

HEWETT, BRITTANY SULLIVAN, Ph.D. Examining Collegiality: Practices of Faculty in Early Childhood Teacher Preparation Programs. (2019)
Directed by Dr. Karen La Paro. 132 pp.

The purpose of this research is to examine teacher preparation program faculty's incorporation of collegial content/practices into their preparation of pre-service teachers. Collegiality is a complex construct that describes the peer cohesion of employees, or the extent to which they trust and support one another (Jorde-Bloom 1988B; Harris & Anthony, 2001; Shah, 2011). As collegiality has been established as a significant component of in-service teachers' work experience, it is an also important consideration for teacher preparation. The current exploratory study describes teacher preparation programs' faculty members' beliefs related to collegiality, the implementation of collegial practices in teacher preparation, and influential factors to these beliefs and implementation. Forty-one faculty in Early Childhood Education program completed surveys and nine participated in follow-up interviews focused on current practices related to collegiality. Findings indicated that faculty believe collegiality to be very important to the preparation of pre-service teachers but the implementation of collegial content and practices within teacher preparation courses is quite variable. Implications and future directions for teacher preparation are discussed.

EXAMINING COLLEGIALLY: PRACTICES OF FACULTY IN EARLY CHILDHOOD
TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

by

Brittany Sullivan Hewett

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
2019

Approved by

Committee Chair

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation written by Brittany Sullivan Hewett has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair _____

Committee Members _____

Date of Acceptance by Committee

Date of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Accomplishing a task of this feat is impossible to complete as a single individual. There are no adequate words to truly convey my gratitude to those who have been involved in this journey.

To my dissertation committee, Dr. Linda Hestenes, Dr. Karen La Paro, Dr. Julie Mendez-Smith and Dr. Catherine Scott-Little, your unfaltering support, wise suggestions, and hard questions have contributed to both my personal and professional growth in innumerable ways. This experience has pushed me to dig deeper, think harder and re-examine more than I have ever had to do, and I am so appreciative of the encouraging role each of you have played.

To my former teachers, especially Lynette Watson, Jane Walsh, Kay Talbott, Randy Young, Natalie Young, Kathryn (Smith) Hammond, Lee Shelton, Liz (Holland) Dorris, and Dr. Archana Hegde, walking into each of your classrooms set me on the trajectory to become an educator. You all have played a crucial role in guiding me to this point in life as you have been role models, supporters and friends. My only hope is that I can leave a portion of the impression you left on me, upon students that enter my classroom.

To my faithful friends who have listened to me ramble on about this work and grumble about writing and data collection for the past two years, you are saints. I so appreciate your gentle (and sometimes not so gentle) nudges to persevere but also to get away from the desk and computer screen for a bit!

To my family (Momma, Daddy, Caleb, Ena, Cindy, David and Ian), thank you for giving me the courage to see this through. You all keep me grounded and remind me what is truly important in life.

To my husband, Zachary Lyle, thank you for being a calm voice of reason when my waters felt difficult to tread. Your unwavering support of me in anything I choose to pursue personally and professionally is never overlooked and always appreciated. I love you. Forever and Ever, No matter what. Amen.

Last, but certainly not least, to my daughter, Brooklynne Belle, I thank you for all of the time that you sacrificed without truly understanding why it was necessary. You have taught me that work will always be there, and babies do not keep. I thank you for demanding me to take breaks because you wanted to be held or play, that is time that I will never regret. You are kind. You are smart. You are important. You are strong. You are cute. You make good choices. You are a trooper, and I love you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THEORETICAL FOUNDATION	4
III. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	11
IV. THE CURRENT STUDY	31
V. METHODS.....	32
VI. RESULTS	47
VII. DISCUSSION	72
REFERENCES.....	89
APPENDIX A. SURVEY	100
APPENDIX B. INTERVIEW GUIDE	107
APPENDIX C. CODING GUIDE	108
APPENDIX D. TABLES	126

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Demographics of Sample (N=41).....	127
Table 2. Participant Experiences of Collegiality in Their Profession and Training (N=41).....	128
Table 3. Faculty's Incorporation of Collegiality Content and Practices in Teacher Preparation Courses (N=41)	129
Table 4. Importance and Incorporation of Collegiality Across Sample Participants (N=41).....	130
Table 5. Differences between Faculty's Experience of Collegiality within Their Department Versus within Their Program (N=41).....	130
Table 6. Associations between Faculty Members' Incorporation of Collegial Content/Practices in Teacher Preparation and Their Personal and Professional Characteristics (N=41)	131

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Collegiality is a complex construct that describes the extent to which colleagues trust and support one another (Jorde-Bloom 1988B; Harris & Anthony, 2001; Shah, 2011). Using this conceptual definition, research conducted in educational settings has shown that the degree of collegiality present in a workplace influences individual teachers' work experiences and the overall climate of the workplace. Collegiality offers connection, support, affiliation, and belongingness to teachers working within the early childhood center context (Rudasill Snyder, Levinson, & Adelson, 2017); collegial relationships have also been associated with teachers' increased levels of job satisfaction, commitment to both their job and the field (Whitebook, King, Philipp, & Sakai, 2016; Zinsser, Christensen, & Torres, 2016; Zinsser & Curby, 2014) and exhibition of higher quality teaching practices (Cassidy, King, Wang, Lower, and Kintner-Duffy, 2016; McGinty, Justice, & Rimm-Kaufmann, 2008). Whereas, a lack of collegial relationships within a teacher's workplace has been found to relate to in-service teachers' decreased job satisfaction and increased experience of distress, emotional burnout, and turnover (Zinsser et al., 2016). As collegiality has been established as a significant component of in-service teachers' work experience, it is an also important consideration for teacher preparation, as preparation program faculty members serve as socialization agents and prepare pre-service teachers for the complex aspects of their future work. Given that teaching is fundamentally relational (Han & Bridglall, 2009;

Pawan, 2008), and learning is co-constructed through interaction with others (NAEYC, 2010), intentionally addressing collegiality is relevant for teacher preparation. Research in early childhood research has recently intensified its focus on interactions and relationships and has demonstrated that the social interactions of in-service teachers that occur both within and between groups (i.e., staff and administration as well as peer groups), and the processes that govern those interactions, are crucial to teacher's individual development and contribute to climate of the organization in which teachers work (Bloom, Hentschel, & Bella, 2010; Dennis & O'Connor, 2013; James & Jones, 1974; Jorde-Bloom, 1996; Klinker, Riley, & Roach, 2005; Lower & Cassidy, 2007; Rudasill et al., 2017; Staton & Hunt, 1992; Wells, 2017). With research demonstrating important linkages between the collegiality dimension of organizational climate and in-service teachers work experiences (Hur Jeon, & Buettner, 2016; Klinker et al., 2005; Wells, 2017), examining faculty members beliefs about collegiality and how and to what extent faculty members address collegiality in their instruction of future teachers is also a crucial consideration for teacher preparation.

Teacher preparation program faculty not only provide teachers the foundational teaching and method skills for doing their job, but, also contribute to teachers' preparedness to meet the expectations of the job, their beliefs regarding appropriate practice, and their development of appropriate professional behavior (Alsup, 2006; Brashier & Norris 2007; Fairbanks et al., 2010; Jones & Abes, 2004; Salli & Osam, 2017; Staton & Hunt, 1992). Faculty thus contribute to teacher development by providing socialization experiences (i.e., imparting or acquiring the values, attitudes, interests, skills and knowledge of a group) through proximal processes they incorporate into their courses related to the field of teaching that are necessary for their students' success

upon graduation. Specifically, preparation program faculty provide students' first interactions as teachers and first experiences with the culture of teaching through practica requirements and imparting social norms and expectations of teachers through the content and practices they incorporate into their courses. It is important to examine not only the ways in which preservice teachers are prepared for content and pedagogical aspects of teaching, but also, the organizational aspects they will encounter in their various teaching contexts and work environments upon graduation. These experiences contribute not only to students' development as a teacher but also to their future understandings of the work of being a teacher (Evans, 2010). Specifically, the importance of collegiality for pre-service teachers future work experience warrants exploration as to how the construct is incorporated into teacher preparation by faculty at institutions of higher education. Therefore, the current study examines teacher preparation program faculty's foci on collegiality and their beliefs regarding the importance of collegiality in preparing their students to become teachers.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

Bronfenbrenner's bioecological theory of human development is widely recognized within early childhood education research, and it provides the framework for the current study. Although the current study is not intended to be a comprehensive use of nor test of bioecological theory, the tenets of proximal processes, person, context (Microsystem, Mesosystem, Exosystem, Macrosystem), and time (Micro-time and Meso-time) guide this study.

Development, as defined by the bioecological model, is "the phenomenon of continuity and change in the biopsychological characteristics of human beings, both as children and groups" (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006, p. 793). As individuals continue to learn throughout their lifespan, they too, continue to develop (Bronfenbrenner, 2001). The current study identifies proximal processes (e.g., coursework, collaborations) through specific practices implemented by teacher preparation program faculty to address collegiality throughout their training of future teachers and role as a teacher educator. From the bioecological theory perspective, teacher preparation program faculty have developed a framework for understanding collegiality through their own interactions across contexts and processes over time and continue to do so throughout their employment within an early childhood teacher preparation program and instruction of the students.

Proximal Processes

The bioecological model has been defined as “an evolving theoretical system for the scientific study of human development over time” (Bronfenbrenner, 2005, p. 3) and at the core of this model is the element of process, or proximal processes, which are considered to be the driving force of development (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). These processes are defined as reciprocal interaction between an organism and environment that is progressively complex. Simply put, proximal processes are “everyday activities and interactions (with objects, symbols, and other persons) in which individuals are actively and consistently engaged” (Rosa & Tudge, 2013, p. 255). In order for proximal processes to be productive, interactions must occur frequently and over an extended length of time (Tudge, Mokrova, Hatfield, & Karnik, 2009). However, Bronfenbrenner and Morris noted that mere repetition is insufficient; these processes must endure long enough to become increasingly more complex.

In the context of early childhood education teacher preparation, proximal processes are activities in which pre-service teachers participate on a daily basis including (but not limited to) opportunities to collaborate with instructors and peers; activity planning; and classroom-based teaching experiences. These and other proximal processes are a socialization process, as teacher educators work to impart the ideologies, technical competencies, and expected behaviors to perform the role of a teacher upon their students, in addition to teaching content and strategies. Specifically examining socialization as a proximal process for pre-service teachers, the importance of interpersonal relationships, social interaction and the processes underlying those interactions are significant contributors to one’s development as a teacher (Staton & Hunt, 1992). The on-going practices pre-service teachers engage in within their

preparation program contribute to their ability to engage in the proximal processes that are relevant to becoming a teacher (e.g., leadership practices, communication processes, family engagement practices, socialization practices, conflict management, and child screening/assessment practices).

The proximal processes that teacher preparation program faculty implement within their courses (and thus the socialization processes they supply) immerse students frequently and enduringly in intentional experiences geared to prepare them for the work of being a teacher. These intentional experiences (including but not limited to: activity planning for classroom implementation, specific coursework, reflection, opportunities for collaboration, and opportunities to demonstrate collegiality), and more specifically the classroom-based experiences incorporated into preparation programs, become increasingly complex as a positive association exists between students' responsibilities within the classroom/organization and length of time in the program. Research has also suggested that these socialization practices become increasingly complex in their implementation or delivery based upon the contributors, contexts, and content of these interactions and the relational aspects of teaching (Kuzmic, 1994; Sinnema, Meyer, & Aitken, 2017; Staton & Hunt, 1992). For example, pre-service teachers' responsibilities within their coursework and their classroom-based experiences increase overtime until they are solely responsible for a portion of instruction during their student teaching; the activity planning, communication with instructors, university supervisors, cooperating teachers and also children's families, in addition to pre-service teachers' roles in classroom management increase throughout their programs and socialization to the field.

There is also a breadth of research demonstrating the impact of beliefs on practice (Kagan, 1992; Kennedy, 1990; Pajares, 1992; Tatto, 1996; Weinstein, 1989); therefore, faculty members' beliefs regarding the essential components of teacher preparation and what elements are necessary to effectively prepare teacher candidates will undoubtedly influence the specific practices, activities and opportunities (i.e., proximal processes) they incorporate into the courses they teach. Therefore, the current study aims to collect information regarding teacher preparation program faculty members' beliefs surrounding collegiality in teacher preparation and the ways in which it is incorporated into the training of future teachers.

Person

Individuals bring with them to each context a multitude of previous knowledge and feelings that influence the ways in which they will participate in their current context. The interactions that occur within these contexts, however, are dependent upon what Bronfenbrenner deemed as person characteristics. Such characteristics are categorized as demand, resource and force characteristics. Examples of demand characteristics include age, gender, race, physical appearance (i.e., things that immediately stimulate another person). Resource characteristics however, are not as immediately apparent, as they refer to the mental, emotional, social, and material resources that an individual has at their disposal. Finally, force characteristics include aspects such as an individual's temperament, motivation, and persistence (Tudge et al., 2009). For teacher preparation program faculty, additional albeit variable, educational levels, specialized training, knowledge and skills would also constitute resource characteristics. The current study seeks to examine the associations between teacher preparation program faculty

members' personal and professional characteristics and their intentional focus on collegiality as teacher educators.

Context

Throughout the course of his work, Bronfenbrenner delineated four interrelated contextual systems: the Microsystem, the Mesosystem, the Exosystem, and the Macrosystem. First, the microsystem is any environment in which an individual spends a fair amount of time. It is also important to note here that people are not limited to simply one microsystem. Whether it is work, home, school, or any of the like, if a fair amount of time is spent in that environment, it is deemed a microsystem for the individual. The mesosystem is considered the interrelations among the multiple microsystems. Thus, for faculty members, their homes, their office, the classrooms within their preparation programs, and their navigation between those could constitute their mesosystem. Next, the exosystem consists of contexts in which people are not actually involved, but are indirectly influenced by; for instance, faculty and their instruction are heavily influenced by the university, department, and program policies of their specific institutions and the licensing requirements of the state in which the program is administered. The university, department, program and state requirements all determine the specific courses that must be taught; and, they each contribute to the implementation of and the adherence to the policies in place. Finally, the macrosystem is the context of any group sharing a value or belief system, lifestyles, and resources (Rosa & Tudge, 2013; Tudge et al., 2016). For teacher preparation program faculty, this may consist of the larger early care and education field which upholds certain values and beliefs as early childhood teacher educators, such as NAEYC's Professional Preparation Standards.

It is also important to note here that Bronfenbrenner and Morris (2006) postulated the crucial elements of development, proximal processes, to occur within the microsystems that people are situated, although other systems of context have some influence. For the current study, the microsystem and exosystem are most pertinent. Faculty members spend a considerable amount of time within the courses of their teacher preparation programs, guiding and teaching students, assigning coursework, reflecting with them on classroom-based experiences and a number of any other requirements for the courses they instruct. Thus, the policies and practices within the exosystem of the faculty's department influence the instruction the faculty members provide in the microsystem of their classrooms. However, there may be a considerable amount of variability across individual faculty members in terms of their beliefs, their instructional practices, the activities they implement in their classrooms, the coursework they require etc. that may impact the proximal processes within the classroom, and ultimately, the development of both themselves and their students as a teacher. Thus, it is important to consider the opportunities faculty provide for pre-service teachers to engage in collegiality within the context of their preparation courses.

Time

Bronfenbrenner described time *and* timing as important aspects of the model because the processes, people, and contexts are examined in terms of relative constancy and change (Tudge et al., 2009). Similar to the system paradigm of context, time too is categorized by several dimensions. Micro-time is the incidence throughout the course of a specific interaction (Tudge et al., 2009); and thus, the time a faculty member takes each day to instruct course meetings, reflect on their teaching, meet with students individually, assign and grade assignments, and plan/implement activities for

future teachings could be considered micro-time. The duration of these experiences, in which faculty members further hone their skills and adapt their instructional techniques/approaches, frame what establishes meso-time. Macro-time, however, is the variation of developmental processes in accordance with historical events (Tudge et al., 2009); this study uses the lenses of meso-time when discussing teacher preparation program faculty members' beliefs surrounding collegiality, and of micro-time when discussing how and to what extent they incorporate collegiality into their teacher preparation courses.

As collegiality occurs within a particular context, across time through meaningful interactions (proximal processes) between people (and their enveloped person characteristics), it does not occur by happenstance (Kelchtermans, 2006; Shah, 2012); and therefore, such interactions need to be structured, taught, and learned. For this reason, Bronfenbrenner's Bioecological Systems Theory and specifically the PPCT model have guided this study in its examination of the teacher development of faculty members, specifically the context through which these individuals prepare future teachers (teacher preparation courses) and the proximal processes emphasized by faculty members within those courses. Key tenets of the bioecological model (proximal processes, person, context, and time) are important to consider in their contribution to the study of early childhood teacher preparation and development related to collegiality.

CHAPTER III

LITERATURE REVIEW

The term collegiality is used to describe the extent to which employees trust and support one another, or the cooperative relationships amongst colleagues (Jorde-Bloom, 1988b; Shah, 2011); however, extant literature has denoted varying conceptual definitions (Freedman, 2009; Jarzabkowski, 2002; Shah, 2011). For example, collegiality is often used interchangeably with terms such as collaboration (Jarzabkowski, 2002; Kelchtermans, 2006; Shah, 2011) or congeniality (Freedman, 2009), but these terms are rather a subset of, and reflective of, collegiality more than they are synonymous with it (Freedman, 2009; Jarzabkowski, 2002; Kelchtermans, 2006; Shah, 2011). Jarzabkowski's work with primary teachers contributes to our understanding of these terms by differentiating collaboration to only be relevant to professional relationships, whilst collegiality encompasses any involvement with co-workers be it intellectual, moral, political, social, or emotional in addition to their professional relationship. Further, research readily acknowledges social and emotional support as important components of teachers' lived experiences with collegiality (Jarzabkowski, 2002); with this support, "individuals feel able to express their emotions, negative and positive, to admit to failure and weakness, to voice resentment and frustration, to demonstrate affection" (Nias 1999, p. 235). Collaborative opportunities within the workplace do not always require (or permit) the intellectual, social, or emotional interactions that contribute to and are characteristic of collegiality. Despite the multiple interpretations present in the literature, collegiality is viewed as vital to teachers

development (Harris & Anthony, 2001), and an opportunity to involve many individuals (and their resource characteristics) in tackling the complexities of education (Shah, 2012). Specifically, Freedman noted that “collegiality is a process that helps to create the conditions for principled agreement by allowing all points of view to be aired and considered” (2009; p. 379). These meaningful interactions also allow colleagues to “learn the affirmative qualities of colleagues by being with them – in business and social contexts both – and experiencing their optimism, humour, and buoyancy” (Donaldson, 2001, p 58); this is an important consideration because the actions of working together are largely impacted by the quality of relationships amongst staff (Kelchtermans, 2006). Thus, collegiality applies to both professional and social interactions/relationships within a workplace (Jazabkowski, 2002; Shah, 2011); and, inevitably impacts teachers’ work experiences, whether positively through its presence or negatively through its absence.

Collegial Relationships

Positive relationships with both peers and administration offer connection, support, affiliation, and belongingness to teachers within the early childhood education context (Rudasill et al., 2017; Shah, 2012). In centers or schools with positive collegial relationships among teachers, a number of positive benefits have been mentioned in the literature. For instance, such relationships improve teachers’ professional growth, development, professionalism, as well as school quality and organizational effectiveness (Shah, 2012). This may be reflective of teachers who feel supported, and as though they belong, increasing their involvement and ownership of their position within the school (Andrews & Lewis, 2002), increasing positive attitudes toward teaching (Brownell, Yeager, Rennells, & Riley, 1997) and participating in more collaboration with their colleagues. Cousins, Ross, and Maynes (1992) noted that when teachers participate in

joint work, less time and effort are expended for task completion, access to instructional resources is enhanced, consensus building, and group decision-making is facilitated. These interactions and relationships are also beneficial to teachers through “the collective generation of ideas and suggestions, enhanced communication, willingness to seek and give help, improved practice, and enhanced repertoires of techniques” (Shah, 2012, p. 1243).

Further, Hur and colleagues (2016) denoted the possible mitigation of stress from challenging work demands and isolation inherent in teaching, through collegial relationships. Similar findings have also been presented in other education literature as well as for the fields of nursing and social work (AbuAlRub, 2004; Abu-Bader, 2000; Corrigan, Paul Holmes, & Luchins, 1995; Miller, 2011; Shah, 2012). Specifically, McGinty et al. (2008) noted the extensive literature on in-service teachers’ feelings of isolation, burnout and stress and that both descriptive and experimental studies have shown that teachers’ perceptions of support from their colleagues may counteract such negative attitudes toward teaching. In fact, Staton and Hunt’s (1992) review of literature indicated that in-service teachers rated colleagues among their most valued sources of support. Other literature has noted collegiality to help educators cope with the uncertain and complex terrains that sometimes accompany teaching; this type of support encourages teachers to become more flexible and respond effectively to rapid change/new demands that might deplete the energy and resources when teachers work individually.

Conversely, a lack of collegial relationships has been associated with in-service teachers’ decreased job satisfaction and increased experience of distress, emotional burnout, and turnover (Zinsser et al., 2016). In 2008, Knox conducted a meta-analysis of both cross-sectional and longitudinal studies to examine the relationship between

occupational stress and social support in extant literature. Of the 61 studies included in this meta-analysis, 13 specifically addressed teachers and findings indicated a negative association between social support among colleagues and occupational stress levels, such that colleagues experiencing more social support exhibited less stress related to their job. Further, Zinsser and colleagues (2016) examined the supports available to preschool teachers in regard to children's social emotional learning and the impacts of the presence or absence of those supports on teachers' mental health. The researchers found that teachers who were employed by centers that implemented more supports for children's social and emotional learning, were not only less depressed and more satisfied with their jobs, but also felt more supported by both administration and colleagues in managing challenging behavior and more comfortable seeking the support of supervisors or colleagues when needed. This particular feeling of being comfortable in seeking out support when needed can be attributed to some degree of collegiality and teachers' perceptions of it within their workplace.

