

# Role Orientation of Certified Athletic Trainers at Institutions of Higher Education

**Kirk Brumels, PhD, ATC\***; **Andrea Beach, PhD†**

\*Hope College, Holland, MI; †Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI

**Objective:** This study examined the role orientation hierarchy among teaching, research, service, and administrative responsibilities of certified athletic trainers (ATCs) employed at the collegiate level.

**Design and Setting:** Four single response role orientation questions regarding their actual, ideal, promoted, and most appropriate role orientations were asked as part of a 45 question role complexity internet survey sent to 1,000 randomly selected collegiate ATCs.

**Subjects:** Twenty-nine potential respondents were eliminated from the random sample after administration of the survey due to partial responses and missing data, illness, vacation and job changes. Therefore, out of 971 potential respondents, 348 usable responses were received for a 36% response rate.

**Measurements:** Emphasizing or de-emphasizing each element of responsibility created sixteen different role orientation hierarchies involving teaching, service, research, and administration. Respondents chose one hierarchy to

answer each of four questions about their actual, ideal, supervisor recommended, and feelings regarding the most appropriate role orientations for themselves and the profession.

**Results:** Study participants report that service responsibilities were significant aspects of their job. Research was deemed as an important, appropriate, and promoted role orientation, but was not often reported as an actual role orientation. Actual role orientation hierarchies were closely aligned with supervisor expectations, with the exception of research, which was promoted more than it was performed.

**Conclusions:** Collegiate ATCs view service responsibilities as important aspects of their job regardless of their job description, but are not performing research as much as they and their employers feel is important and appropriate for the profession.

**Key Words:** role complexity, role orientation, job responsibilities, athletic trainer.

## Introduction

Role orientation hierarchy refers to the individually chosen predominate role that occurs when choices or demands are made regarding the amount of time, effort, and energy placed into a particular employment setting.<sup>1</sup> In previous research performed on role conflict within the field of nursing, it has been found that role occupants handle the conflict between multiple roles and responsibilities by establishing a role orientation hierarchy. This hierarchy regarding teaching, scholarship, service and other responsibilities is made clear to all by the amount of time they

attribute to each task and is created based upon a determination of perceived importance.<sup>2,3</sup> Examination of role conflict in nursing faculty with patient care and student clinical supervision responsibilities elicited a tendency of the role occupant to perceive one role as more important than the other.<sup>1</sup> Commitments to research, teaching, service, continuing education, student advising, administrative duties, and professional organizations are other responsibilities that are sources of potential role complexities for health care providers and thus, often placed into role orientation hierarchies.<sup>4</sup> ATCs who work in colleges and universities are often employed in several different positions which involve many of the same responsibilities as nursing faculty such as clinical work, faculty responsibilities, or both with the percentage of time devoted to the job responsibilities in each role varying between individuals and institutions. To date no specific role orientation research has been conducted in athletic training, but the similarities between nursing and athletic training education programs and processes are such that it was felt that the findings from the nursing literature are relevant to athletic training.

Collegiate athletic trainers are often employed in one of several roles. They might be employed through the athletic department as



*Dr. Brumels is an Assoc. Professor of Kinesiology and Head Athletic Trainer at Hope College. He has varied research interests including evidence-based practice. [brumels@hope.edu](mailto:brumels@hope.edu)*

*Dr. Beach is an Asst. Professor in the Dept. Of Educational Leadership, Research, and Technology at Western Michigan Univ. [andrea.beach@wmich.edu](mailto:andrea.beach@wmich.edu)*

a clinical practitioner responsible for providing health care services to the institution's student athletes. These athletic trainers are responsible for many domains of health care and routinely work with physicians, nurses, athletic training students, coaches, strength and conditioning specialists, emergency medical personnel, nutritionists, other allied medical professionals, and support staff in order to deliver appropriate medical coverage.<sup>5</sup>

Other athletic trainers may be hired in more traditional faculty roles in athletic training education programs (ATEPs) or other academic disciplines. Certain faculty positions may have an athletic training instructional teaching load that consists of both clinical and classroom instruction, while others may include other departmental academic or administrative programming responsibilities or administration of the institution's ATEP.

