DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 446 077 SP 039 516

AUTHOR	Hertzog, Hillary S.; Pensavalle, Margo T.; Lemlech, Johanna K.
TITLE	Collegial Relationships: What Does It Mean To Be a Colleague?
PUB DATE	2000-04-28
NOTE	16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Faculty; *Collegiality; Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Feedback; Higher Education; Interpersonal Communication; *Interpersonal Relationship; Participative Decision Making; Preservice Teacher Education; Student Development; Student Teacher Supervisors; Student Teachers; Student Teaching; *Teacher Collaboration

ABSTRACT

This paper describes a study of a collegial teacher education program aimed at helping student teachers learn interdependent instructional skills and professional behaviors which support the development of authentic collegiality before they experienced the isolation many teachers perceive. The program arranged an environment where student teachers were guided in pairs by supervising teachers and university coordinators to participate in collaborative decision making, pedagogical reflection, and talk about teaching. The program hypothesized that collegiality would develop and systematically integrate students' instructional and professional learning. This study examined whether the program would result in collaborative relationships. Data from 12 cycles of partnered student teachers participating in public school placements were used to examine the issue. Data came from questionnaires, journals, interviews, conferences, observations, and audio and video tapes. Results indicated that the pairings: prepared student teachers to work with other teachers in a professional community; enhanced critical thought about teaching; and identified a continuum of collaborative development stages and behaviors. When partners differed in beliefs about teaching, conflicts emerged that sometimes required assistance. When partners' teaching talents differed significantly, jealousy and rancor were seen. University faculty influenced professional behaviors leading to collegial relationships. (Contains 29 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 446 077

COLLEGIAL RELATIONSHIPS: WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO BE A COLLEAGUE?

By

Hillary S. Hertzog
California State University, Northridge

Margo T. Pensavalle
University of Southern California

Johanna K. Lemlech
University of Southern California

Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association

New Orleans, Louisiana
2000

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H.S. Hertzog

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP039576

Collegial Relationships: What Does It Mean to Be a Colleague?

Introduction

Are all teachers who work in the same school colleagues? Does membership in a professional group certify that the members are colleagues? Hargreaves (1989) distinguished between *contrived* and *authentic* collegiality. He characterizes institutional and bureaucratic procedures that required joint efforts of teachers as *contrived*, primarily because of the formal and imposed nature of the interactions. Lieberman, Saxl & Miles (1988) cautioned that *authentic* collegial behaviors need to be taught, nurtured and supported. We conceptualized a **collegial teacher education program**, aimed at helping student teachers learn interdependent instructional skills and professional behaviors which support the development of authentic collegiality, before they experienced the isolated existence many teachers perceive. By arranging an environment where young teachers were guided in pairs by supervising teachers and university coordinators to participate in collaborative decision-making, (Johnson, 1990a), pedagogical reflection (Zeichner & Liston, 1996) and talk about teaching (Duckworth 1997), we hypothesized that collegiality would develop and systematically integrate their instructional and professional learning.

Perspective

Traditional Teacher Education

Traditional teacher education has been unable to focus programs on a future vision or theoretical rationale (Goodlad, 1990a, 1990b, 1994). Attempts at unification and improvement have not been characterized by collegiality or communication (Howey & Zimpher, 1989). In fact, historically teacher education has received ridicule and dismissal from the academic, and particularly educational research community (Zeichner, 1999).

Few universities have substantial coordination and integration among the three major components of teacher education: pedagogy, foundations of education and practicum (Goodlad, 1990a), and the curriculum and structure of curricula of most teacher education programs have remained unchanged for several decades. Tabachick (1979) and Petrie (1990) point out that the communication, reflection, problem-solving and collaboration, each an important component of collegiality, repeated at teacher education orientations are not modeled by professors or experienced by student teachers. Sykes (1990) questions why most current education programs do not cultivate the development of teachers′ professional judgment. Schon (1987) concurs by stating that this is one of the most difficult tasks facing a pre-service teacher as they must learn to construct their own guidelines rather than adopt those of their supervising teachers.

Joyce (1990) discusses the absence of relevant teacher education programs, where beginning teachers participate in the study of education as well as the practice of teaching. He states that only teachers who are empowered to acquire knowledge about teaching will enhance their ability to effectively educate themselves and ultimately their students.

