about other GAs and faculty members?

6. How did your graduate student responsibilities influence your teaching performance?

Probe: How would you prioritize teaching compared with

your graduate courses and research?

Student Interview Guide

A sample group of two or three students from the third and ninth week teaching observations was interviewed. Contact the students following the teaching observation and ask them to participate in an informal interview prior to the next class meeting. The goal of these eight (i.e., two student groups for each GA) interviews was to assess student views concerning the priority or importance of teaching to the GA.

The following questions guide these interviews:

1. Tell me about this class?

Probes: Why have you enjoyed it so far?
How could it be better?

2. Tell me about how _____ (OBSERVER FILLS IN BLANK WITH GA'S NAME) teaches.

Probes: Why do you think _____ teaches that way?
What do you think are the major forces that influence the way _____ teaches?

3. How important do you think teaching is to _____ ?

Probes: Why do you say that?
What specifically has _____ done for you to say that?

4. How do you evaluate _____ teaching performance?

Probe: Why do you say that?
What specifically has _____ done for you to say that?

Faculty Interview Guide

A sample of three faculty members (i.e., administrators and area coordinators in the basic program) was interviewed to assess faculty views concerning the priority or importance of teaching to the GA. Selected appropriate faculty members was based on their direct contact with the GAs.

Questions guiding the faculty interviews include:

1. Tell me about _____ (OBSERVER FILLS IN BLANK WITH GA'S NAME) class?

Probes: Why have the students enjoyed it so far?

How could it be better?

2. Tell me about how _____ teaches.

Probes: Why do you think _____ teaches that way?
What do you think are the major forces that influence the way _____ teaches?

3. How important do you think teaching is to _____ ?

Probes: Why do you say that?
What specifically has _____ done for you to say that?

4. How do you evaluate _____ teaching performance?

Probe: Why do you say that?
What specifically has _____ done for you to say that?

5. How often did _____ seek help from you or use another faculty as a resource?

Probes: Why do you think that is?

6. How much time do you think _____ spends preparing to teach?

Probes: What specifically has _____ done for you to say that?

7. How much effort does _____ put into teaching his/her class?

Probes: What specifically has _____ done for you to say that?

8. How much effort does _____ expend in other areas such as his/her own research or coursework?

Probes: What specifically has _____ done for you to say that?

Peer Group GA Interviews

A sample of three peer group GAs (i.e., other GAs teaching in the basic program who were not in this study) were interviewed to assess the peer group GA's views concerning the priority or importance of teaching to each of the four GAs.

Questions guiding the peer group GA interviews include:

1. Tell me about _____ (OBSERVER FILLS IN BLANK WITH

GA'S NAME) class?

Probes: Why have the students enjoyed it so far?
How could it be better?

2. Tell me about how _____ teaches.

Probes: Why do you think _____ teaches that way?
What do you think are the major forces that influence the way _____ teaches?

3. How important do you think teaching is to _____ ?

Probes: Why do you say that?
What specifically has _____ done for you to say that?

4. How do you evaluate _____ teaching performance?

Probe: Why do you say that?
What specifically has _____ done for you to say that?

5. How often did _____ seek help from you or use another GA or faculty member as a resource?

Probes: Why do you think that is?

6. How much time do you think _____ spends preparing to teach?

Probes: What specifically has _____ done for you to say that?

7. How much effort does _____ put into teaching his/her class?

Probes: What specifically has _____ done for you to say that?

8. How much effort does _____ expend in other areas such as his/her own research or coursework?

Probes: What specifically has _____ done for you to say that?

Appendix C
Teaching Observation Guide
Videotape Record

The focus of this study was the observation, description, and analysis of the major factors which influence the teaching, planning, and content selection of the four GAs. In order to do this, GA was observed and recorded via videotape and field note narratives. When preparing for a teaching observation I was present at least twenty minutes before class time in order to set-up the necessary equipment. The necessary equipment included:

- One Videotape Camera
- One Blank Videotape
- One Audiocassette Tape Recorder
- One Blank Audiocassette
- One Extension Cord
- One Wireless Microphone with Receiver Unit
- AA Batteries for the Wireless Microphone
- One TV Monitor
- One Tripod Camera Stand

The equipment was set-up to allow easy access to the filming of the instructor without disrupting the normal class activities. The videotape camera stayed focused on the instructor with teacher talk monitored via the TV monitor to allow narrative descriptions during the observation. This videotape record served as a permanent record of teaching and allowed me the opportunity to replay the tape and further analyze teaching events.