Finally, in some institutions, a collegiate athletic trainer may have a joint appointment with clinical practice responsibilities to the athletic department and faculty responsibilities to an ATEP or academic department. Joint appointments between athletics and academics can take many forms in terms of time and responsibilities, and can create a unique set of job responsibilities with regard to the academic obligations of teaching, research, and service, as well as, clinical practice, supervision, and teaching.

Recent research in the socialization and role complexity areas in athletic training have role responsibility implications and are felt to be intertwined and connected to role orientation issues.<sup>6,9,12</sup> Employment in any of the aforementioned settings consists of varied and individualized role responsibilities. In determining what these responsibilities are, athletic trainers like many other professional employees undergo a socialization process involving knowledge acquisition related to their field, as well as, obtaining specific information, norms, and culture of individual work experiences and settings relating to job performance expectations.<sup>6</sup> This culture or work place norms can increase the level of responsibility and expectations for a role occupant, more so than what was expected upon examination of the job description. External locus of control expectations from employers, colleagues, students, and patients regarding time expenditure and responsibilities are among the components of the socialization process that can influence role orientation hierarchy.<sup>7</sup> Practice times, special projects, administrative tasks, mentoring, and off-season expectations / availability are examples of demands that can be placed upon collegiate athletic trainers by others with little or no input from the affected role occupant. In addition, each individual athletic trainer has an element of internal locus of control regarding how they feel their time and energy should be spent for personal and professional development. When those feelings are in contrast to external locus of control issues and the organization's expected role orientation hierarchy, complications arise leading to role complexity issues.<sup>8</sup> Pitney, et al., in a study of National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I athletic trainers, found that "role instability" occurred when there was inadequate or incompatible values, organizational support, and commitment to professional development of the role occupant. This "role instability" led to role complexities which affected job performance

and hindered professional development.<sup>9</sup> Inconsistencies regarding professional roles and responsibilities occurring between the role occupant and supervisors, patients, peers, etc., negatively affect performance and decrease the level of service provided by the ATC.<sup>7</sup> In a study examining the importance and applicability of approved clinical instructor standards (Weidner & Henning Standards) it was noted that joint appointed athletic trainers with clinical and clinical instructor roles complained of role complexity due to: choosing between their dual roles, having conflicting demands on their time, and frustration over their role orientation hierarchy.<sup>10</sup> Role complexity issues such as role conflict, negatively affect performance by increasing anxiety, tension, irritation, resentment, and depression.<sup>11</sup>

Logically, other studies in athletic training have found that role clarification via discussions with administrators lessen the amount of felt role complexities.<sup>12</sup> When the values, attitudes, and demands of the organization are more compatible with those accepted by the role occupant, a more stable and effective work environment is encountered with less felt role complexity.<sup>9</sup> Compatible role orientation hierarchies between employee and employer are essential for a healthy work environment.

It is with the background of role orientation studies in nursing and other studies in role complexity and socialization processes of health care providers, including athletic trainers, that this study was initiated to examine the role orientation of athletic trainers employed in higher education. Our study examined the actual, ideal, promoted, and perceived most appropriate role orientation hierarchies of collegiate athletic trainers and was performed to determine the areas of role responsibility emphasis for collegiate athletic trainers both as a whole, and as three individual groups: faculty, clinicians, or joint appointees. The research questions posed were:

- a) What are the most frequently reported role orientation hierarchies of collegiate athletic trainers?
- b) Are there differences between actual, ideal, most appropriate, and supervisor recommended role orientation hierarchies for collegiate certified athletic trainers?
- c) Are there differences in actual, ideal, most appropriate, and supervisor recommended role orientation hierarchies between faculty, clinician, and joint appointed collegiate certified athletic trainers?