Research has delineated the influence of the collegiality construct on teachers' perceptions of their work and their work place, or the organizational climate (McGinty et al., 2008; Stauffer & Mason, 2013; Zinsser, Christensen, & Torres, 2016). As organizational climate has been described as comprised by several dimensions [professional growth, supervisor support, clarity, reward systems, decision-making structure, goal consensus, task orientation, physical environment, innovativeness and collegiality (Jorde-Bloom, 1988a; Jorde-Bloom, 1988b; Bloom, 1991; Bloom, 2010)], it is crucial to acknowledge the relatedness of these dimensions. Collegial practices impact organizational climate when teachers spend time together, both socializing and working, and develop their own perceptions of what it means to work there or be a part of that

particular organization. For example, proximal processes that in-service teachers participate in quite often involve collegial interactions with their peers (e.g., communication regarding procedures within the center, making decisions within (and possibly beyond) their classroom, and the execution of job tasks and responsibilities assigned to them. In their reflections focused on organizational climate as a staff retention tool for early childhood centers, Klinker and colleagues (2005) reported that for administrators surveyed regarding staff retention strategies, increasing staff camaraderie and cohesiveness was of major concern. Additionally, research has shown collegial communities in schools foster a working environment supportive of innovation, enthusiasm and energy amongst teachers, frequent interaction to share ideas and expertise to come to a consensus regarding organizational goals and plans for action and provide opportunities for teachers' professional growth and development, (McLaughlin, 1993; Shah 2011, 2012). Jarzabkowski (2002) and others who have discussed organizational culture or climate emphasized that no one person is responsible for development of organizational meaning; but rather, everyone who plays any role within that organization has a stake in creating a sense of meaning. Given that administrators have expressed the need for staff camaraderie (Klinker et al., 2005) and the knowledge that each dimension of organizational climate might influence the other, it is important to examine the contribution of collegiality to teachers' work experiences and overall organizational climate.

Albeit the proximal aspects of the classroom are certainly important indicators of quality, failing to consider the larger environment in which the adult caring for the child is situated (and their perceptions of it), does not provide a holistic picture of the quality of care children receive. Zinnser and colleagues (2016) delineated the importance of

acknowledging the interdependence of a teacher's classroom and their place of employment. Specifically, Bloom (2015) noted "the connection between center climate and a teacher's psychological state cannot be overemphasized" (p. 165), indicating that structural and interpersonal aspects of early childhood settings directly influence the teacher, and thus, indirectly influence the child in the care of that teacher (Cassidy et al., 2016; Ekholm & Hedin, 1987; Lower & Cassidy 2007). For example, Lower and Cassidy (2007) examined the relationship between child care administration, organizational climate, and global quality, by administering the Program Administration Scale (PAS; Talan & Bloom, 2004), the Early Childhood Work Environment (ECWES) Survey-Short Form (Jorde-Bloom, 1998a), and the Environment Rating Scales-Revised Forms, (Harms, Clifford, & Cryer, 1998; Harms, Cryer, & Clifford, 2003) to 225 early childhood educators in North Carolina. Their findings indicated positive correlations between preschool classroom global quality and both program administration and organizational climate. Specifically, Lower and Cassidy found a significant relationship between organizational climate (which consists of multiple dimensions, including collegiality) and a language/interaction factor of the ECERS-R and a significant relationship between the PAS and the Parents and Staff Subscale of the ITERS-R and ECERS-R.

Thus, collegial relationships and the outcomes associated with them, whether positive or negative, extend their influence beyond teachers to the children in their care. Research has shown collegial relationships to be associated with in-service teachers' increased levels of job satisfaction, commitment to both their job and the field (McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001; Shah, 2012; Whitebook, King, Philipp, & Sakai, 2016; Zinsser et al., 2016; Zinsser & Curby, 2014) and exhibition of higher quality teaching practices as measured by increased sensitivity and emotional support, encouragement

of children's individual growth, promotion of peer cooperation, and establishment of warm relations with children (Cassidy et al., 2016; McGinty et al., 2008). As such, teachers' experiences of collegial relationships can directly (through teaching practices) and indirectly (through teachers' satisfaction and commitment) influence the children in their care and the overall organizational climate of early childhood education centers in which they work. For example, Cassidy and colleagues administered the Teacher Satisfaction Inventory (TSI) (Cassidy, 2016b) and observed 94 lead teachers in toddler classrooms using the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (La Paro, Hamre, & Pianta, 2012) and the Contentedness and Comfort of Children in Child Care scale (C5) (Cassidy, 2016a) to predict the emotional support of the classroom environment and the positive emotional expressions and behaviors of toddlers from teachers' professional well-being, feelings about their work, and autonomy in their work environment. In relation to collegiality specifically, results from this study indicated that teachers' ability to have input on the hiring of teachers (i.e., have some influence on who will become their colleague) was positively associated with the emotional support they provide to children in their care.

Additionally, McGinty and colleagues administered the Teacher's Sense of the School as Community questionnaire (Battistich & Solomon, 1997) to 68 preschool teachers in an effort to examine two specific aspects of teachers' sense of community: staff collegiality and teachers' influence regarding decision making. An exploratory factor analysis of teachers' responses to the survey indicated that the staff collegiality and shared goals, and staff influence on school norms and decisions, accounted for 66.9% of the variance in teacher responses; these items were also moderately correlated. Scale scores were created by averaging teachers' responses for each

dimension of collegiality and influence. Findings indicated that the majority of teachers (70% or higher) provided high ratings for questions about teacher cooperativeness and support (i.e., “In this school, there is a feeling that everyone is working toward common goals”; “Teachers are supportive of one another”); fewer than 20% of the surveyed teachers provided low ratings on these same items, indicating that this sample had few negative perceptions of collegiality within their respective workplaces. However, McGinty and colleagues caution the interpretation of these results as they may reflect an interaction of teachers’ lowered expectations of collegial interaction and their positive nature when they occur, versus the presence or lack of opportunities to engage in collegial interaction.

In other efforts to gather information related to organizational aspects and include teachers’ voices in considering the quality of early childhood education programs, Whitebook and colleagues (2016) administered the Supportive Environmental Quality Underlying Adult Learning (SEQUAL) tool (Whitebook & Ryan, 2013) to early childhood teachers in California. This particular tool examines five aspects of teachers’ learning environments: teaching supports; learning opportunities; policies and practices that support teaching staff’s initiative and teamwork; adult well-being; and how supervisors and program leaders interact with staff to support their teaching practice. The responses of 338 teachers were examined first using frequency analyses to gain an understanding of teachers’ assessments of workplace policies, practices, and relationships. Average scores for each of the SEQUAL domains were determined and then used in multilevel analyses to examine differences in the SEQUAL scores by site and teacher characteristics. Findings from Whitebook and colleagues’ work related specifically to the

policies and practices supporting teachers' initiative and teamwork dimension are presented below.

Ninety-three percent of teachers surveyed either agreed or somewhat agreed that their coworkers treat them with respect; and, 91% indicated agreement that coworkers value their beliefs about teaching children. The majority of teachers (79%) agreed that the teaching staff within their classroom consider themselves as part of a team and work together well to plan learning experiences for the children (71%). When this inquiry was extended to staff outside of their classroom, 74% agreed and an additional 15% somewhat agreed that teaching staff within their classroom work well with staff from other classrooms. Approximately 90% agreed or somewhat agreed that each staff member does their share of the work and the opinions of all involved are considered. When personal issues arise, 92% of teachers agreed that coworkers support them in their time of need. Conversely, only 69% of teachers surveyed agreed that bullying was not tolerated within their program; and only 64% of teaching staff agreed that each staff member is held responsible for their share of the work. Finally, less than the majority (47%) of teaching staff surveyed indicated agreement that their complaints would be considered fairly. These findings give credence to the influence of interpersonal relationships on teachers' work experiences and effective operation of an early childhood program as high-quality work environments foster teachers' positive perceptions of respect, fairness, collaboration, conflict management, and accountability (Whitebook et al., 2016). Such knowledge of the impact collegial relationships have on teachers' work experience is pertinent for professional development and educational preparation. As institutions of higher education providing early childhood teacher preparation programs are currently and will continue to be entrusted with the preparation

of the early childhood workforce, it is important to examine not only the ways in which students are prepared for content and pedagogical aspects of teaching, but also the organizational aspects present in a variety of contexts in which they may teach upon graduation.

Developing Collegiality

Although the nature of teachers' work may lend itself to collegial practices, busy schedules, course loads, and other duties teachers fulfill sometimes make relationship building a difficult task to complete (Shah 2012); and while this is applicable to teachers of all ages, early childhood teachers have additional situation-specific demands that school-aged teachers may or may not encounter (Jorde-Bloom, 1988b; Kivunja 2015; McGinty et al., 2008). The roles and responsibilities entrusted to teachers within the early care and education sector require them to fulfill a number of roles which include but are not limited to that of: a guide, a facilitator, a safety monitor, a partner, a cheerleader, a nurturer, an interpreter, a liaison, a paper pusher, a planner, a manager, a negotiator, and so on, all for children aged birth through age five (Childcare Education Institute, 2008). Each of the roles teachers fulfill require honed interpersonal skills that ultimately contribute to their collegial practices and development of collegial relationships.

Interpersonal skills are broadly defined as "an on-going development for people's meaningful relationships..." which stress an individual's ability to be friendly, thoughtful, get along well with others, listen effectively and respond sensitively, resolve conflicts, cooperate, follow directions, and any other skill pertinent to group interaction (Lee & Powell, 2005, p.313). Such skills are necessary to facilitate the collaboration needed in teaching as teachers can share various information, ideas, perspectives, resources, and/or materials when these skills are developed and exhibited (Lee & Powell, 2005).

Each of these skills in combination with the roles teachers perform, take a considerable amount of their time, contribute to the complexity of their work in early childhood education, and influence their individual perceptions of their workplace.

In light of the various roles teachers fulfill and the skills they require, it must also be noted that collegiality does not occur by happenstance (Kelchtermans, 2006; Shah, 2012); but rather, within a particular context, across time. Therefore, collegiality can be viewed as meaningful interactions (proximal processes) between people (and their enveloped person characteristics) in their respective microsystem across time through Bronfenbrenner's PPCT model. Shah warns, however, that these interactions and resultant collegiality are not by chance; conversely, they need to be structured, taught, and learned, which is an important consideration for teacher education.

Current national standards and competencies reinforce the need for the early childhood education workforce to have a proficient understanding of areas such as: child development, social/emotional development, family influences on children's learning, effective classroom practices, professionalism and advocacy (NAEYC, 2010). Although recent research has demonstrated a need to investigate if pre-service early childhood teachers are receiving content related to these areas in their preparation courses (Whitebook et al., 2012), there is little knowledge on the preparation of early childhood pre-service teachers in those suggested areas, specifically professionalism (Buettner, Hur, Jeon & Andrews, 2016). Thus, as collegiality could be considered a component of professionalism, if and how students are receiving and learning information related to this construct needs to be examined.

Just as the relationship between teachers' environments and their impact upon the quality of care they provide is a gap to close, information on organizational aspects

of early childhood settings should be incorporated into teacher preparation in order to fully prepare students for the full scope of their work as teachers.

The Role of Teacher Preparation

According to the Early Childhood Workforce Index (Whitebook et al., 2016), 35% of the nation's center-based teaching staff have obtained a bachelor's degree and an additional 17% hold an associate degree. Although an educational standard for the early childhood care workforce is not in place currently, professional organizations (i.e., NAEYC) have embarked upon the journey to provide "Power to the Profession" through implementing standards related to education and training requirements, as well as creating Personnel Preparation Standards (NAEYC, 2010) which are relevant for teacher preparation. However, until these standards are agreed upon and implemented, the field will continue to be represented by teachers with varying education levels, credentials, and competencies. Taking into account that the data delineates a little more than the majority of the field (52%) possesses a higher education degree, and the knowledge that professional organizations are moving to a call for a standard educational requirement for field entry (Buettner et al., 2016; Child Care Aware of America, 2013), as teacher preparation programs provide the opportunity for teacher socialization, it is important for early childhood teacher preparation faculty members to further examine their contribution to the formation of students' understanding of organizational aspects of their work, specifically collegiality and the interpersonal skills needed to participate in collegial relationships. Evans (2010) eloquently describes teacher preparation as "a mechanism of occupational socialization, a process by which novice workers learn the norms and values of the occupation" (p.183). It is within the confines of teacher preparation classrooms that students not only learn *what* to teach but *how* to teach. This is an

important consideration as research has delineated the relational nature of teaching (Han & Bridglall, 2009; Pawan, 2008), and collegial support as being rated among one of in-service teachers' most valued sources of support (Staton and Hunt, 1992). However, without intentional focus on collegiality, these varying levels of education and training that both teachers and administrators bring with them to their centers and classrooms may influence their expectations of what collegiality should look like (McGinty et al., 2008; Whitebook et al., 2016), their experiences of work (Hur et al., 2016; Klinker et al., 2005; Wells, 2017) and the children in their care. Therefore, for collegial relationships to be the norm of early care and education professionals, opportunities to practice and hone these skills must be presented within their preparation programs' courses and students must be socialized in such practices.

Teacher educators specifically, are significant contributors to students' development and occupational socialization (Evans 2010) as they provide support and encouragement amidst students' navigation of the 'space of ambiguity' (Alsup, 2006). It is within this space that feelings of instability, vulnerability and disequilibrium experienced when students' candid beliefs of what it takes to be a teacher are confronted and are recognized as a necessary interval in development (Hong, Greene, & Lowery, 2017). As students' responsibilities increase throughout their preparation courses, they are given insight into the true requirements of teaching as well as the internal and external influences on those requirements. Blase (1985) conducted an ethnographic study examining teacher socialization and conceptualized the term "organizational literacy." In this piece, Blase noted the importance of teacher educators imparting knowledge of organizational literacy for students

University preparatory programs should provide preservice and in-service experiences that lead to the basic psychological, social, political and technical competencies essential to participatory decision making and problem solving at the school level. In the broadest sense, teacher educators are asked to go beyond preparation in subject matter and teaching pedagogy, to expand their programs to include preparation for organizational life founded in participatory principles... (1985, p. 254)

Although proposed over three decades ago, this term of organizational literacy is still relevant for teacher preparation today. In the past, only students' knowledge and performance were emphasized as the benchmark for success (Wayda & Lund, 2005) in teacher preparation; but currently, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity Standard (Standard 3) denotes the responsibility of teacher preparation programs to ensure that candidate quality is an ongoing and purposeful part of their work. This is an important consideration as candidate quality extends beyond an individual's academic ability and includes aspects such as an individual's interpersonal skills, which contribute to their development of collegiality and are pertinent to a candidate's performance in the program and effective teaching (CAEP, 2013). As CAEP and other sources of accreditation have increasingly emphasized the assessment of students' above and beyond their academic skills, it is necessary to acknowledge a focus on collegiality as relevant to the socialization and skills of becoming a teacher.

As pre-service teachers will become members of the early childhood education settings in which they will teach, it is important for teacher preparation faculty members to consider ways to prepare students beyond the content and pedagogy required, specifically incorporating ways in which the collegiality of preservice teachers is cultivated so they may be constructive contributors to their places of employment post-

graduation. When teacher educators promote the organizational literacy of pre-service teachers', they can be viewed as agents of socialization for students.

Teacher Educators as Socializing Agents

Socialization is defined by Merton, Reader, and Kendall (1957) as the complex process through which "people selectively acquire the values and attitudes, the interests, skills and knowledge—in short the culture—current in groups to which they are, or seek to become, a member" (as cited in Staton & Hunt, 1992, p. 109). Teacher socialization, then, begins with teacher education as program faculty impart ideologies and cultivate students' competencies and behaviors expected for success in the field; teacher socialization also endures throughout the career as teachers modify their perspectives, roles and environments based on their experiences (Evans, 2010; Staton & Hunt, 1992). In terms of teacher development, preparation program faculty provide students' first interactions and experiences with the culture of teaching through practical requirements and impart social norms and expectations of teachers through content and practices of their courses. These socialization processes contribute not only to students' development as a teacher but also to their future understandings of work of being a teacher and organizational literacy (Blasé 1985; Evans, 2010). As teacher preparation faculty socialize their students either implicitly or explicitly within their classrooms, is it important to examine their beliefs and implementation surrounding the construct of collegiality.

The Study of the Education of Educators (SEE) collected survey data from 2947 students and 1217 faculty from 29 teacher training institutions seeking to investigate the various sources of influence on students' educational beliefs and values; additionally, 101 individuals (45 students, 40 teacher education faculty members, and 16 cooperating

teachers) were interviewed to further elucidate the socialization experiences of students (Su, 1992). Descriptive statistics and content analyses of the survey and interview data respectively indicated that student teaching and cooperating teachers were the most important source of influence for students; whereas the course curriculum and teacher education faculty were less influential. Previous studies have shown that knowledge, skills, and dispositions introduced to students in methods and foundation courses within their preparation programs have little influence on their subsequent actions (Grant, 1981; Hodges, 1982; Katz & Raths, 1982); and while Su's findings support such findings, the data informing them are over thirty years old. Over this time span, teacher preparation and the field of teaching itself have evolved, informed by both research and professional standards (Cochran-Smith & Villegas, 2015). Research has since been conducted and noted the role of faculty and preparation programs on the development of teachers (Evans, 2010). Thus, it is important to further examine students' current foci on the work of the teaching profession and the influential proponents to their development as a teacher.

With these changes and growth in mind, it is necessary and timely to examine how the collegiality construct is addressed within teacher preparation. This study aims to gain an understanding of how teacher preparation program faculty members address collegiality in teacher preparation programs; thus, the next section focuses on their beliefs and implementation surrounding collegiality. This is a necessary consideration for research regarding collegiality as it is well documented in the literature that teachers' beliefs influence classroom practice (Maxwell, McWilliams, Hemmeter, Ault, & Schuster, 2001; Pajares, 1992; Stipeck & Byler, 1997; Vartuli, 1999); thus, faculty beliefs regarding

the importance of collegiality will likely influence their implementation of content and practices related to collegiality in their preparation of pre-service teachers.

Teacher Preparation Faculty Members' Beliefs. Beliefs can be recognized as dispositions to action, or influences to behavior, that are time and context specific (Brown & Cooney, 1982; Pajares, 1992). Beliefs are based upon evaluations and judgement in contrast to knowledge which is based upon fact; but still, beliefs represent an individual's perception of reality with "enough validity, truth, or credibility to guide thought and behavior" (Pajares 1992, p. 313). For the purposes of this study, teacher preparation program faculty members' beliefs about collegiality may indicate how they interact and build relationships with and between their students, as well as how they plan content and experiences related to collegiality to include in the courses they teach. Given that research has demonstrated the connection between teachers' beliefs and practice, that these beliefs are relatively stable/resistant to change (Kagan, 1992; Kennedy, 1990; Tatto, 1996; Weinstein, 1989), and that understanding the belief structures of both teacher educators and candidates is vital to cultivating their professional preparation and teaching practices (Pajares, 1992), is it important to examine the beliefs of faculty members responsible for instructing pre-service teachers.

If teacher educators believe collegiality to be an important aspect of teacher preparation, it is likely that they will incorporate content and experiences that will convey that belief; conversely, if teacher preparation program faculty members do not believe collegiality to be relevant for teacher preparation, they may be less likely to incorporate related content or experiences for their students. This is an important consideration as the coursework and field experiences students experience during enrollment in a teacher preparation program provide them with knowledge and experiences that may color their

beliefs about collegiality and ultimately their practice (or lack) of collegiality (Pajares, 1992).

Teacher Preparation Faculty Members' Implementation. Given the previous section and well documented literature on beliefs influencing practice (Kaymakamoglu, 2018; Spear et al., 2018), teacher preparation faculty can intentionally use the time students are enrolled in their course to cultivate and hone students' understanding of collegiality and communicate the influence it may have on their future work experiences (Cummins & Asempapa, 2013; Wadlington & Wadlington, 2011). The interpersonal skills that contribute to collegiality (the ability to be friendly, thoughtful, get along well with others, listen effectively and respond sensitively, resolve conflicts, cooperate, follow directions, and any other skill pertinent to group interaction (Lee & Powell, 2005)) require consistent exposure to specific, deliberate, learning experiences (Davison-Jenkins, 2007; Dottin, 2009; Eisner, 1994; Koeppen & Davison-Jenkins, 2007; Misco & Shiveley, 2007) in order to influence students' understanding and expression of collegial interactions and relationships. Anderson postulated that early experiences with collaboration play a crucial role in supporting early childhood teachers' professional development and are critical considerations to include in teacher preparation. Friend, Cook, Hurley-Chamberlain, and Shamberger (2010) defined collaboration as an interaction only possible when individuals engage in specific processes, tasks or activities; thus, within teacher preparation, students must translate their learning into practice. Collaboration requires practice to develop and implement but is certainly reflective of collegiality (Freedman, 2009; Jarzabkowski, 2002; Kelchtermans, 2006; Shah, 2011). NAEYC has also recognized the importance of these collegial interactions and relationships and devoted an entire section within the code of ethics to teachers'

responsibilities to colleagues and employers (NAEYC, 2011 Section III). Thus, the content and activities that teacher preparation faculty members incorporate into their coursework to build and develop collegiality is worth examining. As teacher preparation faculty are not only responsible for communicating the tangible aspects of work, but also serve as the first socialization experience into the field for their pre-service students (Evans, 2010), it is necessary to examine how aspects of professional behavior related to collegiality are woven implicitly and explicitly into teacher preparation courses. However, as teacher preparation programs have such great variability (La Paro et al., 2014; Whitebook et al., 2012), it cannot be assumed that collegiality is defined or emphasized the same by faculty members. Therefore, it is of interest to examine specifically teacher preparation program faculty members' beliefs and implementation of collegiality in their courses to better understand how students are exposed to the ideas and skills necessary to participate in collegial interactions and relationships.

In sum, collegiality is a far-reaching construct encompassing multiple components that are important for the field of teaching. Institutions of higher education providing early childhood teacher preparation programs are currently and will continue to be entrusted with the preparation of the early childhood workforce; therefore, it is important to examine not only the ways in which pre-service teachers are prepared for content and pedagogical aspects of teaching, but also the organizational literacy related aspects of teaching. Specifically, given the importance/centrality of collegiality to teachers' work, this construct warrants further exploration. As pre-service teachers' understanding of collegial interactions and relationships are influenced by their preparation, and this preparation ultimately influences their development as a teacher

and professional practice, examination of teacher preparation program faculty members' beliefs and implementation of collegiality is an important direction for research.

CHAPTER IV

THE CURRENT STUDY

The current exploratory study describes early childhood teacher preparation programs' faculty members' beliefs related to collegiality, implementation of collegial practices in teacher preparation, and demographic factors associated with these beliefs and implementation. To address these research aims, a mixed method approach was utilized. Mixed method designs combine the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative approaches (Heyvaert, Maes, & Onghena; 2013) to provide researchers more flexibility, integrativeness, and inclusiveness to address multifaceted research questions (Saracho, 2017). Therefore, employing the combination of quantitative with qualitative methods is appropriate for research within the dynamic context of early care and education teacher preparation, examining both beliefs and practices that contribute to this preparation. Thus, the current study will address the following research questions:

1. How important do early childhood teacher preparation faculty believe collegiality to be in their preparation of undergraduate early childhood preservice teachers?
 - A. What personal and professional attributes of faculty are associated with reported beliefs?
2. What content and experiences do faculty implement to address collegiality in their undergraduate courses?
 - A. What personal and professional attributes of faculty are associated with implementation?