Smith and O' Day (1988) describe how pre-service teachers are not prepared [with a variety of learning presentations] to deliver a challenging and varied curriculum which is conceptually based. Too often the structure of the teacher education program allows them to maintain a passive interaction during the acquisition of instructional knowledge. They are not encouraged to challenge, question or prove the value of what they are learning as their listener is often a powerful and sometimes backward supervising teacher.

Popkewitz (1987) notes little interest in change on the part of the university, where faculties generally ignore hands-on techniques suggested for teaching pedagogy. He observes that they perpetuate antiquated methods rather than helping to develop problem-solving, inquiry, questioning and creativity. Goodlad (1990b, 1994) completes this discussion by concluding that it is difficult to ask pre-service teachers to become active, collegial, reflective teachers when supervising teachers, university curriculum and milieu, past experiences and everything they see about teaching does not support this.

Cultural Obstacles to the Development of Collegiality

Authentic collaborative behaviors are a critical component of collegiality (Little 1988; Fullan, Bennett and Rolheiser-Bennett 1990). In schools where collaborative cultures are supported and facilitated, instructional practice, teacher efficacy and professional development among teachers increase (Hawley & Villi, 1999). Yet, most teachers work in isolated environments which contribute to professional dissatisfaction (Lortie, 1975, Lieberman and Miller, 1984).

Studies of mentoring relationships indicate that status prevents collaboration and resulting collegiality (Insley, 1987). Other models aimed at improving the retention of new teachers, such as cognitive apprenticeship, provide means for an expert teacher to model desired performance and professional skills. This may improve teacher learning, but has not ensured the development of collegial relationships.

In the traditional setting, status and power govern the relationship between pre-service and supervising teachers. The pre-service teacher is dependent on the supervising teacher for teaching demonstrations and classroom management as well as for mediating the cultural and tacit environment of the school. When a pre-service teacher has a partner, assigned to the same supervising teacher and classroom, he or she has another person to rely upon without the inherent issues of status and power. This partner can help collect materials, answer questions, listen to problems and provide support. Concerns regarding professional hierarchy and evaluation do not affect these interactions.

Other obstacles to the development of collegiality rest within the professional role perception teachers historically hold. Johnson (1990a), Yee (1990) and Lieberman and Miller (1984) found that teachers saw the scope of their influence as limited to their classroom. Lortie (1975), later corroborated by Johnson (1990a) and Yee (1990), wrote that teachers entered teaching to help others because they received a strong, yet intangible, reward from student progress. They *did not* enter teaching for career mobility, to increase their realm of influence, expand upon professional knowledge or improve the current state of education.

The Collegial Teacher Education Program

Meaning of Collegiality

Webster defines a colleague as a co-worker, an associate, of similar rank in a profession or ecclesiastical office. Conceptions of collegial relationships tend to use the medical profession as a model. The physician calls up an associate for an opinion because the associate specializes in and has particular expertise in a patient problem.

Teachers have been loath to consult their peers and frequently ignore their peers' strengths. Very likely this is, in part, a result of the time barriers that impede consultation and the bureaucratic structure of schools. A major consequence of this is that teachers tend not to talk to their peers about teaching problems and teaching processes. To define the meaning of collegiality for teachers, our early research efforts examined the "talk" of pre-service teachers.

The use of the word *colleague* is often used as an introduction of one person to another: Ms. James, I want you to meet my colleague Mr. Brown. Collegiality appears to be an assumed relationship; yet, researchers frequently ignore issues of *status* and *power*. For example clinical supervision assumes that a collegial relationship exists between the supervisor and the supervised (Goldhammer, Anderson & Krajewski, 1993). Glickman (1998, p.162) assumes that a supervisor can move from a directive supervisory style to a collaborative style in which "the teacher and supervisor share decision-making responsibility equally." Evidence of collegiality is lacking.

The rationale for the new preparation program was based on clearly identified problems from the research literature: teacher isolation, one-strategy teaching, and the need for professionalism. We focused our efforts on the structure of clinical practice and the pedagogy of teacher preparation. Program elements represent the policy changes that affected clinical practice and concurrent curriculum and methods preparation.

Elements of the New Program

By pairing student teachers for their practicum experience, we require collaborative activity with the goal of developing collegiality. Students select partners to student teach together in the same classroom. Each team completes two semesters of teaching, one in a primary grade and one in an upper grade. In this new structure, the student teachers are expected to participate with their partner in curriculum planning and feedback to each other of lessons .