## Methods

Role orientation hierarchies were examined using a survey created by Mobily as part of a study on the socialization of nurses.<sup>13</sup> Mobily's study contained a separate section on role conflict issues in addition to the 4 question role orientation section used for this study (See Appendix A). The instrument was originally used to determine the amount of emphasis a nurse faculty member placed on each of the three most common faculty responsibilities: teaching, service, and research. Following pilot study feedback from a convenience sample of ATCs, slight modifications were made, with permission, to make the service portion of the instrument reflect not only the traditional role of

academic, professional, and community service but also to reflect the clinical component of a certified athletic trainer working with athletic teams. In addition, wording changes were made to improve consistency of the language used in the survey to that spoken among those involved in the field of athletic training. Administrative tasks were also added as a role responsibility of athletic trainers to more accurately reflect the various job responsibilities of collegiate ATCs.

Four questions regarding role orientation hierarchy were examined and frequencies observed by role grouping. The respondents were asked: 1) which role orientation hierarchy represented how they *actually* spent their work time, 2) how they would *ideally* like to spend their work time, 3) which they felt was the most *appropriate* role orientation hierarchy for the needs of the athletic training profession, and 4) the role orientation hierarchy that is perceived to be *promoted* or encouraged by their direct supervisor. Emphasizing or de-emphasizing the various responsibilities of teaching, service, research, and administration created sixteen different role orientation typologies as possible answers to each of the four survey questions. The first letter of each responsibility was either capitalized or presented in lower case to reflect the level of importance the respondent felt toward that job responsibility. Capitalization of a letter implied increased level of importance over an un-capitalized letter. For example, if the respondent marked trSa, it is implied that research is most important to him or her with teaching, service, and administrative responsibilities less so. If a respondent marked trSA, it was taken to mean that service and administrative responsibilities were most important with teaching and research obligations less so.

### Survey Population and Responses

The population for our study consisted of 1,000 certified athletic trainers who were employed at U.S. colleges and universities. The National Athletic Trainers' Association national office provided a random list of e-mail addresses of members categorized as collegiate athletic trainers. After three invitations or "waves" <sup>14</sup>, a 36% response rate (348 responses) was obtained. Twenty-nine potential respondents were eliminated from the data

set for reasons such as incomplete data sets, employment changes, inappropriate addresses, or not meeting additional inclusion criteria. Available information on responders and non-responders were compared to the demographics of the national population of collegiate ATCs, and the respondents for this project were found to be a representative sample. The percentages of respondents from NCAA and NAIA institutions across the divisional levels were within 10% of the national population with the exception of NAIA certified athletic trainers between the ages of 23 and 30. Further examination by primary role positions also showed a representative sample with a frequency within 10% of the national sample except for head athletic trainers at the NCAA Division I level. The study sample exhibited more individuals in these positions when compared to the national population; however, the ratio of sample respondents to the national data was still within 13%.

## Results

### Most Frequently Reported Role Orientation

Table 1 outlines the 4 most frequently reported role orientation hierarchy for each question exhibiting that a majority of the respondents answered each question by using one of 6 common role orientations out of the sixteen possible role orientation options. These 6 role orientation hierarchies involved different combinations of teaching, research, service, and administration, but it was interesting to note the importance of the service orientation remaining as a constant element among all four questions. Research was deemed important in 2 of the 6 common role orientations and was not listed as one of the more frequently reported actual or ideal role orientations, but became important to the respondents when asked about which role orientations were promoted by supervisors and most appropriate for the profession. Teaching responsibilities were classified as important aspects in 4 of the 6 common role orientations, but only approximately 30% of the respondents actually possessed this role orientation or ideally wanted it. Teaching was viewed as more important components of a role orientation hierarchy when asked about appropriateness to the profession and supervisory recommendations. Approximately 40%