Appendix D

Classroom Narrative Guide
Field Notes

During each observation, a narrative record of the class was developed which focused on the sequential events of the class and allowed me to provide my own insights and impressions. The field notes included:

Classroom Demographics and Descriptive Information

Instructor:

Course Title:

Time:

Number of Students:

Gender of Students:

Location:

Weather concerns or other contextual factors:

Classroom Map:

Physical Arrangements:

Design of Gym/Courts/etc.:

The field notes themselves included two parts. On the left side of the notebook the sequential events of the lesson were recorded in as much detail as possible. Because of this time consuming task, the focus was on the teaching and content selection employed by the instructor. This descriptive account monitored time, instructional events, and content selected and sought to describe the lesson without any bias or subjectivity.

On the right side of the notebook I recorded my insights and impressions of the lesson and noted questions to ask during the post-teaching interview. This served as the time when I selected appropriate students to be used in the student interviews. These insights included the relevant activities that "filled-in the blanks" for my post-teaching and post-semester interviews.

Following each observation and post-teaching interview I returned to my notebook to expand my field notes and record thoughts and comments in my personal research log concerning the pre- and post-teaching interviews, the teaching observation, and the lesson itself.

Appendix E
Graduate Assistant Teaching Background Questionnaire

1. Your Name _____
2. Please list any classes you teach or have taught here at Va. Tech: _____, _____, _____, _____, _____.
3. Please list any classes or activities you have taught outside of Va. Tech. (i.e., other schools, summer camps, private lessons, etc.):
 _____, _____, _____,
 _____, _____, _____.
4. What is your graduate major? _____.
5. What was your undergraduate major? _____.
 From what school? _____.
6. Did you acquire a teaching certificate as an undergraduate? _____. If so, did you teach? _____. How long? _____.
7. How much teaching have you done outside of your GA responsibilities here at Va. Tech?
8. Did you participate on any High School or College athletic teams? _____. If so, please list the sports:
9. Have you participated in any intramural sports, clubs, or leagues in or out of school? _____. If so, please list the sports:
10. Do you regularly practice any type of sport or physical activity? _____. If so, please list the sports:
11. Did you in the past regularly practice any type of sport or physical activity? _____. If so, please list the sports:
12. Have you ever coached a team? _____. If so, please list the sport(s):
13. Have you ever received any formal instruction (i.e., camps or certification programs) on how to teach or coach sports, games or activities? _____. If so, please list the sport(s):

Appendix F
1990-1991 GA Teaching Induction Workshop

Monday, 20 August

9:00 - 11:00 Opening/Introductions for GAs teaching in the Activity Program plus University and Division Policies
 11:00 - 2:00 Lunch Break
 2:00 - 5:00 Meet at NRCC for Ropes Course/Initiatives
 5:00 - 8:00 GA Get Together

Tuesday, 21 August

9:00 - 11:00 Planning Effective Physical Education Instruction (Part I)
 11:00 - 1:00 Lunch Break
 1:00 - 4:00 Evaluating Effective Physical Education Instruction, Test Construction, Student Evaluations, and Computerized Grading Procedures
 7:00 - 10:00 GA Pool Party

Wednesday, 22 August

9:00 - 11:00 Opening/Introductions for all Graduate Students plus University and Division Policies.
 11:00 - 1:00 Lunch Break
 1:00 - 5:00 Presenting Effective Physical Education Instruction, Effective Teaching Skills, Small-Group Discussions, Group Interaction, and Practice Teaching (Part I)

Thursday, 23 August

9:00 - 12:00 Presenting Effective Physical Education Instruction, Peer Teaching (Part II)
 12:00 - 2:00 Lunch Break
 2:00 - 5:00 Consultation Session with Individual Teachers and Faculty Supervisors

Friday, 24 August

9:00 - 11:00 Review/Wrap-Up Session, Team Planning, Consultation Sessions with Faculty
 11:00 - 1:00 Lunch Break
 1:00 - 2:00 Planning Effective Physical Education Instruction (Part II)
 2:00 - 5:00 CPR Certification Session

VITA

Jon Richard Poole was born in San Diego, California on the 18th of June, 1962. After attending schools in both California and Louisiana, he completed his undergraduate degree at Colorado State University. Graduating with a Bachelor of Science in Exercise Science, he worked for a couple of years in various fitness centers and substitute taught in secondary schools.

In 1986 he enrolled at Virginia Tech to obtain a Master's of Science degree in Motor Behavior/Sports Studies. Completed in 1988, he remained at Virginia Tech to work on his Doctorate in Education Curriculum and Instruction: Physical Education Pedagogy. Upon completion, he and his wife Kathleen will be residing in Salt Lake City, Utah, where he will serve as an Assistant Professor at the University of Utah within the Department of Exercise and Sport Science.