The Physical Educator Vol. 82 • pp. 107–126 • 2025
https://doi.org/10.18666/TPE-2025-V82-I2-12274

PEDAGOGY

Early Career Differences in PETE for Master's and Doctoral Institutions

Thomas Trendowski

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the organizational differences between Doctorate-granting Universities (DUs) and Master's Colleges and Universities (MCUs) that contribute to the achievement of promotion for an assistant professor. Twenty-five full professors at doctoral-granting/master's-level institutions in Physical Education Teacher Education were interviewed. Methodological rigor was applied through the lens of Miles and Huberman's (1994) four-stage process for data analysis with corresponding transcriptions. Curriculum vitae were also collected to aid in triangulation. Career preparedness and initial supports with the primary role responsibility were vastly different between DUs and MCUs, leading to documented episodes of reality shock at MCUs. The study indicates vastly different levels of preparedness for individuals who start their careers at DUs rather than MCUs. The significance of this research indicates that DU's may consider training doctoral candidates by providing a more robust set of experiences conducive to faculty roles.

Thomas Trendowski, Associate Professor, University of North Carolina at Pembroke, Educational Specialties. Please send author correspondence to thomas.trendowski@uncp.edu

Introduction

Upon entry into the field of academia, professors may have profound and different experiences. For some, it has been noted that role expectations and career readiness were a simple transference from doctoral education (Trendowski & Woods, 2021). Others have suggested a wide discrepancy between preparation and daily job functions (Casey & Fletcher, 2012). Ward and colleagues (2011) have discussed the dichotomy in research and explained that graduate students do not have diverse enough experiences. Despite these problems, recent research in physical education teacher education (PETE) offers a complicated picture of preparation and role expectations (McLoughlin et al., 2019; Richards et al., 2022). The significance of such instances may often have professors finding difficulty balancing roles, feeling isolated, or even experiencing burnout (McLoughlin et al., 2019; Richards et al., 2021).

Research in Physical Education Teacher Education

Over the past 10 years, research on PETE professors has increased (McLoughlin et al., 2019; Richards et al., 2022; Trendowski, 2023). When entering the field, initial supports have not exclusively contrasted between Master's Colleges and Universities (MCUs) and Doctorate-granting Universities (DUs) in PETE. However, the current literature does discuss career preparation and initial entry. McLoughlin and colleagues (2019) conducted a longitudinal study and found robust advisor-advisee relationships, along with a supportive department culture during an individual's first faculty position, were important socializing agents. The new faculty member would often maintain a working relationship with the advisor. Richards and colleagues (2022) found that pre-tenure faculty professors face many challenges, including balancing roles, the perception by the university that their subject matters, and feelings of isolation. Trendowski and Woods (2021) studied 14 doctoral institution professors and explored the promotion process to full professor. This was categorized as scholarship being the most salient role while teaching and service were considered secondary.

Theory Occupational Socialization

Historically, socialization theory contains three categories: acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization (Pennington, 2021). The theory was initially utilized as a framework to explain why pre-service and in-service PE teachers reason, behave, and act in their profession (Pennington, 2021). Nevertheless, as research has advanced in recent years, the process has further been developed to explain socialization in the PETE professoriate.

Brunsdon and Curtner-Smith explain that the socialization model includes "acculturation (i.e., the influence of biography before teacher education), professional socialization (i.e., the influence of PETE), organizational socialization (i.e., the influence of the school culture), secondary professional socialization (i.e., the influence of advanced degrees), and secondary organizational socialization)" (2023, p. 923). Richards and Fletcher (2018) contend that within professional socialization, there are two components: anticipatory socialization and graduate education. According to Pennington (2021), this phase was initially there to explore the recruitment of post-bachelorettes into the field of PE. Anticipatory socialization in academia refers to socialization experiences "leading up to one's decision to enter doctoral education" (Richards & Fletcher, 2018, p. 99). During this time, potential doctoral candidates may spend time working as physical educators (Russell et al., 2016). Merrem and Curtner-Smith (2018) explain that anticipatory socialization experiences can greatly influence the meaning or philosophy when starting as PETE faculty. The latter part of professional socialization is graduate education (Richards & Fletcher, 2020). During the doctoral experience, individuals develop the "knowledge, skills, and experience" to become teacher educators (Russell et al., 2018, p. 440). Professional organizations are paramount for facilitating positive interactions via networking, knowledge gained, and experience presenting (Richards et al., 2016). The secondary professional socialization phase is typically seen as more impactful than the initial professional socialization phase (Merrum & Curtner-Smith, 2018).