CHAPTER V

METHODS

The current study used a mixed method design in which both quantitative and qualitative data were gathered from early childhood teacher education faculty members at four-year institutions of higher education. The data were integrated and conclusions were drawn based upon the strengths of data collected using both methodologies in order to address the research questions (Merriam & Tisdale, 2016). This study examined the importance of collegiality in teacher preparation from the perspective of teacher preparation program faculty members, how faculty incorporate collegiality into their instruction of pre-service teachers, and demographic factors associated with these beliefs and implementation.

Sample

This study used purposive sampling to recruit full-time faculty members (tenured/tenure track and clinical) responsible for the instruction of teacher preparation courses from four-year early childhood education (ECE) programs in institutions of higher education. As a large portion of the degreed workforce has bachelor's degrees (Whitebook et al., 2016), and professional organizations are moving toward a four-year educational requirement for field entry (Barnett, 2003; Buettner et al., 2016; Jones, 2017), this study limited its inclusion criteria to full-time, tenured/tenure track and clinical faculty in four-year teacher preparation programs. The sample was recruited from the professional organization of the National Association of Early Childhood Teacher

Educators (NAECTE) which has a stated purpose to advocate for improvements in early childhood teacher education and provide a forum for consideration of issues and concerns of interest to educators of early childhood teacher educators. As this study sought to explore and describe the emphasis that is placed upon preparing students for organizational climate aspects of their work, specifically collegiality, faculty representation from a national organization focused on early childhood teacher preparation is appropriate. All members of the NAECTE organization (approximately 250 total) were recruited to complete a survey addressing the research questions. NAECTE maintains members of various titles in relation to early childhood teacher preparation (e.g., graduate students, active faculty members, and retired faculty); therefore, participation in the current study was limited to active faculty (full-time, tenured/tenure track, and clinical) of bachelor's degree programs in early childhood education at four-year institutions of higher education.

The current study has a sample size of 41 faculty members (63.4% tenured, 24.4% tenure-track, and 12.2% clinical) who were predominantly white (82.9%) and female (90.2%), ranged in age from 30 to over 70, and years of experience in higher education from four to 46 years ($\bar{x} = 15.5$ years). Participants demographic information is displayed in Table 1. A subsample (9 NAECTE members) was interviewed to provide a rich description of the emphasis on collegiality in teacher preparation. Within this subset of nine faculty members, 66.7% were tenured, while 33.3% were on a tenure-track. Additionally, those participating in the interview portion of the study were predominantly white (88.9%) and female (88.9%), ranged in age from 40 to 69, and years of experience in higher education from four to 31 years ($\bar{x} = 15.4$ years) which aligns with the characteristics of the survey sample.

Measures

An initial survey with closed ended and open ended response options was administered to participants to examine the beliefs that teacher preparation program faculty members have regarding the importance of including collegiality as a practice to be taught in teacher preparation, the ways in which faculty members implement content and practices related to collegiality into their coursework for preservice teachers, and the personal and professional characteristics of the faculty members associated with these beliefs and implementation. A semi-structured interview protocol was used to provide further explanation of these beliefs and implementation.

The use of mixed methodology provides researchers with the opportunity to collect complementary data to examine complex constructs in rich detail. Qualitative researchers have long faced claims of validity issues as the very nature of the data being collected is subjective. Specifically, interview data are purely the depiction of the informant's perception at that specific moment in time; the timing of the interview and the data collected will be influenced by a range of cultural, historical, personal, and social factors (Ernest, 2014; Merriam & Tisdale, 2016). Through the use of a mixed methodological approach, and more specifically an explanatory sequential design, quantitative data were collected initially followed by qualitative data from an in-depth interview in an effort to further explain initial results, (Castro, Kellison, Boyd, & Kopak, 2010; Creswell, 2015; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1996; Merriam & Tisdale, 2016).

A common tool used within research designs, and especially mixed methodological designs, is that of triangulation. MacNaughton, Rolfe, and Siraj (2010) proposed types of triangulation to consist of: data triangulation (use of a variety of data sources in a study), methodological triangulation (the use of multiple methods to study a

single problem), investigator triangulation (the use of several researchers), and finally theory triangulation (the use of multiple perspectives to interpret a single set of data). Within the early care and education field, two forms of triangulation are most prevalent: data and methodological. This study practiced data and methodological triangulation through surveys and interviews administered to teacher preparation program faculty in order to understand the implicit and explicit incorporation of collegiality in faculty's instruction of preservice teachers. Additionally, this study practiced investigator triangulation as one additional research associate assisted with the qualitative analyses. The following sections describe the quantitative and qualitative measures used within the current study.

Survey Measure. A survey was created in Qualtrics to gather information about faculty member demographics (e.g. age range, race/ethnicity, tenured/tenure track or clinical position), faculty members' beliefs regarding the importance of teaching collegiality in their undergraduate teacher preparation courses, and their implementation of content and practices related to collegiality. The survey consisted of 45 questions that took participants approximately 30-45 minutes to complete. Thirty of these questions were scored based upon a Likert-type scale, while 10 were formatted as yes/no questions that asked participants to elaborate on their response and five questions were open-ended. See Appendix A for the survey measure.

Several of the questions for this survey were based on Shah's (2011) Teacher Collegiality Scale (TCS). The TCS measure was created to quantify the research related to teacher collegiality, research that is most often conducted through case studies. The TCS was constructed and validated through exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses; and, it is comprised of seven subscales which include: demonstrating mutual

support and trust; observing one another teaching; joint planning and assessment; sharing ideas and expertise; teaching each other; developing curriculum together; and sharing resources. The survey created for the current study was a means to gain more insight into faculty's perspectives of collegiality in teacher preparation, therefore, additional areas were included in the current survey to expand the focus beyond individual's experiences of collegiality.

For the purpose of the current research, the subscales of the TCS served as a foundation for the development of questions to examine the opportunities faculty members take to implement content and practices related to dimensions of collegiality within their own courses. For example, the TCS subscale: *joint planning and assessment* provided the basis for a question to read: "Do you provide opportunities within your undergraduate teacher preparation courses for students to jointly plan teaching strategies and learning experiences to use in their practica?" and the *observing one another teaching* subscale formulated a question to read: "Do you provide opportunities within your undergraduate teacher preparation courses for students to observe one another teaching?". Examples of additional questions that were included in the survey based upon the TCS are: "How important is collegiality to you within your role as a professional?" "In your own your educational training, how much emphasis was placed upon being collegial with colleagues?" "Do you incorporate content related to collegiality within your undergraduate teacher preparation courses?" and "If yes, what content"; "If no, what keeps you from incorporating such content into your undergraduate teacher preparation courses?"

A pilot version of the survey was administered to two personal contacts of the principal investigator within higher education prior to data collection to ensure clarity and

appropriateness of the questions. The pilot survey was created in Qualtrics and sent electronically to these contacts for their initial review. The contacts were asked to take notes of any issues they encountered or questions that arose during administration of the survey. Upon completion, the principal investigator reached out to these contacts via phone or google hangout to discuss their feedback and determine appropriate adjustments to the survey. Minor changes were made to the survey based on the feedback of these contacts (e.g., further explicating the differentiation between program and department faculty).

As the survey questions were formatted as multiple choice, Likert-type scale items, or open-ended items, there was great complexity in the process of scoring that resulted in frequencies from the multiple-choice items, ranges as well as frequencies from the Likert-Type scale items, and themes from the open-ended items. These results helped to shape the interview guide and will be integrated throughout the description of the qualitative data results.

Interviews. Survey responses were reviewed and used to further develop the interview guide of questions exploring faculty members' beliefs and implementation of content and experiences related to collegiality, and factors associated with these beliefs and implementation. Semi-structured interviews are the most common type of interview used within the qualitative research and were used in the current study. This interview structure has a basic topic and line of questioning to open the lines of communication, but, is perceptive to what the respondent has to say and prompts for further information (Merriam & Tisdale 2016).

When employing interviews as a means of data collection, question development is a crucial component of the research endeavor as the questions asked will determine

the data that will be gathered, and the conclusions derived from the data. The wording of these questions is crucial to the type of information they will elicit as well as to the participants' understanding of what is being asked of them (Merriam & Tisdale, 2016). The wording of the questions must also be considered so as not to impose meaning. As researchers, we may enter into the field with preconceived notions of what it means to be collegial or how collegiality is defined; but, the goal of qualitative research is "to find out what is in and on someone else's mind" (Patton, 2015, as cited in Merriam & Tisdale, 2016, p. 108). Therefore, the wording of each question must ensure that the question does not limit participants' responses. Questions included: "In the survey, you defined collegiality as *{inserted participant's response.}*. Can you tell me more about that?", "Is there any variation in how you define collegiality across yourself, others or your students?", "What skills do you think are important to faculty and students to have in their repertoire in order to practice collegiality?" "When do you think students develop (or should develop) the skills to be collegial?", "In your response you mentioned *{activities mentioned within the survey}* What goals did you have in mind for your students when creating these activities?", "What do you see as the biggest challenges for students developing collegiality?", "Do you think future employers are looking for skills in collegiality when they are hiring? Do you think collegiality is something that future employers value or expect? Why or why not?", "Are there ways the field should be responding to this as an area for growth?".

An interview guide with topics and prompting questions (see Appendix B) was constructed based upon the analysis of the survey responses detailing the rating of importance that faculty members assign collegiality within teacher preparation and the degree of alignment between these beliefs and implementation within the different

courses they instruct. The questions allowed the researcher to explore more in depth and garner more explanation as to what faculty members are doing to incorporate collegiality into their instruction of pre-service early childhood teachers and why they are approaching it in the reported manner. These interviews required approximately 30 minutes of each participant's time and were completed virtually via WebEx.

Formulated questions were reviewed and piloted with a co-director of the early childhood teacher preparation program at the principal investigator's university. This process included the initial list of developed questions being sent electronically to the co-director for an independent review. They were asked to note any questions they have, issues that arise, or questions that might need to be included as they thought through the answers they might provide to these questions. The principal investigator then met with the co-director to discuss their thoughts and address concerns with question wording and sequence as well as develop prompts that would be helpful to gather more information from participants.

Procedure

Upon the approval of the Institutional Review Board at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, NAECTE's listserv for members was used to recruit participants for this study. Permission to access the NAECTE's listserv had been granted prior to recruitment. As the listserv did not consistently differentiate between level of membership (i.e. graduate students, active faculty, or retired faculty), the entirety of the listserv was contacted via an email providing a written explanation of the purpose of the study, their opportunity to be involved, and a link to the Qualtrics survey. Within the description of the study, the inclusion criteria were listed and individuals were asked to self-select into the study based upon those criteria. An additional layer of verification

was embedded to determine their level of membership in NAECTE to ensure that only full-time, tenured/tenure track and clinical faculty in four-year teacher preparation programs proceeded in the survey.

Within this email, participants were provided a link to the survey with consent embedded in the survey. The principal researcher monitored responses for completion and one week after the initial email was sent, a second email was sent, including the survey description and link, to the teacher preparation program faculty member to remind them of the study and their opportunity to participate. The principal researcher requested that surveys be completed within two weeks of participants' receipt of it.

Once completed, the survey provided demographic data (i.e. race, age, position title) and information related to each faculty member's specific beliefs and implementation of collegiality in undergraduate early childhood teacher preparation. At the conclusion of the survey, a second consent asked participants if they were willing to be contacted for the second method of data collection: semi-structured interviews. A subset of the original sample (N=16) agreed to participate in an interview to provide further explanation of these beliefs and implementation. The entirety of the subsample willing to participate was contacted to participate; however only nine of those 16 responded.

The interviews were conducted using a Webex software which allowed meetings to be conducted virtually and recorded; each interview was transcribed. This procedure provided the opportunity for the researcher to build rapport with the participant, as they can read visual clues and ensure that the participant is comfortable disclosing information, while also providing more accessibility for participation (Novick, 2008). Further, use of recording ensured the accuracy and authenticity of the participant's

words when transcribing the data. The process of transcription provided time with the data in order to pull back the layers of what has been communicated through the interview. Following Seidman's recommendation (2013), it was necessary to transcribe the entirety of the interview, rather than selected portions, as these may be cause for premature judgements regarding what the participant has shared so that data reduction can occur inductively rather than deductively.

Analysis Plan

To recall, the research questions of the study are:

1. How important do early childhood teacher preparation faculty believe collegiality to be in their preparation of undergraduate early childhood pre-service teachers?
 - A. What personal and professional attributes of faculty are associated with reported beliefs?
2. What content and experiences do faculty implement to address collegiality in their undergraduate courses?
 - A. What personal and professional attributes of faculty are associated with implementation?

The following sections presents the analysis plan for the quantitative and qualitative data collected through survey and interview measures. The descriptive analyses that provided the average ratings of and contributing factors to faculty's beliefs regarding the importance of, the frequency and implementation strategies of their incorporation of collegial content and practices into their teacher preparation courses, and associations between these beliefs and implementation with their personal and professional characteristics, respectively are described.

Quantitative Data Analysis

Demographic data from the teacher preparation program faculty collected from survey responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics (i.e., means, standard deviations, frequencies) and ANOVAs. Data collected through Likert-type questions and multiple-choice questions from the survey were also analyzed using descriptive statistics (i.e., means, standard deviations, and correlations) to describe faculty members' beliefs about collegiality and implementation of content and practices related to collegiality in their courses. For example, questions such as "How important is collegiality to you within your role as a professional?", "How important do you believe collegiality content/learning opportunities are to the preparation of early childhood teachers?", and "How effective do you think these practices are for undergraduate students in developing collegiality?" were examined using means, standard deviations, and ranges of the participants' responses. Questions such as "Do you respect the professional competence of your colleagues?" and "Do you incorporate specific content related to collegiality within your undergraduate teacher preparation courses?" were analyzed using frequencies. Correlations and ANOVAs, respectively, were used to examine associations and differences across personal and professional characteristics and survey responses focused on beliefs or implementation of practices related to collegiality.

Sixteen of the 41 participants indicated a willingness to participate in an interview regarding their beliefs and implementation of collegial content and practices. Each of these 16 participants were recruited for the interview portion of this study, however, only nine participants consented to participate when contacted. The data from the survey

also helped refine an interview guide to delve deeper into the interviewees' responses and gain more information about the meaning of their survey responses.

Qualitative Data Analysis

Qualitative analyses provided important information that expanded and elaborated on faculty's incorporation of collegiality within teacher preparation courses as emphasized in the survey. For instance, to gain a rich description of how content or practices related to collegiality are implemented within their specific course participants were asked "Tell me more about your course". The data collected from the transcription of the interviews and open-ended responses from the survey were examined using an iterative process which entails a cursory examination of the transcriptions, followed by a more thorough examination to find recurring themes across the content of the transcripts. Thus, a combination of content and thematic analysis was used. Content analysis required an organizing of information into categories pre-determined by the research questions (in this case content related to beliefs and implementation related to collegiality) within the first-pass of reviewing the transcripts (Bowen, 2009). Such a technique allowed meaningful and relevant text to be identified through the data yielded (e.g., excerpts, quotations, or entire passages) (Letts et al., 2007). For example, themes amongst the ratings of importance assigned to including collegiality as a practice in early childhood teacher preparation were of interest. Thematic analysis, or a recognition of patterns within the determined categories incorporated the emerging themes into smaller categories for analysis (Bowen 2009). As such, this process resulted in both overarching and emerging themes that will be detailed in the results section.

To address reliability, the principal researcher engaged in the process of bracketing to address previous knowledge, biases, and assumptions regarding the

research topic. Furthermore, one additional research associate was given a clean copy of a randomly selected 20 percent of the transcriptions (i.e., with a subset of N=9, two transcriptions were shared; Barbour, 2001) and asked to analyze them using both content and thematic analyses. Having an additional researcher examine the transcriptions also helped to address the influence of researcher bias and uncover additional themes that may have been missed if only one researcher had reviewed and analyzed the interview data. To reach inter-rater agreement, the researchers met after individually reviewing each of the two transcriptions to examine a randomly selected excerpt from each transcript. These excerpts were discussed to share each researchers' perception of emergent themes and ensure similar interpretation of the data.

Codes were developed for the interview data after both researchers convened to discuss and agree upon the emergent themes. For this study, frequency scale coding (Castro et al., 2010), which involves noting the prevalence of a theme throughout participants' responses, was used to examine how prevalent the themes related to collegiality emerge within the documents. For example, reference to a lack of time or resources may have emerged as a theme and frequency scale coding revealed how often this theme emerged across the transcripts. The frequency of these codes and the content within the themes provided valuable insight as to the beliefs and implementation of collegiality as a practice to be included in undergraduate early childhood teacher preparation from the perspective of program faculty. Both researchers confirmed emergent themes from the interviews; these themes were then coded separately by the principal researcher, reading back through the data to identify excerpts related to each theme. Results from these analyses provided insight to the specific reasoning behind

why faculty held the beliefs that they do as well as why and how they implement activities related to collegiality in their courses.

In addition to this strategy, the principal researcher utilized Glaser and Strauss' (1967) method of constant comparative analysis to further examine the themes related to beliefs and implementation of collegiality as a practice in undergraduate early childhood teacher preparation present in the interview analysis. This method incorporates four stages: "(1) comparing incidents applicable to each category, (2) integrating categories and their properties, (3) delimiting the theory, and (4) writing the theory" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 105). Therefore, the interview data were examined for similarities and differences with respect to beliefs and implementation related to collegiality within their courses to provide a rich description of faculty's perspective of this construct's incorporation to teacher preparation, barriers and obstacles to implementation, and more specifically the rating of importance that faculty members believe collegiality as a practice to have for teacher preparation to determine overarching themes from the data.

The methodological and analytical approaches used within this study take into consideration the tenets of the bioecological model framework (proximal processes, person, context [Microsystem, Mesosystem, Exosystem, Macrosystem], and time [Micro- and Meso-time]) that guide the current study. Proximal processes as defined by this study are specific practices (e.g., coursework, collaborations) implemented by teacher preparation program faculty to address collegiality throughout their training of future teachers and role as a teacher educator. Participants are teacher preparation program faculty who have developed a framework for understanding collegiality through their own resources, interactions across contexts and processes over time. Through a mixed

methodological design, using surveys and interviews, the data gathered provided insight into the processes, people, contexts, and time that contribute to how faculty incorporate collegiality into early childhood teacher preparation.

In conclusion, the data analyses resulted in a specific organization of the findings that first explores faculty's personal definitions and experiences of collegiality. As mentioned previously, beliefs are based upon evaluations and judgement and represent an individual's perception of reality with "enough validity, truth, or credibility to guide thought and behavior" (Pajares 1992, p. 313). Thus, examining faculty's definitions and experiences of collegiality was necessary prior to examining the research questions of this study focusing on their beliefs regarding the importance of and incorporation of collegial content and practices within teacher preparation.

CHAPTER VI

RESULTS

Throughout this section, the data gathered from the Qualtrics survey from 41 participants (see Tables 2, 3 and 4 for descriptive data) and data from nine transcribed interviews are integrated. Emergent themes from the qualitative data are discussed throughout the results, while the overarching themes related to collegiality are presented at the end of this section. These data serve to describe how important early childhood teacher preparation faculty members believe collegiality is in their preparation of pre-service teachers, the ways in which they incorporate content and practices related to collegiality into their preparation of preservice teachers, and the personal and professional characteristics of faculty members associated with these beliefs and implementation. The results presented in the following paragraphs take into account how collegiality is personally defined by study participants and a description of participants' own experiences of collegiality. before moving onto specific data concerning the research questions of this study.

Defining Collegiality

Given that many conceptual definitions of collegiality are present in extant literature (Freedman, 2009; Jarzabkowski, 2002; Jorde-Bloom, 1988b; Kelchtermans, 2006; Shah, 2011), it was not surprising that this term is also variably defined amongst faculty members. Specifically, one participant noted: "collegiality is not a word we use a lot...there are probably other words we could use to describe some of these same

processes;” while another participant noted “I talk about other things. I talk about collaboration, I talk about partnership and I talk about mentorship, that I don’t know that I would have defined as collegiality.”

Definitions of collegiality from participants’ survey responses, frequently included words such as “trust”, “respect”, “collaboration” “positive interaction” “relationship”, “communication” “reciprocity”, “shared goals”, and “valued contributions”. Survey responses indicated that participants reported viewing themselves as highly collegial ($\bar{x} = 4.73$, $sd = .449$) on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) Likert-type scale with only responses of 4 and 5 being reported for this question. Conversely, participants responded they could only sometimes prioritize the time to be collegial within their workplace ($\bar{x} = 3.73$, $sd = .807$) with some faculty responding that they rarely are able to prioritize such time (2), while some responded that they are always able to prioritize the time to be collegial (5). Using the PPCT framework to help further explicate these definitions, elements of both person and process are important contributors to study participants’ definitions of collegiality. This concept will be further addressed in the discussion section.

To further explore these definitions, interview participants were asked to elaborate on their personal definitions of collegiality which provided insight into how these definitions are associated with faculty members’ experiences of and beliefs about the importance of collegiality. Faculty members’ experiences and beliefs about the importance of collegiality and how these contribute to their definitions are discussed in the following two sections respectively.

Faculty's Personal Influential Collegial Experiences

In both the quantitative and qualitative data, two thematic areas of influential collegial experiences emerged. First, the training and mentorship that faculty had received in their educational journey was prominent in their descriptions of the formation of their definitions. Second, faculty members' reported individual experiences as a colleague (both positive and negative) helped to form their definitions of collegiality.

Training Experiences. Although there was a range in responses regarding the emphasis placed upon being collegial with peers in survey participants' educational training ($\bar{x} = 2.98$, $sd = 1.35$, range 1-5) and professional development outside of their current employment ($\bar{x} = 3.54$, $sd = 1.03$, range 1-5), the majority of respondents indicated that explicit opportunities were provided in both their educational training (48.8%) and professional development (51.2%) to practice collegiality. Participants reported that collaborative experiences and assignments, assistantship research teams, and student groups were some of these opportunities in their educational training. With regard to professional development, participants noted, collaboration on committees and boards, networking at conferences, co-authoring manuscripts, involvement with professional organizations and professional learning communities were opportunities to practice collegiality. Participants rated both the opportunities in training ($\bar{x} = 4.60$, $sd = .598$) and professional development ($\bar{x} = 4.71$, $sd = .561$) as moderately-to-extremely worthwhile. One interview participant noted one example of how training experiences were formative to her current view of collegiality:

The influence of mentors is important. So...from my early days in public schools to my doctoral training, I think, you know, having people treat me respectfully and having them willing to listen to my ideas even as a young teacher or...beginning doctoral student; having them see me as an equal or at least making me feel like they did and valuing my ideas and my contribution even if you know, I'm less

experienced or less knowledgeable than they are in a particular area or regarding the situation. So I think having those models influenced me in terms of how I approach my now work with students and colleagues.