The **curriculum of the instructional methods class focuses on new pedagogy** and criteria, including four models of teaching (Joyce & Weil, 2000). The teachers learn to transform concepts of content disciplines into interdisciplinary thematic units. They participate in problem-solving activities through hands-on and reflective strategies modeled by the curriculum methods professor. In addition, they learn strategies to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Supervising teachers participate in the partners' feedback sessions and facilitate talk about teaching. They guide curriculum planning and serve as a resource for developing lesson plans.

University coordinators visit classrooms to observe teaching at least once a week. The pre-service teachers keep individual journals shared with and responded to by the coordinators. The coordinator holds feedback sessions individually, as well as with partners and supervising teachers to assess progress. University coordinators conduct weekly seminars for partner groups.

Bimonthly coordinator meetings are held at the university with the director of student teaching. The curriculum and methods professor is also a critical member of this group. The meetings are problem-solving sessions that focus on students' instructional and collegial interactions and other teaching problems. Pertinent research findings are intermittently discussed.

Methodology

Our goal was to investigate whether a collegial teacher education program that required supportive and collaborative behaviors would result in collaborative relationships. Data from 12 cycles of partnered student teachers participating in public school placements was the basis of this study. We questioned:

- Are there specific behaviors that can be identified as critical to developing collegial relations?
- Would all partnered pairs develop collegiality over time?
- Would there be a progression of behaviors that provided distinct definition?
- Can teacher educators influence the development of collegiality, and what is the instructional and professional value of this type of relationship?

Student teachers were placed in six public schools districts in the greater Los Angeles area. All of the schools served a diverse student population. Supervising teachers and preservice teachers were of mixed ethnicity. Approximately twenty partnered pairs were studied in each program cycle.

Questionnaires, journals, interviews, conferences, observation, audio and videotapes were used to gather data from the pre-service teachers and supervising teachers. **Questionnaires** were completed by pre-service teachers. Their purpose was to assess collegial development, how they perceived teaching and learning relationships, and how they felt the program was preparing them for their own classrooms. **Exit interviews** were conducted at the culmination of the student teaching experience. Teachers were asked about their collegial development.

---

1 University coordinator and university supervisor are synonymous, and are considered adjunct faculty.

Conferences between university coordinators and student teaching partners provided data about collegial relationships.

Weekly **observations** provided data about partner planning, feedback and professional development. **Journals** added insight to collaborative relationships and revealed individual problems.

Findings

Data from twelve cohort cycles revealed patterns of collegial relationships, factors that influence interaction and collegial relations, and means to support and assist professional growth.

Stages of Collegiality

In the early years of the program we questioned (1) whether novice teacher partners could help each other learn to teach and (2) whether there were specific behaviors that could be identified as critical to the development of collegial relationships. We listened to their talk, read their written feedback notes, observed their videos of each other and listened to their taped critiques of the videos. The data revealed significant patterns of interaction that began with *helping behaviors* defined as "...those interactions in which partners indicated support, assistance, ego boosting, appreciation, constructive feedback, and empathy"(Lemlech and Kaplan, 1990, p.8). As partners became accustomed to clinical practice and as trust between them developed, their interactions revealed *reflective behaviors* in which the partners "...discussed classroom organization, classroom management problems, and how to understand students' actions and responses (p.8). The partners were clearly talking the language of teaching.

Data compiled from partner interactions, university coordinators' group discussions and interviews with supervising teachers helped us to identify distinct phases and behavioral characteristics of collegial development. We recognized that the phases described specific "stages" and helped us define collegiality as: *the establishment of a professional relationship for the purpose of service and accommodation through the mutual exchange of perceptions and expertise."* The stages are described as follows:

1. Peer Interaction – the partner team provides emotional comfort and supportive feedback to each other. At this point in the relationship the partners use each other for tacit learning. An example of a journal entry describes the need for comfort and support, "*I'm glad I have a partner; having her here with me makes me feel more secure. I'd hate to have to ask my supervising teacher all the things Rachel and I ask each other."*

2. Partnering – The partner team participates in providing assistance to each other, sharing ideas, and enacting helping behaviors. In an interview, a student described a typical response at this stage, "*Without Sarah's help, I would never have thought about the criteria for what makes a city. Mr. Jenkins seems to think everyone should know that stuff. All he said was – do a lesson on cities."*