Secondary organizational socialization (Russell et al., 2016), sometimes referred to as faculty socialization (McLoughlin et al., 2019) is the socialization experiences of faculty members in academia. There are three levels: junior, mid-career, and senior phases

(McLoughlin et al., 2019), which pose unique challenges as they can be synonymous with assistant, associate, and full professor (Trendowski & Woods, 2021). However, there can be a delay in promotion, and thus, these categories do not always align (Trendowski, 2023). Challenges faced typically revolve around academic roles, including research, teaching, and scholarship (Trendowski & Woods, 2021). The saliency of each depends on which phase of the professor's career they are in (Trendowski & Woods, 2021).

As a pre-tenured faculty (assistant professor), there are many challenges, such as publishing and creating a line of inquiry, teaching new classes, advising students, and participating in service (Trendowski & Woods, 2021). Research notes that pre-tenured faculty are bombarded with commitments such as high teaching loads, grant funding, and research (Gregory & Burbage, 2017). As a result of these pressures, there seems to be an awareness by the administration to lessen the load of committee work on new faculty (Trendowski & Woods, 2021). Socializing factors, such as experiences, mentors, and expectations, influence where an individual's time and energy are spent (Trendowski & Woods, 2021).

The dialectical nature of socialization is important, especially early in the career, as individuals can resist and utilize personal agency in the workforce. An individual's job can be carried out with little tension when personal and institutional expectations align (Graber et al., 2020). However, under misaligned role expectations, pre-tenured faculty members could encounter role conflict (Richards & Levesque-Bristol, 2016). When there is role conflict, faculty members may abandon other roles, withdraw into one role, or try to balance personal and institutional obligations (Burke-Smalley et al., 2017). With mismanagement, burnout and early career termination may transpire (Padilla & Thompson, 2016).

Rationale and Purpose

There has been a recent interest in PETE pre-tenured faculty studies (McLoughlin et al., 2019; Richards et al., 2021). Such research has discussed many challenges and tribulations pre-tenure faculty face. Faculty members generally reported feeling underprepared for their teaching roles due to a lack of training and limited opportunities for Ph.D. experience (Bowman et al., 2017; Casey & Fletcher, 2012). Casey and Fletcher (2012) noted the lack of specific educational

courses and less relevant educational experience within doctoral programs. This situation can be exacerbated when young faculty members work in less research-oriented environments compared to doctoral institutions. This study aimed to investigate the organizational differences between Doctorate-granting Universities (DUs) and Master's Colleges and Universities (MCUs) that contribute to the achievement of promotion for an assistant professor. In recent years, there has not been a targeted study differentiating between MCUs' and DUs' initial experiences in which success of promotion was attained. Pennington (2021) mentions that only a few such studies exist in PETE that are reflective of individuals entering the field from individuals who were successfully promoted.

Methods

Identification of Participants

After permission was granted from the Institutional Review Board, the primary researcher sent an initial inquiry concerning participation in the study. The email included information outlining the study's purpose and an attached consent form. If the recipient declined to be interviewed, communication ended. Participants were requested to participate based on a PETE program database in the United States that comprises more than 600 schools and 250 full professors. All individuals with the rank of full professor employed by doctoral/master-level institutions were considered. Participants were given pseudonyms for anonymity.

In total, 25 participants (nine females and 16 males) from a variety of Carnegie research classifications were selected. This categorization (Carnegie) is based on quantifiable variables, such as research productivity, number of doctoral degrees conferred, size of the program, variety of programs offered, degree type, and number of students enrolled (Indiana University, n.d). In the end, 15 participants were employed at doctoral institutions (DUs), and 10 were employed at Master's institutions (MCUs) during their assistant professorship. Of note, only Todd and Marge moved classifications within assistant professorships (e.g., moving from a master's to a doctoral level). However, in both cases, they were classified as the latter placement, as Todd only spent one year at the institution while Marge spent three. Notably, there were only three cases in which participants moveclas-