Experiences as a Colleague. Survey participants' rated collegiality as very important within their profession ($\bar{x} = 4.49$, $sd = .637$, *Min 3, Max 5*) and often demonstrated respected for colleagues ($\bar{x} = 4.29$, $sd = .680$, *Min 3, Max 5*) and felt respected by their colleagues ($\bar{x} = 4.10$, $sd = .800$, *Min 2, Max 5*). However, there was great variability in participant's experiences as a colleague within their current department and program. Participants agreed that there were feelings of trust and confidence amongst department faculty ($\bar{x} = 4.20$, $sd = .901$, *Min 2, Max 5*) and somewhat felt a sense of belonging within their department faculty ($\bar{x} = 3.66$, $sd = 1.667$). Within their program faculty, participants agreed that there were feelings of trust and confidence ($\bar{x} = 4.34$, $sd = .693$), although there was a range of responses, and somewhat felt a sense of belonging ($\bar{x} = 3.51$, $sd = 1.645$) amongst program faculty. Of note, the full range of the Likert-type scale was used by participants when queried about their sense of belonging to both their department and program. Given the slight differences in means, T-test analyses were conducted to examine differences between faculty perceptions within their program and within their department and revealed statistically significant differences such that faculty have different experiences of collegiality with their department faculty in comparison to their program faculty (see Table 5). The importance of trust and confidence as well as sense of belonging in their program/department was evident in one participant's description of her recent job search:

I recently had an interview for a position and had made it to the point where they wanted to offer me the position and I withdrew my application. I withdrew my

application because of the clear lack of collegiality during the interview process; and, I had a conversation with the hiring committee and with the Dean when they were asking me why I was stopping. I mean who stops right before they're offered a tenure track position, right? I told them that this is really important to me and honestly ...what I felt through this whole process was a lack of respect between peers... I looked at the way they spoke to each other and spoke over me during the interview where I thought, 'Huh, this would be a really hostile working environment for me. I would not feel supported. I would not feel like I had a voice. I would not feel like my voice was valued and I don't think that I would feel respected here' and that's for me where collegiality comes into play as a professional at this level.

Another participant similarly noted:

...having taught in in places where I felt very welcomed and supported by my peers, both as a leader when I've gone in with more experience where others have looked to me for support and as the novice teacher who has gone in completely new and how it feels and how much more successful I am at my job. When I know I have colleagues that I can go to and I can collaborate with and I can bounce ideas off of without judgment and I know that that made me a better teacher, so I am certain that when I teach my students about how they're going to become a good partner to a school, keeping an open mind, being a part of the, the bigger picture of the team feel of a school system, I think that comes through really loud and clear because I've been in the position where I've been very well supported by peers and I've also been not supported at all.

In addition to these individual experiences of collegiality, survey responses were gathered to examine the emphasis placed upon and opportunities provided to practice collegiality within faculty members' respective departments. In this sample, participants reported their department administration to moderately emphasize collegiality amongst faculty ($\bar{x} = 4.15$, $sd = .853$, *Min* 2, *Max* 5); with over half (51.2%) of the survey participants reporting that the department provided explicit opportunities to practice collegiality. Survey responses provided information regarding such opportunities, which included annual faculty retreats, monthly meetings, and committee work; whereas opportunities in which participants sometimes engaged in upon their own accord were: sharing materials related to the courses they teach/or assignments they require ($\bar{x} = 3.58$,

$sd = .549$) and jointly planning teaching strategies or learning experiences for their students ($\bar{x} = 3.17$, $sd = .667$) with some participants responding that these opportunities never occur, and others reporting that such opportunities often occur.

The previous paragraphs have provided background as to how faculty personally define collegiality as well as a description of their own experiences of collegiality. Such definitions and experience have the ability to and may shape faculty members beliefs and practice of collegiality. Therefore, the following paragraphs address the research questions of this study that specifically examine how important faculty members believe collegiality is, and how they incorporate collegial content and practices into their preparation of pre-service teachers.

Beliefs about the Importance of Collegiality

This section addresses research question one which sought to examine how important faculty members believe collegiality is in the preparation of pre-service teachers. As mentioned previously, 41 survey participants' rated collegiality as important within their own profession ($\bar{x} = 4.49$, $sd = .637$, *Min 3, Max 5*); and three themes regarding faculty members' beliefs of the importance of collegiality in teacher preparation emerged. Thus, the following paragraphs detail faculty members' beliefs about collegiality within teacher preparation and examples from the interviews will be shared that support the themes of: 1) education is a team effort, 2) modeling is a necessary component of teacher preparation and 3) the development of skills, that are crucial to the practice of collegiality, is continuous.

Faculty members who participated in the interview shared that a value is assigned to individuals and the contributions they make within the confines of a collegial relationship, such that: "everybody has something to offer and, and you have something

to offer everybody...” Participants indicated that whilst this assignment of value and the relationships resultant of collaborating with colleagues are extremely important in the workplace, in order to foster collegiality, a deeper connection between co-workers is required: “a colleague also attends not only to your professional self, but your personal self.”

Further support of the importance of collegiality and that education is a team effort was evident in the interviews. Seven of the nine interviewed participants shared the belief that the education of young children is a team sport and is not work that can be done alone. Specifically, one interview participant noted:

Because of the amount of teamwork [in education], they're [teachers] working in such a close environment with other teachers and other people, parents and faculty and principals. They have to be able to have those skills...to get along. I always tell my students in every class, 'if you don't like working with people, don't be a teacher.

This point is further explicated by another participant:

Recognizing the work of education is a team sport. It is something that happens in collaboration and through relationships...so the slice and dice model, the whole idea of the factory worker. You do your one part and next-door Miss Smith, will do her one part. Then next-door. Señor Rodriguez will do his solamentè one part...that is such a mechanistic view of schooling and education...and of an approach to teacher preparation.

Thus, this belief of education being a team effort, also extends to the education of future teachers:

It's incredibly important to me as a professional that students recognize that education is a team effort. It's not an individual. And despite my best efforts of wanting to do it all, all the time, I know that I can't work alone and my relationship with my peers is crucial to this, to their success as well as my own.

Relatedly, each of the interviewed faculty and almost half (47.6%) of survey participants shared their belief that modeling was an important part of both their own and cooperating teachers' work in the preparation of pre-service teachers. Such collaboration further demonstrates the necessity of team effort in the education of future teachers. Once again, the components of person and process of the PPCT model can be applied to further explicate faculty's beliefs of the importance of collegiality in teacher preparation such that the relationships that one builds with other teachers help to foster the teamwork that is necessary for the field of education, and the processes through which one develops the skills to be collegial must be practiced and honed. Specifically, one interview participant elaborated: "In the class, and on the job, that's where they [pre-service teachers] really are mastering the art, the heart, the substance of teaching" and in the college classroom, faculty's role is "demonstrating and modeling for students, a way of showing the ability to work well together and be part of a team versus working in isolation." The specific means through which modeling collegiality in teacher preparation can be achieved, however, will be discussed further in the implementation of collegial practices section.

Forty-one survey participants reported collegiality as an important component of teacher education as they rated collegiality content and learning opportunities as very important to the preparation of early childhood teachers ($\bar{x} = 4.73$, $sd = .449$, *Min* 4, *Max* 5); although there was some variability amongst the surveyed participants regarding the context in which the opportunities to develop/hone the skills to be collegial should occur. "We believe the field setting is the best teacher of our students for collegiality - both in seeing it modeled in high quality schools and in having opportunities to practice it themselves" was stated by one survey participant. However, a larger portion of the

surveyed faculty (51.2 %) and each of the nine interviewed participants shared that it was an important part of their work to include opportunities within teacher preparation courses for students to develop and hone the skills to be collegial. One survey participant stated: "Collegiality is important in the teaching profession. Teacher candidates need to see its importance and exercise it in their teacher-prep classrooms." Specifically, one survey participant stated: "In real life, it's ALL group work. This has motivated me to keep providing these opportunities even though they are sometimes not as enthusiastically perceived by students." Additionally, faculty members acknowledged the necessity to continue including collegial content and practices into their courses, and thus, their organizational literacy, as future employers are seeking employees who demonstrate skills that are related to it. To elaborate, one interview participant shared:

Because I get these online, evaluation forms from the districts...a lot of them have areas on here, not so much about what they know, their factual information that they know, but a lot of it has to do with 'how do they get along with people?', 'what type of worker are they?', 'how prompt are they?' All those types of stuff. It's more on the soft skills, than it is often 'do they know their subject matter?

Interviewed faculty were also queried as to which skills they believed were necessary in order to practice collegiality; and of the various skills mentioned, communication skills (listening skills especially), self-awareness, and a willingness to learn were the most frequently noted. Other skills that were discussed included the ability to be empathetic, having an appreciation for diversity, and advocating for yourself and others. However, the development of such skills is an on-going, continual process was a belief about collegiality that the faculty shared. Each of the 9 interview participants discussed that students have a certain level of these skills and prior experience that they bring to the program. Both survey and interview participants

indicated that their respective programs intend to help develop and hone those skills both in the introductions to their program and throughout; but, students still have much to learn once they leave the program and enter the field. Specifically, one interview participant noted “we expect developmental change over time” while a survey participant noted the “connection of theory and practice at the relevant time [is] critical.” These specific points underscore both the belief that the development of the skills to be collegial is an on-going process and that opportunities to connect theory and practice are needed for the development of such skills which will be discussed as an overarching theme.

From these data, it can be gathered that faculty believe collegiality is important to the preparation of pre-service teachers because education requires a team effort. They also believe that modeling is a necessary component of teacher preparation and to students’ development of the skills to be collegial, but also that the development of those skills, is an on-going and continual process. Given these beliefs, the following sections explore faculty members implementation of collegial content and practices into their preparation of pre-service teachers.

Incorporation of Collegial Content and Practices in Teacher Preparation

This section addresses research question two which sought to examine the ways in which faculty members incorporate content and practices related to collegiality into the preparation of pre-service teachers. There was great variability in how faculty included aspects of collegiality in their courses; however, two emergent themes from the qualitative data indicated that both faculty modeling collegiality and students’ participation in course activities and assignments were common ways in which collegiality is incorporated into teacher preparation. Survey responses also support

modeling and coursework as avenues that faculty use to incorporate collegiality into their teacher preparation courses. Considering the PPCT framework, the implementation of these modeling and coursework opportunities constitute the process component of the bioecological systems theory. Therefore, the following sections are guided by specific practices (processes such as modeling and course activities/assignments) faculty members incorporate into their courses and the implementation of those practices (from survey and interview data). Interview data are also included to provide insight into how faculty evaluate those practices and the ways in which faculty feel collegiality could be further addressed.

Modeling. Faculty noted the importance of modeling collegiality for their students because “we not only need to create and structure the assignments, but we also need to scaffold their understanding of what it means [to be collegial].” Each of the nine interview participants delineated modeling as an important contribution to pre-service teachers’ preparation; however, three different contexts of where such modeling might occur were shared by the interview participants. First, faculty mentioned that they model collegiality for students by demonstrating collegiality amongst themselves as a department or program faculty and reflecting a respectful and cohesive work environment. Then, within their respective courses, faculty members model collegiality through their interactions with students and their explicit course policies regarding interactions with both the instructor and fellow students. Specifically, a survey participant noted: “I discuss and model how to appropriately interact in the group. (such as: putting down the cell phone, learning forward, nodding the head, taking turns, positive body language and facial expressions, etc.).” Finally, through students’ field

experiences while in the program and their observation of cooperating teachers, faculty shared:

From observation in the early field experiences and then once they're in practicum and student teaching experiences, they're looking at the other adults in the room and saying, 'oh, I've got to find ways to communicate and I have to find ways to engage and I have to find ways to work together and achieve the same mission...

Course Activities and Assignments. Activities or assignments faculty members use to incorporate or address collegial content and practices consisted of group assignments (100% of faculty use this method), providing peer feedback (90.5%), sharing what students have learned/want to learn (90.5%), sharing students' successes and challenges of their practicums (85.7%), joint planning of teaching strategies to use in field-based experiences (83.3%), and peer observation (52.4%). An objective of incorporating content and practices related to collegiality into teacher preparation is to help students understand "...how to be a good colleague, fellow student and to relate to the cooperating teachers and staff and administration out in the schools," less than half of the survey participants indicated intentionality behind their inclusion this type of content (45.2%) and practices (47.6%) into their teacher preparation courses. Specifically, one survey participant noted, "I think I provide my experiences where collegiality could occur, but I do not feel that I have been as intentional as I probably could and should," whereas another survey participant stated: "I recognize the importance of collegiality and other professional dispositions that are emphasized in our program. I can see where intentional focus on collegiality and opportunities for practice could be expanded." Further, there was a range of variability within participants perceptions of whether or not such content ($\bar{x} = 4.05$, $sd = .705$, *Min* 3, *Max* 5) or

practices ($\bar{x} = 3.00$, $sd = 1.522$, *Min* 1, *Max* 5) were effective for helping students to develop skills to demonstrate collegiality; thus, the next section will detail faculty members' implementation and evaluation of those content and activities.

Implementation of Collegial Content/Practices in Teacher Preparation. In addition to the method and frequency in which activities or assignments related to collegiality were incorporated into teacher preparation courses, specific support and barriers to faculty members' incorporation of collegial practices will be detailed in the following paragraphs.

Method and Frequency. Within faculty members' courses, 41 survey participants reported often including assignments that require group work ($\bar{x} = 4.44$, $sd = .634$, *Min* 3, *Max* 5); and, a large majority (83.3%) of those respondents also indicated that they provide opportunities for students to become familiar beyond the initial course introductions before assigning work requiring group interaction. Frequent community building exercises, in class discussions/activities (an activity to visually introduce similar work preferences, garnering student input) and the use of cohort models were shared as means through which the opportunity to become more familiar is accomplished. Descriptions provided in the survey responses revealed that peer feedback occurred mostly through peer evaluations after a group assignment; and, one interview participant shared aspects of their detailed peer feedback evaluation forms which included ratings for 1) relationship levels, 2) communication and commitment, 3) shared resources to achieve goals, 4) cooperation, as well as essay portions to evaluate group members' qualities of collaboration and contribution and a description of how the responsibilities were divided between the group. Other forms of peer feedback, however, included reviews of draft assignments/revisions after explicit modeling, and "gallery walks" of

student made materials. Survey respondents indicated that the frequency of such opportunities vary from once a week to once a semester dependent upon both the type and content of the course in which they are implemented. Opportunities for students to share their experiences were achieved through reflection and open classroom discussion, surveys, journal reflections, and discussion boards online; such opportunities occur often or always in the respondents' courses. Some specific assignments faculty members described to elaborate on these sharing opportunities were: 1) assigned communication journals/logs that allowed students and cooperating teachers to share learning experiences, clarify feedback, or ask questions as needed and 2) interview assignments that require students to seek out professionals in the field and gain insight into what their future may hold as a teacher and then share through a more formal class discussion, and 3) reviewing the NAEYC code of ethics and requiring students to interview in-service teachers or administrators about a situation in which they had to apply the Code of Ethics in their work, bringing this information back to share with the class.

Joint planning opportunities encompassed activities including cooperative lesson planning, co-teaching, and brainstorming sessions during class time and occur from a range of once a semester to six times per semester. Conversely, peer observation was achieved through several means. First, peers might observe one another through video review, where they watch a lesson/activity led by their peer and then provide feedback. Another avenue of peer observation is that of direct, classroom instruction in the university classroom where students are tasked with creating lesson plans and delivering them in front of their peers. Some practicum classrooms, however, employ the co-teaching model which provides students the opportunity to observe a peer

teaching more organically within a classroom setting. There was, however, some variability in responses based on the intentional incorporation of this strategy or if it happened haphazardly. The frequency of these particular opportunities ranged from once a semester to “many”.

Supports. Specific supports that enabled interviewed faculty members to enhance their focus on collegiality in their teacher preparation courses include policies and recommended practices at both the field level and within the university, department, and/or program communities. At the field level, several of interview participants mentioned that the field of early childhood education is moving to and recognizing communities of practice and the importance of working alongside and respecting colleagues as cited in the NAEYC code of ethics. Participants in both the survey and interview portions of this study indicated that they refer to the NAEYC code of ethics in their preparation of pre-service teachers and discuss the responsibilities teachers have to their co-workers within their places of employment.

More locally, university and program policies such as open discourse and disposition policies, in addition to university practices (requiring enrolled students to complete self-assessments such as “Strengthsfinder”), and departmental practices (e.g., calendar sharing, procedures for admittance to major) are supports in place that enable teacher preparation faculty to enhance their focus on collegiality. Additionally, collaboration with students’ site placements (e.g., mentor trainings, triangulating feedback for students) and individually pursued opportunities for professional development (e.g., Leaders in Action, Educational Technology trainings) were mentioned as other avenues of support for faculty to focus on collegiality.

Barriers. Three major barriers to faculty members' incorporation of collegial content and practices emerged from the quantitative and qualitative data. First, time was an ever-present concern of faculty members; however, this concern is multi-layered. The initial concern of time for faculty members centered on the time they had with their students. Specifically, one participant noted:

That's still hard because some of it is stuff they're coming to us with and, or skills that they don't yet have. And when you only have them for a semester, for three hours of their week, there's not always enough time there to see true progress.

While another participant shared concern over their students' time in practicum placements:

It's like they, they just get to a point where they are comfortable in a setting and get to know people and then all of a sudden the semester ends and we put them somewhere else.

The final layer of concern with time centered on students' ability to truly hone those skills over time in their work settings after leaving the program. Many participants believed that their students were 'primed' to be collegial, but that the level to which students continued to develop in this area was largely dependent upon the student themselves, where they were employed and the climate there. One participant shared:

I worry that in those first couple of years that they largely stay on the surface and it's not until they have been at a school for awhile and have formed relationships with people where they get to the deeper level of what it means to be collegial and collaborative with others. And again, I think it really involves like the right mix of people.

Another barrier to incorporating collegial content and practices into teacher preparation courses were the courses themselves. Within the survey, participants were

asked to describe their course load and their responses showed that the majority of the courses they were responsible for were methods courses (39.5%), followed by practicum courses (23.7%), content courses (20.2%), and child development courses (16.7%) respectively. The majority of these courses were also face-to-face (72.8%), in the middle of students' programs (43%) and typically enrolled 20-30 students per course (85.1%). These course descriptions are important because the interviewed faculty members elaborated on each of these aspects as barriers in their incorporation of collegiality. With respect to the content of the course, one participant noted:

Oftentimes it's really easy as a college professor to get caught up with the content of what you're doing and if you have or don't have a field experience could make a difference because... then I think that there might be more of an opportunity to bring that up than in a class say science methods or something like that where you're so focused on getting the content done in 15 weeks.

Thus, this participant viewed the inclusion of a field experience was important for the incorporation of content and practices related to collegiality and felt that other content courses required a different focus, thus creating a barrier to including content/practices related to collegiality. Another participant noted: "there's probably a lot of assumptions that come into that, like in a content course, like maybe it's not my job to teach them to be nice to one another."

Other concerns with courses being a barrier to incorporating content and practices that focus on collegiality were related to the format and size of the courses. Specifically, several participants noted that from both their own and shared student perspectives, such content or activities were much easier to implement and participate in within smaller face-to-face courses. As the rise of technology is encouraging many programs to move to hybrid or online models, the faculty shared their understanding of

this concept's importance to teacher preparation in the virtual world but felt that they had to be much more intentional to include content and practices related to collegiality in their online courses compared to their face-to-face instruction. Additionally, multiple faculty members mentioned that general education courses tend to subscribe to a 'sit and get' model that does not require students to actively participate in their learning experiences. Additionally, much of the technological advances of today, while certainly increasing our efficiency, have negatively impacted our ability to interact with one another as those social skills are not as formally or frequently practiced in face to face or online courses. Faculty members noted students frequent use of "group-me", texting, Google Docs, and Wikis as an obstacle to their incorporation of collegial content and practices into their teacher preparation courses as it allowed students to complete assignments without ever having to truly interact and collaborate.

A final barrier that was described by faculty members was that students do not yet grasp the value of the concept of collegiality and its role in their future work as educators. Specifically, one participant stated: "a lot of what we do as teacher educators, they don't really understand the impact of it until later and that's probably true for especially these professionalism type of skills." This particular barrier reinforces the shared belief from interviewed faculty that the development of the skills necessary to be collegial is an on-going process.

Faculty Members' Evaluation of Their Incorporation of Collegial Content/Practices. As evaluation holds a prominent position in teacher education, it was necessary to also examine how early childhood teacher preparation faculty members evaluate the content and practices they incorporate related to collegiality into their courses.

Overwhelmingly, faculty members discussed the usefulness of their programs' disposition policies which ultimately influence students' demonstration of collegiality as these policies often detail programs' expectations of student's professional behaviors when interacting with faculty, peers, and cooperating teachers and serve to hone students' interpersonal skills. Yet, many also discussed the variation in how such policies are woven throughout their program. Some noted that dispositions are a prominent aspect of their preparation program that are discussed and revisited frequently, while others noted that it seemed to be more of a reactive process that was only addressed if those dispositional expectations were not met by students. Nevertheless, having set expectations for students' behavior in writing and formal procedures in place were helpful from the faculty's perspective. Additionally, the collaboration between students' site placements and their cooperating teachers, assisted faculty members in being able to triangulate feedback for students on their performance based on these policies, which contribute to students' collegiality. Course-focused forms of evaluation centered around students' individual reflections of their learning. Items such as learner contracts, self-monitoring activities, or journal reflections were used to accomplish evaluation of the content or activities faculty incorporated. To reiterate, this evaluation focuses on the effectiveness of the activities or practices themselves, rather than an assessment of students' collegiality.

Faculty members shared their reticence to provide a graded assessment for students' development of collegiality because their perspective of the students' performance and growth in collegiality is limited to the interactions they have with them: "I obviously can't be there for every, every interaction they have. So I think self-assessment is really important, in this domain." Additionally, the development of the

skills to be collegial, while requiring relationships and interaction, is still very dependent upon an individual:

I think my students that are more comfortable in the craft [teaching] itself and understand teaching and learning and understand children, tend to be more collegial because they trust themselves and they trust each other. The students that don't feel strong, don't graduate feeling like scholars, don't graduate feeling competent, they're more insecure again with maturity and they might be less likely to be collegial.

Further, as the skills to be collegial are ever-developing, as is the work of being a teacher, the opportunity to reflect is an essential element of this development.

Specifically, one participant stated: "I think the reflective process is probably more important there for them than it is for me to say, 'well I thought you were this. And I hear that.' Instead it's better for it to come from them."

Given these reflections, it was of interest to examine how collegiality might be further addressed in teacher preparation; thus a specific question posed to interview participants was: "Are there ways the field should be responding to this as an area for growth? How might this best be encouraged?" The following section details those responses from interview participants.