**Table 1. Top Four Most Frequently Reported Role Orientations**

Role Orientation	Actual	Ideal	Supervisor Recommended	Most Appropriate for Profession
trSa	69 (24.7%)	51 (14.7%)	65 (18.7%)	35 (10.1%)
trSA	89 (25.6%)	42 (12.1%)	–	–
TrSa	56 (16.1%)	61 (17.5%)	52 (14.9%)	58 (16.7%)
TrSA	48 (13.8%)	50 (14.4%)	43 (12.4%)	–
TRSa	–	–	82 (23.6%)	33 (9.5%)
TRSA	–	–	–	106 (30.5%)

- trSa – service most important aspect of role
- trSA – service and administration most important aspects of role
- TrSa – teaching and service most important aspects of role
- TrSA – teaching, service, and administration equally important aspects of role
- TRSa – teaching, research, and service equally important aspects of role
- TRSA – Teaching, research, service, and administration equally important aspects of role

of respondents felt that administrative tasks were an important aspect of their current jobs, but only 26.5% of them would ideally like to have this orientation. Importance placed on administrative responsibilities was not felt to be appropriate for the profession with the exception of the role orientation TRSA, which emphasized each of the four role responsibilities equally. Thirty percent of the study population felt that balanced role orientation hierarchies involving teaching, research, service, and administration were most appropriate for the profession. However, less than 2% of the respondents actually reported that they possessed this hierarchy and only 7% stated that it was their ideal situation. It was noted that many collegiate ATCs do not work in positions with role orientation hierarchies that they ideally prefer or believe are most appropriate for the profession.

### Role Orientation Comparisons

Comparison of the differences between the respondents' reported actual role orientation hierarchy and their ideal, promoted, and most appropriate hierarchies were performed using a McNemar's test. This test was chosen due to its ability to examine statistical significance between paired proportions of a non-independent sample taken from the same population and to determine if there were statistically significant differences between the paired proportions of role orientation questions.

The significant results of the McNemar tests can be found in Table 2. When comparing actual versus ideal role orientation hierarchies the only statistically significant difference ( $P < .0001$ ) occurred between the higher number of respondents whose actual role orientation placed importance on service and administration (trSA) and those who would like that orientation in an ideal setting.

**Table 2. McNemar Tests Comparing Proportions of Respondents and Their Role Orientations**

Role Orientation Comparison	df	z - value	P
Actual vs. Ideal trSA	1	27.27	<.0001
Actual vs. Most Appropriate trSa	1	4.01	<.0001
trSA	1	7.98	<.0001
TrSA	1	2.93	.034
TRSa	1	-9.86	<.0001
TRSA	1	-4.90	<.0001

- trSa – service most important aspect of role
- trSA – service and administration most important aspects of role
- TrSa – teaching and service most important aspects of role
- TRSa – teaching, research, and service equally important aspects of role
- TRSA – Teaching, research, service, and administration equally important aspects of role

Observations of actual role orientation hierarchies versus supervisor promoted hierarchies showed no statistically significant differences between the four most frequently reported as actually performed and the ones most frequently promoted by their supervisors. The McNemar comparison of actual role orientation hierarchies and those that were felt to be most appropriate for the profession elicited statistically significant differences between 5 of

the 6 commonly reported hierarchies. Significant differences were found for the role orientations which listed the following responsibilities as most important: service (trSa;  $P < .0001$ ); service and administration (trSA;  $P < .0001$ ); teaching, service, and administration (TrSA;  $P = .034$ ); teaching, research, and service (TRSa;  $P < .0001$ ), and the most balanced role orientation of teaching, research, service, and administration (TRSA;  $P < .0001$ ). The respondents felt that roles involving an equal balance among teaching, research, service, and administration (TRSA) were the most appropriate for the profession of athletic training, but the roles actually performed most often included service (trSa), service and administration (trSA), and teaching, service and administration (TrSA).

### Role Orientation According to Role Delineation Grouping

In order to further evaluate the role orientation hierarchies of the study respondents, similar analysis was done after each respondent classified themselves according to their primary role responsibility. McNemar tests were run for faculty, clinicians, and joint appointees in an attempt to determine if role orientations changed among and according to role responsibility. The role orientations with significant differences can be found in Table 3.