Table 1
Description of Participants

Participant	Carnegie Classification at Pre-Tenure Institution(s)	Carnegie Classification at Current Institution	Years at Assistant Professor Rank	Years at Full Professor Rank	Geographic Region
Abraham	R2	R2	6	15	West
Barney	R1/R2	R1	8	7	Midwest
Bart	R1	R1	2	13	South
Carl	M1	M1	3	4	Northeast
Charles	R1	M1	5	2	West
Edna	D/PU	D/PU	6	2	Northeast
Eleanor	M2	M2	5	4	Northeast
Elizabeth	M1	M1	6	10	Northeast
Helen	R1	R1	5	6	South
Homer	R1	R1	6	12	South
Kent	R1/R1	R2	7	21	Midwest
Lenny	M1	M1	5	23	West
Lisa	R1/R1	R2	6	4	West
Maggie	M1	M1	11	6	South
Marge	BA/M1	M1	7	8	Northeast
Martin	M1	M1	7	20	South
Moe	M1	M1	6	13	South
Nelson	R1	R2	6	12	Midwest
Patty	R1	R1	8	5	Midwest
Ralph	M1/M1	M1	4	11	Northeast
Selma	R1	R2	6	3	Midwest
Seymour	R2	R2	3	6	Northeast
Todd	M1/R2	R1	6	15	Midwest
Tony	M1	M2	6	5	Northeast
William	R1	R1	7	24	Midwest
Mean			5.88	10.48	

sification strata. The two previously mentioned, and Charles, went from a DI to an MI after promotion. The demographic data related to the participants are listed in Table 1.

Interviews

Interviews were contingent upon participants' preferences and were conducted in person, by phone, or via Skype. Each lasted approximately 60 to 90 minutes, and questions sought to gain perceptions of context, supports offered at each institution, and barriers participants encountered. Semi-structured, open-ended interviews utilized a formal guide for consistency. That is, the primary research

had time for informal, participant-driven discussion and utilized the interview questions to direct the conversation and keep interviews consistent (Patton, 2015). This method allowed the participants to steer the conversation about impactful experiences before the interviewer prompted the individual since the constructivist paradigm was utilized (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). The interview questions were developed about occupational socialization theory (Richards et al., 2022; Russell et al., 2016). Example questions were, "What challenges did you face early in your career?" and "How did you manage the roles of teaching service and scholarship?" There were no instances of a participant declining a question or stopping the interview.

Curriculum Vitae

To aid triangulation, participants emailed current copies of their Curriculum Vitae (CVs) to the primary researcher before the interview process began. This step served to enhance the quality of the interview questions. For example, if it applied to the participant in their pre-tenure experience, one such question asked, "Can you explain three supports at (institution participant first worked) and compare them to (second university the participant worked)?" This dynamic form of data collection allowed the researcher to objectively analyze participants' pre-tenure careers and seek to discover which types of resources were more impactful. Moreover, CVs supported the information elicited during the interviews and offered additional insights into various faculty roles (Richards et al., 2022). The researcher was able to identify significant events, including press coverage, significant awards, speeches, publications, and invited appearances that were not present on the vitae in some instances.

Data Analysis and Trustworthiness

In an ongoing effort to collect data, prospective participants were contacted every two weeks until it was determined that data saturation was met through analysis of major themes. Before analysis, member checking was utilized to verify the validity of the transcripts. Miles and Huberman's (1994) four-stage process of data generation, data reduction, data display, and data and theme analysis for analyzing transcripts. As data was being analyzed, participants were placed in stratified fields based on the Carnegie Classification systems (Trendowski & Woods, 2021). After the data was coded, a secondary

researcher who volunteered was utilized as a debriefer for all analyses (McLaughlin et al., 2019). Deductive reasoning was used as the primary research that examined the data via occupational socialization theory. Inductive elements were also considered as the primary researcher and peer debriefer consciously sought information that could challenge or advance the theory. CVs were also examined for congruencies and linked to corresponding interview questions (Patton, 2015). Individual profiles were utilized to augment the CVs or help with gaps. Finally, CVs were coded and linked for significant themes. There were no instructions on the CV content, but it was noted to the participants that they had to be updated before sending (Dodds, 2005; Trendowski, 2023).