Addressing Collegiality Further in Teacher Preparation. As a means to determine how faculty's intentionality regarding collegiality might be addressed, interviewed faculty were asked "Are there ways the field should be responding to this as an area for growth? How might this best be encouraged?" Suggestions reported by faculty centered on embedding professional development opportunities throughout and beyond students' enrollment (e.g., promoting student and graduate groups to build community); re-evaluating the practicum and student-teaching requirements (e.g., extended time in practicum classrooms or pairing students across semesters with

specific cooperating teachers to provide time to build the necessary relationship to be collegial); and finally incorporating self-care.

Related to the professional development and community building, faculty overwhelmingly expressed the value of following up with graduates of their programs. Although the ways in which this is achieved is quite variable (if even achieved at all), many participants noted that in their time with students they are not afforded the opportunity to see the extent of student's collegiality development, and that much of the experience that helps students to be collegial will occur on the job; thus, having connections to graduates once in the field would be a helpful way for graduates to share their experience and for faculty to evaluate the collegial content and practices they incorporate into their teacher preparation courses. Specifically, one participant shared the importance of seeking out the graduate perspective in that:

We are the professors. We are the gray haired and the experienced. But they bring passion, and they bring interest, and they want to get a degree and get a job, but they also want to learn and join the profession. So, we need to get better at asking them to guide the profession, to direct us, to create explanations of it.

In regard to incorporating self-care, one interview participant noted:

We pay a lot of attention to how we treat families and parents, but we probably don't spend as much time talking about how we interact with other professionals and I sometimes wonder if that's why people don't stay in the field...It seems like the people who stay are the ones who like really find a home and find the right setting the right people to work with.

Other participants noted the inclusion of a social and emotional focus for children in the NAEYC draft standards but felt that a focus on the social and emotional experiences of teachers was lacking. "Teaching can be very isolating" stated one interview participant;

and thus, forging relationships on both a personal and professional level with colleagues is certainly an element of self-care. One participant shared:

I'm in a department with counselor educators and one of the things that has struck me is that in counselor ed, they have in their code of ethics, and their guidelines for professional practice, items that address self-care and we do not. And I think as a field that's a pretty big oversight.

Associations Between Faculty Members' Characteristics and Beliefs and Implementation Related to Collegiality

To address the aspect of the research questions of how faculty members' personal and professional characteristics associate with their beliefs and implementation related to collegiality, correlations between the survey items of interest were analyzed. No significant differences and limited associations (see Table 6) were found between surveyed faculty members' personal (race, ethnicity, gender, age, or education) or professional (current role in teacher preparation, position title, years of experience or department type) characteristics and their incorporation of collegial content and practices into teacher preparation. Departmental practices were also included in these analyses as these are related to the professional characteristics of the sample. Low to moderate associations were found between a number of the study participants professional characteristics and their beliefs of the importance of and incorporation of collegial content in teacher preparation. For example, moderate correlations exist between believing there was a feeling trust and confidence among program faculty and faculty members requiring students to provide peer feedback in their undergraduate teacher preparation courses ($r= 0.414$, $p= .01$). Associations were also present between the feeling trust and confidence among department faculty and 1) the frequency of group work assigned with the intention of fostering collegiality ($r= 0.371$, $p= .05$) and 2) faculty

members providing students the opportunity to be open with their peers regarding their successes and challenges in their practicums ($r= 0.346$, $p= .05$). In regard to professional development opportunities that faculty members sought on their own (outside of university, departmental, or program requirements), weak to moderate correlations exist between an explicit emphasis on collegiality being present in their professional development opportunities and 1) providing opportunities for students to share their successes and challenges ($r= 0.415$, $p= .01$), and 2) faculty members intentional incorporation of content related to collegiality in their undergraduate teacher preparation courses ($r= 0.447$, $p= .01$).

As these data indicate weak to moderate, but still significant, associations between faculty members' personal and professional characteristics, it was important to examine the data both thoroughly and broadly. Thus, the following section provides overarching themes derived from the previously reported data to further describe faculty's inclusion of collegiality into teacher preparation.

Overarching Themes

Examining data regarding faculty's personal definitions and experiences of collegiality, their beliefs regarding the importance of collegiality in teacher preparation, and their implementation of content and practices related to collegiality in teacher preparation courses resulted in the emergence of two major overarching themes throughout the previously reported data that are: 1) Collegiality is integral to the field of education, because relationships, and the interactions that build them, are essential components to teaching, and 2) Opportunity is both a necessary element for pre-service teachers to develop the skills to be collegial and a constraint for teacher preparation faculty members to incorporate collegiality into their courses.

First, faculty members' personal definitions and description of their experiences of collegiality (whether positive or negative) were characterized by words such as "relationship," "contribution," "value," "respect," and "having a voice" or "feeling heard;" from these descriptions of collegiality, it seemed relationships and the necessary interactions to build them were central to faculty members beliefs about collegiality and demonstrate the person and process elements of the PPCT model. This notion is supported by faculty's reflection of their experiences and concerns for the students they are sending out into the field: "there's the danger of not having good professional relationships, not collaborating with other people who, who know you or have the same philosophical orientation and help you, you know, be like a touchstone." Positive interactions and relationships contribute to collegiality within the workplace as support and encouragement are provisions of such relationships.

In regard to opportunity being both a necessary element for pre-service teachers to develop the skills to be collegial and a constraint for teacher preparation faculty members to provide such occasions in their courses, faculty members training experiences helped to instill, cultivate, and hone the skills faculty still employ today in their current roles; however, because of the multifaceted work of teaching and multiple demands upon faculty (e.g., meeting CAEP standards, ensuring lectures are prepared, conducting research, being involved in committee work, etc.) the time in which faculty have to truly practice *and model* collegiality is limited. "Time is an issue...finding space to incorporate [it] into an already full schedule" was the sentiment of one survey respondent. The importance of opportunity extends to pre-service teachers enrolled in teacher preparation programs also, as the collegial interactions students are afforded to observe and participate in are dependent on their level of involvement in their program

or in their practicum/internship classrooms. This particular theme is supported by the framework of the PPCT model in that the processes (or opportunities) in which students can participate to develop the skills to be collegial occur in a variety of contexts whether it be their practicum classroom or college course and occur over the course of time.

CHAPTER VII

DISCUSSION

The overall goal of the current study was to gain insight into how collegiality is addressed in teacher preparation; therefore, data examining early childhood education teacher preparation program faculty members' personal definitions of collegiality, their beliefs about the importance of collegiality in teacher preparation and their incorporation of collegial content and related practices into the preparation of pre-service teachers were collected and analyzed. Two overarching themes derived from these analyses that encapsulate participants' responses across their beliefs of importance and their incorporation of collegial content and practices in teacher preparation are that 1) collegiality is integral to the field of education, because relationships, and the interactions that build those relationships, are essential components to teaching, and 2) opportunity is both a necessary element for pre-service teachers to develop the skills to be collegial and a constraint for teacher preparation faculty members to incorporate collegiality into their courses. The following paragraphs will discuss these themes along with findings related to faculty members' definitions, beliefs and implementation of collegial content and practices, as well as the implications and limitations of the current study.

Findings indicated that faculty use a multitude of terms such as: "trust", "respect", "collaboration" "positive interaction" "relationship", "communication" "reciprocity", "shared goals", and "valued contributions" most frequently to define collegiality. These feelings of trust and confidence as well as a sense of belonging are the root of Jorde-Bloom's

(1988b) definition of collegiality and are quite impactful for faculty members as described through their educational training and experiences as a colleague. However, aligning with extant research, findings from this study provide support of no true consensus on how collegiality in teacher education is defined.

Although extant research has consistently noted the influential role beliefs have on teachers' practice (Kagan, 1992; Kaymakamoglu, 2018; Pajares 1992; Spear et al., 2018; Tatto 1996; Weinstein, 1989) and models of teacher education most often subscribe to theory-to-action pedagogies, it is possible for this process to be cyclical as the practices in which one engages may shape or even drive what they believe (Rozelle & Wilson, 2012). As such, both faculty members' definitions and experiences of collegiality contributed to the beliefs that faculty members hold regarding the importance of collegiality. Faculty shared beliefs which centered on the field of education as being a team sport, and that the development of the skills to be collegial is a continuous process, thus contributing to both the overarching themes of relationships and opportunity.

Data from the survey and interview suggest that faculty members believe collegiality is important in their own profession, but also important to the preparation of pre-service teachers. Although, the majority of survey participants indicated incorporating group work, peer feedback, sharing, joint planning, and peer observation opportunities in their teacher preparation courses, there is much variability in the ways in which content or practices are incorporated in teacher preparation courses intentionally. As collegiality does not occur by happenstance, such interactions need to be structured, taught, and learned. Thus, *intentional* implementation of collegial content and practices is an important consideration for teacher preparation as collegiality, in both definition and practice, occurs within a particular context, across time through meaningful interactions

(proximal processes) between people (and their enveloped person characteristics). As one of the overarching themes that emerged from the data concluded that collegiality is integral to the field of education, because relationships and the interactions that fortify them are essential components of teaching, the people (and their individual dispositions, skills, and perspectives) who engage in these relationships and the processes that occur to forge those relationships help to underscore the importance of addressing collegiality in teacher preparation. Further reinforcing this theme is Jarzabkowski's (2009) work with primary teachers, which contributes to our understanding of collegiality by differentiating collaboration to only be relevant to professional relationships, whilst collegiality encompasses any involvement with peers be it intellectual, moral, political, social, or emotional. Specifically, both the individuals' role and the processes that will occur within each interaction are largely dependent upon the relationship between the individuals and the context in which they occur (e.g., peer to peer vs. student to professor in undergraduate courses, or supervisee to supervisor in classroom-based experiences). Research has continually noted the integral role relationships play in teaching (Han & Bridglall, 2009; Pawan, 2008) and the interactions within these relationships can be both positive and negative; therefore, it is important to consider the relational aspect of interaction and instruction. As recent early childhood research has increased its focus on interactions and relationships, it has demonstrated the social interactions of in-service teachers that occur both within and between groups (i.e., staff and administration as well as peer groups), and the processes that govern those interactions, are crucial to teacher's individual development and contribute to climate of the organization in which teachers work (Rudasill et al., 2017; Staton & Hunt, 1992; Wells, 2017). Collegial relationships have been found to be positively associated with teachers' professional

growth, development, professionalism, school quality and organizational effectiveness (Shah, 2012) and negatively associated with teachers' occupational stress (Knox, 2008); whereas a lack of collegial relationships has been found to be positively associated with in-service teachers' decreased job satisfaction and increased experience of distress, emotional burnout, and turnover (Zinsser et al., 2016). Therefore, relationships forged between teachers are of great interest in terms of pre-service teachers' development, organizational literacy, and commitment to the field of teaching. Relationships also take time and effort to build; thus, as a field, it would be beneficial for faculty in teacher preparation programs to further cultivate collegial relationships with and amongst pre-service teachers, to be more attentive to, and recognizing, students' individual strengths and challenges to help them further develop as both a colleague and a professional.

The second overarching theme considers opportunity as both a necessary element for pre-service teachers to develop the skills to be collegial and a constraint for teacher preparation faculty members to incorporate collegiality into their courses. It is also here that the elements of Bronfenbrenner's PPCT model (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006) can be considered. An individual's person characteristics (demand, resource and force) each contribute to that individual's participation and engagement in the opportunities that can foster the development of the skills to be collegial. Specifically, resource and force characteristics may determine an individual's social/emotional capacity, and their motivation to engage in any opportunity to develop such skills.

The process and context elements of Bronfenbrenner's work related to this second theme are essential to consider in teacher preparation as faculty members within the survey rated the incorporation of collegial content and practices as very important to teacher preparation; yet, less than half indicated their intentionality of incorporating

collegial content and practices into their undergraduate courses. This finding seems contradictory as for an action to qualify as intentional, that action must be taken on behalf of goals that the actor deems valuable (Sen as cited in Alkire, 2005); if collegiality is rated as very important to teacher preparation, it should then also be incorporated more intentionally. Thus, incorporating group work, peer feedback, sharing, joint planning, and peer observation opportunities in teacher preparation courses could certainly serve to help students develop the skills to be collegial; however, if that is not the intent or that intent is not made explicit by faculty, incorporating such activities for the purpose of developing the skills to be collegial may be overlooked by students. Paris and Lung (2008) reiterated that "while intentional action is purposeful, not all purposes are considered as leading to action that is deemed intentional" (p. 263). As teacher preparation program faculty members serve as socialization agents for pre-service teachers, considering a more explicit and intentional incorporation of collegial content and related practices into teacher preparation is necessary given the impacts of collegial relationships on in-service teachers work experiences (Hur et al., 2016; Klinker et al., 2005; Jazabkowski, 2002; Shah, 2011; Wells, 2017).

Teacher socialization is an enduring process that begins with teacher education as program faculty impart ideologies and cultivate students' competencies and behaviors expected for success in the field (Evans, 2010; Staton & Hunt, 1992). The importance of this socialization process is underscored by faculty members, in both the survey and interview, noting their role of modeling the skills to be collegial. Preparation program faculty impart social norms and expectations of teachers and teaching through modeling and the incorporation of content and practices within their courses; faculty also provide students' first interactions as teachers and first experiences with the culture of teaching

through practica requirements. Such classroom-based experiences are important in teacher development as practica and student teaching experiences are salient components of experiential learning and understanding. These classroom-based experiences help preservice teachers to achieve learning objectives and professional development goals by combining theoretical coursework from their preparation program to field-based observation and practice opportunities within their practica settings (Baum & Korth, 2013; Butler & Cuenca, 2012; Caires, Almeida, & Vieira, 2012; La Paro, Van Shagen, King, & Lippard, 2017). Within practicum experiences, faculty and cooperating teachers have reciprocal responsibilities and common goals to serve pre-service teachers. It is expected for both teacher preparation faculty members and cooperating teachers to provide efficient communication processes, feedback and create trust and rapport with their students to model these practices, forge students' development as a teacher, and help them navigate the 'space of ambiguity' (Alsup, 2006). The faculty role is a major influence on the preparation and practicum experience for teacher candidates (Zeek, Foote, & Walker, 2001); and, cooperating teachers have a distinct influence on the preparation and development of teacher candidates in their classroom specifically (Anderson, 2007). As teacher preparation faculty and cooperating teachers socialize their students either implicitly or explicitly within their classrooms, these socialization processes contribute not only to students' development as a teacher but also to their future understandings of the work of being a teacher (Evans, 2010), or their organizational literacy (Blasé, 1985; Kuzmic, 1994).

The perceived supports and barriers faculty have to incorporate collegial content and practices influence the execution of that incorporation, and ultimately the socialization of students becoming teachers. Specifically, both survey and interview

participants noted that course content and format presented unique barriers to incorporate collegial content and related practices. In terms of course content, faculty felt that courses that focused on methods and content did not necessarily lend themselves to the incorporation of collegial content and practices, or they were not able to incorporate such content or practices on top of the required elements of that course. Methods courses specifically have been defined in the literature to serve as a period of induction into the teaching profession and are highly important to the process of teacher preparation as it is in these methods courses where “preservice teachers learn how to teach or develop a pedagogy” (Darling-Hammond 1990; Powers, 2004 p. 4). However, there is also debate as to what influence and impact such courses have on pre-service teachers’ instructional style and subsequent actions once in a classroom of their own (Letts, Bailey, & Scantlebury, 1997). Letts and colleagues noted that traditional methods course topics may no longer adequately prepare preservice teachers for the challenges of teaching as the field needs more reflective practitioners than technical experts. As noted previously, teacher preparation programs and their faculty not only provide teachers the foundational teaching and method skills for doing their job, but, also contribute to teachers’ preparedness to meet the expectations of the job, their beliefs regarding appropriate practice, and their development of appropriate professional behavior (Alsup, 2006; Brashier & Norris 2007; Fairbanks et al., 2010; Jones & Abes, 2004; Salli & Osam, 2017; Staton & Hunt, 1992); therefore, it is important to examine not only the ways in which preservice teachers are prepared for content and pedagogical aspects of teaching, but also, aspects related to organizational literacy.

As the relationships students will have with their future colleagues will comprise the degree of collegiality within their setting (influencing the setting’s organizational

climate) and will be shaped by the interpersonal skills of the individuals participating in the interactions building those relationships and their professional behavior (i.e., dispositions), cultivating pre-service teachers' development and understanding of interpersonal skills (which contribute to their formation of collegial relationships) and professional behavior (i.e. dispositions) is also a crucial consideration for teacher preparation. Also noted previously, research has broadly defined interpersonal skills as "an on-going development for people's meaningful relationships..." which stress an individual's ability to be friendly, thoughtful, get along well with others, listen effectively and respond sensitively, resolve conflicts, cooperate, follow directions, and any other skill pertinent to group interaction (Lee & Powell, 2005, p. 313). Such skills are necessary to facilitate the collaboration needed in teaching as teachers can share various information, ideas, perspectives, resources, and/or materials when these skills are developed and exhibited (Lee & Powell, 2005). The development and exhibition of interpersonal skills, however, is largely dependent upon an individual's disposition. Although dispositions have been variably defined throughout the literature and debated upon as flexible or static in nature (Cummins & Asempapa, 2013; Dottin; 2009; Ruitenberg, 2011), they can be broadly defined as a person's inherent qualities of mind and character (Cummins & Asempapa, 2013; Hunzicker, 2013). Dispositional attributes can include but are not limited to: ethical behavior, responsibility, personal and professional conduct, inclusion and affirmation of diversity, collaboration, reflection, receptivity to feedback, efficacy, and engagement/commitment to teaching profession (Cummins & Asempapa, 2013); and, are necessary evaluative aspects of teacher performance as these dispositions impact teaching practices (Hunzicker, 2013; Rike & Sharrp, 2008; Wadlington & Wadlington, 2011). In fact, dispositions are "just as critical

to effective teaching as skills and knowledge” (Rike & Sharp, 2008; Wadlington & Wadlington, 2011, p. 323). As such, collegial content and practices is a worthwhile inclusion to teacher preparation courses, regardless of content.

Conversely, faculty also shared it was seemingly easier to incorporate collegial content and practices into smaller face-to-face courses in comparison to larger face-to-face or online courses. This is an important consideration as online education is becoming an increasingly important long-term strategy for institutions of higher education (Kim & Bonk, 2006). However, Kennedy (2013) expressed concern that this initiative may lead to reduced educational interactions between teachers and students and students with their peers. This is another important consideration as the role of an online course instructor differs from that of a traditional face-to-face instructor; these different roles require different training and support that is not always readily available to faculty (Kim & Bonk, 2006). Research has also denoted that faculty have expressed concerns regarding online learning formats that include a lack of standards for an online course, lack of institutional support, and a lack of training as obstacles to delivering online education (Maguire, 2005). Explicitly, faculty participants within this study noted that they had to be much more intentional when incorporating collegial content and practices into the online courses they instruct and shared that students have expressed experiencing more difficulties collaborating and forging relationships with peers in an online setting.

Additionally, although some variability amongst the surveyed participants regarding the context in which the opportunities to develop/hone the skills to be collegial should occur was found, the majority of both surveyed and interviewed participants revealed that including such opportunities is integral to effective teacher preparation.

Given this notion and that CAEP (2016) and other sources of accreditation have increasingly emphasized the assessment of students' above and beyond their academic skills (i.e., including the assessment of student dispositions), the format and content barriers of courses must be addressed.

As time is considered within the second overarching theme, the skills to be collegial are developed and honed through the provision of opportunities (or lack thereof) to practice their use. This usage or lack of using said skills, and the activities that do or do not provide that opportunity, occur over the course of time. Each of the interviewed faculty shared the notion that students come to teacher preparation courses with varying levels of these skills based upon their previous experience and opportunity to engage in practicing them; thus, an important consideration for teacher preparation is that if collegiality and the skills that are needed to practice it are ever-evolving, both the pre-service teachers in teacher preparation programs and the faculty and cooperating teacher modeling collegiality are also still developing those skills through on-going opportunities to do so as teacher socialization endures throughout one's education and career (Evans, 2010; Staton & Hunt, 1992).

Implications

Some important implications of this work begin with the construct of collegiality itself. Within extant literature and the findings of this study, collegiality is ill-defined with many words used synonymously; thus, asking teacher preparation faculty members to explicitly define collegiality may serve to further the field's understanding of the construct, expand the literature, and enable more intentional incorporation of the construct into the preparation of pre-service teachers. A deeper understanding of the components of collegiality can support intentional changes and improvements in teacher

preparation. As the results of this study communicate that teacher preparation program faculty members both believe collegial content and practices are important to the preparation of pre-service teachers and that the ways in which those content and practices are intentionally incorporated is quite variable, an implication of this work is that the importance of collegiality to students' future work experiences can be further and more intentionally emphasized within teacher preparation programs. Of note, an assumption or debate that is critical for teacher educators to examine individually (and as a field) are the roles of teacher educators in students' learning and experience of collegiality. Participants noted: "there's probably a lot of assumptions that come into that like maybe it's not my job to teach them to be nice to one another" or "is our job to teach the content or are we developing people?" But several participants also noted the role of teacher educator is more than simply sharing content knowledge: "We all as early childhood faculty just need to be more intentional and realizing our job is about much more than [students] walking away with the content." Further, "teaching is a challenging but rewarding profession. [Teacher educators] need to encourage the benefits of positive and productive collegiality." As research has continuously demonstrated the relational nature of teaching (Freedman, 2009; Han & Bridglall, 2009; McLaughlin, 1993; Nias, 1998; Shah 2012), and participants within this study have expressed their motives to continue to incorporate what they can related to collegiality, it is important to acknowledge the necessity of *intentionally* providing opportunities for students to develop, hone, and practice the interpersonal skills that contribute to the relationships they will build (Cummins & Asempapa, 2013; Wadlington & Wadlington, 2011) and the impact collegiality will have on their future work (Hur et al., 2016; Klinker et al., 2005; Jazabkowski, 2002; Shah, 2011; Wells, 2017). It is also necessary for teacher

educators to make this intent more explicit so that students may gain further awareness of the influence such skills will have within their future careers and engage appropriately with the content and practices related to collegiality that faculty provide.

Another implication of this work calls attention to self-care within the field of teaching. As a means to further address collegiality in teacher preparation, several interview participants discussed incorporating elements of social/emotional awareness and self-care into the instruction of preservice teachers, but also to the professional development of teachers already in the field. This is a particularly important suggestion as research has demonstrated the impacts of collegiality in both positive and negative work environments for teachers. Extant literature has shown positive relationships with both peers and administration to offer connection, support, affiliation, belongingness, and stress-mitigation to in-service teachers within the early childhood center context (Hur et al., 2016; Rudasill et al., 2017; Shah, 2012). Such relationships improve teachers' professional growth, development, professionalism, as well as school quality and organizational effectiveness (Shah, 2012). Thus, forging relationships on both a personal and professional level with colleagues is certainly an element of self-care and worthwhile to incorporate more intentionally into the preparation of pre-service teachers.

