1-1-1979

Faculty attitudes toward teaching : a descriptive interview-based study of three departments of physical education.

James A. Rog
University of Massachusetts Amherst

FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD TEACHING: A DESCRIPTIVE INTERVIEW-BASED STUDY OF THREE DEPARTMENTS OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

A Dissertation Presented

by

JAMES ALLEN ROG

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

May 1979

Education

FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD TEACHING: A DESCRIPTIVE INTERVIEW-BASED STUDY OF THREE DEPARTMENTS OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

By

JAMES ALLEN ROG

Approved as to style and content by:

Lawrence F. Locke, Chairperson of Committee

Fern L. Johnson, Member

Sheryl Riechmann, Member

Frank N. Rife, Member

Mario Fantini, Dean
School of Education

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

One of the more pleasant tasks of scholarship is the public thanking of those who have helped in the course of the research and writing. Although there were times when I felt desperately alone in the task, there were far more moments of support and understanding.

My wife, Donna Burtner Rog, contributed in more ways than I can identify. She moved with me through the demand imposed by each stage of the work; caring, bolstering and responding throughout. She typed each draft and gave countless hours to other work and household chores so that I could write. Her love, energy and encouragement have made the difference.

Each committee member contributed in different ways and at different times, but each contribution was valued. Larry Locke provided thoughtful and precise criticism throughout all phases of the dissertation. His unwavering concern for high quality writing will remain with me forever. Fern Johnson gave needed support and expertise in the early design of the study. Sheryl Riechmann provided the initial incentive to engage in this task and increased my sensitivity to the personal issues that accompanied my involvement in the study. Frank Rife gave of his time, friendship and energy in the critical coding stages of the work. His acceptance of the role as independent coder added strength and clarity to the final product.

Finally, to Craig and Aaron, who helped provide a home atmosphere that was conducive to writing. Their patience when my moods were poor and temper short will always be treasured. I only hope that my time spent on this task has not cost them.

FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD TEACHING: A DESCRIPTIVE INTERVIEW-BASED STUDY OF THREE DEPARTMENTS OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

(May, 1979)

James Allen Rog, B.S., M.Ed., Kent State University
Ed.D., University of Massachusetts

Directed by Lawrence F. Locke, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

In order to explore the attitudes toward teaching held by physical education faculty members at the state university level, 40 full-time physical education faculty were interviewed using an in-depth interview procedure. The subjects were from three departments of physical education located in three different state universities. The level at which degrees were offered was seen as a likely factor in attracting or shaping faculty with differing views about teaching. Therefore, one department (Dept. A) was selected in which the terminal degree was a bachelor's degree; one (Dept. B) was selected in which the terminal degree was a master's degree and one (Dept. C) was selected in which the terminal degree was a doctorate. In all, 40 of the 42 eligible faculty agreed to be subjects for the study.

Each subject was asked to complete a questionnaire which was designed to solicit background information and to probe the subjects' perception of teaching. For the interview itself, each subject was asked the same set of questions covering four topical areas: general teaching situation, teaching effectiveness, rewards for teaching and

teaching improvement. The interviews all were tape-recorded.

During the pilot study, a coding system was devised whereby the open-ended responses from the interview could be categorized and tabulated for analysis. Inter-coder agreement between the author and an independent coder was established for each question in 13 of the 40 interviews. The overall inter-coder agreement was .83 with individual question agreement ranging from 1.0 to .61. Results were reported in terms of frequencies with excerpts from the interviews used to enrich the data.

Results

Overall, physical education faculty in this study:

1. Expressed an interest in teaching that was greater than their interest in research, publication or coaching.

2. Attempted to achieve two major instructional purposes:

   a) To encourage student interest and enthusiasm for an area of study

   b) To provide students with subject matter knowledge

3. Did not identify the central pedagogical skills of planning, teaching methods and evaluation as important competencies they needed as teachers.

4. Viewed the competencies they did identify as being self-taught and acquired by informal means.

5. Depended almost entirely upon students for data on which to determine their teaching effectiveness.

Response patterns to several questionnaire and interview items varied widely among the three departments. Some of the more important

areas are presented below:

1. Research and writing for publication were not important to faculty from Department A; were slightly important to faculty from Department B; and were important to faculty from Department C.

2. Teaching was not viewed as being important for personnel decisions or adequately rewarded in Department A. It was viewed as important and adequately rewarded in Department B, but was viewed as having mixed value for personnel decisions and rewards in Department C.

3. Faculties from Departments A and B perceived informal learning experiences to be the source of competencies needed to be effective teachers, while faculty from Department C viewed their competencies as being developed through formal learning experiences.

4. Faculties from Department A and C felt that increasing the rewards for teaching would improve the quality of teaching in their departments. Faculty from Department B, where teaching was perceived as most rewarded, did not agree with this position.

Conclusions

1. Teaching is an individual activity nurtured and developed by the physical education faculty member alone.

2. The individualistic nature of teaching increases the complexity of attempting to improve teaching.

3. Departments do not intentionally attempt to socialize faculty into particular roles as teachers.

4. Leadership does make a difference in the value placed on teaching in departments and across the institution.

5. The physical education faculty express views on teaching which are similar to other faculty in higher education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iv

ABSTRACT vi

LIST OF TABLES xii

Chapter

I INTRODUCTION 1

Importance of Attitudes 3
Need and Justification of Research 7
Purpose of the Study 9
Definition of Terms 10
Design of the Study 11
Study Population 12
Coding Reliability 12
Reporting Results 13

II REVIEW OF LITERATURE 14

General Findings 14
The Status of Teaching 17
Institutional Differences 20
Determining Teacher Effectiveness 27
Physical Education Faculty 30

III METHODOLOGY 35

Subjects 35
Advantages and Disadvantages of Interview Studies . . 37
Data Collection and Instrumentation 40
Pilot Study 43
Coding Procedures 45
Coding Reliability 47
Reporting Results 48

IV RESULTS 50

SECTION 1: Departmental Profiles 50
SECTION 2: Questionnaire Results 52
SECTION 3: Departmental Responsibilities 67
SECTION 4: Purposes, Competencies and Strengths . . 84
SECTION 5: Teacher Effectiveness 89
SECTION 6: Status of Teaching 98
SECTION 7: Image as Teachers 113
SECTION 8: Improvement of Teaching 123

V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 137

Summary of Findings 137
Discussions and Conclusions 147

BIBLIOGRAPHY 155

APPENDIX A 163

APPENDIX B 166

APPENDIX C 171

APPENDIX D 175

APPENDIX E 189

APPENDIX F 205

LIST OF TABLES

1. "Do Your Interests Lie Primarily in Teaching or Research?" by Type and Quality of Institution (U.S.A.) 24
2. Rank Order of Faculty Subculture Groups on Selected Variables 32
3. Subjects' Departmental Affiliation 53
4. Sex of Subjects 53
5. Age of Subjects 54
6. Rank of Subjects 55
7. Degree Held by Subjects 56
8. Number of Years Subjects Held a Salaried Position at Their Present Institution 57
9. Number of Years Since Subjects Completed Their Last Professional Degree 58
10. Tenure Status of Subjects 59
11. Primary Teaching Area of Subjects 60
12. Subjects' Interest in Teaching When Compared to Research . . 63
13. Subjects' Interest in Teaching When Compared to Writing for Publication 65
14. Subjects' Interest in Teaching When Compared to Coaching . . 66
15. Subjects' Major Responsibilities 69
16. Subjects' Most Satisfying Responsibility 71
17. Sources of Dissatisfaction 73
18. Subjects Teaching a Course(s) They Prefer not to Teach . . . 77
19. Subjects' Reasons for Not Wanting to Teach a Course 78
20. Subjects' Desire to Teach a Course They Were Not Now Teaching 80
21. Subjects' Most Satisfying Course 81
22. Why Favorite Course was Satisfying 83
23. Purposes Subjects Try to Achieve as Teachers 85
24. Competencies Needed by Subjects to Achieve Stated Purpose . . 87
25. How Subjects Felt Their Competencies were Developed 88
26. Subjects' Greatest Strength as a Teacher 90
27. Subjects' Perceived Effectiveness as a Teacher 91
28. Processes Subjects Use to Determine the Effectiveness of Their Teaching 93
29. Process Providing Subjects with the Most Accurate Assessment of Their Teaching Effectiveness 96
30. How Subjects Came to See Themselves as Effective or Ineffective Teachers 97
31. Subjects' Perception of the Importance of Teaching for Promotion, Tenure and Personnel Decisions in Their Department 99

32. Subjects' Perception of How Well Teaching is Rewarded in Their Department 102
33. Reasons Perceived for Relative Importance of Teaching . . . 104
34. Subjects' Status in Regards to Research or Publication . . . 107
35. "No One Can Be A Good Teacher Unless He/She is Actively Involved in Research" 109
36. Perceived Rewards for Teaching, Other than Promotion, Tenure, Advancement 112
37. What Subjects Would Like Colleagues to Say About Them as Teachers 114
38. What Subjects Would Like Students to Say About Them as Teachers 115
39. Subjects' Philosophy of Teaching 118
40. Subjects' Perception of What Students Want From Them 122
41. Characteristics Subjects Sought in Students Enrolled in Their Class 124
42. Types of Changes Made by Subjects in Attempts to Improve Their Courses 126
43. Sources of Help for Improving Teaching 128
44. Time Spent on Development of Teaching Competencies 130
45. Ways Subjects Might Make Teaching a More Viable Activity in Their Departments 131
46. Things the Department Might Do to Better Support Teaching . 133
47. Will Increasing the Rewards Available for Teaching Increase the General Quality of Teaching in this Department? 135
48. Number of Hours Subjects Spend on Job Related Activities . . 189
49. Size of School from Which Subjects Received Their Latest Degree 190
50. Number of Higher Education Institutions Where Subjects Held a Salaried Position 191
51. Total Number of Years Subjects Held a Salaried Position in Higher Education 192
52. Approximate Number of Students from Various Levels Enrolled in Subjects' Courses 193
53. Number of Different Classes Subjects were Meeting this Term 195
54. Number of Different Courses (Not Sections) Subjects were Teaching this Term 196
55. Number of Hours Subjects Spend Teaching Activities for Undergraduate Students 197
56. Number of Hours Subjects Spend Teaching Activities for Graduate Students 198
57. Subjects' Teaching Assignment by Student Level 199
58. Subjects' Involvement in Coaching 200
59. Number of Subjects who had Taken a Course or Workshop that Dealt Specifically with Teaching in Higher Education 201

60. Number of Subjects who had Taken a Course or Workshop that Focused on Group Dynamics 202
61. Number of Days Each Academic Year Subjects were Away from Campus Attending Professional Activities 203

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

As pressure for quality teaching in higher education persists, faculty and administrators will continue to be faced with the inherent problems and issues evoked by that concern. If substantial changes are to occur as a result of the pressure for better quality teaching, more must be learned about faculty members as teachers. More importantly, there is a need to study the specific characteristics represented in various faculty sub-populations.

One reason for our present lack of adequate information concerning instruction in higher education is that faculty have operated in relative isolation and autonomy in performing their teaching responsibilities. Teaching has been a happening between them and their students. It has not been systematically observed, evaluated, or developed. Thus, teaching exists as a highly personal endeavor, nurtured and developed by the individual faculty member alone.

Undergraduate teaching is not "a true profession" (Sanford, 1971, p. 359). There exists little formal training in teaching for faculty, either before employment or once on the job. University faculty do not identify themselves with teaching but rather identify themselves with their particular discipline or department. One reason for this is that traditional graduate programs are directed toward research and a narrow specialization within an academic discipline. With such a focus, grad-

uate training instills in the future faculty member those behaviors which are least conducive to teaching undergraduates. (Mandelbaum, 1975, p. 24).

Teaching, although verbally acknowledged as a major responsibility both by faculty and by their administrators, generally is not so weighted as a criterion for personnel decisions. In addition, teaching improvement is given little priority as an activity by institutions, departments or individuals. Eble, in discussions with hundreds of professors, found comparatively ". . . few inclined toward developing teaching as an art or themselves primarily as teachers" (1972, p. 24).

Faculty have not been encouraged, during their training or during their employment, to engage in intellectual activities related to understanding their students, their institutions or their profession. Gaff provides a pointed summary of this situation.

> Our colleges and universitites are now staffed by faculty who, in general, have never studied the history of their profession, are unfamiliar with the topography of the educational landscape, are unaware of the professional literature in higher education and have never been expected to formulate systematically their own philosophies of education or their views about teaching and learning. (1975, p. 16).

Faculty of today are in greater need than ever to understand issues related to their teaching. Recent proliferation of faculty development programs expounding changes for faculty, current decline in faculty mobility, prolonged institutional tenure, a retrenchment atmosphere on campuses and other pressures have created conditions in which many professors admit to "a pervasive unease and confusion" a "lack of professional identity" and a "sense of vulnerability" (Freedman & Sandford, 1973, pp. 3, 13). There is ample reason for faculty to be concerned.

Institutions are in a personnel marketing position that favors making demands for better faculty productivity and performance; institutions are being pressured to do so. As Gaff notes, "High quality and excellence in teaching have become more than ideas; they have become survival skills, both for individuals and organizations" (1976, pp. vii-i).

Importance of Attitudes

If efforts to improve the quality and effectiveness of teaching are to succeed, it is imperative that the attitudes faculty hold toward their own teaching, teaching-related activities, improvement of teaching, teaching effectiveness and other related issues be explored. As Stanford states, "the best laid plans for academic reform will go awry unless they accord with faculty attitudes and wishes" (1971, pp. 369-370). We cannot afford to guess about attitudes faculty hold; we need to investigate them. Without a foundation of basic information from faculty themselves, it is highly unlikely that progress will be made in the improvement of teaching in higher education.

Research studies focused on technical and methodological aspects of teaching, teaching effectiveness, faculty-student relations and evaluation of teaching are numerous, but studies which seek information from faculty relative to their attitudes toward such issues or toward themselves as teachers are rare (Wilkerson, 1977). Although the former studies are important for the acquisition of information about teaching improvement, the latter studies must be done if the acquired information is to be used. For example, recent research on teaching methods

suggests strongly that Personalized Self-Instruction (PSI) is a promising method for enhancing learning for college-age students (Cole 1978, p. 64), yet few faculty or departments have even begun to develop courses of this design.

Unless current attitudes of faculty are examined and subsequent strategies developed to enhance or change these attitudes, a serious void will exist in the change process. We need to know what faculty consider effective teaching, what competencies they see as necessary to achieve their instructional purposes and what their instructional purposes really are. It is reasonable to believe that many faculty consider their teaching to be more than adequate and feel no real pressure to engage in improvement efforts beyond those in which they are presently engaged.

Specific Focus

Although teaching represents one of the major responsibilities for faculty in deparments of physical education, the professional physical educator as teacher is an unknown quantity in higher education. We know very little concerning how these faculty feel about their teaching responsibility or how committed they are to this responsibility. We are not even sure if prospective physical education faculty recognize that teaching is a major responsibility in their intended career.

There are six major areas of instruction that often are found in departments of physical education. They are: (1) Professional Preparation (Methods, Curriculum, Administration and Activity courses); (2)

Exercise Science (Kinesiology, Anatomy and Exercise Physiology courses); (3) Sports Studies (Psychology, Philosophy, and Sociology of Sport courses); (4) Leisure Studies (Recreation, Camping and Outdoor Education courses); (5) Coaching (Psychology, Philosophy and Methods of Coaching courses); and (6) General Physical Education (Activity courses such as golf, tennis, volleyball and swimming taught for the general college student population).

Faculty who enter the field primarily to coach usually teach coaching methods, general physical education and professional preparation activity courses. They usually do not pursue a doctorate nor do they see teaching as their primary function. In larger programs the coaching faculty often are housed in an athletic department and serve the physical education department as adjunct faculty.

The professional preparation faculty usually specialize in a specific areas such as curriculum, methods or administration. They are hired to teach their speciality, but also are requested to teach activity courses and in some circumstances, to coach. In some small departments a master's degree may be acceptable, but in the larger programs, especially those with graduate students, a doctorate is required. Many of these faculty do not wish to coach or to teach activity courses. They prefer to spend their time pursuing academic areas of special interest. They may publish and on rare occasions engage in research.

Faculty in leisure studies follow a similar pattern to those in professional preparation. They do less coaching but are involved in many recreation and outdoor education activity courses. Doctorates

often are required, especially in programs which service both undergraduates and graduate programs. These faculty may publish but they rarely engage in research.

Persons attracted to sports studies usually do not coach and do not teach activity courses. They pursue their areas of special interest, involve themselves in scholarly publication and occasionally do research. Faculty teaching in this area almost always have a doctorate and seek positions which allow them to work with graduate students.

Faculty who primarily seek exercise science as their field of study follow a pattern similar to sports studies. They do not coach or teach activity courses. They prefer to pursue their area of special interest and involve themselves in scholarly publication. Research is a central activity for this group. They almost always have a doctorate and prefer to be associated with graduate programs.

The demands of most departments of physical education do not allow faculty to conveniently place themselves into categories such as the ones just described. Faculty often are required to play a variety of roles and rarely have the luxury of pursuing their ideal career. Nonetheless, faculty with primary interest in these different areas are likely to hold different attitudes about their teaching.

In this study, a number of questions seem to be pertinent. How do physical education faculty feel about their teaching responsibilities? What kinds of competencies do they feel they have that allow them to effectively perform their teaching responsibilities? How effective do they feel they are in their teaching? With what importance

do colleagues view each other's teaching? What kind of rewards do they feel are available for effective performance of teaching? Do female physical education faculty hold different attitudes about their teaching than their male counterparts? Do faculty with doctorate degrees hold different attitudes toward their teaching than those who do not have a doctorate? Does the type of teaching assignment affect the attitude of faculty toward teaching? Do faculty working in departments offering different levels of degrees hold different attitudes about teaching? This study was designed to investigate some of these questions.

Need and Justification for Research

The turmoil of the late sixties which disrupted the normally placid atmosphere on America's campuses drew the attention of a critical public who showed a strong interest in the institutions and the professors who worked in them. Much of the interest centered around the quality of the professor's work as a teacher. The few earlier studies had characterized the college professor as one who had much interest in research and scholarly activity. They were viewed as discipline rather than institution oriented and as seeing teaching as a necessary, although not always desirable work function (Wilson, 1942; Caplow & McGee, 1961 and Gouldner, 1957 & 1958).

The most recent studies, however, have tended to characterize the college professor in quite different terms (Wilkerson, 1977;

Hruska, 1975; Wilson & Gaff, 1975). These studies present the college professor as much more interested in teaching than had previous works and more locally oriented and less involved in writing for publication or research. In addition the professors' proclivity toward these activities was found to vary depending upon the type of institution in which they were employed (Parsons & Platt, 1968; Fulton & Trow, 1974), their academic orientation (Pohlmann, 1976; Wilkerson, 1977; Peter, 1974), and their rank, sex and tenure status.

The results of such studies strongly suggest that efforts to understand the college professor should focus on specific sub-populations of professors. Research efforts which treat college professors as a homogeneous group without attention to institutional, academic and personal variables, have little value as a basis for planning and policy decisions. The present study focused on physical education faculty members employed in state universities. The major reasons for conducting this study were:

1. While teaching is a major responsibility of most full-time faculty in departments of physical education; the attitudes faculty hold toward this responsibility have not been studied systematically or in depth.

2. Factors which are both internal and external to departments of physical education place increasing demands upon the individual faculty member to adapt and respond in ways that are different from the past.

3. Management of the human resource is a critical problem for

persons with administrative responsibilities. A study of the attitude that physical education faculty hold for teaching can have important consequences for the development of better administrative, personnel and staff development practices.

4. Present and future physical education faculty need to gain clearer insight into their own lives in order to make wiser and more deliberate decisions about their careers and their personal development. Studies such as this can begin to provide faculty with useful information for such decisions.

Before we can reasonably act to provide services which can address the needs of physical education faculty members, the administrators or the students, we must have a fundamental understanding of how these populations see their present condition. The present study was an effort to understand the physical education faculty members' expressed attitudes and perceptions concerning their work as teachers. The information was obtained directly through a personal interview. This process allowed faculty to describe their condition as they perceived it.

Purpose of the Study

This study involved full-time faculty members in departments of physical education at selected state universities. The purpose of this study was as follows:

1. To explore the attitudes of these faculty toward their own teaching and activities related to teaching.

2. To explore whether, in otherwise similar institutions, faculty whose departments grant degrees at different levels express different attitudes toward their own teaching and activities related to teaching.

3. To explore whether selected status and demographic variables (such as rank, degree held, age or sex) are associated with particular faculty attitudes toward their own teaching and activities related to teaching.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as follows for the course of this dissertation:

1. Full time faculty members are persons with regular, salaried full time appointments, having teaching responsibilities in the employing institution. Those faculty members considered adjunct, part-time, or on sabbatical leave are not to be included in the population. Graduate teaching assistants and associates also are excluded.

2. Teaching is defined as those activities engaged in by the faculty member in preparation for and conduct of an entire course or a particular class. Teaching also includes all those activities undertaken as a direct result of class sessions, such as reviewing content materials, evaluating students' work and providing individual feedback to students about class related issues. General student advisement, membership on master's or doctoral committees and sponsorship of

student organizations usually are treated as non-teaching services in personnel documents and thus will not be considered as teaching activities for this study.

3. Attitude is composed of affective, cognitive and behavioral components. Zimbardo and Effesen (1970, p. 7) identify the components as follows, "The affective component consists of a person's evaluation of, liking of, or emotional response to some object or person. The cognitive component has been conceptualized as a person's beliefs about, or factual knowledge of, the object or person. The behavioral component involves the person's overt behavior directed toward the object or person."

Design of Study

The study of attitudes called for the use of questionnaires or interviews or a combination of both. The exploratory nature of this study made the use of the indepth interview the most viable choice. Nevitt Sanford and his associates at the Wright Institute, after conducting 300 faculty interviews, concluded that " . . . an interview is an excellent procedure--probably the very best procedure--for stimulating faculty members to reflect on their own development and on their institutional situation" (Brown and Shukraft, 1971, p. 105). Katz and Kahn (1966) added further support to the use of indepth interviewing stating that the exploration of attitudes is best facilitated through " . . . systematic depth interviewing of appropriate populations samples

within the organization" (p. 66).

Study Population

Forty full-time physical education faculty from three different New England state universities served as subjects for this study. Nineteen were from a physical education department in which the highest degree offered was a bachelor's degree. Fourteen were from a physical education department in which the highest degree offered was a master's degree and 7 subjects were from a department in which the highest degree offered was a doctorate. All of the eligible faculty from the three departments are represented in the study population except for 2 faculty from the doctorate-granting department who declined to take part in the study.

Coding Reliability

For this study an independent coder and the author were the principal coding agents. The reliability between coders was established during the pilot study. During the actual study, the first eight interviews were used to check the reliability of the coders and an additional five interviews were selected throughout the study as checks on reliability. In all, 32 percent of the interviews were coded by the author and an independent coder. The remaining 68 percent were done by the author alone. Scott's π (Scott, 1955, pp. 321-325) was used to

determine intercoder reliability. In this study, Scott's π was .83 for all 13 interviews on which intercoder reliability was determined.

Reporting Results

Since the intent of this study was exploratory and descriptive in nature, specific hypotheses were not established or tested. Descriptive statistics such as frequency distributions and cross tabulations were used where appropriate.

The fact that reliability in open-ended interviews typically is low (McGee, 1971, pp. 245-6) suggests the appropriateness of simple statistical tools. The first hand knowledge gained by the researcher in conducting the interviews, the taped interviews and the coded data provided the researcher with several sources of empirical information about the area in question. The availability of a variety of sources made the question of reliability less serious than if only one source was available (McGee, 1971, p. 245).

Interpretation of the data includes appropriate vignettes from the interviews. The vignettes are used to enrich the discussion and to provide the reader with insights into the attitudes of the subject population that are not possible in other types of survey techniques.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter is designed to provide the reader with an overview of previous research within which the present study is to be considered. This review is divided into four sections: General Findings, Institutional Differences, Determining Teacher Effectiveness, and Physical Education Faculty.

General Findings

Investigations of university teaching have not traditionally included the study of attitudes or values held by the university teacher. In a review of research on teaching in higher education, McKeachie (1963) concluded with a section on faculty attitudes and values in which he cited no research, but described impressions. In addition, Wilkerson (1977) in an extensive review of literature on faculty attitudes toward teaching, concluded that empirical studies of the professoriate were almost non-existent prior to 1969. Hruska (1975) in a review of research literature on the professor, listed six major directions of research. Research on attitudes and values of the university teacher was not mentioned.

Early studies of professors relied heavily on personal experience, retrospection and general observation. The intent was to describe professors rather than to elicit information from professors. Although not directed specifically to exploring the attitudes of

faculty toward teaching, these studies produced impressions of the university professor as not having much interest in teaching, having a strong concern for research and publication and experiencing conflict in trying to fill both roles (Wilson, 1942; Caplow & McGee, 1961; Knapp, 1962; Wilson, 1971).

A 1966 study by Austin and Lee in which Academic Deans were surveyed, provided support for earlier findings of conflict between teaching and research responsibilities. Although over 90 percent of the deans reported that teaching was a major consideration in personnel decisions, only 12 percent indicated the use of any systematic process for evaluation of teaching. Research and publication appeared to be the real criteria, thus faculty felt the pressure to perform in these areas rather than in the classroom.

Further evidence of faculty members' general disregard for teaching can be found in studies by Gouldner, 1957 & 1958; Dressel, 1970; and Warriner, 1970 in which faculty attitudes toward their discipline, department and institutions were examined. These studies generally supported the notion of a general shift away from teaching, departmental and institutional concerns, to an increasing interest in the discipline and research. Gouldner's "cosmopolitan" and Dressel's "discipline referenced" professors were more attentive to basic research, belonged and contributed to national associations in their discipline, attended national conferences, workshops and research meetings, sought support of federal agencies and foundations for their interest and in general felt little commitment to their institution.

These studies also pointed out another salient fact; faculty differ as individuals. They hold differing attitudes and values about their work and about their departments and institutions. Such findings are a caution for researchers who wish to study faculty and who attempt to generalize findings from small samples to a larger population.

The campus disruptions of the late sixties brought institutions of higher education under close public scrutiny and placed the student population with its potential power, its changing character and its radical attitudes in center focus. Student concerns about the quality of teaching, the over-use of Teaching Assistants, the preoccupation of faculty with their research and faculties' general ignorance of student needs became public conversation. Studies of faculty coming out of this background differ in important ways from the previous works. The conclusions of these studies are based on more carefully designed empirical procedures which focused on specific issues. Studies of teaching effectiveness, teaching techniques and methods, faculty-student relations, teacher evaluation and personnel practices which began at that time have now become common place. Research on faculty attitudes and perceptions however, has remained limited.