Multiple techniques were used to confirm the findings, enhance credibility, and ensure trustworthiness. Triangulation of interviews, profiles, and CVs was utilized to collaborate themes and ensure the validity of information (Patton, 2015). Constant comparison with a volunteer researcher transpired for emerging themes, generation, and negative cases (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). A graduate assistant was utilized for an independent audit. In addition to member checking, this made sure the validity of transcripts via the assistant listening to six different audiotapes for 30 minutes and comparing them to the transcripts (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The primary researcher also provided an audit trail, with specific methodological procedures, to an independent researcher to improve conformability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Once these methodological procedures were complete, the peer debriefer conferred findings and questioned any biases/assumptions postulated by the primary researcher.

Results

Returning to the theoretical framework of socialization and the dynamic influences of certain variables, results will now be presented through the lens of the following themes: (a) the influence of career preparation and (b) the influence of initial supports. The former will identify how participants were prepared to meet the demands of their jobs. The latter was the influence of roles and the support that ensued.

Influence of Career Preparation

The influence of career preparation from DUs allowed participants entering the field at DUs to flourish. These individuals found an easier time to transition into higher education compared to their counterparts initially employed at MCUs. In general, these individuals asserted that their doctoral preparation prepared them to meet initial duties as pre-tenure professors at DUs because they were equipped to conduct research, the primary role responsibility. In addition, participants employed at DUs identified no perceived barriers, while participants employed at MCUs described a lack of internal support during their early career years.

DU's Professional Preparation

Educators at DUs stated that they believed they were successful during their induction years because of the specific training within their doctoral programs. For example, Abraham explained, "I knew exactly what was up in front of me…Through coursework in my doctoral program, I was keenly aware of what it took to be [employed] at a research institution." Doctoral degree programs conveyed professional expectations directly through graduate school coursework and mentoring by faculty. Barney added, "I would argue all my socialization occurred in my doctoral program. I graduated pretty much socialized. I don't consider myself socialized through the profession." To that point, he believed he had already acquired all the necessary skills to be a quality researcher and had adequate knowledge of the field he anticipated joining.

Participants at DUs felt prepared as graduate training established high standards and expectations for conducting research. Helen articulated, "Well, coming out of my doctoral program, I always knew that those were the expectations… to research and write." William and many others espoused feelings that they were prepared to conduct research from the beginning. He stated, "The driving force behind [being successful]… I attribute this to my preparation at my doctoral school. I think I was very well-prepared in research methods and statistics and qualitative research." Selma stated that her doctoral program established lofty goals to ensure promotion would be achieved. To further validate these perceptions, CV data indicated that participants met the demands of research activity at

Table 2
Role Responsibilities DUs versus MCUs Assistant Professor Phase

	DUs	MCUs
Mean Publications per Year	2.18	1.21
Percentage of Data-Driven Publications	77%	27%
Mean Presentations per Year	3.42	2.10
Mean Number of Books Published as an Assistant Professor	0.90	0.14
Mean Credit Hours Taught per Year	15.29	25.03
Percentage of Participants Required to Compile Accreditation Reports	33%	80%

their institutions. During the assistant professor years, participants employed at DUs, on average, tallied 2.18 (*SD* = 1.19) manuscripts and 3.43 (*SD* = 1.84) presentations per year and wrote a total of 0.90 books (*SD* = 1.45). To distinguish the significance of scholarship, MI's expectations were vastly different and displayed in the CVs (excluding Lenny, who was an outlier) had 50 % fewer research-based manuscripts, tallied 1.21 (*SD* = 0.71) manuscripts and 2.10 (*SD* = 1.81) presentations per year, and wrote 0.14 (*SD* = 0.30) books. These statistics indicate significant disparities in expectations in scholarship (see Table 2).

Lack of Preparedness at MCUs

In contrast to early readiness experiences reported conducting research tasks, most participants employed at MCUs did not characterize their graduate training as significant for their career preparation. They did not feel equipped to teach large course loads or handle accreditation. Ralph was teaching four classes a semester and described grading, "I once gave an assignment due on the same day for all four classes, my weekend was spent being an ink jockey." For the most part, participants employed at MCUs were overwhelmed with their teaching loads, and this resulted in many documented cases of reality shock. Similar instances transpired among participants who were not familiar with processes such as accreditation. As Eleanor

explained when writing reports, "It was a nightmare, and I felt like a sheep thrown to the wolves."