Limitations

Although timely, the current study is not without limitations. First, the current sample presents several challenges in that it was recruited from a professional organization focused on the education of pre-service early childhood teachers. Involvement within this organization may have positively influenced the sample's views of collegiality as faculty members' definition of collegiality are informed by their personal experiences; and both these personal definitions and experiences may have contributed

to the judgement or evaluations that influence faculty members' beliefs about and implementation related to collegiality in their preparation of pre-service teachers. Further, the small sample size, low response rate, and some of the inclusion criteria imposed by the study, limits the generalizability of these findings to the larger population of faculty who are teaching undergraduate teacher preparation courses. Specifically, excluding adjunct instructors, non-tenure contracted employees, and faculty employed by two-year programs from the study is not an accurate representation of all individuals who are entrusted to instruct early childhood teacher preparation courses and may not perceive similar supports or barriers to incorporate collegial content and practices into their courses as those who participated in the current study. Additionally, significant differences were found in faculty members' ratings of the importance of collegiality in their profession and their intentional incorporation of collegial practices in their undergraduate courses between participants who were and were not willing to be interviewed (Table 4 depicts these differences).

Another area of limitation is related to the survey measure. Despite the option provided for text entry and to elaborate on participant responses, the response options for items relating to content and practice incorporation could be considered limiting by only allowing participants to consider the collegial content and practice opportunities they provide for a single course, when they may have several courses that vary in content and format. This may have influenced the restricted range of responses on several of the survey items, which creates an issue by limiting the power of any correlational evidence and does not provide a necessarily accurate reflection of the association between faculty members' beliefs about and implementation of collegial content and practices and their personal and professional characteristics in its entirety.

Another limitation relates to the use of mixed methodological design as such increases the complexity of evaluation. Specifically, the use of an embedded sample and the completion of a survey prior to the interview (Wisdom & Creswell, 2013) may have influenced the findings (i.e., positive themes and lack of variation in qualitative data) such that after completing the survey faculty may have been primed to answer the queries in a way that supported and exaggerated their previous reports of including collegial content and practices into their teacher preparation courses.

Future Directions

In efforts to address some of the above limitations and further extend the literature regarding collegiality in teacher preparation using Bronfenbrenner's Bioecological Systems theory and PPCT model as a framework, there are several avenues for future directions. Of note, the first area for expansion of this work would be to further examine the people involved in the instruction of pre-service teachers. For instance, surveying and interviewing participants with varying faculty titles (e.g., adjunct faculty, non-tenured contracted employees) and those within associate degree programs. Although the current study excluded these populations, further work to include the range of instructors and faculty preparing teachers would provide a more holistic view of collegiality and related content and practices within teacher preparation. Additionally, this expansion of inclusion criteria would provide the opportunity to further examine personal and professional characteristics of those responsible for the instruction of pre-service teachers and how those characteristics may be associated with their implementation of collegial content and practices in their teacher preparation courses.

Another avenue includes survey refinement. First, additional open-ended response options could be developed, rather than specific ratings of beliefs and incorporation. It would also be of interest to interview participants based upon certain response patterns within the survey to determine if this pattern is indicative of a trend within their courses or teacher preparation program specifically or for the field of teacher preparation largely. Also, given that some weak associations were found between the professional characteristics of faculty and their beliefs and implementation related to collegiality, it is necessary to consider that both revision of the survey and inclusion criteria. Addressing these areas may provide an avenue for further analysis to examine if any associations between personal or professional characteristics and faculty members' beliefs or implementation related to collegiality exist.

Another area for exploration is that of the process of differentiation of instruction as it is a prominent concern in education at all levels. Given that the majority of interviewed faculty members discussed the variability of the skills that pre-service teachers enter their teacher education program with, and the development of those skills during and after their time in the program, it would be of interest to further examine the processes (assignments, practices, etc.) that faculty members implement within their courses to address differentiation of instruction in regards to collegiality and the development of skills associated to it. Course assignments, requiring student written or verbal reflections and having faculty review these, or pre-/post-assessments of students learning and faculty's experiences may be ways to explore this particular area.

As each interview participant noted the utility of the graduate perspective, it would be beneficial to pursue research regarding both the enrolled students', university supervisors' and graduates' perspectives regarding collegiality within their teacher

preparation program as well as the perspective of employers and the role collegiality plays within their work. This particular avenue would provide insight into the various contexts and the element of time that are relevant to the preparation of pre-service teachers. Specific areas of interest would include how these individuals define collegiality themselves, does/did collegiality impact their experiences within their program, what opportunities may have reinforced or negated the importance of this construct within their work? Other data to collect would be their evaluation of the content or practices they found most helpful or effective to reinforce development of the skills to be collegial.

Finally, as CAEP (2016) and other sources of accreditation include the assessment of students' above and beyond their academic skills and NAEYC has included responsibilities to colleagues within their Code of Ethics (2011) , it is of interest as a field to examine how collegiality fits into both accreditation standards and ethics related to teacher preparation.

Conclusion

In conclusion, both previous literature and the current study reinforce the complex nature of the construct of collegiality and the fact that there is little to no agreement as to what constitutes collegiality in definition or practice. Early childhood teacher preparation faculty members who participated within this study defined collegiality variably and implemented collegial content and practices within teacher preparation courses variably; yet, each believe the inclusion of this construct to be very important to the preparation of pre-service teachers. Despite these findings, no personal or professional characteristics were found to associate with faculty members' beliefs or implementation related to collegiality.

As teacher preparation program faculty can be considered socializing agents for pre-service teachers, it is necessary to consider and further evaluate how collegiality is being addressed both within the university and field-based settings of teacher preparation. As important as collegiality is in the work of in-service teachers and ultimately within the preparation of pre-service teachers, it is necessary to acknowledge the barriers in place that prevent faculty from *intentionally* incorporating content and practices related to collegiality within their coursework. Barriers such as time, course formats and student engagement/awareness are present, apparent, and logical. However, with this acknowledgement, comes the charge to find ways to address and circumvent such barriers, so that the pre-service teachers are being adequately prepared for the field.

REFERENCES

- AbuAlRub, R. F. (2004). Job stress, job performance, and social support among hospital] nurses. *Journal of nursing scholarship*, 36(1), 73-78.
- Abu-Bader, S. H. (2000). Work satisfaction, burnout, and turnover among social workers In Israel: A causal diagram. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 9(3), 191-200. Work satisfaction, burnout, and turnover among social workers in Israel: A causal diagram. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 9(3), 191-200.
- Alkire, S. (2005). Subjective quantitative studies of human agency. *Social indicators research*, 74(1), 217-260.
- Alsop, J. (2006). *Teacher Identity Discourses: Negotiating Personal and Professional Spaces*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Anderson, D. (2007). The role of cooperating teachers' power in student teaching. *Education*, 128, 307-323.
- Andrews, D., & Lewis, M. (2002). The experience of a professional community: Teachers developing a new image of themselves and their workplace. *Educational Research*, 44(3), 237-254.
- Barbour R. S. (2001). Checklists for improving rigour in qualitative research: a case of the tail wagging the dog?. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, 322(7294), 1115-7.
- Barnett, W. S. (2003). Better Teachers, Better Preschools: Student Achievement Linked to Teacher Qualifications. NIEER Preschool Policy Matters, Issue 2.
- Battistich, V., & Solomon, D. (1997). Teachers' Sense of the School as a Community (TSSC) Unpublished tool.
- Baum, A. C., & Korth, B. B. (2013). Preparing classroom teachers to be cooperating teachers: A report of current efforts, beliefs, challenges, and associated recommendations. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, 34(2), 171-190.
- Blase, J. J. (1985). The socialization of teachers: An ethnographic study of factors contributing to the rationalization of the teacher's instructional perspective. *Urban Education*, 20(3), 235-256.
- Bloom, P. J. (2015). *Blueprint for action: Leading Your Team in Continuous Quality Improvement*. Lake Forest, Ill: New Horizons.

- Bloom, P. J. (1991). Child care centers as organizations: A social systems perspective. *Child and Youth Care Forum*, 20, 5, 313-333.
- Bloom, P. J., Hentschel, A., & Bella, J. (2010). *A great place to work: Creating a healthy organizational climate*. Lake Forest, Ill: New Horizons.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40.
- Brashier, A., & Norris, E. (2008). Breaking down barriers for 1st-year teachers: What Teacher preparation programs can do. *Journal of early childhood teacher education*, 29(1), 30-44.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (2001). The bioecological theory of human development. In U. Bronfenbrenner (Ed.), *Making human beings human: Bioecological perspectives on human development* (pp. 3-15). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (2005). *Making human beings human: Bioecological perspectives on human development*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The bioecological model of human development. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & R. M. Lerner (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 1. Theoretical models of human development* (6th ed., pp. 793-828). New York: John Wiley.
- Brown, C. A., & Cooney, T. J. (1982). Research on Teacher Education: A Philosophical Orientation. *Journal of research and Development in Education*, 15(4), 13-18.
- Brownell, M. T., Yeager, E., Rennells, M. S., & Riley, T. (1997). Teachers working together: What teacher educators and researchers should know. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 20(4), 340-359.
- Buettner, C. K., Hur, E. H., Jeon, L., & Andrews, D. W. (2016). What are we teaching the teachers? Child development curricula in US higher education. In *Child & Youth Care Forum* (Vol. 45, No. 1, pp. 155-175). Springer US.
- Butler, B. M., & Cuenca, A. (2012). Conceptualizing the roles of mentor teachers during student teaching. *Action in Teacher Education*, 34(4), 296-308.
- Caires, S., Almeida, L., & Vieira, D. (2012). Becoming a teacher: Student teachers' experiences and perceptions about teaching practice. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(2), 163-178.
- Cassidy, D. (2016a). Contentedness and comfort of children in Child Care Scale (C5). Unpublished manuscript
- Cassidy, D. (2016b). *Teacher Satisfaction Inventory (TSI)*. Unpublished manuscript.

- Cassidy, D. J., King, E. K., Wang, Y. C., Lower, J. K., & Kintner-Duffy, V. L. (2016). Teacher work environments are toddler learning environments: teacher professional well-being, classroom emotional support, and toddlers' emotional expressions and behaviours. *Early Child Development and Care*, 1-13.
- Castro, F., Kellison, J., Boyd, S., & Kopak, A. (2010). A Methodology for Conducting Integrative Mixed Methods Research and Data Analyses. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 4, 4, 342-360.
- Child Care Aware of America (2013). We can do better: Child Care Aware of America's Ranking of state child care center regulations and oversight. *Arlington, VA: Author.*
- Childcare Education Institute. (2008). Teacher roles and responsibilities. *Teaching Enrichment Training Solutions Newsletter*, 3(8).
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Villegas, A. M. (2015a). Framing Teacher Preparation Research: An Overview of the Field, Part 1. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(1), 7–20.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Villegas, A. M. (2015b). Studying teacher preparation: The questions That drive research. *European Educational Research Journal*, 14(5), 379–394.
- Corrigan, P. W., Holmes, E. P., & Luchins, D. (1995). Burnout and collegial support in State psychiatric hospital staff. *Journal of clinical psychology*, 51(5), 703-710.
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2016). *CAEP accreditation handbook, version III*. Washington, DC: CAEP.
- Cousins, J. B., Ross, J. A., & Maynes, F. J. (1994). The reported nature and consequences of teachers' joint work in three exemplary schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 94(4), 441-465.
- Creswell, J. W. (2015). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*.
- Cummins, L., & Asempapa, B. (2013). Fostering Teacher Candidate Dispositions in Teacher Education Programs. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 13(3), 99-119.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). Teaching and knowledge: Policy issues posed by alternate certification for teachers. *Peabody Journal of education*, 67(3), 123-154.
- Dennis, S. E., & O'Connor, E. (2013). Reexamining Quality in Early Childhood Education: Exploring the Relationship Between the Organizational Climate and The Classroom. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 27, 1, 74.
- Donaldson GA (2001) *Cultivating leadership in schools: connecting people,purpose and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Dottin, E. S. (2009). Professional judgment and dispositions in teacher education. *Teaching and teacher education*, 25(1), 83-88.
- Eisner, E. W. (1994). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Ekholm, B., & Hedin, A. (1987). Studies of day care center climate and its effect on children's social and emotional behavior. *Early Child Development and Care*, 27, 43-57.
- Ernest, J. M. (2014). Using Q Methodology as a mixed methods approach to study beliefs about early childhood education. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 5, 2, 223-237.
- Evans, L. (2010). Professionals or technicians? Teacher preparation programs and Occupational understandings. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 16(2), 183-205.
- Fairbanks, C. M., Duffy, G. G., Faircloth, B. S., He, Y., Levin, B., Rohr, J., & Stein, C. (2010). Beyond knowledge: Exploring why some teachers are more thoughtfully adaptive than others. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 161-171.
- Freedman, S. (2009). "Collegiality Matters: How Do We Work With Others?" *Proceedings of the Charleston Library Conference*.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284314771>
- Friend, M., Cook, L., Hurley-Chamberlain, D., & Shamberger, C. (2010). Co-teaching: An illustration of the complexity of collaboration in special education. *Journal of educational and psychological consultation*, 20(1), 9-27.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory* Chicago. Adeline, USA.
- Goodwin, W. L., & Goodwin, L. D. (1996). *Understanding quantitative and qualitative research in early childhood education* (Vol. 59). Teachers College Press.
 Chapter 7: Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Research
- Grant, C. (1981) Education that is multicultural and teacher preparation: an examination from the perspectives of preservice students, *Journal of Educational Research*, 75, pp.95-101.
- Han, W. J., & Bridgall, B. L. (2009). Assessing school supports for ELL students using the ECLS-K. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 24, 445-462.
- Harms, T., Clifford, C. M., & Cryer, D. (1998). *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale: Revised Edition*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Harms, T., Cryer, D., & Clifford, C. M. (2003). *Infant/Toddler Environment Rating Scale: Revised Edition*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Harris, D. L., & Anthony, H. M. (2001). Collegiality and its role in teacher development: Perspectives from veteran and novice teachers. *Teacher Development*, 5(3), 371-390
- Heyvaert, M., Maes, B., & Onghena, P. (2013). Mixed methods research synthesis: definition, framework, and potential. *Quality & Quantity : International Journal of Methodology*, 47, 2, 659-676.
- Ho, D., Lee, M., & Teng, Y. (2016). Size Matters: The Link between Staff Size and Perceived Organizational Support in Early Childhood Education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30, 6, 1104-1122.
- Hodges, C. (1982) Implementing methods: if you can't blame the cooperating teacher, Whom can you blame? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 33, pp. 25-29.
- Hong, J., Greene, B., & Lowery, J. (2017). Multiple dimensions of teacher identity Development from pre-service to early years of teaching: a longitudinal study. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 43, 84-98.
- Hur, E., Jeon, L., & Buettner, C. K. (2016). Preschool Teachers' Child-Centered Beliefs: Direct and Indirect Associations with Work Climate and Job-Related Wellbeing. *Child & Youth Care Forum : Journal of Research and Practice in Children's Services*, 45, 3, 451-465.
- Hunzicker, J. (2013). Attitude has a lot to do with it: Dispositions of emerging teacher leadership. *Teacher Development*, 17(4), 538-561.
- James, Lawrence R., & Jones, Allan P. (1974). Organizational climate: A review of theory and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol 81(12), 1096-1112.
- Jarzabkowski, L. M. (2009). The social dimensions of teacher collegiality. *The Journal of Educational Enquiry*, 3(2).
- Jones, J. (2017). US Early Childhood Policy: Towards a More Coherent Early Childhood Policy in the US. *The SAGE Handbook of Early Childhood Policy*, 133.
- Jones, S. R., & Abes, E. S. (2004). Enduring influences of service-learning on college students' identity development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45(2), 149-166.
- Jorde-Bloom, P. (1996). The Quality of Work Life in NAEYC Accredited and Nonaccredited Early Childhood Programs. *Early Education and Development*, 7, 4, 301-317.

- Jorde-Bloom, P. (1988a). Assess the climate of your center: Use the early childhood Work environment survey. *Day Care and Early Education*, 15, 4, 9-11.
- Jorde-Bloom, P. (1988b). Closing the gap: An analysis of teacher and administrator perceptions of organizational climate in the early childhood setting. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4, 2, 111-120.
- Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implications of research on teacher belief. *Educational Psychologist*, 27, 65-90.
- Katz, L. & Raths, J. (1982) The best of intentions for the education of teachers. *Action in Teacher Education*, 4, pp. 8-16.
- Kaymakamoglu, S. E. (2018). Teachers' Beliefs, Perceived Practice and Actual Classroom Practice in Relation to Traditional (Teacher-Centered) and Constructivist (Learner-Centered) Teaching (Note 1). *Journal of Education and Learning*, 7(1), 29-37.
- Kelchtermans, G. (2006). Teacher collaboration and collegiality as workplace conditions. A review. *Zeitschrift fur padagogik*, 52(2), 220.
- Kennedy, G. (2013). *Understanding our present*. Paper presented at the 30th ASCILITE conference, Macquarie University, Sydney.
- Kim, K. J., & Bonk, C. J. (2006). The future of online teaching and learning in higher education. *Educause quarterly*, 29(4), 22-30.
- Kivunja, C. (2015). Leadership in Early Childhood Education Contexts: Looks, Roles, and Functions. *Creative Education*, 6, 16, 1710-1717.
- Klinker, J. M., Riley, D., & Roach, M. A. (2005). Organizational Climate as a Tool for Child Care Staff Retention. *Yc Young Children*, 60, 6, 90-95.
- Knox, H. M. (2009). A Review of Contemporary Research on the Relationship between Occupational Stress and Social Support: Where Are We Now?. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Organisational Psychology*, 2, 1, 44-63.
- Koepfen, K. E., & Davison-Jenkins, J. (2007). Teacher Dispositions: Envisioning Their Role in Education. *Rowman & Littlefield Education*.
- Kuzmic, J. (1994). A Beginning Teacher's Search for Meaning: Teacher Socialization, Organizational Literacy, and Empowerment. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 10, 1, 15-27.
- La Paro, K. M., Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2012). Classroom assessment scoring System (CLASS) – Toddler. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

- La Paro, K. M., Scott-Little, C., Ejimofor, A., Sumrall, T., Kintner-Duffy, V. L., Pianta, R. C., & ...Howes, C. (2014). Student teaching feedback and evaluation: Results from a seven-state survey. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 35*, 318-336. doi:10.1080/10901027.2014.968297
- La Paro, K. M., Van Schagen, A., King, E., & Lippard, C. (2017). A Systems Perspective on Practicum Experiences in Early Childhood Teacher Education: Focus on Interprofessional Relationships. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 1-11*.
- Lee, S., & Powell, J. V. (2005). Manifestation of Pre-Service Teachers' Interpersonal Skills: Effects of Simulated and Real Experience. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 34*, 3, 317-339.
- Letts, W., Bailey, B., & Scantlebury, K. (1997). Preparing science teachers in an era of reform: Practitioners' perspectives of methods courses. *School Science and Mathematics, 97*(4), 192-199.
- Letts, L., Wilkins, S., Law, M., Stewart, D., Bosch, J., & Westmorland, M. (2007). Guidelines for critical review form: Qualitative studies (Version 2.0). *McMaster University Occupational Therapy Evidence-Based Practice Research Group*.
- Lower, J. K., & Cassidy, D. J. (2007). Child Care Work Environments: The Relationship With Learning Environments. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 22*, 2, 189-204.
- MacNaughton, G., Rolfe, S. A., & Siraj, I. (2010). *Doing early childhood research: International perspectives on theory and practice*. Buckingham England: Open University Press.
- Maguire, L. L. (2005). Literature review—faculty participation in online distance education: Barriers and motivators. *Online journal of distance learning administration, 8*(1), 1-16.
- Marvin, C., LaCost, B., Grady, M., & Mooney, P. (2003). Administrative Support and Challenges in Nebraska Public School Early Childhood Programs: Preliminary Study. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 23*, 4, 217-228.
- Maxwell, K. L., McWilliams, R. A., Hemmeter, M. L., Ault, M. J., & Schuster, J. W. (2001). Predictors of developmentally appropriate classroom practices in kindergarten through third grade. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 16*, 431-452.
- McGinty, A. S., Justice, L., & Rimm-Kaufman, S. E. (2008). Sense of school community for preschool teachers serving at-risk children. *Early Education and Development, 19*(2), 361-384.
- McLaughlin, M. W. (1993). What matters most in teachers' workplace contexts? In J. W. Little, & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Teachers' work: Individuals, colleagues and Contexts* (pp. 79-103). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (2001). *Professional communities and the work of High school teaching*. University of Chicago Press.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and Implementation*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Miller, J. F. (2011). Burnout and its impact on good work in nursing. *Journal of Radiology Nursing, 30*(4), 146-149.
- Misco, T., & Shiveley, J. (2007). Making sense of dispositions in teacher education: arriving at democratic aims and experiences. *Journal of Educational Controversy, 2*(2).
- National Association for the Education of Young Children (2010). NAEYC Standards for Early childhood professional preparation, Position Statement.
- National Association for the Education of Young Children (2011). NAEYC Code of Ethical Conduct
- National Association of Early Childhood Teacher Educators. (n.d.). Purpose of the NAECTE. Retrieved from <https://naecte.org/>
- Nias J (1998) Why teachers need their colleagues: a developmental perspective. In A Hargreaves, A Lieberman, M Fullan & D Hopkins (eds) *International handbook of educational change*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp 1257-1271.
- Nias J (1999) Teachers' moral purposes: stress, vulnerability, and strength. In R Vandenberghe & AM Huberman (eds) *Understanding and preventing teacher burnout: a sourcebook of international research and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp 223-237.
- Novick, G. (2008). Is there a bias against telephone interviews in qualitative research?. *Research in nursing & health, 31*(4), 391-398.
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of educational research, 62*(3), 307-332.
- Paris, C., & Lung, P. (2008). Agency and child-centered practices in novice teachers: Autonomy, efficacy, intentionality, and reflectivity. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 29*(3), 253-268.
- Pawan, F. (2008). Content-area teachers and scaffolded instruction for English language earners. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*, 1450-1462.
- Powers, A. L. (2004). Teacher preparation for environmental education: Faculty perspectives on the infusion of environmental education into preservice methods courses. *Journal of Environmental Education, 35*, 3-18.