In recent studies in which faculty opinions have been sought, the conclusions generally have not agreed with the conclusions of earlier non-empirical works. Faculty are seen as being interested in their teaching and in some instances wishing to spend more time doing it. Research and publication are seen as important, but not at the expense of teaching. Conflict between teaching and research seems to be

limited to specific faculties whose working conditions encourage such conflict. Faculty, in general, support systematic evaluation of their teaching and desire that teaching play a larger role in personnel decisions. They express satisfaction with teaching and their career decisions.

These conclusions are supported in studies by Wilkerson (1977), Hruska (1975), Fulton and Trow (1974), Wilson and Gaff (1975), Eble (1972), Eckert (1959), Eckert and Williams (1971), Parson and Platt (1969) and Sanford et al. (1971). Comparison of results among these studies is difficult, however, and the ability to generalize from them often is questionable. Inattention to specific variables such as faculty discipline affiliation, sex, rank, level of institution, and level of degree granted by the department has reduced the usability of the information.

The Status of Teaching

Studies on work motivation (Herzberg, 1968) suggest that certain basic rewards must be present in order for the worker to be productive. Money, advancement and position status are representative of such basic rewards. In higher education, promotion, tenure and monetary increases serve as basic rewards to faculty members. The work motivation research also suggests that the areas in which these basic rewards are most evident to the worker are the areas in which the worker will attempt to be most productive and spend most of his/her time. In higher education the faculty member's time generally is distributed between three broad

areas of responsibility: research and publication, teaching, and service. Although faculty often are encouraged to participate equally in all three areas, the distribution of basic rewards suggests that research and publication are more important than teaching and teaching is more important than service. As indicated below, studies of faculty in higher education generally support this conclusion.

In a review of literature on college teaching, Lee concluded that faculty members were minimally devoted to teaching, preferring to pursue their individual research and publication for which they received advancement and promotion (1967). Wilson and Gaff (1971) found few rewards being made available to faculty for teaching. In addition they found little systematic evaluation of teaching, low colleague support for teaching and a general dissatisfaction among faculty for the rewards available for teaching.

In Logan Wilson's historical study, The Academic Man (1942), he concluded that in rhetoric, teaching was of major importance, but tenure, recognition and advancement continued to be awarded for involvement in investigative research that was publishable. Caplow and McGee (1962) found similar incongruence between job assignments and the reward system. They suggested that faculty were "paid to do one job, whereas the worth of their services is evaluated on how well they do another" (p. 82). As a result of this incongruence, Caplow and McGee indicated that faculty view teaching in negative terms and that teaching represented an obstacle to getting research done. In addition to the inequity of the institutional reward system, the rewards available to faculty for

engaging in publication, research, consulting and professional association activities make these involvements a " . . . formidable foe of teaching . . ." (Wilson, 1967, p. 104).

Austin and Lee (1966) give further support to the discrepancies between the reward system and job requirements. In summarizing their data, collected from academic deans, they concluded that simply using classroom teaching as a major factor in personnel decisions does not encourage higher quality productivity for teaching as long as teaching ability is more likely to be measured on the basis of scholarly research and publication, rather than first-hand information gathered by systematic observation of activities more directly relevant to effective classroom performance (p. 304).

Livesay (1975), on data gathered from interviews with "famous professors" from across the country and from his own experience, concluded that success for faculty came from outside the profession or institution. Work with professional associations, consultant efforts with various populations, awards of substantial research grants and other outside pursuits provide the avenue to widespread prestige for faculty. Being committed to teaching was not seen as a viable means to advancement within the career.

Despite the tendency of institutions to not explicitly reward teaching, faculty attitudes toward teaching are far more favorable than many would predict. In recent empirical studies (Wilson & Gaff, 1975; Hruska, 1975; Wilkerson, 1977; Bayer, 1971, 1975; Ladd and Lipset, 1975), faculty as a group, regardless of discipline or institution, in-

dicate an interest in and involvement with teaching to a considerably greater degree than research. These faculty tended to view teaching as a central activity, liked to teach, saw themselves as competent, wanted to be effective teachers and desired to have teaching considered as a primary criteria for promotion. Such attitudes on the part of faculty are considerably different than those suggested for faculty in earlier non-empirical studies.

Perhaps faculty are changing their perspective on their careers in higher education, or perhaps the earlier studies played heavily to the stereotype of the university professor as intellectual, scholar and researcher. Wilkerson suggested that perhaps the conflicting results of non-empirical and empirical literature may have resulted from inadequate attention to population variables such as "level of institution, sex, discipline and rank;" specific methodological problems such as "sampling procedures, timing and bias of the researcher" or a "change in faculty attitude toward teaching since the late 1960's" (1977, p. 50).

Institutional Differences

Four studies present a strong case for the need to recognize the effect of institutions on the attitudes and perceptions of faculty regarding teaching. Specific examples from each study are presented in this section of the review.

Ruth Eckert, 1958

In 1958, Eckert sent a questionnaire concerning career choice and career satisfaction to faculty members in Minnesota's 33 colleges and universities. Reported results are based on a 94 percent return rate (706 respondents) and interviews with 87 randomly selected members of the sample.

In reviewing the data from Eckert's study, Wilkerson (1977, pp. 36-37) noted that when the data on the University of Minnesota faculty alone was examined, it produced some interesting results. For example, the opportunity to do research was indicated as a major source of satisfaction by only 10 percent of the total sample, yet 50 percent of the University of Minnesota sample saw research as a major source of satisfaction. In addition, approximately one-fourth of all the faculty in Eckert's study viewed intellectual stimulation as a major source of satisfaction, yet 50 percent of the University of Minnesota faculty chose this item. Such large discrepancies suggest "that populations sampled should be carefully described before generalizations about attitudes toward teaching can be drawn accurately from reported results" (1977, p. 37).

Parsons and Platt, 1968

For their pilot study of eight four-year colleges and universities, Parsons and Platt generated a Scale of Institutional Differentiation (SID) to divide the institutions into categories of "high" (strongly research oriented), "medium" (research and general education oriented) or "low" (education of citizenry and professional training oriented).

The SID was designed to assist the investigators in testing their theory that "cognitive rationality" which "mandates rational action in the comprehension and solution of intellectual problems" (Platt, 1976, p. 14) was the thread that held the entire system of higher education together.

Of importance to the present study was the question of actual versus ideal distribution of time among the various professional responsibilities. By comparing the actual and ideal times for both undergraduate and graduate teaching and research, the investigators concluded that teaching and research did form the central core of activity for faculty. Faculty within the different levels of institutions based on the SID also expressed different opinions regarding these activities. Faculty in the "high" institutions were more acceptant and desirous of research than either the "medium" or "low" institutions.

In follow-up interviews with selected faculty from these institutions, Parsons and Platt found that faculty in "high" institutions perceived little conflict between the teaching and research responsibilities, and that faculty from the "low" institutions recognized their primary mission as teaching and were not disturbed because of lack of involvement in research. In the "medium" SID institutions however, the investigators found a high degree of conflict between teaching and research activities expressed by the faculty.

Although these findings come from a small sample of "prestigious" institutions and the generalization of the data is limited, the notion that the type of institution may effect the attitudes of the faculty

is strongly suggested.

Fulton and Trow, 1974

In an attempt to examine the relationship between teaching and research, Fulton and Trow made use of data collected in an extensive national survey by Bayer in 1969. Using the 303 institutions from Bayer's study, they categorized the universities and four-year colleges into those of "high," "medium" or "low" quality. The quality ranking was established on factors such as highest degree awarded, characteristics of the faculty and students and the expansiveness of institutional resources. Junior colleges also were included in the study but were not ranked as to quality (see Table 1).

As noted in Table 1, slightly less than one-fourth of the total sample expressed a primary interest in research yet one-half of the sample from the "high" quality universities expressed such an opinion. Significant differences regarding research and teaching can be noted among the quality categories of both the universities and four-year colleges. Significant differences also exist between the same quality categories across both the university and four-year college-type institutions.

The results of this study demonstrate the importance of careful organization of data according to institutional characteristics, and that studies which treat faculty as a homogeneous group are likely to produce data that are misleading. This study also demonstrates that faculty members in higher education generally report a high level of support for teaching activities.

TABLE 1

"DO YOUR INTERESTS LIE PRIMARILY IN TEACHING OR RESEARCH?,"
BY TYPE AND QUALITY OF INSTITUTION (U.S.A.)
(PERCENT)

Primary Interest	Type of Institution: Universities — Quality: High I	Universities — Quality: Medium II	Universities — Quality: Low III	Four-year Colleges — Quality: High IV	Four-year Colleges — Quality: Medium V	Four-year Colleges — Quality: Low VI	Junior Colleges — All VII	All Institutions
Very heavily in research	9	7	4	4	1	1	1	4
	50	40	28	26	12	10	5	24
Both, but leaning to research	41	33	24	22	11	9	4	20
Both, but leaning	35	37	39	39	37	34	18	34
Very heavily in teaching	15	23	33	35	51	56	77	43
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%

Sample: All respondents (N=60,028)

Note. From Fulton and M. Trow (1974).

Wilson and Gaff, 1975

In a study involving faculties from community colleges, state colleges and state universities, Wilson and Gaff found significant differences in professional attitudes toward teaching and perception of rewards for teaching. The state college faculties experienced much more personal ambiguity about rewards and time allocation than did either community college staff or state university staff. Community college staff recognized their major task as teaching and felt rewarded for such. State university staffs regarded research and teaching as of equal importance. State college faculty, because of their aspirant nature, felt more pressure and tension between the expectation for teaching and the need to publish. It appears state college faculty feel that to gain positions in more prestigious institutions they had to publish. It might be reasonable to conclude that the pressure to do research and publish is endemic to persons who aspire to make themselves more mobile in the academic market place and to those young professors competing for a limited number of tenured positions.

Academic Orientation

Research suggests that faculty with differing academic orientations behave differently as teachers (Pohlman, 1976; Wilkerson, 1977; Peters, 1974) and are perceived as different by students (Centra and Creech, 1976).

In his study of instructor attributes, Pohlman (1976) found that faculty from science and math, education, social science, humanities and business exhibited different teaching styles and that student

ratings of these faculty varied by discipline. Wilkerson (1977) found the faculty vary in their mode of teaching and that different modes were more often used in one discipline than in another. For example, she found that 82 percent of the humanities faculty interviewed chose the instructor centered mode of instruction (disseminated information through discussion) while only 26 percent of the professional faculty had such a proclivity. Peters (1974) intereviewed 98 male faculty from diverse disciplines. Using a classification scheme developed by Holland (1966) to categorize various disciplines, Peters found important differences existed in the teaching techniques based on faculty orientation and that the subject a faculty member taught was also a factor in how he taught.

Centra and Creech (1976) found that the student ratings of instructors differed significantly when teaching area was used as a dependent variable. Faculty from humanities received the highest ratings and those from natural sciences received the lowest. The studies by Wilkerson (1977) and Peters (1976) indicated that faculty in humanities used teaching styles that were more open and involved students, while the natural science faculty chose closed lecture-type teaching. As consumers of faculty teaching, students do have preferences as to style of teaching. These styles, however, do not occur in a random dispersal among faculty but appear to be more common to specific groups of faculty with specific academic orientations. What type of teaching style is preferred by faculty in physical education is not known. Insights into this area are needed before rational decisions about faculty

development, faculty evaluation and graduate programs can be made for this population of faculty.

Determining Teacher Effectiveness

How effective faculty feel they are as teachers, the means they use to determine their effectiveness and what they consider to be effective teaching are of interest in the present study. The literature cited below provides a framework with which responses of the subjects in the present study can be analyzed.

The competence with which faculty perform the task of teaching has been and continues to be a difficult thing to measure. Pressures for faculty accountability, and the recent moves to make teaching performance a more central criterion in personnel decisions have caused a proliferation of studies on teacher evaluation. These studies have tended to focus on four major issues: (1) what criterion ought to be used to measure the effectiveness of the teaching performance, (2) who should be responsible for and carry out the evaluation process, (3) how reliable and valid are the various instruments in measuring effective teaching performance, and (4) what is the correlation of such measures with student ratings?

In general, faculty in higher education support the idea of student evaluation of their teaching (Wilkerson, 1977; Wilson, 1971; Gaff, 1975; Bavry, 1970; Bayer, 1973). Part of the reason for this appears to be that faculty feel students will generally give them positive ratings.

Wilson and Gaff (1975) in a survey of over one thousand faculty, asked faculty how they felt students would rate their teaching performance. Eight percent indicated their students would rank them "average," 22 percent said "slightly above average," 50 percent said "well above average," and 19 percent said "rated among the very best" (p. 15). Such confidence suggests that faculty see themselves as competent teachers or that they see students as not being able to discriminate various levels of teaching quality. There is, nonetheless, an expression of need for more formal procedures in evaluating teaching.

The lack of formal procedures and the unavailability of tools for self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness, make the process of determining effectiveness less than satisfactory. Faculty often rely on intuitive feelings about their teaching rather than more objective measures. Administrators, often not qualified as judges of teaching, make use of second-hand information such as course outlines, enrollment figures and number of courses taught, and rarely base their judgements on first-hand systematic observation of the faculty members in their teaching activities (Hildebrand, M., Wilson, R.D., & Dienst, E.R., 1975).

The perceptions that faculty have of their teaching effectiveness and the processes they use to gain such perceptions are of interest in the present study. Literature would suggest that faculty make use of student input in either formal or informal ways and that they consider their intuitive judgement as a viable method for determining their

effectiveness (Wilkerson, 1977, p. 123).

When asked to identify colleague teaching effectiveness, faculty consider more than teaching behaviors. Research activity, professional recognition, participation in the academic community are frequently mentioned criteria (Braunstein and Benton, 1975; Hildebrand, Wilson, and Dienst, 1975). It appears that for faculty, teaching effectiveness involves more than knowledge of subject matter, enthusiasm, effective organization and other criteria commonly associated with student evaluation of teaching. For faculty, teaching effectiveness seems not to have distinct boundaries but is reflected in the overall performance as researcher, teacher, writer, service resource and person. Such a broad perception of teaching effectiveness could act to dilute the more salient criteria which focus on specific behaviors as teachers. Such dilution may permit faculty to perceive themselves as more effective teachers than they actually are. This broad concept of teaching effectiveness may account for the belief that they are effective in their teaching and that instructional improvement activities are not of great concern.

In general, faculty perceptions of their own effectiveness and their attitudes toward evaluation systems have not been studied. Such studies are needed to provide foundation information for continued development of strategies to determine teacher effectiveness. One section of the interview schedule for this study solicited information from respondents on this and other related topics. How faculty presently acquire information on their teaching and their attitudes toward

activity are important to the understanding of the faculty member's general attitude toward teaching.

Physical Education Faculty

There are only a limited number of studies that have focused on the physical education faculty member in higher education. Most of the studies that are available focus on administration and leadership, or organizational climate and job satisfaction. Although none of these studies relate directly to faculty attitudes toward teaching, some studies do provide insights into the general attitudes of physical educators in higher education.

In an attempt to explore how faculty diversity may affect the success of interdisciplinary studies, Wilson & Gaff (1975) divided their sample into four faculty cultures: humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and professional and applied fields. These four groups were then examined in terms of their educational values, teaching orientation, and life styles by the use of Likert type scales. Significant variations were found in several areas suggesting that faculty sub-cultures do exist and that members of these sub-cultures hold values and attitudes that are different.

Of importance to the present study was the investigation of sub-culture differences and teaching style. The information gathered from the respondents for this area focused on classroom teaching practices and attitudes toward students. Each major faculty culture group was

subdivided into several sub-cultures. The professional and applied fields were subdivided into four groups: business administration, education, engineering and physical education (see Table 2). Important differences can be noted among the sub-groups within professional and applied fields and among the sub-groups of the other major faculty cultures. Whether the cause of these differences rests with subject matter or the personalities (Holland, 1966) of the faculty, the fact that differences exist provides a strong rationale for studying sub-cultures within institutions of higher education.

Morgan (1974), in a study of factors influencing job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, sampled 197 full-time physical educators and coaches in small liberal arts colleges. He concluded that feelings of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction were independent of the sex of the faculty member, degree held, tenure status and three other demographic variables. Faculty in the small liberal arts colleges were found to be more satisfied with their jobs than dissatisfied.

In another study of job satisfaction, Daniel (1971) sampled full-time faculty members in divisions of physical education in 10 Ontario universities and found that rank, tenure, academic qualifications and years of service were important variables to consider when studying job satisfaction. In addition, Daniel concluded that faculty who perceived their roles as congruent with the role expected by the institution, exhibited higher levels of satisfaction than faculty who did not perceive such congruence. Although this finding is not surprising, it is important to note that regardless of the actual

TABLE 2

RANK ORDER OF FACULTY SUBCULTURAL GROUPS
ON SELECTED VARIABLES

Subcultures	Teaching Practices		Attitudes Toward Students	
	Discursive	Student-Centered	Skepticism	Permissiveness
HUMANITIES				
philosophy-religion	1	6	12	3
fine and performing arts	5	2	9	9
foreign languages	6	7	2	5
English	9	8	11	2
speech-journalism	10	14	4	10
SOCIAL SCIENCES				
history	2	10[a]	13	6
governmental science	4	12	8	4
behavioral science	7	4	14	1
NATURAL SCIENCES				
biological science	8	3	6	11
physical science	12	9	7	7
mathematics	15	15	10	12
PROFESSIONAL AND APPLIED FIELDS				
education	3	1	15	8
business administration	11	10[a]	5	14
physical education	13	5	1	15
engineering	14	13	3	13

[a]Both groups received the same score on this variable.

From:
Wilson & Gaff, 1975, p. 60.

Note:

Discursive refers to a style of teaching which emphasizes active discourse among students and between students and the teacher.

Student-Centered refers to a style of teaching which gives students major decision making responsibilities for their own learning.

institutional expectations, it is the faculty member's perception of these expectations that is the major determiner of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

In her study of employment status of men and women physical educators in four-year public colleges and universities, Ashcraft (1972) found that more differences existed among faculty members differentiated by sex than either the institution in which they were employed or the type of administrative unit in which they worked. Men, overall, were better paid and had better working conditions than women. These findings suggest that the context of the job is different for women and as such their perceptions of their job might differ from their male counterparts.

Dannehl's study of organizational climate in 20 physical education adminstrative units in selected mid-western universities demonstrates the importance of context. Faculty in units located in colleges of education or colleges of fine arts, view their climate in less favorable ways than those faculty from units located in a school of physical education or college of physical education. In addition, Dannehl found that faculty who coach and teach perceive the climate differently than those who teach only.

These studies indicate that such variables as sex, tenure, degree held, work assignment and rank might be important determiners of attitudes toward teaching. They also suggest that the context in which their teaching takes place may influence the faculty member's perception of that work.

Summary

Improving the opportunities for faculty to gain satisfaction from their work and increasing the probability that faculty will engage in improvement efforts, requires the understanding of the perceptions they hold about their work and themselves. The literature suggests that major differences toward teaching exist among faculty based on the institution in which they work, the discipline to which they belong, the subject matter they teach and their age and sex. There is, however, a general perception of faculty members as persons who see teaching as important, are sensitive to the reward structures of the university, view themselves as effective teachers and are struggling for identity within the academic culture. Where physical education faculty fit in this emerging concept of faculty is not known. This study is designed to solicit data which should provide important insights into physical education faculty in higher education, especially in their role as teacher.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In order to gather data from university physical education faculty regarding their attitudes toward their own teaching and teaching-related activities, 40 faculty from three departments of physical education located in three New England state universities were interviewed. An in-depth, tape-recorded interview was used as the primary means of data collection. Additional information was obtained via a questionnaire and a review of documents which described the departments and their programs. It was anticipated that data collected in this manner would contribute to the understanding of university physical education faculty as teachers and to the generation of specific hypothesis for future testing. For the purpose of manageability and clarity, the study was limited to a single type of institution--the state university--and to full-time faculty who had teaching responsibilities in the departments of physical education.

Subjects

The type of institution in which the faculty member was employed has been shown to be an important variable in the study of faculty attitudes toward teaching (Fulton & Trow, 1974; Wilson & Gaff, 1971). The state university was selected because it provided control over the

type of institution, yet offered the opportunity to select departments which granted degrees at different levels.

The level at which degrees were offered by departments within the state universities was seen as a likely factor in attracting faculty with differing views about working in higher education, even though the general institutional environments were similar. Programs offering only bachelor's degrees were not seen as likely to attract faculty who were highly interested in graduate students and research, but would attract faculty who were primarily interested in teaching and working with undergraduate students. Conversely, programs offering graduate degrees were seen as not likely to attract faculty who were highly interested in teaching undergraduate students but would likely attract faculty primarily interested in graduate students and research.

For this study, one state university was selected that had a physical education department in which the highest degree offered was a bachelor's degree. Another was selected which had a physical education department offering a bachelor's degree, but in which the highest degree was a master's. A third state university was selected which had a physical education department offering bachelor's and master's degrees but in which the highest degree was the doctorate.

Subjects for this study consisted of 95 percent of the full-time faculty members of the physical education departments located in the three state universities described above. In all, 40 of 42 eligible faculty agreed to be subjects for the study. In institution A, in

which the physical education department's highest degree offered was a bachelor's degree, and in institution B, in which the physical education department's highest degree offered was a master's degree, all eligible faculty took part in the study. In institution C, in which the physical education department's highest degree offered was a doctorate, two of the nine eligible faculty declined to take part in the study.

Faculty identified by the department chairperson as being full-time faculty of the department and having teaching responsibilities within the department were considered appropriate subjects for this study. Part-time or adjunct faculty were not included. Graduate assistants or associates were not included. Full-time faculty whose responsibilities were only administrative, only supervisory, only coaching or only research were not included. A more complete description of the study participants can be found in Chapter 4 and in Appendix E, page 189.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Interview Study

The in-depth, semi-structured interview was used in the present study for the advantages this approach offered over the traditional large sample, questionnaire survey approach in the exploration and clarification of attitudes. "The free-response format of the interview produces a depth and breadth of descriptive, attitudinal information, elicited through the probing of the interviewer concerning those beliefs, feelings, opinions and action-orientations on which an

attitude is based" (Wilkerson, 1977, p. 63).

The interview clearly allowed the investigator to gain insights into areas that were not possible to explore in a questionnaire. The open end format of the interview offered the opportunity to probe into potentially fruitful areas. This attribute was particularly important in an exploratory study where the range of possible responses could not be easily predicted.

The low threat nature of interviews with faculty (Bergquist and Phillips, 1975, p. 204) suggested that the probability of gathering "honest" information was very high. The face-to-face nature of interviews also strengthened the probability that the respondents would not fake their responses to the questions. Inconsistencies in responses were explored during the interview, whereas a questionnaire survey would not have given the author this opportunity. The clarification of such inconsistencies added substantially to the richness of the data.

The interview process allowed for immediate clarification of the questions and responses. Questions were rephrased and restated when it appeared that the respondent had misinterpreted the intent. Answers to questions were paraphrased back to the respondent to check if the interviewer had interpreted the response correctly. Such give and take increased the probability that the information elicited by a specific question reflected the real intent of the question and of the respondent. If the respondent became confused, apprehensive, hostile, or betrayed other emotional states, the interviewer helped the respondent by creating an atmosphere of rapport and confidence which made the

further exploration of sensitive issues possible.

The affective behaviors of the respondent were noted and explored during the face-to-face interview. Changes in voice, tone, body language and responsiveness were used as cues for further probing or were noted to provide a richer interpretation of the data at a later time. The general environment and physical characteristics of the respondent were observed by the interviewer and provided insights that would not have been possible with a questionnaire survey.

Finally, the interview approach gave the researcher a high participation rate, a substantial amount of the respondent's time and an assurance that the respondent was a member of the chosen sample.

Certain problems were inherent in the interview approach and as such had the potential to distort or influence the accuracy of the data. The fact that the author also was the interviewer brought to question the possibility of bias which, under some circumstances, might influence the respondent and or the interpretation of the data. Although in some instances the respondent may react adversely to the interviewer's style or mode of operation and such reactions clearly could hinder the process of gaining accurate information, there was no suggestion that this happened in the present study.

McGee (1971, pp. 216-227) suggested that "boredom, inattention and fatigue" would present the greatest hazard in the interview process. Under these conditions the richness of the data would be compromised even though all of the questions are asked and answered. In addition, McGee noted that the constant "role playing" necessitated by the

interview process in order to elicit unbiased responses, could cause interviewers to hurry through the process so that they may again be their own self. Although precautions were taken in an attempt to avoid these hazards suggested by McGee, the author experienced circumstances in which the overall quality of an interview was probably lessened because of one or more of these factors.

Because the interview process demanded that the author have considerable personal knowledge of the area in question, the author was careful not to inadvertently lead the respondent, or offer too much information.

Although the interview process had some disadvantages, the potential breadth and depth of data that could be gathered via this process clearly outweigh the potential risks. In addition, the disadvantages could be reduced to a minimum by careful planning and alertness on the part of the interviewer.

Data Collection and Instrumentation

Data for the study were collected via a questionnaire completed by each participant and in an interview, of approximately one hour in length, conducted by the author. Three aspects of this process--initial contact, questionnaire and interview--are presented in the following paragraphs.

Initial Contact

Department chairpersons from three state universities were initially contacted by telephone in mid-April, 1978. A letter was then sent to each chairperson (see Appendix A) and a meeting with each chairperson was held in which eligible faculty were identified and permission was granted to contact the identified faculty.

All eligible faculty in the three departments were sent a letter which identified the author, briefly described the study and the process by which the data would be collected (see Appendix A). A maximum commitment of two hours was requested from each participant for completing the questionnaire and the interview. The questionnaire and a schedule of dates for the interviews also was included in this mailing.

This initial correspondence with faculty was followed by a telephone contact or a personal visit in which the faculty member's willingness to take part in the study was confirmed, and a time, place and date for the interview was set. At the two institutions which were at a substantial distance, two or three sequential days of interviewing were planned.

Except for one interview held in late August, the interviews were completed by mid-July, 1978. Scheduling the interviews after students had left campus proved to be a great asset in getting faculty to participate. The fact that faculty in one institution were on ten-month contracts and thus avilable until mid-June and all faculty at another worked during summer sessions also facilitated the collection

of data.

Questionnaire

Each eligible faculty member was sent a 27 item questionnaire (see Appendix B) in the initial mailing. The questionnaire was designed to solicit background information and to probe the participant's perception of teaching as it related to research, writing for publication and coaching. A complete examination of the data from the questionnaire is presented in Chapter 4.

All participants were asked to complete the questionnaire and bring it with them to the scheduled interview. This procedure proved effective in that only three participants neglected to bring their questionnaires. In these cases, they were given a second questionnaire and asked to complete it prior to the start of the interview.