**Faculty.** Examining the results of the McNemar Tests performed on the proportions of selected role orientations of faculty members did not produce statistically significant differences between the respondent's actual and ideal roles. When comparing the actual versus promoted role hierarchies, the only significant difference occurred with the hierarchy that emphasized teaching and research (TRsa). This role orientation was promoted by supervisors at a significantly higher rate ( $P = .011$ ) than it was actually being performed by the individual faculty member. It was surprising to note that athletic training faculty members did not participate in research as much as their supervisors promoted even though they felt role orientation hierarchies which involved research were most appropriate for the profession. Significant differences were noted in the TrSA ( $P = .003$ ) and TRSA ( $P < .0001$ ) hierarchies as more respondents felt these orientations to be more appropriate than actually performed.

**Clinicians.** No significant differences were found between their actual and promoted roles, but with regard to actual vs. most appropriate role orientations, it was noted that a statistically significant and larger number of respondents had actual roles involving service (trSa;  $P < .0001$ ) and service/administration (trSA;  $P < .0001$ ) than what they felt were appropriate. Examination of actual versus ideal role orientation showed that service (trSa;  $P = .022$ ) and service/administration (trSA;  $P < .001$ ) roles were possessed by a significantly higher number of respondents who did not feel that it was their ideal role orientation hierarchy. A significantly larger number of respondents ( $P < .0001$ ) felt that the TRSA role orientation was more appropriate and ideal.

**Joint Appointees.** Much like the clinicians and the majority of the faculty responses, there was not a significant statistical difference between the joint appointee respondent's actual and promoted role orientation hierarchy. This was consistent with the entire study population and with the other individual employment roles. Regarding the joint appointee's actual versus ideal hierarchy, the only orientation that was statistically different was when service and administration (trSA) were listed as the dominate role hierarchy more frequently than what the respondents felt was ideal ( $P = .041$ ).

Upon examination of actual versus most appropriate role orientation for joint appointees significant differences occurred between the responses for the following role orientations: trSA ( $P = .0003$ ), TRSa ( $P = .001$ ), TrSA ( $P = .01$ ), TRSA ( $P < .0001$ ). The joint appointees actually possessed the service/administration or teaching/service/administration role orientations more often than they felt were appropriate, and reported that the more appropriate role orientations would emphasize teaching, research, and service with and without administration (TRSa and TRSA). Therefore, it was felt that research was an appropriate role orientation that should be a part of the joint appointee's workload, but it was not performed often in current employment settings.

**Table 3. Significant McNemar Test Results Comparing Role Orientation Proportions According to Role Responsibility**

Role Orientation Comparison	df	z - value	P
<b>Faculty</b>			
Actual vs. Promoted			
Trsa	1	-2.53	.011
Actual vs. Appropriate			
TrSA	1	3.00	.003
TRSA	1	4.53	<.0001
<b>Clinicians</b>			
Actual vs. Appropriate			
trSa	1	4.68	<.0001
trSA	1	7.35	<.0001
TRSA	1	-4.39	<.0001
Actual vs. Ideal			
trSa	1	2.29	.022
trSA	1	5.13	<.0001
TRSA	1	3.90	<.0001
<b>Joint Appointees</b>			
Actual vs. Appropriate			
trSA	1	3.65	.0003
TRSa	1	-3.21	.001
TrSA	1	2.61	.01
TRSA	1	-6.32	<.0001
Actual vs. Ideal			
trSA	1	2.04	.041

- trSa – service most important aspect of role
- trSA – service and administration most important aspects of role
- TrSa – teaching and service most important aspects of role
- TrSA – teaching, service, and administration equally important aspects of role
- TRSa – teaching, research, and service equally important aspects of role
- TRSA – Teaching, research, service, and administration equally important aspects of role