3. Competition – The partner team exhibits envy for each other's abilities and compares strengths and weaknesses with each other (usually in private). One student described competition in an interview, *"I am really beginning to see that I need to be more assertive. I feel as thought the kids compare me all the time to Jamie. Sometimes I'm afraid they like her better because she always seems to know what to say and do in different situations."*

4. Study of Teaching – The partner team overcomes competition, and begins to participate in reflective problem solving which acknowledges strengths and weaknesses. In a journal entry a partner discussed the impact of her actions as observed by her partner, *"Ralph and I talked about the punitive remarks I made to Ernesto. Ralph's notes showed how he actually got worse after I got on him. We're beginning to notice that there is a direct relationship between teaching behavior and student behavior in a lesson."*

5. Integration of Skills – The partner team reflects a confident readiness for the teaching process and demonstrates competence, insight, and refinement of skill. In a partnering questionnaire, two partners wrote *"The first semester was more about getting to know each other and learning how to work together. But during the second semester we really learned to work well together. We used Group Investigation and Inductive Thinking models a lot more. And our kids were really doing critical and creative thinking. We can hardly wait to get our own classrooms."*

6. Collegiality – The partner team regularly enacts peer coaching, consulting, demonstration of expertise for others, and experimentation, with a sense of commitment and responsibility. During an exit interview, a student teacher described her greatest experience of the year, *" My partner and I turned the classroom into a rainforest for our unit of study. We used the theme of change and we integrated everything. It took a lot of planning together and went on for a month. By the end, we had the other first grade teachers at the school asking us if we would share how we taught the thematic unit at a grade level meeting. Our supervising teacher said we did a great job explaining thematic unit planning."*

Identification of stages was critical to understanding how the structure of clinical practice can influence what teachers learn. The development of collegial relationships in partner student teachers provided faculty with insight about what the student teachers were learning at the university, their ability to observe teaching processes, their understanding of children's diversity, and their growth and acceptance of responsibility as future teachers.

Factors and Action Plans to Influence the Development of Collegial Relationships

While the majority of student teacher partnerships thrived and advanced through the stages, sometimes progression appeared to be a back-and-forth process, and for a few partnerships their relationships deteriorated. Using the conceptual structure of the stages, faculty began to focus on factors that facilitated or inhibited collegial relationships. Through observation, reading of the students' journals, and the conferences that the university coordinator would have with the partners, assessment of relationships emerged. The bi-monthly meetings of the university coordinators were used for inquiry and problems solving about how to help partner groups that appeared to falter in their development of professional relationships.

University coordinators experimented with interventions for supporting and assisting the partner student teachers. Action plans were formalized at the university coordinator meetings. Descriptions of factors, samples from the data set, the stage at which growth towards collegiality failed to progress and successful action plans are described below.

Partnership communication. Peer talk is natural, and the contextual and emotional structure of student teaching provides much to talk about. In addition, program requirements defined collaborative assignments (planning, arranging the environment, verbal and written feedback on lessons). As a consequence, most partner groups communicated easily and frequently shared their concerns as they traveled to and from their school site together. But for a few partner groups sharing was divulging personal priorities, biases, and acknowledging insecurity. These groups required assistance. An example of a student complaint to the university coordinator follows:

"Lisa always acts like she knows what to do. She won't listen to my ideas when we plan together. Whatever we use, it's her idea. After planning, she always takes the manual home. Yesterday she called me early and said she wasn't coming to school. But she had the lesson plans and the math teacher's guide with the answers. She doesn't think about how that might affect me and if I say anything she gets defensive." (Stage affected: Partnering)

Action Plan: University faculty developed a "communications" curriculum which was added to the first semester seminar. Partners were instructed on how to bring up sensitive issues and use proactive, non-confrontational language patterns to discuss issues. Supervising teachers were encouraged to facilitate communication when they detected interaction problems. Partners were also encouraged to elicit the support of university faculty. When partners could not resolve communications problems among themselves, university faculty held mediation conferences to model communication skills.

Sharing responsibility: Some pre-service teachers have not had cooperative group experience, and as a consequence they prefer independent work assignments. While the majority of partner groups were able to work constructively as a team, and as a cooperative triad with their supervising teacher, occasionally there were individuals who would avoid responsibility. The following conversation portrays two partners discussing this issue:

Linda :I feel like there isn't enough time to plan, and when I get home I am overwhelmed by the amount of work I need to do before the next day. I don't sense that feeling from Kate (her partner). I know that I'm the type of person that really needs to arrive early in the morning with everything read, but Kate feels more secure and she comes late. Because of that I feel that I am taking on extra work. I know all the preparation is helpful to both of us, but I am getting really burned out.