The Interview

The interview schedule consisted of 34 open-ended questions in four topical areas--general teaching situation, teaching effectiveness, rewards for teaching and teaching improvement (see Appendix C). The questions were designed to solicit extensive rather than simple responses. Questions were worded to elicit responses that reflected the personal perceptions and personal behaviors of the respondents. This focus on the individual, as opposed to the third person or department was reinforced throughout the interview. Questions were in the same sequence in each interview unless the flow of the interview demanded otherwise. For example, in some cases, the participant answer-

ed the question before it was asked and the question could be omitted. In other cases, some wording of the questions was changed to fit the conversation. For the most part, however, the original wording and sequence of questions were followed. Banaka's (1971) system for planning, conducting and analyzing interviews provided an important base for the development of the interview schedule. The questions included in the interview were suggested by the work of Wilkerson (1976), a sociological study of teaching by Lorti (1975), the author's own experiences in working with faculty, and discussions with colleagues related to teaching in higher education.

Interviews were held in the office of the participant whenever possible. There were times, however, when this was not possible and the interview was held at some other mutually agreed upon location. The participants were generous with their time, displayed a genuine interest in the study and provided the author with much personal encouragement. They responded with little prompting, answered questions in the normal flow of conversation and in general appeared to enjoy the experience.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted in April, 1978, in order to: (1) determine the effectiveness of the interview schedule for eliciting the desired data, (2) examine the participants' reaction to the interview process, (3) assess and improve the content and readability of the questionnaire, (4) determine the workability of the audio tape system and (5) provide an opportunity to develop a coding system to

establish reliability of coders and to develop coding skills.

Five participants were selected for the pilot study. They represented various characteristics of the physical education population to be studied. Three were males, 2 were females. They represented different age groups, taught different types and levels of courses and held different degrees.

After the first interview, some wording changes were made in the interview questions to reflect more clearly the intent of the question and in some cases to increase the focus on the individual. Except for minor adjustments in wording, the questionnaire remained unchanged. Two more interviews were held using the revised interview schedule. The information gathered in these interviews was more personal and the participants expressed little confusion on any of the interview questions. After minor changes in wording, the final two interviews were conducted and produced results which were entirely satisfactory.

All five participants in the pilot study had agreed to be tape-recorded and none of them expressed or showed any apprehension about this process. The tape-recording proved to be an invaluable aid, not only because it allowed the storage of the exact interview, but it freed the author to attend to the conversation, to interact with the participant and to probe and elicit more complete responses.

The design and utilization of a coding system was explored during the pilot study. The initial coding form was designed by the author using a format similar to one used by Caplow and McGee (1961). The

coding of the pilot tapes was done by the author and a faculty member who had agreed to be a coder for the study. Reliability of the coders was established for each question in the pilot interviews. After the first two interviews were coded, several changes were made in the coding instrument. Some categories were added, others were deleted and others were changed in wording to more clearly express the intent of the category. A process for handling coder disagreements was established and the discriptors of the categories were expanded.

In summary, the pilot study involved the interviewing of five faculty members, the revision of the interview schedule, the questionnaire, the coding instrument and the establishment of inter-coder reliability for the interview questions. No major changes were made in either the questionnaire or the interview schedule. Some major changes were made in the coding instrument.

Coding Procedures

A coding system designed by Crittenden (McGee 1971, pp. 228-246) was used as the framework for the coding procedures in the present study. The first step was to decide on the size of the coding unit to be used in determining responses. Because of the open-ended nature of the interview questions and the fact that some participants answered questions before they were asked, it was decided that the entire interview would be the most appropriate coding unit. Although some objectivity may have been lost due to this decision, the increased accuracy of data obtained outweighed such loss.

The second step of the coding procedure involved the development of nominal response categories for each of the interview questions. These categories were developed by the author based on his experience in the interviews, suggestions from previous studies, and input from colleagues. The categories were then reviewed and evaluated to determine if as Crittenden suggested they: (1) derived from a single principle of classification; (2) consisted of mutually exclusive and exhaustive alternatives; (3) fitted the collected data.

The exploratory nature of this study and the nature of the free response data provided the author with some difficulty in meeting Crittenden's suggested criteria. Because qualitative differentiation was not of prime importance in this study, coders were instructed to record multiple responses given by the participants without identifying that which was "most important" or "first mentioned." This decision increased the quantitative potential of the data since more than one response was permitted per question. It also increased the objectivity of the data and did not introduce the necessity of inference on the part of coders which would increase the probability of coding error.

Because it was impossible to anticipate all possible responses to questions in this study, "other" and "no response" categories were utilized. The use of these categories violated the concept of single principle classification. Their use in this study, however, was mandated by the nature of the questions and the purpose of the study.

Coding Reliability

The author and a faculty member acted as principal coders for this study. An inter-coder agreement for each interview question was established during the pilot study (see Appendix F). Scott's pi (π) was utilized to determine this agreement (Scott, 1955, pp. 321-325). Scott's π corrects for the number of categories in the code and the frequency with which each category is used. Used as a coefficient, it provides the extent to which obtained agreement exceeds chance. For the pilot study, the Scott's pi ranged from 1.0 to .21 with 29 of the 46 values falling above .70 and 37 of the 46 values falling at .60 or above. Based on McGee's (1971) experience in coding interviews, it was determined that this reliability was high enough to proceed with the coding of the actual study tapes.

The coders proceeded to code three interview tapes independently. The inter-coder agreement for these interviews (see Appendix F) ranged from 1.0 to .51 with 43 of 46 values falling above .70. Five more tapes were independently coded. Inter-coder agreement for these five interviews (see Appendix F) ranged from 1.0 to .58 with 45 of 46 values falling above .70 and 38 of 46 values falling above .80. In addition to these eight interviews, a random selection of 5 interviews was independently coded throughout the remainder of the study. Inter-coder agreement for these 5 interviews (see Appendix F) ranged from 1.0 to .49 with 35 of 46 values falling above .70 and 18 of 46 values falling above .80. In all, 13 interviews were coded by both the author and an independent coder. This was 32 percent of the

total interviews. The remainder of the interviews were coded by the author alone. The mean individual question inter-coder agreement for the 13 interviews was .83 (see Appendix F).

Coder Disagreement

After the inter-coder reliability was determined for the interviews in question, the coders negotiated for agreement on questions where they had disagreed. Specific parts of the interview were reviewed by the coders together, and an agreement was made on how the particular question was to be recorded for that subject. In all cases a single set of codes was established for each subject. Disagreements between coders fell into three categories: (1) mechanical error, i.e., placing a mark in the wrong code number, (2) human error, i.e., not picking up an obvious response by the participant, and (3) disagreement, i.e., where the coders heard the same information but interpreted it differently.

Reporting Results

All interviews and questionnaires were coded on the IBM General Coding forms. This process saved considerable time over conventional card punching of the data cards. The SPSS Multiple Response package (Hohlen, 1977) was used to produce frequency distributions and cross-tabulations of interview and questionnaire data. In addition, vignettes from the interviews were used to enrich and provide clarity for the interpretation of data.

Summary

This exploratory study involved the use of an in-depth interview and a questionnaire to gather data on 40 faculty from departments of physical education in three state universities. The interviews were recorded on audio tapes and transferred to coding forms using a coding scheme developed by the author. Approximately one-third of the interviews were jointly coded by the author and an independent coder. Satisfactory inter-coder reliability was established and the remaining interviews were coded by the author alone. The data were processed using the SPSS Multiple Response Package and reported through frequency distributions, cross-tabulations and vignettes.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Data for this study were collected via a questionnaire and an in-depth interview with 40 subjects from 3 departments of physical education located in 3 New England state universities. The results are presented in terms of frequencies using tables as the primary display format. In addition, excerpts from the interviews are used to enrich the data and provide clarity to the interpretation.

This chapter is divided into 8 sections. Section 1 contains a brief profile of the departments used in the study. Selected data from the questionnaire is presented in section 2, while sections 3 through 8 contain data elicited from subjects during the interview.

SECTION 1: Department Profiles

Department A (Bachelor's degree only)

Department A was located in a small state land grant university with an approximate enrollment of 8,000 students. Of the 21 faculty employed by the department 19 met the criteria for inclusion as subjects. The two department members not included were employed full-time in athletics. Housed in the School of Education, the department offered a B.A. in Education with program concentrations in elementary school physical education, secondary school physical education, broad field K-12 physical education and adjunct programs in leisure studies

and health. Approximately 200 undergraduates were enrolled in these programs.

Department B (Bachelor's and Master's degrees)

Located in a medium-sized state land grant university of approximately 10,000 students, the department had a total of 14 full-time faculty. All 14 faculty met the criteria for inclusion as subjects. Housed in the School of Health Services, the department offered both B.A. and M.S. degrees. The department offered concentrations in physical education, physical therapy and adapted physical education. There were approximately 200 undergraduates enrolled in the programs and 35 graduate students enrolled in these programs.

Department C (Bachelor's, Master's and Doctorate degrees)

This department was located in a large state land grant university with an enrollment of approximately 20,000 students. It had the smallest faculty of all departments in the study. All 9 full-time faculty met the criteria for inclusion as subjects. The program enrolled approximately 180 undergraduate students, 35 master's students and 6 full-time doctorate students. At the undergraduate level the department offered concentrations in physical education, recreational service education and special physical education. The graduate program offered the M.A., Sixth Year and Ph.D. degrees in sports studies, recreational service education and special physical education. All members of the faculty taught in both the graduate and undergraduate programs.

SECTION 2: Questionnaire Results

Introduction

Each subject completed a 27 item questionnaire prior to being interviewed. The questionnaire was designed to elicit specific demographic information and to provide initial information regarding the subject's attitude toward teaching.

This section contains a profile of the subjects based on selected items from the questionnaire. Items selected for display in this section were chosen because the review of literature suggests that these items may be important variables to consider when examining attitudes toward teaching. This section closes with a brief discussion of the data, including a comparison of sample characteristics with the national profile for university faculty. Additional questionnaire items not presented in this section may be found in Appendix E).

Departmental Affiliation

Table 3 indicates the number of subjects from each of the departments represented in the study. Department A's program offered only a bachelor's degree; Department B's program offered both the bachelor's and master's degrees; and Department C's program terminated with a doctorate degree.

TABLE 3

SUBJECT'S DEPARTMENTAL AFFILIATION

Department	Frequency	Percent
A (Bachelor's Degree Only)	19	47.5
B (Bachelor's & Master's Degree)	14	35.0
C (Bachelor's, Master's & Doctorate)	7	17.5
TOTAL	40	100.0

Sex of Subject

Table 4 lists the sex of the subjects for the full study population and by individual department. Overall, females comprised 42 percent of the subjects. Only one female was on the faculty in Department C, while nearly half of the faculty in Departments A and B were females.

TABLE 4

SEX OF SUBJECTS

Department	Males	PCT	Females	PCT
A	10	52.6	9	47.4
B	7	50.0	7	50.0
C	6	85.7	1	14.3
All Combined	23	57.5	17	42.5

Age of Subjects

The subjects were asked to indicate their age within 10 year ranges. The span for these categories was 25 to over 55. The median age was in the 35-44 age range. Table 5 contains this information.

TABLE 5

AGE OF SUBJECTS

Age Range	Frequency	PCT	Cum PCT
Over 55 years	4	10.0	10.0
45 to 55 years	12	30.0	40.0
35 to 44 years	15	37.5	77.5
25 to 34 years	9	22.5	100.0
Under 25 years	0	00.0	100.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	

Rank of Subjects

The rank of "Full Professor" was indicated by only 5 subjects. As the combined data summary in Table 6 shows, the rest of the subjects were rather evenly distributed within the other ranks. However, when individual departments are examined, important differences will be noted in the Associate Professor and Instructor/Lecturer categories. Over 40 percent of the subjects from Departments B and C held the rank of Associate Professor, but only 10.5 percent of the subjects from Department A held the rank of Instructor or Lecturer, but none of the

subjects from Department C and only 14.3 percent of the subjects from Department B held these ranks.

TABLE 6

RANK OF SUBJECTS

Dept.	Prof.	PCT	Assoc. Prof.	PCT	Asst. Prof.	PCT	Instructor/ Lecturer	PCT
A	2	10.5	2	10.5	6	31.6	9	57.4
B	2	14.3	6	42.9	4	28.6	2	14.3
C	1	14.3	3	42.9	3	42.9	0	00.0
Combined	5	12.5	11	27.5	13	32.5	11	27.5

Degree Held by Subjects

Forty-five percent of the subjects reported having completed a doctorate. As indicated in Table 7, all of the subjects from Department C had doctorates, and half (N=7) of the subjects from Department B had doctorates, but only 15.8 percent (N=4) of the faculty in Department A had doctorates.

TABLE 7

DEGREE HELD BY SUBJECTS

Degree	Dept. A	PCT	Dept. B	PCT	Dept. C	PCT	Combined	PCT
Ed.D.	1	5.3	1	7.1	1	14.3	3	7.5
Ph.D.	3	15.8	6	42.9	6	85.7	15	37.5
M.S.	9	47.4	4	28.6	0	00.0	13	32.5
M.Ed.	3	15.8	3	21.4	0	00.0	6	15.0
Bachelor's	1	5.3	0	00.0	0	00.0	1	2.5
Other	2	10.5	0	00.0	0	00.0	2	5.0
TOTAL	19	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0	40	100.0

Number of Years at Present Institution

Sixty percent of the subjects reported holding a salaried position at their present institution for 10 years or more. Table 8 shows that the category most often indicated was from "10 years to 14 years" with 45 percent of the subjects falling in this category. Interestingly, however, none of the subjects from Department C had been at their institution for 10 years or more, but well over half of the subjects from Departments A and B had served for this period.

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF YEARS SUBJECTS HELD A SALARIED POSITION AT THEIR PRESENT INSTITUTION

Number of years	Dept. A	PCT	Dept. B	PCT	Dept. C	PCT	Combined	PCT
Less than one	1	5.3	1	7.1	0	00.0	2	5.0
1 to 4 years	0	00.0	2	14.3	4	57.1	6	15.0
5 to 9 years	4	21.1	1	7.1	3	42.9	8	20.0
10 to 14 years	10	52.6	8	57.1	0	00.0	18	45.0
15 to 19 years	3	15.8	0	00.0	0	00.0	3	7.5
20 or more years	1	5.3	2	14.3	0	00.0	3	7.5
	19	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0	40	100.0

Number of Years Since Completion of Last Degree

Table 9 gives the number of years since the subjects completed their last professional degree. The data are presented for the combined population and by individual departments. Nearly 60 percent of the subjects reported receiving the last degree 10 or more years ago.

TABLE 9

NUMBER OF YEARS SINCE SUBJECTS COMPLETED THEIR LAST PROFESSIONAL DEGREE

Year Degree	Dept. A	PCT	Dept. B	PCT	Dept. C	PCT	Combined	PCT
Less than 1 yr.	0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0
1-4 years	3	15.8	1	7.1	2	28.6	6	15.0
5-9 years	4	21.1	2	14.3	4	57.1	10	25.0
10-14 years	5	26.3	6	42.9	1	14.3	12	30.0
15-19 years	3	15.8	1	7.1	0	00.0	4	10.0
20 or more years	4	21.1	3	21.4	0	00.0	7	17.5
Missing	0	00.0	1	7.1	0	00.0	1	2.5

Tenure Status

Fifty-five percent of the subjects reported that they held full tenure status. Thirty-two percent indicated that they were not on a tenure track. Of those not on tenure track, 11 were from Department A. In addition, no member of Department A was presently being considered for tenure. Department B, which had the greatest number of faculty with full tenure, had 2 of its members working toward tenure. C had 3 of its members working toward tenure (see Table 10).

TABLE 10

TENURE STATUS OF SUBJECTS

Tenure Status	Dept. A	PCT	Dept. B	PCT	Dept. C	PCT	Combined	PCT
Full Academic Tenure	8	42.1	11	78.6	3	42.9	22	55.0
0-1 yr. to Tenure Decision	0	00.0	0	00.0	1	14.3	1	2.5
2-3 yrs. to Tenure Decision	0	00.0	0	00.0	2	28.6	2	5.0
4 or more yrs. to Tenure Decision	0	00.0	2	14.3	0	00.0	2	5.0
Not on Tenure Track	11	57.9	1	7.1	1	14.3	13	32.5
TOTAL	19	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0	40	100.0

Primary Teaching Area

Table 11 gives the primary teaching area for subjects in this study. Seventy percent of the subjects reported having two or more primary teaching areas. Interestingly, no subject taught only professional preparation activity courses and none of the subjects taught just coaching courses.

TABLE 11

PRIMARY TEACHING AREA OF SUBJECTS

Primary Teaching Area	Frequency	PCT
Professional Preparation (Academic Courses)	5	12.5
Professional Preparation (Activity Courses)	0	00.0
Exercise Science	3	7.5
Sports Studies	2	5.0
Leisure Studies	1	2.5
Coaching	0	00.0
General Physical Education (Activity Courses)	1	5.0
Two or more of the above	28	70.0
TOTAL	40	100.0

How typical of faculty members across the country were the subjects of this study? In 1974, Bayer reported the findings of a survey of 60,000 college faculty conducted by the American Council on Education (ACE) and the Research Applied to National Needs program (RANN) of the National Science Foundation. The following comparisons are based on that report.

Nationally, males comprised 83.5 percent of the faculty at universities while females comprised 16.5 percent. In the present study, males comprise only 57.5 percent of the subjects and females comprise 42.5 percent. Bayer's study reported that 12.2 percent of the faculty in universities were 55 years of age or older and the average age for faculty was 40 years. In the present study, 10 percent of the physical education subjects were 56 years of age or older and 67.5 percent were between the ages of 35 and 55 years.

Nationally, 36.2 percent of the faculty held the rank of Professor. Only 12.5 percent of the physical education subjects in the present study held this rank. In the general university faculty population, 11.9 percent held the rank of Lecturer and Instructor. Over 27 percent of the physical education subjects held those ranks.

In the ACE/RANN study, 42.9 percent of the faculty reported having either an Ed.D. or Ph.D. degree. Of these, 40.2 percent were Ph.D.'s. Forty-five percent of the present physical education subjects reported having either an Ed.D. or Ph.D. degree. Of these, 37.5 percent were Ph.D.'s. Nationally, over 47 percent of the university faculty had been at their current institution for ten or more years. Sixty

percent of the subjects from the physical education departments reported being at their current institutions ten or more years.

Teaching and Research

Although the questionnaire was primarily intended to gather basic facts about the subjects, three additional questions were included in order to obtain a preliminary estimate of the subjects' attitude toward teaching. The first question asked subjects to rank their interest in teaching compared to their interest in research. Previous studies (Wilson & Gaff, 1975; Sanford et al., 1971; Wilkerson, 1976) have suggested that higher education faculty are more interested in teaching than they are in research. As Table 12 indicates, the subjects in this study also expressed this position. None of the subjects reported being "Extremely interested in research": or "Interested in teaching but more interested in research."

Significantly, of the 6 subjects who indicated an equal interest in both teaching and research, 5 were from Department C which offered the doctorate. In addition, 13 of the 18 subjects who expressed an extreme interest in teaching were from Department A which offered only a bachelor's degree.

TABLE 12

SUBJECTS' INTEREST IN TEACHING WHEN COMPARED TO RESEARCH

Category	Combined Freq.	PCT	Dept. A Freq.	PCT	Dept. B Freq.	PCT	Dept. C Freq.	PCT
Does not apply to me	0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0
Extremely interested in research	0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0
Interested in teaching but more interested in research	0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0
Equally intrested in both	6	15.0	1	5.3	0	00.0	5	71.4
Interested in research but more interested in teaching	16	40.0	5	26.3	10	71.4	1	14.3
Extremely interested in teaching	18	45.0	13	68.4	4	28.6	1	14.3
TOTAL	40	100.0	19	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0

Teaching and Publication

Writing for publication is a task that faculty often are expected to perform. Subjects were asked to rank their interest in teaching compared to their interest in writing for publication. Although teaching was still the overwhelming interest of the subjects, writing for publication was seen as a more attractive function than research.

As Table 13 indicates, 67 percent of the subjects expressed some degree of positive interest in writing for publication. Of the 13 subjects who expressed a disinterest in writing for publication, 10 were from Department A.

Teaching and Coaching

Coaching is a vocation often associated with the teaching of physical education. Because physical education faculty in higher education often are expected to coach or to hav had previous experience as a coach, subjects were asked to rank their interest in teaching compared to their interest in coaching. As Table 14 indicates, teaching was still the more important activity for these subjects.

There was, however, an important change in the composition of those subjects who chose the category "Extremely interested in teaching." In the present question, only 5 subjects from Department A indicated an extreme interest in teaching. For subjects from Department A, coaching was seen as a more attractive function relative to teaching than either research or writing for publication.

TABLE 13

SUBJECTS' INTEREST IN TEACHING WHEN COMPARED TO WRITING FOR PUBLICATION

Category	Combined Freq.	PCT	Dept. A Freq.	PCT	Dept. B Freq.	PCT	Dept. C Freq.	PCT
Does not apply	0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0
Extreme interest in writing for publication	1	2.5	0	00.0	0	00.0	1	14.3
Interested in teaching but more interested in writing for publication	0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0
Equal interest in both	3	7.5	0	00.0	0	00.0	3	42.9
Interest in writing for publication but more interest in teaching	23	57.5	9	47.4	11	78.5	3	42.9
Extreme interest in teaching	13	32.5	10	52.6	3	21.4	0	00.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	19	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0

TABLE 14

SUBJECTS' INTEREST IN TEACHING WHEN COMPARED TO COACHING

Category	Combined Freq.	PCT	Dept. A Freq.	PCT	Dept. B Freq.	PCT	Dept. C Freq.	PCT
Does not apply	5	12.5	0	00.0	2	14.3	3	42.9
Extreme interest in coaching	0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0
Interest in teaching but more interest in coaching	3	7.5	3	15.8	0	00.0	0	00.0
Equal interest in both	7	17.5	5	26.3	2	14.3	0	00.0
Interest in coaching but more interest in teaching	9	22.5	6	31.6	2	14.3	1	14.3
Extreme interest in teaching	16	40.0	5	26.3	8	57.1	3	42.9
TOTAL	40	100.0	19	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0

Summary

Subjects in this study expressed a strong interest in teaching when compared to research, writing for publication and coaching. Subjects from Departments B and C were most likely to express some degree of positive interest in both research and writing for publication, but indicated considerably less interest in coaching. Subjects from Department A, however, were less likely to express a positive interest in either research or writing for publication, but were more likely to express a positive interest in coaching.

SECTION 3: Departmental Responsibilities

The literature of higher education identifies teaching, research and service as the major responsibilities of faculty. The actual importance of these in the view of faculty is unknown. Some studies (Livesay, 1975; Lee, 1967) picture the faculty member as a scholarly researcher with little time for other tasks. Other studies, however, picture the faculty member as a teacher who has some interest in research and service, but who is primarily a teacher (Wilson & Gaff, 1975; Hruska, 1975). What proclivity faculty in physical education have for prioritizing these responsibilities is not known.

The relative importance assigned these responsibilities by subjects in this study was viewed as an indicator of their overall attitude toward teaching. The analysis of responses to interview questions related to this issue produced several interesting findings. First, teaching and service were viewed as major responsibilities;

research was not. Second, teaching was identified as the source of most job satisfactions. Third, coaching was mentioned as a major responsibility by over 30 percent of the subjects. Fourth, subjects generally reported being satisfied with their overall teaching situation. Thus, the overall attitude toward teaching was seen to be favorable, although not without complaint.

This section contains information relative to the subjects' perception of major responsibilities, sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, teaching preference and overall feeling toward their present teaching responsibilties. Data in tabular form, brief discussion and vignettes drawn from the interviews are presented.

Major Responsibilities

To ascertain what subjects in this study viewed as their major responsibilites, each was asked to describe the major responsibilities they had as a faculty member in their department. An examination of responses to this question revealed several important findings (see Table 15).

Research was mentioned as a major responsibility by only 5 percent of the subjects. Service was viewed as a major responsibility by only 37 percent of the subjects and teaching was seen as a major responsibility by all subjects. The picture of faculty as scholarly researchers was not an image that subjects in this study held for themselves. They saw themselves primarily as teachers.

Two additional categories of responsibility were frequently mentioned; administration and coaching. Administration included

TABLE 15

SUBJECT'S MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES

	Combined Departments			Department A			Department B			Department C		
Categories	Freq.	N=87 PCT Resp.	N=40 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=43 PCT Resp.	N=19 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=27 PCT Resp.	N=14 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=17 PCT Resp.	N=7 PCT Cases
Teaching	40	46.0	100.0	19	44.2	100.0	14	51.9	100.0	7	41.2	100.0
Coaching	14	16.1	35.0	12	27.9	63.2	2	7.4	14.3	0	0.0	0.0
Administration	16	18.4	40.0	9	20.9	47.4	4	14.8	28.6	3	17.6	42.9
Departmental Service	11	12.6	27.5	2	4.7	10.5	4	14.8	28.6	5	29.4	71.4
University Service	4	4.6	10.0	1	2.3	5.3	2	7.4	14.3	1	5.9	14.3
Research	2	2.3	5.0	0	0.0	0.0	1	3.7	7.1	1	5.9	14.3
TOTAL	87	100.0	217.5	43	100.0	226.3	27	100.0	192.9	17	100.0	242.9
VALID CASES	40											

responsibilities as chairperson or coordinator of such areas as student teaching, graduate studies and activity programs. Coaching was assigned some importance, especially by subjects in Department A which did not have a separate athletic department. Coaching was not as important in the other two departments where such separation had been established. Administration, however, was an important category across all three departments.

Except for the position of chairperson, administrative responsibilities such as those described (e.g., Coordinator of Racket Sports, Coordinator of Professional Preparation Activity Courses) often are included as part of departmental services in personnel documents. If administration is considered as service and combined with department and university service, then service was mentioned as a responsibility by over 70 percent of the subjects.

Viewed in this way, teaching and service were the major responsibilities mentioned by subjects across all departments. Coaching was viewed as a responsibility primarily by subjects from Department A. Research was considered a major responsibility by only 2 of the 40 subjects.

Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers

Not only was teaching seen as the primary job function, it also was viewed as the most satisfying (see Table 16). Only 6 subjects did not mention teaching as the most satisfying responsibility. Teaching was mentioned as a function that offered the opportunity for personal growth, challenge and achievement. It provided subjects with

TABLE 16

SUBJECT'S MOST SATISFYING RESPONSIBILITY

	Combined Departments			Department A			Department B			Department C		
Categories	Freq.	N=50 PCT Resp.	N=40 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=23 PCT Resp.	N=19 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=16 PCT Resp.	N=14 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=11 PCT Resp.	N=7 PCT Cases
Teaching	34	68.0	85.0	16	69.6	84.2	11	68.8	78.6	7	63.6	100.0
Coaching	5	10.0	12.6	4	17.4	21.1	1	6.3	7.1	0	00.0	00.0
Administration	2	4.0	5.0	1	4.3	5.3	1	6.3	7.1	0	00.0	00.0
Departmental Service	2	4.0	5.0	0	00.0	00.0	1	6.3	7.1	1	9.1	14.3
University Service	1	2.0	2.5	1	4.3	5.3	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0
Research	3	6.0	7.5	0	00.0	00.0	1	6.3	7.1	2	18.2	28.6
Other	3	6.0	7.5	1	4.3	5.3	1	6.3	7.1	1	9.1	14.3
TOTAL	50	100.0	125.0	23	100.0	121.1	16	100.0	114.3	11	100.0	157.1

contacts and interactions with students in an atmosphere that subjects found satisfying. These feelings of satisfaction are illustrated by the following responses given by subjects when asked the question "Of the responsibilities you have just described, which gives you the most satisfaction?":

> I would say my teaching, I really love teaching elementary school methods. . . I enjoy going out in the field and working with professional students. (006)

> I think I enjoy the interaction with people and the feedback you get from a class when they begin to get stimulated with the subject matter. (027)

> Teaching by far. . . for me it would be a strange world indeed if I could not work with the general university student in sport activities. (039)

> I enjoy formal discussions with graduate students who are really interested in the work. . . I enjoy teaching very much, especially in a seminar situation. (026)

> It (teaching) is the most direct contact with students. It is doing something which is creative and challenging and continuously changing. It's very stimulating in those respects. (007)

Service components were mentioned as a source of satisfaction by only 5 subjects. In contrast, over 50 percent of the subjects mentioned service as a source of dissatisfaction (see Table 17). Service was seen as a function which deprived subjects of the opportunity to associate with students and reduced the subjects' opportunity for personal growth and achievement. Much of the service responsibilities was viewed as "busy work," "paper shuffling," "time-consuming" and not supported with adequate clerical help. These themes are illustrated in the following excerpts:

TABLE 17

SOURCES OF DISSATISFACTION

	Combined Departments			Department A			Department B			Department C		
Categories	Freq.	N=44 PCT Resp.	N=39 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=21 PCT Resp.	N=19 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=15 PCT Resp.	N=14 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=8 PCT Rest.	N=6 PCT Cases
Teaching	3	6.8	7.7	1	4.8	5.3	1	6.7	7.1	1	12.5	16.7
Coaching	5	11.4	12.8	4	19.0	21.1	1	6.7	7.1	0	00.0	00.0
Administration	16	36.3	41.0	9	42.8	41.3	6	40.0	42.8	1	12.5	16.7
Department Services	6	13.6	15.4	1	4.8	5.3	3	20.0	21.4	2	25.0	33.3
University Services	2	4.5	5.1	1	4.8	5.3	1	6.7	7.1	0	00.0	00.0
Research	3	6.8	7.7	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	3	37.5	50.0
Other	9	20.4	23.0	5	23.8	26.3	3	20.0	21.4	1	12.5	16.7
TOTAL	44	100.0	112.0	21	100.0	110.5	15	100.0	107.1	8	100.0	133.3

. . . The time taken by some committees, the clock hours that are taken; not the tasks but the time. We are so democratic in higher education it's not very efficient. (031)

. . . Probably the paper work. . . There is an awful lot of paper work that comes across my desk, most of which is not of much value. (020)

The most dissatisfying aspect of the whole thing is paper work. Not so much the paper work associated with classes, but the extraneous paper work everybody gets. I don't like what takes me away from the thing I like best and that's contact with students. (005)

Including administrative? . . . Oh ya, that's the most dissatisfying. The attention to detail, the interest and enthusiasm for things in that area have just diminished. Sixteen years as a chairman here and at other institutions and problems and issues I really think it was wearing. (034)

The committee work is probably most dissatisfying. I find it very difficult and I certainly perceive its need in the organization of the university . . . but I find it frustrating because you have a good deal of autonomy as a faculty member and you can do things as you see fit. . . That's just not true with committees, things are under group control and no control at the same time and seem to wander about aimlessly and waste a lot of time. (041).

Although coaching was mentioned as a major responsibility by 35 percent of the subjects, it was mentioned as a "most satisfying responsibility" by only 5 subjects. As a job function in the public schools coaching often is considered to be the source of more satisfaction than teaching. For subjects in this study, however, coaching does not appear to hold such status.

Research was indicated as a source of satisfaction by 3 subjects, 2 from Department C and 1 from Department B. It also was mentioned as a source of dissatisfaction by 3 subjects, all from Department C. Interestingly, Department C was the only department in which subjects were expected to engage in research activities.

Teaching Assignment

In order to obtain elaboration on the subjects' feelings toward teaching, they were asked to focus on various aspects of their teaching assignment.

The following questions were used to probe this area:

IQ 10, 11. "In regard to your teaching responsibilities, how are teaching assignments generally made in this department? How do you feel about this procedure?"

IQ 12, 13, 14. "Of the courses you now teach, are there any that you prefer not to teach? Which one(s)? Why?"

IQ 15, 16, 17. "Are there courses that you are not now teaching, but would really like to teach? Which one(s) Why?"

IQ 18, 19. "Of the courses that you now teach, which do you find most satisfying for you? Why?"

The assignment of teaching responsibilities was seen as a collaborative effort by 90 percent of the subjects. The remaining 10 percent saw the assigning of teaching responsibilities as a function of the administration alone. Generally, subjects expressed satisfaction with the way teaching assignments were determined. Of the 6 subjects who expressed dissatisfaction with assignment procedures, 5 of them were from Department A. The dissatisfaction of this group stemmed from the lack of coordination between the persons responsible for making teaching assignments and those responsible for making coaching assignments.

Teaching Preference

Over one-fourth of the subjects indicated that they were now teaching a course that they preferred not to teach (see Table 18). Working conditions such as class size and the time of day class was offered, and resource problems such as lack of adequate space and equipment were the most frequently mentioned reasons for not wanting to teach a particular course (see Table 19). Some subjects, however, did mention that they lacked the qualification to teach the course and others expressed a lack of interest in the subject matter. The following quotations were typical of those who indicated a desire to not teach a particular course:

> I am not really sure how to organize the content of the course, there's another person on the staff who teaches it and does things I just don't want to do and I feel pressured to do it in a standard way and not do my thing. (001)

> It (health education) involved a whole new structure and organization . . . one year preparation for that was certainly not enough. I was very dissatisfied with my involvement in that line because it's one that is growing so much. I was happy to get out of that. (0018)

> Psychology of sport is a secondary area of mine and I'd prefer not to teach it. . . it's a matter of preference, I'd rather concentrate in my area of interest (sociology of sport). (026)

> Occasionally I'm assigned . . . and that I don't like to teach. Mainly because the facility is off campus and requires the use of my own transportation. . . the traveling time going there and back and the length of the class, which is two hours, so it's the whole afternoon, so it really blows coaching to. . . I had trouble getting back for my coaching. (013)

TABLE 18

SUBJECTS TEACHING A COURSE(S) THEY PREFER NOT TO TEACH

Category	Frequency	PCT Responses	PCT Cases
Yes	12	30.0	30.0
No	28	70.0	70.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	100.0

TABLE 19

SUBJECTS' REASONS FOR NOT WANTING TO TEACH A COURSE

Category	Combined Freq.	PCT Responses	PCT Cases
Working Conditions/Resources	6	35.3	50.0
Lack of Personal Competencies	4	23.5	33.3
Relationship with Students	1	5.9	8.3
Course Content	4	23.5	33.3
Lack of Personal Growth/ Challenge Achievement	2	11.8	16.7
TOTAL	17	100.0	141.7
VALID CASES	12		

Over half of the subjects expressed an interest in teaching a course they were not presently teaching (see Table 20). There was considerable energy expressed by the subjects as they discussed the course they would like to teach and the reason for wanting to teach it. The strong desire to engage in an area of interest was reinforced by the fact that subjects felt they had important competencies in that area and that they expected opportunities for personal growth, challenge and achievement if they were given a chance to teach in that area. This expression of optimism is revealed in the following quotations.

> I would like to be much more involved in the graduate program that I am now involved in. I would like to focus more of my efforts in the area of neuro-physiology. . . I think that's where important answers lie to helping man understand movement. (041)

> Psychology of Coaching. . . I think I know my subject. I have a lot of knowledge and experience in teaching. I think I have a lot of information I can give people to help them become better educators. (001)

> It (exercise physiology lab) would be more stimulating in my own development and allow me to interact more directly with students on topics of importance and current interest to me. (023)

> . . . I am particularly interested in the psychology and sociology of sport and when we get our graduate program, I would like to teach in this area. . . this was my major interest for my graduate degree. (009)

A majority of subjects from Departments A and B identified an undergraduate course in a specific discipline or professional area as the most satisfying course they were now teaching. An undergraduate activity course was mentioned as most satisfying by the rest of the subjects in these departments. Of the 7 subjects from Department C, 5 of them identified a graduate activity as the most satisfying and only two selected an undergraduate course (see Table 21).

TABLE 20

SUBJECTS' DESIRE TO TEACH A COURSE THEY WERE NOT NOW TEACHING

Category	Frequency	PCT Responses	PCT Cases
Yes	33	82.5	82.5
No	7	17.5	17.5
TOTAL	40	100.0	100.0

TABLE 21

SUBJECT'S MOST SATISFYING COURSE

Categories	Combined Department Freq.	N=46 PCT Resp.	N=39 PCT Cases	Department A Freq.	N=22 PCT Resp.	N=18 PCT Cases	Department B Freq.	N=16 PCT Resp.	N=14 PCT Cases	Department C Freq.	N=8 PCT Resp.	N=7 PCT Cases
Undergraduate Discipline Or Professional Course	25	54.3	64.1	14	63.6	77.8	9	56.3	64.3	2	25.0	28.6
Undergraduate-Activity Course	12	26.1	30.8	7	31.8	38.9	5	31.3	35.7	0	00.0	00.0
Graduate-Discipline Or Professional Course	4	8.7	10.3	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	4	50.0	51.1
Graduate-General	1	2.2	2.6	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	1	12.5	14.3
Other	4	8.7	10.3	1	4.5	5.6	2	12.5	14.3	1	12.5	14.3
TOTAL	46	100.0	117.9	22	100.0	122.2	16	100.0	114.3	8	100.0	114.3

Relationships with students, opportunities for personal growth, challenge and achievement, and interest in the content were the most frequently mentioned sources of satisfaction within the identified course (see Table 22). The enthusiasm expressed for these "most satisfying courses" is evident in the following comments:

> I'm really interested in it, it's something I enjoy. I feel it's a very important part of the professional preparation area. There are just some fascinating things about Physiology that apply to sport and physical education. (003)

> Scuba, that's where my major interest is in terms of teaching. . . it's where my goals and my direction are progressing. If I go back to get a degree it will be to stay in this area. (034)

> Part of the reward . . . with Test and Measurement is I know the students don't like it, they don't like math and when I get students that are able to at least comprehend it at a fairly enjoyable level, I get great satisfaction. . . (031)

> Exercise Physiology on the graduate level . . . because of the class size being smaller and the opportunity to have a little more discussion, plus the people are more advanced and they get into a more conceptual base rather than a pure factual base. (023)

Overall Satisfaction

When asked to give three or four words that best described their feelings toward their present teaching responsibilities, the subjects were overwhelmingly positive. "Enthusiastic," "satisfying," "challenging," "enjoyable," "demanding" and "interesting" were the descriptions most often expressed. Although the subjects were not without complaint about their present teaching responsibilities, overall they did express positive attitude about teaching.

TABLE 22

WHY FAVORITE COURSE WAS SATISFYING

Categories	Combined Departments Freq.	N=66 PCT Resp.	N=36 PCT Cases	Department A Freq.	N=33 PCT Resp.	N=18 PCT Cases	Department B Freq.	N=22 PCT Resp.	N=12 PCT Cases	Department C Freq.	N=11 PCT Resp.	N=6 PCT Cases
Working Conditions/ Resources	10	15.2	27.8	6	18.2	33.3	2	9.1	16.7	2	18.2	33.3
Personal Competencies	5	7.6	13.9	4	12.1	22.2	1	4.5	8.3	0	00.0	00.0
Relationship With Students	18	27.1	50.0	10	30.3	55.6	4	18.2	33.3	4	36.4	66.7
Course Content	15	22.7	41.7	6	18.2	33.3	7	31.8	58.3	2	18.2	33.3
Personal Growth/ Challenge/ Achievement	17	25.8	47.2	7	21.2	39.8	7	31.8	58.3	3	27.3	50.0
Relationship With Collegaues	1	1.5	2.8	0	00.0	00.0	1	4.5	8.3	0	00.0	00.0
TOTAL	66	100.0	183.3	33	100.0	183.3	22	100.0	183.3	11	100.0	183.3

SECTION 4: Purposes, Competencies and Strengths

The focus of this section is on purposes (instructional intentions) expressed by the subjects and the competencies they felt were needed in order to accomplish those purposes. The following series of questions required the subjects to examine themselves as teachers. The questions are presented in the same order in which they were asked.

IQ 21. Please try to explain to me what you try most to achieve as a teacher, that is, what are you really trying to do, most of all?

IQ 22. What competencies--i.e., skills or knowledges--do you feel are necessary for you to have in order to achieve those things you really think are important for you to accomplish as a teacher?

IQ 23. How do you feel you have developed these competencies?

IQ 24. What do you consider to be your greatest strength as a teacher?

The findings which emerged from these questions are presented in a manner which stresses the interrelationship among the various questions and the responses to those questions. The data from each question are presented in table format and are supported with discussions.

Two predominate purposes emerged from the responses that subjects gave when asked what they most wanted to achieve as teachers (see Table 23). Sixty percent expressed a desire to encourage student interest and enthusiasm for an area of study, and just over half mentioned the desire to provide students with subject matter knowledge. These purposes appear to be based on different assumptions about the nature of teaching. Correspondingly, each purpose was perceived to require different competencies in order to increase the probability of their attainment.

TABLE 23

IQ 21. PURPOSES SUBJECTS TRY TO ACHIEVE AS TEACHERS

	Combined Departments			Department A			Department B			Department C		
Categories	Freq.	N=65 PCT Resp.	N=40 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=32 PCT Resp.	N=19 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=22 PCT Resp.	N=14 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=11 PCT Resp.	N=7 PCT Cases
Provide Knowledge of Subject	21	32.3	52.5	10	31.3	52.6	6	27.3	42.9	5	45.5	71.4
Provide Positive Educational Environment	5	7.7	12.5	2	6.3	10.5	3	13.6	21.4	0	00.0	00.0
Meet Personal Needs of Students	7	10.8	17.5	4	12.5	21.1	2	9.1	14.3	1	9.1	14.3
Encourage Interest and Enthusiasm in Area of Study	24	36.0	60.0	13	40.6	68.4	8	36.4	57.1	3	27.3	42.9
Other	8	12.3	20.0	3	9.4	15.8	3	13.6	21.4	2	18.2	28.6
TOTAL	65	100.0	162.5	32	100.0	168.4	22	100.0	157.1	11	100.0	157.1

The expressed need to encourage student interest and enthusiasm for an area of study suggests that subjects see students as not usually eager to learn and that it is the teacher's responsibility to capture the student's intellectual curiosity and interest. Such capturing, which clearly goes beyond direct concern for curricular content, was seen as requiring competencies that were not easily defined and which were generally acquired in an informal way.

In contrast, the intention to transmit subject matter knowledge suggests that subjects held a commitment to provide course related information for the students and that they view this responsibility as a central function of teaching. Providing subject matter knowledge is a direct curricular function, which was seen by subjects as requiring competencies which were easy to define and which were acquired in formal ways.

Many subjects from each department expressed the desire to accomplish both of these purposes. Some interesting differences do, however, emerge from an analysis of the data by department. Subjects from Department C (offering the doctorate), for example, were more likely to mention the desire to provide subject matter knowledge than were subjects from either Departments A or B (see Table 23). In addition, subjects from Department C were more likely to identify competencies which were easy to define and objectively measurable than were subjects from either Departments A or B (see Table 24). Subjects from Department C also were more likely to indicate that the competencies they needed were developed by formal means such as academic training and inservice training (see Table 25).

TABLE 24

IQ 22. COMPETENCIES NEEDED BY SUBJECTS TO ACHIEVE STATED PURPOSES

Categories	Combined Departments Freq.	N=91 PCT Resp.	N=40 PCT Cases	Department A Freq.	N=45 PCT Resp.	N=19 PCT Cases	Department B Freq.	N=28 PCT Resp.	N=14 PCT Cases	Department C Freq.	N=18 PCT Resp.	N=7 PCT Cases
Knowledge of Subject	33	36.3	82.5	16	35.6	84.2	10	35.7	71.4	7	38.9	100.0
Knowledge of Students	5	5.5	12.5	2	4.4	10.5	2	7.1	14.3	1	5.6	14.3
Interpersonal Skills	16	17.6	40.0	8	17.8	42.1	5	17.9	35.7	3	16.7	42.9
Skills in Instructional Techniques/ Methods	10	11.0	25.0	3	6.7	15.8	2	7.1	14.3	5	27.8	71.4
Planning/Organizing Skills	3	3.3	7.5	1	2.2	5.3	2	7.1	14.3	0	00.0	00.0
Feedback/Evaluation Skills	1	1.1	2.5	1	2.2	5.3	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0
Personal Qualities	19	20.9	47.5	11	24.4	57.9	6	21.4	42.7	2	11.1	28.6
Other	4	4.4	10.0	3	6.7	15.8	1	3.6	7.1	0	00.0	00.0
TOTAL	91	100.0	227.5	45	100.0	236.8	28	100.0	200.0	18	100.0	257.1

TABLE 25

IQ 23. HOW SUBJECTS FELT THEIR COMPETENCIES WERE DEVELOPED

	Combined Departments			Department A			Department B			Department C		
Categories	Freq.	N=88 PCT Resp.	N=40 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=44 PCT Resp.	N=19 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=27 PCT Resp.	N=14 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=17 PCT Resp.	N=7 PCT Cases
Academic Training	17	19.3	42.5	7	15.9	36.8	6	22.2	42.9	4	23.5	57.1
Previous Teaching Experience	8	9.1	20.0	6	13.6	31.6	1	3.7	7.1	1	5.9	14.3
Previous Experience Other than Teaching	11	12.5	27.5	8	18.2	42.1	3	11.1	24.4	0	00.0	00.0
Observing/Working With Colleagues/ Peers	12	13.6	30.0	7	15.9	36.8	3	11.1	24.4	2	11.8	28.6
Self Taught	26	29.5	65.0	12	27.3	63.2	10	37.0	71.4	4	23.5	57.1
Inservice Training	12	13.6	30.0	3	6.8	15.8	4	14.8	28.6	5	29.4	71.4
Other	2	2.3	5.0	1	2.3	5.3	0	00.0	00.0	1	5.9	14.3
TOTAL	88	100.0	220.0	44	100.0	231.6	27	100.0	192.9	17	100.0	242.9

Subjects from Department B were least likely to mention transmission of subject matter as a purpose they wished to achieve. They also were least likely to identify knowledge of subject as a needed competency and most likely to indicate that the competencies they did need were self taught. In contrast to faculty in Departments A and C, these subjects mentioned "personal qualities" as their greatest strength as a teacher more often than any other strength (see Table 26).

Personal Qualities were not perceived to be developed by formal means such as academic courses or inservice training. They were, however, seen as being developed from personal experience and the intuitive understanding of those experiences and one's self. Whatever competencies are implied by "personal qualities," they obviously are difficult to measure and their origins difficult to ascertain. Perceptions such as those displayed by many subjects in this study reflect the belief that teachers are born and not made, and if they are made, they are self made.

SECTION 5: Teacher Effectiveness

Subjects identified a variety of competencies as necessary to accomplish the purposes they desired to achieve. How effective subjects felt they were in accomplishing these purposes, and the means they used to determine that effectiveness are examined in this section.

Perceived Effectiveness as Teachers

Three-fourths of the subjects described themselves as effective teachers. None of the subjects viewed themselves as ineffective (see Table 27). They relied on their own judgment and student evaluations as the primary means by which to estimate their teaching effectiveness

TABLE 26

IQ 24. SUBJECTS' GREATEST STRENGTH AS A TEACHER

Categories	Combined Departments Freq.	N=58 PCT Resp.	N=40 PCT Cases	Department A Freq.	N=27 PCT Resp.	N=19 PCT Cases	Department B Freq.	N=21 PCT Resp.	N=14 PCT Cases	Department C Freq.	N=10 PCT Resp.	N=7 PCT Cases
Knowledge of Subject Matter	14	24.1	35.0	8	29.6	42.1	4	19.0	28.6	2	20.0	28.6
Knowledge of Students	4	6.9	10.0	1	3.7	5.3	0	00.0	00.0	3	30.0	42.9
Interpersonal Skills	11	19.0	27.5	7	25.9	26.8	3	14.3	21.4	1	10.0	14.3
Skills in Instructional Technique/ Methods	6	10.3	15.0	4	14.8	21.1	1	4.8	7.1	1	10.0	14.3
Skills in Planning/ Organizing	2	3.4	5.0	0	00.0	00.0	2	9.5	14.3	0	00.0	00.0
Skill in Feedback/ Evaluation	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0
Personal Qualities	21	36.2	52.5	7	25.9	36.8	11	52.4	78.6	3	30.0	42.9
Other	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0
TOTAL	58	100.0	145.0	27	100.0	231.6	21	100.0	150.0	10	100.0	142.9

TABLE 27

I 29 SUBJECT'S PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS AS A TEACHER

	Combined Departments			Department A			Department B			Department C		
Categories	Freq.	N=40 PCT Resp.	N=40 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=19 PCT Resp.	N=19 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=14 PCT Resp.	N=14 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=7 PCT Resp.	N=7 PCT Cases
Effective	30	75.0	75.0	14	73.7	73.7	11	78.6	78.6	5	71.4	71.4
Moderately Effective	9	22.5	22.5	4	21.1	21.1	3	21.4	21.4	2	28.6	28.6
Ineffective	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0
Other	1	2.5	2.5	1	5.3	5.3	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	100.0	19	100.0	100.0	14	100.0	100.0	7	100.0	100.0

(see Table 28), and seldom used colleagues or administrators as sources of feedback.

Some subjects displayed confidence and self-assurance when describing themselves as effective.

> I think I am pretty effective. All the kinds of feedback that I get are good and I feel very good about my teaching so I rate myself pretty high. (005)

> I don't want to sound egotistical but I think I am a darn good teacher. Students say they enjoy my classes and they often recommend them to other students. . . I want to be good, I like the feeling it gives me. (023)

Others were less confident in estimating their teaching effectiveness.

> I don't think I am the world's greatest teacher, there are always things you can improve on. I need to use more variety in methodology in my teaching. . . I think I am pretty effective, at least when I go out in the schools and see my students doing things that I have taught . . . it . . . well . . . means I have taught them something. (006)

> In terms of my capacity (for effectiveness) maybe 75 percent, far from what I could be. I would love to be able to find out what my potential is as a teacher. I don't know. . . I find myself committed to my department, my college and the university. (004)

The fact that subjects rely on themselves and their students in determining their effectiveness suggests that the process for determining teaching effectiveness is a closed system. It is a happening between the two principal characters in the teaching-learning situation, the teacher and the student. Even when colleague or administrator feedback was mentioned, it never was a result of direct observation of the subject's teaching, but instead involved the colleague only as an indirect source of student input. Formed without the benefit of objective, non-participant information, professional judgments of

TABLE 28

IQ 25. PROCESSES SUBJECTS USE TO DETERMINE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THEIR TEACHING

	Combined Departments			Department A			Department B			Department C		
Categories	Freq.	N=82 PCT Resp.	N=40 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=39 PCT Resp.	N=19 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=27 PCT Resp.	N=14 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=16 PCT Resp.	N=7 PCT Cases
Systematic Feedback from Students	33	40.2	82.5	17	43.6	89.5	11	40.7	78.6	5	31.3	71.4
Non Systematic Feedback from Students	21	25.6	52.5	10	25.6	52.6	6	22.2	42.9	5	31.3	71.4
Student Achievement	15	18.3	37.5	5	12.8	26.3	6	22.2	42.9	4	25.0	51.1
Systematic Feedback from Colleagues/ Administrators	2	2.4	5.0	2	5.1	10.5	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0
Non Systematic Feedback from Collegaues/ Administrators	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0
Intuitive Sense	9	11.0	22.5	4	10.3	21.1	3	11.1	21.4	2	12.5	28.6
Other	2	2.4	5.0	1	2.6	5.3	1	3.7	7.1	0	00.0	00.0
TOTAL	82	100.0	205.0	39	100.0	205.3	27	100.0	192.9	16	100.0	228.6

teaching effectiveness were based on limited inputs from sources which were likely to have highly selective viewpoints.

Student Feedback on Teaching

Each of the departments investigated had policies suggesting that their faculty use some type of systematic student evaluation of their teaching, and provided such instruments for faculty use. Over 80 percent of the subjects mentioned systematic student evaluation as a process they used in determining their teaching effectiveness. Interestingly, however, only 40 percent indicated that systematic student evaluations provided the most accurate assessment of their teaching. This suggests that although systematic student evaluations are used, they are viewed with varying degrees of skepticism.

Non-systematic student feedback, though received through casual conversations with students, was viewed as an important source of information across all departments, but was of particular importance for subjects from Department C (see Table 28).

The third category of student input mentioned was student achievement. This category represents a distinct departure from the previous two student input categories, in that the focus on student achievement clearly involves a product rather than process bases for determining instructional effectiveness. This apparently involves a recognition by some subjects that they are responsible for what students learn and that how students perform on tests is a reflection of their effectiveness as teachers. Those subjects who did mention

student achievement also were likely to view it as an accurate means of determining their teaching effectiveness (see Tables 28 and 29). Student achievement played the largest role in professional judgments in Department C, a smaller role in Department B and was relatively insignificant in Department A.

It would appear from these data, that subjects depended heavily on students as a source of information about their performance. Taken collectively, student achievement and student feedback (formal and informal) account for all but a small fraction of information processed in determining self estimates of teaching effectiveness. Responses to a related question, however, strongly suggest that subjects rely on themselves almost as much as they do students (see Table 30). The two previous questions asked subjects to identify the "process" used to determine their teaching effectivenss and to place a value on their accuracy. The data in Table 30 resulted from asking subjects "how" they made the judgment that they were effective or ineffective. In the latter questions, subjects were not asked to identify a particular process.

In a system of feedback that includes only the teacher and student, it is the teacher who must assimilate student assessments and make judgments as to their validity, reliability, and usefulness. Such judgments usually are made alone without assistance from colleagues, administrators or students. In this sense, self evaluation is an exclusively subjective process in which the professor serves as both judge and jury.