### Role Orientation Patterns

Many athletic trainers involved in this survey did not have employment situations which allowed them to participate in the role orientation hierarchy that they felt was most appropriate for the profession. The respondents stated that their actual responsibilities most often included service or a combination of service and

administration as most important, in contrast to what they believed were more appropriate role hierarchy involving equal importance between service, teaching, research, and in some cases administration. It was interesting to note the role orientation patterns that become apparent based on role position. The clinical ATCs felt that service alone or the combination of service and administration were important components of their jobs and 76% of respondents actually claimed this role orientation. Approximately 70% of faculty ATCs claimed that teaching and administrative orientations were most important, with the combinations of teaching and service or teaching, service, and administration as the second and third most frequent orientation. As expected, joint appointees had multiple role orientation hierarchies most likely depending on their particular employment position and often involving service, service and teaching, service and administration, or service, teaching, and administration.

Actual role orientation hierarchies and those promoted by a supervisor were strikingly similar across the role groups with the exception of the research dominated role orientation for faculty members. It is felt that these findings can be explained by the ATC protecting his or her job security by responding to the expectations of supervisors. Performing according to expectations and evaluative procedures can be reasonably expected if an employee has a desire to maintain employment. Athletic trainers, like many other employees, have probably come to understand what is expected of them and how they will be evaluated, and perform accordingly. If an individual in a supervisory role expects professional role duties to be aligned with a particular role orientation, the role occupant is obligated to provide those expected services or be in jeopardy of dismissal from his or her professional position. The problem with this type of workplace culture is that it may require an individual to work with a role orientation hierarchy that they feel may not be best for either themselves or the athletic training profession.

Allowed to state their ideal or most appropriate role orientation hierarchy for the profession, a larger portion of the sample chose orientations that allowed for a more equal division of time and effort between teaching, research, service, and administration. When free to determine their desired or most appropriate role hierarchy, clinicians chose the additional roles of research and/or teaching, while joint appointees seemed to move away from blended teaching and service orientations into positions involving less teaching and more administration or research. The joint appointee findings are somewhat disconcerting for athletic training clinical education, as they show a desired departure from teaching responsibilities with only one-third of them choosing an ideal role orientation hierarchy where teaching is viewed as an important aspect of their professional role. This potentially creates role complexity issues for the joint appointee with clinical and teaching responsibilities as the supervisor for each responsibility can realistically expect importance to be placed in the area which they oversee.

ATEP directors can expect focus on educational responsibilities; much like a coach or athletic director can expect emphasis on athletic responsibilities. Conflict for the role occupant can then arise between athletics and academics, coach and ATEP program director, as well as, student and instructor, further confounding role orientations and time spent on separate and distinct role responsibilities.

## Discussion

Overall, the results of this role orientation hierarchy exploration produced both expected and unexpected results. The emphasis on service and clinical practice was expected based on the nature of what athletic trainers do. Athletic trainers understand that the profession was and is founded on clinical service to an active population, and therefore it was reasonable to expect that many of the athletic trainer's who responded to this survey would list those responsibilities as an important aspect of their job.

On the other hand, while it is appropriate and encouraging that athletic training educational reform and support from the NATA has stimulated clinicians and joint appointees to ideally support research becoming a more important responsibility, it is troubling that the faculty members in this study did not perform and seemed uninterested in performing research related to the profession. In fact, only 10% of faculty respondents ideally desired the traditional faculty role responsibilities of teaching, service, and research. Over 60% preferred positions that only focused on teaching or combinations of teaching, service, and administration, but not research. This was perplexing as approximately 62% of the 29 respondents who listed faculty status as their primary role possessed a terminal degree and should both understand the importance of and be comfortable with, producing research. Research by athletic trainers is important if our profession is to earn and maintain its voice and enhance our position within the medical community. It is interesting, that the push toward more research seems to be coming from those individuals who are practicing clinicians instead of those in traditional faculty roles. Approximately 5% of clinicians actually possess role orientations where research is important, but 23% ideally want it. In contrast, 30% of faculty respondents possess roles where research is important but only an additional 6% would choose such a role orientation in their ideal setting.