Some participants carried responsibilities that their institutions considered to be more important than research. For example, Marge explained a similar feeling when talking about the complexities of classes and aligning to standards: "I just wish someone would have sat down with me during grad school and told me you need x, y, z." Part of their tenure at her school was aligning courses with best practices, and this task could be considered a scholarship. However, Marge, like many, felt unprepared when designing courses to align with appropriate methods and national accreditation standards. In total, the CVs and interviews of those employed at MCUs mentioned being required to formulate accreditation reports 80% of the time compared to a mere 33% of those participants employed at DUs (Table 2). In cases such as these, the combination of a lack of preparedness from doctoral training programs (specifically related to completing accreditation reports) and large teaching loads contributed to the cases of reality shock.

The Influence of Supports with Primary Role Responsibility

To begin with, these primary role responsibilities were scholarship at DUs and teaching at MCUs. Participants at DUs explained that some combination of reduced teaching loads, grants, and initial start-up packages helped facilitate their primary role. In contrast, almost all the participants at MCUs stated that there was no support for their primary role as teachers.

Early Resource Supports at Doctoral Institutions

DUs had many supports that facilitated their success. Bart categorized these as "more the exact opposite of barriers." In his eyes, it was "everything put in place for you to be as successful as you want to be." Most individuals at DUs did not have a sense of reality shock because of the environment. For example, Helen stated, "I just did what I needed to do. I didn't feel neglected. I didn't feel overwhelmed." For these participants, support came in a variety of forms, including a reduced teaching load, monetary start-up packages, and grants to support research. To that point, as a current department head, Abraham acknowledged the importance of having individuals

teach fewer classes. Participants mostly identified reduced teaching loads to aid scholarly productivity during the early portion of one's career. Lisa, for example, taught fewer classes in her first year and was provided money for research funding. She added,

> I got $2,000 every year that [I] was there to support my research, and then they had summer money, too. I think I got a $5,000 grant once. [School] had internal funding that we could apply for regularly, so I think I ended up with maybe $15,000 in funding that came from the institution.

Internal funding, such as the type provided to Lisa, was a way to pay for resources necessary for research and provide equipment for the department's PETE program. Most of the participants at DUs reported receiving internal grant funding within their first six years of employment, mainly in the form of summer research grants.

In addition, monetary compensation often accompanies the hiring process, and individuals may receive "start-up packages" for research supplies. For example, Barney was given a yearly budget and $100,000 to start a PE lab. He stated, "I was king of the hill—I could do anything I wanted there. [I was] incredibly fortunate." This start-up package facilitated research for Barney, and that, in turn, provided financing for resources, such as P.E. equipment and technology, for his students. Comparably, Bart, speaking about his administration, said, "You need money? We'll find a way to get it. You need release time? We'll find a way to work it out. If you need some flexibility in this [class], we'll do what we can. Doesn't always happen, but we'll put in an effort." Bart's quotation epitomizes the nature of support often provided within organizations to facilitate faculty success at DUs. Overall, the doctoral institutions provided ample support to enable pre-tenure professors to succeed, especially within their primary role responsibility related to research.

Lack of Support at Master's Institutions

At MCUs, the situations were starkly different than those described in the preceding content. Despite categorizing their colleagues and administration positively, individuals often perceived little institutional support to meet the demands of their primary role, teaching. Eleanor elaborated, "For the most part, I was on my own,

but the colleagues I developed friendships with helped." However, in her case, even the most basic tools were not provided when she started. Eleanor said, "I have to take you back to 1995 when I was an assistant professor. We had to petition the Dean in order to get a computer." Most individuals stated that there was limited funding, if any, for their programs. In fact, in the CVs of professors employed at MCUs, only two participants noted the receipt of internal grant funding not associated with travel. Moe explained, "You need to do the best with what you have. It is hard to justify spending money… have to make do." This lack of funding even impacted the students at some MCUs as access to equipment and technology became more problematic, potentially impacting specific undergraduate coursework.

Tony emphasized this lack of support: "You know it's funny, we are at a teaching institution, and we do not receive a reduced teaching load to help improve our teaching. At these larger schools, they give you help with research… Why not us?" Maggie and a few other participants laughed when they were asked if they ever received a reduced teaching load. Most professors decided as Maggie explained "suck it up" for the first few years. Lenny furthered this as he elucidated, "There I was, I was on my own… There was no release time. I walked in— Here are your classes. Here is your text. I would spend late hours in the evening preparing, trying to stay one day ahead of my students and classes. Brand new prep."