TABLE 29

IQ 26. PROCESS PROVIDING SUBJECTS WITH THE MOST ACCURATE ASSESSMENT OF THEIR TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

	Combined Departments			Department A			Department B			Department C		
Categories	Freq.	N=49 PCT Resp.	N=40 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=23 PCT Resp.	N=19 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=17 PCT Resp.	N=14 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=9 PCT Resp.	N=7 PCT Cases
Systematic Feedback from Students	17	34.7	42.5	12	52.2	63.2	4	23.5	28.6	1	11.1	14.3
Non Systematic Feedback from Students	12	24.5	30.0	5	21.7	26.3	4	23.5	28.6	3	33.3	42.9
Student Achievement	10	20.4	25.0	3	13 0	15.8	4	23.5	28.6	3	33.3	42.9
Systematic Feedback from Colleagues/ Administrators	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0
Non Systematic Feedback from Colleagues/ Administrators	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0
Intuitive Sense	6	12.2	15.0	2	8.7	10.5	2	11.8	14.3	2	22.2	28.6
Other	4	8.2	10.0	1	4.3	5.3	3	17.6	21.4	0	00.0	00.0
TOTAL	49	100.0	122.5	23	100.0	121.1	17	100.0	121.4	9	100.0	126.8

TABLE 30

IQ 30. HOW SUBJECTS CAME TO SEE THEMSELVES AS EFFECTIVE OR INEFFECTIVE TEACHERS

	Combined Departments			Department A			Department B			Department C		
Categories	Freq.	N=60 PCT Resp.	N=40 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=29 PCT Resp.	N=19 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=18 PCT Resp.	N=14 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=13 PCT Resp.	N=7 PCT Cases
Student Feedback	27	45.0	67.5	10	34.5	52.6	11	61.1	78.6	6	46.2	85.7
Colleague Feedback	7	11.7	17.5	4	13.8	21.1	1	5.6	7.1	2	15.4	28.6
Administrator Feedback	2	3.3	5 0	1	3.4	5.3	0	00.0	00.0	1	7.7	14.3
Self Evaluation	23	38.3	57.5	13	44.8	68.4	6	33.3	42.9	4	30.8	57.1
Other	1	1.7	2.5	1	3.4	5.3	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0
TOTAL	60	100.0	150.0	29	100.0	152.6	18	100.0	128.6	13	100.0	185.7

SECTION 6: Status of Teaching

Importance of Teaching for Personnel Decisions

Teaching, as noted in Section 3, was mentioned as a major responsibility by all subjects. It was, however, not seen as important for granting promotion, tenure or other improvements in status by many of the subjects (see Table 31). Except for the 14 subjects from Department B, who all felt that teaching performance had importance for personnel decision in their department, subjects were most likely to view teaching performance as being only "somewhat important" or "not important" at all. Subjects from Department A were most likely to mention teaching as "not important" for such decisions.

Transcripts of the interviews reveal that subjects from Department A expressed considerable frustration and a pervasive sense of helplessness within their situation. The department offered only a bachelor's degree, the subjects viewed their job primarily as teaching and coaching, generally saw themselves as effective teachers and yet it was their perception that teaching performance was not important for positive personnel decisions. In fact, none of the 11 non-tenured subjects from Department A was presently being considered for tenure. None of these subjects was on a tenure track and all held the rank of lecturer. Regardless of their teaching performance, unless these subjects received a terminal degree, they could not be promoted or tenured. In addition, they had to be reappointed to their position each year.

The following comments by subjects from Department A illustrate the feelings expressed by many of these faculty in their interviews.

TABLE 31

I. 34. SUBJECTS' PERCEPTION OF THE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING FOR PROMOTION, TENURE AND PERSONNEL DECISIONS IN THEIR DEPARTMENT

Categories	Combined Depts. N=40 Freq.	PCT Cases	Dept. A N=19 Freq.	PCT Cases	Dept. B N=14 Freq.	PCT Cases	Dept. C N=7 Freq.	PCT Cases
Important	22	55.0	6	31.6	14	100.0	2	28.6
Somewhat Important	8	20.0	5	26.3	0	00.0	3	42.9
Not Important	10	25.0	8	42.1	0	00.0	2	28.6
TOTAL	40	100.0	19	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0

> In order to get advanced at the University of _____, you have to have a Ph.D. Under any other circumstance you could be the best teacher, the best coach around and you are not going to get it. You can adequately research and publish and I think it's still going to be very difficult to get tenure or promotion. (014)

> . . . Our bosses here can look at someone and say "that person is a really effective teacher." You take that same person and put him in front of the faculty affairs committee of the University who's responsible for reappointment, promotion and tenure and they will say "Yes he's an effective teacher, a very effective teacher, but that's not what we promote him on, that's not what he gets tenure on. (001)

In contrast, subjects from Department B displayed remarkable solidarity about the importance of teaching in their department. Of the non-tenured subjects, 2 were on a tenure track and held the rank of assistant professor. The third, who had not completed a terminal degree, held the rank of instructor and was not presently on a tenure track. It was, however, the opinion of both tenured and non-tenured subjects that teaching performance would be given substantial consideration in promotion, tenure and other personnel decisions. This opinion is expressed in the following quotes:

> It's (teaching) definitely the strongest area. There's no question, that it's most important. (036)

> Oh! It's, for good or evil, the overriding factor. . . It's the overriding factor in any tenure decision, it is the overriding factor in any promotion decision up to and including the associate professor rank. It's not, and I don't think it should be, the overriding factor in the promotion to the rank of full professor. (037)

The subjects from Department C were split in their perceptions of the importance of teaching for personnel decision (see Table 31). The need to do research, publish and teach were expectations that subjects in this department held for themselves. Teaching, however, was seen as

holding various degrees of worth as a means for advancement. The following excerpts illustrate the range of opinion:

> . . . I think in this day and age it would have to be a consideration of both (teaching and research). Teaching by itself--it's hard to say--my tenure is in two years and I'm fairly new on the scene and I know over the years these things change. In this day and age, teaching counts but there has to be the other too. There is, according to the leadership we have up through the dean, there is a dual need in the university. (022)

> . . . There's nobody systematically looking into it (teaching), there are very few rewards, if any, for quality teaching. We just have not tended to reward it greatly. . . Rarely in promotion or tenure decisions does teaching carry very much weight, unless it's very poor. I have served quite a number of years on Promotion and Tenure Committees for both the deapartment and the school. Research is the primary factor. Teaching is one of the minimal concerns. (023)

How Well Teaching Was Rewarded

To further investigate teaching as an activity that was respected and rewarded by the departments, subjects were asked the following question:

> IQ 40. All things considered, how well do you feel teaching is rewarded by your department?

Sixteen of the 19 subjects from Department A indicated that teaching was "minimally rewarded" or "not rewarded." In contrast, 11 of the 14 subjects from Department B felt that teaching was substantially rewarded and only 3 subjects indicated a lower estimate of its potency in gaining departmental rewards. Subjects from Department C were split with 4 subjects indicating teaching was rewarded and 3 indicating otherwise (see Table 32).

TABLE 32

I. 40. SUBJECTS' PERCEPTION OF HOW WELL TEACHING IS REWARDED IN THEIR DEPARTMENT

Categories	Combined Depts. N=40 Freq.	PCT Cases	Dept. A N=19 Freq.	PCT Cases	Dept. B N=14 Freq.	PCT Cases	Dept. C N=7 Freq.	PCT Cases
Rewarded	18	45.0	3	15.8	11	78.6	4	57.1
Minimally Rewarded	10	25.0	7	36.8	2	14.3	1	28.6
Not Rewarded	12	30.0	9	47.4	1	7.1	2	14.3
TOTAL	40	100.0	19	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0

Those who did not perceive teaching as being rewarded by their department tended to repeat previously mentioned concerns, but with added emphasis on the lack of financial rewards.

> There is very little incentive to do anything over and above what the job calls for. . . you can't look forward to a $1500 bonus or recognition, there is none of that and I guess without those positive reinforcers--ah--that's one of the reasons why there is so little interest and apathy within the department for getting out and really hustling and doing things above what you understand you have to do. (003)

> . . . There aren't any monetary rewards. Ever since I've been here, raises have been across the board and they have been less than the cost of living. . . I don't see people who teach well rewarded any more than ones who teach poorly. Except they know they did a good job and maybe their colleagues know they did a good job. But, because right now everybody is just stuck! There's nobody in our department that is eligible for promotion or tenure. The ones that are already on tenure are stuck at the place they are at. Those that are not on tenure aren't going to get on. That's where you get a salary reward, if you get tenured or promoted. (011)

This comment by a subject from Department B exemplifies the opinion held by almost 80 percent of the subjects in that department.

> In terms of salary increments within a step without any promotion involved, my perception of that, and it's really hearsay, is that it is rewarded. Quality teaching is rewarded. Having served on the Promotion and Tenure Committee, I know we value quality teaching as the most important thing we look for when we look at the three areas. So, yes, in this department we do look favorably on that aspect. People are being promoted and tenured, not solely on, but we have to have that as one of those three aspects. Quality teaching, if you don't have it, you don't get promoted and you don't get tenured. (031)

The Relative Importance of Teaching

Subjects were asked to discuss the reasons why teaching held the position it did in their department (see Table 33). In Department A, where teaching was perceived as relatively unimportant, most subjects

TABLE 33

IQ 35. REASONS PERCEIVED FOR RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING

Categories	Combined Departments			Department A			Department B			Department C		
	Freq.	N=42 PCT Resp.	N=40 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=19 PCT Resp.	N=19 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=15 PCT Resp.	N=14 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=8 PCT Resp.	N=7 PCT Cases
Traditional Concept of A University	6	14.3	15.0	2	10.5	10.5	0	00.0	00.0	4	50.0	57.1
Influence of the Wider Institution	19	45.2	47.5	13	68.4	68.4	3	20.0	21.4	3	37.6	42.8
Unique Mission of The Dept. or School	11	26.1	27.5	2	10.5	10.5	9	60.0	64.3	0	00.0	00.0
Characteristics of Teaching	1	2.4	2.5	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	1	12.4	14.2
Other	5	11.9	12.5	2	10.5	10.5	3	20.0	21.4	0	00.0	00.0
TOTAL	42	100.0	105.0	19	100.0	100.0	15	100.0	107.1	8	100.0	114.1

attributed this condition to the influence of the wider institution. For many of these subjects the "liberal arts attitude" prevailed in their institution and teaching was not held in high esteem. There was, among many of these subjects, a pervasive sense of little or no control over their fate. They saw their leadership as "powerless" or "unwilling" to deal with the central administration of the university. The following quote was reflective of most subjects in this department.

> . . . I think it's very unfortunate, but I think it's the Arts College philosophy, and this university is dominated by the Arts College philosophy. We have a vice-president who is an Arts College man, we have a president who's an Arts College person. . . We do have a University Faculty Affairs Committee, but it tends to be an elitest group . . . and politically, and that's another thing, they (Arts College) are political and education, home ec., business and engineering I don't think are political and that's why we get hurt, it's because we allow the Arts College to wield their influence on campus and in those kind of academic matters. (007)

In Department B, however, where teaching was viewed as the most important function, subjects indicated that teaching was held as important because it was accepted as the unique mission of the department not only by department and school leaders, but by leaders at the university level as well. Although other departments on their campus were held to more traditional scholarship requirements, subjects from Department B felt they were recognized and respected for their primary mission, which was teaching.

The traditional scholarly emphasis of a university and the tendency of the wider institution to uphold this tradition were viewed as the primary reasons for teaching holding an unobtrusive position within Department C.

One reason often cited for teaching not having much importance is that it is difficult to judge good teaching because objective measures of good teaching are rare. Interestingly, this reason was mentioned by only one subject in the present study.

Research and/or Writing for Publication

Research was not mentioned as a major responsibility by subjects in this study (see Table 15, p. 69). In addition, research and writing for publication were seen as having some importance when compared to teaching, but teaching held the greatest interest for most subjects (see Tables 12 and 13, pp. 63, 65). To further explore the subjects' disposition toward research and writing for publication, they were asked the following question:

> IQ 37. Are you actively involved in research and/or publication at this point in your career?

Subjects working in Department C, which offered a doctorate degree, were most likely to be involved in research or writing for publication while subjects from Department A, which offered a bachelor's degree only, were least likely to be so engaged (see Table 34). Subjects in Department B, which offered a master's degree were more involved in research and publication than those in Department A, but were less involved than subjects in Department C.

Research and writing for publication were expected behaviors for subjects in Department C. In Department B, subjects did not mention the pressure or expectation to research or publish, but for many it was something that was important to them personally and professionally.

TABLE 34

IQ 37. SUBJECTS' STATUS IN REGARDS TO RESEARCH OR PUBLICATION

	Combined Departments		Department A		Department B		Department C	
Categories	Freq.	PCT Cases	Freq.	PCT Cases	Freq.	PCT Cases	Freq.	PCT Cases
Actively Involved in Research And/Or Publication	19	47.5	6	31.5	7	50.0	6	85.7
Not Actively Involved In Research And/Or Publication	20	50.0	13	68.4	7	50.0	1	14.3
Other	1	2.5	1	5.3	0	00.0	0	00.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	20	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0

For most subjects from Department A, however, research or writing for publication were not important to their immediate employment situation, were not valued in a personal sense, were not expected and were not supported through adjustments in faculty work loads.

Research and Good Teaching

Although nearly half of the subjects indicated that they were presently engaged in research and/or writing for publication, these activities did not appear to be connected to their perception of what it takes to be a good teacher. When asked the following question;

> IQ 36. Do you agree with the statement that "No one can be a good teacher unless he/she is actively involved in research"?

32 of the 40 subjects responded with a negative statement (see Table 35). There was, however, an important degree of uncertainty expressed by subjects when discussing this topic. Twenty of the responses were coded as "yes, with reservation" or "no with reservation." For most subjects whose responses were categorized into these two categories, it was a question of what definition should be used for the word research. If the definition of research had been expanded to include the collection of new information, reading research or applying new information in their jobs, then many more of the subjects would have agreed that research was important to good teaching. However, since a narrow definition of research was used, many subjects had reservations about the exact nature of the importance assigned to the role of research in good teaching.

TABLE 35

I 36. "NO ONE CAN BE A GOOD TEACHER UNLESS HE/SHE IS ACTIVELY INVOLVED IN RESEARCH"

	Combined Departments		Department A		Department B		Department C	
Categories	Freq.	PCT Cases	Freq.	PCT Cases	Freq.	PCT Cases	Freq.	PCT Cases
Yes	2	5.0	0	00.0	0	00.0	2	28.6
Yes, with reservation	6	15.0	5	26.3	0	00.0	1	14.3
No, with reservation	14	35.0	5	26.3	6	42.9	3	42.9
No	18	45.0	9	47.4	8	57.1	1	14.3
TOTAL	40	100.0	19	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0

Informal Rewards

Although promotion, tenure and advancement are important rewards for faculty, it is reasonable to believe that other important reward sources exist within their work environment. In order to identify what some of the other sources might be, subjects were asked the following questions:

> IQ 38. Other than the formal rewards we have been discussing, do you find any other rewards available to you for engaging in teaching?
>
> IQ 39. If yes, what are they?

For subjects in this study, the most frequently mentioned informal reward was relationships with their students. For many, this was perceived as the "real" reward for teaching. The affection and need that subjects felt for their students are reflected in the following excerpts from the interviews:

> . . . It's the personal satisfaction you get from being with young people and seeing them grow intellectually, professionally as they go through the program, and whatever impact you have on them and their lives is displayed from time to time directly by them or through words you get from others. (011)
>
> The things I gain from it (teaching) are the day-to-day contacts, the day-to-day good feeling in the relationships with students, it's a mutually supportive thing. (003)
>
> . . . the contact with students. That's got to be my overriding reason for being here anyways. Can't be the money . . . (032)
>
> . . . it's the intangible things, the appreciation from the students, hearing from them after they have graduated. (038)

Eighteen subjects perceived teaching as an enriching activity that offered the opportunity for personal growth, challenge and

achievement (see Table 36). Many, whose responses were coded into this category, found reward in the struggle to remain current in their field and in bringing the student and subject matter together. The following excerpts, from the interviews, illustrate the feelings expressed by these subjects:

> . . . pedagogy, anyone who's in it for the extrinsic rewards has probably made a bad decision. Its principal payoffs are in intrinsic rewards, in meeting personal needs to be a provider, to help people in their quest for knowledge. (037)

> . . . it's that I am doing what I like to do and am interested in and I think is important, that I can contribute and have some success. (042)

> I have a lot of contact with high schools, with individual communities and it's been one way that I have kept in touch with the field. My work with the state and meeting so many people, it allows me to grow. (007).

Working conditions and resources were seen as important rewards by 11 subjects. For them, reasonable course loads, long vacations, flexible time schedules, facilities to play in and libraries to study in were seen as a bonus for their career choice. Interestingly, only 3 faculty from Department A mentioned working conditions and resources as an informal reward (see Table 36). As noted earlier, faculty from Department A were generally not satisfied with their working conditions.

Relationships with colleagues were viewed as an informal reward by 6 subjects. Of these, 4 were from Department B, with one each from Departments A and C. Although colleagues could potentially be a source of great satisfaction, they were not such for most faculty in this study. Even in Department B, which by the responses in the interviews and the general impression they left with the investigator

TABLE 36

IQ 39. PERCEIVED REWARDS FOR TEACHING, OTHER THAN PROMOTION, TENURE, ADVANCEMENT

Categories	Combined Departments Freq.	N=57 PCT Resp.	N=39* PCT Cases	Department A Freq.	N=24 PCT Resp.	N=19 PCT Cases	Department B Freq.	N=21 PCT Resp.	N=6 PCT Cases	Department C Freq.	N=11 PCT Resp.	N=6 PCT Cases
Relationships With Students	21	36.8	53.8	11	45.8	61.1	6	28.6	42.9	4	36.3	66.6
Relationships With Colleagues	6	10.5	15.4	1	4.2	5.6	4	19.0	28.6	1	9.0	16.6
Personal Growth/ Challenge/ Achievement	18	31.6	46.2	9	37.5	50.0	6	28.6	42.9	3	27.2	50.0
Working Conditions/ Resources	11	19.2	28.2	3	12.5	16.7	4	19.0	28.6	3	27.2	50.0
Other	1	1.8	2.6	0	00.0	00.0	1	4.8	7.1	0	00.0	00.0
TOTAL	57	100.0	146.2	24	100.0	133.3	21	100.0	150.0	11	100.0	183.2

* 1 case missing.

were a rather close knit group, only 4 subjects mentioned their peers as a source of informal reward.

SECTION 7: Image as Teachers

In the context of the job situation, students and colleagues represent the primary persons with whom faculty members interact. Because these two groups are likely to have some importance in the life of the faculty member, subjects were asked to describe the image they wanted their students and colleagues to have of them as teachers. The questions used to solicit information on this topic are listed below:

IQ 27. What would you like to have your colleagues say about you as a teacher?

IQ 28. In the same light, what would you like to have your students say about you as a teacher?

The information from both Table 37 and Table 38 strongly suggests that subjects wanted first to be recognized as persons with desirable personal attributes. They wished to be seen as fair, enthusiastic, sensitive to others and hard-working. The desire to be seen in terms of their personal qualities reflects a dispostion of most subjects to view good teachers first as good people.

Many subjects, however, did mention attributes more clearly identified with the formal role of the teacher. They expressed the desire to be recognized as knowledgeable in their field and as being responsible for the achievements of their students.

Although planning, teaching methods and evaluation are recognized as essential pedagogical skills, only a small fraction of the subjects

TABLE 37

IQ 27. WHAT SUBJECTS WOULD LIKE COLLEAGUES TO SAY ABOUT THEM AS TEACHERS

Categories	Combined Departments Freq.	N=60 PCT Resp.	N=40 PCT Cases	Department A Freq.	N=29 PCT Resp.	N=19 PCT Cases	Department B Freq.	N=21 PCT Resp.	N=14 PCT Cases	Department C Freq.	N=10 PCT Resp.	N=7 PCT Cases
Knowledge Of Subjects	10	16.7	25.0	4	13.8	21.1	4	19.0	28.6	2	20.0	28.6
Relationship With Students	4	6.7	10.0	2	6.9	10.5	2	9.5	14.3	0	00.0	00.0
Personal Qualities	22	36.7	55.0	9	31.0	47.4	10	47.6	71.4	3	30.0	42.9
Student Achievement	8	13.7	20.0	5	17.2	26.3	2	9.5	14.3	1	10.0	14.3
Instructional Techniques/ Methodologies	2	3.3	5.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	2	20.0	28.6
Feedback Evaluation Skills	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0
Planning/Organizing Skills	1	1.7	2.5	1	3.4	5.3	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0
Other	13	21.7	32.5	8	27.6	42.1	3	14.3	21.4	2	20.0	28.6
TOTAL	60	100.0	150.0	29	100.0	152.4	21	100.0	150.0	10	100.0	142.9

TABLE 38

IQ 28. WHAT SUBJECTS WOULD LIKE STUDENTS TO SAY ABOUT THEM AS TEACHERS

	Combined Departments			Department A			Department B			Department C		
Categories	Freq.	N=76 PCT Resp.	N=40 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=33 PCT Resp.	N=19 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=26 PCT Resp.	N=14 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=10 PCT Resp.	N=7 PCT Cases
Knowledge Of Subject	15	19.7	37.5	4	12.1	21.1	6	23.1	42.9	2	20.0	28.6
Relationship With Student	5	6.6	12.5	3	9.1	15.8	1	3.8	7.1	0	00.0	00.0
Personal Qualities	29	38.2	72.5	15	45.5	78.9	9	34.6	64.3	3	30.0	42.9
Student Achievement	19	25.0	47.5	10	30.3	52.6	5	19.2	35.7	1	10.0	14.3
Instructional/ Techniques Methodology	4	5.3	10.0	0	00.0	00.0	3	11.5	21.4	2	20.0	28.6
Feedback/Evaluation Skills	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0
Planning/Organizing Skills	2	2.6	5.0	1	3.0	5.3	1	3.8	7.1	0	00.0	00.0
Other	2	2.6	5.0	0	00.0	00.0	1	3.8	7.1	2	20.0	28.6
TOTAL	76	100.0	190.0	33	100.0	173.7	26	100.0	185.7	10	100.0	146.5

indicated a desire to have their students or colleagues perceive them in terms of their ability to employ these skills. It is apparent that subjects in this study do not see these pedagogical skills as important competencies for achieving their stated purposes (see Table 24, p. 87) nor are they concerned that these pedagogical skills be recognized as important attributes of their teaching.

Generally, the subjects want both students and colleagues to say the same thing about them as teachers. They did, however, have a more difficult time describing what they would like their colleagues to say. Many of their responses were vague or general statements such as "That I'm doing a good job" or "I am a professionally competent teacher" or "I am doing the best job that I can." Responses such as these were coded in the category "other" in Table 37.

Several of the subjects mentioned that they had never really thought about what their colleagues might say about them. Two subjects emphatically stated that they "really didn't care" what their colleagues thought.

Reactions such as these suggest that conversations among colleagues which focus on their teaching are not common. It also suggests that the concept of peer evaluation of teaching might be met with resistance.

Philosophy of Teaching

Each subject in the study was asked the following questions in order to elicit information relative to their basic philosophy of teaching:

> IQ 33. What is your philosophy of teaching? How do you believe students learn? What do you see as your role as teacher?

The categories used to define the philosophies of teaching (student centered, instructor centered and content centered) were identified by Berquist and Phillips (1975) and were the categories used for a similar question in Wilkerson's (1977) study of professors at the University of Massachusetts. Table 39 depicts the frequency and percentage of responses coded into each of these categories in the present study and examines patterns of responses by department affiliation.

Twenty-five of the forty subjects described their basic philosophy of teaching as student-centered. These subjects viewed themselves primarily as facilitators, organizers and resource persons. They view the student as being responsible for important learning decisions and as an active participant in the learning process. The following comments characterized subjects whose responses were coded in this category:

> The teacher is there to help the student to learn as best they can and pose some questions; not necessarily give them answers but to stimulate their thinking so they will want to develop. I like elementary teachers to be as creative as possible. . . (006)

TABLE 39

I 33. SUBJECT'S PHILOSOPHY OF TEACHING

	Combined Departments		Department A		Department B		Department C	
Categories	Freq.	N=40 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=19 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=14 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=7 PCT Cases
Content Centered Teaching	7	17.5	3	15.8	3	21.4	1	14.3
Instructor Centered Teaching	8	20.0	4	21.1	1	7.1	3	42.9
Student Centered Teaching	25	62.5	12	63.2	10	71.4	3	42.9
	40	100.0	19	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0

> . . . I think a teacher ought to be a resource more than anything else. The student should be the prime factor in terms of learning. They have to be able to initiate many of the experiences. Granted, the teacher has to set up the model or format, but in terms of the student getting something out of the teacher-learning process, I think we have to weigh it very heavily on the learner's part not on the teacher's part. (031)

The remainder of the subjects were almost evenly split between the instructor centered and content centered categories. Eight subjects described their teaching as instructor centered. They viewed themselves as models, guides and discussion leaders. They encouraged student input and questions, but such questioning and input was usually between the student and the instructor rather than student to student. Those subjects appeared to compromise between the more open student centered approach and the more structured content centered approach.

> I guess I see myself providing the experiences and settings, environment for communicating and certain body of information. Kind of a planner, organizer, a pulling together of all the experiences. . . pulling them together in a package and passing them on to students. (022)

> . . . I picture myself as an expert guide who kind of lays the material out for them. . . I see the problem that needs to be dealt with and I have to get a structure so that they can learn. My job in the process is to do it in a way that will be most beneficial to them. (016)

Seven subjects described themselves as being responsible for covering an appropriate body of knowledge. These subjects were coded as being content centered. This philosophy of teaching places the teacher in the center, as the disseminator of information and authority in the classroom. The following comments were typical of subjects who were coded as content centered teachers:

> . . . I am pretty much the boss of the dissemination of knowledge. They (students) are not exploring or looking for knowledge; not necessarily trying to key in on a particular thing. I'm directing their interest in a specific area. (021)

> I guess it's to present materials in lectures, to give the students the information I have so that they can save some time in their learning. . . It's my responsibility to see that they get the information. (009)

The degree of student centeredness expressed by these subjects is high when compared to the results Wilkerson found in her study of faculty at the University of Massachusetts (1977). In Wilkerson's study, some physical education faculty were included in a subgroup called "professional studies." When the responses of subjects from the present study were compared to that subgroup, the number of subjects who indicated a student centered philosophy was 3 times as great in the present study as those in Wilkerson's study.

Many of the subjects had primary teaching responsibilities in activity type courses. The content and context of these courses create a high probability that little lecturing will occur, a variety of grouping patterns will occur, students will act on their own in determining the number of trials, in helping each other, and in monitoring the behaviors of others. How intentional or planned this is by teachers may be questioned, but when describing themselves as teachers in these situations, they often sound very student centered.