Some of the push toward more research originating with clinicians could be due to the relatively young age of the clinical athletic trainers who responded to this study (51% < 30 yrs and 85% < 40yrs). Recent master's level graduates hired as clinicians could possibly be more comfortable with the research process and view it as an important aspect of professional behavior. The recent trend for evidence-based research with direct applicability to how clinical work is done may also be a reason for this orientation as more and more clinicians encounter questions and examine scientific studies for a more effective way of performing their clinical responsibilities.

In addition, many of the role respondents did not work in positions that possessed role orientation hierarchies they would prefer or believe are appropriate for the profession. From the data collected in this study, it is difficult to determine if the role hierarchy was previously agreed upon in a job description or whether it is a response to what the respondents felt was expected of them once they were hired. Either scenario has negative implications for the incumbent employee, the potential employee, and the employer. Therefore, it is imperative that current or future role occupants critically examine their preferred role orientation in order to eliminate potential role complexities as a result of role orientation difficulties. However, the onus of eliminating role orientation difficulties does not only lie solely with the individual seeking employment. Colleges and universities must critically examine their position openings and determine the most desired role orientation according to their needs or expectations and perform

candidate searches and interviews based on the role orientation framework. Making sure that the role applicant has a role orientation hierarchy that is compatible with the open position is essential for a good working relationship and perhaps becomes the most important step in the process of eliminating role complexities before they occur.

Further study in this area should focus on the socialization process for young employees as they work toward success in employment settings emphasizing both clinical service and traditional faculty responsibilities. The nature of ATEP emphasizes practical skill attainment, but allows only for varied, tenuous, and sometimes incomplete socialization skills. Preparation of athletic trainers who are competent in the service and health care arena and also more competent with handling the various responsibilities as researchers, teachers, colleagues, and leaders becomes paramount for success. Additional research could examine how to better prepare young athletic training professionals for the various components of workplace socialization consisting of interpersonal communication, relationship development, time management, responsibility prioritizing, and professional/personal life balance.

## References

1. O'Shea, H. S. Role orientation and role strain of clinical nurse faculty in baccalaureate programs. *Nursing Research*. 1982;31:306-310.
2. Ruby, J. Baccalaureate nurse educators' workload and productivity: ascription of values and the challenges of evaluation. *Journal of New York State Nurses Association*. 1998;29:18-22.
3. Steele, R. L. Attitudes about faculty practice, perceptions of role, and role strain. *Journal of Nursing Education*. 1991;30:15-22.
4. Mobily, P. R. An examination of role strain for university nurse faculty and its relation to socialization experiences and personal characteristics. *Journal of Nursing Education*. 1991;30:73-80.
5. Arnheim, D. D., & Prentice, W. E. *Essentials of Athletic Training*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill; 2002.
6. Pitney, W. A. Organizational Influences and Quality-of-Life Issues during the Professional Socialization of Certified Athletic Trainers Working in the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Setting. *J Athl Train*. 2006;41:189-195.
7. Mensch, J., Crews, C., & Mitchell, M. Competing Perspectives during Organizational Socialization on the Role of Certified Athletic Trainers in High School Settings. *J Athl Train*. 2005;40:333-340.
8. Brumels, K. A. *Professional Role Complexities and Job Satisfaction of Collegiate Certified Athletic Trainers*. 2005; Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan.
9. Pitney, W. A., Ilsley, P., & Rintala, J. The professional socialization of certified athletic trainers in the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I context. *J Athl Train*. 2002;37:63-70.
10. Weidner, T. G., Henning, J. M. Importance and Applicability of Approved Clinical Instructor Standards and Criteria to Certified Athletic Trainers in Different Clinical Education Settings. *J Athl Train*. 2005;40: 326-332.
11. Hardy, M. E., & Conway, M. E. *Role theory: Perspectives for health professionals* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Norwalk, CT: Appleton and Lange; 1988.
12. Pitney, W. A., Stuart, M. E., & Parker, J. *The Prevalence of Role Strain Among Dual Position Physical Educators and Certified Athletic Trainers in the High School Setting*. Paper presented at: The Illinois Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance Convention; November 18, 2005; St. Charles, IL.
13. Mobily, P. R. C. Anonymous *Socialization, Academic Role Orientation and Role Strain of University Nurse Faculty* [dissertation]. Iowa city: University of Iowa; 1987.
14. Dillman, D. A. *Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons Inc.; 2000.