- Rike, C. J., & Sharp, L. K. (2008). Assessing preservice teachers' dispositions: A critical dimension of professional preparation. *Childhood Education, 84*(3), 150-153.
- Rosa, E. M., & Tudge, J. (2013). Urie Bronfenbrenner's theory of human development: Its evolution from ecology to bioecology. *Journal of Family Theory & Review, 5*(4), 243-258.
- Rozelle, J. J., & Wilson, S. M. (2012). Opening the black box of field experiences: How cooperating teachers' beliefs and practices shape student teachers' beliefs and practices. *Teaching and teacher education, 28*(8), 1196-1205.
- Rudasill, K. M., Snyder, K. E., Levinson, H., & Adelson, J. L. (2017). Systems View of School Climate: A Theoretical Framework for Research. *Educational Psychology Review, 1*-26.
- Ruitenbergh, C. W. (2011). The trouble with dispositions: A critical examination of personal beliefs, professional commitments and actual conduct in teacher education. *Ethics and Education, 6*(1), 41-52.
- Salli, A., & Osam, U. V. (2017). Preservice teachers' identity construction: emergence of expected and feared teacher-selves. *Quality & Quantity, 5*(1), 1-12.
- Saracho, O. N. (2017). Writing and Publishing Qualitative Studies in Early Childhood Education. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 45*, 1, 15-26.
- Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in Education and the social sciences*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Shah, M. (2011). The dimensionality of teacher collegiality and the development of teacher collegiality scale. *International Journal of Education, 3*(2), 1.
- Shah, M. (2012). The importance and benefits of teacher collegiality in schools—A literature review. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46*, 1242-1246
- Sinnema, C., Meyer, F., & Aitken, G. (January 01, 2017). Capturing the Complex, Situated, and Active Nature of Teaching Through Inquiry-Oriented Standards for Teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 68*, 1, 9-27.
- Spear, C. F., Piasta, S. B., Yeomans-Maldonado, G., Ottley, J. R., Justice, L. M., & O'Connell, A. A. (2018). Early childhood general and special educators: An examination of similarities and differences in beliefs, knowledge, and practice. *Journal of Teacher Education, 69*(3), 263-277.
- Stanton, A. Q. & Hunt, S. L. (2009) Teacher socialization: Review and conceptualization, *Communication Education, 41*:2, 109-137, DOI: 10.1080/03634529209378875

- Stauffer, S. D., & Mason, E. C. (2013). Addressing elementary school teachers' professional stressors: Practical suggestions for schools and administrators. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(5), 809-837.
- Stipek, D. J. & Byler, P. (1997). Early childhood education teachers: Do they practice what they preach? *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 12, 305-325.
- Su, J. Z. X. (1992). Sources of Influence in Preservice Teacher Socialization. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 18, 3, 239-58.
- Sugawara, A. I., Ruder, T. P., & Burt, L. M. (2006). Relationships between teaching self-efficacy, work environment autonomy, and teacher competency among early childhood preservice teachers. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, 19, 1, 38.
- Talan, T. N., & Bloom, P. J. (2004). *Program administration scale: Measuring early Childhood leadership and management*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Tatto, M. T. (1996). Examining values and beliefs about teaching diverse students: Understanding the challenges for teacher education. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis*, 18(2), 155-180.
- Tudge, J. R., Mokrova, I., Hatfield, B. E., & Karnik, R. B. (2009). Uses and misuses of Bronfenbrenner's bioecological theory of human development. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 1(4), 198-210.
- Tudge, J. R., Payir, A., Merçon-Vargas, E., Cao, H., Liang, Y., Li, J., & O'Brien, L. (2016). Still Misused After All These Years? A Reevaluation of the Uses of Bronfenbrenner's Bioecological Theory of Human Development. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 8(4), 427-445.
- Vartuli, S. (1999). How early childhood teacher beliefs vary across grade level. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 14(4), 489-514.
- Wadlington, E., & Wadlington, P. (2011). Teacher dispositions: Implications for teacher education. *Childhood Education*, 87(5), 323-326.
- Wayda, V., & Lund, J. (2005). Assessing dispositions: An unresolved challenge in Teacher education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 76(1), 34-41.
- Weinstein, C. S. (1989). Teacher education students' perceptions of teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(2), 53-60.
- Wells, M. B. (2017). Is all support equal?: Head Start preschool teachers' psychological job attitudes. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 63, 103-115.

- Whitebook, M., King, E., Philipp, G., & Sakai, L. (2016). *Teachers' Voices: Work Environment Conditions That Impact Teacher Practice and Program Quality. Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, University of California at Berkeley.*
- Whitebook, M., McLean, C., & Austin, L.J.E. (2016). *Early childhood workforce Index 2016, Executive Summary.* Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, University of California, Berkeley.
- Whitebook, s., & Ryan, S. (2013). *Supporting Environmental Quality Underlying Adult Learning (SEQUAL).* Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, University of California, Berkeley). Unpublished tool.
- Whitebook, M., Sakai, L., Almaraz, M., Kipnis, F., Ryan, S., Austin, L. J. E., & University of California, Berkeley. Center for the Study of Child Care Employment. (2012). *By default or by design? Variations in higher education programs for early care and education teachers and their implications for research methodology, policy, and practice. Executive summary.* Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, University of California, Berkeley.
- Wisdom, J., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Mixed methods: integrating quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis while studying patient-centered medical home models.* Rockville: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.
- Zeek, C., Foote, M., & Walker, C. (2001). *Teacher stories and transactional inquiry: Hearing the voices of mentor teachers.* *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(5), 377-385.
- Zinsser, K. M., Christensen, C. G., & Torres, L. (2016). *She's supporting them; who's supporting her? Preschool center-level social-emotional supports and teacher well-being.* *Journal of school psychology*, 59, 55-66.
- Zinsser, K. M., & Curby, T. W. (2014). *Understanding preschool teachers' emotional support as a function of center climate.* *SAGE Open*, 4(4), 2158244014560728.
- Zinsser, K. M., Denham, S. A., Curby, T. W., & Chazan-Cohen, R. (2016). *Early Childhood directors as socializers of emotional climate.* *Learning Environments Research: an International Journal*, 19, 2, 267-290.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY

Please complete the following:

I. Personal Characteristics:

Race: _____ African American _____ Asian American
_____ European American _____ Latino
_____ Native American _____ Mulit-racial/Multi-ethnic
_____ Other – please specify:

Ethnicity: _____ Of Hispanic/Latino Origin _____ Not of Hispanic/Latino Origin

Age: _____

Gender: Female Male

Highest Education Level Achieved:

GED High School Diploma Some College
 Associate's Degree, Degree Area _____
 Bachelor's Degree, Degree Area _____
 Master's Degree, Degree Area _____
 Doctorate, Degree Area _____

Year highest degree was received: _____

II. Professional Characteristics:

Total years of experience in higher education: _____

Institution at which you are currently employed: _____

Length of time you have been employed at this institution: _____

Title of your position: _____

Tenured/Tenure Track or Clinical Position: _____

Length of time you have held your current position: _____

Within the last three years have you taught an undergraduate teacher preparation course? _____

Main focus of undergraduate course/s content you have taught/are currently teaching:

_____ Methods _____ Context _____ Development

Average number of students per course listed:

Where does/do the course/s fall in the students' course sequence (e.g. are they early, middle or late within the program)? _____

Format of course/s: _____ Face-to-Face _____ Online _____ Hybrid

III. Collegiality

How do you personally define collegiality? _____

WORK EXPERIENCES OF COLLEGIALITY

How collegial do you believe yourself to be overall?

- Not Collegial at All
- Slightly Collegial
- Neutral
- Moderately Collegial
- Extremely Collegial

How important is collegiality to you within your profession?

- Collegiality is not important for me within my profession
- Collegiality is somewhat important for me within my profession
- Collegiality is moderately important for me within my profession
- Collegiality is important for me within my profession
- Collegiality is extremely important for me within my profession

To what extent does collegiality within your workplace affect your work?

- No Affect
- Minor Affect
- Neutral
- Moderate Affect
- Major Affect

From your perspective, there is a feeling of trust and confidence among department faculty.

- Strongly Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Somewhat Agree
- Strongly Agree

From your perspective, there is a feeling of trust and confidence among program faculty.

- Strongly Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Somewhat Agree
- Strongly Agree

How often do you and your colleagues share materials related to course content and assignments?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often

How often do you and your colleagues jointly plan teaching strategies and learning experiences to use in your respective courses?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often

Do you respect the professional competence of your colleagues?

- Never _____
- Rarely _____
- Sometimes _____
- Often _____
- Always _____

Do you feel your colleagues respect your professional competence?

- Never _____
- Rarely _____
- Sometimes _____
- Often _____
- Always _____

Using your personal definition, how often do you believe that you have time to prioritize being collegial within your workplace?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

To what extent does your department administration emphasize collegiality between faculty members within your current workplace?

- Not Emphasized at All
- Slightly Emphasized
- Neutral
- Moderately Emphasized
- Extremely Emphasized

Are faculty members given explicit opportunities within the department to practice collegiality?

- No
- Unsure
- Yes (please describe) _____

TRAINING EXPERIENCES OF COLLEGIALITY

As a reminder, please use your personal definition of collegiality to respond to the following questions.

In your educational training, how much emphasis was placed upon being collegial with peers?

- Not Emphasized at All
- Slightly Emphasized
- Neutral
- Moderately Emphasized
- Extremely Emphasized

Did explicit opportunities exist within your educational training to practice collegiality with your peers?

- No
- Unsure
- Yes, please describe _____

If so, do you believe these opportunities were worthwhile?

- Not at all worthwhile
- Slightly worthwhile
- Somewhat worthwhile
- Moderately worthwhile
- Extremely worthwhile

In your current continuing professional development, how much explicit emphasis has been placed upon being collegial with colleagues?

- Not Emphasized at All
- Slightly Emphasized
- Neutral
- Moderately Emphasized
- Extremely Emphasized

Have explicit opportunities been provided within your continuing professional development to practice collegiality with colleagues?

- No
- Unsure
- Yes, please describe _____

If so, do you believe these opportunities were worthwhile?

- Not at all worthwhile
- Slightly worthwhile
- Somewhat worthwhile
- Moderately worthwhile
- Extremely worthwhile

COLLEGIALITY AND TEACHER PREPARATION

Again, please use your personal definition of collegiality to respond to the following questions.

How important do you believe collegiality content/learning opportunities are to the preparation of early childhood teachers?

- Collegiality is not important for teacher preparation
- Collegiality is somewhat important for teacher preparation
- Collegiality is moderately important for teacher preparation
- Collegiality is important for teacher preparation
- Collegiality is very important for teacher preparation

Do you provide opportunities within your undergraduate teacher preparation courses for students to become familiar with one another beyond introductions before assigning group work?

- No, and I have not considered including such opportunities
- No, but I have considered including such opportunities
- Yes, please describe _____

How often do you assign group work?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

Do you require students to provide peer feedback in your undergraduate teacher preparation courses?

- No, and I have not considered including such opportunities
- No, but I have considered including such opportunities
- Yes, please describe _____

How often do students provide peer feedback?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

Do you provide opportunities within your undergraduate teacher preparation courses for students to jointly plan teaching strategies and learning experiences to use in their practica?

- No, and I have not considered including such opportunities
- No, but I have considered including such opportunities
- Yes, please describe_____

How often do you provide these opportunities?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

Do you provide opportunities within your undergraduate teacher preparation courses for students to share what they have learned and want to learn?

- No, and I have not considered including such opportunities
- No, but I have considered including such opportunities
- Yes, please describe_____

How often do you provide these opportunities?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

Do you provide opportunities within your undergraduate teacher preparation courses for students to be open with their peers about their successes and challenges in their classroom-based experiences?

- No, and I have not considered including such opportunities
- No, but I have considered including such opportunities
- Yes, please describe_____

How often do you provide these opportunities?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

Do you provide opportunities within your undergraduate teacher preparation courses for students to observe one another teaching?

- No, and I have not considered including such opportunities
- No, but I have considered including such opportunities
- Yes, please describe_____

How often do you provide these opportunities?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

Do you intentionally incorporate content (e.g., readings or other course materials) related to collegiality within your undergraduate teacher preparation courses?

- No, and I have not considered including such information
- No, but I have considered including such information
- Yes, please describe _____

If no, what keeps you from incorporating such content into your undergraduate teacher preparation courses?

How often do you intentionally incorporate content (e.g. readings/course materials) and practices (e.g. assignments or class activities) related to collegiality within your undergraduate teacher preparation courses?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

How effective do you think this content is for undergraduate students in developing collegiality?

- Not at all effective
- Slightly effective
- Somewhat effective
- Moderately effective
- Extremely effective

How effective do you think these practices are for undergraduate students in developing collegiality?

- Not at all effective
- Slightly effective
- Somewhat effective
- Moderately effective
- Extremely effective

If you do not incorporate practices related to collegiality within your undergraduate teacher preparation courses, what keeps you from doing so?

Please share any other thoughts or ideas related to collegiality and teacher preparation:

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW GUIDE

“In the survey, you defined collegiality as *{Insert Participant responses.}* Can you tell me more about that? Can you provide one or two examples of what that might look like in practice? Is there any variation in how you define collegiality across yourself, others or your students?”

“What skills do you think are important to faculty and students to have in their repertoire in order to practice collegiality?” What experiences have guided your practices or the way you demonstrate collegiality?”

“A participant noted ‘connection of theory and practice at the relevant time [is] critical’. When do you think students develop (or should develop) the skills to be collegial? If in your classroom, how do you intentionally incorporate content or experiences to address those skills?”

“Less than half of participants indicated their intentionality of incorporating collegial content/practices into their courses. Why do you think this might be? Can you tell me more about the courses you teach? Which ones lend themselves to be able to incorporate collegial content/practices? Why? And what are some departmental supports are in place for you to do this? Barriers?”

“Within the survey analysis, there was a range of variability in participants’ perceptions as to whether or not incorporating practices or activities were effective for helping students to develop the skills to be collegial. In your response you mentioned *{Insert activities they listed}* What goals did you have in mind for your students when creating these activities? (Probes: “Is collegiality a goal? An intentional or fortuitous one? And how do you evaluate the effectiveness of these activities in that regard? Do you believe these activities are effective in the short or long term?”

“What do you see as the biggest challenges for students developing collegiality? (Probes: What do these challenges say about the field? About the field’s view of or focus on collegiality?)”

“What are your thoughts on next steps for your students? When they graduate, what are they prepared for the most? The least? And where does collegiality fall as far as being prepared? Do you think future employers are looking for skills in collegiality when they are hiring? Do you think collegiality is something that future employers value or expect? Why or why not?”

“Are there ways the field should be responding to this as an area for growth? How might this best be encouraged? What are some ideas on what we should be doing as a field to support collegiality early in students’ education? During practicum courses? During student teaching? During their first years of teaching?”

“Is there anything else you would like to tell me about collegiality?”

APPENDIX C
CODING GUIDE

Collegiality (in both definition and practice) is dependent upon people (skills, dispositions, and perspectives) and contexts (courses, placements, field entry)

- **Beliefs regarding collegiality**
 - **Relationships are important XXXXXXX**
 - Support
 - Encouragement
 - Respect
 - **Requires connection XXXXX**
 - “a colleague also attends not to your professional self but your personal self.”
 - **Value assigned to members/their contribution of the interaction XXXXX**
 - everybody has something to offer and, and you have something to offer everybody, some people are going to be open to it and some people aren't.
 - They have, they realize it's important, um, they realize that there are going to be people that they're going to encounter that are going to be able to teach them things”
 - **Education is a team sport XXXXXXXX**
 - Can't do it alone
 - It's people intensive
 - “the slice and dice model, the whole idea of the factory worker. You do your one part and the next door Miss Smith, will do her one part. Then next door. Senor Rodriguez will do his solamente one part that is such a mechanistic view of schooling and education and of a approach to teacher preparation.”
 - “Because of the amount of teamwork these students, these people have, they're working in such a close environment with other teachers and other people, parents and and faculty and principals and everything like that. They have to be able to have those skills. If not, I told people, I always tell my students in every class, I said, if you don't like working with people, don't be a teacher.”
 - “It's incredibly important to me as a professional that students recognize that education is a team effort. It's not an

- individual. And despite my best efforts of wanting to do it all, all the time, I know that I can't work alone and my relationship with my peers is crucial to this, to their success as well as my own”
- This is not work you do by yourself
- **Power differentials**
 - Faculty-dept chair
 - Faculty-student
 - Student-Ct
 - Student-student
- For some---collegiality knows no boundaries
- **On-going/growth mindset**
 - Come with a certain level to the program—begins with the family/in elementary school
 - that's still hard because some of it is stuff they're coming to us with and, or skills that they don't yet have.
 - “It's very difficult to develop those skills. I think just as a, um, as a student at the college level if they've never had, if they don't know how to get along with people, um, at the, at the unit, you know, if they have never, if they have a hard time getting along with people growing up and then suddenly now here they're in a college student and they have to work in group work and all this and they haven't developed those skills themselves.”
 - They should have developed to some degree before they get into the teacher preparation program, this is not their first time in school and it's not their first time to work with their peers,
 - Focus on in intro coursework XXXXXXXXXX
 - Incorporated throughout program XXXXXXXXXX
 - “that something they're developing all through college.”
 - “We expect developmental change over time”
 - “helping them also understand the real world”
 - Basically, when they get to my class and I expect them to already have the skills necessary and I give them opportunities to practice that or even develop it further on in my classes

- Still things to learn once they graduate XXXX
 - “It’s something you have to attend to.”
- **Collegiality as a focus**
 - **“Collegiality is not a word that we use a lot”**
 - “So I am kind of curious about the word collegiality. I wonder if it’s, um, that word, like, so they’re are probably other words we could use to describe some of these same processes.”
 - “I don’t know if I intentionally talk about it, but I talk about other things. I talk about collaboration and I talk about partnership and I talk about mentorship that I don’t know that I would have defined as collegiality, but as the more the questions you’ve asked and I’ve just been thinking about your project since that original questionnaire. I think we, I do do it. I just don’t know that I defined it that way.”
 - being kind of an umbrella term for multiple skills. I think that might be why because people define it in different ways, which is why maybe I HOPE that that’s maybe why they’re not including it as intentionally
 - Synonyms
 - Professionalism
 - Get-along-ability
 - Collaboration XXXXXX
 - “But I think they do it without knowing it, without thinking of that they have discussion groups, they have a show and tells, they have a uh, teams come up and make presentations”
 - “I facilitate student teaching, so I would say we talk about it a great deal again, indirectly now that I’m recognizing what I’ve done, but I, we speak a great deal about in, in concert with their student teaching semester.”
 - “I don’t have a lot of content on collegiality, but I have a lot of assignments that would require them to do that...”
 - “we teach them that it’s important to collaborate but not how to collaborate, you know, and we teach them that it’s important to be professional, but I sometimes think they walk away with like surface level understandings of those things.”
 - “sometimes in teacher Ed we just say to students, okay, it’s a group project, figure it out and we don’t give them the skills that they need to figure it out.”
 - **Supports that help faculty include collegiality as a focus**

- University policies—open discourse
- Program handbooks—disposition policies XXXXX
- Department practices
 - Calendar sharing
 - Faculty meetings
 - Committees
- Admission to major
 - Portfolio reviews
 - interviews
- Collaboration with field placements
 - “we're pretty hands on when it comes to supervision of field experiences.”
 - we just did a big training for our mentor teachers, um, last spring, um, because we do believe that mentors need preparation. You can be an awesome teacher and a horrible mentor because it's a different skill set. But we also believe that students need preparation in order to receive, um, information from a mentor.
 - CT evals of students
- Elective but not required opportunities XX
 - “I was sent to a group and a lot of us have gone to this, it's called leaders in action and it was put on by hr and it was a whole year and a half training program every month”
 - TLT center
 - IT Support
 - there's ample, umm technological resources to make it possible in online classes.
 - Uh, but there is no directive from anybody here that 'you need to do this or you can use this' I just found the tools.
- **Barriers to focusing on/developing collegiality**
 - **Time**
 - “I mean providing more time for them to just develop and think about who they are and interact with others.”
 - “that's still hard because some of it is stuff they're coming to us with and, or skills that they don't yet have. And when you're, when, you know, when you only have them for a semester, for three hours of their

week, there's not always enough time there to see true progress.”

- “It's like they, they just get to a point where they are comfortable in a setting and get to know people and then all of a sudden the semester ends and we put them somewhere else.”
- “I worry that in those first couple of years that they're they largely stay on the surface and it's not until they have been at a school for awhile and have formed relationships with people where they get to the deeper level of what it means to be collegial and collaborative with others. And again, I think it really involves like the right mix of people.”
- So here's the rub. I think they value and respect it and look for it, but yet in particularly in public schools, don't make time for it. So they, um, I think certainly that they're going to be looking for that in their, new hires, but I think that then in order to like truly value that you would make time and space for it.

- **Courses**

- Content
 - “oftentimes it's really easy as a college professor to get caught up with the content of what you're doing and if you have or don't have a field experience could make a difference because um, I think that if you're teaching just a regular content class that doesn't have anything like that. You're not really thinking.”
 - “there's probably a lot of assumptions, assumptions that come into that like with, well, like in a content course, like maybe it's not my job to teach them to be nice to one another.”
 - “I think it probably goes back to this like essential debate that, you know, we have as teachers like is our job and I think sometimes even more so in, in higher ed, like is our job to teach the content or are we developing people?”
 - maybe they've been doing what they're doing for a very long time

- Class sizes
 - “I definitely felt like it's a lot harder to build relationships, model, that kind of stuff with a larger group”
- Format
 - Easier to incorporate in F2F
 - Have to be more intentional in online setting
 - Because it's important. Even like collegiality in the virtual environment.
 - According to the students, it was more difficult for them to collaborate in an online class
- overload of courses, maybe they have several classes or
- **Learners are compliant, sedentary, don't like change, prefer rubrics**
 - much of the General Ed coursework that they have had up until this point has been you come into class and you listen
 - increasingly, I'm finding at least my students that we really don't have very well developed social skills because they're not very practiced
 - Well, increasingly I would say over the last maybe three or four years, students just don't want to talk to each other. They are increasingly using group me. They're increasingly trying to get by for group projects using Google docs or um, you know, uh, a Wiki or a, you know, they're texting each other all the time.
 - there's just so many technological, um, means that people can collaborate without ever having to speak to each other. And really, I see a lot of miscommunication that happens as a result. I mean, you can't, you have, you don't have the use of body language or tone in a text message.
 - Many of them don't like it!
 - “they're concerned about being right or getting all the grades or things like that”
- **Short-staffing**—adjuncts/doc students who aren't required to participate in meetings or committees

- “Not that I don't want them there, but I don't want them to feel obligated because we're paying them nothing, you know,”
 - **Maturity XXX**
 - **Being reactive instead of proactive XX**
 - Assume it is ingrained
 - Basically, when they get to my class and I expect them to already have the skills necessary and I give them opportunities to practice that or even develop it further on in my classes
 - “Um, it's sort of like just assumed maybe and it's not brought into, it's not really. You don't really think about it until you're running into situations where you're seeing, like I did this semester”
 - “I know I do a lot of that kind of more on a one on one coaching type basis as they, um, experience perhaps challenges interacting with others in the, in field settings”
- **As a field we can...**
 - **Lay the foundation—talk about it, continue to talk about it XXX**
 - I would say that I think we all as early childhood faculty probably just need to be more intentional and realizing that our job is about much more than them walking away with, um, the content that we need them to be.
 - I think just talking about it, your, your research, getting this kind of thing out there is what we need to be doing... having that conversation and letting people know, hey, we should be talking to students about how you're part of a team. We should be talking about how you collaborate with others. How do you share resources? How you support children with, uh, with the help of others, we should be talking about it because it's important and that's the best thing that field can do is just start having those or continue to have those conversations.
 - **Embed specific professional development opportunities**
 - Student groups XXXX
 - Graduate groups XXXX

- Longer practicum experiences
 - It's like they, they just get to a point where they are comfortable in a setting and get to know people and then all of a sudden the semester ends and we put them somewhere else. So I feel like if we were more thoughtful about putting them maybe in year long placements that there might be more opportunities for them to develop relationships and work on those skills.
- **Follow-up and Follow Through**
 - pay the universities to follow their Grads or if they even had it, if they even had an induction process, or induction program at the school.
 - it would help kind of shore them up and introduce them into the profession and help them to find a way to be collegial within their own school without losing their voice or a selling out their profession
 - Mentor Network
 - I've been around a little while and there have been a few organizations who have tried to do mentoring programs, like I was in one with a SRCD, society of research on child development and um, I got assigned to a couple of mentees and um, you know, and I talked to them, like weekly for one of them for two years, but then that program just kind of fell away. And then I'm also at NAECTE and we've talked about doing like a formal mentor network.
- **Incorporate Self Care**
 - Be more attentive to recognizing, students' individual strengths and challenges as a professional
 - personality types XXXX
 - teaching can be very isolating
 - I'm in a department with um, counselor educators and one of the things that has struck me is that, counselor ed, they have in their code of ethics and their guidelines for professional practice. They have, um,

uh, items that address self care and we do not. And I think as a field that's a pretty big oversight.