Maggie and many others spoke to the fact that they would spend an additional "4-5 hours a night" preparing for courses their first few years. Professors also alluded to other job responsibilities more often than DIs, such as advising, accreditation, grading, and supervising interns.

Participants employed at MCUs who reported coursework taught on their CVs/interviews averaged 25.03 (SD = 2.61) credit hours per year compared to 15.29 (SD = 3.03) credit hours for their counterparts at DUs (see Table 2). This did not take into account summer courses but did overloads. An overload is when courses are taught supplemental to the regular coursework, and professors are compensated for their time. Noteworthy, there tended to be a higher propensity for overloads in MCUs. To validate the point further, the disparity between the actual amounts of required credit hours of

teaching for pre-tenure professors would be further exacerbated if the release time typically granted to participants employed at DUs during their first year had been included in the above calculations.

To summarize, within PETE programs, beginning faculty at DUs perceived more support for their main role responsibility (research), while participants at MCUs felt a sense of reality shock as there was less support for teaching. Grading, advising, accreditation, and preparing for new classes took an extraordinary amount of time, leaving most individuals employed at MCUs feeling overwhelmed.

Discussion

Results from this study indicated that the influences of career preparation and early support may ease a beginning professor's transition into academia. However, organizational supports were largely dissimilar when comparing environments at DUs to those at MCUs. In many cases, this led to reality shock for individuals employed at MCUs as they sought to fulfill departmental demands that were, at times, vastly different than those addressed during their doctoral training. These results will now be examined through two categories: (a) the influence of preparation and (b) initial support for primary role responsibility.

The Influence of Preparation

This ability to find an equilibrium of roles is often hard for beginning faculty to achieve without developing strategies; in this case, many of the individuals employed initially at DUs had already honed these abilities through their doctoral programs. The literature has noted that moving from a doctoral candidate to a first-year faculty member can be stressful (McLoughlin et al., 2019). McLoughlin and colleagues (2019) found that many participants found it difficult to navigate their teaching load. In this study, it was found that many of the DUs had support within the school to help alleviate some of these initial challenges. McLoughlin (2019) noted that participants "expressed frustration that they were trained for research but were not able to meet personal research goals due to their heavy teaching load (p. 708)." While Barney, employed at a DI, felt prepared for his main role as a researcher, many other participants, including Moe, employed at an MI, felt overwhelmed with teaching responsibilities. Nevertheless, the participants at MCUs did not feel as prepared and

felt a sense of reality shock. This is similar to the classic Williamson (1993) study, in which participants had a similar experience. In that manuscript, one participant stated, "God, I am going to fall on my face" (p. 290).

The results highlight challenges that are associated with concerns raised by Ward (2016). He highlighted elements of a PETE educator's role, such as instructor (e.g., edTPA, program accreditation), to which they had not been exposed during doctoral education. This study reveals a mismatch between PhD student preparation and the availability of PETE positions at MCUs, suggesting the need to consider more comprehensive models of doctoral education that involve deliberate preparation for teacher education (Ward, 2016). Ward and colleagues (2011) suggested that doctoral programs are deficient in preparing PETE professionals. In the current study, new hires at DUs were perceived to be better equipped than those who began employment at MCUs because their doctoral preparation was more attuned to the expectations they encountered during occupational socialization. For some, the absence of this harmonious alignment resulted in the reality shock perceived by several participants at MCUs. McLaughlin and colleagues (2019) did find several instances where participants did not feel prepared for role responsibilities. To this end, Ward and colleagues (2011) contended that PETE doctoral students are not ready to meet all the potential duties of the profession. They stated that doctoral students are trained "too narrowly," and a broader perspective should be considered (Ward et al., 2011, p. 146). Engaging in an authentic and challenging pre-service program with diverse experiences can prevent reality shock in physical education and extend to PETE (Casey & Fletcher, 2012). Similarly, Casey and Fletcher (2012) conducted the study and postulated that doctoral programs should offer greater variability within their programs. Others, such as Mcloughlin and colleagues (2019), suggest shadowing current professionals to get a greater sense of job and role expectations. These opportunities would allow doctoral students to select different courses depending on their intended career trajectory instead of being trained with a "one-size-fits-all" approach (Casey & Fletcher, 2012, p. 377). Often, today's PETE programs train graduate students to become productive researchers but do not effectively incorporate instruction related to other major role responsibilities and

tasks such as advising, teaching, navigating accreditation processes, and serving on committees (Ward et al., 2011).