Student Expectations

When asked to describe what they felt students expected from them as teachers, subjects most often saw themselves as needing subject matter knowledge (see Table 40). They felt that students expected them to be able to provide the knowledges and information specific to the courses they were teaching. This expectation, perceived as important to students, was congruent with the expectation that the subjects held for themselves (see Table 24). This also was true for the need to have acceptable personal attributes. Subjects felt that students expected them to be fair, enthusiastic, sensitive, hard-working teachers.

The primary pedagogical skills of planning methodology and evaluation accounted for only a small fraction of the responses when subjects were asked to describe what competencies they needed to achieve their stated purposes (see Table 24). These skills, however, did account for an important proportion of the responses when subjects were asked what students expected of them. Subjects perceived students as expecting them to present materials in interesting ways and that lessons be well planned and organized.

The fact that these skills were recognized as important to students, yet were not viewed as important competencies or as a teaching strength by the subjects, creates a potential cause for students' dissatisfaction with the teaching performance. If faculty sense that students find these skills important and yet do not value them sufficiently to expend time and energy on their cultivation and

TABLE 40

IQ 31. SUBJECTS' PERCEPTION OF WHAT STUDENTS EXPECT FROM THEM

	Combined Departments			Department A			Department B			Department C		
Categories	Freq.	N=74 PCT Resp.	N=40 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=36 PCT Resp.	N=19 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=22 PCT Resp.	N=14 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=16 PCT Resp.	N=7 PCT Cases
Knowledge Of Subject Matter	27	36.5	67.5	11	30.6	57.9	11	50.0	78.6	5	31.3	71.4
Student Centered Skills	3	4.1	7.5	2	5.6	10.5	0	00.0	00.0	1	6.3	14.3
Technical/ Methodological Skills	14	18.9	35.0	7	19.4	36.8	4	18.2	28.6	3	18.8	42.9
Planning/Organizing Skills	10	13.5	25.0	6	16.7	31.6	1	4.5	7.1	3	18.8	42.9
Feedback/Evaluation Skills	5	6.8	12.5	4	11.1	21.1	1	4.5	7.1	0	00.0	00.0
Personal Qualities	12	16.2	30.0	4	11.1	21.1	4	18.2	28.6	4	25.0	51.1
Other	3	4.1	7.5	2	5.6	10.5	1	4.5	7.1	0	00.0	00.0
TOTAL	74	100.0	185.0	36	100.0	189.5	22	100.0	157.1	16	100.0	228.6

application, the probability of conflict exists.

Characteristics of Students

Overall, subjects expected their students to be personable individuals who possessed good study skills and were bright and inquisitive (see Table 41). Subjects from Departments A and B were most likely to mention personal qualities such as fairness, honesty and caring as characteristics they sought in students. Subjects from Department C, however, were uniformly more interested in students having good study skills.

SECTION 8: Improvement of Teaching

The improvement of teaching has emerged as an important conern for institutions of higher education. Numerous faculty development centers have been created and substantial amounts of state, federal and foundation monies have been spent in attempts to improve teaching on today's campuses. In order to determine how subjects in this study felt about the improvement of their own teaching skills, each was asked the following questions:

IQ 44. When you work to improve your course(s), what type of changes do you usually make?

IQ 45. If you were dissatisfied with something in your teaching, where or with whom (if anyone) would you go in order to improve the situation?

IQ 46. How much time, energy and effort do you actually give to your continuous development of your teaching competencies?

IQ 47. Could you suggest things that you might do to make teaching a more viable activity for yourself and your colleagues in this department?

TABLE 41

IQ 32. CHARACTERISTICS SUBJECTS SOUGHT IN STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THEIR CLASSES

	Combined Departments			Department A			Department B			Department C		
Categories	Freq.	N=72 PCT Resp.	N=40 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=35 PCT Resp.	N=19 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=24 PCT Resp.	N=14 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=13 PCT Resp.	N=7 PCT Cases
Cognitive Skills	14	19.4	35.0	5	14.3	26.3	7	29.2	50.0	2	15.4	28.6
Interpersonal Skills	3	4.2	7.5	2	5.7	10.5	1	4.2	7.1	0	00.0	00.0
Study Skills	24	33.3	60.0	12	34.3	63.2	5	20.8	35.7	7	53.8	100.0
Personal Skills	30	41.7	75.0	15	42.9	78.9	11	45.8	78.6	4	30.8	57.1
Other	1	1.4	2.5	1	2.9	5.3	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0
TOTAL	72	100.0	180.0	35	100.0	184.7	24	100.0	171.4	13	100.0	185.7

IQ 48. In the same light, are there things that you think the department might do to better support teaching?

IQ 49. What?

Course Changes

Thirty-one of the 40 subjects mentioned that they made changes in the subject matter content in an attempt to improve their course (see Table 42). Although some subjects from all departments indicated such changes, subjects from Department C were most likely to do so.

Changes in instructional and methodological procedures were mentioned by 23 subjects. Examples of such changes included utilization of "competency-based learning materials," increasing use of "discussion groups," expanding the use of "audio-visual materials," redesigning laboratory materials to be more "self-paced" and creating a "more seminar-like atmosphere in class." Subjects from Departments A and B were more likely to indicate these types of changes than were subjects from Department C.

Planning and organizing changes were coded for 12 subjects. The need to restructure the course sequence and/or redesign segments of the course were typical responses of these subjects. The only other category to receive an important number of responses was the category "student centered changes." Eight subjects responded with statements that indicated an interest in addressing individual needs of the students, reducing the size of the class or selecting materials that the students would find more useful.

TABLE 42

IQ 44. TYPES OF CHANGES MADE BY SUBJECTS IN ATTEMPTS TO IMPROVE THEIR COURSES

	Combined Departments			Department A			Department B			Department C		
Categories	Freq.	N=77 PCT Resp.	N=40 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=38 PCT Resp.	N=19 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=25 PCT Resp.	N=14 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=14 PCT Resp.	N=7 PCT Cases
Content-Subject Matter Changes	31	40.3	77.5	15	39.5	78.9	10	40.0	71.4	6	43.0	85.7
Instructional/ Methodological Changes	23	29.9	57.5	11	28.9	57.9	9	36.0	64.3	3	21.5	42.8
Feedback/Evaluation Changes	3	3.9	7.5	2	5.3	10.5	0	00.0	00.0	1	7.0	14.2
Student Centered Changes	8	10.4	20.0	4	10.5	21.1	3	12.0	21.4	1	7.0	14.2
Planning/Organizing Changes	12	15.6	30.0	6	15.8	31.6	3	12.0	21.4	3	21.5	42.8
Changes in Inter-personal Skills	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0
Other	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0
TOTAL	77	100.0	192.5	38	100.0	200.0	25	100.0	178.6	14	100.0	200.0

Sources of Support for Improving Teaching

When dissatisfied with something in their teaching, subjects were most likely to solicit the aid of a colleague (see Table 43). It appears that colleagues are considered an important source of help for improving teaching even though they are not an important source of information for determining teaching effectiveness, nor a source for informal teaching rewards (see Tables 28 and 36, p. 93 and 112). In the same light, students were not mentioned as an important source of help (see Table 43) even though subjects did consider students as an important source of information on their teaching effectiveness and as an important source of informal rewards (see Tables 28 and 36, p. 93 and 112).

Fifteen subjects stated that they would go to their administrator for help in improving their teaching. When seeking help to improve their teaching, subjects looked across to peers or up to administrators, but rarely looked down to students. The fact that colleagues and administrators are so frequently mentioned as sources of help suggests that, if attempts to upgrade the quality of teaching are to succeed, important efforts will need to be directed to these groups.

All 3 institutions had some type of instructional improvement center operating on their campus. Some subjects from each department indicated that they would, and in some cases already had, used the center as a source of help for improving their teaching (see Table 43). In all, 14 subjects viewed the improvement center as a possible resource.

TABLE 43

IQ 45. SOURCES OF HELP FOR IMPROVING TEACHING

Categories	Combined Departments Freq.	N=77 PCT Resp.	N=40 PCT Cases	Department A Freq.	N=35 PCT Resp.	N=19 PCT Cases	Department B Freq.	N=23 PCT Resp.	N=14 PCT Cases	Department C Freq.	N=13 PCT Resp.	N=7 PCT Cases
Colleagues In The Department	25	35.2	62.5	13	37.1	68.4	8	34.8	57.1	4	30.7	57.1
Professionals In The Field	6	8.5	15.0	3	8.6	15.8	3	13.0	21.4	0	00.0	00.0
Instructional Improvement Center	14	19.5	35.0	7	20.0	36.8	4	17.4	28.6	3	23.0	42.8
Students	4	5.6	10.0	2	5.7	10.5	1	4.3	7.1	1	7.6	14.2
Administrator	15	21.1	37.5	7	20.0	36.8	3	13.0	21.4	5	38.4	71.4
Self Help (Book, Articles, References)	7	9.9	17.5	3	8.6	15.8	4	17.4	28.6	0	00.0	00.0
TOTAL	77	100.0	177.5	35	100.0	184.2	23	100.0	164.2	13	100.0	185.5

Time Spent on Improvement

When asked how much time and effort they spent on the continuous development of their teaching competencies, 19 of the 40 subjects responded with statements that were coded as "a great deal of time" (see Table 44). Because subject matter knowledge was viewed as the most important competency by subjects in the present study, time spent reading articles and books was viewed as time spent on improving their teaching competence.

Of the 9 subjects who indicated that they spent little time on the development of their teaching competencies, 7 were from Department A and 2 were from Department C. For those from Department A, coaching and administrative responsibilities were seen as the major reasons for not having more time to devote to developing teaching skills. The subjects from Department C indicated that interest in research and writing consumed the majority of their time outside the classroom.

Increasing the Importance of Teaching

Nearly half (19) of the subjects suggested that sharing ideas or materials with each other might make teaching a more viable function within their department (see Table 45). Many of these 19 subjects suggested that it would be useful and enjoyable if the faculty could get together in "brown bag" type seminars to share ideas and skills. Sharing was viewed as a rare yet valued activity. It appeared that for many subjects, the normal type of casual and spontaneous faculty interactions did not encourage or support sharing activities.

TABLE 44

I 46. TIME SPENT ON DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHING COMPETENCIES

Categories	Combined Departments		Department A		Department B		Department C	
	Freq.	PCT Cases	Freq.	PCT Cases	Freq.	PCT Cases	Freq.	PCT Cases
A Great Deal of Time	19	47.5	7	36.8	9	64.3	3	42.9
A Moderate Amount Of Time	11	27.5	4	21.1	5	35.7	2	28.6
A Small Amount Of Time	9	22.5	7	36.8	0	00.0	2	28.6
Other	1	2.5	1	5.3	0	00.0	0	00.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	19	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0

TABLE 45

IQ 47. WAYS SUBJECTS MIGHT MAKE TEACHING A MORE VIABLE ACTIVITY IN THEIR DEPARTMENT

Categories	Combined Departments Freq.	N=47 PCT Resp.	N=40 PCT Cases	Department A Freq.	N=22 PCT Resp.	N=19 PCT Cases	Department B Freq.	N=15 PCT Resp.	N=14 PCT Cases	Department C Freq.	N=10 PCT Resp.	N=7 PCT Cases
Encourage/Attend Inservice Activities	9	19.1	22.5	4	18.2	21.1	2	13.3	14.3	3	30.0	42.8
Share Ideas, Materials (formal & informal)	19	40.4	47.5	7	31.8	36.8	8	53.3	57.1	4	40.0	57.1
Collaborate With Colleagues/ Administrators	1	2.1	2.5	1	4.5	5.3	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0
Encourage Observation of Classes/Teaching	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0
Encourage Self Monitoring of Classes	2	4.3	5.3	2	9.1	10.5	0	00.0	00.0	0	00.0	00.0
Can Not Thing of Anything	8	17.0	20.0	4	18.2	21.1	2	13.3	14.3	2	20.0	28.5
Other	8	17.0	20.0	4	18.2	21.1	3	20.0	21.4	1	10.0	14.2
TOTAL	47	100.0	117.5	22	100.0	115.8	15	100.0	107.1	10	100.0	142.6

Overall, subjects had difficulty suggesting alternatives for improving the condition of teaching within their department. Nine subjects suggested that attending and encouraging others to attend inservice activities might be helpful. Eight subjects indicated that they could not think of anything they could do. No subject suggested that professors observe each other's teaching performance and only 2 subjects mentioned that they attempt to self-monitor their own teaching. For subjects in this study, the direct involvement of observing each other's teaching or investigative involvement with their own teaching behaviors were not viewed as an important means for making teaching a more viable activity in their department.

Departmental Support for Teaching

Although 6 subjects indicated that they did not see things that their department might do to better support teaching, most subjects had little difficulty suggesting things their department might do (see Table 46). Of the 6 subjects who did not identify things their department might do, 5 were from Department B where teaching already was viewed as substantially supported.

Subjects did not identify one predominate category of actions that their departments might take to better support teaching. The greatest nunber of responses coded into any one category was 13 in the category "provide better equipment and facilities." Overall, two themes emerge from these data. First, subjects suggest that by making changes in the basic working condition, i.e., better equipment, support personnel and work loads, departments can support teaching. Second,

TABLE 46

IQ 49. THINGS THE DEPARTMENT MIGHT DO TO BETTER SUPPORT TEACHING

	Combined Departments			Department A			Department B			Department C		
Categories	Freq.	N=56 PCT Resp.	N=34* PCT Cases	Freq.	N=34 PCT Resp.	N=18* PCT Cases	Freq.	N=12 PCT Resp.	N=9 PCT Cases	Freq.	N=10 PCT Resp.	N=7 PCT Cases
Recognition for Good Performance	9	16.1	26.5	5	14.7	27.8	2	16.7	22.2	2	20.0	33.3
Provide Better Equipment and Facilities	13	23.2	38.2	8	23.5	44.4	4	33.3	44.4	1	10.0	16.6
Provide Support Personnel	8	14.3	23.5	7	20.6	38.9	1	8.3	11.1	0	00.0	00.0
Adjust Work Loads	4	7.1	11.8	2	5.9	11.1	1	8.3	11.1	1	10.0	16.6
Increase Monetary Support	8	14.3	23.5	5	14.7	27.8	1	8.3	11.1	2	20.0	33.3
Provide Opportunities For Personal Development	6	10.7	17.6	3	8.8	16.7	2	16.7	22.2	1	10.0	16.6
Other	8	14.3	23.5	4	11.8	22.2	1	8.3	11.1	3	30.0	50.0
TOTAL	56	100.0	164.7	34	100.0	188.9	12	100.0	133.3	10	100.0	149.8

*6 Missing Cases *1 Missing Case *5 Missing Cases

that support also can be demonstrated by changes in the department's formal and informal reward structure, i.e., recognition, monetary support and opportunities for personal development.

Increased Rewards and Improved Teaching

It often is argued that if there is to be an increase in the quality of teaching in higher education, then the rewards available to faculty who display such quality will have to be increased. In this light, the following question was asked subjects in the present study:

> IQ 50. Do you feel that improving the rewards available for effective performance of teaching will increase the general quality of teaching in this department?

Thirteen of the subjects definitely felt that increasing the rewards available would increase the quality of teaching in their department. Another 11 subjects indicated that increased rewards would probably increase the quality of teaching but they were less confident than the former group (see Table 47). In all, 24 of the 40 subjects held that increasing rewards for teaching held promise for increasing the quality of teaching in their department.

Interestingly, in Department B, where teaching was considered to be substantially rewarded, only 5 of the 14 subjects indicated that increasing the rewards for teaching would result in higher quality teaching. In Department A, however, where rewards for teaching were considered lacking, 14 of the 19 subjects saw increased rewards as leading to higher quality teaching. In Department C, where the rewards for teaching were unclear, 5 of the 7 subjects also viewed increased

TABLE 47

I 50. WILL INCREASING THE REWARDS AVAILABLE FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING INCREASE THE GENERAL QUALITY OF TEACHING IN THIS DEPARTMENT

	Combined Departments		Department A		Department B		Department C	
Categories	Freq.	PCT Cases	Freq.	PCT Cases	Freq.	PCT Cases	Freq.	PCT Cases
Yes, definitely	13	32.5	7	36.8	3	21.4	3	42.9
Yes, with reservation	11	27.5	7	36.8	2	14.3	2	28.6
No, with reservation	6	15.0	3	15.8	2	14.3	1	14.3
No, definitely	10	25.0	2	10.5	7	50.0	1	14.3
TOTAL	40	100.0	19	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0

rewards as leading to higher quality teaching.

The responses of these subjects would suggest that where substantial rewards for teaching are lacking or unclear, increasing the rewards is seen as having a good probability of improving the quality of teaching. However, where teaching already is being substantially rewarded, simply increasing the rewards probably will not be an adequate incentive for poorer teachers to improve their performance.

C H A P T E R V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Findings

In order to explore the attitudes toward teaching held by physical education faculty members at the state university level, the investigator interviewed 40 full-time physical education faculty using an in-depth interview procedure. The faculty participants were from three departments of physical education located in three different state universities. The level at which degrees were offered was seen as a likely factor in attracting or shaping faculty with differing views about teaching. Therefore, one department was selected in which the terminal degree was a bachelor's degree; one was selected in which the terminal degree was a master's degree; and one was selected in which the terminal degree was a doctorate. In all, 40 of the 42 eligible faculty from these departments agreed to be subjects for the study.

Although the interview was the primary source of data, each subject also was asked to complete a 27 item questionnaire prior to their interview. The questionnaire was designed to solicit background information and to probe the subjects' perception of teaching. For the interview itself, each subject was asked the same set of questions covering four topical areas: general teaching situation, teaching effectiveness, rewards for teaching and teaching improvement. The interviews were approximately one hour in length and all were tape-

recorded.

During the pilot study, a coding system was devised whereby the open-ended responses from the interview could be categorized and tabulated for analysis. Inter-coder agreement between the author and an independent coder was established for each question in 13 of the 40 interviews (32%). The overall inter-coder agreement was .83 with individual question agreement ranging from 1.0 to .61. Results were reported in terms of frequencies and crosstabulations using tables as the primary display format. In addition, vignettes from the interviews were used to enrich and provide clarity to the interpretation of the data.

The major findings of this study are summarized for presentation in two sections. First, results are summarized for the sample as a whole. Second, results are grouped in order to summarize those responses which best discriminate among the three departments investigated.

Attitude Toward Teaching: A Summary of Major Findings for the Entire Sample

The vast majority of physical education faculty members in the present study expressed an interest in teaching that was greater than their interest in research, writing for publication or coaching. They viewed themselves primarily as teachers and not as scholarly researchers. This strong interest in teaching, however, was moderated for some faculty by the lack of departmental support perceived for teaching.

Although teaching clearly was seen as their primary job function, most did identify service as a major responsibility. For most, the service component of their job was viewed as a source of dissatisfaction. In contrast, the teaching component was seen as a source of great satisfaction.

Overall, faculty were satisfied with their present teaching assignments. Over half of the faculty, however, did identify and express an interest in teaching a course they were not presently teaching.

Faculty in this study attempted to achieve two predominate purposes in their teaching. First, they desired to encourage student interest and enthusiasm for an area of study and second, they wanted to provide their students with subject matter knowledge. The competencies most often mentioned by faculty as needed to accomplish their purposes, were knowledge of subject matter (82%), acceptable personal qualities (48%) and good interpersonal skills (40%). Not only were these competencies viewed as necessary, they were also perceived by the faculty members to be their greatest strengths as teachers. Over half of the faculty identified acceptable personal qualities as their greatest strength, over one-third mentioned knowledge of subject matter and over a fourth identified interpersonal skills.

The central pedagogical skills of planning, teaching methods and evaluation were not identified by these subjects as important competencies needed for the conduct of instruction. In addition, subjects were not likely to mention these pedagogical skills as attributes for

which they wished to be recognized by their colleagues or students. The subjects did, however, feel that students expected them to be competent in these skills.

Most subjects felt that the competencies they had as teachers were self taught. Overall, subjects viewed their teaching competencies to be acquired through informal rather than formal learning experiences.

Most subjects experienced some difficulty in attempting to express what they might do to make teaching a more viable activity in their department. After some contemplation, however, nearly half of them suggested that they might share ideas and materials with each other in an informal setting. Subjects found it easier to suggest what their departments might do to better support teaching. The suggestion mentioned most often was that the departments provide better equipment and facilities.

When seeking solutions to problems in their teaching, subjects were most likely to turn to their colleagues for help. They were least likely to turn to their students. The campus instructional improvement center was viewed as a source of help with teaching problems by 14 of the 40 subjects.

Nearly half of the subjects indicated that they spent a great deal of time in the continuous development of their teaching competencies. Continuous development of teaching competencies, however, was found mostly to include things associated with keeping up-to-date in one's field by reading professional journals, reviewing research and writing

for publication.

The subjects were generally uncertain whether increasing the rewards for teaching would increase the general quality of teaching in their department. Seventeen of the subjects held some reservation about this concept, 13 supported it outright and 10 did not support it.

A Summary of Findings that Discriminate Among the Departments Investigated

In the present study, response patterns to several of the questionnaire and interview items varied widely among the three departments. The results that best discriminate among the departments are briefly described in this section.

Department A (Bachelor's Degree Only)

(1) Nine of the 19 subjects from this department were female. Only 4 of the 19 subjects held the rank of Associate Professor or above and only 4 of the subjects had a doctorate degree. In addition, 12 subjects had completed their last professional degree 10 or more years ago, and 14 subjects had been at their present institution 10 or more years. Full tenure status was held by 8 subjects; however, of the 11 remaining subjects, none were on a tenure track.

(2) When subjects were asked to indicate their interest in teaching compared to their interest in research, 13 of the subjects indicated they were extremely interested in teaching.

(3) Overall, subjects from Department A were much more interested in teaching than in writing for publication. Over half of the

subjects indicated an extreme interest in teaching and the remaining subjects showed only a slight interest in writing for publication.

(4) Overall, teaching held more interest for subjects in this department than did coaching. Coaching, however, held a moderate interest for most subjects and in 3 cases was seen as more desirable than teaching.

(5) The instructional purpose most subjects in Department A desired to achieve was to encourage student interest and enthusiasm in an area of study. In addition, most subjects felt that the competencies they needed to achieve their instructional purposes were acquired by informal means.

(6) Systematic student feedback was the primary means used by subjects in Department A, to collect information about their teaching effectiveness. In addition, subjects from Department A were more likely to view the systematic student feedback as an accurate assessment of their teaching effectiveness than were subjects from either Department B or C.

(7) Teaching as a criterion for promotion, tenure and advancement was viewed as somewhat important or not important by most subjects from Department A. Overall, teaching was seen as minimally rewarded or not rewarded by the department.

(8) Research was not an important activity in this department, nor was writing for publication.

(9) Subjects from Department A were more likely to go to their colleagues for help when experiencing a teaching problem than were

subjects from either Departments B or C.

(10) The subjects from Department A generally supported the concept that increasing the rewards available for effective teaching would increase the quality of teaching in their department.

Department B (Bachelor's and Master's Degrees)

(1) Seven of the subjects from Department B were males and 7 were females. Over half of the subjects currently held the rank of Associate Professor or above and half of the subjects held a doctorate degree. Ten of the 14 subjects had been working in their department for 10 or more years and 11 subjects had completed their last professional degree 10 or more years ago. In addition, 11 of the 14 subjects had full academic tenure, 2 were on tenure track and 1 was not on a tenure track.

(2) Overall, subjects in this department were more interested in teaching than in doing research. Ten subjects did, however, indicate a slight interest in research.

(3) Overall, subjects in this department were more interested in teaching than writing for publication. Eleven subjects did, however, indicate a slight interest in writing for publication.

(4) Most subjects from Department B expressed an extreme interest in teaching when compared to interest in coaching. Two subjects did, however, express an equal interest in both.

(5) Subjects in Department B perceived their teaching competencies being developed by informal learning experiences and identified personal qualities as their greatest teacher strength.

(6) Teaching was considered an important criterion for promotion, tenure and advancement by all subjects in Department B. Overall, teaching was viewed as adequately rewarded by 11 of the 14 subjects in the department.

(7) Teaching was seen to hold an important position for peronnel decisions and rewards because it was recognized as the unique mission of the department.

(8) One-half of the subjects in Department B indicated that they were currently involved in research and/or writing for publication.

(9) The subjects from Department B generally did not support the concept that increasing the rewards available for effective teaching would increase the quality of teaching in their department.

Department C (Bachelor's, Master's and Doctorate Degrees)

(1) Only one of the subjects from Department C was a female. All the subjects held a doctorate degree, but only one subject held the rank of Professor. The remaining 6 subjects were evenly divided between the ranks of Associate and Assistant Professor. None of the subjects had been working in their department more than 10 years. In addition, 6 of the 7 subjects had completed their last professional degree less than 10 years ago. Three subjects in Department C had full academic tenure; 3 were on tenure track and one was not on tenure track.

(2) Research held equal importance with teaching for 5 of the 7 subjects from Department C.

(3) Four of the 7 subjects expressed an interest in writing for publication that was equal to or greater than their interest in

teaching. The remaining three showed a slight interest in writing for publication.

(4) None of the subjects in Department C expressed an interest in coaching that was equal to or greater than their interest in teaching.

(5) All but one of the subjects from Department C were currently involved in research and/or writing for publication. Research was considered a source of satisfaction for 3 subjects, but it was also considered a source of dissatisfaction by 3 subjects.

(6) Subjects from Department C saw their teaching competencies being developed more often by formal than informal learning experiences. Most of the subjects wanted to provide students with subject matter knowledge and all 7 subjects identified knowledge of subjects as a primary teaching competency. In addition, 5 subjects identified instructional techniques as an important competency. Knowledge of subject matter and personal qualities were the most often mentioned teacher strengths by subjects in this department.

(7) Subjects from Department C made more use of non-systematic student feedback and student achievement as sources of information for determining their teaching effectiveness than did subjects from either Departments A or B. These two sources of student information also were viewed as being an accurate assessment of teaching effectiveness by subjects from Department C.

(8) Teaching was seen to hold various degrees of worth for personal decisions by subjects in Department C. There were also mixed

feelings about how adequately teaching was rewarded in the department. Four subjects felt that it was adequately rewarded while 3 stated otherwise.

(9) Overall, subjects from Department C supported the concept that increasing the rewards available for effective teaching would increase the quality of teaching in their department.

Department Morale

Being with members of the departments, talking with them, seeing their facilities, offices and work areas, allowed the investigator to develop impressions of the people and the departments. Although these impressions were not part of the more objective data gathering procedures, they do have some importance in understanding the subjects of this investigation.

Faculty from Department A expressed satisfaction with their teaching and teaching in general. Nonetheless, the overall morale of these faculty members appeared to be low. This condition seemed to have several causes. Unavailability of institutional rewards for most faculty, weak, disorganized and complicated administrative practices, poor facilities and office space and the physical separation of the faculty into two buildings, all appeared to interact to create an atmosphere in which faculty morale dropped. There was a prevailing expression of doubt about their administrative leadership and a general feeling of second-class citizenship within the university community.