## Appendix A

### Role Orientation Hierarchy

By emphasizing or de-emphasizing each of the four primary roles of teaching, research, service, and administration, the following hierarchies of role orientations were constructed. For the purposes of this study, please note that research includes all types of scholarly endeavors. Teaching refers to both classroom and clinical instruction. Service includes service to college or university athletic programs, to the community, and to the profession, while administration refers to administrative duties performed for the athletic training program or institution.

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Before responding to the questions that follow, please study carefully the typologies below. You will be asked to identify which best represents your actual job, your ideal job, which you feel is most appropriate for athletic training, and which is promoted by supervisors.

**Type I TEACHING-research-service-administration (Trsa)**

*Teaching is prime commitment; research, service, and administration are less important.*

**Type II teaching-RESEARCH-service-administration (tRsa)**

*Research is prime commitment; teaching, service, and administration are less important.*

**Type III teaching-research-SERVICE-administration (trSa)**

*Service is prime commitment; teaching, research, and administration are less important.*

**Type IV teaching-research-service-ADMINISTRATION (trsA)**

*Administration is prime commitment; teaching, research, and service are less important.*

**Type V TEACHING-RESEARCH-service-administration (TRsa)**

*Both Teaching and research are significant and have equal importance; service and administration are less important.*

**Type VI TEACHING-research-SERVICE-administration (TrSa)**

*Both teaching and service are significant and have equal importance; research and administration are less important.*

**Type VII TEACHING-research-service-ADMINISTRATION (TrsA)**

*Both teaching and administration are significant and have equal importance; research and service are less important.*

**Type VIII teaching-RESEARCH-SERVICE-administration (tRSa)**

*Both research and service are significant and have equal importance; teaching and administration are less important.*

**Type IX teaching-RESEARCH-service-ADMINISTRATION (tRSa)**

*Both research and administration are significant and have equal importance; teaching and service are less important.*

**Type X teaching-research-SERVICE-ADMINISTRATION (trSA)**

*Both service and administration are significant and have equal importance; teaching and research are less important.*

**Type XI TEACHING-RESEARCH-SERVICE-administration (TRSa)**

*Teaching, research, and service are significant and have equal importance; administration is less important.*

**Type XII teaching-RESEARCH-SERVICE-ADMINISTRATION (tRSA)**

*Research, service, and administration are significant and have equal importance; teaching is less important.*

**Type XIII TEACHING-research-SERVICE-ADMINISTRATION (TrSA)**

*Teaching, service, and administration are significant and have equal importance; research is less important.*

**Type XIV TEACHING-RESEARCH-service-ADMINISTRATION (TRsA)**

*Teaching, research, and administration are significant and have equal importance; service is less important.*

**Type XV TEACHING-RESEARCH-SERVICE-ADMINISTRATION (TRSA)**

*Extensive commitment in all four areas.*

**Type XVI** teaching-research-service-administration (trsa)

*Minimal commitment in all four areas.*

## **Role Orientation Questions**

USING THE PREVIOUSLY DESCRIBED HIERARCHIES PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

- A. Which orientation best represents how you would ideally like to spend your work time? Type \_\_\_\_\_
  - B. Which orientation best represents how you actually spend your work time? Type \_\_\_\_\_
  - C. In your judgment, which orientation is the most appropriate for the needs of the athletic training profession? Type \_\_\_\_\_
  - D. Which orientation does your direct collegiate supervisor promote/encourage for you? Type \_\_\_\_\_
-