Initial Supports for Primary Role Responsibility

Once entering the profession, support for participants at DUs and MCUs was vastly different. Most individual's DUs were given grant opportunities, start-up packages, and reduced teaching loads. A reason for this may be found in other literature. Richards and colleagues (2022) noted that research may have higher prestige. Furthermore, this is exacerbated as he states that there is relatively limited and inconsistent accountability for quality teaching practices. As a result, some participants often tried to produce more scholarship than needed (Richards et al. 2022). Richards and colleagues suggested (2022) that this is in parallel with the teacher/coach conflict in physical education. Teachers/coaches often retreat into the coaching role because of personal aspirations and reward and accountability structures (Richards et al., 2019). It was more evident from this study that the professors were trying to meet the expectations bestowed upon them by the university. Very few of the professors published on pace with their counterparts at DUs. This would suggest the didactic approach to occupational socialization in which the university reflects its standards, and the professor must meet them to gain promotion (Trendowski & Woods, 2021). Narratives from MI's explained how their long hours were spent on their teaching rather than research. A more nuanced perspective would indicate socialization theory and dictate that individuals are socialized to meet their role expectations (Trendowski & Woods, 2021).

It is worth commenting that professors met their research expectations and were eventually promoted to the associate timeframe within the traditional timeframe of six years. This meant that despite MCUs feeling overwhelmed at first, they were able to meet expectations. As Mcloughlin and colleagues (2019) suggested those at "teaching-focused institutions expressed that they felt 'over prepared' for research as their research requirements were lower than they had anticipated as doctoral students" (p. 708). These research expectations have been noted as the paramount and most salient role in the promotion of individuals at DUs (Trendowski & Woods, 2021).

One rationale for the initial lack of support upon entering could be found in the literature. As Mclaughlin and colleagues (2019) note, "It seems as if faculty mentors assumed they would be good teachers, perhaps because many of them had prior teaching experience in P-12 school environments" (p. 708). However, as Casey and Fletcher (2012) explained, higher education and teaching physical education are dissimilar. Another explanation for the lack of support at MCUs could be that there tends to be less funding at MCUs (Desrochers & Hurlburt, 2016). Professors typically are not granted the initial monetary support as there is less money. This was shown in several commentary responses when participants laughed at a reduced teaching load.

Limitations and Future Studies

The results of this study indicate that PETE programs should train future practitioners to prepare for a wider variety of roles. Master's degree institutions should try to decrease stress and reality shock by providing support, such as reducing teaching loads, providing monetary funds, or other supplemental help. Academic leadership should consider access to colleagues with positive dispositions who are willing to provide mentorship is an important asset related to successful assimilation for beginning professors. More investigation is certainly warranted to clarify expectations/role responsibilities and provide strategies for professors to be able to successfully meet guidelines. Future inquiries should also focus on the various opportunities DUs present for students who want to work at MCUs.

Despite methodological rigor, several limitations inhibited this study. Testimonials regarding these participants' socialization experiences during their pre-tenure years may contain inaccuracies as interviews relied on recollection, and in some cases, extensive time had elapsed since this phase of their career. Furthermore, perceptions of socialization in this study have been reflected across the totality of participants' career**s**. As individuals near retirement, the reflection of early socialization experiences could be influenced by each participant's satisfaction with their current occupational status. If participants found their roles fulfilling**,** they may have reacted positively toward their initial experiences.

References

Bowman, T. G., Klossner, J. C., & Mazerolle, S. M. (2017). The doctor of philosophy experience of athletic trainers: Facilitators and barriers to anticipatory faculty socialization. *Journal of Athletic Training*, *52*(10), 925–936. https://doi.org/10.4085/1062-6050-52.7.01

Brunsdon, J. J., & Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2023). "We're trying to produce serious educators": Impact of secondary organizational socialization on mid-career faculty members' delivery of PETE. *Sport, Education and Society*, *28*(4), 369–380. https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2022.2030700

Burke-Smalley, L. A., Rau, B. L., Neely, A. R., & Evans, W. R. (2017). Factors perpetuating the research-teaching gap in management: A review and propositions. *The International Journal of Management Education*, *15*(3), 501–512. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2017.08.004

Casey, A., & Fletcher, T. (2012). Trading places: From physical education teachers to teacher educators. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *31*, 362–380.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2015). *Basics of qualitative research*. Sage.