Kate: I didn't know you felt this way. I thought you didn't mind doing the work. I do appreciate all the work you do. I didn't realize you wanted me to do more. I *thought you were just a person who needs to feel more prepared than I do.* (Stage affected: Partnering)

Action Plan: Articulation of a problem is the first step towards restoring equilibrium. Supervising teachers or university faculty often helped mediate a resolution. University faculty checked intermittently with partners to gauge how they communicated work expectations and shared the responsibility of meeting them.

Over dependence by one partner: The program encouraged partners to learn from each other, provide assistance, and even serve as "gophers" for each other But as teaching skills developed, relationships matured and while planning together continued as a team endeavor, the partners became less dependent on the resources of each other. However, when a student was insecure and teaching skills lagged, over-dependence and frustration occurred. The following conversation illustrates the problem:

Rachel: I'm beginning to feel like I am the one generating all the ideas when we do our planning. I think planning together is really helpful, but when it comes to putting the lessons together, I'm beginning to feel like Teresa can't do it alone.

Teresa: I don't feel ready to do that. I don't think my lessons will be as good without you. I know that we are only supposed to teach together for the first few weeks, but I have not felt able to begin to do it by myself. I am very uneasy about writing lesson plans alone and feel much better when you are there for (with) me. (Stage Affected: Partnering)

Action Plan: Depending on the strength of the partnership, the more confident partner may need some coaching and support to initiate this conversation with her partner. In this case, a conversation a plan to reduce the level of assistance one partner provided for the other was determined. Subsequent observations focused on the implementation of the plan and the partner's progress towards autonomy. If this strategy is not successful and the more dependent pre-service teacher does not move towards working more independently, it may be suggested that she continues her practicum without a partner. This gives each person involved a better assessment of the partners individual strengths.

Inappropriate choice of partner. Students were given opportunity to get acquainted with their cohort at the beginning of the student teaching year. They were then asked to select the person they wanted to work with as a partner. They were cautioned that social friendships should not influence their choice. But occasionally they chose close friends or individuals whose life experiences were too dissimilar. Exit interviews with two friends who partnered the first semester and then chose to separate for the second semester illustrates the problem:

Tami: We became friends in our sorority and we are very close. We wanted to be partners because we thought we could support each other and the idea of student teaching was very scary. I think we both knew after the first two weeks that it was a mistake. In student teaching, we are supposed to watch each other teach lessons and offer constructive suggestions for how the lesson could be better. I knew that Laura is more bubbly and fun with the kids and they liked that. She got better behavior from them than I did. It was too hard for me to hear her make suggestions for how to get more attention in lessons. We finally talked and decided *you can't be close friends and teaching partners, so we decided to separate for the second semester. We're both happier and our friendship is doing better.*

Laura: *The first semester was a nightmare. Tami and I tried to partner together because we were good friends, but our egos got in the way. We couldn't break through and feel comfortable seeing each other teach and focusing on the teaching process. We both chose different partners for second semester and we know our teaching improved because of it. We understand the difference between friendship and professional relationship now.* (Stage affected: Competition)

Action Plan: Partnerships were assessed during the first semester for social competition issues. If competition was determined to be an inhibitor to the development collegiality, and counseling did not alleviate the problem, partners were asked to separate for the second semester. Most chose to separate; in a few cases university faculty required separation.

Development of expertise at different rates. Though foundational coursework undergirds the experience for student teachers, some teacher candidates are better prepared than others. In addition, learning to teach is a developmental process, and as such, differential skill advancement is natural. Therefore, it was not a surprise that some partner groups would experience difficulty adjusting as self-confidence ebbed or swelled. If differences between partners were profound, the competition phase of collegial relationships became a sticking point. A student's reflective journal illustrates the problem:

"We are both trying to teach guided reading right now – we each have two groups. My groups never go well. I'm having trouble with behavior and I don't achieve my objectives. Martha's groups are doing better. I think she got the easier groups because all the kids get along well. She doesn't have behavior problems. I'm getting so frustrated I don't want to plan with her. How come I can't get them focused like she can?" (Stage affected: Competition)

Action Plan: The university faculty and supervising teacher need to work together to find an area of strength for the struggling partner to develop. In this case, the supervising teacher had detected that the student's curriculum strength was in math, so she was told to begin planning and teaching math lessons. Her strength in the subject area resulted in well-planned lessons, and with some classroom management coaching, she was able to feel success in her teaching.