- we've had an explosion of popularity or have a positive receptivity of mental health counseling as a tool for teacher preparation just to to know thyself. To get yourself well.”
- “I think that especially that there needs to be some areas like for instance the teachers, you know, they're coming out with the new standards. All right, and this is, they do have a lot more on social emotional in the new NAEYC draft standards, but it's mostly social and emotional for a little kid.”
- “we pay a lot of attention to how we treat families and parents, but we probably don't spend as much time talking about how we interact with other professionals and I sometimes wonder if that, why people don't stay in the field and there's a lot of reasons why people don't stay in teaching for long, but I sometimes think it's because there's a lot of turnover. It seems. It seems like the people who stay are the ones who like really find a home and find the right setting the right people to work with.”
- And she's basically shamed by teachers in upper grades for having four year olds who acted like four year olds. And so I think that that's the danger of not having good professional relationships, not collaborating with other people who, who know you or have the same philosophical orientation and help you, you know, be like a touchstone. I'm like, no, I will stand up to this. This is not developmentally appropriate.
- “one of the things I worry about is that they walk out not, not knowing how to balance and manage all of those competing needs. Um, and I think that's why their first years are so hard is because there's a big learning curve for a lot of things,”
- “ASK THEM. We are the masters of their destiny and we are the professors. We are the gray haired and the experienced. But they bring passion, and they bring interest, and they, they want to get a degree and get a

job, but they want to learn and join the profession, so we need to get better at asking them to guide the profession, to direct us, to create explanations of it.”

- **Skills needed**

- Listening XXXXXX
- Communication XXXXXXXX
- Empathy XXX
- Openmindedness
- Self-awareness XXXXX
- Social/emotional skills XX
- With-it-ness X
- Multiculturalism X
- Appreciation for diversity XXX
- Reliability
- Dependable
- Willingness to learn XXXX
 - recognizing that often they will not know as much as they need to and they'll have to lean on their peers for content or for information
- Perspective-taking
 - “We help students understand that how you handle situations as a person may be different on how you would handle situations in the workplace”
- Advocating for yourself and others XX

- **Importance of modeling**

- **Faculty-Faculty**

- “certainly always trying to model it means to be a collegial, respectful, professional person”
- “Just demonstrating and modeling for students way of showing, oh, the ability to work well together and uh, be part of a team versus working in isolation.”
- So I think it's so important to be friendly with people, to be supportive of people, to say Nice things about people to support your colleagues up to the students to, you know, say, you know, they're good faculty, you know, don't ever talk against them to students or anything like that to try to uh, keep a positive faculty meeting here, you know, and also to demonstrate to students when you're out there that, that how they need to see our faculty as a unit getting along.
- Students speaking ill of other faculty

- a style difference between myself and current instruction
 - **In-Class**
 - left to their own devices. My students will create a, like a Google doc. Like they will never, if I did not make them, you know, get in a room together and actually talk. They would create a google docs and never set foot in the same room or have a face to face verbal conversation. And so I think that, you know, we not only need to create the structure and the assignments, but we also need to scaffold their understanding of what it means, particularly in recent years where people are texting and doing group me and having a, you know, a google doc and in place of a meeting where things are discussed.
 - **CTs**
 - “on the job, that they really are mastering the art, the heart in the substance of teaching”
 - “They're learning from observation in the early field experiences and then once they're in practicum and student teaching experiences, they're the ones that are looking at the other adults in the room and saying, oh, I've got to find ways to communicate and I have to find ways to engage and I have to find ways to work together and achieve the same mission and that's challenging”
 - I do think that really depends on how their field experiences and their student teaching have gone.
 - we just did a big training for our mentor teachers, um, last spring, um, because we do believe that mentors need preparation. You can be an awesome teacher and a horrible mentor because it's a different skill set. But we also believe that students need preparation in order to receive, um, information from a mentor.
- **Evaluation**
 - **Purposes**
 - “One is how to be a good colleague fellow student, but how also to relate to the cooperating teachers and staff and administrators out in the schools”
 - ” I also think it's important to look at between peers as students not even taking myself out of the equation, just as them teaching them how to work collaboratively to support

each other and demonstrate collegiality as they're in this teacher prep program preparing to launch into the field.”

- To be able to work effectively with anybody, uh, they're able to work effectively with a difficult person, they are able to work effectively with somebody that is collegial. They're able to overcome their first reactions when their ideas are rejected or they interrupt them

- **Means of**

- Self-monitoring, learner contracts, Reflection XXXXXXXX
 - “I think the reflective process is probably more important there for them than it is for me to say, well I thought you were this. And I hear that. Like instead it's better for it to come from them.”
 - “I obviously can't be there for every, every interaction they have. So I think self assessment is really important, in this domain”
 - “iterative work that gets reflection and improvement during the semester”
- Peer feedback
 - Gallery Walks
 - Discussion Boards XXXXX
- Developed tools
 - Communication log X
 - Communication journal X
 - Interviews
 - “interview another professional, professional about a topic of interest and they work with a partner to complete that activity”
 - “they talk and interview teachers and leadership to say for them to share some ethical dilemmas they've had to unpack and then they apply the code of ethics again to those dilemmas”
 - Group project evaluations
 - Relationship level
 - Communication and commitment
 - partnerships, shared resources to achieve goals cooperation
 - Qualities of collaboration
 - Qualities of contribution.

- Describe how your group divided up responsibilities for this project—essay portion
- CT evals
 - and, and a lot of times what we do in the field courses and clinical practice is triangulating, um, feedback and perspective.”
- Dispositions XXXXX
 - “Well, I don't know how much they think about it, you know, they sign it, they don't, they sign the sheet, but who knows if they even looked at it, you know, so I don't know how effective it is except it hopefully serves as documentation and a red flag for those students that should not be in the classroom, you know?”
- **Graduate Follow-up**
 - “Now I don't have a handle on what works. I don't have an idea of which of these different factors,”
 - Students are “primed for it” in regards to collegiality and preparation after graduating
 - In general—highly variable but in general they're ready for it
 - there're different factors and they have different reactions. So maybe for some it would be something that will really be significant.
 - it does vary. I think some students, you know, actually as we sit here and talk about this, I think my students that are more comfortable in the craft itself and understand teaching and learning and understand children tend to be more collegial because they trust themselves and they trust each other. The students that don't feel strong, don't graduate feeling like scholars don't graduate feeling competent, they're more insecure again with maturity and they might be less likely to be collegial.
 - “a lot of what we do as teacher educators, um, they don't really understand the impact of it until later and that's probably true for especially these professionalism type of skills, these dispositions.”

- “I wish that I had more connection to my students in three to five years out that I could really spend more time listening to their experience”
 - “So unfortunately we don't do a lot of longterm research on our students postgrad because we graduate so few, we're just starting that study, um, for our own ed prep department now and I, I do believe it's part of our accreditation where we're talking about ethics and ethical responsibilities. We do have the benefit of having many of our students stay local and those local students have been five or six years later become cooperating teachers of our own.” XX
 - Creating professional networks post-grad XX
 - “we do actually follow our cohorts. We have contact information on all of our students every year we send out, um, you know, a little, you know, hey, update your information. So within reasonable, probably like 80 percent, we know what grade people are teaching, who went to graduate school, what school they're currently teaching at. And we have a little bit more information about, um, how many of them are keeping in touch with each other.”
 - Rates of retention past 5 years XX
- **Realizations of the field**
 - **Working with others**
 - NAEYC code of ethics XXXX
 - Communities of practice
 - It's not like the old days when I taught you went in and shut the door and that you are your own person, you know.
 - “We've been getting a lot of feedback from students that, especially early childhood, that one of the bigger challenges for them as they transition into the field is working with assistants that they really aren't prepared to do that. They don't know how to manage that relationship. They don't know how to do that kind of work.”
 - **Employers**
 - people want employees just by and large, not just in education, people who can, um, collaborate, who can get along, who have well developed social emotional skills. Um, but I think also, you know, if you look at, um, you know, emotions are contagious and people need to be able to get along and have good social skills because if not the stress is

transmitted to kids. You know, anxious teachers make anxious kids.

- principals are absolutely looking for that because for many reasons, but really they spend so much time kind of going between dispositions with people who don't get along and they're they're conquering disagreements, squabbles and relationships and principals don't have time for that, so if they can hire somebody who understands the importance of being part of a team and working together in a school that's gonna be really important and I think stand out for them.
- “Because I get these online, evaluation forms from the districts, you know a lot and depending on your district, a lot of them have areas on here, not so much about what they know. Their factual information that they know, but a lot of it has to do with their, how do they get along with people, what type of worker are they, how prompt are they? All those types of stuff. It's more on the soft skills, that type of stuff. Then it is often in do they know their subject matter and that and when they call up sometimes that's the type of thing they're asking for.”
- they're looking for it but they're not following through on how to further develop it.

○ **Field Perceptions**

- Well, I think we were challenged in the field of early ed because in our society. We believe anyone can do it. You need at most likely your high school diploma and heartbeat and you'll get hired and I don't believe that we value the teachers that work with infants, toddlers especially, but infants, toddlers and preschoolers. ...they don't get paid for it. They don't get recognized for it, and we're constantly belittling the work that early care teachers do. In fact, in a lot of places they're not called teachers there. They're called caregivers or babysitters. Heaven help us. They're expected to wear scrubs as a uniform because they can't dress themselves. I mean, it's just disrespectful everywhere you go that it's an uphill battle”
- Student perspective: “I'm so young and I'm worried no one's going to take me seriously...I'm struggling because I'm going out and I'm interviewing child development centers and I know what high quality care looks like and I don't feel like they're offering it here and I know when I show up I'm just

going to look like a high school kid to them and no one's going to take me seriously.”

- “but I recognize how much of my work is futile, is like lambs to the slaughter. It's like I'm preparing students to go into impossible environments that they can't succeed. They can't be themselves, that they need to get a tough skin and craft another way of getting along.”

- **Influential experiences**

- **Mentors**

- “the influence of mentors is important. So people have, um, you know, from my early days in public schools to my, um, doctoral training, I think, you know, having people treat me respectfully and having them willing to listen to my ideas even as a young teacher or an, you know, beginning doctoral student, having them see me as an equal or at least making me feel like they did and valuing my ideas and my contribution even if you know, I'm less experienced or less knowledgeable than they are in a particular area or regarding the situation. Um, so I think having those models influenced me in terms of how I approach my now work with students and colleagues.”

- **Classroom teaching**

- “I have left my first love, my true love for my job, which is General Ed prep. And I bring all of that early childhood work into everything I do and talk about it.”
- I was a practitioner for years before I went to higher ed and so I think, you know, that kind of makes me see things more from a practitioner basis
- what I miss the most about the classroom is that opportunity to collaborate and work with others.
- “My past experience as a teacher in the classroom. I think knowing, having been those sort of so to speak boots on the ground and having taught in in places where I felt very welcomed and supported by my peers, both as a leader when I've gone in with more experience where others have looked to me for support and as the novice teacher who has gone in completely new and how it feels and how much more successful I am at my job. When I know I have colleagues that I can go to and I can collaborate with and I can bounce ideas off of without judgment and I know that

that made me a better teacher, so I am certain that when I teach my students about how they're going to become a good partner to school, keeping an open mind, being a part of the, the bigger picture of the team feel of a school system, I think that comes through really loud and clear because I've been in the position where I've been very well supported by peers and I've also been not supported at all. And, and I can tell you those years were harder years of teaching.”

- “my team teaching was such an important part of my experience with young children”
- Sabbatical:
 - it made me realize that was hard for me as someone who's been in the field for x number of years and so it did help me have greater empathy for how hard those first couple years are because they're still even just trying to learn the basics of the job, while being, all this other stuff gets thrown on top of them.

○ **Experiences as a Colleague**

- I think I carry with me for my, for my, um, in-service and preservice teachers, the experiences that I have as a colleague
- I've been in situations where it's been very difficult and it makes life very difficult working with colleagues that are not like that
- I recently had a interview for a position and um, had made it to the point where they wanted to offer me the position and I withdrew my application and I withdrew my application because of the clear lack of collegiality during the interview process. And I had a conversation with the hiring committee and with the Dean when they were asking me why I was stopping. I mean who stops right before they're offered a tenure track position. Right. And I told them that this is really important to me and honestly the and I don't know. I have not done any research. I certainly don't know what I felt through this whole process was a lack of respect between peers and that was the the crux of collegiality. I looked at the way she spoke to each other and spoke over me during the interview where I thought, Huh, this would be a really hostile working environment for me. I would not feel supported. I would not feel like I had a voice. I would not feel like my voice was valued and I don't think that I would feel respected

here and that's for me where collegiality comes into play as a professional at this level.

- Department Chair—focus on building people up
- “I have a chair that she's just like me {non-confrontational} and so it's very, it's difficult. I've outwaited it and I've been here 27 years and I've gone through 10 faculty members that come and gone come and gone, come and gone because it hasn't worked out for their own reasons. And when I look back on it, it turns out that it's because there's stuff going on in their personal life. Could be guests on the Jerry Springer show and that's what's causing it or they're not. They're getting ready not to get tenure and that's caused it. There's all kinds of issues.”

APPENDIX D
TABLES

Table 1. Demographics of Sample (N=41)

Teacher Preparation Faculty Members' Characteristics	(%)	\bar{x}	<i>sd</i>
Race			
African American	2.4%		
Asian American	4.9%		
European American	82.9%		
Multi-racial	2.4%		
Other	4.9%		
Ethnicity^a			
Of Hispanic/Latino Origin	2.4%		
Not Of Hispanic/Latino Origin	80.5%		
Age Range			
30-39 Years	7.3%		
40-49 Years	24.4%		
50-59 Years	34.1%		
60-69 Years	29.3%		
70+ Years	4.9%		
Gender			
Female	90.2%		
Male	7.3%		
Education Attained			
Master's Degree	9.5%		
Doctoral Degree	90.5%		
Role in Teacher Preparation			
Tenured Faculty in a Teacher Preparation Program	63.4%		
Tenure Track Faculty in a Teacher Preparation Program	24.4%		
Clinical Faculty in a Teacher Preparation Program	12.2%		
Years of Experience in Higher Education		16.59	9.667

^a = N=34

Table 2. Participant Experiences of Collegiality in Their Profession and Training (N=41)

Work and Training Experiences of Collegiality	%	\bar{x}	SD	Min	Max
Perception of own Collegiality		4.73	.449	4	5
Time to prioritize being collegial		3.73	.807	2	5
Educational training emphasis upon being collegial		2.98	1.35 1	1	5
Professional Development emphasis on collegiality		3.54	1.02 7	1	5
Explicit opportunities in educational training	48.8%				
Explicit opportunities in professional development	51.2%				
Opportunities in training were worthwhile		4.60	.598	3	5
Opportunities in professional development worthwhile		4.71	.561	3	5
Importance of collegiality within profession		4.49	.637	3	5
Respect Professional Competence of Colleagues		4.29	.680	3	5
Colleagues Respect their Professional Competence		4.10	.800	2	5
Trust/confidence among department faculty		4.20	.901	2	5
Sense of Belonging within department faculty		3.66	1.66 7	1	5
Feelings of trust/confidence among program faculty		4.34	.693	2	5
Sense of Belonging within Program Faculty		3.51	1.64 5	1	5
Department emphasis on collegiality		4.15	.853	2	5
Explicit opportunities provided by department		1.66	.762	1	2
Share materials related to courses		3.58	.549	2	4
Jointly plan teaching strategies/learning experiences		3.17	.667	1	4

Table 3. Faculty's Incorporation of Collegiality Content and Practices in Teacher Preparation Courses (N=41)

Incorporation of Collegiality in Teacher Preparation	%	\bar{x}	SD	Min	Max
Intentional incorporation of collegial content	45.2%				
Intentional incorporation of collegial practices	47.6%				
Importance of collegiality content/learning in teacher preparation		4.73	.449	4	5
Effectiveness of incorporating content		4.05	.705	3	5
Effectiveness of incorporating practices		3.00	1.522	1	5
Activities					
Groupwork	100%				
Frequency of groupwork		4.44	.634	3	5
Allow students to become familiar with one another before assigning group work	83.3%				
Peer feedback	90.5%				
Sharing what students have learned/want to learn	90.5%				
Sharing students' successes/challenges in their practicums	85.7%				
Joint planning teaching strategies to use	83.3%				
Peer observation	52.9%				
Courses					
Methods	39.5%				
Practicum	23.7%				
Content	20.2%				
Child development	16.7%				
Face to face delivery	72.8%				
Situated in middle of students' program	43%				
Course enrollment of 20-30 students	85.1%				

Table 4. Importance and Incorporation of Collegiality Across Sample Participants (N=41)

Groups	Will Interview		Will Not Interview		<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
	\bar{x}	<i>SD</i>	\bar{x}	<i>SD</i>			
Importance of collegiality in their profession	4.81	.403	4.29	.690	38	8.39	.006
Intentional incorporation of collegial practices in their undergraduate courses	2.71	.488	3.00	.000	20	60.61	.000

Table 5. Differences between Faculty's Experience of Collegiality within Their Department Versus within Their Program (N=41)

Items	\bar{x}	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Feelings of trust and confidence among department Faculty	4.20	.901	40	29.829	.000
Sense of belonging among department Faculty	3.80	1.691	40	14.404	.000
Feelings of trust and confidence among program Faculty	4.34	.693	40	40.104	.000
Sense of belonging among program Faculty	3.66	1.682	40	13.924	.000

Table 6. Associations between Faculty Members' Incorporation of Collegial Content/Practices in Teacher Preparation and Their Personal and Professional Characteristics (N=41)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Rating of importance of collegiality in teacher preparation	1									
2. Frequency of group work with intention of fostering collegiality	.161	1								
3. Opportunities provided for students to familiarize before group work	-.111	.096	1							
4. Students required to provide peer feedback	.253	.197	-.110	1						
5. Opportunities provided for students to jointly plan	.217	.290	.154	.149	1					
6. Opportunities provided for students to share learning	.372*	.164	-.091	.370*	.225	1				
7. Opportunities provided for students to be open with their peers	.355*	.238	.057	.221	.560**	.306	1			
8. Opportunities provided for students to observe one another teaching	.107	-.119	-.170	.026	.038	-.187	-.159	1		
9. Intentional incorporation of practices related to collegiality	-.171	-.076	.167	-.069	-.126	-.100	-.126	. ^c	1	
10. Intentional incorporation of content related to collegiality	.247	-.074	-.144	-.013	.356*	.245	.134	.236	-.020	1
11. Education	-.199	-.294	.060	-.092	-.136	-.076	-.111	.295	. ^c	.022
12. Years of experience	-.063	-.343*	-.117	.137	-.005	-.171	.166	.152	-.006	-.149
13. Program Type	.154	-.074	.244	.175	.218	.151	.170	.225	.000	.228
14. Position Title	.210	.098	-.274	-.019	.100	.095	.330*	-.240	-.177	-.163
15. Personal collegiality rating	.130	-.103	.142	.041	-.251	.132	-.192	-.079	.161	-.077
16. Importance of collegiality within profession	.207	-.172	-.052	-.080	-.008	.000	.264	-.054	-.247	.053

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
17. Trust/confidence among department faculty										
18. Sense of belonging within department	.028	.035	.021	-.145	-.255	.038	-.193	.053	.352	-.324*
19. Trust/confidence among program faculty	.141	-.008	.114	.414**	.106	.109	.158	.089	-.025	-.141
20. Sense of belonging within program	-.124	-.067	.189	-.170	.081	.017	-.075	.000	.331	-.190
21. Respect professional competence of colleagues	.100	.390*	.087	.122	.078	.101	.270	.010	.159	-.128
22. Colleagues respect your professional competence	.144	-.037	.048	.272	.051	.029	.250	.230	-.076	-.175
23. Frequency in which program colleagues share materials	.137	.237	.316*	-.048	.187	.027	.195	-.065	.346	-.048
24. Frequency in which program colleagues jointly plan	.324*	.173	.017	.073	.212	.404**	.338*	-.041	.266	.145
25. Time to prioritize being collegial	.141	-.008	.009	.023	.034	.206	.300	-.068	.263	.054
26. Department administration emphasis on collegiality	.105	.340*	.068	.049	-.010	.040	.059	.104	.181	-.031
27. Explicit opportunities provided by department to practice collegiality	-.128	-.199	-.326*	.121	-.188	.045	-.044	-.242	-.241	.097
28. Emphasis on collegiality in educational training	-.011	-.046	.328*	.276	-.008	.334*	.112	-.233	.064	.040
29. Explicit opportunities within educational training to practice collegiality	-.201	-.067	-.089	-.281	-.014	-.312*	-.164	-.008	-.100	.081
30. Emphasis on collegiality in current continuing professional development	.212	.013	-.069	.149	.355*	.118	.415**	.053	.206	.447**
31. Explicit opportunities provided by professional development to practice collegiality	-.154	.085	.265	.117	.172	.196	.171	-.233	-.324	-.114

* = p. < .05, ; ** = p. 0.1