In comparison, the morale of faculty from Department B appeared to be high. Expectation for faculty seemed clear, institutional rewards

were seen as available, the department leadership was seen as quite competent and there was an expressed interest in the continuous development of faculty to meet departmental needs. It was, from the author's view, a psychologically healthy place to work.

Faculty from Department C exhibited a level of morale which varied from individual to individual dependent upon their particular circumstances. There appeared to be less collegial relations among these faculty, less dependence upon the administration for services and approval, and a more individualistic attitude about their work. Overall, these faculty seemed to operate with more autonomy than the faculties in Departments A or B. Each had a special area of preparation and seemed satisfied to function within that area without great amounts of collegial or administrative support.

Discussions and Conclusions

Comparisons to Other Research

Results of the present study correlate to a great extent with recent studies of faculty in higher education. As a group, the subjects in the present study tended to view teaching as a central activity, liked teaching, saw themselves as effective teachers and overall, desired to have teaching play an important role in personnel decisions. Such attitudes on the part of faculty are supported in the findings of Wilson & Gaff, 1975; Hruska, 1975 and Ladd & Lipet, 1976.

Many subjects in the present study felt that major incongruence existed between the job function and the reward system of their

institution. Such incongruence was also identified by faculty in studies by Caplow & McGee, 1962; Austin and Lee, 1966 and Wilkerson, 1977.

The characterization formed in earlier studies of the university professor as primarily a scholar and researcher (Wilson, 1942; Caplow & McGee, 1961 and Dressel, 1970) was not supported in the present study. The university physical education professor in the present study appeared as a teacher who attached some importance to research but who overall preferred the role of teacher. This characterization is in keeping with the more recent studies of faculty in higher education (Fulton & Trow, 1974 and Wilson & Gaff, 1975).

Subjects in the present study generally viewed themselves as effective teachers, were dependent upon their students for feedback regarding their effectiveness as teachers and were favorably disposed to the use of formal student evaluations. Similar findings were cited in studies by Wilkerson, 1977; Wilson & Gaff, 1975 and Bayer, 1973.

Many subjects in the present study perceived their teaching role as incongruent with the role expectation of the institution; these subjects displayed less satisfaction with their job than did subjects who viewed the roles as congruent. Daniel (1971) cited similar findings in his study of job satisfaction among physical education staffs in several Canadian institutions of higher education.

Although all subjects in the present study were employed at a state university and all had the same basic academic orientation, important differences in attitudes and perception toward teaching were revealed. This finding supports the conclusions by Wilkerson, 1977;

Fulton & Trow, 1974 and Wilson & Gaff, 1975 that institutional, academic and/or demographic differences are likely to be associated with differing attitudes toward teaching.

Conclusions

Individualism of teaching. For faculty in this study, their development as teachers was dependent upon internalized models of "good teachers" from the past and trial and error in their early years. It was not perceived to be derived from commonly held and often practiced principles of pedagogy. Without such a common or shared set of expectations, faculty in this study proceeded as have generations before them, to develop teaching roles which reflect personal preference and individual recollection. Under these conditions, teaching becomes a very personal experience developed and nurtured by the faculty member alone.

The responses of faculty in this study indicate that colleagues and administrators do little, if anything, to intentionally influence faculty into particular teaching roles. This lack of attention by members of the department enhanced the individual nature of teaching and left a void in the socialization process of faculty as teachers. This void was to some degree filled by students. In the present study, faculty saw students playing important roles in their teaching. Students were the primary source of feedback on teaching and they were the most important source of informal rewards for teaching. How strong a role students actually played in the socialization of these faculty as teachers is not known. Students did appear to have the opportunity

and the status to have important impact. The fact that teaching has changed little over time suggests that if students are important socialization agents, their expectations of faculty have also remained stagnant.

The lack of potency in the formal learning experiences and the limited impact of departments in shaping the teaching role of faculty, means that opportunities for faculty to experience new ideas, standards and orientations to teaching are severely limited. Since most faculty in the present study viewed themselves as effective, there is little reason to believe that they have a strong desire to explore new ideas or orientations to teaching. This may be a need that others perceive but it is not necessarily a a desire faculty hold for themselves.

Without clear, powerful expectations from colleagues, administrators or students, faculty develop an individualistic approach to teaching increase the probability that faculty will display highly conservative behaviors related to their teaching. Attempts to get faculty to discuss their teaching or expose their teaching to colleagues and administrators are likely to be met with apprehension on the part of faculty. This would be especially true for faculty who have not received positive feedback about their teaching from students.

The individualism of teaching places the responsibility for success or failure squarely on the shoulders of the individual faculty member. Where pressures of failure are not shared, the avoidance of possible failure may be greater. Thus faculty are not likely to try new styles or techniques which might increase their opportunity to fail.

Again this is especially true of faculty who have had little positive feedback from students.

The individualistic nature of teaching also enhances faculty autonomy. Without proven or established practices of pedagogy on which to rely, peers and administrators are likely to feel they are treading on thin ice when attempting to address the teaching needs of a colleague. Thus, all except extremely poor teaching performances are treated as acceptable. With such a wide variance in acceptable teacher performance, faculty activities which support teaching (planning, evaluating, etc.) also can vary widely. Faculty generally can put as much or as little time into their teaching as they wish without encountering important consequences from the department.

Under these circumstances, when the departmental reward system favors low involvement in teaching activities and high involvement in publication, research or service, faculty are likely to pursue things other than teaching. Conversely, where departmental reward systems favor high involvement in teaching, faculty are likely to pursue teaching. The conditions just described probably are most true of faculty working for tenure or promotion. Faculty not pursuing these goals have more choice as to their level of involvement.

Improving the status of teaching. The results of this and other studies (Hruska, 1975, Gaff, 1975) have indicated that faculty have a high degree of interest in teaching. They find it satisfying, they would like to spend more time doing it and would like to see teaching rewarded in more meaningful ways. This attitude on the part of faculty

would suggest that they are likely to respond in positive ways to efforts which enhance the status of teaching in their departments and the institution. Whether faculty are willing to absorb many of the hidden costs involved in raising the status of teaching is unknown.

Studies have shown that faculty value the autonomy that comes with a university position (McHenery et al., 1977). The present status of teaching in departments and institutions enhances faculty autonomy. Attempts to make teaching a shared rather than individual matter within departments will certainly compromise the autonomy now enjoyed by faculty. Once expectations regarding teaching are made clear by departments and quality teaching becomes a more objectively measurable quantity, faculty will have less freedom to choose their own level of involvement in teaching activities. This will become even more evident as teaching gains desired status as criterion for departmental and institutional rewards. Under these conditions, administrators and personnel committee members will be held more accountable for the evaluation of a faculty member's teaching performance. Thus, there is a high probability that faculty will have to open their classroom doors to allow their teaching to be scrutinized by others.

Movement toward a more collective teacher socialization process represents an intentional attempt by faculty to socialize themselves to a specific, openly valued, set of expectations regarding teaching. If faculty are willing to accept the challenge, teaching, which faculty say they like to do best, may become even more interesting and enjoyable. More time, money and other departmental, institutional and personal resources could be allocated to teaching activities. The types and

amounts of informal teaching rewards available to faculty from students, colleagues and the institution can be increased.

Based on the results of the present study, several suggestions can be made which could enhance the efforts of departments to move toward a collective process of teacher socialization. First, the broad concept of intentional socialization needs to be explored by faculty and administration together. It is the acceptance of the basic tenets of a socialization process that is critical to departmental change. That teaching be the focus of the socialization process is not as important as the faculty, administration and students agreeing that intentional socialization is something they desire.

Second, all parties who have major stakes in the department need to be included in the change process. Students especially must have an expanded role in developing and supporting departmental efforts to change the condition of teaching.

Third, it is clear that faculty attitudes about teaching vary across departments and even within departments. Interventions designed to change attitudes and behaviors related to teaching must accommodate for these differences. Thus, intervention activities which are individualistic in nature and designed from data collected directly from the department members will have a higher probability of success.

Fourth, faculty generally do not perceive their teaching ability as being developed from formal learning experiences. Thus, initial intervention efforts ought to include activiites through which faculty can explore their own development as teachers.

Fifth, before substantial efforts to improve teaching can be expected of faculty, the basic needs of faculty must be reasonably secure. Times of austere budgets, program and personnel cutbacks and critical pressures from outside the department are least conducive to change efforts. These are the times, however, when we often decide that change is most needed.

Sixth, the attitudes that faculty hold about their autonomy will have important consequences on faculty development efforts. Procedures must be designed which convey a sensitivity to the desires of faculty for autonomy, yet offer encouragement to them for engaging in collective action.

Finally, it is clear that major incongruencies exist between what physical education faculty attempt to teach students about effective teaching and what faculty believe as teachers. Students are taught that pedogogical skills such as planning, instructional techniques and feedback are central to effective teaching yet faculty identify subject matter and a pleasant personality as the "real" competencies. Under these conditions faculty practice teaching as though it were an art and talk of teaching as though it were a craft. Efforts which focus on improvement of teaching within a department would need to address this incongruence and its potential effect on both the faculty and their students.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ashcraft, R.J. Comparison of employment status of men and women physical educators in four year public colleges and universities (Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1972) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 6793-A. (University Microfilms No. 72-17, 534).

Astin, W., & Lee, C.B.T. Current practices in the evaluation and training of college teachers. The Educational Record, 1966, 47, 361-375.

Banaka, H. Training in depth interviewing. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Bayer, E. College and university faculty: a statistical description. Washington, D.C.: American Council of Education, 1970. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 042 425).

Bayer, E. Teaching faculty in academe: 1972-73. Washington, D.C.: American Council of Education, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 080 517).

Berquest, H., & Phillips, S. (EDS). A handbook for faculty development. Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges in association with The College Center of Finger Lakes, 1975.

Bergquist, W.H., & Phillips, S.R. A handbook for faculty development volume 2. Washington, D.C.: The Council for Advancement of Small Colleges, 1977.

Bergquist, W.H., & Phillips, J.R. Components of an effective faculty development program. Journal of Higher Education, 1975, 46, 177-210.

Braunstein, D.N., & Benston, G.J. Student and department chairman views of the performance of university professors. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 58 (2), 244-249.

Brown, J., & Shukraft, R.C. Personal development and professional practice of college and university professors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, 1971.

Caplow, T.I., & McGee, R.J. The academic marketplace. New York: Science Editions, 1961.

Centra, J.A. Effectiveness of student feedback in modifying college instruction. Journal of Educational Psychology, Dec., 1973, 395-401.

Centra, J.A. Strategies for improving college teaching. ERIC Clearinghouse on higher education, Report No. 8. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education, 1972.

Centra, J.A., & Creech, F.R. The relationship between student, teacher and course. Characteristics and student ratings of teacher effectiveness (Report No. 8). Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

Cohen, A.M., & Brawer, F.B. Measuring faculty performance. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969. (ERIC Document Reprodcution Service No. ED 031 222).

Cole, C.C., Jr. To improve instruction. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education (ERIC/Higher Education Report No. 2), 1978.

Crittenden, R.S. Actual and reconstructed coding procedure. In R. McGee, Academic janus. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Dannehl, W.E. The organizational climate in physical education administration units in selected mid-western universities (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1970) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 6381A-6382-A.

Daniel, J.V. Differentiated roles and faculty job satisfaction in departments of physical education and athletics in Ontario universities (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1971) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 5590-A (University Microfilms No. 72,129).

Dressel, P.L., Johnson, F.C., & Marcus, P.M. The confidence crisis. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Dressel, P., & Thomson, M.M. College teaching: improvement by degrees. Monograph No. 13. The American College Testing Program, 1974.

Eble, K. Career development of the effective college teacher. Washington, D.C.: AAUP Press, 1971.

Eble, K. Professors as teachers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Eble, K. The craft of teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Eble, K. The recognition and evaluation of teaching. Washington, D.C.: AAUP Press, 1970.

Eckert, R.E. New tasks for teachers: the changing personnel. New Directions for Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Winter, 1973, 41-58.

Eckert, R.E., & Neale, D.C. Teachers and teaching. Review of Educational Research, 1965, 35, 304-317.

Eckert, R.E., Stecklein, J.E., & Sagen, H.B. College faculty members view jobs. AAUP Bulletin, 1959, 40, 513-528.

Eckert, R.E., & Williams, H.G. College faculty view themselves and their jobs. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 074 960).

Evans, R.I. Resistance to innovation in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Freedman, M., & Sanford, N. (Eds.). The faculty member yesterday and today. Facilitating Faculty Development: New Directions for Higher Education, 1973, 1, 1-15.

Gaff, J.G. Making a difference: the impacts of faculty. Journal of Higher Education, 1973, 44, 605-622.

Gaff, J.G. Toward faculty renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Gaff, J.G., & Wilson, R.C. Faculty culture and interdisciplinary studies. Journal of Higher Education, 1971, 42, 186-201.

Gaff, J.G., & Wilson, R.C. The teaching environment. AAUP Bulletin, 1971, 57, 475-493. (G).

Gaff, S.S. Resource notebook. Washington, D.C.: Project on Institutional Renewal Through the Improvement of Teaching, 1976.

Finkeiner, C.T., Lathrop, J.J. & Schuerger, J.M. Course and instructional evaluation: Some dimensions of a questionnaire. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1973, 64, 159-163.

Gage, N.L. The appraisal of college teaching. Journal of Higher Education, 1961, 32, 17-22.

Gouldner, A.W. Cosmopolitans and locals (part II). Administrative Science Quarterly, 1958, pp. 352-370.

Gouldner, A.W. Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1957, pp. 281-306; 444-480.

Hammond, P.E., Meyer, J.E., & Miller, D. Teaching versus research: Sources of misperception. Journal of Higher Education. Dec., 1969, 682-689.

Hildebrand, M., Wilson, R.D., & Dienst, E.R. Evaluating University Teaching, Berkeley, California Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1975.

Hodgkinson, H.L. Adult development: Implications for faculty and administrators. Educational Record, 1975, 55, 263-274.

Hruska, E.K. A study of role perceptions of University of Massachusetts/Amherst faculty, spring 1974. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 36, 5864-5865-A. (University Microfilms No. 76,5334).

Isaacson, R.L., McKeachie, W.J., Milholland, J.E., Yin, Y.G., Hoefeller, M., Vaerwalt, J.W., & Zinn, K.L. Dimensions of student evaluation of teaching. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1964, 55(6), 344-351.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. Social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Knapp, R. Changing functions of the college professor. In N. Sanford (Ed.), The American College. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Kulik, J.A., & McKeachie, W.J. The evaluation of teachers in higher education. In F.N. Kerlinger (Ed.), Review of Research in Education (3rd Ed.) Illinois: F.G. Peacock, 1975.

Ladd, E.C., Jr., & Lipset, S.M. Technical report: 1975 survey of the American professoriate. University of Connecticut, 1975. (Mimeographed).

Ladd, E.C., Jr., & Lipset, S.M. What do professors like best about their jobs? Surprise: it isn't research. Chronicle of Higher Education, April 19, 1976, 12, 14.

Ladd, E.C., Jr., & Lipset, S.M. Only 12 percent of U.S. faculty members think "intellectual" describes them best. Chronicle of Higher Education, April 19, 1976, 12, 14.

Ladd, E.C., Jr., & Lipset, S.M. Sex differences in academe. Chronicle of Higher Education, May 10, 1976, 12, 18.

Ladd, E.C., Jr., & Lipset, S.M. Nearly all professors are satisfied with their choice of an academic career. Chronicle of Higher Education, May 24, 1976, 12, 16.

Lee, C.B.T. (Ed.). Improving college teaching. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Livesay, H. The professors: who they are, what they do, what they want and what they need. New York: Charterhouse, 1975.

Lortie, Dan C. Schoolteacher--a sociological study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

McGee, R. Academic janus. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

McHenry, D.E., and Associates. Academic departments. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

McKeachie, W.J. Research on teaching at the college and university level. In N.L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Marcus, W.B. A survey of attitudes of administrators and other faculty in regards to faculty work load in physical education in higher education (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1971) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 4400A (University Microfilms No. 72-4435).

Manzane, R.M. Faculty attitudes and teaching improvement. Improving College and University Teaching, 1973, 21, 208-211.

Morgan, T.D. An investigation of factors influencing job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of physical education and athletic personnel in selected small liberal arts colleges. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 7107A. (University Microfilms No. 75-11, 785).

Noam, J. Developing and evaluating a model for improving university teaching (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts/ Amherst, 1974).

Parsons, T., & Platt, M. The American academic profession: a pilot study. Report to the National Science Foundation, 1968. (Mimeographed).

Parsons, T., & Platt, G.M. Considerations of the American academic system. Minerva, 1967, 6, 497-523.

Peters, D.S. The link is equitability. Research in Higher Education, 1974, 2, 57-64.

Pohlman, J.T. A description of effective college teaching in five disciplines as measured by student rating. Research in Higher Education, 1976, 4, 335-346.

Sanford, N. Academic culture and the teacher's development. Soundings, 1971, 54, 357-371.

Sanford, N. (Ed.). The American college. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Sanford, N. Higher education as a field of study. In N. Sanford (Ed.), The American college. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Sanford, N. What ever happened to action research? Journal of Social Issues, 1970, 25, 3-23.

Scott, W.A. Reliability of content analysis: the case of nominal scale coding. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1955, 19, 321-325.

Severy, L.J. Procedures and issues in the measurement of attitudes. TM Report 30. Princeton, New Jersey: ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests, Measurement and Evaluation, 1974.

Simerly, R. Faculty development: planning for the effective use of human resources. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Society for College and University Planning. Washington, D.C.: 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 125 521).

Smith, A.B. Faculty development and evaluation in higher education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education (ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 8), 1976.

Solomon, D. Teacher behavior dimensions, course characteristics and student evaluation of teachers. American Educational Research Journal, Jan. 1966, 1, 35-47.

Trent, W., & Cohen, A.M. Research on teaching in higher education. In R.M. Travers (Ed.), Second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Trow, M. Undergraduate teaching at large state universities. In B.T. Lee (Ed.), Improving college teaching. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Tuckmen, H.P., & Hagemann, R.P. An analysis of the reward structure in two disciplines. Journal of Higher Education, 1976, 47, 447-464.

Warriner, C.K. Professional commitment and instructional loyalty as factors in faculty orientations. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare, 1970.

Wilkerson, L. University teaching: a study of faculty attitudes. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, 1977).

Wilson, L. The academic man. New York: Oxford University Press, 1942.

Wilson, L. Shaping American higher education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Wilson, R.C., Gaff, J.G., Dienst, E.R., Wood, L., & Bavry, J.L. College professors and their impact on students. New York: Wiley, 1975.

Wilson, R., & Gaff, J.G. Faculty values and improving teaching. In K. Smith, New teaching, new learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Zeigler, E.F., & Spaeth, M.J. (Eds.) Administrative theory and practice in physical education and athletics. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.

Zimbardo, P., & Ebbesen, E.B. Influencing attitudes and changing behaviors. Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1970.

APPENDIX A

LETTERS OF INITIAL CONTACT

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
University of Massachusetts
Amherst 01002

May 1, 1978

Dear _____:

I am writing this letter to ask for your cooperation as a participant in my dissertation study. I have recently met with your department chairperson and have secured his support for my conducting the study in your department.

The purpose of the study is to explore the attitudes of full-time faculty in departments of physical education toward their own teaching and teaching related activities. Teaching is a major responsibility of faculty and as such has not been systematically studied. Data from this type of study will be helpful for designing more satisfactory policies, procedures and work settings within departments.

Involvement in this study would require that you agree to be interviewed and that you complete the enclosed questionnaire. The total time requirement for you will be approximately one hour. The interviews will be audio-taped and take place in a mutually agreed upon location. Information gathered from you will be kept confidential throughout the study and in the reporting of the data for the dissertation.

Regardless of whether you are able to contribute your time and thoughts to the study or not, please fill out the enclosed form and give it to your department secretary within the next two days. I will be contacting your department office to secure the list of names of those able to assist me with the study. If you have any questions, please let your office know and I will contact you personally.

Sincerely,

Jim Rog
Doctoral Candidate,
Physical Education-Teacher Education
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
01003
Phone 413-545-2324 (office)
413-549-6530 (home)

NAME:_____

_____Yes, I am willing to take part in your study.

_____Sorry, I cannot take part at this time.

Listed below are the dates that I will be on your campus. Please select a first and second choice of date and indicate the times that would be the most convenient for you. I will contact you to confirm the interview.

_____Monday, May 15 (After 10:00 a.m.)_____

_____

_____

_____Tuesday, May 16 (Anytime) _____

_____

_____

_____Wednesday, May 17 (Before 5:00) _____

_____

_____

_____Monday, May 22 (After 10:00) _____

_____

_____

_____Tuesday, May 23 (Anytime) _____

_____

_____

_____Wednesday, May 24 (Before 5:00) _____

_____

_____

_____ None of these dates are acceptable, we need to make other arrangements.

_____ I will be available in June if necessary.

APPENDIX B

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

NUMBER

1978

PHYSICAL EDUCATION FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

Please circle the number of the item that most nearly represents your present status.

1. Date_____ 2. Institution_____ 3. Sex 1. Female 2. Male

4. Age
   1. 55 and over
   2. 45-54
   3. 35-44
   4. 25-34
   5. under 25

5. Academic Rank
   1. Full Professor
   2. Associate Professor
   3. Assistant Professor
   4. Instructor
   5. Other, please describe_____

6. What degree do you now hold?
   1. Ed.D
   2. Ph.D
   3. M.S.
   4. M.Ed.
   5. Bachelor's
   9. Other, please describe_____

7. How many hours/wk. do you spend on job related activities?
   1. Less than 20 hr./wk.
   2. 20-29 hrs./wk.
   3. 30-39 hrs./wk.
   4. 40-49 hrs./wk.
   5. 60 or more hrs./wk.

8. Size of school from which you received your latest degree.
   1. Under 1,000
   2. 1,000-4,999
   3. 5,000-9,999
   4. 10,000-19,999
   5. 20,000 or more

9. Number of higher education institutions where you have held a salaried appointment.
   1. one
   2. two
   3. three
   4. four
   5. five or more

10. Number of years you have held a salaried position at <u>your present</u> institution.
    1. Less than 1 year
    2. 1-4 years
    3. 5-9 years
    4. 10-14 years
    5. 15-19 years
    6. 20 or more years

11. <u>Total</u> number of years you have held a salaried position in an institution of higher education including your present position.
    1. Less than 1 year
    2. 1-4 years
    3. 5-9 years
    4. 10-14 years
    5. 15-19 years
    6. 20 or more years

12. Number of years since completion of your last professional degree.
    1. Less than one year
    2. 1-4 years
    3. 5-9 years
    4. 10-14 years
    5. 15-19 years
    6. 20 or more years

13. Academic tenure status
    1. full academic tenure
    2. on tenure track-decision due 0-1 year
    3. on tenure track-decision due 2-3 years
    4. on tenure track-decision due 4 or more years
    5. not on tenure track

14. About how many students at each level indicated below are enrolled in your courses this term?

A. Introductory Undergraduate

1. none	5. 50-99
2. under 10	6. 100-249
3. 10-25	7. 250-399
4. 26-49	8. 400 or more

B. Advanced Undergraduate

1. none	5. 50-99
2. under 10	6. 100-249
3. 10-25	7. 250-399
4. 26-49	8. 400 or more

C. Graduate

1. none	5. 50-99
2. under 10	6. 100-249
3. 10-25	7. 250-399
4. 26-49	8. 400 or more

15a. How many different classes (including different sections) are you meeting this term?

1. none	5. four
2. one	6. five
3. two	7. six or more
4. three	

15b. How many different courses (not including sections of the same course) are you teaching?

1. none	5. four
2. one	6. five
3. two	7. six or more
4. three	

16. Primary area in which you teach.

1. Physical Education Professional Preparation (Method-Curriculum-Administration)
2. Physical Education Professional Preparation (Activity Courses)
3. Exercise Science (Kinesiology-Anatomy-Physiology)
4. Sports Studies (Psychology of Sport-Philosophy-Sociology)
5. Leisure Studies (Recreation, Camping, Outdoor Education)
6. Coaching (Psychology of Coaching-Philosophy-Methods of Coaching)
7. General Physical Education (Activity courses for general student population)
8. I teach in two areas about equally, they are_____.
9. Other, please describe_____.

17a. Number of hours/wk. you usually spend in teaching activities (Organizing-teaching-Evaluating) undergraduate students.

1. none
2. less than 10
3. 10-19
4. 20-29
5. 30-39
6. 40 or more

17b. Number of hours/wk. you usually spend in teaching activities (Organizing-Teaching-Evaluating) graduate students.

1. none
2. less than 10
3. 10-19
4. 20-29
5. 30-39
6. 40 or more

18. Please indicate which group is the primary target of your teaching.

1. undergraduate students
2. graduate students (masters level)
3. graduate students (doctoral level)
4. both graduate and undergraduates equally
9. other, please describe_____
_____

19. Please indicate your present involvement in coaching.

1. none
2. assistant one sport
3. assistant more than one sport
4. head coach one sport
5. head coach more than one sport
6. other, please describe_____
_____

20. In the last five years, have you audited or taken for credit any formally established university or college course(s) that dealt specifically with the design, implementation and/or evaluation of college or university instruction?

    1. yes
    2. no

21. In the last five years, have you ever attended a workshop(s) or training session(s) that dealt specifically with the design, implementation and/or evaluation of college or university instruction?

    1. yes
    2. no

22. In the last five years, have you ever audited or taken for credit any formally established university or college course(s) that focused on group dynamics, humanistic education and/or sensitivity training?

    1. yes
    2. no

23. In the last five years, have you ever attended a workshop(s) or training session(s) that dealt specifically with group dynamics, humanistic education or sensitivity training?

    1. yes
    2. no

24. Please indicate the item that best fits your present feelings toward your responsibilities as a teacher and as a researcher.

    1. Does not apply to me (I have no teaching or no research responsibilities)
    2. Extremely interested in research
    3. Interested in teaching, but more interested in research
    4. Equally interested in both
    5. Interested in research but more interested in teaching
    6. Extremely interested in teaching

25. Please indicate the item that best fits your present feeling toward your responsibility as a teacher and as an author of professional publications (books and articles other than research reports)

    1. Does not apply to me (I have no teaching or no publishing responsibilities)
    2. Extremely interested in writing for publication
    3. Interested in writing for publications but more interested in teaching
    4. Equally interested in both
    5. Interested in teaching but more interested in writing for publication
    6. Extremely interested in teaching

26. Please indicate the item which best fits your present feelings toward your responsibilities as a teacher and as a coach.