Communication with the supervising teacher. Supervising teachers were selected by the university coordinators with the accord of the school principal. In most cases these guiding teachers were superior in their own practice. However, on occasion supervising teachers would withhold feedback and guidance for the partners, and as a consequence the partners felt neglected and their reflection inhibited. Journal entries from two students illustrate the problem.

"I'm having trouble getting Ms. T to communicate with me about lessons. I think she likes Tracy better because sometimes she'll tell her it's a good lesson, but she's never told me that." (Stage affected: Competition)

"This was an interesting semester. We wanted Mrs. B to spend more time with us talking and planning, but we had trouble getting her to be collegial with us. She's abrupt, and doesn't mince words. She doesn't know how to tell you that you need to change something in a way that is constructive. We've talked about how we stopped conferencing at school because she would butt in and make us feel bad. We finally started doing more planning away from school. (Stage affected: Study of Teaching)

Action Plan: University faculty need to work with partners to develop communication skills for interacting with supervising teachers. This can happen individually, but also can be a curriculum topic in seminars. When partners could not resolve problems themselves, university faculty needed to arrange conferences between supervising teacher, partners and the faculty member to discuss issues and develop a communication plan. In some cases, faculty established regular planning times (early morning or after school) when all participants agreed to be present. Some problems were resolved by engaging the supervising teacher in keeping written notes and a dialogue journal with partners. In a few rare cases, partners needed to be removed from a supervising teacher's classroom, usually at the midpoint of the semester.

Conflict with supervising teacher by one partner:_ Single assignment student teachers often experience conflict with their supervising teacher, and partner student teachers are not immune to similar problems. Levels of competence, teaching style, personality, individual comfort levels with different degrees of assertiveness, feedback style and cultural characteristics may all contribute to conflict. Partner student teachers do not always develop the same rapport with their supervising teacher. Consequences may include diminished confidence level for the excluded partner, unwillingness to engage in risk-taking teaching behavior, and constrained communications with partner and in the triad situation. The following conversation between two partners and their university coordinator illustrates the need for an action plan:

Joy: When I am teaching a lesson, she [the supervising teacher] sometimes interrupts, in a frustrated manner, to add instructions to the students or correct me, even though she's already seen and O.K.ed the lesson plan. I don't see my presentation, expectations or style being that much different than Lisa's, but she does not do this to her. It is frustrating, embarrassing and breaks the continuity of my lesson. When the lesson is over I don't want feedback; I just want to get away.

Lisa: It's really true. Joy teaches good lessons. We plan together, so they are really a result of joint thinking. Her lessons don't use drastically different models or activities than mine do, but Mrs. B. does not interrupt me or criticize my lessons the way she does Joy (Stage affected: Study of Teaching).

Action Plan: Whenever possible, partners need to be coached to speak with the supervising teacher when a problem arises. However, such a meeting does not always resolve the problem, and university faculty may need to advocate on the partners' behalf to review concerns and perceptions. If this is successful, resolution occurs. However, if resolution can not be brought about, the decision may be made by the coordinator to change the clinical classroom placement.

Overconfidence in ability. Learning to teach using teaching models and learning to talk the language of teaching in their feedback sessions, developed the partners' pedagogical self confidence and facilitated their collegial progression. But for a few students, their self efficacy was inflated. These students sometimes became complacent and failed to refine their skills. A questionnaire response revealed the problem:

"My partner and I haven't been peer coaching recently. We know the models, we feel our questioning is good. We aren't struggling any more with planning issues. We are each focusing on assessment issues. We are ready for our own classrooms." (Stage affected: Integration of Skills)

Action Plan: University faculty worked with supervising teachers to challenge students with new tasks and assignments. Faculty counseled with partnerships and gave higher level assignments. The university methods professor offered "clinics" for advanced study of instructional strategies. Participation in the clinics was either voluntary or recommended by university faculty who saw evidence of complacency.