Curtner-Smith, M. D., Hastie, P. A., & Kinchin, G. D. (2008). Influence of occupational socialization on beginning teachers' interpretation and delivery of sport education. *Sport, Education and Society, 13*(1), 97–117. doi:10.1080/13573320701780779

Desrochers, D. M., & Hurlburt, S., 2016. *Trends in college spending: 2003–2013—Where does the money come from? Where does it go? What does it buy?* American Institute for Research.

Dodds, P. (2005). PETE women's experiences of being mentored into postsecondary faculty positions. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *24*, 344–367.

Graber, K. C., Richards, K. A. R., Killian, C. M., & Woods, A. M. (2020). PETE faculty preferences and responsibilities for research, teaching, and service in the United States. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *39*(3), 396–406. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2019-0056

Gregory, K., & Burbage, A. (2017). Exploring faculty development identity through self-study: teaching philosophies, *Reflective Practice, and Critical Friendship. Journal of Ethnographic & Qualitative Research, 12,* 110–124.

Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research. (n.d.). *The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*, 2015 edition.

Jowers R. F., Brunsdon J. J., Peterson J. T., Mitchell, H. L., & Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2021). Influence of occupational socialization on sport pedagogy doctoral students' beliefs and actions. *Journal of Teaching Physical Education*, *41*, 175–183.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.

McLoughlin, G. M., Richards, K. A. R., & Ivy, V. N. (2019). A longitudinal study of the transition from doctoral student to faculty member in physical education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, *90*(4), 699–711. https://doi-org.proxy181.nclive.org/10.1080/02701367.2019.1645940

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

Miles, M., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Sage Publications.

Padilla, M. A., & Thompson, J. N. (2016). Burning out faculty at doctoral research universities: Burning out faculty. *Stress and Health*, *32*(5), 551–558. https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2661

Patton, M. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Pennington, C. G. (2021). The transition into professorship: Beyond the three-phase approach to socialization. *The Physical Educator*, *78*(1), 43–60. https://doi.org/10.18666/TPE-2021-V78-I1-10190

Richards, K. A. R., Eberline, A., & Templin, T. J. (2016). Secondary professional socialization through professional organizations: An exploratory study. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 35*, 70–75. doi:10.1123/jtpe.2014-0180

Richards, K. A. R., & Fletcher, T. (2020). Learning to work together: Conceptualizing doctoral supervision as a critical friendship. *Sport, Education and Society*, *25*(1), 98–110. https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2018.1554561

Richards, K. A. R., Kinder, C. J., Shiver, V. N., Woods, A. M., & Cushing, C. L. (2022). Disciplinary marginalization and sociopolitics: the U.S. PETE pre-tenure experience. *Sport, Education and Society*, *27*(6), 761–774.

Richards, K. A. R., & Levesque-Bristol, C. (2016). The influence of self-efficacy and self-regulated motivation on civic learning in service learning courses. *Journal of College Student Development*, *57*(7), 827–843. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2016.0081

Russell, J., Gaudreault, K. L., & Richards, K. A. (2016). Doctoral student socialization: Educating stewards of the physical education profession. *Quest*, 68, 439–456. doi:10.1080/00336297.2016.1234963

Trendowski, T. (2023). Delayed promotion to full professor in physical education teacher education. *International Journal of Kinesiology in Higher Education*, 1–11. 10.1080/24711616.2022.2152510.

Trendowski, T. N., & Woods, A. M., (2021). Attaining full professorship in physical education teacher education. *International Journal of Kinesiology in Higher Education, 2,* 83–105. https://doi.org/10.1080/24711616.2021.1975520

Ward, P. (2016). Policies, agenda and practices influencing doctoral education in physical education teacher education. *Quest*, *68*(4), 420–438. https://doi-org.proxy181.nclive.org/10.1080/00336297.2016.1234964

Ward, P., Parker, M., Sutherland, S., & Sinclair, C. (2011). A critical examination of the curriculum of physical education teacher education doctoral programs. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *30*, 145–156.

Williamson, K. M. (1993). A qualitative study on the socialization of beginning physical education teacher educators. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, *64*(2), 188–201.