1. Does not apply to me (I have no teaching or no coaching responsibilities)
2. Extremely interested in coaching
3. Interested in teaching but more interested in coaching
4. Equally interested in both
5. Interested in coaching, but more interested in teaching
6. Extremely interested in teaching.

27. About how many days during the past 1976-77 academic year were you away from campus for professional activities (Professional Meetings-Speeches-Consulting)?

1. none
2. 1-2 days
3. 3-5 days
4. 6-10 days
5. 11-20 days
6. 21-30 days
7. 31 or more days

Thank you for your cooperation in filling out this questionnaire. Plesae bring it with you to our interview.

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

A. Respondents name
B. Institution
C. Date

II. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of the interview
B. Ethics (use of information-confidentiality)
C. Topics to be covered in the interview
D. Concerns of the person being interviewed

III. THE GENERAL TEACHING SITUATION

1. Would your please describe your major responsibilities as a faculty member in this department.

2. Of the responsibilities that you just described, which gives you the most satisfaction? Why?

3. In the same light, which is most dissatisfying to you? Why?

4. In regard to your teaching responsibilities, how are teaching assignments generally made in this department? How do you feel about this procedure?

5. Of the courses that you now teach, are there any that you would prefer not to teach? Which ones? Why?

6. Are there courses that you are not now teaching but you would like to teach? Which ones? Why?

7. Of the courses that you now teach, which is the most satisfying for you? Why?

8. Please give me three or four words that best describe your feelings toward your present responsibilities.

IV. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

9. Please try to explain to me what you try most to achieve as a teacher. What are you really trying to do most of all?

10. What competencies--i.e., skills, knowledges--do you feel are necessary in order to achieve those things that your really think are important for you to accomplish as a teacher?

11. How do you think you have developed these competencies?

12. What do you consider to be your greatest strength as a teacher?

13. What process do you use to determine the effectiveness of your teaching?

14. Of these, which do you feel gives you the most accurate assessment of your teaching effectiveness? Why?

15. What would you like to have your colleagues say about you as a teacher?

16. In the same light, what would you like to have your students say about you as a teacher?

17. How effective do you really feel you are as a teacher? How have you come to hold this view?

18. What do you think that students expect from you when they enroll in your class?

19. As the instructor, what do you expect from students who enroll in your class?

20. What is your philosophy of teaching? (How do you believe students learn? What do you see as your role as teacher?)

V. REWARDS AVAILABLE FOR TEACHING

21. What relative importance do you see teaching having for promotion, tenure, and other personnel decisions in your department?

22. Why do you think that teaching holds such a position for personnel decisions in your department?

23. Do you agree with the statement that "No one can be a good teacher unless he/she is actively involved in research."? Why?

24. Are you actively involved in research and/or publication at this point in your career? If yes, what kind? Why do you do it? Is it part of your assigned load?

25. Other than the formal rewards we have been discussing, do you find any other rewards available to you for engaging in teaching? If yes, what are they? If no, why not?

26. All things considered, how well do you feel performance in teaching is rewarded in this department? Would you like to see it rewarded more? Less? In what ways?

VI. IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING

27. What changes--of any kind that occur to you--would allow you to do a better job of what you are really trying to achieve as a teacher?

28. When you work to improve your courses, what type of changes do you usually make?

29. If you were dissatisfied with something in your teaching, where or with whom (if anyone) would you seek help in order to improve the situation?

30. How much time, energy and effort do you actually give to the continuous development of your teaching competencies? Why do you feel this activity is so important? Why do you feel you invest so little time into this activity?

31. Could you suggest things that you might do to make teaching a more viable activity for yourself and for colleagues in your department.

32. In the same light, are there any things that you think the department might do to better support teaching?

33. Do you feel that improving the rewards available for effective performance of teaching will increase the general quality of teaching in this department? If yes, in what ways? If no, why not?

34. Are there any issues, concerns or interest that we have not covered that you feel are important to your teaching situation?

This is all of the questions that I have. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

APPENDIX D

CODING FORMS

CODING FORM

ROG DISSERTATION

INSTRUCTIONS

Circle the most appropriate responses category for the questions listed below. Some responses may be given even though the specific question is not asked. Wait until hearing the entire tape to mark answers you might infer. After hearing the entire tape, check your coding to see if the entire interview alters your original responses in any way.

On the separate transcription form, please note any specific responses that you feel are particularly good and/or are strong evidence of the respondent's attitude toward teaching.

Be sure to sign all sheets and forms before you turn them in.

OVERALL RATING FORM--ROG DISSERTATION

Instructions: After listening to the entire tape, please answer the following five questions regarding the respondent. This is not part of the coding but will be used to help establish a general impression of the respondent in question.

1. What is the respondent's general attitude toward his/her departmental responsibilities and teaching assignments?

2. What does the respondent see as the most important thing to achieve as a teacher?

3. How effective does the respondent feel as a teacher?

4. How well rewarded does the respondent feel as a teacher?

5. Overall, what is the respondent's general attitude toward teaching?

_____

Coder Initial

5. Would you please describe your major responsibilities as a faculty member in this department?

   1. Teaching
   2. Coaching
   3. Administration
   4. Departmental Services
   5. University Services
   6. Research
   8. Other (please describe)
   9. No Response

6. Of the responsibilities that you just described, which gives you the most satisfaction?

   1. Teaching
   2. Coaching
   3. Administration
   4. Departmental Services
   5. University Services
   6. Research
   8. Other (please describe)
   9. No Response

7. Why?

   1. Working conditions and resources
   2. Personal Competencies
   3. Relationship with Students
   4. Course Content/Activity Content
   5. Personal Growth/Challenge/Achievement
   6. Relationship with Colleagues
   8. Other (please describe)
   9. No Response

8. In the same light, which is most dissatisfying to you?

   1. Teaching
   2. Coaching
   3. Administration
   4. Departmental Services
   5. University Services
   6. Research
   8. Other (please describe)
   9. No Response

9. Why?

1. Working Conditions and Resources
2. Personal Competencies
3. Relationship with Students
4. Course Content/Activity Content
5. Personal Growth/Challenge/Achievement
6. Relationship with Colleagues
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

10. In regards to your teaching responsibilities, how are teaching assignments generally made in this department?

1. Haphazard (no set pattern)
2. By Administration Alone
3. Administration and Individual Faculty Collaboration
4. Individual Faculty but Submitted to Administration for Approval
5. Individual Faculty Alone
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

11. How do you feel about this procedure?

1. Satisfied
2. Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
3. Dissatisfied
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

12. Of the courses that you now teach, are there any that you would prefer not to teach?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

13. Which ones?

1. Undergraduate--discipline area
2. Undergraduate--skills-activity area
3. Graduate--discipline area
4. Graduate--general (seminar, research methods)
5. Combination of above (please specify)
8. Other (please specify)
9. No Response

14. Why?

1. Working conditions and Resources
2. Personal Competencies
3. Relationship with Students
4. Course Content
5. Personal Growth/Challenge/Achievement
6. Relationship with Colleagues
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

15. Are there courses that you are not now teaching, but you would like to teach?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

16. Which one(s)?

1. Undergraduate Course--discipline area
2. Undergraduate Course--activity-skills area
3. Graduate Course--discipline area
4. Graduate Course--general (seminar, research method)
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

17. Why?

1. Working Conditions and Resources
2. Personal Competencies
3. Relationship with Students
4. Course Content
5. Personal Growth/Challenge/Achievement
6. Relationship with Colleagues
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

18. Of the course that you now teach, which is the most satisfying for you?

1. Undergraduate--discipline area
2. Undergraduate--skills-activity area
3. Graduate--discipline area
4. Graduate--general (seminar, research methods)
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

19. Why?

1. Working Conditions and Resources
2. Personal Competencies
3. Relationship with Students
4. Course Content
5. Personal Growth/Challenge/Achievement
6. Relationship with Colleagues
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

20. Please give me three or four words that best describe your feeling toward your present teaching responsibilities.

1. Words generally express satisfaction
2. Words generally express a moderate position
3. Words generally express dissatisfaction

EXAMPLES:

Satisfaction: challenging, fun, enjoyable, rewarding, satisfying, exciting
Neutral: It's OK, alright, somewhat overloaded, I can't think of any words
Dissatisfaction: Boring, frustrating, overloaded, unfair, hard, unsatisfying

21. Please try to explain to me what you try most to achieve as a teacher, that is, what are you really trying to do most of all?

1. Provide knowledge of subject matter
2. Provide for a positive educational environment
3. Meet needs of students
4. Encourage interest and enthusiasm in area of study
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

22. What competencies--i.e., skills or knowledges--do you feel are necessary to achieve those things that you really think are important for you to accomplish as a teacher?

1. Knowledge of the Subject Matter
2. Knowledge of Students
3. Interpersonal Skills
4. Skill in Instructional Techniques/Methodology
5. Planning/Organizing Skills
6. Feedback/Evaluation Skills
7. Personal Qualities
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

23. How do you feel you have developed these competencies?

1. Academic Training
2. Previous Teaching Experience
3. Previous Work Experience Other Than Teaching
4. Observing and/or Working with Peers/Colleagues
5. Self Taught
6. Inservice Training Experiences
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

24. What do you consider to be your greatest strength as a teacher?

1. Knowledge of the Subject Matter
2. Knowledge of the Students
3. Interpersonal Skills
4. Skills in Instructional Techniques/Methodology
5. Planning/Organizing Skills
6. Feedback/Evaluation Skills
7. Personal Qualities
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

25. What processes do you use to determine the effectiveness of your teaching?

1. Systematic Feedback from Students
2. Non-Systematic Feedback from Students
3. Student Achievement
4. Systematic Feedback from Colleagues/Administrators
5. Non-Systematic Feedback from Colleagues/Administrators
6. Intuitive Sense
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

26. Of these, which do you feel gives you the most accurate assessment of your teaching effectiveness?

1. Systematic Student Feedback
2. Non-Systematic Student Feedback
3. Student Achievement
4. Systematic Feedback from Colleagues/Administrators
5. Non-Systematic Feedback from Colleagues/Administrators
6. Intuitive Sense
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

27. What would you like to have colleagues say about you as a teacher?

1. Knowledge of Subject Matter
2. Relationship with Students
3. Personal Qualities
4. Students Achievement
5. Instructional Techniques/Methodology
6. Feedback/Evaluation Skills
7. Organizing/Planning Skills
8. Other (please describe)
9. No response

28. In the same light, what would you like to have your students say about you as a teacher?

1. Knowledge of Subject Matter
2. Relationship with Students
3. Personal Qualities
4. Students Achievements
5. Instructional Techniques/Methodology
6. Feedback/Evaluation Skills
7. Organizing/Planning Skills
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

29. How effective do you really feel you are as a teacher?

1. Effective
2. Moderately Effective
3. Ineffective
8. Other

30. How have you come to hold this view?

1. Student Feedback
2. Colleague Feedback
3. Administration Feedback
4. Self Evaluation
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

31. What do you think students expect from you when they enroll in your class?

1. Content-Centered Skills
2. Student-Centered Skills
3. Technical/Methodological Skills
4. Planning/Evaluation Skills
5. Feedback/Evaluation Skills
6. Personal Qualities
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

32. As the instructor, what do you expect from students who enroll in your class?

1. Cognitive Skills
2. Interpersonal Skills
3. Study Skills
4. Personal Qualities
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

33. What is your philosophy of teaching? How do you believe the students learn? What do you see as your role as a teacher?

1. Content-Centered Teaching and Learning
2. Instructor-Centered Teaching and Learning
3. Student-Centered Teaching and Learning
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Responses

34. What relative importance do you see teaching having for promotion, tenure and other personnel decisions in your department?

1. Teaching is Important
2. Teaching is Neither Important or Unimportant
3. Teaching is Unimportant
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

35. Why do you think that teaching holds such a position for personnel decisions in your department?

1. Traditional Concept of a University
2. Influence of the Larger Institution
3. Unique Function/Mission of Department or School
4. Characteristic of Teaching
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

36. Do you agree with the statement that "No one can be a good teacher unless he/she is actively involved in research?

1. Yes, definitely
2. Yes, reservation
3. No, reservation
4. No, definitely
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

37. Are you actively involved in research and/or publication at this point in your career?

1. Yes (Research)
2. Yes (Publication)
3. Yes (Both)
4. No (Research)
5. No (Publication)
6. No (Both)
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

38. Other than the formal rewards we have been discussing, do you find any other reward available to you for engaging in teaching?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

39. If yes, what are they?

1. Relationship with Students
2. Relationship with Colleagues
3. Personal Growth/Challenge/Achievement
4. Working Conditions/Resources
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

40. All things considered, how well do you feel performance in teaching is rewarded in this department?

1. Teaching is rewarded
2. Teaching is minimally rewarded
3. Teaching is not rewarded
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

41. Would you like to see it rewarded?

1. Yes
2. No
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

42. In what ways?

1. Administrative Recognition
2. Policies Personnel
3. Advancement for Teaching
4. Colleague Recognition
5. Monetary Recognition
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

43. What changes--of any kind--that occur to you--would allow you to do a better job of what you are really trying to achieve as a teacher?

1. Administrative and Management Duties
2. Policy and Procedure Changes
3. Personnel Changes
4. Resource Allotment Changes
5. Assignment Changes
6. Student Related Changes
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

44. When you work to improve your courses, what type of changes do you usually make?

1. Content-Subject Matter Related Changes
2. Instructional/Methodological Changes
3. Feedback/Evaluation Changes
4. Student Centered Changes
5. Planning.Organizing Changes
6. Interpersonal Skills
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

45. If you were dissatisfied with something in your teaching, where or with whom (if anyone) would you seek help in order to improve the situation?

1. Colleague in the Department
2. Professional in the Field/Discipline
3. Instructional Improvement Center
4. Students
5. Administrator
6. Book, Articles, Other References (self managed changes)
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

46. How much time, energy and effort do you actually give to the continous development of your teaching competencies?

1. A Great deal of Time
2. A Moderate Amount of Time
3. A Small Amount of Time
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

47. Could you suggest things that you might do to make teaching a more viable activity for yourself and your colleagues in this department?

1. Encourage/Attend Inservice Training Opportunities
2. Share Ideas, Materials Informal/Formal
3. Collaborate with Administrators/Colleagues
4. Encourage Peer Observation Classes/Teaching
5. Encourage Self Monitoring of Classes/Teaching
6. Can Not Think of Anything
8. Other (please describe)
9. No Response

48. In the same light, are there things that you think the department might do to better support teaching?

1. Yes
2. No
9. No Response

49. What?

1. Provide Recognition for Good Performance
2. Resources and Facilities
3. Support Personnel
4. Work Load
5. Monetary Support
6. Opportunities for Personal Development
8. Other (please describe)

50. Do you feel that improving the rewards available for effective performance of teaching will increase the general quality of teaching in this department?

1. Yes, definitely
2. Yes, reservation
3. No, reservation
4. No, definitely
9. No Response

APPENDIX E

TABLES FROM QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

TABLE 48

7. NUMBER OF HOURS SUBJECTS SPEND JOB RELATED ACTIVITIES

Category	Freq Combined (ABC)	PCT	CUM PCT
Less than 20 hrs/wk.	0	00.0	00.0
20 to 29 hrs/wk.	1	2.5	2.5
30 to 39 hrs/wk.	2	5.0	7.5
40 to 49 hrs/wk.	12	30.0	37.5
50 to 59 hrs/wk.	8	20.0	57.5
60 or more hrs/wk.	17	42.5	100.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	

TABLE 49

8. SIZE OF SCHOOL FROM WHICH SUBJECTS RECEIVED THEIR LATEST DEGREE

Category	Freq Combined (ABC)	PCT	CUM PCT
Under 1,000	0	00.0	00.0
1,000 to 4,999	10	25.0	25.0
5,000 to 9,999	3	7.5	32.5
10,000 to 14,999	5	12.5	45.0
15,000 to 19,999	3	7.5	52.5
20,000 or more	19	47.5	100.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	

TABLE 50

9. NUMBER OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS WHERE SUBJECTS HELD A SALARIED POSITION

Category	Freq Combined (ABC)	PCT	CUM PCT
One Institution	12	30.0	30.0
Two Institutions	10	25.0	55.0
Three Institutions	13	32.5	87.5
Four Institutions	4	10.0	97.5
Five or more Institutions	1	2.5	100.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	

TABLE 51

11. TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS SUBJECTS HELD A SALARIED POSITION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Category	Freq Combined (ABC)	PCT	CUM PCT
Less than 1 year	1	2.5	2.5
1-4 years	3	7.5	10.0
5-9 years	4	10.0	20.0
10-14 years	12	30.0	50.0
15-19 years	6	15.0	65.0
20 or more years	12	30.0	95.0
Missing data	2	5.0	100.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	

TABLE 52

14. APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF STUDENTS FROM VARIOUS LEVELS ENROLLED IN SUBJECTS' COURSES

Category	Freq Combined (ABC)	PCT	CUM PCT
A. Introductory Undergraduate			
None	7	17.5	17.5
Under 10	1	2.5	20.0
10-25	6	15.0	35.0
26-49	15	37.5	72.5
50-99	4	10.0	82.5
100-249	4	10.0	92.5
250-399	1	2.5	95.0
400 or more	1	2.5	97.5
Missing Data	1	2.5	100.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	
B. Advanced Undergraduate			
None	5	12.5	12.5
10-25	3	7.5	20.0
26-49	9	22.5	42.5
50-99	11	27.5	70.0
100-249	6	15.0	85.0
250-399	1	2.5	87.5
400 or more	0	00.0	87.5
Missing Data	5	12.5	100.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	

TABLE 52 (Con't.)

Category		Freq Combined (ABC)	PCT	CUM PCT
C. Graduate				
None		21	52.5	52.5
Under 10		8	20.0	72.5
10-25		4	10.0	82.5
26-49		1	2.5	85.0
50-99		0	00.0	85.0
100-249		0	00.0	85.0
250-399		0	00.0	85.0
400 or more		0	00.0	85.0
Missing data		6	15.0	85.0
	TOTAL	40	100.0	

TABLE 53

15A. NUMBER OF DIFFERENT CLASSES SUBJECTS WERE MEETING THIS TERM

Category	Freq Combined (ABC)	PCT	CUM PCT
None	0	00.0	00.0
One Class	2	5.0	5.0
Two Classes	3	7.5	12.5
Three Classes	7	17.5	30.0
Four Classes	11	27.5	57.5
Five Classes	7	17.5	75.0
Six or More Classes	9	22.5	97.5
Missing Data	1	2.5	100.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	

TABLE 54

15B. NUMBER OF DIFFERENT COURSES (NOT SECTIONS) SUBJECTS WERE TEACHING THIS TERM

Category	Freq Combined (ABC)	PCT	CUM PCT
None	0	00.0	00.0
One Course	2	5.0	5.0
Two Courses	6	15.0	20.0
Three Courses	13	32.5	52.5
Four Courses	8	20.0	72.5
Five Courses	3	7.5	80.0
Six or More Courses	2	5.0	85.0
Missing Data	6	15.0	85.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	

TABLE 55

17A. NUMBER OF HOURS SUBJECTS SPEND TEACHING ACTIVITIES FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Category	Freq Combined (ABC)	PCT	CUM PCT
None	1	2.5	2.5
Less than 10 hours	3	7.5	10.0
10-19 hours	10	25.0	35.0
20-29 hours	10	25.0	60.0
30-39 hours	8	20.0	80.0
40 or more hours	7	17.5	97.5
Missing Data	1	2.5	100.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	

TABLE 56

17B. NUMBER OF HOURS SUBJECTS SPEND TEACHING ACTIVITIES FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

Category	Freq Combined (ABC)	PCT	CUM PCT
None	19	47.5	47.5
Less than 10 hours	5	12.5	60.0
10-19 hours	9	22.5	82.5
20-29 hours	1	2.5	85.0
30-39 hours	0	00.0	85.0
More than 40 hours	0	00.0	85.0
Missing Data	6	15.0	85.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	

TABLE 57

18. SUBJECTS' TEACHING ASSIGNMENT BY STUDENT LEVEL

Category	Freq Combined (ABC)	PCT	CUM PCT
Undergraduate Students	35	87.5	87.5
Graduate Students (Masters Level)	2	5.0	92.5
Graduate Students (Doctorate Level)	0	00.0	92.5
Both Graduate and Undergraduate Equally	3	7.5	100.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	

TABLE 58

19. SUBJECTS' INVOLVEMENT IN COACHING

Category	Freq. Combined (ABC)	PCT	Freq. Dept. A	PCT	Freq. Dept. B	PCT	Freq. Dept. C	PCT
None	22	55.0	3	15.8	12	85.7	7	100.0
Assistant One Sport	2	5.0	2	10.5	0	00.0	0	00.0
Assistant More Than One Sport	0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0
Head Coach One Sport	14	35.0	12	63.2	2	14.3	0	00.0
Head Coach More Than One Sport	2	5.0	2	10.5	0	00.0	0	00.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	19	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0

TABLE 59

20 & 21. NUMBER OF SUBJECTS WHO HAD TAKEN A COURSE OR WORKSHOP THAT DEALT SPECIFICALLY WITH TEACHING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Category	Freq. Combined (ABC)	PCT	Freq. Dept. A	PCT	Freq. Dept. B	PCT	Freq. Dept. C	PCT
A. Courses								
Yes	10	25.0	6	31.6	4	28.6	0	0.0
No	30	75.0	13	68.4	10	71.4	7	100.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	19	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0
B. Workshop								
Yes	23	57.5	10	52.6	9	64.3	4	57.1
No	17	42.5	9	47.4	5	35.7	3	42.9
TOTAL	40	100.0	19	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0

TABLE 60

22 & 23. NUMBER OF SUBJECTS WHO HAD TAKEN A COURSE OR WORKSHOP THAT FOCUSED ON GROUP DYNAMICS

Category	Freq. Combined (ABC)	PCT	Freq. Dept. A	PTC	Freq. Dept. B	PCT	Freq. Dept. C	PCT
A. Courses								
Yes			7	36.8	3	21.4	2	28.6
No			12	63.2	11	78.6	5	71.0
TOTAL			19	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0
B. Workshop								
Yes			6	31.6	6	42.9	3	42.9
No			12	63.2				
Missing Data			1	5.3	8	57.1	4	57.1
TOTAL			19	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0

TABLE 61

27. NUMBER OF DAYS EACH ACADEMIC YEAR SUBJECTS WERE AWAY FROM CAMPUS ATTENDING PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Category	Freq. Combined (ABC)	PCT	Freq. Dept. A	PCT	Freq. Dept. B	PCT	Freq. Dept. C	PCT
None	3	7.5	3	15.8	0	00.0	0	00.0
1-2 days	3	7.5	3	15.8	0	00.0	0	00.0
3-5 days	4	10.0	3	15.8	1	7.1	0	00.0
5-10 days	11	27.5	2	10.5	7	50.0	2	28.6
11-20 days	13	32.5	5	26.3	3	21.4	5	71.4
24-30 days	3	7.5	1	5.3	2	14.3	0	00.0
31 or more days	3	7.5	2	10.5	1	7.1	0	00.0
TOTAL	40	100.0	19	100.0	14	100.0	7	100.0

APPENDIX F

INTER-CODER RELIABILITY

MEAN SCOTTS' π INTER-CODER RELIABILITY FOR THE ENTIRE INTERVIEW

Interview Number	High	Low	Mean
A. 06, 24, 38	1.0	.51	.75
B. 14, 11, 21, 34, 27	1.0	.58	.79
C. Total first 8 tapes	1.0	.54	.77
D. 08, 19, 26, 39, 43	1.0	.44	.72
E. Total all 13 tapes	1.0	.49	.74

MEAN INDIVIDUAL QUESTION INTER-CODER AGREEMENT (13 Interviews) = .83

Individual Question Inter-Coder Agreement

	Scotts' π
5. Would you please describe your major responsibilities as a faculty member in this department?	.91
6. Of the responsibilities that you just described, which gives you the most satisfaction?	.92
7. Why?	.80
8. In the same light, which is the most dissatisfying to you?	.95
9. Why?	.92
10. In regards to your teaching responsibilities, how are teaching assignments generally made in this department?	.94
11. How do you feel about this procedure?	.84
12. Of the courses that you now teach, are there any that you would prefer not to teach?	.64

		Scott's π
13.	Which ones?	.80
14.	Why?	.78
15.	Are there course that you are not now teaching, but you would like to teach?	.86
16.	Which one(s)?	.91
17.	Why?	.84
18.	Of the courses that you now teach, which is the most satisfying for you?	.79
19.	Why?	.83
20.	Please give me three or four words that best describe your feelings toward your present teaching responsibilities.	.77
21.	Please try to explain to me what you try most to achieve as a teacher, that is, what are you really trying to do most of all?	.87
22.	What competencies--i.e., skills or knowledges--do you feel are necessary to achieve those things that you really think are important for you to accomplish as a teacher?	.92
23.	How do you feel you have developed these competencies?	.84
24.	What do you consider to be your greatest strength as a teacher?	.81
25.	What processes do you use to determine the effectiveness of your teaching?	.86
26.	Of these, which do you feel gives you the most accurate assessment of your teaching effectiveness?	.87
27.	What would you like to have colleagues say about you as a teacher?	.83
28.	In the same light, what would you like to have your students say about you as a teacher?	.75

		Scotts' π
29.	How effective do you really feel you are as a teacher?	.88
30.	How have you come to hold this view?	.83
31.	What do you think students expect from you when they enroll in your class?	.76
32.	As the instructor, what do you expect from students who enroll in your class?	.76
33.	What is your philosophy of teaching? How do you believe students learn? What do you see as your role as a teacher?	.80
34.	What relative importance do you see teaching for promotion, tenure, and other personnel decisions in your department?	.82
35.	Why do you think that teaching holds such a position for personnel decisions in your department?	.68
36.	Do you agree with the statement that "No one can be a good teacher unless he/she is actively involved in research"?	.83
37.	Are you actively involved in research and/or publication at this point in your career?	.84
38.	Other than the formal rewards we have been discussing, do you find any other reward available to you for engaging in teaching?	1.0
39.	If yes, what are they?	.76
40.	All things considered, how well do you feel performance in teaching is rewarded in this department?	.86
41.	Would you like to see it rewarded?	.78
42.	In what ways?	.88
43.	What changes--of any kind--that occur to you--would allow you to do a better job of what you are really trying to achieve as a teacher?	.83

		Scotts' π
44.	When you work to improve your courses, what type of changes do you usually make?	.87
45.	If you were dissatisfied with something in your teaching, where or with whom (if anyone) would you seek help in order to improve the situation?	.74
46.	How much time, energy and effort do you actually give to the continuous development of your teaching competencies?	.74
47.	Could you suggest things that you might do to make teaching a more viable activity for yourself and your colleagues in this department?	.90
48.	In the same light, are there things that you think the department might do to better support teaching?	.61
49.	What?	.74
50.	Do you feel that improving the rewards available for effective performance of teaching will increase the general quality of teaching in this department?	.73