Collegial coaching modeled by the supervising teacher. The role of the supervising teacher as a coach was a critical component of student teaching. In the program, the supervising teacher was expected to be a collegial team leader modeling professional relationships, coaching, and facilitating partnership critiques (Lemlech & Hertzog, 1994). A questionnaire administered at the end of student teaching elicited the following responses from two partners:

"Mrs. O was such a wonderful model for us. We didn't do too well as a partnership last semester, but this semester she really made us feel like a team. We spent so much time together talking about teaching and ideas and she really shared her kids with us. We talked a lot about the progress individuals were making and what to do to help them. I hope in my new job that I'll get to work with other teachers the way we all did this semester. I am a better teacher because of our experience."

"I learned so much this semester. Mrs. O modeled collegiality and treated us like her partners. She is the grade level chair and she included us in all the grade level work. We all met every week. She was a great role model."(Stage affected: Collegiality)

Action Plan: Identification of collegial coaching as a factor in helping partners reach the stage of collegiality profoundly affected criteria for selecting supervising teachers. It became more important to select a teacher who modeled collegial behavior, than to choose a teacher who was well skilled at teaching. The criteria influenced interaction with principals, who were encouraged to seek out teachers who could function well in facilitating the collegial growth of partners. The program began to seek out past graduates who had demonstrated exceptional collegial behavior and these graduates were used for supervision. Even though they were sometimes only third year teachers, their ability to coach partners was usually exceptional.

Conclusions

Collegial Relationships

- Pairing pre-service teachers to develop collegial relationships prepares them, potentially, to work with other teachers in a professional community.

- Collegial relationships enhanced critical thought about teaching, encouraged the sharing of ideas and reflection, and developed respect for other viewpoints.
- A continuum of collaborative development (stages) with corresponding behaviors were identified.
- Thought most partner groups succeeded and developed to high levels of collaborative behavior, those partners with perhaps emotional and/or authoritarian needs, required separation.

Factors Affecting Collegial Relationships

- When partners differed in their beliefs about teaching, conflicts emerged that sometimes required assistance from the university coordinator or other advisors.
- When partners' teaching talents were markedly different, jealousy and rancor were more likely.

Support and Assistance For Professional Growth

- University faculty can influence professional behaviors that lead to collegial relationships through modeling, program requirements, advisement, and specific instruction.

Implications

- Collegial and professional skills play an important role in the success of the beginning teacher. These skills can be taught and practiced in the pre-service program.

- Collegial pre-service programs have the potential to positively effect the public school site's professional climate and culture.

- Novice teachers can contribute to each other's understanding of teaching processes and can provide meaningful critiques of each other's performance. Communication with a peer is more meaningful and natural for a beginning teacher than communication with an experienced teacher because mutual problems can be shared.

- Personality problems may affect professional relationships and classroom behavior. This is an area that warrants further study for candidate admission to teacher preparation.

References

Duckworth, E.(1997).*Teacher to teacher: Learning from each other.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M., Bennett, B. & C. Rolheiser-Bennett (1990). Linking classroom and school Improvement. *Educational Leadership,* 47(8), 13-19.

Glickman, C.D., Gordon, S.P. & J.M. Ross-Gordon. (1998). *Supervision of Instruction - A developmental approach 4th ed.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R.H. & R.J. Krajewski. (1993). *Clinical supervision-Special methods for the supervision of teachers* 3rd ed. Forth Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers.

Goodlad, J. (1990a). Studying the education of educators: From conceptions to findings. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 71(9), 698.

Goodlad, J. (1990b). *Teachers for our nation's schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J. (1994). *Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hargreaves, A.(1989)*Curriculum and assessment reform.* Milton Keynew, United Kingdom: Open University Press.

Hawley, W.D., & Valli,L. (1999).The essentials of effective professional development: A new consensus. In Darling-Hammond & Sykes (eds.) *Teaching as the learning profession-Handbook of policy and practice.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Howey, K.R., & Zimpher, N. (1989). *Profiles of preservice teacher education: Inquiry into the nature of programs.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Insley, P. (1987). The relationship between mentor teacher preparation for collegial assistance and the help provided to beginning teachers. Unpublished dissertation. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.

Johnson, S.M.,(1990) . Redesigning teacher's work. In R. Elmore & Associates, *Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Joyce, B. (1990).The self-educating teacher. *Changing school culture through staff Development.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Joyce, B.,Weil, M. & E. Calhoun (2000). *Models of teaching 6th ed.* Boston: Allyn Bacon.

Lemlech, J.K., Hertzog, H.H.(1994). Studying teaching processes through collegial Development and case studies –Linking school and university. *Teacher*

Education Quarterly 20(4), 19-28.

Lemlech, J.K., Kaplan, S.N. (1990) Learning to talk about teaching: Collegiality in clinical teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education, 12(1), 13-18.*

Lieberman, A., Saxl,E.R., & M. B.Miles (1988). Teacher leadership: Ideology and Practice. In A.Lieberman (ed.) *Building a professional culture in schools.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1984) The social realities of teaching. *Teachers, their world and their work: Implications for school improvement.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Little, J.W. (1988). Assessing the prospects of teacher leadership. In A. Lieberman, (ed.) *Building a professional culture in schools.* White Plains, NY: Longman Press.

Lortie, D.C. (1975).*Schoolteacher: A sociological study.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Petrie, H. (1990). Reflections in the second wave of reform: Restructuring the teaching profession. In S.L. Jacobson & J.A. Conway (eds.) *Educational leadership in the age of school reform.* White Plains NY: Longman Press.

Popkewitz, T. (1987). *Critical studies in teacher education: It's folklore, theory and practice.* Philadelphia : The Falmer Press.

Schon, D.A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, M., O'Day, J. (1990). National curriculum American style. *American Educator, 14(11) 10-17; 40-47.*

Sykes, G. (1990). Fostering teacher professionalism in schools. In R.Elmore & Associates, *Restructuring Schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tabachick, R. (1979). Teacher education and the professional perspectives of student teachers. *Interchange, 10(4), 14.*

Yee, S.M. (1990). *Careers in the classroom: When teaching is more than a job.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Zeichner, K.M., Liston, D.P.(1996) *Reflective teaching: An introduction.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Zeichner, K.M.(1999).The new scholarship in teacher education. *Educational Researcher 28(9), 4.*

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Collegial Relationships: What Does It Mean To Be A Colleague?

Author(s): Hertzog, Hillary S.; Pensavalle, Margo T; Lemlech, Johanna K

Corporate Source:

Publication Date: 5-1-00

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ↑ ☒	Level 2A ↑ ☐	Level 2B ↑ ☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here,→ please

Signature: Hillary S Hertzog

Printed Name/Position/Title: Hillary S. Hertzog, Asst. Professor

Organization/Address: Calif. St. University Northridge
18111 Nordhoff St
Northridge, CA 91330-8265

Telephone: (818) 677-2103

FAX: (626) 441-8299

E-Mail Address: hhertzog@earthlink.net

Date: 7/5/00

(over)

ERIC®

Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation

University of Maryland
1129 Shriver Laboratory
College Park, MD 20742-5701

Tel: (800) 464-3742
(301) 405-7449
FAX: (301) 405-8134
ericae@ericae.net
http://ericae.net

May 8, 2000

Dear AERA Presenter,

Hopefully, the convention was a productive and rewarding event. As stated in the AERA program, presenters have a responsibility to make their papers readily available. If you haven't done so already, please submit copies of your papers for consideration for inclusion in the ERIC database. We are interested in papers from this year's AERA conference and last year's conference. If you have submitted your paper, you can track its progress at http://ericae.net.

Abstracts of papers accepted by ERIC appear in *Resources in Education (RIE)* and are announced to over 5,000 organizations. The inclusion of your work makes it readily available to other researchers, provides a permanent archive, and enhances the quality of *RIE*. Abstracts of your contribution will be accessible through the printed and electronic versions of *RIE*. The paper will be available through the microfiche collections that are housed at libraries around the world and through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

We are gathering all the papers from the **2000 and 1999 AERA Conference**. We will route your paper to the appropriate clearinghouse. You will be notified if your paper meets ERIC's criteria for inclusion in *RIE*: contribution to education, timeliness, relevance, methodology, effectiveness of presentation, and reproduction quality.

Please sign the Reproduction Release Form enclosed with this letter and send **two** copies of your paper. The Release Form gives ERIC permission to make and distribute copies of your paper. It does not preclude you from publishing your work. You can mail your paper to our attention at the address below. Please feel free to copy the form for future or additional submissions.

Mail to:

AERA 2000/ERIC Acquisitions
University of Maryland
1129 Shriver Laboratory
College Park, MD 20742

Sincerely,

Lawrence M. Rudner

Lawrence M. Rudner, Ph.D.
Director, ERIC/AE

ERIC is a project of the Department of Measurement, Statistics & Evaluation

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC