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ABSTRACT

In recent years, there has been increased attention on teacher quality and on teacher candidate development (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Schuster, 2012). Demands on teachers are growing (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005) with an expanding diversity and needs of students (Villegas & Lucas, 2002; Walsh, 2012). Now, more than ever, it is important to understand how candidates are prepared for the teaching profession (Ladson-Billings, 2001). This study examined one vital aspect of teacher education: the role of teacher educators in preparing candidates to partner with families. In spite of substantial evidence of a positive correlation to students’ academic success with increased partnerships between the home and school (Dearing, Kreider, Simpkins, & Weiss, 2006; Epstein & Sheldon, 2002; Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Hoover-Dempsey, Battiato, Walker, Reed, DeJong, & Jones, 2001; Jeynes, 2007), teacher candidates still lack the necessary skills to work with families (Caspe, Lopez, Chu, & Weiss, 2011). This study used critical pedagogy as a theoretical framework to investigate how teacher educators applied family-school partnership (FSP) modules into their courses. Through a qualitative phenomenological research design, interview and survey data were collected and analyzed on 11 teacher educators and 200 candidates over a two-year period of time. The constant comparative method (Merriam, 2009) was conducted to analyze multiple interviews of the teacher educators, which was triangulated (Stake, 2004) with surveys of teacher candidates. Findings indicated that (a) teacher educators’ FSP beliefs were positively influenced by piloting of FSP modules, (b) teacher educators’ locus of control affected their ability to apply FSP content into their courses, and (c) teacher candidates’ one-sided views of family-school relationships could be changed to one of “partnerships.” The implications of this research affirm the need to support teacher educators in preparing their candidates to work with families.
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CHAPTER 1

PREPARING TEACHER CANDIDATES TO PARTNER WITH FAMILIES

In the past decade America has seen an increased attention on teacher quality and preparation with the states and U.S. government playing a more active role in determining the defining characteristics of quality (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Schuster, 2012). For instance, in 2009, President Obama signed into law the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) which allocates $4.35 billion for the Race to the Top Fund. This action is remarkable because in determining which states qualify for funding, 28% of the criteria for selection are dependent upon improving the quality of teachers and principals and of teacher and principal preparation programs (Race to the Top Executive Summary, 2009).

As a result of this new federal mandate and other recently introduced state and local policies, demands on teachers are increasing (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). The scrutiny and pressure on teacher preparation programs has risen as well: colleges and universities are now required to assess and publicly report the quality of their programs and the performance of their graduates. Furthermore, the government is tying federal funds to states’ disclosures of students’ achievement (as a result of the programs), and the threat of closure for poor performing programs (Dillon & Silva, 2011).

While it is debatable whether there is a crisis in the quality and preparation of our nation’s teachers (Kumashiro, 2012; Ravitch, 2011), the increased dialogue can encourage professional reflection on the topic. This study examines one vital aspect of teacher education: the role of teacher educators in preparing teacher candidates to partner with families. The focus on this aspect of teacher preparation is significant because interacting with families is viewed by teachers as a major factor in improving student performance (Capse, Lopez, Chu, & Weiss, 2011) and is well documented in the literature as contributing to students’ academic
growth (Henderson & Mapp, 2002). However, most teacher preparation programs in the U.S. relegate family-school partnership (FSP) practices to piecemeal exposure or voluntary course offerings (Epstein & Sanders, 2006). This study contextualizes and focuses the national debate on teacher quality by looking at how teacher educators prepare their candidates to partner with families in the largest teacher education preparation program in the state of Hawai‘i.

**Statement of the Problem**

There is substantial evidence supporting the positive effects of collaborative partnerships between the home and school on attendance (Epstein & Sheldon, 2002), on completion of homework assignments (Hoover-Dempsey, Battiato, Walker, Reed, DeJong, & Jones, 2001), on literacy (Dearing, Simpkins, Kreider, Weiss, 2006), and on overall academic achievement (Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Jeynes, 2007). This empirical evidence is further legitimized by several federal mandates requiring state boards of education and school districts to engage families: (a) Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994—include a written statement of parental involvement (Smith & Piper, 2002), (b) No Child Left Behind Act of 2002—communicate effectively with all parents and the public (Epstein & Sanders, 2006), (c) McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act—provide education and training to families of homeless children, (d) Individuals with Disabilities Act—allow families the right to be involved in the child’s education (Michigan Department of Education, 2011), and (e) Head Start—welcome parents into classrooms and positions of influence (Epstein, 2011).

In spite of the evidence and the increased pressure from federal policies, U.S. teacher education programs continue to lag behind in preparing their candidates to engage families in partnerships (Epstein & Sanders, 2006). According to Caspe, Lopez, Chu, and Weiss (2011), candidates are not receiving adequate support and resources to prepare themselves to partner
with families, are not prepared to work with students of linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds, and lack the training to have positive dispositions towards families.

To ameliorate this dichotomy of the importance of teachers’ partnering with families and teacher candidates being underprepared to do so, an analysis of the preparations of teacher candidates should be more closely examined. One way that analysis can be accomplished is by studying the role of teacher educators in affecting the candidates’ family practices’ development. There are, however, very few studies that analyze the roles of teacher educators in teacher preparation programs (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to explore the roles of teacher educators in the implementation of FSP curriculum in teacher education courses. With the growing demands on teachers (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005) coupled with the growing diversity and needs of students and their families (Villegas & Lucas, 2002; Walsh, 2012), it is increasingly important to reexamine teacher preparation programs and methods for educating teacher candidates (Ladson-Billings, 2001). Specifically, the curriculum of FSP content in teacher education programs (Epstein, 2011) and the lessons and activities for teaching those skills to the candidates (Ratcliff & Hunt, 2009) should be understood more fully. Areas such as teachers communicating with families (Graham-Clay, 2005) while reflecting upon their own backgrounds and how these perceptions influence working with linguistically and culturally diverse families (Banks et al., 2007; Lucas & Villegas, 2013; Villegas & Lucas, 2002) are opportune contexts for candidates to develop skills to connect more meaningfully with their future students’ families. More information on the role of teacher educators and their effect in nurturing a candidate’s confidence in working with families is needed (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005). Knowing more about teacher educators’ FSP beliefs and experiences and
how they implement FSP lessons and activities into teacher education courses allows us further insight into the preparation of candidates to partner with families. This insight can give us important tools with which to enhance teacher education programs.

**Significance**

Research indicates that teacher candidates’ beliefs in teaching practices are relatively unchanged upon graduation (Schultz, Jones-Walker, & Chikkatur, 2008, p. 157). Discovering the beliefs and experiences of teacher educators with regard to FSPs and how those might change over time could provide insightful information which, in turn, could lead to even more interesting findings on how candidates are affected by their teacher educators. While there is a substantial amount of research on teacher candidates, teacher education programs, and field experience schools, there is a vacuum of information when it comes to the explicit practices of teacher educators (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005). This lack of information represents a challenge because in order to better prepare teacher candidates to partner with families, we should know more about the roles of their instructors. I will address this gap in knowledge by examining teacher educators’ implementation of FSP modules in teacher education courses.

In a study that looked at teacher educators preparing candidates to work with families, de Bruïne et al. (2014) studied three teacher education programs in the Netherlands, Belgium, and the United States. The authors sought to discover how teacher educators perceived their roles in affecting candidates’ beliefs about FSP as well as how candidates perceived their development of FSP in a teacher education program. Data were collected on focus groups of 65 candidates and 32 educators along with course syllabi. De Bruïne et al. found that there were striking similarities across the curricula in the three countries’ programs: “developing reciprocal partnerships with families was not mentioned, one way communication from
teacher to parent was the norm and there were no graded assignments on this topic” (p. 416). The researchers also found that candidates and educators both had trepidations regarding partnering with families but also found, that, in spite of these concerns, there were no dedicated courses on FSP in the three university programs studied, with only sporadic coverage in some of the classes. As is commonly noted in the research literature, FSP has an insignificant representation in the curriculum or field experiences of teacher education programs (Caspe et al., 2011; Epstein & Sanders, 2006). de Bruïne et al. (2014) believe that teacher educators significantly influenced teacher candidates’ FSP preparation and without the educators’ clear understanding and instruction of FSP, the candidates would not be adequately prepared to engage with families.

The following study on the role of teacher educators in preparing candidates to partner with families contributes to the research and education field in the following ways:

(a) Firstly, this study contributes to the teacher education and family engagement literature by presenting an alternative theoretical framework. This focus responds directly to the 2005 Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education, which argued that the teacher education literature is under-theorized and states that future research “better situate research studies in relation to relevant theoretical frameworks” (Zeichner, 2005, p. 741). This lack of theoretical frameworks related to research on FSP was also confirmed by Yamauchi, Traynor, Ponte, and Ratcliffe (2015).

(b) Secondly, this study contextualizes the current discussion of teacher education programs and their educators by examining the process of teacher educators’ implementing FSP lessons and activities and their abilities in doing so. This study is especially useful since there is a lack of empirical research on teacher education programs and how teacher educators are preparing their candidates (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005).
(c) Thirdly, this study provides an understanding of FSPs and a support structure for novice and experienced teachers to better partner with families. The importance of such a research focus is confirmed by teachers reporting that support from families and strategies to engage them were the most challenging and important issues they faced when trying to improve the success of their students (Caspe et al., 2011).

(d) Finally, this study contributes to the FSP research field which has a lack of longitudinal studies (Epstein, 2011). The following dissertation traces the process of teacher educators adding FSP content to their curriculum, piloting lessons and activities, and then a year later returning to their classes to ascertain changes in their beliefs and teaching practices. This research adds vital information to help improve the preparation of teacher candidates to partner with families.

**Research Questions**

1. How do teacher educators implement FSP lessons and activities into teacher education courses?

2. What are teacher educators' beliefs and experiences with FSP and how do those beliefs and experiences affect their implementation of FSP lessons and activities?

3. How does the implementation of FSP lessons and activities influence the beliefs and practices of teacher educators?

**Abbreviations and Defining of Terms**

In this study, the following abbreviations are commonly used: College of Education (COE), family-school partnership (FSP), family engagement (FE), critical pedagogy (CP), Early Childhood Education (ECE), and Special Education (SPED).

*Family-school partnership* and *family engagement* are frequently used in this study. Over the years, the terms *family involvement* and *family engagement* have been used in the
research literature to label the relationship between schools and families. Family involvement denotes the family’s responsibility to be involved. Often the school sets the agenda, with the family responding to the school’s needs by participating in school events, checking their children’s homework, and donating their time and money (Carreón, Drake, & Barton, 2005; Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Souto-Manning & Swick, 2006). Because the burden of sustaining family involvement fell on the families themselves, it could, therefore, be said that if the family-school relationship was not fruitful, it was a direct result of the family’s lack of involvement. On the other hand, family engagement implies more responsibility on the part of the classroom teacher and the school to reach out to engage with families. There is more emphasis on learning about families, their needs, and ways for them to contribute to the school community dialogue (Barton, Drake, Perez, Louis, & George, 2004; Harris & Goodall, 2008). For some researchers, family engagement additionally means including family members in curriculum projects, establishing open lines of communication, and creating a welcoming environment for families to contribute to and participate in the school community (Halgunseth & Peterson, 2009; Weiss & Lopez, 2009). Both of these terms, however, still might imply a deficit model for parents to be involved and engaged in the school rather than for responsibilities to be equally distributed between school, family, and community (Epstein, 2011). To clarify this distinction and emphasize a more equal relationship, Joyce Epstein, a nationally recognized author and researcher in the field, advocates the use of the term family-school partnerships. She argues that the use of partnership more accurately "assign[s] responsibilities to schools, to families, and to communities” (Epstein, 2011, p. 258) rather than to families alone.

In this study, I have used the term family-school partnerships in the text of the study while in the data collection instruments (i.e., interviews and surveys) I have used family
engagement. This decision was based on the prevalence of the term family engagement in literature at the beginning stages of this research; the term family involvement had fallen out of favor. Therefore, in this study, the two terms, FSP and FE, are used interchangeably to describe the school and family equitably sharing in the responsibilities of partnering. This means that the families, depending on their resources, participate and interact with the school through events, communicate with teachers and staff, and contribute their time and skills in the classroom and at home. For the school and teachers, it means that they invite and support families to come into the school and classrooms to contribute their time, knowledge, and expertise in the partnering of the education of their children.

Teacher educators and teacher candidates are also terms commonly used in this study. Teacher educators are used to mean the instructors/professors teaching in COE courses. Teacher candidates are then the students of these COE professors. It is assumed the teacher candidates in teacher educators’ classes have the intention of becoming a teacher upon graduation.

Overview of the Dissertation

Chapter 1 begins by establishing the importance for this study based on current issues in the field. Chapter 2 describes the decisions made in arriving at the theoretical framework and discusses prominent theories being used in the FE literature. I then explain CP in relation to research on the practices of teacher educators. Chapter 3 focuses on the benefits, challenges, and drawbacks of developing stronger preparation for teacher candidates to partner with culturally and linguistically diverse families, and the role of teacher education programs in strengthening those ties. Chapter 4 explains the context for this study, and details the methods for collecting and analyzing the data. Chapters 5 and 6 are dedicated to the results and implications of the study.
CHAPTER 2
CONCEPTUALIZING A NEW THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR FSPs

Literature Review

The FSP literature presents particular theories that are reoccurring throughout the research studies. These various frameworks have helped me build a foundation to understand the conceptualization of FSPs in teacher education programs. However, none of these theories completely captures the phenomenon or the importance of preparing teacher candidates to partner with families and their communities. Zeichner (2005) noted that the teacher education literature is under-theorized, and indicated that it is more important than ever to “situate research studies in relation to relevant theoretical frameworks” (p. 741). To describe the process of arriving at a new theory, I begin by summarizing Epstein’s overlapping spheres of influence, Bronfenbrenner’s bioecological systems theory, and Moll’s funds of knowledge together with Vygotsky’s sociocultural learning theory, which are common theoretical constructs being applied in the FE field. Next, I provide a synopsis of each framework and then point out some of their benefits and drawbacks in terms of their application. Afterwards, I explain CP and how I use it as a theoretical framework in my own research. Finally, I justify the use of CP and its benefits over other theories commonly employed in the FSP teacher education field.

Overlapping spheres of influence. Epstein is widely cited in the field of FSPs. Her decades’ worth of research has created a model to represent the interconnectivity of school, family, and community (Epstein, 2011). The model is based on the presumption that the greater overlap of the three spheres of school, family, and community, the higher likelihood of a student’s success.
The external structures of school, family, and community are determined by time, experience in family, and experience in schools, while internal structures are affected by family and school interactions such as communications, events, and other forms of advocacy (Epstein, 2009). The more deliberate actions teachers and school personnel take to reach out and connect with families and the community, the stronger the relationship will be. Similarly, the more initiatives families and the community enact to participate in school events and contribute to the child’s school experience, the greater the likelihood of student successes. The cohesiveness of these spheres is mitigated by the corresponding actions of these actors. Time is an underlying presence tending to bring the spheres closer together in the earlier years (i.e., kindergarten and younger grades) while separating them in the older grades of middle and high school. The school, family, and community work together to create family-like structures to cocoon the growing child: “teachers and administrators create more family-like schools” while at the same time “parents create more school-like families” (Epstein, 1995, p. 702).

Another framework by Epstein that is commonly used in the literature is her six typologies of FSP (Yamauchi et al., 2015). Rather than a theory or a model, the six types of family involvement—parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision making, and collaborating with the community (Epstein, 1995)—are a conceptual framework that helps the school community to operationalize the notion of the overlapping spheres of influence into an action plan (Epstein & Sanders, 2006).

There are many contributions to the FSP field from Epstein’s *Overlapping Spheres of Influence* model and six typologies framework. For example, (a) a large body of research on FSP, which has resulted in greater recognition of the importance of FSP; (b) a national framework for engaging families, with the National PTA adopting her framework of six
typologies and The No Child Left Behind Act (2002), including activities based on each of the six types (Epstein, 2011); and (c) a model and typologies that are fairly easy to understand and operationalize (Corter & Pelletier, 2005) and therefore easily translatable and usable by teachers and schools. However, there are a few potential drawbacks to Epstein’s model and typologies. Firstly, by stressing an FSP model such as Epstein’s overlapping spheres of influence, we may be neglecting the underlying causes of why parents are not involved and may unintentionally shift the blame to families without determining the root sources of their disengagement. In fact we may be “reinforcing patterns of discrimination based on social class, ethnicity, and gender through the creation of new stratified structures of participation” (Carvalho, 2000, p. 3). In other words, those families who already have the “capital” to participate in schools will continue to benefit while those families whose cultures, languages, and socio-economic conditions do not meet the prerequisites of the family-school relationship will be further disenfranchised. For instance, by establishing the home as an extension of the school, such as expecting family members to help their children with homework, the school is “imposing on the parents a certain educative (parenting) model—educational policy is, in fact, extending political regulations onto the diffuse realm of the family and private life” (Carvalho, 2000, p. 46). Furthermore, families have different ways of being involved and supportive of their children’s schooling based on their various cultural, ethnic, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds (Pomerantz, Moorman, & Litwack, 2007), and this diversity is not sufficiently recognized in Epstein’s theory.

Secondly, Epstein’s framework is criticized for being largely based on a White, middle-class model (Baquedano-Lopez, Alexander, & Hernandez, 2013; Carvalho, 2000). Other ethnic, racial, linguistic and cultural groups may be deemed, therefore, non-normative (Barton, Drake, Perez, Louis, & George, 2004; Lareau & Horvat, 1999; Lee & Bowen, 2006).
We need to be sensitive to how we define FSP and the kinds of expectations we have of family members. While framing certain groups as having more positive involvement—“affluent communities currently have more positive family involvement” (Epstein, 1995, p. 703)—educators should be careful to not label “Other” families with a deficit mindset. There should not be one formula directed by the school to welcome families into the school. Instead, the school, as a part of the community, needs to access families’ voices, listen to their needs, and then determine the best way to establish partnerships. Furthermore, policies of FSP that are drafted by school officials and disseminated to families are not true forms of collaboration since the locus of action resides with the school and is not truly shared with families.

**Bioecological systems theory.** According to Bronfenbrenner (1979), the field of developmental psychology leading up to the 1970s lacked a critical analysis of environmental factors that affected individual growth. He argued that the research at that time focused on “strange situations with strange adults for the briefest possible periods of time” (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, p. 19). Rather than only viewing the environment in the immediate vicinity of a developing individual, he argued that the broader contexts (e.g., family members’ working conditions, culture of the community, political atmosphere of the country) also affected the growth of a person. That is, he believed that a complex system of dynamic environmental factors influenced the growth of a child. Bronfenbrenner proposed levels of environmental conditions or relationships that contributed to the growth of individuals.

Bronfenbrenner’s ecological theory consists of four levels of ecological systems: microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, and macrosystem (Bronfenbrenner, 1974, 1979). The first level consists of the microsystem, those factors closest to the individual’s development. For example, the type of school a child attends contains factors such as the school curriculum, the commuting time from home, and the network of friends, which may, in turn, influence the
child’s growth. The mesosystem, the next larger system, encompasses two or more microsystems. Therefore, for instance, if an Individualized Education Program (IEP) were developed for a student, data on the student’s various microsystems—performances in the classroom, during recess, and at after-school programs—might provide insightful information on the child, in addition to studying only one microsystem. The third outer layer is the exosystem, which includes two or Microsystems, with at least one of them not involving the individual as a participant. The macrosystem, the “overarching pattern” of the other three systems, characterizes the customs, culture, politics, and bodies of knowledge influencing the individual (Bronfenbrenner, 1994, p. 40). For example, political tensions or news coverage of political events in the nation or world may affect home or school discussions which, in turn, may influence the beliefs of the developing child. Later in the mid-1980s and through the following two decades, Bronfenbrenner expanded his ecological theory into the bioecological systems theory by including the effects of time on a person’s development since time is endemic to the maturing characteristics of the individual and the environment in which they are living (Bronfenbrenner, 1994).

Family plays a key role in Bronfenbrenner’s bioecological theory. He was the co-founder of the national Head Start program, the school readiness program that has served disadvantaged children and families since 1965 (Woo, 2005), and whose premise established that the family and all the contexts the child interacted with are instrumental in the development of the whole individual. His work spotlighted the importance of family as having a significant impact on the development of a child without portraying the family in a deficit manner (Rosa & Tudge, 2013). A possible drawback, however, of Bronfenbrenner’s theory may result from the complexity of the multiple domains of the ecological systems in
tandem with time and the lack of a prescriptive nature (Tudge, Mokrova, Hatfield, & Karnik, 2009; Ungar, 2002).

Funds of knowledge. Funds of knowledge is based on a concept that families have valuable knowledge and cultural assets (Moll & Greenberg, 1990). An overview of Lev Vygotsky’s theories helps to contextualize an understanding of this idea. Vygotsky made his mark in history by critiquing the theory that humans’ intellectual growth arose solely from maturation, and he was the first to posit that culture was a part of a person’s nature (Cole & Scribner, 1978, p. 6). Vygotsky believed that children’s cognitive development occurred long before they entered a classroom: “any learning a child encounters in school always has a previous history” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 84). In other words, there was a process of “social formation” in the development of children’s learning which was affected by the social, cultural, and historical context in which they were living (Daniels, 2004). Vygotsky’s ideas were in sharp contrast to other theorists of the time who emphasized that there was a self-determination of the individual and that maturation determined growth.

Vygotsky additionally distinguished between development and learning. He argued that developmental and learning processes did not necessarily occur simultaneously, but rather learning tending to appear first with development ensuing later (Vygotsky, 1978). Vygotsky further clarified development into an actual developmental level, that which has already been acquired, and the zone of proximal development, that which is yet to be acquired. More specifically, the zone of proximal development was the distance between the actual developmental level and the potential level a child could achieve under the guidance of an adult or a peer (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86). Hence sociocultural learning theory was attributed to Vygotsky’s emphasis on the learning process via an individual’s actions in conjunction with other persons’ guidance in their surroundings (Daniels, 2004). The daily, multifaceted
contexts in which children mature led to the emblematic “internalization of cultural forms of behavior” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 57) which helped to shape their growth and identity.

Based on Vygotsky’s research and the notion of the zone of proximal development—a child advances from an actual developmental stage to a higher potential through the interaction with adults or other members of the child’s community—Moll and his colleagues posited that the role of social interactions and networks outside of school were significant funds of knowledge contributing to a child’s advancing stages of development. Based on research in Latino communities, Moll argued that these minority families were frequently perceived as being deficient rather than recognized for their wealth of resources (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992). Moll’s research contributed to the educational and research literature by recognizing the valuable assets of families and communities and how they might contribute to a richer understanding of students’ backgrounds. There might, however, be some limitations to this theory. For example, researchers tended to restrict their identification of family’s funds of knowledge to the adults and the more readily accessible family characteristics rather than other traits such as social class and power relationships between families and the school (Rios-Aguilar, Kiyama, Gravitt, & Moll, 2011).

**The Gap in Knowledge**

A theoretical framework is the orientation of the research study which “becomes an advocacy perspective that shapes the types of questions asked, informs how data are collected and analyzed, and provides a call for action or change” (Creswell, 2009, p. 62). The theory, in turn, is the major concept that connects all the smaller themes or ideas of the study so that there is one central tenet guiding the direction and interpretation of the data (Corbin & Strauss, 2014). The current research establishes FSP in teacher education as a phenomenon and analyzes how it is portrayed in the FSP research literature. Initially, I made an effort to
orient my understanding of FSPs with the aforementioned theories, but I soon found that none of them linked concepts together in ways that resembled my own knowledge of and familiarity with FSPs, gathered while working with teacher candidates, teacher educators, and families, as well as by reading the FSP literature. I began to question why the often cited merits of FSP are lauded, yet the actual follow through seemed underrepresented. I wondered too about why these commonly referenced theories, which emphasized the rich backgrounds and resources students brought to school, were often cited in the research literature while, in practice, there still seemed to exist a discourse of “fix-the-broken family.”

As previously mentioned, these theories and models all have merits and have contributed instrumentally in advancing the field of FE or FSPs. However, the theories tend to be used in the research literature as a means to frame the assets of the family rather than to examine the underlying structures deterring increased partnerships and to propose initiating actions for fundamental changes. Therefore, in the following section, I propose and argue for critical pedagogy (CP) as an alternative and unique theory to practically and theoretically frame FSPs in teacher education programs.

Theoretical Framework

**Critical pedagogy.** CP is teaching for social justice, and involves teaching, guiding, and challenging students to be critically aware of the societal structures marginalizing themselves or others and encouraging students to become agents of change (Crookes, 2013). With the mindset of critical pedagogues, we, as educators, are challenged to question our neutrality towards the curriculum, the school-home relationships, and other established and potentially disenfranchising structures. We need to ask ourselves who is framing our perception of this reality (Kumashiro, 2012). For example, we should ask questions such as the following: Why is the family-school relationship this way?, Why aren’t parents more
involved?, What does involvement mean to the school as compared to the family and community?, Who is served by our decisions and who is being excluded?, and What is my positionality in disseminating this information?

By inserting CP as a framework for viewing educative practices, teachers of students of all ages can “highlight the performative character of education” (Giroux, 2004, p. 41) so that there is a concerted effort to understand and ameliorate the schooling experiences and relationships connecting school and home. Paolo Freire (1970) said,

[Students should be engaged in] dialogue and problem-posing instruction so that they can develop their power to perceive critically the way they exist in the world with which and in which they find themselves; they come to see the world not as a static reality, but as a reality in process, in transformation. (p. 83)

In the same respect, teacher education programs can benefit from infusing a CP framework into their curriculum. Rather than primarily looking at the dimensions of (a) the importance of family-school relationships and its problems and (b) the ways to improve upon it, CP could create a third dimension of (c) critical consciousness. In other words, teacher educators could create an environment which goes beyond the simple face value of the situation and have candidates struggling with these kinds of questions: Why is the FSP relationship failing?, Why aren’t family members attending this event as we would have wished?, and Why aren’t parents checking their children’s homework on a nightly basis? This approach, again, would be especially beneficial for teacher candidates who are mostly young and inexperienced and who often come from culturally and linguistically different backgrounds than their students (Feistritzer, 2011; Guest, 2011; Hodgkinson, 2008; Sleeter & Milner, 2011).

Before proceeding any further with these explanations, it is important to distinguish terminology frequently associated with CP such as: *multicultural education, social justice,*
teaching for social justice, culturally relevant teaching, and critical thinking/consciousness.

Defining the terms of this study helps to establish clarity of language because some scholars use the terms interchangeably with varying definitions (Burbules & Berk, 1999; Lee, 2011; North, 2006).

According to Banks and Banks (2009), *multicultural education* is the following:

An idea, an educational reform movement, and a process whose major goal is to change the structure of educational institutions so that male and female students, exceptional students, and students who are members of diverse racial, ethnic, language, and cultural groups will have an equal chance to achieve academically in school. (p. 1)

Among scholars and educators, there is a vast range of understanding of multicultural education. Too often it is interpreted as meaning something added to the existing curriculum rather than as a resource for re-examining educators’ beliefs and practices to include students and families of diversity (Nieto, 2010).

*Social justice* is the act of individuals working together to exercise some type of justice. The process and product of that action is socially construed (Novak, 2000). It is not an individual effort with individual benefits. There has to be a group or a community working together to improve a human condition which in turn benefits a (large) group of people. For instance, social justice could be a group of citizens banding together to right a wrong, to advocate for disadvantaged persons, or to change an institutionalized way of doing something. *Teaching for social justice* then means the educator is oriented to be aware of and to look for institutionalized structures in schools which unfairly favor some students and not others.

Teaching for social justice examines the instructional practices for engaging students and families and how some approaches inherently value some students or communities over
others (Nieto, 2000). It moves beyond the “window dressing” of multicultural education to ask the uncomfortable questions of “access, equity, and social justice” (Nieto, 2000, p. 180). These are the types of questions a critical pedagogue would ask about family-school relationships and the preparation of teacher candidates to work with families.

_Culturally relevant teaching_ establishes the central importance for teachers to identify and incorporate into their curriculum students’ backgrounds. According to Ladson-Billings (1995), culturally relevant teaching for students entails the following characteristics: (a) academic success, (b) cultural competence, and (c) critical consciousness (p. 160). As noted later in this chapter, some of the approaches used to implement FSPs do not truly partner with all families and communities because they frame certain practices as normative while others are seen as deficient (Ba quedano-Lopez et al., 2013). Students of culturally and linguistically diverse families will forever be the square peg being put into the round hole if new teachers do not reconceptualize and practice more culturally relevant teaching. In teacher education programs, this kind of critical awareness and culturally relevant teaching can lead to discomfort, causing some teacher candidates to avoid reflecting critically on issues of race and culture or to dismiss issues of racism or inequality as no longer existent in American society (Gay & Kirkland, 2003). However, as shown throughout this literature review, there are teacher education programs that are successfully integrating consciousness-raising and culturally relevant teaching. Culturally relevant teaching is a good first step in preparing candidates to work with students and families of diversity. If it is then coupled with CP’s focus on action, teacher candidates will be better prepared to connect with the communities of their schools.

_Critical thinking/consciousness_ concerns itself with having people examine more closely the underlying assumptions of daily life: “to be more discerning in recognizing faulty
arguments, hasty generalizations, assertions lacking evidence, truth claims based on unreliable authority,” and so on (Burbules & Berk, 1999, p. 46). An educator espousing critical thinking in his or her teaching would have the student be a “critical consumer of information . . . driven to seek reasons and evidence” (Burbules & Berk, 1999, p. 48). In a similar manner, CP also concerns itself with the notions of “justice, democracy, and ethical claims” with an epistemological orientation (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2008, p. 7). However, the key distinction between critical thinking and CP lies in action:

This emphasis on change, and on collective action to achieve it, moves the central concerns of critical pedagogy rather far from those of critical thinking: the endeavor to teach others to think critically is less a matter of fostering individual skills and dispositions, and more a consequence of the pedagogical relations, between teachers and students and among students, which promote it. (Burbules & Berk, 1999, p. 51)

Therefore, an educator espousing CP would not only examine and question the establishment of FSPs, for example, and the inherent structure(s) favoring certain groups over others, but would be moved to action to rectify the situation.

An example of an empirical study incorporating many of the aforementioned terminology and concepts is a study by Lynn and Smith-Maddox (2007). Lynn and Smith-Maddox collaborated with a teacher education program cohort coordinator and her fourteen preservice elementary teacher candidates to examine a west coast university-based teacher education program’s efforts in preparing socially just educators. Over the course of a year the researchers looked at how the candidates learned to (a) “discuss an idea or concept that has social justice relevance,” (b) “analyze their emerging teacher identities,” (c) justify decisions
regarding their classroom, and (d) form “pedagogical habits for self-directed growth” (Lynn & Smith-Maddox, 2007, p. 95).

Lynn and Smith-Maddox used Friere’s (1970) notion of problem-posing education to require the candidates to critically reflect on their observations and interactions with the school curriculum, classroom practices, and school-home partnerships. By creating an inquiry component—“observing, questioning, and critiquing of established practices and policies while conceiving new and alternative pedagogical approaches” (Lynn & Smith-Maddox, 2007, p. 98), the authors found that students were better able to reflect “openly and honestly” about sensitive issues, make connections between theory and practice, and confront some of their own biases in order to develop more personal agency.

This type of inquiry-based reflection and dialogue requires significant effort and commitment on the part of teacher educators and their candidates but, at the same time, fosters a stronger awareness and a better agency in novice teachers who must work with an increasingly diverse range of students. Because Lynn & Smith-Maddox investigated methods for empowering candidates via an inquiry problem-posing approach, their findings are very informative for this study, which also aims to help bring about more equitable pedagogical approaches in teacher education programs and correspondingly in candidates’ future teaching.

In conclusion, I am engaged with “theory building” to add CP as another layer to the common constructs in the FSP and teacher education literature. A theory “describes a specific realm of knowledge and explains how it works,” which is further influenced by the researcher’s philosophical orientations (Swanson & Chermack, 2013, p. 14). I am orienting my research with CP as an overarching lens in order to refocus issues of FSP practices in the preparation of teacher candidates in College of Education (COE) courses and to understand
how to ameliorate the inequitable relationship between schools and families in Hawai‘i, and specifically between schools and families of culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.

**Teacher change.** I have presented CP as a theoretical framework in order to craft the invisible and visible structures that give coherence and direction to this study. CP as an emic stance provides the invisible structure, while its more visible application shapes the process throughout the research. Rather than applying the theoretical framework as a formula, as might be done in Epstein’s six typologies of FSP, I have moved beyond the use of the theoretical framework as an abstract concept to focus on the endemic qualities of CP, such as critical awareness, empowerment, questioning of (dis)empowering institutionalized structures, and agency (Crookes, 2013; Freire, 1970).

As noted previously, in order for CP to take place, a person must first have a critical understanding or awareness of structures causing inequities, i.e., the family-school relationship, and is then empowered to have agency to take action—put into practice those beliefs. Research shows that teacher beliefs significantly influence their instructional decisions (Gay, 2010), and that in teacher education programs, without first addressing teacher beliefs, teacher educators will not be able to change candidates’ instructional practices (Kagan, 1992; Richards, Gallo, & Renandya, 2001). In the case of this study, data were gathered on how educators and candidates interacted with FSP lessons and activities added to their education courses. The curriculum was developed to enable the teacher candidates to reflect on their own backgrounds and experiences with family-school relationships and families of diversity. In addition, the curriculum encouraged candidates to know more about families (of diversity) and discover how to partner more effectively with them as future teachers. Teacher candidates’ experiences and beliefs about diversity also greatly affect their
development in becoming a teacher; however, these beliefs are rarely addressed in teacher education (Gay, 2010).

Finally, the curriculum sought to challenge the candidates’ notions of what it means to partner with families and to create equitable relationships. This curriculum, based on FSP modules from a project named AFFECT (Activating Educators Focus on Family Engagement as Central to Teaching), explained more in detail in Chapter 4, incorporated culturally relevant and social justice-oriented activities and resources. Studying the role of teacher educators in applying these modules allowed me to glean insight on the preparation of candidates to espouse these qualities. In other words, we might ascertain whether or not the backgrounds, beliefs, and experiences of the teacher educators and their implementation of the FSP curriculum create a sense of awareness and agency among the candidates and may explore, as well, other factors hindering the candidates’ development. Furthermore, we may determine whether teacher educators themselves have a sense of empowerment and agency to enact changes to ameliorate the family-school relationship.

In order to ascertain the presence of CP in the teacher educators’ implementation of FE content into their courses, I will use Bandura’s social cognitive theory of *triadic reciprocal determinism*. According to Bandura (1978),

> It is largely through their actions that people produce the environmental conditions that affect their behavior in a reciprocal fashion. The experiences generated by behavior also partly determine what individuals think, expect, and can do, which in turn, affect their subsequent behavior. (p. 345)

As shown in Figure 1 below, these three factors—a person’s behavior, their personal conditions (i.e., motivation, beliefs, thoughts), and the environment—interact in such a way that people are both affected by their environment and are effectors of it. Therefore, people
are not simply “onlookers” of environmental events but can be “agents of experiences” (Bandura, 1999, p. 4). This reciprocal determinism is an important concept in this study if we are to understand how the teacher educators implement FSP content into their courses and how they act as critical pedagogues in raising issues of social justice. The teacher educators’ experiences and beliefs of FSPs may affect their piloting of the AFFECT modules as well as have those experiences change their beliefs in preparing candidates to partner with families.

Figure 1. An illustration of Bandura’s reciprocal determinism.

The notion of reciprocal determinism can be additionally explained, at least partially, by Rotter’s (1966) social learning theory of locus of control. In the case that a teacher perceives his or her locus of control on internal variables, then there will be a higher likelihood of persistence and success; whereas, in the case that a teacher perceives his or her locus of control on external variables, then there will be a decreased motivation to complete the actions. The internal and external variables of Rotter’s locus of control are then the equivalent of the personal and environmental factors, respectively, in Bandura’s model. In this study, the external variables might be (a) the piloting of the AFFECT modules, (b) the educator’s existing curriculum and courses, and (c) the educator’s department expectations. The internal variables might be the teacher educator’s experiences, beliefs, and thoughts of
FSPs. Based on this study’s findings, we may be able to determine which educators have a higher level of internal control—“the person perceives that the event is contingent upon his own behavior” (Rotter, 1966b, p. 1)—and which educators have a higher level of external control—“under the control of powerful others, or as unpredictable because of the great complexity of the forces surrounding him” (p. 1). It is assumed that those educators who pilot the modules to a lesser extent will hold their beliefs in a more external locus of control. Determining the location of the educators’ beliefs in external or internal control may inform teacher education on ways to better support educators in preparing their candidates to partner with families.

Lastly, Wood and Bandura’s (1989) four sources of self-efficacy beliefs—mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, physiological and emotional states, and social persuasion—may further complement the use of reciprocal determinism in this study. In the piloting of the AFFECT modules, the teacher educators were given choices of how they wanted to interact with and implement the FSP lessons and activities. Since this was the first time for all of them to pilot the modules, there were not opportunities for mastery experiences based on repeated performances. However, there were opportunities for them to gain vicarious experiences by collaborating with an AFFECT researcher. For the educators who chose to have an AFFECT researcher present the FSP lessons, they might have benefitted from seeing explanations and modeling of FSP lessons. The facilitation of these lessons by the researcher might have strengthened the educator’s internal locus of control. The second source of experience, which may come into play with the educators’ piloting, is social persuasion. Since the participants were from several programs within one COE, there might be discussions among the faculty about the AFFECT project, which then might result in higher levels of internal or external control. For example, if one colleague says that the
AFFECT modules are large and unwieldy, then another colleague might have a higher perceived locus of external control. In another respect, if someone praises the benefits and importance of teacher candidates’ reflecting on their backgrounds, understanding families of diversity, and gaining strategies to partner with families, this discussion might raise a colleague’s internal locus of control (i.e., strengthening beliefs and resolve to implement) to implement the AFFECT modules. The use of CP operationalized with reciprocal determinism hopefully leads to a better understanding of the role of teacher educators in preparing their candidates to partner with families and establishing institutional structures to support them.

**Benefits of critical pedagogy as a theoretical framework.** CP can overcome some of the weaknesses noted for other commonly used theories in the FSP literature, as were discussed earlier in this chapter. Firstly, in regards to Epstein’s overlapping spheres of influence and typologies of FSPs, while these approaches can provide valuable information about families, the results still compartmentalize and quantify the meaning of the partnership to the one applying the criteria of the family-school relationship. For example, Patte (2011) applied Epstein’s six typologies as a framework to look at 200 preservice teachers’ perceptions of FSPs. The author used Epstein’s typologies to code and assign meaning to the collected data so that he was then able to ascertain the kinds of strategies a new teacher might employ. The weakness of such an approach is that the teachers’ perceptions are limited to the framework of Epstein’s typologies. There may be other issues affecting the growth of the family-school relationship but the typologies, in this instance, may not sufficiently address those concerns.

Secondly, CP can foster an inquiry problem-posing approach to understand and facilitate a sense of agency for those involved. With a CP approach, one would be less apt to force a “White, middle class” or school-directed perspective, as might occur in Epstein’s
model, because in its truest form a “problem-posing” approach would have an essential question coming from the “oppressed people” and through critical awareness those people would develop a sense of agency. In that respect, teacher candidates would not initiate the problem-posing question(s) for the families. Instead the candidates would work alongside the families in a subordinate role to help empower and give agency to the families rather than continuing a school-directed relationship. This approach is not only a theoretical or philosophical orientation but is also a practical way of growing equity from the inside out. Rather than the traditional top-down approach of the school, the teacher education program, or a teacher directing or ascertaining the needs of families, the teacher candidates can find new ways to empower families to have more agency.

Thirdly, Bronfenbrenner’s theory of the ecological systems and their effects on the maturing individual are valuable concepts but there are many potential combinations in the ecological system, which make it quite complex and difficult to operationalize (Ungar, 2002). Each family, community, and school is different and how they interact in an ecological system will always vary based on social, geographic, ethnic, racial, economic, individual, and familial contexts (Munhall, 2001). CP addresses these shortcomings by first having the teacher candidate, teacher educator, or involved persons be critically aware to understand the various relationships and then engage in inquiry and dialogue to determine action plans. CP may, therefore, lead to a new paradigm of FSPs by employing an unrestricted approach to interpreting such a phenomenon.

Finally, CP seeks to empower families by partnering with schools. Moll’s theory, on the other hand, for instance, may be perceived as quantifying the amount or qualifying the kinds of funds that a family or community has (Oughton, 2010). This perception, in turn, may inadvertently place the school as the legitimatizer of those funds (Baquedano-Lopez et al.,
In this study, I argue that teacher educators and teacher candidates both have the potential to be empowered by gaining skills to think more critically, to question more thoroughly, and to dig more deeply into the root causes of the inequalities or injustices around the FSP relationships. For example, Kiyama (2011) applied Moll’s funds of knowledge by looking at the role of Mexican-American families in shaping their children’s paths to college. She found, contrary to what she called the prominent dialogue in the literature, that Mexican-American families prepared their children for college-bound knowledge and assets. Unfortunately, the educators in the schools and even the families themselves did not recognize these valuable practices. Kiyama argued that these “nondominant” forms of college-going practices are also valuable funds of knowledge and should be appreciated by the families as well as the school personnel. Kiyama’s research is valuable in that it celebrates the cultural and linguistic diversity of these families as assets in their children’s college preparation and success. From a CP standpoint, then, the questions could be asked: Why are these Mexican-American families’ daily practices not viewed by the families themselves or the school community as valuable educational opportunities for their children? And why do these families view homework, chosen and given by the school, as the families’ only primary contribution to the education of their children? By using CP as an alternative lens through which to view the FSP situation, teacher educators and candidates may uncover additional truths or the root causes of the inherent imbalances between home and school relationships.

CP can address an underlying thread not being addressed enough in the FSP literature by questioning one-sided ways of viewing the family-school relationship and framing the relationship in such a way as to give voice to students and families of diversity. Without diminishing the contributions of other theories, CP can add a layer of critical awareness to
expand upon the existing validation of children’s cultural, ethnic, linguistic, familial, and social being. CP can push commonly applied theories into a sense of action. Finally, CP can establish a new framework within which teacher candidates can critically reflect, empower and be empowered, and gain agency.
CHAPTER 3
FAMILY-SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

The Context

The cultural and linguistic landscape of the U.S. is quickly changing. There are already four states, Hawai‘i, California, Texas, New Mexico, and the District of Columbia, where the minority is the majority (The Associated Press, 2012). Based on the number of people five years and older, 20% of the U.S. population in 2007 spoke a language other than English at home (US Census Bureau, 2010). This number has more than doubled in the past thirty years (US Census Bureau, 2010). Meanwhile the demographic population of the teaching force has remained relatively unchanged over the years (Feistritzer, 2011) with teacher preparation programs, especially those serving urban populations of diversity, enrolling a disproportionately small number of minority teacher candidates (Sleeter & Milner, 2011). One in five children in American schools are now Hispanic (Guest, 2011), and by 2025 it is expected that a majority of K-12 students in U.S. public schools will be non-white (Hodgkinson, 2008). In contrast to the growing diversity of students, the race of teachers in the United States has remained relatively unchanged over the years.

In Hawai‘i, where this study was conducted, the ethnicity of students and teachers is much more diverse than the national norm. In fact, K-12 public school students in Hawai‘i have the highest “diversity index” in the country (Toppo & Overberg, 2014). Of the 186,825 students, 63.9% identified themselves as Asian/Pacific Islander, 13.6% White, 9.9% Hispanic, 2% Black, 0.4% American Indian/Alaska Native, and 9.95% as Other (Hawai‘i Department of Education, n.d.). Of the 11,136 public school teachers, 26.4% identified themselves as Japanese, 21.5% White, 9% Hawaiian, 5.6% Filipino, 0.9% Korean, 0.5% African-American, and 31.8% Other (Hawai‘i Department of Education, n.d.). In the general population of
Hawai‘i, 38.6% of its residents identify themselves as Asian, 24.7% White, 23.6% two or more races, 10% Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander, and 8.9% Hispanic or Latino (U.S. Census, 2010). The majority of the residents (74.6%) over the age of five reports speaking only English at home, with a quarter of the population reporting that they speak various languages including Tagalog, Japanese, Ilokano, Chinese, Hawaiian, Spanish, Korean, and Samoan. Based on the 2011 to 2012 academic year, Hawai‘i had 13.5% of its students enrolled in ELL programs, which is the fifth largest enrollment of ELLs in K-12 in the nation (Digest of Education Statistics, 2013).

Despite such a rich ethnically and culturally diverse context, teacher candidates in Hawai‘i still struggle with issues of social class, educational backgrounds, and other factors of identity different from their own (Au & Blake, 2003). One way to bridge this racial, cultural, or linguistic gap between the classroom teacher and his or her students is to better prepare teacher candidates to work with families (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005).

**Benefits of FSPs for Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Families**

As noted in Chapter 1, there is substantial evidence of the positive effects of collaborative partnerships between home and school on areas such as attendance (Epstein & Sheldon, 2002), completion of homework assignments (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2001), literacy (Dearing et al., 2006), and overall academic achievement (Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Jeynes, 2007). The commonly cited meta-analysis of FSP literature by Henderson and Mapp (2002) further confirms these findings. Henderson and Mapp (2002) applied strict criteria in selecting 51 representative articles based on qualities such as diverse populations, variety in research methodology, different sources of data, regions from all parts of the U.S., and community as well as parent/guardian and family involvement. In their extensive review of the articles, they found FSPs benefit students by increased academic performance, better
attendance, improved behavior at school and at home, involvement in more academically challenging programs, and better social skills at school (p. 24). According to Henderson and Mapp, the most compelling benefit which was gleaned from their analysis of a decade of FSP-related literature was improved academic achievement for students. In fact, Henderson and Mapp found that all students, regardless of their racial, ethnic, cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds, benefited from increased FSPs. Given the positive impact of strong FSPs on students, teachers, and schools, it seems imperative that those charged with preparing teacher candidates provide them with opportunities to gain the practical skills and confidence to work effectively with families.

One of the most important benefits of establishing strong FSPs in schools with high percentages of culturally and linguistically diverse families is better support and enhancement of students’ literacy. For example, Dearing, Kreider, Simpkins, and Weiss (2006) analyzed data from a federally funded Comprehensive Child Development Program for low-income children and their families with 21 sites across the U.S.. The authors analyzed data from three sites to examine the effects of low-income and family involvement on students’ development. Participants were selected based on an ethnic and low-income criterion: culturally and linguistically diverse students (e.g., 21% Latinos, 18% had English as non-native language) were included in addition to Caucasian and African-American students in kindergarten through Grade 5. Children’s literacy performance was assessed at kindergarten, Grade 3, and then Grade 5 to determine longitudinally if, across families and within the family, increased family involvement predicted increased literacy performance. One finding from the study indicated that involvement had a significant effect on children’s literacy, more so than the parent’s socioeconomic or educational levels.
Another benefit of implementing FSPs in schools with culturally and linguistically diverse students is the improved communication between the family and the school. School and family communication can come in many forms: written documents such as class/school newsletters, teacher letters, class/school websites, memos to or from the family, or announcements. Home-school communication might also happen orally through class/school events, phone calls, parent/teacher conferences, or open houses. With an increase in these kinds of communication, coupled with comprehensible language in English or translated/interpreted in the family’s home language, the family may benefit in the following ways: (a) feeling included/welcomed in the school community (Epstein, 2011), (b) gaining knowledge and skills to support their child(ren) at home and at school (Kiyama, 2011), (c) developing relationships with their child’s teacher, school personnel, and other families (Ratcliff & Hunt, 2009), (d) feeling valued and empowered to share their knowledge, skills, culture, and language (Hensely, 2005), and (e) seeing their children’s academic performance improved (Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Jeynes, 2007).

In addition to the benefits for diverse families included above, the classroom teacher (and school personnel) also benefit by the following: (a) receiving more support in completion of the student’s homework from family members (Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2001); (b) having opportunities to gain insight on the families’ richly diverse backgrounds and how that might contribute to the school’s educational environment (Carreón, Drake, & Barton, 2005); (c) including other “experts,” such as family or community members in sharing their culture, language, and other knowledge and skills (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992); (d) knowing more about each student so that the teacher can modify instruction accordingly based on the backgrounds and needs of the students (e.g., cultural, linguistic, religious, political, social, and economic backgrounds) (Villegas & Lucas, 2002); and (e) crafting a
more positive school climate with increased teacher retention (Caspe et al., 2011). While the above benefits are not exhaustive, they clearly indicate the importance of FSPs in schools with high percentages of culturally and linguistically diverse students, and the need to prepare teacher candidates accordingly.

**Challenges to the Establishment of FSPs**

While there are many benefits to partnering with culturally and linguistically diverse families, there are a number of challenges in establishing FSPs. For instance, if the family-school relationship is framed in such a way that the burden of “partnering” is the family’s responsibility, then the actions are a result of only families volunteering in the classroom, coming to fundraisers, attending conferences, and checking homework. This one-sided “partnership” is not an ideal relationship and is a challenge if the various stakeholders do not consider the mutually beneficial resources each has to offer. Furthermore, in schools with high percentages of culturally and linguistically diverse students, these kinds of families tend to be perceived as being “uncommitted and detached” (Kiyama, 2001, p. 38). These proclivities towards viewing the family-school relationship in an unequal light or perceiving the deficits of families could be addressed in teacher education programs in order to teach candidates to create truer FSPs. One approach to address this challenge is proposed by Kiyama (2001). She successfully assisted elementary school parents in understanding college going academic preparations and improved communication and involvement with their schools. The author found that the Latino and immigrant parents had many family and community assets that were contributing to their children’s college-going academic preparations but were not usually recognized as such. Based on Kiyama’s research, a teacher education program could prepare candidates, with the guidance of their mentor teachers, to help welcome these families’ assets into the school, assist in clarifying any misinformation.
among the “funds of knowledge” that families might have, and create networks across families to share their knowledge and skills. This approach would prepare teacher candidates to look at the strength-based assets of families while creating a more reciprocal relationship between the school and families.

Another challenge may occur when the classroom teacher or school personnel do not provide the necessary forms of advocacy to support families of culturally and linguistically diverse students (Zhang & Bennett, 2003). For instance, parents who do not speak English or know the cultural norms for interacting with their child’s teacher or school staff may be reluctant to communicate or participate in their child’s schooling (Sohn & Wang, 2006). Even if the family member has a high proficiency in English, it may still not be sufficient to understand the academic language or cultural ways of learning in an American school.

Another challenge researchers have identified, even when schools have established expectations for FSPs, is that some teachers may avoid communicating with or inviting certain families into the classroom or on field trips because of racial, ethnic, or linguistic differences. For example, Lo (2008) interviewed twelve Chinese immigrant families of children with disabilities about their experiences with American schools. The families were concerned that because of their linguistic and cultural differences, the school did not make the necessary efforts and accommodations related to the children’s IEPs. Due to their low English proficiency, the parents could not read the school documents and “were often reluctant to attend school events” (Lo, 2008, p. 80). Interpreters were provided during IEP meetings, but translated written copies were not received until months later, even though state regulations mandated a parent signature within 30 days. The parents who considered themselves fluent English speakers also reported having “difficulties understanding some of the terminology used by professionals in meetings and on evaluation reports” (Lo, 2008, p. 80). These
Chinese parents felt that the school was not culturally sensitive and did not want a true partnership. In teacher education programs, these types of field placement environments will not allow for teacher candidates to see best practices unless teacher education programs promote candidates’ critical awareness of inequalities and increase their agency to advocate on the behalf of families.

In another study, Sohn and Wang (2006) also found challenges to school and family partnerships based on linguistic and cultural differences. The participants in this study were six Korean immigrant mothers who had children in preschool through fourth grade. All of the women had university degrees, four bachelor’s and two master’s degrees, and had been living in the U.S. anywhere from two to 15 years. Based on Korea’s long history of education founded on Confucianism, Sohn and Wang (2006) noted that Korean teachers are highly respected, and that Korean parents relinquish the education of their children to the school and would consider it disrespectful to question or challenge the teacher’s authority (p. 125). As a result, U.S. teachers may incorrectly assume Korean parents are disengaged or not interested in their children’s education because U.S. educators anticipate a different kind of involvement from parents when compared to expectations in the Korean educational system. Based on in-depth interviews, the researchers found that the Korean mothers were generally happy with their educational experiences in American schools; however, they were frustrated with the lack of bilingual services and the teachers’ lack of language accommodations (such as speaking more slowly and using less academic jargon) when speaking with them. As will be discussed later in Chapter 6, there are practical communication strategies that teacher education programs can incorporate into their coursework to strengthen candidates’ abilities to partner with families such as being an active listener, paraphrasing with fewer “teacherese,” and echoing back the key points the family member is saying.
Lastly, the recent push for more scrutiny, standards, and funding related to FSPs may create yet another challenge for establishing equal partnerships between schools and families of diversity, which causes greater disparity between students. For example, if the FSP is only based on a White middle class or White/African-American approach without considering the linguistic and cultural diversity of other groups, then the challenges cited earlier will be evident and/or more pronounced (Carvalho, 2000; Linse, 2011). The problem is compounded when teacher education programs do not adequately prepare their candidates to partner with culturally and linguistically diverse students and their families (Ratcliff & Hunt, 2009). As a result, candidates do not have the skills or confidence to connect with families of diversity. Furthermore, the candidates who have preconceived deficit notions of culturally and linguistically diverse families may have those biases further reinforced by their field placement or teacher education courses (Ullucci, 2010).

In a review of studies on candidates in teacher education programs, Hollins and Guzman (2005) indicated that even though candidates are open to learning about the diversity of their students, they still feel underprepared and reluctant to work in neighborhoods different from their own socio-economic or cultural backgrounds. This lack of training and apprehension on the part of candidates is a major challenge for FSPs because the backgrounds of the majority of student teachers are often different from the families of the students they will be teaching (Sleeter & Milner, 2011).

**Potential Drawbacks and Considerations for FSP Practices**

When reconceptualizing teacher education programs based on the aforementioned points, there are potential drawbacks and considerations when including FSP practices. Firstly, teacher education programs are already overloaded with required content; therefore, adding a FSP component may compound the stressors on the program (Lassonde, Michael, & Rivera-
Secondly, teacher education has to look critically at how it prepares candidates to meet the needs of the changing demographics of students. Adding topics of diversity alone will not adequately address issues of social justice and inequities (Nieto, 2000). Thirdly, teacher educators need to examine whether or not they have the background, training, or resources to educate and prepare candidates to deal with issues of social justice such as partnering with culturally and linguistically diverse families (Correa, McHatton, McCray, & Baughan, 2014; Ladson-Billings, 2001). Without such preparation, they cannot in turn provide sound professional development for their students in this area. Fourthly, some students’ families may not want to be involved, or at least, may not want to be involved with the FSP model presented to them. This reluctance may be a result of their busy lifestyles or of not wanting the home to be an extension of school, for example, using family time to do school-related assignments (Carvalho, 2000). Teacher education programs will want to help candidates recognize these signs of differing levels of family involvement and welcome the families into a mutually beneficial relationship. Fifthly, if the FSP model puts too much emphasis on the role of the families or the FSP relationship, educators, administrators, or policy makers could shift the blame of students’ lack of academic progress on the “failures” of the families. Such a FSP model results in ostracizing or portraying families of diversity in a negative light (Carvalho, 2000). Teacher education programs have to embed a sense of critical awareness throughout their curriculum and field placements to ensure the teacher candidates do not fall into this negative discourse. Lastly, if a school applies one particular FSP model or one based on a criterion favoring certain assets over others, particular groups of families will be inherently cast in a negative light (Oughton, 2010). This adverse portrayal affects teacher education programs in that extra care should be taken in matching candidates to their field placement schools. In addition, teacher educators will need to provide the
necessary support to help teacher candidates critically reflect on the FSPs at their given schools and be agents of change.

**The Role of Teacher Education Programs**

In the following section, I describe and enumerate suggestions for restructuring teacher education programs to better prepare teacher candidates to partner with families of linguistic and cultural diversity.

Without more dedicated time set aside for the preparation of candidates to work with families (Caspe et al., 2011; Epstein & Sanders, 2006), and with families of cultural and linguistic diversity (Ferguson, 2008; Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Sleeter & Milner, 2011), classroom teachers will continue to struggle in this area, which will adversely affect the emotional, social, and academic development of their students (Beltrán, 2012; Boser, 2014; Caspe et al., 2011; Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Jeynes, 2007). Teacher educators, school administrators, and policymakers have to reevaluate their criteria for preparing candidates and reexamine the supports that are necessary to help teacher candidates be more successful.

According to Henderson and Mapp (2002), there are three key principles for schools who successfully partner with families of diverse backgrounds: (a) a focus on building trust between teachers, families, and community; (b) a recognition and respect of the families’ diversities and needs; and (c) a philosophy of sharing power and responsibility. With these three points in mind, teacher education programs could implement a backward build-up of their FSP curriculum (or lessons and activities) in which they identify their end goals and then scaffold the preparations of their candidates from the very first semester towards those objectives. One way this program restructuring could be done is by teacher educators and candidates both reflecting on their beliefs, experiences, and identities and how those shape who they are as educators. Indeed, the literature frequently references the need for teacher
candidates to identify their own backgrounds and family histories, to address their own biases, and to reflect on the diversity of their students and their students’ families, as well as ways for teachers to better engage them (Banks, 2005; Nieto, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

Since “teacher attitudes are strongly related to teacher activity with families” (Graue & Brown, 2003, p. 731), teacher education programs need to develop a critical awareness in their candidates so that they can reflect on their histories, beliefs, and identities. For example, in a study of 130 primary and secondary teacher education students, Graue and Brown (2003) were interested in exploring the memories of candidates’ own family experiences with schooling and the preconceived beliefs they brought to FSPs. The first-year student teachers were given a survey to assess their beliefs and memories of FSPs. As is frequently noted in the literature, the students saw the roles of teachers and families in very distinct realms. The candidates were suspicious of parents (e.g., expected they would complain, ask for special favors, and not admit problems with their children), and thought of them as problems that would have to be dealt with. Also, when asked to choose the kinds of FSP activities they might enact as a teacher, the majority of the candidates chose teacher-directed rather than collaborative activities.

Teacher educators are at the front lines of designing programs so that candidates can understand and identify various forms of invisible ideologies that might prevent them from forming a critical consciousness and agency (Bartolomé, 2008). Too often, however, teacher education programs avoid asking difficult questions related to diversity, equality and social justice (Nieto, 2000). In order to move beyond a superficial approach to diversity and multicultural education (e.g. celebrating holidays, enjoying cultural foods), Nieto (2000) suggested that teacher education programs “(a) take a stand on social justice and diversity, (b) make social justice ubiquitous in teacher education, and (c) promote teaching as a life-long
journey of transformation” (p. 182). Teacher educators need to rethink the curriculum so that issues of diversity and multiculturalism are “infused” throughout the teacher education program in a more meaningful and impactful way (Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

Essentially a teacher education program should have a pedagogy that is culturally responsive to the diversity of the U.S. school system (Ladson-Billings, 2001; Nieto, 2000). The preparation candidates receive is a model and a framework for them to carry into their classrooms. However, rarely do candidates examine their own cultural identities and how these impact their instructional practices (Ladson-Billings, 2001). Ladson-Billings (2001) argued that this level of competence only comes from the teacher understanding culture and its role in education, the teacher taking actions to know about the students and their cultural backgrounds, and the teacher integrating the students’ culture into instruction. In a sense the only practical solution for teacher candidates, many of whom come in with deficit beliefs or whose own backgrounds do not match their students, is for them to engage more directly with families in their teacher education courses and field teaching placements so that they get a better sense of working with families of diversity (Caspe et al., 2011).

Encouraging teacher candidates to engage and have authentic exposure to families and families of diversity could be done in simple ways, such as having a panel discussion with parents representing a range of social, racial, cultural, linguistic, gender, and sexual orientation groups. Norris (2010) argued that teacher education programs should move beyond traditional techniques and resources such as textbooks and case studies and instead employ more direct methods. Norris, as a teacher educator herself, brought in a panel of women representing a diversity of families in which students’ parents were single, married, White, African-American, Vietnamese, and members of a same-sex union. The panel discussion seemed to have a simple structure of (a) examples of diverse families presented on
PowerPoint, (b) panelists presenting the diversity of their families with suggestions for the candidates, and (c) a question and answer session. Afterwards, teacher candidates commented that the panel was beneficial because they were able to hear the perspectives of actual diverse family members rather than only reading articles or having classroom discussions about the diversities of families.

Yet another way to provide candidates with more direct access to families is by simply having them “listen” to the community. In a unique study, Orozco (2008) studied low-income immigrant Latino parents and how they viewed their participation in their children’s lives and schooling. She did this by analyzing a talk show on a Spanish-language radio program. Orozco wanted to find out what the families valued and how that could contribute to FSPs. She found four defined themes: (a) the family is very important to Latino culture, therefore children are very important; (b) information from aural means such as the radio or TV are important for the low-income immigrants, some of whom may be illiterate or have little formal education; (c) the immigrant parents believed the only way to survive and succeed in the U.S. was to work hard, and they did so; and (d) the parents emphasized the importance of keeping their bilingual identities as a way of preserving their culture. While listening to a talk show may not necessarily be a practical solution for teacher candidates, the point Orozco was trying to make was that teachers needed to listen to families of diversity. As demonstrated in Orozco’s research, low socioeconomic Latino immigrant parents, just like all parents, are “concerned about their children, have high hopes for them, and want to be involved in their children’s schooling experiences” (p. 32).

Another method of preparing teacher candidates to work with families of diversity is to expose the candidates to the communities where they will be teaching. For example, in Waddell (2011), the author explained how a mid-western university redesigned its elementary
teacher education program to better prepare its teacher candidates for the cultural diversity of urban schools. To provide more opportunities for teacher candidates to immerse themselves in the communities where they would be teaching, three courses were offered: one involved a summer community immersion program; one, working with families and communities; and one, a student teaching internship. The summer community immersion course was built upon collaboration with organizations in the community. Members from the community participated in forums and focus group conversations to emphasize to the candidates the importance of the strengths of the community and to help them become more aware of the background experiences of their students and their students’ families. Candidates spent eight weeks participating in these discussions along with attending field trips, simulations, excursions, and service learning. In addition, they completed an unpaid 40 to 80 hour summer internship (Waddell, 2011). The author noted that even a relatively small task given to the candidates, such as a “simulation” that required them to complete a task without transportation, could help shift a candidate’s notion of deficit thinking towards a recognition that families have to be very resourceful given their circumstances.

The second course titled, “Working with Families and Communities,” built upon the community immersion course. This Working with Families and Communities course met somewhere in the community a semester before student teaching began and included activities such as text discussions, family interviews, community events, and family involvement activities. The process of redesigning a program in a structured way with a variety of consistent, meaningful experiences with the families and community members and organizations, as the one just described, could be a powerful model for other teacher education programs to replicate.
Lastly, an example of an empirical study based on preparing classroom teachers to work more effectively with English language learners and their families gives us insight into establishing impactful standalone curriculum for teacher candidates. Chen, Kyle, and McIntyre (2008) examined a professional development program for K-12 teachers. Its purpose was to help the teachers develop better instructional strategies to teach English language learners (ELLs) and to partner with their students’ families. The participants learned the well-known SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) model developed by Echevarria, Vogt, and Short (2004) as one of the ways to better teach ELLs. The program lasted 18 months with the teachers producing an action plan for working with ELLs as well as positive partnership strategies for the families. This type of professional development whereby specific needs of in-service teachers are targeted is not uncommon among in-service teacher professional development programs, but it is not prevalent in the teacher candidate preparation field. Teacher education programs could benefit from engaging in a similar process to identify the targeted needs of their teacher candidates and then develop a curriculum based around a short, intense professional development model. In that respect, the curriculum could be a standalone module without extensive modifications to the teacher education program’s syllabi. This approach could be especially relevant in terms of preparing teacher candidates to engage students and families of culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.

In conclusion, there are many ways to prepare teacher candidates to effectively teach all students, regardless of the backgrounds they come from. Policy makers, school administrators, mentor teachers, teacher education programs, and teacher candidates all need to work together to help prepare teachers to partner with families, especially those of diverse backgrounds. There is a need in the teacher education and the FSP research literature for
more information on how to prepare teacher candidates (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005), and this study sheds light on some of those ways.
CHAPTER 4

METHODS: STUDYING FSPs IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Background

The following study focused on the implementation of FSP lessons and activities by teacher educators in various COE programs at the largest university in the state of Hawai‘i. The genesis for this work came from my involvement with the AFFECT project. In the proceeding chapter, I describe the AFFECT Project and the role of the researcher, the research paradigm, the participants, the instruments, and the procedures and data analysis.

AFFECT project. The AFFECT project was started by three education professors—Dr. Eva Ponte, Dr. Katherine Ratliffe, and Dr. Lois Yamauchi—in the COE at a large university in the state of Hawai‘i in early 2012. The purpose of the project was to develop three FE, or FSP, learning modules for teacher educators in the various programs within the COE to use with their teacher candidates. The majority of the teacher educators’ candidates were enrolled in undergraduate teacher education programs such as Elementary, Early Childhood, Elementary and Early Childhood (dual certification), Elementary and Special Education (dual certification), and pre-program education students, or Master’s of Education (Elementary) teaching program. The three modules were based on having the candidates (a) reflect on their own backgrounds and get to know the students, families, and communities in the local context of Hawai‘i, (b) learn effective communication strategies in order to welcome families into the school and to support families outside of the school, and (c) acquire various strategies, ideas, and resources to engage families within and outside of the classroom.

The AFFECT project is web-based (https://affect.coe.hawaii.edu/) with the three modules broken down into topics. Figure 2 below shows the AFFECT website. Each of the topics focuses on the context of the corresponding module. Once an area is chosen within a
given module, the reader is presented with a short description of the theoretical foundation (for that topic) and then a list of lesson activities, which, in turn, provides procedures, standards, and resources for that lesson. The steps for the activities are written for candidates to read and follow as independent work or for teacher educators to apply to classroom tasks. At the end of the lesson activity, there are drop-down buttons where the teacher educator, or the candidate, can see the content (i.e., Common Core State Standards) or teacher standards (i.e., Hawai‘i State Professional Teaching Standards) that are addressed. Lastly, there is a section listing Internet or text-based resources for additional information or extended study.

Figure 2. The homepage of the AFFECT website.

The following is an example of using the AFFECT website: if one were to choose Module 1, Getting to Know Your Students and Their Families, the following topic areas would be provided: (a) The Importance of Student and Family Background, (b) Cultural and Linguistic Diversity, (c) Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness, and (d) Instruction that
Responds to and Flourishes within the Cultural and Linguistic Background of Students and Families. Choosing the second topic, Cultural and Linguistic Diversity, the reader is presented with a short “background theory” section, various charts and graphs on the linguistic and ethnic diversity and growth in the U.S. and Hawai‘i, and four choices of lesson activities. The activity Learning about Linguistic Diversity contains procedures for teacher candidates to follow such strategies as reflecting on the linguistic diversity of their field placement schools, creating a map of the languages spoken at their school, lesson planning on how to integrate the linguistic information from their field placements into their teaching, and, then in small groups (of candidates), reading and discussing language-related articles (links are provided). Below the procedures are drop-down buttons with Hawai‘i Teacher Performance Standards and Resources listed. The aforementioned description is the typical structure of a lesson activity.

**Role of the researcher.** In the fall of 2012, I was hired as a graduate assistant, along with another doctoral student, Kim (pseudonym), to work on the AFFECT project. My main responsibilities were to research and develop lesson activities for the AFFECT website topics, identify and list the content and teacher standards, and find relevant text and web-based resources for the modules. There were three professors from the COE who were the project’s principal investigators. In the first semester, my time was dedicated to developing three areas (procedures, standards, and resources) for each of the lesson activities. This work involved an extensive amount of time researching the literature, consulting teacher sites, and creating lessons, handouts, and other resources to complement the activities. To date, there are approximately 30 lessons in Module 1 and approximately 35 lessons each in Modules 2 and 3. About 60% of these were developed the first semester.
In the second semester (spring, 2013), Kim and I continued revising and adding content, and finalizing lessons, especially with regard to standards and resources. At the same time, the three professors from the AFFECT team started to recruit teacher educators to participate in the piloting of the modules. Kim and I, and the three professors, began interviewing the teacher educators who agreed to participate in the piloting. Development of the AFFECT modules and the initial interviews of the teacher educators lasted through the spring and into the summer.

In the fall of 2013, Kim and I started transcribing the initial interviews and continued developing the modules. At the same time, we, together with the three AFFECT project professors, coordinated with the participating teacher educators to pilot the AFFECT modules within existing teacher education courses. I, or one of the other AFFECT team members, communicated with the educators through email or telephone to explain the piloting procedures. Next, we arranged a time to visit the educators’ classes to introduce the project to the teacher candidates, ask for the teacher candidates’ consent to participate in the research, and administer the pre-survey to the candidates. This visit generally occurred at the beginning of the fall, 2013 semester. During the semester, the educators had a choice of finding lessons or activities from the AFFECT modules to integrate and apply to their education course or having one of the members of the AFFECT team present a lesson for them. If it was the case they chose an AFFECT member to present a lesson, I was the one who visited their classes and developed lessons based on the needs and interests of their candidates. At the end of the semester, one of the AFFECT team returned to the teacher educators’ classes to administer a post-survey to the candidates. Also, at the end of the fall semester or shortly thereafter, the AFFECT researchers administered three focus group interviews with teacher educators as a
culmination to the piloting. I participated in the focus group interviews by helping to either video-record or interview the participating teacher educators.

In the spring of 2014, I was the only graduate assistant working on the project with the three COE professors. The four of us continued to pilot the modules with more educators, and I continued in the role of communicating and setting up the logistics of the piloting, helping to interview teacher educators, visiting teacher educator classes to obtain their candidates’ consents to participate in the research and to administer surveys, presenting FSP lessons based on the AFFECT modules in teacher educators’ classrooms, and transcribing initial teacher educator interviews.

In the fall of 2014, I remained active with the AFFECT project as a casual hire. At the same time, I was teaching as an adjunct instructor at a local community college and in the COE. In the meantime, the AFFECT project hired a new graduate assistant, Clara (pseudonym). In the fall of 2014 and the spring of 2015, Clara and I completed the transcriptions of the teacher educators’ initial and focus group interviews. We also continued developing the AFFECT website by revising content and adding information and resources where they were needed. Furthermore, Clara and I were involved with other members of the AFFECT team in researching and writing articles based data from the project. In the fall of 2015 and since that time, my role with the project has mainly consisted of collaborating with one of the principal investigators to develop and present a professional development course on FSPs to in-service teachers on the island of O’ahu.

As someone on the AFFECT project research team, I was intimately familiar with the data that were collected during the piloting of the FSP modules. I was involved with interviewing and video-recording the teacher educators, visiting teacher educators’ classrooms to introduce the project, obtaining candidates’ consent and administering surveys,
and transcribing the teacher educators’ initial interviews and end-of-piloting focus group interviews. Because of my role in the development of the AFFECT modules and the interactions with the teacher educators, I naturally became very interested in how teacher educators were preparing their candidates to work with families. I had taught elementary students and university teacher candidates for several years, but had never been very aware of the field of FSPs. As I read research literature on the importance of FSPs, and saw the need in teacher education, I became invested in knowing more.

**Research Paradigm**

I conducted a qualitative study to investigate the practices of teacher educators as they added FSP lessons and activities to their existing teacher education courses, and I examined the resulting effects of such involvement. A qualitative research orientation allowed for an inductive analysis of emerging themes and continual (re)interpretations of the data (Creswell, 2009). Such an approach was advantageous in gathering multiple variables inherent in the incorporation of FSP practices into teacher education courses for the following reasons: first, little is known about teacher educators’ perspectives of FSP practices and their influences on candidates (de Bruïne et al., 2014). Second, educators may be reluctant to open up their practices for others to see (Waxman & Padrón, 2004). A qualitative orientation, therefore, permitted time to build relationships with participants and to fully understand the phenomenon of FSP in teacher education. Third, the inductive nature of this study’s methodology helped to examine the application of CP as a novel theoretical framework and determine its appropriateness to FSP research in teacher education. In conclusion, this process of qualitative inquiry, immersing myself in the phenomenon, greatly facilitated the uncovering of new knowledge (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007).
Phenomenology was another important methodological orientation for this study. Phenomenology can be viewed as an endemic characteristic of qualitative research (Merriam, 2009). It can be understood simply as a type of qualitative research design that gathers data on a shared and unique phenomenon of a select group of individuals (Clark & Creswell, 2009; Creswell, 2009). According to Clark and Creswell (2009), the key characteristics of a phenomenological research design include: (a) finding out about a single phenomenon, (b) collecting data from individuals who have uniquely experienced the phenomenon, (c) analyzing data to understand the phenomenon, and (d) identifying and describing the nature of the phenomenon based on the findings (p. 239).

Participants

The participants for this study were chosen based on their involvement in the piloting of the AFFECT modules. There were a total of 11 teacher educators, 96 piloting teacher candidates, and 97 non-piloting teacher candidates. These teacher educators and candidates were purposefully selected from various programs within the COE of the largest university in Hawai‘i: Curriculum Studies, Elementary Education, Early Childhood Education, Educational Psychology, Elementary Education and Special Education (dual certification), Elementary and Early Childhood Education (dual certification), and Master’s of Education in Elementary Teaching. [In this study the following pseudonyms are used to address the teacher educators: Prof. Jackson, Prof. Matsumoto, Prof. Lee, Prof. Kaelele, Prof. Cruz, Prof. Shiroma, Prof. Cortez, Prof. Palakiko, Prof. Robertson, Prof. Millard, and Prof. Hwang. Please note that the ethnic background implied in the pseudonyms assigned to participants in no way matches the backgrounds of the teacher educators involved in the study.]

The teacher educators’ participation in this study, and their implementation of the FSP modules was voluntary. Since the FSP modules were not a required component of their
education courses, applying the FSP lessons and activities to their courses during the piloting or in the proceeding semesters was not mandatory. While voluntary participation had the potential to “threaten the external validity” of the study (de Vaus, 2001), purposeful sampling of teacher educators in a COE who were involved in varying degrees with the AFFECT modules and who were working with teacher candidates in elementary education strengthened the validity and reliability of the data.

In the piloting stage of the AFFECT modules, there were a total of 96 teacher candidates who provided consent and agreed to the research as students in the piloting teacher educators’ classes. As shown in Table 1 below, the teacher candidates were distributed in various COE programs with a majority of them being in their first semester. Two to three semesters after the completion of the AFFECT project piloting, the 11 teacher educators who previously piloted the modules, agreed to be re-interviewed for this study. Due to conflict of interest and non-piloting, three teacher educators were not re-interviewed; however, the initial interviews, surveys, and focus group interviews of the three were later used (with the participants’ consent) in the data analysis. Additionally, I obtained consent for research participation of the teacher educators’ current candidates. As shown in Table 2 below, a total of 97 new candidates completed surveys in the follow up study. In summary, there are three sets of participants in the study: 11 teacher educators and 96 teacher candidates from the piloting of the AFFECT modules and 97 teacher candidates from a follow up study two to three semesters after the teacher educators’ piloting of the AFFECT modules.
### Table 1

**Teacher Candidates of Teacher Educators Piloting AFFECT Modules**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Pre/Post Surveys</th>
<th>Year in Teacher Education Program</th>
<th>Degree Candidates Are Pursuing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Majority in 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; semester</td>
<td>• BEd in Elementary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• BEd in Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• BEd in Elementary Education/Special Education (dual certification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• BEd in Elementary Education/Early Childhood Education (dual certification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Master’s of Education in Elementary Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

**Teacher Candidates of Teacher Educators 2-3 Semesters after Piloting AFFECT Modules**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Pre/Post Surveys</th>
<th>Year in Teacher Education Program</th>
<th>Degree Candidates Are Pursuing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>• pre-program enrollment</td>
<td>• BEd in Elementary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; semester</td>
<td>• BEd in Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; semester</td>
<td>• BEd in Elementary Education/Special Education (dual certification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; semester</td>
<td>• BEd in Elementary Education/Early Childhood Education (dual certification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Master’s of Education in Elementary Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instruments

In order to understand the role of teacher educators as they piloted the FSP lessons and determine their locus of control in doing so, various research instruments were employed in this study over an approximate two-year period of time. These instruments helped to unearth information on teacher educators’ prior FSP experiences and beliefs, teacher educators’ implementation or non-implementation of FSP content, teacher candidates’ FSP experiences and beliefs, and teacher candidates’ experiences with teacher educators’ piloting or non-piloting of FSP content. The findings can serve as a foundation towards understanding the role of teacher educators in the preparation of teacher candidates to partner with families.

Table 3 below provides an overview showing the alignment of the study’s research questions and instruments.

Table 3
Alignment of Research Questions with Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Data Collection Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How do teacher educators implement FSP lessons and activities into teacher education courses?</td>
<td>• Focus group interview of teacher educators&lt;br&gt;• Individual interview (one year post-piloting) of teacher educators&lt;br&gt;• Piloting candidates’ post-surveys&lt;br&gt;• Non-piloting candidates’ surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What are teacher educators’ beliefs and experiences with FSP and how do those beliefs and experiences affect their implementation of FSP lessons and activities?</td>
<td>• Initial interview of teacher educators&lt;br&gt;• Survey of teacher educators&lt;br&gt;• Focus group interview of teacher educators&lt;br&gt;• Individual interview (one year post-piloting) of teacher educators&lt;br&gt;• Pre- and post-surveys of piloting candidates&lt;br&gt;• Survey of non-piloting candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How does the implementation of FSP lessons and activities influence the beliefs and practices of teacher educators?</td>
<td>• Initial interview with teacher educators&lt;br&gt;• Survey of teacher educators&lt;br&gt;• Focus group interview with teacher educators&lt;br&gt;• Individual interview (one year post-piloting) with teacher educators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviews. I used interviews as the primary data collection tool to study the phenomenon of the role of teacher educators’ implementation of FSP content in their courses. Interviews are commonly used in qualitative research methods (Patton, 2002), but they are a labor intensive activity for a researcher (Seidman, 2012). However, according to Kaplan and Maxwell (2005), the gains are recovered in the rich narratives:

Qualitative research typically involves systematic and detailed study of individuals in natural settings, instead of in settings contrived by the researcher, often using open-ended interviews intended to elicit detailed, in-depth accounts of the interviewee’s experiences and perspectives on specific issues, situations, or events...the goals of qualitative research typically involve understanding a phenomenon from the point of view of the participants, and in its particular social and institutional context. (p. 32)

In this study, interviews were one of the important tools allowing access into the FSP beliefs and experiences of the teacher educators.

The teacher educators’ initial interviews were the first set of interviews to be scheduled and video-recorded before the educators started piloting the AFFECT modules. These interviews occurred anywhere from January 2013 to March 2014 depending on when the educators piloted the modules. I included these initial interviews in the study as pre-existing data to orient and give direction to the research. As noted in Appendix A, these initial interviews were invaluable in that they provided evidence of the teacher educators’ personal factors of FE: their beliefs of FE, their experiences and thoughts about FE while working with candidates, and their suggestions for the modules being worked on by the AFFECT team. The interview questions were in a semi-structured format to ensure structure and consistency across interviews while allowing probing questions based on each person’s
individual responses. The interviews were approximately 45 to 60 minutes long and took place at either a COE conference room or the teacher educator’s office. As specified in the section on the role of the researcher, I was actively involved in either interviewing or video-recording these educators’ initial interviews.

An analysis of the roles of teacher educators in preparing teacher candidates to work with families requires documentation gathered over a period of time in order to ascertain how teacher educators’ beliefs and critical awareness influenced their teaching of FSP practices. From an empirical point of view, Wilson, Floden, and Ferrinin-Mundy (2002), in the report by the Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy prepared for the U.S. Department of Education, examined more than 300 peer-reviewed reports over the past 20 years on the most salient issues facing teacher education. The authors found that teacher education research needed to include more longitudinal studies. With this finding in mind, I re-interviewed the same teacher educators in the spring of 2015, which was anywhere from one to two years after the initial interviews. I chose to extend the time, immersing myself in the phenomenon of teacher educators preparing candidates to partner with families. I also wanted to extract richer data applicable to improving the teacher education field.

These individual follow up interviews had the same semi-structured format of the questions on the initial interview. As shown in Appendix F, first, I asked the same questions as on the initial interview such as the definition and importance of FE, the kinds of support candidates needed, and the barriers candidates faced. Based on Bandura’s (1978) triadic reciprocal determinism, this two-year comparison strengthened the validity and understanding of the personal factors of the teacher educators in regards to FE and their teaching of it to their candidates. Second, I asked the teacher educators specific questions about whether they had been using the AFFECT modules or had been incorporating FSP
content into their courses since the completion of the AFFECT piloting. These responses, coupled with data from the focus group interviews and candidate surveys, were instrumental in determining the educators’ behaviors in raising critical awareness and instilling a sense of agency with their candidates as they implemented the modules. Last, I asked the teacher educators for their perspectives on how the piloting of the modules affected their beliefs and practices of FSPs. Their responses, together with explanations from the initial and focus group interviews, provided insightful feedback on the environment, or their levels of external locus of control in implementing FSP content.

With the teacher educator’s permission, I audio-recorded the interviews. The conversations lasted approximately 45 minutes and, again, took place in a COE conference room or the educator’s office. Afterwards, I manually transcribed the interviews to achieve better familiarity with the phenomenon under study (Merriam, 2009). The narratives from these follow up interviews allowed for a comparison to the educators’ initial and focus group interviews (explained in the next section). The educators’ initial and final interview responses were then compared with the pre- and post-surveys of the piloting candidates and the surveys of the non-piloting candidates.

This study seeks to contribute to teacher education and to the FSP research field by uncovering rich amounts of data over an extended period of time (Cohen et al., 2007). Such a process is essential in gleaning insight into teacher education institutions that are “notoriously” slow to change (Nieto, 2000). This longer time in the field not only provided opportunities to gain trust and access to the inner workings of teacher educators’ practices, but the interviews, and the dynamics between the researcher and participants, may have also enabled the teacher educators to be more conscious of their involvement in the implementation of FSPs in their courses and to take action (Seidman, 2012). The method of engaging with teacher educators
through interviews can be especially appropriate considering this study’s *critical pedagogy* theoretical framework. In conclusion, interviewing not only allowed a window into the phenomenon of teacher educators implementing FSP practices into education courses, but it may have also lit a spark of critical awareness for teacher educators to reflect on FSP and its role in teacher preparation.

**Focus groups.** At the end of the piloting of the AFFECT modules, researchers on the AFFECT team administered three focus group interviews to the teacher educators. These focus groups were video-recorded and lasted approximately 60 minutes with two to three teacher educators in a group, for a total of seven teacher educators. One additional educator, who could not attend, responded in writing to the focus group questions. As noted in Appendix D, the educators were asked such questions as how they would describe the piloting of the AFFECT modules, explain successes and challenges in the use of the modules, and share candidates’ reactions to their participation in the piloting. The focus group discussions were later transcribed by members of the AFFECT team.

In the current study, I analyzed the pre-existing data of the focus group interview transcriptions as a means to gather information on the piloting of the AFFECT modules, to determine the teacher educators’ amounts and types of interactions with the modules, and to ascertain the teacher educators’ reactions to the FE content. These data were extremely valuable in understanding the *behaviors* of the teacher educators in implementing the FSP content, the teacher educators’ *locus of control* or efficacy in piloting of the modules, and the effects of the piloting and the FSP content on the beliefs of the teacher candidates.

There were several benefits from including focus group interviews in the current study. One was that the focus group structure created a dynamic and less threatening environment (Onwuegbuzie, Dickinson, Leech, & Zoran, 2009) for the teacher educators, who are leaders
in their field. They were able to reflect comfortably on their experiences with the piloting of the modules without feeling judged by their peers (Krueger & Casey, 2009). Another reason is that the interactional and the contextual dynamics of the focus group provided another perspective on the teacher educators’ language usage (compared to the individual interviews) due to the social and situational circumstances of the group (Pennebaker, Mehl, & Niederhoffer, 2003). These discussions allowed for collegial sharing of the *environmental factors* effecting the piloting of the modules and further insight into the educators’ efficacy in doing so.

**Surveys.** To strengthen the validity of the study’s findings and triangulate the data from the pre-existing initial individual interviews and focus group interviews and the later collection and analysis of follow-up teacher educator interviews, I included four sets of surveys: (a) pre-existing surveys of the piloting teacher educators, (b) pre-existing pre- and post-surveys of the piloting teacher candidates, and (c) surveys of teacher candidates in the classes of teacher educators who had piloted two to three semesters previously. Firstly, the teacher educator survey (see Appendix D), given around the same time as the first video-recorded interview, provided another way of documenting the educators’ *personal factors*: demographic information, experiences with and beliefs about FE, and their thoughts related to preparing their candidates to work with families. This survey mirrored some of the same questions from the initial interviews, such as how the teacher educator defined FE, the support candidates needed and the barriers they faced. Including the AFFECT project’s teacher educator surveys in the study provided another means of documenting and verifying the educators’ understandings, experiences, and beliefs in preparing their candidates to partner with families.
Next, I incorporated in the study the piloting candidates’ pre- and post-surveys as another layer to confirm the findings from the teacher educators’ interviews. The piloting candidates’ pre-survey (see Appendix C) asked general background questions of the candidates such as their name, age, degree pursuing, and year in the program. The survey also asked the candidates specific questions about FSPs: for example, their definition of FE, the kinds of lessons or activities they had seen in their course work or field experiences, and the types of FSPs they would like to learn about. In addition to the candidates’ pre-survey, I gathered and analyzed the candidates’ post-survey, given at the end of the AFFECT piloting. As noted in Appendix E, the candidates were questioned on the impact of the AFFECT modules, the effects of the piloting in changing their FE beliefs, and their definition of FE. This additional information on the piloting, from the candidates’ perspectives, clarified and validated data obtained from the interviews of the teacher educators, specifically in regards to their implementation (i.e., behaviors) of the modules. Furthermore, these pre- and post-surveys allowed for comparative data analyses on the beliefs and experiences of the candidates and how they were affected by their levels of engagement in the piloting as a result of their teacher educators’ instructional decisions.

Finally, when I re-interviewed the teacher educators two to three semesters after the completion of their involvement with the piloting of the AFFECT modules, I also surveyed their candidates. These later candidates were given a survey similar to the one distributed to the earlier piloting teacher candidates. The candidates were asked basic demographic information such as their name, age, university degree pursuing, and year in program as well as content questions related to their understanding of FE, as shown in Appendix G. In both surveys, the one given to piloting candidates and the one given to non-piloting candidates (of the teacher educators who had previously piloted), the candidates were asked to define FE.
Additionally, the latter candidates, who were not part of the piloting, were questioned about their knowledge of the AFFECT website. The intention behind comparing piloting and non-piloting candidates on their definitions of FE and their descriptions of the AFFECT content was to determine whether the teacher educators had incorporated FSP concepts into their current teaching as a result of their previous participation in the AFFECT piloting. Since the teacher educators were not required to continuously use the AFFECT modules after their involvement in the piloting, an additional question was asked to the non-piloting candidates to determine if they had received any exposure to FE lessons or activities, regardless of if the exposure came from the AFFECT modules or elsewhere. Lastly, these candidates, who had not participated in the piloting of the AFFECT modules, were asked a probing question about whether they would like to learn anything more about FE in schools. It was expected that their responses would provide further insight on the efficacy of whether, and how, the teacher educators were currently applying FSP lessons and activities in their courses.

These three teacher candidate surveys (pre- and post-piloting, and non-piloting) provided a comparison among the piloting candidates’ data, between the piloting and non-piloting candidates’ data, and against the data of the teacher educators. For the piloting candidates, the pre-survey provided data on the candidates’ FE beliefs and experiences before their involvement in the piloting of the AFFECT modules. The post-survey of the same piloting candidates established evidence of the candidates’ participation in the piloting and on the teacher educators’ role in engaging the candidates in learning about FSP practices. In addition, a comparison of the piloting candidates’ pre- and post-surveys permitted a comparison of the candidates’ understandings and beliefs of FE, and how those understandings and beliefs might have changed as a result of the candidates’ involvement in the piloting.
Surveys of the non-piloting teacher candidates, whom I surveyed two to three semesters after their teacher educators finished their involvement in the AFFECT piloting, allowed a comparison with the piloting candidates’ answers. By comparing these two sets of surveys, those candidates who had participated in the piloting of the AFFECT modules and those candidates who did not, it was possible to further examine the influence of FSP content on teacher candidates and the long-term efficacy of teacher educators to prepare their candidates to work with families. These multiple interpretations of the surveys, triangulated with a comparison to the teacher educator interviews, strengthened the validity of the results (Stake, 2004).

Data Collection Procedures

**Stage 1: Pre-existing data from AFFECT piloting.** I began data analysis by examining the pre-existing data from the piloting of the AFFECT project. In order to strengthen the credibility of this research, I documented an audit trail (Merriam, 2009) to explicate the procedures used to collect data during and after the piloting of the AFFECT modules. It was important to create transparency in the research (Moravcsik, 2014) by detailing these processes, especially since I had used pre-existing data from the AFFECT project as a foundation for this study. Figure 3 below shows an overview of the data collection process during the teacher educators’ piloting of the AFFECT modules.
Figure 3. A timeline of stage one piloting data collection procedures.

Starting in the fall of 2012, and continuing over several semesters, members of the AFFECT research team recruited teacher educators for the piloting of the AFFECT modules. With the teacher educators’ consent, one or two members of the AFFECT team individually interviewed the educator and video-recorded the session. Around the same time that this initial interview occurred (see Appendix A), the teacher educators completed a written survey (see Appendix B). Altogether, a total of 16 educators were interviewed and surveyed over a period of four semesters.

Piloting of the AFFECT modules began in the fall of 2013 with eight teacher educators. In the spring of 2014, three more educators piloted. Table 4 below shows who participated and when the AFFECT modules were piloted. Note that not all the educators who were interviewed and who had originally agreed to participate piloted the modules. In most cases, the piloting began at the start of the semester, at which time a researcher from the AFFECT team interviewed and surveyed the teacher educators. These initial interviews and surveys always occurred before the educators had begun instructing lessons or leading activities from the AFFECT modules. Next, an AFFECT researcher coordinated with the teacher educator to visit his or her class for approximately 15 minutes to introduce the
AFFECT project, obtain candidates’ consent to participate in the research, and administer the candidates’ pre-survey (see Appendix C).

Table 4

*AFFECT Piloting Schedule*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2013 Piloting</th>
<th>Spring 2014 Piloting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prof. Jackson</td>
<td>1. Prof. Cortez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prof. Matsumoto</td>
<td>2. Prof. Millard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prof. Lee</td>
<td>3. Prof. Hwang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prof. Kaelele</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Prof. Cruz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prof. Shiroma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Prof. Palakiko</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Prof. Robertson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of the piloting, the AFFECT research team encouraged the teacher educators to find pieces of the modules that they could incorporate into their courses. Due to delays in the website development, in the first semester of piloting, some teacher educators had a PDF version of the modules. Later in the semester and in proceeding semesters, all of them had access to the web-based version. The teacher educators determined how they would incorporate the FSP lessons and activities from the AFFECT website into their courses. The AFFECT research team suggested that, if the teacher educators needed support, an AFFECT member could collaborate with them by suggesting ways to incorporate the AFFECT content into their courses or an AFFECT member could assist by leading a class with FSP lesson(s) from the AFFECT website. Figures 4 and 5 below depict the types of explanations and examples given to the teacher educators on the ways to complete their piloting of the AFFECT modules.
Hello ****,

Hope your semester is off to a good start. I just wanted to follow up with you about your thoughts as far as piloting content from the modules. What do you think? I know there’s a lot of stuff there so it could be difficult to decide. If you want, what we’re doing with some other folks is actually one of us on the team could present and teach some content then you wouldn’t have to worry so much about it. Just an idea. What we’re doing with one class is 1) going in to introduce the project, get students’ consent, pass out surveys, b) do a brief T-P-S to see what candidates want to know more about family engagement, c) then someone on our team (with your consent/collaboration) prepares a lesson(s) with some student-centered task for the candidates to learn about and apply family engagement.

Or you and someone from our team could identify a lesson(s) on family engagement to give as a task to the candidates for them to learn about and apply.

I suppose there’s a lot of different ways we could approach the family engagement content in our modules. I just want to help make it accessible to you and doable for your circumstances/instructional time. When you get a chance, I’d love to hear what you think.

Thank you! Sorry for the long email.

****

Figure 4. Suggestions on ways to implement the FSP modules.

Aloha ****,

I hope your semester is going well. As far as the 3 modules and possible implementation into your course, the modules are rather large so I’m (or one of the team members) more than happy to brainstorm ideas of how you can implement bits and pieces of them into your curriculum. We’re currently piloting with ****************, and ***** has done it in the past. So we could share some of those experiences/ideas with you.

Thank you. Looking forward to working with you.

*****

Figure 5. Follow up suggestions on ways to implement the FSP modules.
At the end of a piloting semester, an AFFECT researcher returned to the educator’s class for approximately 10 minutes to administer the candidates’ post-surveys (see Appendix E). Lastly, in the spring of 2014, as a culmination of the AFFECT module piloting, the AFFECT team conducted three separate focus group interviews (see Appendix D) of seven teacher educators. Members of the AFFECT team later transcribed these focus group interviews.

The aforementioned explanations detailed the procedures the AFFECT team and I, as a member of the team, took to ensure the piloting of the AFFECT modules and the collecting of data. In the current study, I am analyzing the following data from the AFFECT project development and piloting from fall 2012 to spring 2014: (a) teacher educators’ initial interviews, (b) teacher educators’ written surveys, (c) teacher candidates’ pre-surveys, (d) teacher candidates’ post-surveys, and (e) teacher educators’ focus group interviews. These data will serve to answer the research questions and provide a foundation to better understand FSP practices in teacher education.

**Stage 2: Post-piloting data.** Figure 6 below provides an overview of Stage 2 data collection procedures. This second stage of data collection occurred approximately one to two years after the teacher educators’ initial interviews or two to three semesters after piloting the AFFECT modules. At this time I contacted the educators to determine their availability to be interviewed as a follow up to their previous participation in the AFFECT project. All eight of the teacher educators consented; three of the original 11 who piloted were not re-interviewed due to non-piloting or conflict of interest. Over approximately two months, I interviewed (see Appendix F) and audio-recorded the teacher educators either at their office or in a COE conference room. The interviews lasted approximately 45 minutes. In addition to these follow up interviews, I arranged with the teacher educators to visit their

67
classes at the end of the semester in order to administer a survey to their candidates. At the
time of the classroom visit, I also briefly introduced the AFFECT project and obtained the
candidates’ consent for research participation. The survey took candidates approximately 10
minutes to complete. These final teacher educator interviews and candidate surveys were the
last pieces of data that I collected for the study.

![A timeline of stage two post-piloting data collection procedures.](image)

**Data Analysis**

**Interviews.** I began analysis of the teacher educators’ initial interviews by
completing multiple readings of the transcripts (Merriam, 2009). This holistic reading of all
the narratives permitted me an overall understanding of the *personal factors, behaviors, and
environment*—in Bandura’s (1978) triadic reciprocal determinism model—of the
phenomenon of teacher educators implementing FSP content with their candidates while
making me aware of reoccurring themes (Creswell, 2009). I then reread the educators’
responses to each of the interview questions. I looked at all the educators’ responses one
question at a time. Next, I reread each of their responses multiple times, employing the
constant comparative method (Merriam, 2009) with an orientation towards finding
information on the educators’ FSP beliefs and their methods and efficacy of integrating FSP
into their courses. This process was done by highlighting areas in the transcript that seemed to denote meaningful information such as words the educator emphasized, reoccurring ideas or topics, or impressionable quotes (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2013). I repeated this process one interview question at a time.

After I finished highlighting the transcriptions and taking notes in the margins, I transferred that information—text that I had highlighted, repeated ideas/topics that I had circled, or quotes that I found interesting—into a spreadsheet with three columns: one for the educator’s name, one for the information extracted from the transcriptions, and one for codes (to be added). I then coded—garnered meaningful units of data (Plano Clark & Creswell, 2010)—the second column of information by interpreting the main message of the quotes and gathering repeated ideas/topics, which I added to the third column as “codes.” Next, I analyzed the codes and when I found a code being repeated at least two or three times in the educators’ responses, I considered it a theme (Merriam, 2009), at which time I created a fourth column titled “themes.” I repeated this process for each of the educators, one interview question at a time. Once I concluded analyzing all the educators’ transcripts for all the interview questions, I created a new spreadsheet compiling the four columns of information on all of the teacher educators into a one- or two-page summary for each of the questions. Lastly, I compared the themes of the educators in the context of the reciprocal determinism theory. If at least two or three of the same themes appeared for a particular question, I considered it a theme for one of the three factors: personal beliefs/thoughts, behaviors, or environment. If the theme was indicative of only two or three educators, then I considered it as a minor theme; whereas, if it occurred in at least five of the 11 participants, I counted it as a major theme. I repeated the same process for the focus group interviews and the interviews.
two- to three-semesters after the educators had participated in the piloting of the AFFECT modules.

**Surveys.** I started analysis of the written surveys by looking at the teacher educators’ responses. In the beginning of this study, I intended to use the teacher educator survey as a means to present detailed information on the educators’ backgrounds and experiences related to FSPs. However, after concerns of confidentiality, I decided to include only the most basic demographic information such as the name of the teacher education program without identifying any one individual’s name associated with it. The content questions on the survey, the ones that matched the research questions, were used as a form of triangulation with the verbal answers during the interview. I did this comparison by copying the exact words of the educators’ responses to the question (from the written survey) and putting them alongside the verbal response from the interviews that had been transcribed. This process of comparison allowed for a further confirmation of the educators’ personal beliefs with regard to such questions as their definition of FE, the importance of FE, and the kind of support for and barriers to implementing FE facing their candidates.

To analyze the piloting candidates’ surveys, I started by reading through all the pre- and post-survey responses to gain general impressions. I then reread all the pre-surveys and took notes on the candidates’ demographic information (i.e., age, year in program, major, and degree pursuing) and on their answers to each of the FE content questions. I repeated the process with the post-survey. Next, I made a chart for each class of the teacher educators’ candidates based on their demographic and content answers. Afterwards, I created another chart summarizing each class of candidates by merging and trimming the data from the two surveys down to responses of questions that provided interesting results and that helped to answer the research questions, such as pre- and post-definitions of FE and post-survey
answers to the question on the most helpful content from the modules and to the question on whether the candidates’ views of FE had changed as a result of participation in AFFECT piloting. Then, by looking at all the classes of candidates lined up on the spread sheet, I took notes and compiled the candidates’ demographic information: the total number of participants, their age range, average age, year in program, and degree pursuing. I then did the same with their answers to the content questions. For their pre-survey definitions of FE, I visually scanned their descriptions to see the language they were using. So, for instance, if they used words such as “family should get involved,” “family should support the teacher,” “parents helping their children with homework,” “parents coming to open houses, parent-teacher conferences, and other kinds of school events,” or other similar types of comments which stressed the responsibilities of the family, I interpreted the definition to mean “what the family should do.” If a candidate defined FE, instead, as “a collaboration between the family and school,” “the school and family communicating,” “the teacher and/or school bringing the student’s family knowledge into the curriculum,” “working to establish trust between home and school,” or other similar types of comments, then I considered the definition to mean “partnership between school and home.” To determine the total number and the majority and minority percentages, I then counted how many candidates’ FE definitions aligned to the category of “what the family should do” versus “partnership between school and home.”

After completing the analysis of the pre-surveys, I repeated the same process on the post-survey with the addition of examining two more content questions: candidates’ responses on the most helpful content from the modules and on whether the candidates’ views of FE had changed as a result of participation in AFFECT piloting. The first feature I examined, when analyzing the first of these two questions, was the candidate’s language—whether it included references to content from the AFFECT modules (indicative of being
familiar with this content). If the candidate referenced lessons, activities, or the structure of the AFFECT website or modules, then I considered that they were familiar with the materials. However, if they stated “I haven’t learned it yet,” “I don’t remember using it,” or “It was good information,” without reference to specific content, or other similar general comments, then I considered the candidates had participated only minimally in the piloting. I then calculated the percentages of candidates who fell into each category. The second feature I looked at with the latter of the two content questions was the percentage of candidates who responded that their beliefs had changed. I repeated the same process for the non-piloting candidates’ surveys.

Based on the analyses from each of these instruments, I was able to compare across data sources to strengthen the validity of the findings (Stake, 2004) specifically in regards to the teacher educators’ behaviors in piloting the modules. First, I compared the data analyses of the piloting candidates’ to the non-piloting candidates’ surveys. I checked three areas: (changing) definitions of FE, knowledge of AFFECT modules, and changing beliefs about FE as a result of participation in AFFECT piloting. Second, I compared these three categories of the piloting and non-piloting candidates to the analyses of the teacher educators. I determined if the themes of the educators’ behaviors and efficacy in piloting aligned with any particular pattern of the piloting and non-piloting candidates’ changing FE definitions, expressed involvement in piloting, and changing beliefs. This comparison was done by analyzing, side-by-side, the teacher educator’s spread sheet with the piloting candidates’ pre and post-survey and the non-piloting candidates’ survey. I repeated this same process for each of the educators.
CHAPTER 5
RESULTS: IMPLEMENTATION OF FSP CURRICULUM

In this chapter, I discuss the results of the two-year longitudinal study of teacher educators’ implementation of FSP lessons and activities with their teacher candidates. These results are organized into three sections: teacher educators’ FE beliefs, the implementation of the FE modules by the teacher educators, and the teacher educators’ changing beliefs as a result of using the modules and/or participating in the study.

Teacher Educators’ FE Beliefs

An analysis of the teacher educators’ initial interviews and written surveys provides insight into the teacher educators’ beliefs about and values of FSPs before piloting the AFFECT modules. The findings indicate the most salient areas of the teacher educators’ FSP practices: their definitions of FE, their views about the importance of FE, their preferences for the kinds of FE activities used with their candidates, and their opinions on the kinds of support their candidates need to implement FE with their students and the barriers their candidates are facing. This information contributes to knowing about the personal factors in Bandura’s triadic reciprocal determinism model. Since teacher beliefs influence their instructional strategies (Gay, 2010; Richards, Gallo, & Renandya, 2001), knowing more about the educators’ personal factors—beliefs, attitudes, perceptions, and thoughts (Bandura, 1978; Woods & Bandura, 1999), can help understand how those beliefs influence the other factors of behavior and environment in the reciprocal determinism relationship.

Definitions of FE. The teacher educators in this study defined FE in one of three ways: the actions of the family, the collaboration between school and home, or the integration of students’ families into the school curriculum. Four of the teacher educators cited the importance of the students’ families’ contributions to the school. For instance, Prof. Kaelele
defined FE as the family’s presence in the home or at school: “Parents participating in their child’s school, whether it’s spending time with them at home on homework, spending time doing activities at school, or going to some event such as parent-teacher conferences.” (Note that quotes have been slightly edited to facilitate reading, without changing the meaning.)

Like Prof. Kaelele’s FE definition, Prof. Matsumoto also emphasized the family’s contributions and took the “teacher perspective” by describing FE as “The way that parents, families, guardians are involved with their child in the school whether it’s bigger projects like volunteering for an event or bringing in knowledge that a parent can share with the class or just helping out.” Profs. Kaelele and Matsumoto both emphasized the importance of families having their presence at school known to their children. Similar to their responses, Prof. Robertson also noted the importance of students’ families’ actions in FE, while emphasizing the importance of extended family members:

> Family engagement means the opportunities allowed to families, not just parents, but extended families, aunts, uncles, grandparents, and guardians to participate in their children’s education on many levels. So it might be helping the school to do tasks, like copying for teachers, or, you know, helping with clean up, coming into classrooms and maybe being involved in teaching to the level of doing homework with their child and supporting their education in that way, to big school events, such as May Day, spring programs, or helping with the fairs.

In contrast to the teacher educators who cited the importance of the family’s actions in FE, another four educators considered FE to mean a reciprocal relationship between home and school. For instance, Prof. Palakiko stated, “Family engagement, in my mind, translates to collaboration. So it means that the students and I are not just in isolation.” Prof. Cruz agreed that FE comprised a collaborative effort between home and school: “I think for me it’s
about a reciprocal relationship between families and the school, their teachers, and providing opportunities to collaborate with families.” Prof. Hwang also shared these views when reflecting on previous teaching experiences: “The word that comes to mind is partnership. Engagement is a partnership and without that nothing happened. Kids wouldn’t do anything.” The importance of establishing relationships with the families was a common thread found in the beliefs of this group of teacher educators.

To a slightly less extent, three teacher educators emphasized the importance of integrating the students’ families into the school curriculum. For example, according to Prof. Millard, “True family engagement is not just coming to parent-teacher night, although that’s nice. When we really look at true family engagement, it’s the idea of parents and their values and their strengths being integrated into a curriculum.” This third group of teacher educators provided examples of activities families could be doing and cited instances of reciprocal relationships between home and school. These examples were similar to those two given by the previous groups. However, this third category of teacher educators defined FE with many more references to family culture, students’ background, and family assets being integrated into the school curriculum. Prof. Shiroma characterized these definitions by explaining:

Family engagement to me is involving families in all aspects of learning. So, the first thing that comes to mind for me is with curriculum. How do you involve the experiences and the knowledge and the backgrounds of families in what you’re teaching, the topic that you’re teaching? And so at a curriculum level, it’s about bringing the homes of the children into the classroom.

Before analyzing the data, I expected the teacher educators to have similar definitions of FE, closely aligned to the third groups’ FE being centered on a partnership between family and home. I thought they might show signs of critical pedagogy, such as challenging the
candidates to question the ways they perceived the family-school relationship and the power dynamics preventing more democratic modes of doing things (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2008). However, the findings indicate that the educators have a range of beliefs in explaining the family-school relationship. Knowing about teacher educators’ personal factors (e.g., beliefs, experiences, thoughts) in the triadic reciprocal determinism model contributes to the scarce research on teacher educators (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005), especially in the field of FSPs. In the following sections, I explore in more detail teacher educators’ FSP beliefs and how those beliefs might affect their behaviors—the second factor in the triadic reciprocal determinism theory—in teaching their candidates.

Triangulation across the data sources of video-recorded interviews and written surveys confirmed the FE definitions teacher educators’ expressed during the interviews, as discussed above. For instance, Prof. Matsumoto, who emphasized the contributions of the family in the definition of FE, affirmed those beliefs on the written survey: “I believe the definition of family engagement is whatever is happening in the home that would promote their [students’] educational progress. And then beyond that it would be engagement that the families would have within the school like helping in classrooms, working with the school, whatever programs they have.” In a similar example of teacher educators’ verbal and written responses matching, Prof. Cortez, who described FE as integrating the students’ family into the school and curriculum, wrote on the survey that “the idea of engagement is how much the school allows parents’ voice, parents’ involvement inside the classroom, inside the school, but also what opportunities are to represent individual children and families within the classroom curriculum and activities.” Interestingly, in the teacher educators’ definitions of FE, there was no relationship between their definition of FE and their programs within the COE. I would have expected that educators from the Early Childhood (ECE) program, for example, would
have provided similar responses while educators from a different program, such as Special Education (SPED), would have defined FE differently but similarly among themselves. However, I found the FE definitions in the three aforementioned categories were spread out almost evenly among the teacher educators’ five different programs (Elementary, ECE, SPED, Educational Psychology, and Curriculum Studies) in the COE.

**Perspectives on the importance of FE.** Asking the teacher educators’ views on the importance of FE afforded another perspective into their personal factors (i.e., understandings and values) of FE. The findings indicated that the teacher educators attributed the importance of FE to four distinct areas: teacher benefits, student benefits, school atmosphere improvements, and family-home relationship building. A comparison of their definitions of FE and their views of its importance, points to an interesting relationship. For those educators who defined FE as the responsibility of families, the importance of FE was attributed to the benefits for the teacher or the student. For example, Prof. Kaelele, who responded to the question on the definition of FE with “parents participating in their child's school,” responded to the question on the importance of FE as “any facet that [the family] supports the school in their efforts and your child recognizes that the efforts are being made,” with examples such as volunteering, attending PTA meetings, donating, or helping their children at home. Kaelele felt students benefited from seeing their family members involving themselves in school in this way. Similarly, Prof. Matsumoto, who also defined FE as the contributions of the family, verified those beliefs when responding to the question on the importance of FE:

The importance of family engagement goes back to the child so that they view the importance placed on school by their family. Maybe it will motivate them to be more
engaged in school activities and their academics if they know how involved their parents are, in events and just helping out.

These educators saw the importance of FE as benefiting the students or teachers; the meaning of FE rested on the responsibilities of the family to contribute their time and support to enable those benefits.

On the other hand, those teacher educators who in the initial interview and written survey had defined FE as not only the family’s actions but also the school’s efforts to communicate and include families in the curriculum, the educators attributed the importance of FE to mutual benefits between school and home (i.e., a more welcoming school atmosphere and improved relationships between school personnel and families). For the teacher educators who defined FE in this manner, their explanation of the importance of FE confirmed those beliefs, as evident in Prof. Shiroma’s case: “[FE is] involving families in all aspects of learning” [whereas the families] “feel like they're empowered and they have a voice in the schooling of their children.” Shiroma explained the importance of FE as more than just the participation of families in school events:

So much of education happens in the home and in the school so you need to really connect those experiences for children. And so it's so important for families to feel like they feel connected to the school, that they have a relationship with their [children’s] teachers, where they can come to school and feel that they can voice issues or to talk about, you know, what's going well or not well with their child. And so I think that begins with relationships….

Once again, this third smaller group of teacher educators appeared to espouse qualities of critical pedagogy with their desires for the candidates to “empower families,” allow families to “voice issues,” and change the curriculum to incorporate the family’s culture knowledge
and assets. The other eight educators, however, lacked descriptions of FE in terms of social justice or transformative types of endeavors (Mezirow, 2000). The description or value of FSP appeared to be more on the basic importance of establishing family-school relationships rather than promoting candidates to have a critical awareness.

In conclusion, I found that those teacher educators who defined FE as the actions of the families, tended to emphasize the importance of FE as benefitting students or teachers. On the other hand, those educators who defined FE as more of a partnership between school and family, and who emphasized bringing families into the curriculum, correspondingly tended to stress the importance of FE benefiting students and teachers as well as an overall improved school atmosphere and improved relationships between students’ homes and the school.

**Suggested FE activities for candidates.** When asked the kinds of FE activities the teacher educators would like their candidates to implement in their teaching, all of them placed the responsibility on the school or on the teacher candidates’ themselves. The teacher educators hoped that their candidates focused on activities that involved families in the curriculum, that allowed the candidates to reflect on their own backgrounds and potential biases towards families, and that facilitated the establishment of relationships between the school and families. Interspersed with the educators’ hopes for candidates’ self-reflection, relationship building, and curriculum development were the educators’ frustrations over time constraints and over not being able to prepare their candidates well enough to address these FE desires. For example, Prof. Lee, who defined FE as the family’s contributions to the school, said it was important for candidates to “really pull families into the actual curriculum, the things that they're really doing in the classroom.” Lee lamented, however, that “the teacher candidates don't get too many opportunities to do a lot [of that].” Prof. Robertson expressed the same time constraint concerns and noted the excessive requirements in the
teacher education program, which made Robertson feel “inundated with requirements” and, therefore, limited in the amount of time given to develop candidates’ skills in FE. These findings were the first indications of the environmental factors affecting the educators’ beliefs and behaviors to integrate FE content into their courses. If teachers perceive a high external locus of control then they are more likely to believe that their environment is controlled by “external forces over which they have no control” (Wang, Zhang, & Jackson, 2013, p. 1429) and therefore, in this case, will be less likely to incorporate FE practices into their curriculum. Knowing about the environmental factors affecting the teacher educators’ personal and behavior factors will help teacher education programs to better support their faculty to incorporate FE content into the curriculum.

**Perspectives on the support candidates need.** After analyzing and cross-referencing the interviews and written surveys on the question, “What kind of support do teacher candidates need to receive to promote family engagement in schools?,” I found that three themes appeared in almost every teacher educator’s response: (a) candidates needed more opportunities to interact with families, (b) candidates needed more time to reflect on their own biases and assumptions about families and FE, and, (c) in their efforts to improve FE, candidates needed more support from their field placement mentor teachers. Firstly, according to Prof. Robertson, candidates needed support so that FE is “more than just sending communication letters back and forth.” Prof. Matsumoto also noted that candidates should have opportunities to engage directly with families in order to “see those connections” between family and school curriculum, and between family and classroom management. If support were increased, Matsumoto stipulated, FE might not be put “on the back burner.” Secondly, to support candidates in learning about FE, teacher education programs needed to create “entry points,” according to Prof. Cortez, for the candidates to develop experiences
with families. Prof. Jackson, too, expressed this concern, and wished that “teacher candidates could actually have the time to do it [FE] and [wished there was time to] show them how to do it.” Teacher candidates could not be expected to create these entries on their own, especially if the culture of schools was not welcoming of families. Thirdly, candidates needed systematic, built-in opportunities to work with families as a context for practical understandings and strategy building. As Prof. Cruz explained,

[Teacher candidates] need the skills and knowledge to really be able to implement [FE]. I think it’s one of those things we can talk about abstractly, this is important, but I think candidates will say, okay great, but what do I do the first week of school, the second week of school. What does that [FE] look like? And I know they need a theoretical foundation, but they also need concrete tools and strategies.

The teacher educators clearly valued the importance of establishing FSP practices with their candidates with ten out of 11 of them mentioning the importance of creating opportunities for the candidates to interact with students’ families. In addition, they suggested that there needed to be more support structures in the COE’s course work and field experiences to allow their candidates to do so. These results confirm the research literature on the need for teacher education programs to provide teacher candidates with increased course coverage and field teaching opportunities to interact with students’ families (Caspe et al., 2011).

In addition to saying teacher candidates needed more opportunities to interact with families, seven of the educators also cited the importance of candidates reflecting on their own backgrounds. Prof. Shiroma pointed out that this reflective process could begin with the candidates realizing “the importance of family first in their own life and how it has shaped who they are and how they learn and how their families are part of a particular culture which again shapes how they learn and then as teachers to be conscientious of that.” The candidates’
examinations of their backgrounds—biases and assumptions—was particularly important to Prof. Palakiko who said, “I'm a firm believer in having them [candidates] reflect on their own background so they can understand their own family before they start approaching other families. So they avoid that [judgment].” The teacher educators stated in their interviews that it was important for candidates to reflect on their identities and experiences with families in their own upbringing and to contemplate how that understanding would affect their future relationships with families as teachers.

I found these commentaries interesting for two reasons. First, in the context of Bandura’s reciprocal determinism, the teacher educators were examining the personal factors of the teacher candidates, such as their FSP beliefs, experiences, perceptions, and biases. As participants in this study, I was examining the teacher educators’ FE beliefs and experiences and how that affected their instructional practices. However, now, I was witnessing the teacher educators examining their own candidates’ beliefs and attitudes of students’ families and how that affected their preparations to work with families. I felt the teacher educators’ recognition of the importance of these factors for their candidates was an affirmation of my use of Bandura’s theory in the study of teacher change in teacher education. Second, the teacher educators’ reflections hinted of one aspect of CP, which is critical reflection. The educators were examining their candidates’ personal factors and suggesting that more needed to be done to prepare them to work with families. They were exhibiting traits of CP by trying to expose the misconceptions and the marginalizing structures that permeate the beliefs of beginning teachers towards students’ families (Wink, 2005).

Lastly, eight of the educators additionally emphasized the importance of the role of the candidates’ field placement mentors in supporting their FE experiences. Prof. Palakiko explained, “[The teacher candidates] are going to need somebody who's willing to listen to
them, who's going to be able to give them advice, and that person might be in the form of a mentor.” The mentor would have to be someone who espoused FE practices and who modeled those qualities to the candidates. Prof. Jackson shared that candidates needed “[Mentors] who are engaged in these kinds of activities or at least buy into it [FE] and see it as a good thing.” Prof. Cruz also mentioned the same values of being a mentor, “In order to engage in the kind of FE we aspire to, candidates need other likeminded people at their school, you know, their supervisor, their mentor teacher. They need folks that will support it [FE] and say it’s important.”

The teacher educators’ strong emphasis of the mentor’s influence confirmed the importance of Wood and Bandura’s (1989) notion of mastery, vicarious, and social persuasion experiences. First, by providing candidates mastery experiences, the mentors were allowing the candidates to practice their skills to interact with students’ families. Naturally, if the mentor avoided these opportunities for the candidates due to their own personal beliefs of FE or due to environmental constraints, then the candidates would have fewer opportunities to develop practical FE skills in the field. Second, the mentors’ modeling and interactions with the students’ families before and after school, during parent-teacher conferences, at school events, and in oral/written correspondence provided the candidates with vicarious experiences of seeing how to conduct meaningful FSPs. However, again, if the mentors’ beliefs were not aligned with equitable FSPs, then the candidates would not benefit from these experiences and could be adversely affected if the mentors held prejudices against students’ families. Third, social persuasion experiences, such as the candidates listening to the mentors’ explanations of students’ families, the values in establishing FSPs, and the joy of establishing a school community, could increase the candidates’ willingness and confidence to interact with students’ families. These experiences with mentor teachers were so important
to the candidates that Prof. Lee believed the FE examples the candidates saw from their mentors were “much more meaningful,” in the eyes of the candidates, than what they saw from their university instructors. Teacher education programs, therefore, need to partner with mentor teachers who are willing to provide candidates with mastery, vicarious, and social persuasion experiences in order to foster the skills necessary to grow healthy family-school relationships.

Aside from the support the teacher educators believed their candidates needed to apply FE in schools, a fourth theme arose, in which the teacher educators examined the kind of support they had been given to prepare candidates to engage families. Prof. Robertson, for instance, said, “I can't really think of any [support I’ve gotten to promote FE for my teacher candidates]. I'm gonna be honest. All those things [I do is] because of what I do inherently.” In another interview, Prof. Matsumoto confided, “We only come with so much knowledge in that area [FE], so [I would like to have] like having other strategies that we could share with them [candidates]. Or, I guess [new] ideas on how to get families more engaged with their classrooms would be helpful.” Prof. Palakiko reiterated the same points: “It’s also very important for those of us that are going to be working with these candidates to share our own experiences that we've had with parents so that they know that there's a lot of things that can happen with parents.” In the same way that mentors are influential in the lives of the candidates, so, too, are the teacher educators in presenting opportunities and introducing skills for the candidates to foster FSPs. As such, teacher educators also need support in this undertaking. Prof. Kaelele explained,

Even in our methods courses, like how do we [as teacher educators] promote family engagement while they're [teacher candidates] learning something. And you know I talk about [FE], but I've never really shown them what it looks like or sort of
help[ed] them create or develop a plan for one. So even that aspect from an instructor level, I think they need more . . . guidance, more showing, not just saying.

This fourth theme that teacher educators themselves need more FSP support from their own programs in order to effectively prepare candidates to work with students’ families, further strengthens the importance of this study.

The interview findings on the limited level of support that teacher educators received to promote FE with their candidates were consistent with the teacher educators’ responses on the written surveys, where they responded to the following open-ended question: How much or what kind of support have you received as a faculty member to promote family engagement in schools? Seven of the teacher educators responded, “none” (e.g., “none,” “not much,” “nothing,” or “not really any”), one responded with “some”, two who did not respond directly to the question, and one who said, “much support.” This outlier comment of “much support” was surprising considering that the majority of the educators reported that they had not received any identifiable support from their respective programs within the COE. Unfortunately no more data are available to determine what the educator meant by “much support.”

In conclusion, all the educators noted that candidates required more support from their teacher education courses and their field experience mentors in order to develop the necessary skills to be future partners of families. These findings were further confirmed on the survey questionnaire when the teacher educators were asked how much support candidates received in their teacher education programs to promote FE in schools. As shown in Table 5 below, eight out of 11 said that the FE support for candidates from the educators’ programs (in the COE) ranged from “none” to “some.”
Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support from Teacher Education Program to Promote FE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>level of support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perspectives on the barriers that hinder candidates.** When the teacher educators were asked in the interviews to describe the kinds of barriers hindering their candidates from developing FSP skills, they voiced the same three themes as they had earlier noted when discussing candidates’ support: mentors supportive of FE, opportunities for candidates to interact with families, and opportunities for candidates to reflect on their own family and cultural/ethnic/racial backgrounds. Mentor teachers’ negative influences in the candidates’ field placements were noted by nine out of 11 of the teacher educators as a potential barrier in the candidates’ FSP development. For instance, Prof. Matsumoto, who had previously emphasized the candidates’ backgrounds as an area for needed support, when asked about barriers facing candidates’ FE growth, spoke at length about the candidates’ mentor teachers’ roles in affecting candidates’ access, impressions, and strategies to develop partnerships with families. Matsumoto explained,

I think family engagement is difficult for candidates in the sense they’re kind of following the lead of their mentor teachers. So, I know some of our candidates would want to be more in touch with parents and involve them more but they’re also bound by the desires of their classroom mentors and so if they [mentors] don’t have that set up already [FSPs] then it’s hard for the candidates to establish that especially when they’re coming in a little bit later, their 4-week solo teaching, which is usually in the middle of the semester. So it’s hard to . . . implement something in the middle,
when everything, the foundation of the classroom and the engagement with families, is . . . set by the mentor teacher.

In a similar vein, Prof. Matsumoto explained that the candidates’ mentor teachers also might have a “deficit mentality” in regards to working with families. Therefore, Matsumoto posited, it would be imperative for teacher educators to do more with candidates to help them realize their own “ah-hah” moments in understanding and working with families.

In addition to the possibly negative influences of the candidates’ mentors and other potential barriers hindering the candidates’ development, Prof. Kaelele explained that the barriers affecting the candidates extended beyond the mentor teachers’ classrooms. Kaelele said the candidates’ FSP experiences were aligned to “the culture and the environment of the school” and the “kind of partnerships happening there.” Profs. Kaelele and Matsumoto insisted, therefore, that teacher education programs need to instill a sense of empowerment in their candidates so that they could be the change agents, regardless of the mentor teachers’ influence or the culture of the field placement schools. One necessary characteristic of CP is reflection, as noted previously in the chapter. A second main ingredient is the creation of agents of change (Wink, 2005). Profs. Kaelele and Matsumoto believed in the importance of creating agents of change in their candidates in order for them to overcome barriers that they might be facing in establishing FSPs. In the next section on the implementation of the FSP modules, we will see if the teacher educators applied these characteristics of CP to their piloting.

Prof. Lee, who had previously extolled the presence of the candidates’ mentor teachers by saying they were more influential at times than the university instructor, returned to the impact of mentors on candidates but, in the context of barriers, pointed out that the candidates’ lack of time in the field with their mentors, as a result of the structure of their
teacher education program, could adversely affect their skill development in working with families. Lee believed,

> It can be challenging for mentors to completely share the work of reaching out to families because the teacher candidates, especially in the first year, are only there two days a week. So I think that it's just about the depth of their knowledge. You don't know as much as you might about a child if you're only there two days a week. And it can be a tricky thing for a teacher candidate to answer questions families have about their children [because the candidates don’t have the knowledge from interacting with the students on a regular basis].

As Lee alluded to when explaining the impact of mentors, there were certain program constraints (limited time in the field) which restricted the opportunities for the candidates to develop their FSP skills. Prof. Cortez also expressed frustrations with program constraints, such as limited course coverage of FE and the lack of candidates’ opportunities in field placements: “It’s [exposure to FE] not enough because it’s one course in a whole degree and the [field placement] schools don’t support the candidates working with families. So it’s all second hand [knowledge], and I don’t know how else to get them to reach understandings [of FE]. They don’t have access to genuine relationships with the families so it’s theoretical.”

Prof. Jackson noted the same points as did Profs. Lee and Cortez:

> Well, the first thing is I don’t think they see a lot of examples [of FE]. So I think they need to read about it, watch videos, talk to people, so they see it as something that is real and can be implemented. I think the main barrier is going to be the access, you know, having the time like I said, time and the opportunity to be involved. They don’t have a lot of control when they’re student teaching or in just doing their practicum work.
Eight of the teacher educators raised disconcerting points about the candidates’ lack of exposure, examples and practice of FE (i.e., working with families) in teacher education programs as well as field placements. These findings, again, emphasized the need for teacher education programs to partner with mentors who believed in FSPs and who were willing to provide the candidates with *mastery, vicarious,* and *social persuasion experiences.* The mentors at the field placement schools need to engage and develop the candidates’ *personal* (beliefs), *behavioral* (teaching practices), and *environmental* (conditions at the field school) factors for them to be better prepared to work with families.

Program constraints were not limited to the teacher education program itself. The teacher educators noted that their ability to encourage candidates to apply their knowledge from the teacher education program into their field placements was also restricted by the availability of good mentor teachers. Prof. Matsumoto commented that it was difficult for the teacher education program to be more selective in choosing mentors who were exemplars of FSP practices because the mentors were chosen by the administrators of the candidates’ field placement schools. Matsumoto added, “We just never know where’s our place to talk to the mentors because they’re also doing us a favor.” Some of the teacher educators also explained that even if the candidates were in a field placement where there might be opportunities to interact with families, there still might be some reluctance to include them on the part of mentor teachers or school administrators because of the candidates’ youth and inexperience in dealing with family or personal information-related situations. This reluctance compounded the barrier to placing the candidates with good mentors. The troubling issue of providing candidates’ enough time and opportunity to develop relationships and strategies to partner with families was a common theme throughout the teacher educators’ narratives.

Unfortunately, as Prof. Shiroma lamented, too often the program asked the candidates to
“imagine what it would be like” rather than fostering conditions more conducive to candidates’ actually interacting and learning from FSPs.

The last main barrier in preparing candidates to work with families cited by the teacher educators was the mismatch they saw between the candidates’ backgrounds and that of their students and students’ families. In the previous section discussing what support candidates needed, the teacher educators responded in a general way with regard to the support that candidates needed to overcome their own biased or judgmental perspectives towards families and families of diversity. When the teacher educators were asked about barriers hindering their candidates’ development of FE practices, all 11 of them noted the candidates’ backgrounds. They specifically referenced the candidates’ inexperience, youth, lack of maturity, or fear of working with parents. In response to this question, Prof. Cortez said very simply, “I think the biggest one [barrier] simply is their own fear [of working with families].” Prof. Jackson explained that their ages and inexperience made working with families difficult for candidates: “If you’re young, then [you] haven’t had that much life experience. And I think it’s really hard to see that perspective when you’re just in college, not knowing how it feels to be a family, a parent or guardian.” Lastly, Prof. Palakiko expressed a concern that the candidates, as young 19, and 20-year-old professionals, would “struggle” if they did not receive the necessary support to understand the importance of FSPs. These physiological facts of the candidates’ ages and cumulative life experiences coupled with psychological factors such as fear, low expectations, or preconceived, sometimes biased notions of families, create barriers that need to be addressed in teacher education if programs are going to adequately prepare teacher candidates to partner with families. Perhaps if the teacher educators incorporated CP more explicitly into the teacher education curriculum, the transformational nature of CP could help the candidates to reflect on their personal beliefs
and, as a result, approach students’ families differently. With a CP approach, the educators could create opportunities for the candidates to be more sensitive, analytic, and reflective of their own misconceptions by engaging in discussions of critical awareness (Groenke & Hatch, 2009).

**Teacher Educators’ Implementation of the AFFECT Modules**

This section explains the results of teacher educators’ instructional practices during the piloting of the AFFECT modules and from the post-piloting data (gathered two to three semesters after their completion of the AFFECT piloting). These findings address two of the study’s research questions: (a) *How do teacher educators implement FSP lessons and activities into teacher education courses* and (b) *What are teacher educators’ beliefs and experiences with FSP and how do those beliefs and experiences affect their implementation of FSP lessons and activities?* In the previous section, we have a detailed understanding of the teacher educators’ *personal factors* based on Bandura’s (1978) triadic reciprocal determinism model. In this section, firstly, we will explore the other two factors, *behaviors* and *environment*, and how the interplay of all three factors in the reciprocal determinism model influence the success of the teacher educators’ piloting.

Secondly, I triangulate the findings from these *behavioral* and *environmental factors* with results from the pre- and post-piloting surveys of the piloting teacher educators’ candidates. In order to determine the general influence of the FSP modules on the candidates and the impact of their teacher educators’ piloting on the candidates’ FE beliefs, I analyze three areas of the survey data from the piloting teacher educators’ candidates: the candidates’ pre- and post-survey definitions of FE, the candidates’ opinions on the beneficial aspects of the AFFECT modules, and the candidates’ perspectives on their changing views of FE as a result of their involvement in the piloting.
Thirdly, I present the findings from the teacher educators’ FSP instructional practices from two to three semesters after their piloting of the AFFECT modules. This follow up study permits further examination of the personal, behavioral, and environmental factors affecting educators to implement FE content. Lastly, I discuss the results of surveys given to new candidates of the teacher educators (two to three semesters after the AFFECT piloting). This additional data source is included to further confirm the efficaciousness of the teacher educators to incorporate FSP practices and to determine how the FSP curriculum was affecting the development and preparation of the candidates.

**Methods of piloting.** The 11 teacher educators implemented the FSP modules in their COE courses in a range of ways with three primary methods being the most common with one of the educators not piloting. One approach, which was common with four of the teacher educators, involved the educators providing the AFFECT modules to their candidates and then having the candidates look over the modules, or parts of them, as homework. As an example of this type of approach, Prof. Shiroma explained, that “as part of their homework [I had them] look over the [AFFECT] module then we discussed it.” Prof. Robertson applied the same approach but appeared to assign the candidates more responsibility by placing the candidates in homework groups (to look over one of the three modules) which later presented their findings to the class. Robertson explained the piloting method:

> I divided the class up into groups, and each one would take a module. They then previewed the modules and reported back to the class about the content of the modules and those areas that they thought were particularly relevant based on what we were doing in the classroom.

In this first approach to the piloting of the modules, Robertson and the others had the candidates explore the modules on their own and report back to the class their findings.
The second common approach to piloting the AFFECT modules, used in three of the classes, was to give candidates’ tasks and activities to understand and apply the content from the modules. Prof. Matsumoto, for instance, assigned the modules in a similar manner to the first approach, as independent homework, but in addition,

[I] introduced the modules to the students and asked them to review each one. They needed to select one activity and modify it for use in their classrooms. I then asked them to share the activity or activities they implemented with the class towards the end of the semester.

Prof. Jackson also applied the modules in this way, but she incorporated student-led stations as well:

[The teacher candidates] had to read through the modules, choose something that they wanted to explore further, and teach it to their classmates. So I had them in centers. So they would do their lesson three times during the class period. That was a big part of the second half of the class, every class two people were doing a lesson based on the modules. And I kept it really open because it was very threatening, you know; they had to do it by themselves for one thing. So I let them choose whatever they wanted to choose. And it also allowed me to see what was of interest to students at that level.

The third approach, employed in three other classes, involved the teacher educator partnering with one of the AFFECT researchers to lead student-centered lesson(s) based on the AFFECT modules in their course. In Prof. Kaelele’s class, for instance, an AFFECT researcher collaborated extensively, presenting three 60-90 minute lessons. In the first lesson, the researcher introduced the AFFECT project, obtained the candidates’ consent to participate in research, and administered the candidates’ pre-survey. Then, the researcher led the class in
the completion of a K-W-L chart (What do you Know, What do you want to find out, What did you Learn) about FE. The AFFECT researcher then analyzed the candidates’ feedback on their FE interests or concerns, based on the KWL chart and class discussion, and then developed and presented two 90-minute lessons to Kaelele’s candidates. As a result of this collaboration between the educator and the AFFECT researcher and the candidates’ interest in the FSP lessons, the instructor redesigned the syllabus to include a major assignment requiring candidates to develop a project based on an activity of their choice from the AFFECT website which they would in turn apply to their field experience teaching. Prof. Lee, another educator who also partnered with an AFFECT researcher, had a first-person narrative that further illuminated the process of collaboration in the third approach. An AFFECT member came in to the classroom to help lead a lesson in piloting of the modules:

I partnered with . . ., [AFFECT member] which was great. We talked first, and then . . . [AFFECT member] came in and asked the students to sort of just write down some ideas about what they were particularly interested in, what they really felt they wanted to know more about. This was in the first semester, [so the students] haven’t had very many opportunities to work with families. Then . . . [AFFECT member] took all of those pieces of paper back and looked for common themes, and the themes that we saw were parent-teacher conferences. One of the things was about how do you work with families where English isn’t the first language, and more practical kinds of things like that. And then . . . [AFFECT member] designed these great activities for the students to do. [Then] came back again and then they did these activities where they created things like posters or they did skits, they developed dialogue. It was pretty short. We didn’t have very much time.
In the case of this third approach to the piloting of the modules, the educators partnered with an AFFECT researcher to have him or her lead FSP lesson(s) in the class. This collaborative effort between instructors and AFFECT researcher seemed to influence positively the instructors’ beliefs or teaching practices of FE, because, as noted in the situation of Prof. Kaelele, a major change was made to the course curriculum after the researcher had presented an FSP lesson.

As the teacher educators narrated their experiences in the piloting of the FE modules, both their successes and challenges, two distinct themes of constraints and efficacy emerged. First, *environmental factors* such as course or program constraints were mentioned quite extensively throughout the data, gathered from all the participating teacher educators. About half of the educators noted that these constraints were a major obstacle in the piloting of the AFFECT modules, which resulted in their doing less with FSP than they had originally envisioned. Even though the educators might have had strong beliefs and values attributed to establishing FSP practices with their candidates—as noted in the previous descriptions of the educators’ *personal factors*—the interactions of the other two dimensions, *environment* and *behaviors*, according to Wood and Bandura (1999), also impact the cognition and performance of the individual. Second, while other piloting educators also mentioned various constraints in attempting to integrate FE practices into their courses, they exhibited more evidence of what I interpreted as efficacy or a higher *internal locus of control*.

*Using the modules and constraints.* There were various levels of constraints that the teacher educators cited. One of the most salient themes was the lack of time. For instance, Prof. Robertson said, “We didn’t have too much time in our semester so that [the implementation of FE] was difficult.” There were also specific course constraints. Prof. Shiroma explained:
So the topic itself [FE] is really important, but I did not integrate it. It was definitely more of an additive. I just stuck it in where I thought it could fit best, without looking at it holistically. I didn’t integrate it [the modules] more purposely in my syllabus. But at the same time, we [colleagues and I] were also trying something new [a new course] and so trying to just fit in everything that we had already wanted to do and then include all of this was tedious. Even though I believe very strongly with the aims of this [preparing candidates in FSPs].

All of the educators who approached the piloting by assigning the modules as homework to only look over the modules, and thus “didn’t go very deeply” into the material, pointed to course constraints such as lack of time, too much content to cover already in their curriculum, a new course that they were not familiar with teaching, and/or disconnected opportunities for the candidates to engage in FSP between the teacher education courses and field teaching.

On a larger scale, all the piloting educators cited program constraints—the candidates’ heavy course content requirements, the limited time to add content or application to existing courses, the need to prepare candidates for the state teacher credentials—as an inhibiting factor in preparing their candidates to partner with families. Prof. Palakiko’s comments illustrated these concerns,

[The teacher candidates] seemed kind of unsure as to what all this [AFFECT modules] was about. I think it was just the overwhelming amount of work that they faced in the program. They have several different instructors saying this is really important. So it’s a challenge for students to sift through the monumental amount of material to figure out (laughing) what’s really important.
While I approached the educators’ piloting of the AFFECT modules with an eye towards CP, it seemed that for some of them their external locus of control was too high for them to integrate only the basic FSP content into their courses.

**Efficacy in applying FSPs.** Those teacher educators who assigned the modules as hands-on tasks requiring candidates to develop and then apply activities to either their peers or field experience students or those who chose to pilot the modules by partnering with an AFFECT project team member spoke less frequently about the various constraints they faced in implementing the AFFECT modules. Instead, they seemed to have a higher internal locus of control by discussing the changes they could make in their courses to overcome the obstacles in the piloting and expose their candidates to more FSP practices. Prof. Lee, who partnered with an AFFECT researcher to lead lessons in class, lamented the lack of time spent on the FE modules, but said “I think what was a really valuable thing is that they [candidates] got it on their radar. They stopped thinking about teaching as only me and students, and families have no place in the picture.” Even though Lee acknowledged that not much time was spent on the AFFECT piloting, Lee was pleased that, by participating in the piloting, the candidates were now more aware of FSP issues. Lee explained:

I felt very happy that they were having this time to think about families right in the first course. I think the fact that they’re doing more of it [FE] signals that this is really important. Even if they don’t get everything, and they won’t, that’s ok with me. But it’s just, ok here it is, and we’re going to revisit and revisit. So, I felt like it was great to have that happen in the first semester in a deeper way than it has been before.

Prof. Lee believed that because the AFFECT modules were implemented with the cohort in the first semester of the program, that effort alone emphasized that the teacher education program valued teaching practices which involved FSPs, regardless of individual professors’
depth of coverage in the piloting of the modules. Prof. Kaelele, who also partnered with an AFFECT member to lead FSP lessons in the classroom, agreed with the notion of sequencing and spiraling FE topics:

> These are just stereotypes [prejudice against families] and when you have these beliefs you’re contributing to these stereotypes. I think that’s what we don’t want them [the candidates] to walk away with so I think in many ways, I’m glad that we did it [FSP] in the first semester because I have three more semesters to demystify that [prejudices against families] hopefully.

Returning to Wood and Bandura’s (1999) sources of experiences to promote teacher’s *self-efficacy* or *internal locus of control*, I found that Profs. Lee and Kaelele were confident and comfortable talking about their experiences piloting the modules. In contrast to the aforementioned educators who cited constraints and lack of piloting, Lee and Kaelele seemed pleased with the amount of exposure and interactions their candidates had with the modules. It appeared that their *vicarious* and *social experiences* with an AFFECT researcher helped to heighten their internal locus of control.

Even though I was pleasantly surprised with Profs. Lee’s and Kaelele’s positive explanations of the piloting, I could not find clear evidence of CP, such as the professors choosing content from the AFFECT website to challenge the candidates’ biases towards students’ families or to have the candidates think more critically about the needs of families over the needs of the school. Similar to the educators who piloted to a limited extent, Lee and Kaelele were more focused on just exposing their candidates to some of the FSP content. The lessons that they chose were related to parent-teacher conferences and home-school communication strategies and not necessarily on raising critical awareness or developing a sense of agency. According to Groenke and Hatch (2009),
Even colleagues who seem to understand and at least tacitly support critical pedagogy still generate issues for critical educators because of the time and energy it takes to include critical approaches in already packed teacher education programs. (p. 69)

Therefore, even though the educators might value the concept of CP, their beliefs of *environmental factors* could hinder their ability to spend more time on CP heavy lessons. Another reason the educators might have chosen “lighter” lessons from the AFFECT website could be based on the belief that their candidates lacked the foundational knowledge of FE and were, therefore, not ready to explore critical issues (Groenke and Hatch, 2009).

The focus group interviews, used at the end of the piloting semester, provided another unique opportunity to glimpse the differences between the pedagogical approaches and *locus of control* levels of the teacher educators. In contrast to the initial individual interviews, the format of the focus group interview allowed for interesting interactions among the teacher educators. In addition to responding to the interviewer’s questions, at times, the teacher educators engaged in discussions with each other on how they approached the modules (i.e., their *behaviors* in implementing) and how they dealt with these aforementioned constraints (i.e., *environmental factors*). For example, when the interviewer asked for suggestions on ways to improve the modules, Prof. Palakiko said, “Maybe break them down in such a way that there’s not, that it’s more manageable for the student to get a handle on. And I don’t know how to go about doing that except making them smaller chunks so that they can do something with them.” Prof. Lee, who was in the same focus group interview, responded to this comment by saying, in contrast,

> I think it would be my responsibility to, you know, find pieces that I would then suggest to the students. Then, of course, they go and look for more. But I wouldn’t
just give the students the link to the modules (laughing) and say go, look, explore. I think I would say, look at this in particular, and then, of course, you can look at everything if you want but, you know, I would sort of break it down more for them. Prof. Lee believed it was the instructor’s responsibility to take the resources of the AFFECT modules and determine what would be appropriate for the candidates rather than relying on the candidates’ ability to navigate the content. Lee seemed to have a higher internal locus of control in navigating and implementing the modules as compared to Palakiko.

This notion of prescriptive versus open ended presentation of the AFFECT modules and how the instructors and candidates should be engaged with the modules came up again in the same focus group interview with Profs. Lee and Palakiko. Lee returned to the issue of the approach of integrating the modules into the course and the engagement of the instructor, as noted below:

I thought it was great that there was so much flexibility and willingness to do whatever we needed. So, I actually think that’s wonderful. It wasn’t like there was one way. I mean I remember when I talked to . . . [AFFECT member] first. . . . [The AFFECT member] said we could do this or you know anything that works. And so that was really, that was great I thought. And I think that will make it work in many different classes.

Prof. Palakiko, on the other hand, disagreed, “Part of me wants to have somebody tell [me what to do]. When we were going through those initial meetings about the modules, and before the year started, it was so nebulous for me. And so part of me likes to have, the teacher part of me just to have somebody say, ok, this is how you should do it.” These exchanges between the teacher educators showed how the two of them, both of whom cited constraints in including more FE practices in their courses and both of whom were provided with the
same support opportunities, engaged with the FSP modules. They expressed differing preferences for the format of the AFFECT modules—prescriptive versus open ended—and exhibited differing levels of efficacy—higher external locus of control (focused more on environmental constraints) versus higher internal locus of control (focused more on what can be done and the benefits of doing so)—in the piloting of the modules. Interestingly, it seemed as if Prof. Palakiko could have benefitted from vicarious experiences, such as explanations and modeling from an AFFECT researcher, to gain more assurance to implement the modules. Whereas, Prof. Lee, who accepted the invitation to partner with an AFFECT researcher, gained a higher level of internal locus of control. These types of interactions with the FE modules indicate the importance of a flexible FSP curriculum and opportunities to collaborate with colleagues.

In a separate focus group interview, Prof. Kaelele, who piloted some aspects of the AFFECT modules by also partnering with an AFFECT team member, indicated similar levels of confidence with the modules, possibly due to the modeling and interactions with an AFFECT researcher. For instance, when two other members in the focus group mentioned the added constraint of the large, unwieldy nature of the modules, Kaelele’s response was, “Because I think my candidates did actual activities, I think they were more centered on the activities they did instead of the whole curricula itself.” In other words, instead of the instructor assigning entire modules (which had extensive amounts of lesson activity ideas, resources, content and professional standards, etc.) to the candidates, Kaelele’s candidates were asked to focus on specific lessons or activities that were applicable to their field teaching placements. Kaelele appeared to have confidence to navigate the curriculum on the AFFECT website and assign tasks according to the candidates’ needs. On the other hand,
other members in the focus group, who had not partnered with a researcher, saw the modules as daunting and unwieldy.

Prof. Kaelele returned to this notion of efficacy in integrating the AFFECT modules into teacher education courses when, later in the focus group interview, Kaelele suggested that support such as what was received when partnering with an AFFECT team member to pilot the modules should be available to the other teacher educators. (Kaelele was unaware that such an invitation had been extended to all teacher educators who wanted to pilot the AFFECT modules).

I think what was helpful for me was that . . . [AFFECT member] came to my class. And so that’s something, if you offered it to other instructors . . . . [The AFFECT researcher] actually came in to a few of my classes and did lessons with them [the candidates]. That was helpful for them to learn the modules in a more practical, hands-on way. And so if that’s part of the invitation. Based on what . . . [AFFECT member] talked about, I changed some of my course syllabi because they [the candidates] were so interested in the English language learner piece. If other instructors [knew], or [you can tell them], we can send some of our staff to do a lesson or to actually show what this looks like, then that might be helpful.

Kaelele clearly emphasizes the value of vicarious experiences of partnering with the AFFECT researcher. Not only did Kaelele gain confidence in navigating the vast resources of the AFFECT website, but also took ownership of the FSP content by redesigning the course syllabus to allow for FSP to be a bigger piece.

While it is nearly impossible to determine which factor of the triadic relationship is affecting the success of teaching (Bandura, 1978), this study contributes to the research literature by demonstrating that the pedagogical decisions (behaviors)—assigning hands-on
tasks and collaborating with colleagues—increases the teacher educators’ abilities to incorporate FSP content into their courses. The results provide useful information for new curriculum development in teacher education.

A changing efficacy. A surprising change in behavior occurred near the end of each of the three focus group interviews. The teacher educators who frequently prefaced their piloting of the modules by talking about the constraints and who had assigned the content as something to look over as homework, started to reflect on their experiences and started to suggest approaches that might help them overcome the environmental constraints that previously hindered their piloting. One professor explained the change in methodology that could be taken: “I think if I were to use them again, I would probably change my approach to them. And spend a little more time maybe just selecting one area to really develop well to have them work with. Because there’s so much in there that’s valuable.” In a separate focus group, another professor reflected on how the students were engaged with the materials and what could be done differently:

And so quite honestly, I didn’t integrate it [FE] as much as I had would have liked. And hearing . . . [other teacher educator in focus group] talk about some of the things . . . [that professor] did, I think I would be more deliberate about having students be more hands-on with taking what they read and doing something with it. Later in the interview, another professor also responded to these points by commenting on how to overcome the time constraints,

I think that just kind of inhibited it [the piloting] in the beginning. It [the modules] was a lot, and I didn’t have the time to kind of break it down for myself, to figure out how I was going to really integrate it. I see these modules fitting so naturally, I mean it just naturally fits with what I do. And so, again, just being a little more deliberate
about how do I really take what resources you’ve created and integrate [them] more is something that I’ve gotta figure out.

The educators’ remarks clearly indicate that they value FSP practices for their candidates, but are missing the necessary support to apply the AFFECT modules more fully.

In a third, separate focus group, another professor, who also piloted by assigning the modules only as homework for candidates to look over, talked about being more deliberate and about the teacher education program as a whole, including content such as FSP practices as a regular component in course offerings.

And so if we [as teacher educators] can be a little bit more deliberate. You know I was laughing because you know they’re [the candidates] thinking that it is the newsletter. ‘I sent home a letter; I’ll put it in my portfolio.’ No, because that’s pretty much the only [FE] thing that they have to grasp at because we don’t really make them intentionally do anything over and beyond. So the program itself expects very little in that area because we’re wanting them to get the other things [program requirements] under their belt in a 2-year time frame. So if [we] can just address that [FE] in a scant way, we’re good with that. So [it’s about] our expectations.

Even though this professor’s desires and abilities to pilot the AFFECT modules were hindered by perceptions of various constraints, the importance of exposing teacher candidates to more FSP practices was still recognized. The professor also challenged the teacher education program’s minimal expectations of candidates’ FSP development as well as the little amount of FSP involvement they, as teacher educators, were requiring of the candidates.

In the same focus group, another professor reflected on the institutional constraints of accreditation, standards board, and standardized testing and their possibly negative effects on
the candidates’ growth. The professor suggested ways that the teacher education program faculty could come together to better resolve these issues,

It’s a challenge. We too are bending to external pressures, the same as classroom teachers, to spend more time on academic content. We [have] sort of lost control of our profession, too. So I think that that is a challenge for us to think about. So how do we weave this [FSP instruction] in? We actually do curriculum mapping across the department because of performance-based assessments that our candidates are going to have to start passing in a couple years. And so maybe it’s an opportunity for us to look at other content that’s valuable to us to see about how we can integrate it [FSP] in a meaningful way.

In addition to suggesting ways that colleagues could come together to address candidates’ FSP preparations, this professor commented that the focus group interview itself, aside from the piloting, was a beneficial experience. The professor shared that the focus group discussion allowed one to know more about what was going on in the COE and individuals in one’s own program. The professor had even been previously unaware that her colleagues were also piloting the AFFECT modules. The professor commented that it would be beneficial to the COE if faculty members shared their research and teaching experiences with each other more often. This suggestion is indicative of Wood and Bandura’s (1989) social persuasion experience. As the professor noted, if a colleague had previously shared information about the AFFECT modules, then the piloting professor might have had more efficacy, or internal locus of control, in approaching the content. While some of the educators noted a lack of satisfaction with their piloting of the FSP modules, at the end of the focus group interviews they reflected on ways to enable themselves and other teacher educators to adapt their course and program expectations to better meet the needs of candidates.
Piloting candidates’ perspectives. In order to triangulate the results of the teacher educators’ responses, I analyzed data on pre- and post-piloting surveys of candidates who were in the piloting teacher educators’ classes. Returning to the research question how do teacher educators implement FSP lessons and activities into teacher education courses, the candidates’ responses showed their levels of involvement and the impact of the teacher educators’ piloting in their courses. In the 11 teacher educators’ classes, 96 candidates’ consented and participated in the pre- and post-surveys.

In order to understand how the candidates were engaged with the modules and their levels of changing understandings or beliefs, I analyzed responses to the following questions: (a) How do you define family engagement?; (b) In terms of learning about family engagement with the AFFECT modules, what did you find the most helpful? Why?; and c) Have your views of family engagement changed? The data were useful for future development of the modules and, more importantly for this study, provided insight on the candidates’ conceptions of FE in schools prior to their exposure to the AFFECT modules, and after their exposure, the effects of the piloting. Table 6 below presents an overview of the piloting candidates’ data that I analyzed from the pre and post-surveys.
Table 6

Piloting Teacher Candidate Data: Organizing and Coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Survey</th>
<th>Pre-Survey: the candidates’ initial definition of FE:</th>
<th>Post-Survey: the candidates’ definition of FE at end of piloting:</th>
<th>Post-Survey: in terms of learning about FE with the AFFECT modules, what did the candidates find the most helpful?</th>
<th>Post-Survey: have the candidates’ views of FE changed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>• Major theme: what family should do; in some instances, entire piloting classes defined it that way</td>
<td>• Major theme: had changed definition; candidates now using words such as partnership, communicatio, curriculum, etc.</td>
<td>• Major theme: mentioned specific activities or examples from the modules; candidates talked about what they liked with specific reference to ideas that were based on the modules</td>
<td>• Major theme: said “yes” or they said they gained some new perspectives, or something in the modules impacted them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minor theme: school and family collaborating and communicating</td>
<td>• Negative case: one class had no substantial change</td>
<td>• Negative case: one class (same as above) gave no substantive answers; general responses without reference to content or activities from modules</td>
<td>• Minor theme: said views were unchanged but the modules had strengthened their commitments and beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Negative case: one class (same as above) had no substantive responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tendency to portray FE in a limited way is useful as baseline data, especially since this information was gathered before the candidates began their participation in the piloting of the AFFECT modules.

Even though the teacher educators and the AFFECT researchers felt that candidates’ exposure to FE activities with the AFFECT modules had been rather limited, and therefore, neither group expected to see significant understandings and/or beliefs about FSP, the candidates’ post survey tells us otherwise. There was, in fact, a noticeable difference in the candidates’ understandings and/or beliefs about FE. Most changed from a one-sided view of FE, with the responsibility for FE lying with the family, to an FE relationship based on mutual communication and on the school making efforts to reach out to families. At the end of the piloting, only 27% of the candidates were now defining FE in terms of the family’s responsibilities. This change was evident in Prof. Matsumoto’s candidates. Their initial definition of FE—families playing a role, parents attending school events, parents being aware and helping with their children’s schooling, and families being involved—shifted to a final, more collaborative definition by the end of the study—the teacher being more proactive and working collaboratively with families, having open communication between families and school, building community, communication, and beneficial for everyone. Table 7 below shows the comparison of Matsumoto’s candidates’ pre- and post-survey FE definitions.
### Table 7

**Prof. Matsumoto’s Candidates’ Changing Definitions of FE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Initial Definition of FE</th>
<th>Final Definition of FE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>Family engagement in schools involves student family/caregivers playing a role in their students’ school system.</td>
<td>[did not complete]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>Parents attend school events, parents know their child’s teachers, family/caregivers chaperone field trips and volunteer @ events.</td>
<td>The teacher being more pro-active. Don’t wait for parents to approach you. Invite them in. Show them how they can participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Parents/families aware of the child’s education and participates &amp; helps child.</td>
<td>FE is essential to the growth and achievement of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>The participation of family (immediate/extended) within the classroom and school.</td>
<td>FE is the involvement and open communication between school (teachers) and home (parents).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>Parents who check if their child(ren) did their homework every night.</td>
<td>[did not complete]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>Ohana events that are open to entire family (spouses, siblings). Parent participation in education.</td>
<td>[did not complete]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>Communicating and collaboration between teachers and parents.</td>
<td>Working collaboratively with families to improve their children’s education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>Families/parents/guardians &amp; teachers/schools having constant communication &amp; helping each other out with the student &amp; community.</td>
<td>Engaging families with their children’s education, building the relationship with the teacher and families, and building a community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>Family involvement in student’s academics at home and school; participation in after-school family programs; communication btw families and school teacher/faculty.</td>
<td>It is not just about forming a line of communication. I can get them actively engaged without requiring a lot of their time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Parents are informed of child’s progress/areas needing improvement, they come to school events and volunteer to help out, they help their child w/homework.</td>
<td>Getting to know the students, building classroom community, keeping parents/families involved, and in the loop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>Family participation in the school and helping their students outside of school with school work.</td>
<td>Family engagement for me means really getting families involved in students’ education through constant communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>Family engagement is minimal at the school I’m at. Only 5 families showed up for open house out of 21 students.</td>
<td>[did not complete]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>Open House, family fair, etc. Any way to get families to become involved with their child’s school.</td>
<td>[did not complete]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>The involvement of parents with student learning.</td>
<td>FE means to involve the families in and out of the classroom in as many ways as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>Parent-participation in school related events.</td>
<td>[did not complete]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
That the changing of FE definitions is so visible in Matsumoto’s candidates’ responses is probably due to the fact that the class piloted the modules to a greater extent than those who assigned the modules as only something to be looked over. Matsumoto’s candidates, on the other hand, modified an activity from the AFFECT modules, turning the activity into a teaching lesson and then presenting it to the class. While Matsumoto’s candidates’ changing beliefs were more readily detectable, many of the candidates participating in the piloting changed their definitions of FE from a one-sided view to one of more collaboration and communication.

The level of the candidates’ involvement in the AFFECT modules was a result of their teacher educator’s high internal locus of control in implementing the new curriculum. The impact of the modules on the candidates’ FE beliefs was further confirmed by the candidates’ responses to the questions: In terms of learning about family engagement with the AFFECT modules, what did you find the most helpful? Why? Have your view of family engagement changed? The candidates provided substantive answers to the questions. Their answers appeared to suggest that the candidates were invested in the modules. While the teacher educators’ reflections seemed to indicate that they had not done much with their candidates in the piloting of the modules, the candidates’ responses showed otherwise. For instance, as shown in Table 8 below, the candidates from Prof. Robertson’s class, who had been assigned the AFFECT modules as something to look over as homework (without any follow up tasks), and as a result had spent less time interacting with the modules, still mentioned specific examples from the AFFECT modules that they found helpful such as the cultural information and activities, the parent-teacher conference lessons, and the strategies for engaging with families. Robertson commented repeatedly that the piloting of the modules was greatly limited due to various course and program constraints, and wished more could
have been done with the piloting; however, the results showed that Robertson’s exposure of the FSP content, even in a limited manner, still had a positive impact on the candidates.
### Table 8

**Prof. Robertson’s Candidates’ Post-Survey Responses to Piloting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>In terms of learning about FE with the AFFECT modules, what did you find the most helpful? Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>I liked the AFFECT module provided a lot of resources and examples relevant for connecting w/families and your students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Reasons why parents don’t engage, because they don’t understand, not because they don’t care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>I really loved learning more about incorporating culture into our teaching as well as representing all cultures and religious/individualities and showing connectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>What I found most helpful was the many suggestions on how to get the family involved in their students education. I can honestly say I only examined 15 slides of the module.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>In terms of FE I learn a lot about it in my module. The most helpful was about how to be respectful about others from different cultures and countries and what activities can be done in the classroom to accommodate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>I thought learning about how to be culturally sensitive &amp; ***** (illegible) in others to build that trust and communicate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>I found AFFECT module # 2 very interesting, especially the parent teacher conferences and the use of open house as a way to engage w/parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>I found the resources used the most helpful because we’re able to refer back to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>I found a lot of information about how to include families and communities in the classroom. It’s helpful because I know how to apply that in my classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>There’s a great list of strategies to take when in different situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>How we as future teachers can incorporate culture into the classrooms to make students feel more at home and comfortable in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>I thought practical tips of engagement with teachers and family was great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>We were exposed to new information which we wouldn’t have learned otherwise. This helped us to be more knowledgeable and thus understanding when it comes to working with our future students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Parents need to be more involved in their children’s school work. Their involvement has a major impact on their progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>I really liked the organization of the activities and the connections to teacher standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>The information in general was real good. It was helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>I really enjoyed reading about the different methods to engage families into their child’s education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>I didn’t really find anything helpful for learning, but it was very informational. There was too much slides in my affect 3. So it was too much to take in. I would forget the earlier slides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>The questions were mostly situational which put the knowledge in a position where we could actually apply and help us remember.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>The fact that some family do not take part in their child’s education because of various barrier.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was, however, disconfirming evidence of the effects of the teacher educators’ piloting of the AFFECT modules. Prof. Shiroma’s candidates, who looked over and discussed the modules (without follow up tasks), demonstrated a lack of substantive changes in their FE beliefs from their initial FE definitions to the ones at the end of the semester. In the pre-survey (done before piloting started), Shiroma’s candidates defined FE with words such as “getting parents involved,” “family support,” and “families that care.” In the post-survey (given at the end of the semester of piloting), they continued to use terms such as “parents having meetings with teachers,” “involving families,” and “participation of families.” In contrast to candidates in other classes, who seemed to do more than their teacher educators’ reports of not doing much with the AFFECT modules might indicate, Shiroma’s candidates’ responses suggest that they engaged very little with the modules during piloting. For instance, when asked about what they found most helpful in learning about FE through the AFFECT modules, Shiroma’s candidates responded with fairly general answers, not referencing specific content from the AFFECT modules, or they said they had not learned or did not remember the information from the modules, as shown in Table 9 below. Perhaps the additional task of, for example, having the candidates present their knowledge of the AFFECT modules to the whole class, as was the case with Prof. Robertson’s students, added more incentive for the candidates to engage with the modules than did the discussion task given to Prof. Shiroma’s candidates. In conclusion, teacher educators’ locus of control in engaging the candidates in FSP lessons and activities and how that efficacy contributed to the changing FSP beliefs of teacher candidates provided intriguing results. The results from the candidates’ surveys also confirmed the lack of a critical stance with the educators’ approaches to the piloting. While the findings of the candidates’ shifting definitions of FE was reassuring,
there were no signs of a critical awareness or deeper understanding/questioning of the family-school relationship.

**Teacher educators’ follow up results.** An analysis of eight of the 11 teacher educators’ interviews and surveys, from one to two years after their initial involvement with the AFFECT project, revealed similar themes of course constraints and levels of efficacy that appeared during the piloting phase. When the teacher educators were asked, *Have you been using the modules since piloting?*, six of them said they had not used the AFFECT modules with five of them citing various constraints—in spite of their desires—to implement more FSP content as a follow up to their participation in the AFFECT project. One educator explained implementing some content into an existing course and another educator described using the AFFECT resources as a complement to current courses. The educator who applied some content since the piloting also mentioned constraints hindering further application of the FSP content. The constraints of these six educators ranged from the teacher education program’s focus on preparing candidates for licensure to the teacher educators’ lack of familiarity with the FSP content in the AFFECT modules. For instance, Prof. Palakiko said that after the semester of piloting the AFFECT modules, the emphasis in the program had been on content-related course work and field teaching. The candidates had seminar classes, which could have been an opportunity for the modules, but Palakiko said, “It’s directed, for the most part, at the upcoming teaching profession” such as mock interviews and preparations for employment in the school system. Palakiko said he had not revisited the modules since the piloting. After Palakiko explained that the candidates were immersed in their field teaching experiences with “full responsibility of the class,” the interviewer asked about the value of reintroducing FSP content into the seminar classes.
Table 9

Prof. Shiroma’s Candidates’ Post-Survey Responses to Piloting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Initial Definition of FE?</th>
<th>Final Definition of FE?</th>
<th>In terms of learning about FE with the AFFECT modules, what did you find the most helpful? Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Parents are a part of the student’s education.</td>
<td>Parents having meetings with teachers.</td>
<td>I thought it was interesting because it went with what I had learned in this class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Families getting involved with their children’s education.</td>
<td>Involving students, their families, and their communities as family engagement.</td>
<td>Group discussion, because I did not always understand everything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Having full support of your child’s education. Helping not only the child but the school as well.</td>
<td>Like a family.</td>
<td>I thought it was most helpful learning in a small group and learning the modules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Support from family like playing for school, homework, teaching you to come a better person.</td>
<td>[no response]</td>
<td>I didn’t learn any of this yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>I guess I would describe it as involvement in school activities even if it is just signing a planner or permission slip.</td>
<td>The participation of families with school &amp; their children.</td>
<td>[no response]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>When the community is involved with it schools?</td>
<td>I define FE in schools by understanding the importance of having FE used in classrooms.</td>
<td>Better to relate to students &amp; families outside of the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Families that care about their child’s progress, happiness and well-being in school are engaged.</td>
<td>Parents, students, teachers working together to promote the education/well being of students.</td>
<td>How in depth the modules were. Very informational.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>I feel that it is when the student’s family wants to be interested in how well their child is doing in school.</td>
<td>I feel that it is the same as I saw it before in the beginning. I feel it is important to have.</td>
<td>I found most helpful was that I found that it is important to have student’s families be involved in their children’s education. I don’t remember using these things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Participation.</td>
<td>[no response]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Palakiko responded,

That certainly wouldn’t hurt to have something like that [FE in seminar class]. You know what happens . . . [AFFECT member], is that we tend to compartmentalize everything. So it’s hard for a candidate to make the connections among it all. We have a course that deals with family, we have a course that deals with teaching Math, and a course that deals with classroom management. So it’s hard for students until they get a little bit of experience in the field to know to see how it’s all connected.

Even though the student teaching semester might have been an opportune time to introduce or reintroduce FE activities, Prof. Palakiko believed the current program structure hindered including such content. Prof. Robertson also explained that program constraints made it difficult to revisit the AFFECT modules over the past year since piloting. When asked about using the modules since the piloting, Robertson stated,

Sorry but no (laughing). I think I was making sure they don’t sink. They [the candidates] had so many credits so when I did see them finally, it was more like housekeeping, getting them ready for their final year, the Praxis, all the licensing stuff.

Prof. Hwang, on the other hand, spoke more about course constraints, the amount of content to cover, and the lack of familiarity with the AFFECT modules from the previous piloting. In response to the same question, Hwang said,

No, but that’s not to imply that they’re not valuable. There’s a lot to teach. I never finish everything. If I would have spent some more time with . . . [AFFECT member] or whoever would be showing the modules on how I might use them. I can’t say I got a real sense. And then that’s no one’s fault; it could be mine.
Prof. Cortez also had not used the modules since piloting, and noted that this inability to pilot was affected by the kinds of courses being taught. Like Prof. Hwang, Cortez, too, cited a lack of familiarity with the modules from the previous piloting. See below for the discussion with the interviewer from the AFFECT project:

Interviewer: I think it’s been about a year since we touched base with your piloting. So have you been using the AFFECT modules at all in the past semesters?

Cortez: Nope. In fact I was going to look at them before you came in just so I could, you know, throw out the terms.

Interviewer: (laughing)

Cortez: And I didn’t do that either.

Interviewer: That’s fine.

Cortez: (laughing)

Interviewer: So if you haven’t, why? Could you explain why you haven’t?

Cortez: The primary reason is since I’m not teaching the [same] course, it wasn’t a direct resource for the course I was teaching. But I guess the other thing is, too, I didn’t spend enough time last year getting super familiar with them [the AFFECT modules].

Cortez and other teacher educators who had not extensively piloted the modules seemed to lack familiarity with the AFFECT website or perhaps lacked a certain level of efficacy to overcome course and program constraints to apply FSP content with their candidates after the piloting experience.

When I compared these results with the teacher educators who had more actively piloted the modules, I found similar results. In contrast to when they were piloting, these educators—who during the piloting seemed to have high internal locus of control—revisited
the AFFECT modules (or FSP-related content) very little or not at all. Some of them assigned
the candidates’ independent tasks to browse the AFFECT modules but none employed their
previous hands-on activities and/or assignments. When Prof. Matsumoto was asked about
using the AFFECT modules since piloting from over a year ago, Matsumoto explained,

No. I shared it [AFFECT website] with the class. I went to the modules with them to
explain what was there as a resource. Then the next semester I was working with the
same cohort but we didn’t use it [AFFECT website] at that point. And this past
semester I didn’t have a cohort to use it with. You know it would have been useful
for them. They were in their student teaching semester and I think they, as well as I,
(laughing) were so overwhelmed with how much we needed to cover to get them
graduated, or at least certified. So, we just didn’t have that as part of the syllabus to
do.

Prof. Lee, on the other hand, had the most recent candidates look at the modules by choosing
something of interest from the AFFECT website, and then had them write a blog about it. Lee
contemplated, “I think in future semesters, I’ll narrow it down for them. I didn’t in the second
semester because things got very busy for them.”

Since about a year from their piloting had passed for most of the educators, I had
hoped that they would have had a higher internal locus of control to manage their course and
program expectations while navigating the AFFECT website to slowly infuse more critical
awareness into their candidates. However, it appeared that the same issues of external
variables—the environmental factors such as course load, time constraints, and program
expectations—were continuing to bog down the educators’ attempts to implement FE content
into their curriculum. The educators’ personal beliefs and thoughts (personal factors) in
applying FE content to their courses seemed to be high, but their abilities to follow through
on those desires were constrained. Based on the favorable results of those educators who partnered with an AFFECT researcher during the piloting and the lack of researcher support after piloting, a reasonable argument could then be made that in order to increase teacher educators’ efficacy in adding FE practices to their courses, a FE mentor researcher or colleague should be made available.

Non-piloting candidates’ perspectives on FE. In addition to individually interviewing the teacher educators as a follow up to their piloting of the AFFECT modules (two to three semesters previously), I probed their candidates’ perspectives to determine if, as a new cohort of students, they had received any exposure to the modules or any FSP content in general. Specifically, I analyzed these new cohorts of candidates’ definitions of FE to determine the behaviors of the educator’s current teaching practices, which in turn allowed comparisons among the educators and across the semesters (piloting versus post-piloting). In order to strengthen those findings, I also examined the candidates’ survey responses to questions on their knowing anything about the AFFECT project and their involvement in lessons or activities in recent courses that altered their beliefs about FE. Lastly, I studied candidates’ responses to the question on whether they wanted to learn about FE, which was useful for future research directions, and afforded another means to interpret the teacher educators’ influence.

Table 10 below provides an overview of the responses of the new candidates in the teacher educators’ classes in the spring 2015 semester, which was anywhere from two to three semesters after the teacher educators’ previous piloting of the AFFECT modules. A total of 97 candidates consented and participated in the research survey (see Appendix E). A majority of these new candidates, 74%, defined FE as the responsibility of the family to be involved with school events and support the school with their involvement. This finding was consistent with
the piloting candidates’ responses before their participation in the AFFECT modules. See Table 11 below for examples of these new candidates’ FE definitions. The results seemed to indicate that the teacher educators of these new candidates, who were the same teacher educators who had previously piloted the AFFECT modules, were not exposing their proceeding candidates’ to the AFFECT modules, or FSP content in general.

Table 10

**Non-Piloting Teacher Candidate Data: Organizing and Coding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Survey</th>
<th>Candidates’ definition of FE</th>
<th>Candidates’ knowledge of AFFECT modules or website</th>
<th>Candidates’ involvement in lessons or activities to change their beliefs of FE</th>
<th>Candidates interest in FE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>• Major theme: focused on what family should do vis-à-vis the school</td>
<td>• Major theme: had not heard of them</td>
<td>• Major theme: no</td>
<td>• Major theme: wanted to learn more; cited specific examples of things they wanted to learn about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minor theme: collaboration, partnership, and communication between family and school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Sample of Non-Piloting Candidates’ FE Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>How do you define family engagement in schools?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Family engagement is when the parents are involved with the school and their child academics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Parents or guardians of the student involved in the student(s) education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>The way the students family participates in their child’s school (events, field trip, pta...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>[no response]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>The process of how active the parents are in their child’s academics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Families being actively involved in school supporting their child’s education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>[no response]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>The way in which families participate in and communicate with the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>How families interact with the school/teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>It depends on the school some have more family engagement than others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Parents and families of students participating with teachers and schools for academic success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>When students &amp; their family engage in school related activities/get together &amp; academics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>Family engagement in schools are how much the parents keep themselves engaged, such as coming to school functions and keeping in touch with the teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>Families are involved in school activities (parent night, conferences, etc.) &amp; open communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Depending on the school and age level/grade level, family engagement fluctuates. Usually, I see the parents/families of younger students being involved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To further explore whether or not the teacher educators were applying any lessons from their previous involvement in the AFFECT project, the current candidates were asked on the survey, *Do you know anything about the AFFECT modules or website?* 79% of the candidates said they had not heard of the modules; in some classes, all of them had not heard of them. The next question I asked the candidates, as an extension of the previous one on whether or not they were familiar with the AFFECT modules, was whether they had done any lessons or activities in their course(s) this semester that made them change their beliefs about FSPs. To determine if the candidates were receiving any instruction related to FSPs, or if any instruction had influenced their FE beliefs, the question did not stipulate participation in the context of the AFFECT modules. Across all the classes, 72% of the candidates said they had experienced very little in their courses this semester to change their beliefs about FE. Lastly,
on the survey, the candidates were asked, *Is there anything (more) you would like to learn about family engagement in schools?* A majority of the students, 81%, with the exception of a few candidates in each class, clearly expressed that they wanted to know more. Furthermore, in some of the cohorts, they requested seemingly basic information about FE teaching practices such as *What is family engagement?*, *How can we promote it?*, and *How can we increase family involvement?* See Table 12 below for a sample of candidates’ responses to the question about what they wanted to know more about FE.
### Table 12

**Non-Piloting Candidates’ Wanted to Know More About FE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>How do you define family engagement in schools?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>How to involve parents more &amp; get them more willing to help/support/care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>How to effectively implement family engagement in lower elementary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>What are ways we can foster it in our classrooms and school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 107  | How/In what ways can you better engage families in a child’s education?  
     | What can teachers do to promote involvement? |
| 108  | How to increase family involvement in schools? |
| 109  | How can we better engage ELL families?            |
| 110  | Strategies for involving families.               |
| 111  | What can I do to improve it in my own classroom? |
| 112  | How to motivate parents to participate more?     |
| 113  | Anything and everything! 😊                      |
| 114  | What can a classroom teacher do to maintain communication w/o extra “hassle” of scheduling, etc.? |
| 115  | Just about how to get more involvement in public school. |
| 116  | What is your website?                            |
| 117  | How to increase family engagement?               |
| 118  | How to engage families and invite them to participate with the school and classroom when there is a language barrier. |
| 119  | How to promote it. 😊                           |
| 120  | Maybe how to engage families in education, how to get parents of ELL students involved. |
| 121  | [no response]                                    |
| 122  | How can we get families engaged through lessons/activities? |
| 123  | Not sure.                                        |
| 124  | How to motivate families.                        |
| 125  | How to get parents/caregivers motivated to connect w/school. How to enable them the will to be involved. |
Non-piloting candidates’ results. The results from the follow up surveys of the new teacher candidates seemed to suggest that, first, the teacher educators (who had formerly piloted the AFFECT modules) might not be applying FSP content to their courses, even after their participation in the piloting of the AFFECT modules. Second, the new teacher candidates, at the end of their first semester, were defining FE in the same way as the AFFECT piloting candidates had done at the beginning of their semester (before receiving instruction from AFFECT modules). These data appear to suggest that these current non-piloting candidates were not receiving instruction in FSP. Third, exposure of FSP modules, or FSP content, in a teacher education program helped change candidates’ views of FE from one of strictly the family’s involvement and responsibilities to the school to one of partnership and communication between the school and home. Finally, the teacher candidates were very interested in learning more about FE teaching practices. These findings helped to corroborate the results from the piloting and non-piloting data of the teacher educators: the teacher educators provided opportunities for the candidates to engage with the AFFECT modules based on their efficacy to overcome various course and program constraints.

Changing Beliefs of Teacher Educators

This last section of the results was organized around answering the research question, How does the implementation of FE lessons and activities influence the beliefs and practices of teacher educators? I began by analyzing the interviews of the teacher educators administered from one to two years after they had initially started participating in the piloting of the AFFECT modules. Many of the same questions were asked in the initial interview, written survey, and end-of-semester focus group interview. These multiple data collection points allowed for an extended period of time in which to immerse myself in the phenomenon the educators were experiencing. The rich data descriptions, triangulated within and across
the data sources, helped capture the experiences and beliefs (*personal factors*) of the teacher educators as they prepared their teacher candidates to partner with families.

**A two-year comparison of teacher educators’ perspectives on support candidates need in FE and barriers they will face.** The teacher educators, in the interviews given one to two years after piloting, cited the same kinds of support needed by the candidates to develop skills and promote FE in schools as they had raised in their initial pre-piloting interviews. They noted the influence, positive or negative, of the candidates’ mentor teachers, discussed opportunities and strategies for candidates to interact with students’ families, and mentioned the candidates’ biases towards the students’ families. In addition to reiterating these three major themes—as well as the minor theme of the teacher educators themselves needing more support—a fourth theme of embedding FE content throughout the COE programs emerged in these follow up findings, as shown in Table 13 below. In commenting on the cyclical nature of teaching content, Prof. Lee noted, “I think they [candidates] need it [FE] talked about every single semester.” Lee hoped that in every class of the teacher education program, the candidates would get some sort of FE exposure or application because, Lee remarked, “I think they need to be reminded again and again.” Prof. Robertson agreed, and, in addition, believed that the teacher education program should have an FE “thread” woven throughout the program and scaffolded according to the semester the candidates were in. Lessons or activities would have to be developmentally appropriate to what “a first semester candidate can handle” and progressively adapted to each semester of the program. Robertson believed that there was currently only one course in the program where the candidates received directed instruction on FE related content. In still another program, Prof. Cortez also expressed concerns that the value and priority of FE is “not necessarily across the board and it’s definitely not throughout the candidates different classes. You’ve got one class
where you’re supposed to work with families and the rest of them you’re supposed to work with kids!” Cortez hoped there could be a change in the balance of the course offerings so that more value and priority could be placed on FE.

Table 13

Support Needed for Candidates to Promote FE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What kinds of support do teacher candidates need to receive to promote family engagement in schools?</th>
<th>Themes from Teacher Educator Initial Interviews and Written Surveys</th>
<th>Themes from Teacher Educator Interview 1 to 2 years later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major themes:</td>
<td>Major themes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support from mentors</td>
<td>• Support from mentors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunities and strategies to interact with students’ families</td>
<td>• Opportunities and strategies to interact with students’ families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Candidates reflect on own biases of students’ families</td>
<td>• Candidates reflect on own biases of students’ families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor theme:</td>
<td>Minor theme:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support needed by teacher educators</td>
<td>• Support needed by teacher educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These same themes of support needed by the candidates—the mentor’s support of candidates, opportunities for candidates to interact with students’ families, and candidates needing to reflect on these perceptions of students’ families—reappeared in the teacher educators’ explanations of barriers to the candidates’ development of skills to work with their students’ families. See Table 14 below for a longitudinal comparison of teacher educators’ beliefs about the barriers hindering their candidates’ growth in FE skills. The results of the teacher educators’ responses on their beliefs of the support candidates’ needed and the barriers they faced held constant in pre- and post-piloting, and, several semesters later, in interviews and surveys of the teacher educators.
Table 14

**Barriers Hindering Candidates’ Implementation of FE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What kinds of barriers will teacher candidates most likely face in implementing family engagement in schools?</th>
<th>Themes from Teacher Educator Initial Interviews &amp; Written Surveys</th>
<th>Themes from Teacher Educator Interview 1 to 2 years later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major themes:</td>
<td>Major themes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∙ Lack of support from mentors</td>
<td>∙ Lack of support from mentors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∙ Lack of opportunities and strategies to interact with students’ families</td>
<td>∙ Lack of opportunities and strategies to interact with students’ families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∙ Candidates’ biases towards students’ families</td>
<td>∙ Candidates’ biases towards students’ families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A two-year comparison of teacher educators’ definitions of FE.** I started the previous section by probing broadly to determine the long-term effects of the AFFECT piloting and to discover if the teacher educators had changed their teaching practices to include more FE content. Next I narrowed the focus by analyzing the educators’ beliefs and how those beliefs might have been affected by their involvement in the piloting and their integration of the FE modules. These data were instrumental in knowing more about the educators’ *personal factors* in the triadic reciprocal determinism model. Comparisons of teacher educators’ definitions of FE over two years, from the initial interview to the final interview, indicated that, in general, the educators’ participation in the AFFECT piloting seemed to have had little effect on their FE definitions. If, for example, they had said in the initial interview that FE was based on the family’s involvement in volunteering, helping out in the classroom, or coming to school events, then they defined FE in a similar manner on the interview two years later. In a similar fashion, those teacher educators who defined FE as collaboration between home and school with reciprocal communication in their initial interviews, continued to define it in that way on the final interview. There were, however, two
exceptions where I noticed remarkable change. First, Prof. Lee, in the initial interview, emphasized the responsibilities of the families in the description of FE, as noted below:

   So, anything from [the parents] coming in and helping in the classroom, being involved with going on trips, talking to teachers about what kids are interested in. Of course one of the most important things is sharing all the stuff about your child no one else knows except you.

However, after the AFFECT piloting, and two years after the initial interview, Lee said,

   I think family engagement in schools means family partnership. It means working with families. I think families are ready to be engaged. I think they almost always want to be engaged. They want to know what their children are doing. They want to be involved. But I do think that it’s the teacher’s responsibility to listen to what that engagement will mean for a particular family. Because families experiences, and their availability, what’s going on in their lives, it’s so different from family to family. So I don’t think it can just mean one thing. I do think it means partnering with families and for teachers listening closely to how that can work.

The first impression that struck me when comparing Lee’s initial and final interviews was the thoughtful explanations provided in response to the FE related questions in the final interview. Lee talked at length, and in the case of this question on the definition of FE, provided a quite different answer from the initial interview by repeating the word “partnership” (between home and school) and pointing out the teacher’s responsibility to reach out to families and be sensitive to their differing needs.

I found a second teacher educator with another fairly different response from the initial to final interviews. In the initial interview defining FE, Prof. Kaelele stated,
I define family engagement in schools as parents participating in their child's school whether it's spending time with them at home doing homework, spending time talking about school, spending time doing activities at school, going to some event such as parent-teacher conference, or May Day celebration.

In this initial interview, before piloting of the AFFECT modules began, Kaelele seemed to believe that parents’ involvement was a central role of FE. In contrast, after piloting and approximately two years later, Kaelele stipulated,

I define family engagement in schools as opportunities for the school faculty and families to work in partnership for children, for students at the school. I also believe that there’s continuum of [family] engagement, whether it’s from non-physical to physical.

Before piloting the AFFECT modules, Kaelele emphasized the role of parents in the defining of FE (by listing several activities, i.e., checking homework, doing activities at school, and going to school events). In the final interview, however, Kaelele stressed the actions of both the school and family, and, similarly to Lee, used “partnership” in explanations. Since the findings indicate that only Lee and Kaelele have remarkably different defining beliefs of FE, the vicarious and social experiences of their partnering with an AFFECT researcher might provide further impetus to the importance of establishing mentoring relationships between novice and experienced teacher educators of FSPs.

**A two-year comparison of teacher educators’ perspectives on the importance of FE.** Upon examination of the final interview responses to the question, *In your view, what is the importance of family engagement in schools?* I noted that six out of eight of the educators were now using terminology such as “building relationships” and “collaboration” with three of them frequently using “partnership” in their explanations. Since this notion of partnership
with families was a central focus of the AFFECT modules, it could be inferred that the educators’ beliefs were affected by the piloting to some extent. However, the findings show that most of the teacher educators had similar explanations of the importance of FE from the initial to final interviews, as shown in Table 15 below. For example, Prof. Cortez talked about the importance of FE as the school working together with families and making school a richer, more authentic experience in the initial interview. In the final interview, Cortez, again, explained the importance of relationships, school and family working together, to build a better environment for the students. Prof. Millard also provided similar answers in the initial and final interviews by noting the importance of culturally relevant curriculum and the inclusion of families in both. Further research would be needed in the cases of educators who did not change their beliefs about the importance of FE, in order to determine whether or not they were affected by the AFFECT piloting, and in the case of the educators who initially saw the importance of FE as something benefitting families and the school, whether or not the piloting reinforced those beliefs.
Table 15

*Teacher Educators’ Responses Over 2 Years: Importance of FE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What’s importance of FE in schools?</th>
<th>Initial Interview (before piloting began)</th>
<th>Final Interview (1 to 2 years after piloting)</th>
<th>Final Interview Themes (compared to initial interview)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Lee</td>
<td>• Know child very well</td>
<td>• When everyone is partnering, it’s best outcome for the child</td>
<td>• Partnership benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Child feels comfortable, where they belong, where he/she can succeed, and everyone is like a family</td>
<td>• Child benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If the family knows what’s going on then there are many ways they can be a part of their child’s learning</td>
<td>• Family empowerment (different response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Kaelele</td>
<td>• Family involvement; physical presence</td>
<td>• “the schools reaching out to families and showing that there’s a partnership”</td>
<td>• School reaching out to family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Child gets validated; important for child self-esteem; safe feeling</td>
<td>• “to let the families know that they exist”</td>
<td>• Partnership benefits (different response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Cortez</td>
<td>• Richer experience; school is more authentic</td>
<td>• “teachers are more successful”</td>
<td>• Teacher success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Families are clients and school should be serving them;</td>
<td>• “engaging the families makes the child safe, happier, more open, trusting, and builds that relationship”</td>
<td>• Child benefits (similar response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gives teachers more insight</td>
<td>• “teaching is based on relationships”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Hwang</td>
<td>[wasn’t asked by interviewer]</td>
<td>• Parents are the ally</td>
<td>• Teacher benefits (similar response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Robertson</td>
<td>• It helps the success of students and teachers</td>
<td>• Message to children that school cares; message from families that they care</td>
<td>• Mutual message of care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• So children see that their parents are interested in their education</td>
<td>• “it’s about partnerships”</td>
<td>• Partnership benefits (different response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Matsumoto</td>
<td>• The importance placed on school by the family; what the families can do for the teacher or school</td>
<td>• Students will have more success; students well being; student might have difficulty assimilating</td>
<td>• student benefits (similar response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students’ pride that their parents come in and do things with school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Palakiko</td>
<td>• Allows you to know about the student and family</td>
<td>• Success in teaching</td>
<td>• Teacher benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows you to communicate and builds trust</td>
<td>• Partner together</td>
<td>• Partnership benefits (similar response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Millard</td>
<td>• Sense of belonging for parents</td>
<td>• The school understands the child outside of school life</td>
<td>• school benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Culturally relevant teaching for the students</td>
<td>• Funds of knowledge</td>
<td>• curriculum relevant (similar response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Curriculum as relevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lastly, based on a comparison of the initial and final interviews, spanning a period of approximately two years, three teacher educators had final interview responses to this question—what is the importance of FE—that were remarkably different from pre-piloting times. For example, Prof. Robertson explained the importance of FE in the initial interview as something that contributes to students’ success because they see their families involved; whereas, in the final interview, Robertson noted the role of the school and family in establishing a message of caring, a “partnership.” Similarly, before piloting began, Prof. Kaelele reported: “I think it's just important for a parent to support the child in any endeavor whether it's school or some activities.” Kaelele’s response centered on the contributions of the parents. In contrast, in the interview two years later, Kaelele said:

I think the importance of family engagement in schools is the schools reaching out to families and showing that there’s a partnership, for the children, and actually for the families . . . . Or even just [the teacher] like calling to say thank you [to the family] for contributing this or something. That’s nice, just to let them know that families exist . . . .

In fact, in the final interview, Kaelele completely shifted the importance of FE from talking about the family’s contributions, as the professor had done in the initial interview, to talking about the school’s role in establishing a partnership. Finally, Prof. Lee, as noted previously in the dramatically changed definition of FE, again, gave a very different response from the initial to final interviews. In the pre-piloting stage, Lee simply stated the importance of FE as the teacher being able to know the child well. Two years later, and after involvement in the AFFECT project, Lee provided a lengthy response with emphasis on the importance of FE as benefitting everyone (school, family, and student) in a partnership. Additionally, Lee pointed
out that there were many ways for a family to be involved, depending on how the school engaged them.

**A two-year comparison of teacher educators’ suggested FE activities for candidates.** The next evidence gained from comparing the teacher educators’ responses across the semesters was their answers on the initial and final interviews to the question: *What kind of family engagement activities would you like your teacher candidates to implement in their teaching?* As shown in Table 16 below, the educators explained similar FE activities that they wanted their candidates to be implementing in their teaching. For example, in the initial interview, Prof. Hwang talked about the candidates building relationships and practicing to communicate with families. In the final interview, Hwang, again, described similar FE activities such as the candidates’ contacting the families and practicing active listening. There were, however, two teacher educators who suggested very different kinds of activities in their responses on the initial and final interviews. Prof. Lee, as was the case with the aforementioned answers, gave very different explanations. Lee’s initial interview (before piloting of the AFFECT modules), had three defining characteristics. First, it was brief. Second, it emphasized one point only of bringing the students’ families into the school curriculum. Third, it noted that there were too many program constraints for candidates to apply FE types of activities. In marked contrast in the interview two years later, Lee listed multiple FE activities the candidates could do, elaborated with lengthy explanations, and did not mention constraints at all. Prof. Lee’s changes in the interview responses warrant further research to verify the findings and to determine whether these changes could be replicated for other teacher educators.
Table 16

**Teacher Educators’ Responses Over 2 Years: FE Activities for Candidates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What kind of FE activities would you like your teacher candidates to implement in their teaching?</th>
<th>Initial Interview (before piloting began)</th>
<th>Final Interview (1 to 2 years after piloting)</th>
<th>Final Interview Themes (compared to initial interview)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prof. Lee</strong></td>
<td>• pull families into the curriculum; however, candidates don’t get these opportunities</td>
<td>• informal ways such as when parents pick up/drop off; communication; parents/teachers get to know each other; relationship building</td>
<td>• Different quality of response; length and details are very different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• older grade teachers: newsletters, invitations for parents to come in, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• see what mentor is doing; share with classmates what’s happening in field; examples of what should/shouldn’t be doing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• talks about what candidates might do each semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• reflect on candidates own experiences in school and FSPs; reflecting; repetitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prof. Kaelele</strong></td>
<td>• Understand the meaning of family</td>
<td>• Communication</td>
<td>• Similar response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not have assumptions of families; reflection</td>
<td>• Recognizing importance of parents; see connection of students to their families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Every child is important</td>
<td>• Sending letters to parents; candidates introduce themselves each semester; different kind of letter in solo teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prof. Cortez</strong></td>
<td>• For candidates to know there’s a difference between needing and involving families</td>
<td>• Teacher can do workshops for parents</td>
<td>• Similar response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Being prepared for impromptu conversations; two-way conversations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prof. Hwang</strong></td>
<td>• Time to make relationships with family members (e.g., speaking on phone, learning to listen)</td>
<td>• Establish mutual respect; contacting the family; intentional listening; work towards common goals</td>
<td>• Similar response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prof. Robertson</strong></td>
<td>• It’s hard because candidates are “inundated” with so many requirements; doesn’t identify any activities</td>
<td>• Communication; sending home a communication notebook, letters, introducing themselves, etc.</td>
<td>• Different quality of response; not talking about constraints, giving examples instead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inviting families into classroom to share culture, participate in certain events, events around families, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Get involved with family related events, e.g., fairs, unit plans, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Prof. Matsumoto | **• Engage with parents; let parents know expectations and work with them**  
| **• Be open to parents; be willing to work with parents so mutually beneficial**  
| **• Let the parents know what’s going on in classroom; providing opportunities for parents to be involved in classroom**  
| **• Getting to know students as a foundational piece**  
| Prof. Palakiko | **• Collaboration**  
| **• Contact the parents; keep communication going the whole year; be an advocate**  
| **• Interview a family and watch them in their natural environment; family has gifts; incorporate family assets into teaching**  
| **• Strategies for connecting families; coffee or tea talk time**  
| **• Responsibility on school and teachers to invite parents**  
| Prof. Millard | **• To design lesson plans and activities that incorporate assets of families**  
| **• Find out families’ resources through surveys**  
| **• Observe families and interactions during drop off/pick up times**  
| **• Similar response**  
| **• Similar response**  
| **• Similar response**  

Notedly, and contrary to the previous sections, Prof. Robertson also provided a substantially different final interview response compared to the pre-piloting stage. In the initial interview, Robertson spoke extensively about course and program constraints without answering the question on the kinds of activities the professor would like candidates to implement in their teaching. On the other hand, two years later in the final interview, Robertson talked about many practical FE activities without a single reference to constraints:

- Paper forms of communication, sending home a letter, introducing themselves. I would hope my candidates would open themselves up to be personable, like introducing themselves to the families. The mere routine of establishing routines of how to communicate, signing of planners, letting parents know it’s ok to communicate through this composition book. Just having a communication notebook, that to me is something . . . as well as inviting families into classrooms, sharing their culture, inviting parents or families to volunteer for certain events, having events that center around the family . . . . I’m hoping that candidates can get involved in fairs, unit plans, or getting kids [their students] to talk about their families . . . .
Compared to Prof. Lee (whose answers consistently changed), Prof. Robertson’s answers only changed in this one area—initial and final response to kinds of FE activities for candidates. Although this answer was very different in content, it is unclear to what extent Robertson’s belief may have changed. Robertson seemingly piloted the AFFECT modules to a lesser extent than some other colleagues so further study would be needed to see if Robertson’s answer was an anomaly or if it holds consistent in other areas of FE.

Lastly, while examining these data, I would have expected Prof. Kaelele, based on previous categories of responses, to have had provided a different explanation of FE from the initial to final interviews. The final interview is slightly different, with the mention of communication between home and school and specific examples of activities the candidates could do with the students’ families; however, in both interviews Kaelele talked about the importance of candidates getting to know the students’ families and making connections with the students’ families so the candidates reduced their misconceptions of students’ families. One reason, possibly, for a not substantial difference between the explanations is that Kaelele had already spoken about various activities in the initial interview.

In conclusion, the teacher educators’ explanations and beliefs (personal factors) of FE remained largely unchanged over the two years except for Profs. Lee and Kaelele. Along with the other educators, Lee and Kaelele also lacked efficacy in follow up application (behaviors) of FE content into their courses. They, as well as the other educators, cited the environmental factors of course and program constraints hindering their abilities to integrate FE into their courses. However, the personal beliefs of Lee and Kaelele in describing FE changed over the two years, apparently from their participation in the piloting of the AFFECT modules. These results were an encouraging sign of the possibilities to change or add efficacy to help educators to do more with FSPs in teacher education. Further research would be
needed to determine whether those educators who had similar answers between the two-year span of interviews, as well as those who provided answers with wording such as “collaborate,” “communicate,” and “partner with families,” had their beliefs reinforced by their participation in the AFFECT piloting or were unchanged by their participation. Additionally, further research would be needed to determine if the educators who had changed responses remained consistent in other areas of FSPs.

Teacher educators’ first-person point of view on changing FE beliefs. To help complete this examination of whether FSP content affected the personal beliefs of teacher educators as a result of piloting FSP modules, I asked directed questions to each of them in the final interview: After piloting the modules from the AFFECT project have your views and beliefs about family-school partnerships changed? and Do you feel like your teaching practices have changed? These questions afforded a first-person point of view, allowing the teacher educators from the various COE programs to interpret how they might have been affected by their involvement. As veteran educators and as participants who perhaps lacked engagement with the AFFECT modules, I did not expect the educators to say their beliefs had changed. However, three of them—Cortez, Kaelele, and Matsumoto—reported that their beliefs had changed as a result of their participation in the piloting of the AFFECT modules.

The educators who recognized a change in their beliefs stated that the experience with the AFFECT piloting had made them more aware of FSPs and the importance of preparing their candidates to work with families, had encouraged them to be more explicit with FSP practices with their candidates, and had motivated them to be more passionate about advocating FSP values in their teacher education courses. For example, Prof. Cortez said,

Yes. I believe my beliefs have changed, too. I have become much more explicit and much more passionate [about FSPs] when speaking to the students in an effort to
both pull out their natural empathy [for students’ families] and to help prepare them for school settings that might not model or even support new teachers with these family-inclusive beliefs.

The remaining five educators who said their beliefs had not changed qualified their answers by saying that the piloting of the AFFECT modules had helped them to be more conscientious of the FSP practices with their candidates and had strengthened their previously held beliefs of establishing strong FSPs. Prof. Lee, for instance, commented: “I don’t know if I would say changed say so much as I would say been pushed more to the forefront. It helps you to keep it [FSP practices for teacher candidates] in mind.” Prof. Palakiko reaffirmed the same notion: “I think they [beliefs of FSPs] have been strengthened. They haven’t been altered but broadened.” The piloting of the AFFECT modules, as a result, either changed these teacher educators’ beliefs to be more clearly aligned with FSPs in the teaching of their candidates or strengthened their resolve in the FSP preparations of their candidates.

And lastly, when asked if the teacher educators’ teaching practices had changed as a result of their involvement in the project, seven out of eight of them said that it had changed to varying extents. They said things such as “I think I’ve talked more with them [the teacher candidates] about it [FSP]. And shared more stories;” Another teacher educator commented, “I think I have more conversations about understanding families now. It’s [teaching practice] changed. It’s [the teaching of FSP with candidates] more explicit.” Even though the data seemed to indicate otherwise, the teacher educators’ comments illustrated that their involvement with the piloting affected their beliefs (personal factors) and teaching practices (behaviors) of FE. While their instructional practices did not necessarily demonstrate evidence of critical pedagogy, their reflections at the end of this two-year study showed signs
of hope since, according to Freire (1970),

Those who through reflection perceive the infeasibility or inappropriateness of one or another form of action (which should accordingly be postponed or substituted) cannot thereby be accused of inaction. Critical reflection is also action. (p. 128)

These teacher educators were questioning, discussing, and critically reflecting on their beliefs and the needs for better preparing candidates to partner with families. The results from this study can have an important impact on the design and piloting of future FSP content in teacher education programs, which, in turn, might enable more critical pedagogy into the FSP dialogue.

In concluding this section on whether the beliefs of the teacher educators were changed as a result of their participation and piloting of family engagement modules, I noted that the evidence suggested that some of the teacher educators’ beliefs changed remarkably while others changed to varying degrees. Overall, it appeared that the teacher educators’ participation in the piloting of the AFFECT modules, based on FSP practices, shifted the educators’ beliefs to one of more partnership. The educators cited their role in the preparation of their teacher candidates with regard to FSP and the importance of preparing them to gain the practical skills to establish partnerships between students’ homes and schools.
CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION: MORE SUPPORT OF FSPs IN TEACHER EDUCATION

This study on the role of teacher educators in the implementation of FE modules in COE courses addresses the gap in literature that indicates that, while there is a positive relationship between students’ academic success with increased partnerships between the home and school (Dearing et al., 2006; Epstein & Sheldon, 2002; Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2001; Jeynes, 2007), teacher candidates still lack the necessary skills to work with families (Caspe et al., 2011). The results of this study provide insights into teacher educators’ FSP beliefs and how those beliefs are affected by their piloting of FSP instructional modules. The findings suggest that teacher educators’ FSP beliefs are positively influenced by their participation in piloting and/or research of FSP modules. The findings also indicate that teacher candidates initially tend to espouse limited views of students’ families, as noted in Souto-Manning and Swick (2006), but involvement in FSP lesson(s)—even a limited amount—can shift the candidates’ views more towards seeing the school and home as a partnership. Furthermore, the findings demonstrate that teacher educators may need additional support to prepare their candidates to work with families; otherwise, the teacher educators’ efficaciousness may be hindered by various constraints.

Findings

Teacher educator beliefs. The first salient finding is based on data analysis of teacher educators’ beliefs before piloting the AFFECT modules. I found four of the teacher educators described FE in more limited terms, such as the actions of the family, while others defined it as either a partnership between school and home or teachers’ efforts to bring in the assets of the students’ families. Likewise, when the teacher educators were asked about the importance of FE, those who viewed FE in a limited manner said that it benefited students.
and teachers. On the other hand, those who viewed FE as a collaboration or open communication between family and home attributed its benefits to students and teachers as well as to school atmosphere and to relationship building between home and school. These results provide insights into teacher educators’ FE beliefs: educators’ perceptions of FE may contribute to their understanding of FE which, in turn, affect how they prepare their candidates to work with families. If teacher educators believe FE is the family’s responsibility and is chiefly for the benefit of teachers and students, without an explicit recognition of the other contributing roles of the family (i.e., partnering and contributing assets to the school), then teacher educators may espouse those views and practices in their teaching of candidates (Gay, 2010; Souto-Manning & Swick, 2006). For example, educators may expect candidates to apply only one-sided types of FE activities (i.e., sending a letter home to parents informing them of upcoming school events and explaining how they can contribute) in their coursework to satisfy program requirements rather than assigning FE activities which encourage candidates to find out about the students’ families and to bring that knowledge into the candidates’ field teaching classrooms. In this study, Prof. Robertson cites sending letters home to parents as a common assignment in the teacher education program, which Robertson believes sends a misleading message to the candidates that it is an exemplary FE practice.

A second finding in this study indicates that the teacher educators, based on their FE beliefs and experiences with candidates, posit that in order to successfully support candidates to develop skills to partner with families, the candidates need to (a) reflect on their own backgrounds and biases towards families, (b) have opportunities to interact with families, and (c) receive support from mentor teachers in field placements. The research literature confirms this need for teacher candidates to reflect on their beliefs and to examine the influence of such beliefs when working with students and their families (Banks et al., 2007; Geneva Gay
& Kirkland, 2003; Milner, 2006; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). All teachers need to be reflective practitioners, a form of culturally responsive pedagogy, because “knowledge of self and of others (students, parents, community) is an essential foundation for constructing, evaluating, and altering curriculum and pedagogy so that it is responsive to students” (Banks et al., 2007, p. 245). Baum and Swick (2008) suggested the development of dispositions to help teacher candidates reflect on their backgrounds and to acquire these culturally responsive skills to partner with families. These dispositions include having a positive attitude towards families, viewing the strengths of families, partnering with families, recognizing and supporting the families’ unique backgrounds, engaging in reciprocal communication between home and school, and remembering that teaching is a life-long learning experience (Baum & Swick, 2008, p. 580-581).

In the current study, the teacher educators mentioned the candidates’ youth, lack of experiences, and unfamiliarity with diverse families as obstacles to having an open-mindedness towards developing relationships with students’ families. To address these concerns, the AFFECT website (FSP modules) was a tool developed to support teacher educators in helping candidates’ foster positive dispositions towards families. Lesson activities on the website presented tasks for the candidates to reflect on their perceptions of students’ families and the family-school relationship. For the educators who engaged the candidates more extensively in the FSP activities, the results indicated that the candidates’ beliefs and understandings changed remarkably. This finding is important for the literature because it shows the growth of candidates’ FE beliefs as well as the educators’ roles in affecting that development.

Educators believed that candidates needed more time interacting with students’ families in order to gain confidence and strategies for working with parents. The educators
commented that there was a lack of opportunities in the students’ teacher education courses and in their field placements to do so. First and foremost, the educators noted that there were limited FE course offerings in the teacher education programs. Also, in the candidates’ first year of student teaching, they were only in the field twice a week, which the educators believed was an insufficient amount of time to develop relationships with students’ families and gain the necessary FSP strategies. The literature confirms this sporadic and sparse coverage of FE in teacher education programs and the lack of opportunities for candidates to interact with families (Caspe et al., 2011). This study confirms that the more opportunities the candidates had to interact with FE content—reflecting on their own family histories, exploring the cultural and linguistic landscape of Hawai’i, developing lesson plans to incorporate the assets of students and their families into the classroom, gaining strategies to welcome families into the school and communicating with parents in a mutually respectful and beneficial way—the more positively their beliefs and attitudes towards students and their families changed. The data provided tangible evidence of the transformative effect of FSP content on the beliefs of candidates and teacher educators.

The teacher educators in this study also believed that support from mentor teachers in the candidates’ field placements was crucial to their development of FE practices. This finding is supported in the research literature. The mentor’s influence on a candidate’s development is invaluable. For example, in a study of 223 pre-service teacher candidates, Uludag (2008) found that many of the candidates’ opinions towards the students’ families had changed based on their student teaching experiences. In the current study, the teacher educators repeatedly mentioned the troubling dual role of the mentor as being a necessary support for the candidates while at the same time being a possible barrier to the candidates’ FSP growth. The educators in this study discussed the various constraints in placing their
candidates with exemplary mentors of FSP practices: the mentor may not exhibit positive FSP practices, the mentor may not trust the candidate’s abilities to engage with students’ families and therefore may not include the candidate in those opportunities, and the teacher educators/teacher education program had little control over choosing the schools’ mentors. As Prof. Matsumoto pointed out in her interview, the decision of choosing the mentors lies with the individual school administration, and the school’s decision in matching mentors with candidates may not be reflective of the teacher education program’s values. Mentors provide an important piece in candidates’ overall growth, and particularly in regards to FSPs, they can help candidates both understand the strength-based assets of families and acquire practical strategies for navigating a partnership-like relationship with students’ families. More research and collaboration between teacher education programs and field placement schools are needed to support candidates and mentor teachers to employ FSP practices (Zeichner, 2002).

**Effects of piloting FSP content on teacher educators.** This study uniquely contributes to the research literature by examining the beliefs and teaching practices of teacher educators as they piloted FSP content over a two-year period. There is a scarcity of research knowledge on the practices of teacher educators (aside from teacher educators analyzing their own classrooms) and of longitudinal studies in teacher education (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005). This study addresses the gap in knowledge by looking at the particularly important topic in teacher education of preparing candidates to work with families.

First, data showed that all of the teacher educators who held one-sided views of FE either had their beliefs or their teaching practices changed as a result of piloting FSP content and/or had implemented the piloting in such a way as to change their candidates’ FE beliefs. For example, before the piloting of the AFFECT modules, Profs. Matsumoto, Lee, Kaelele,
and Robertson held limited definitions of FE (the responsibility was on the family). Two years later, however, after one semester of piloting, Profs. Lee and Kaelele were giving remarkably different descriptions of FE during their final interviews, using words such as “partnership,” “communication,” “looking at family dynamics,” “the teacher’s responsibility,” and “the family, the teacher, and the school partnering closely together.” The teacher educators’ beliefs about FE, or at least their descriptions and emphasis on its importance had dramatically changed. Even at the end of the piloting semester during the focus group interviews, Profs. Kaelele and Lee seemed to be advocating to their colleagues the importance of implementing the modules and the benefits of their methods of piloting (partnering with an AFFECT researcher). Additionally, when Kaelele and Lee were asked during the final interview if their FE beliefs or teaching practices had changed, they made comments such as “It [FE instruction with candidates] is now at the forefront of my mind and I’m doing more with it” and “I’m promoting it [FE] more with the candidates and having more conversations about it.”

Prof. Robertson was another teacher educator (in the group of those who defined FE in a one-sided way) who gave a markedly different response from the pre- and post-piloting interviews. In reply to the pre-piloting interview question on the kinds of FE activities for teacher candidates, Robertson cited only course and program constraints without even answering the question; whereas, in the final interview, the professor listed numerous FE activities with lengthy explanations while not mentioning a single constraint. In another instance, Prof. Matsumoto’s responses to the same interview questions, did not demonstrate the changes as noted with Kaelele, Lee, and Robertson. However, in the final interview the professor commented that the experience of piloting the AFFECT modules “made me look at it [the importance of students’ families] in a different way.”
The second striking piece of information, when looking at these four individual professors, was their method of engaging with and presenting the AFFECT modules to their candidates. Profs. Lee and Kaelele, who exhibited the most change in their explanations of FE, were also the ones who piloted the AFFECT modules by collaborating with an AFFECT researcher. A researcher attended each of their classes for 150 to 300 minutes. Only one other teacher educator, Prof. Hwang, had an AFFECT researcher present a lesson to a class. In Hwang’s case, the researcher spent only 45 minutes sharing a FSP lesson with the candidates. On the other hand, Prof. Robertson assigned the modules as homework for the candidates to look over without any follow up tasks. Prof. Matsumoto, however, assigned the modules as homework to look over but then additionally had the candidates develop a lesson plan based on the FSP content and present it to their peers. The other teacher educators who piloted by engaging candidates more extensively in the FSP activities with application tasks—Profs. Jackson and Millard—seemingly did not have remarkably different responses over the two years. This finding may be a result of pre-piloting answers that already exhibited language denoting “partnership,” “bringing families into the curriculum,” and “the importance of collaboration and communication.”

There is insufficient evidence to determine whether the teacher educators’ approaches in piloting the FSP modules later changed or reinforced their beliefs and teaching practices with their candidates. Further research to determine a relationship between teacher educators’ efficacy in implementing task-based FSP lessons and their effect on educators’ own FE beliefs would help to confirm the findings in this study. Teacher locus of control is the third piece of interesting data from the educators’ piloting. I noted recurring themes of various kinds of constraints affecting the piloting of the FSP modules. These narratives were evident in almost all of the teacher educators’ accounts. However, in the context of so-called
external locus of control—time, course, and program constraints—some of the educators seemingly piloted the modules quite extensively while others less so. Perhaps the educators who engaged more with the modules had a higher level of internal control.

Those teacher educators who engaged more with the modules were the ones who either partnered with an AFFECT researcher or gave their candidates hands-on tasks from the modules. For instance, Profs. Lee’s and Kaelele’s decisions to partner with an AFFECT researcher may have increased their efficacy by vicarious experiences (seeing lessons modeled by another), and, in turn, may have helped change their views and teaching practices of FE. As noted by Kaelele’s focus group interview reflection on the process of piloting the modules, “You know, based on what . . . [the AFFECT researcher] talked about [the FSP lesson presented to the candidates], I changed some of my course syllabi.” In contrast, those educators who commented that they had wished they had done more with the piloting would have benefited from supports to their sources of expectations. For example, Prof. Cruz commented on the “extremely worthwhile” benefits of hearing about two colleagues’ experiences in piloting the AFFECT modules. Cruz appeared to say that if there were a “perceived collective efficacy” (Bandura, 1982)—feedback or support from fellow teacher educators on the integration of the FSP—then there might have been more efficacy in piloting the modules. This study contributes valuable insights on teacher educators’ efficacy in implementing FSP content into their courses. More research on the teacher educators’ FSP personal factors (i.e., beliefs, thoughts, and motivation), instructional behaviors in applying FSP content to their courses, and environmental conditions of teacher education programs will hopefully lead to discussions of ways to better support teacher educators and their candidates.
Teacher candidates’ FE beliefs and the effects of their educators’ piloting. In regards to the data analysis of the teacher candidates, this dissertation study confirms the research literature findings that candidates tend to enter a teacher education program with limited views of FE. Before piloting of the AFFECT modules, a majority of the candidates defined FE as the responsibilities of the students’ families to contribute their presence, time, support, or money to the school. In a phenomenological study of 10 teacher education students, Dellard (2013) also found that teacher candidates perceived FE as the parents “being involved and showing that school is important” with the teacher’s role as supporting or appeasing parents to get on their good side (p. 81). If we agree that students’ school success is closely tied to FSPs (Dearing et al., 2006; Epstein & Sheldon, 2002; Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2001; Jeynes, 2007) and teacher beliefs significantly affect instructional practices (Gay, 2010; Kagan, 1992; Richards et al., 2001), then we, in teacher education, need to address candidates’ preconceived limited beliefs about families and create the conditions for them to see FE as a partnership between the families and the school.

Lastly, and importantly, the results of this study indicate that even small amounts of exposure to FSP content by teacher educators can change their candidates’ views of FE, helping them to see the importance of including students’ families in meaningful partnerships. I hope this unexpected finding encourages the participants in this study: even though they were discouraged by numerous constraints in piloting the AFFECT modules, their efforts positively affected their candidates. Furthermore, I hope this finding encourages those in other teacher education programs in that even small endeavors to prepare their candidates to work with families have the potential to change candidates’ dispositions.
Critical pedagogy as the theoretical framework. CP was the orienting lens in this study to see the effects of the FSP modules in the educators’ courses. Soon into the analysis, however, I realized two things. First, the positionality of trying to insert CP into interpreting the vast amount of data was in stark contrast with the research methodology of phenomenology, and, furthermore, confounded my attempts to understand the data. It appeared that the theoretical framework and research methodology were in opposition. At one point, I asked myself, “Am I looking for the effects of CP as teacher educators’ pilot FSP modules or am I trying to understand the effects of teacher educators’ piloting FSP modules and whether or not there were instances of CP?” I felt that the essence of the study was centered on understanding the process and effects of piloting FSP content, which related to the second question. I found myself, therefore, spending less time looking for or orienting myself with a CP layer in order to understand the phenomenon. Once I removed CP as my primary lens, themes began to emerge, and, as a result, the data seemed to open up to me.

Second, I found that the teacher educators had not piloted the AFFECT modules to the extent that I had expected and possibly, therefore my abilities to determine instances of CP were limited. As I analyzed the narratives of the teacher educators and their descriptions of their activities and methods of piloting the modules with their candidates, I could not identify defining characteristics of CP, such as critical awareness or agency. If such a CP presence existed, I would have expected the teacher educators to be leading classroom discussions around, for example, the inequalities of the family-school relationship, or about the absence of students’ families’ assets in school curriculum, or on discussions/assignments examining the reasons behind low parental involvement or classroom teachers’ reluctance to engage students’ families. Perhaps these discussions or other similar CP-related activities occurred, but the results seemed to indicate otherwise. A possible explanation for the
educators not choosing to engage the candidates in this way might have been a result of the AFFECT modules not all explicitly targeting CP. Furthermore, the teacher educators might not have chosen those “CP heavy” activities due to Bandura’s notion of personal or environmental factors. They might have simply felt that given the time and various constraints, a readily accessible and applied lesson, such as role playing a parent-teacher conference or making a cultural artifact box, could be a more manageable fit into their existing courses.

From another point of view, the argument might be made that when the educators reflected on their lack of efficacy in implementing the FSP modules with their candidates, these discussions might have been small instances of critical awareness. However, more work needs to be done to support teacher educators and to build awareness of the issues surrounding FSPs in teacher education. I am hopeful with the increased discussions of preparing candidates to work with students’ families there will be opportunities to revisit CP.

**Application to Practice**

Based on the findings from this dissertation study, I would like to make several suggestions to help support teacher educators to incorporate FSP practices into teacher education.

**Teacher education program expectations for working with families.** “In our program we just have the candidates send a letter home to the families and we’re good with that type of family engagement. So it’s our expectations.”

First, in order to emphasize the importance of preparing candidates to work with families, teacher education programs should have explicitly stated expectations for candidates to interact with families. These requirements or guidelines could be in the form of dispositions or application-based assessments (Ratcliff & Hunt, 2009). An FSP portfolio
piece could be one alternative or an FSP service learning project. As Baldwin, Buchanan and Rudisill (2007) found, a service learning project can help candidates reflect on their own biases and allow them to become more comfortable working with students and families from underserved communities. In the current study, the teacher educators voluntarily tried to integrate FSP content into their courses. However, without program-level expectations and support of FSP practices, it appears teacher educators will have great difficulty in attaining higher levels of internal locus of control.

**Teacher educators’ peer testimonials and standalone FSP resources.** “Hearing about the piloting from you two was the icing on the cake.”

Second, learning from fellow colleagues on how to incorporate FSP content into teacher education courses should be considered a useful tool to recruit faculty members. Information on the logistics of choosing FE topics for their candidates, sharing advice on managing time and content, and general reflections on each other’s experiences would be very insightful. These sharing sessions could be in the form of short, impactful written or video testimonials presented during faculty meetings or on the COE’s intranet. Furthermore, a website such as the AFFECT site (https://affect.coe.hawaii.edu/), a standalone resource with theory, lesson activities, text/web-based resources, and teacher/content standards, could be used to contextualize resources to the needs of educators and families in Hawai‘i and make these resources readily accessible.

**FSP content embedded throughout teacher education programs.** “The candidates need to be reminded again and again . . . if there’s a place hold for family engagement in the program, in the first semester and later on, then candidates will see that we value it.”

A third suggestion is that we, as teacher educators, truly value the concept of partnering with families, we should ensure that teacher candidates have ample opportunities
to develop their beliefs of working with families (Baum & McMurray-Schwarz, 2004; Patte, 2011). One way this could be done would be to have a variety of course and field experiences embedded throughout the semesters of the candidates’ program. Such an approach would allow a spiraling of FSP content so that candidates’ would have time to reflect on their beliefs about working with families, practice activities and techniques to partner with students’ families, and receive feedback on those collaborative efforts from the families themselves, the students, the mentor teachers, and the teacher educators. We should not, however, leave these types of opportunities for only at the end of a program

**FSP curriculum mapping in teacher education.** “We tend to compartmentalize everything so it’s hard for a candidate to make the connections among it all. We have a course that deals with family, we have a course that deals with teaching Math, and a course that deals with classroom management. So it’s hard for students until they get a little bit of experience in the field to know to see how it’s all connected.”

Fourth, a one-page graphic representation (i.e., a combination of a chart and timeline) of suggested FSP lessons and activities for each program within the COE would simplify the integration of FSP content into teacher education coursework. This visual display of lessons and activities—organized developmentally based on the candidates’ needs and chronologically based on the semester of the program and the availability of FE in the courses and field teaching—would provide teacher educators with choices of topics to integrate into classroom lessons, independent assignments, or field-based projects.

**Adopt partnership terminology.** Fifth, since, at the time of this study, family engagement was the term commonly found in the research literature with family-school partnership becoming the more favored term to frame the family-school relationship (Epstein, 2011), I intermittently used both expressions in the study. I believe, however, the subtle
distinction between the two labels may affect how candidates interpret the language used by teacher educators. This point may be a minor suggestion but using family-school partnership terminology signals that the home-school relationship is a collaborative endeavor placing more value on familial knowledge and assets.

**Limitations and Future Research**

**Limitations.** One potential limitation of this study is that it is based on an emic positionality. I am researching a phenomenon that I have been involved with as a researcher. The professors, who were my participants, were from the same institution where I was completing my PhD. Along these lines, one of the foci of this research is on teacher educators’ practices, and I am a teacher educator. Even though I believe in the notion that all researchers bring with them their preconceived orientations (Miles et al., 2013), I need to take precautions towards potential biases. The first way I believe this is accomplished is due to the fact that I also hold an etic position in this research. I am relatively new to Hawai‘i and to the university where this study took place. I am an outsider without the collegial networks or an affinity to any particular program. I am not looking to affirm or validate any particular theory, persons, or institution. Secondly, even though I have been an educator for many years, I had never been particularly aware of the field of FE in my previous school experiences. By researching a topic area that is new to me, the “curiosities” of looking at a new discipline with fresh eyes, can lead me to question and search out new possibilities, which in turn may diminish possibilities of bias (Chenail, 2011).

Collecting rich amounts of data from video-recorded interviews and written surveys may present a third way to help to decrease bias (Voss, Tsikriktsis, & Frohlich, 2002). Fourthly, multiple points of measurement, with the same teacher educators, with extensive narrations on their experiences, beliefs, and application of the modules, can help me
understand the phenomenon through the participants’ eyes rather than through my own
(Essau & Petermann, 1997; Merriam, 2009). The teacher educator interviews were transcribed
verbatim to allow themes to emerge, which were then exemplified by specific quotes from
the educators. The validity of these interview data were further strengthened by the
triangulation of teacher educator surveys, piloting candidates’ pre- and post-surveys, and non-
piloting candidates’ surveys, again, done over a period of time.

Another potential limitation to this study is the relatively small sample size and the
research location limited to one university’s COE. The findings cannot be generalized outside
of Hawai‘i; however, Schofield (2002) notes that the goal of qualitative research is to
“produce a coherent and illuminating description of and perspective on a situation that is
based on and consistent with detailed study of that situation” (p. 174). The qualitative nature
of this study can illuminate a better understanding of the phenomenon of teacher educators
preparing their candidates to work with families.

One last potential limitation of this study may be based on the data collection
methods used for interviewing and surveying the teacher educators’ and candidates’ beliefs
and experiences with the FSP modules. The questions on these instruments may have
contributed to a self-fulfilling prophesy (Kane, Sandretto, & Heath, 2002) in which the
participants formulated responses to questions to fulfill the researcher’s expectations. For
instance, the teacher educators in this study may have construed favorable responses to
interview and survey questions, such as inflated descriptions of their use of the modules, in
order to appease the AFFECT researchers, all of whom were colleagues in the same COE as
the participants. Additionally, the candidates may have written complimentary answers on the
survey responses in order to protect the practices of their instructors or satisfy the
researcher’s expectations. I hope through the vast and rich data sources and the longitudinal nature of this study I have mediated these potential biases.

**Future research directions.** I believe this study establishes a solid foundation for several potential follow-up studies. One example could be a replication of the current study with a larger sample size of teacher educator and candidate participants. Since the AFFECT modules are already developed, the same treatment could be given to various COE programs around the country. The sampling from various sites would ensure stronger generalizability of the findings and possibly allow for better interpretation of the effects of piloting FSP content on teacher educators’ beliefs and efficacy as well as candidates’ beliefs.

Another future research application could be a multi-year, longitudinal study tracking candidates’ FE beliefs as they enter an education program, as they complete their course work, as they move into student teaching, and finally as they find positions as novice teachers. Ways to prepare teacher candidates could be studied more extensively (Ladson-Billings, 2001) by increasing longitudinal studies (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005) to help understand the candidates’ process of acquiring strategies to partner with families.

A last future research suggestion could be work related to candidates’ field placement mentor teachers. As noted extensively in this study, mentor teachers’ influence on candidates’ FSP growth is instrumental in shaping their positive dispositions towards families. Therefore, more research knowledge on the FE beliefs (i.e., *personal factors*) of mentor teachers, on the methods (i.e., *behaviors*) they use to interact with students’ families, and on the FE opportunities they afford their teacher candidates/student teachers (i.e., *vicarious experiences*) would be very valuable. Furthermore, knowing more about the FE beliefs of the mentor teachers and whether or not those beliefs align with their teaching and if they also align with the candidates’ teacher education program would provide insightful information on mentors’
personal factors, potentially leading to strengthened and cohesive relationships between teacher education programs and field placement schools.
APPENDIX A

Teacher Educator Initial Interview Questions

* For the record, can you tell me your name and position at the university?

1. How do you define family engagement in schools?
2. In your view, what is the importance of family engagement in schools?
3. Are there any family engagement activities you would like your teacher candidates to know about and/or implement in their teaching?
4. Are there any ideal family engagement practices you would like your teacher candidates to try but think it is difficult for them to implement? [why?]
5. What kind of support do you think teacher candidates need to receive to promote family engagement in school?
6. In your opinion, what kinds of barriers will teacher candidates most likely face in implementing family engagement in schools?
7. Are there any areas about family engagement that teacher candidates do not learn about in their studies at the COE that you think they should learn about?

Regarding the Modules:
8. Do you have any suggestions regarding family engagement theories that should be included in the modules?
9. Do you have any proposals about how these theories could be presented in the modules?
10. Do you have any suggestions about family engagement activities we should include in the modules?
11. Do you have any suggestions for resources we could use in the modules?

* Would you be willing to review one or more of the modules or parts of them and provide us feedback?
APPENDIX B

TEACHER EDUCATOR WRITTEN SURVEY

Today’s date: ____________________

1. Name_______________________________  2. Department______________________________

3. What is your cultural/ethnic/linguistic background? ______________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________________________________________

4. How many years have you been teaching in the U.S._______ and in Hawai‘i__________?

5. How many years have you lived in the U.S_________ and in Hawai‘i__________?

6. How many years have you worked as a teacher educator in the U.S.____ and in Hawai‘i__?

7. How do you define family engagement in schools? ______________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________________________________________

8. Have you attended any professional development workshops or training sessions related to
   family engagement? (If yes, please list and briefly explain. If not, please briefly state why not)
   ___________________________________________________________________________________________________

9. Have you delivered any family engagement PD workshops or sessions? If yes, please describe. If not, why?
   ___________________________________________________________________________________________________

10. In your view, how important is family engagement in schools? Please circle your choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not very important</th>
<th>a little important</th>
<th>somewhat important</th>
<th>rather important</th>
<th>very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What family engagement knowledge and skill(s) do you think teacher candidates need in
    order to work effectively with families? Please list:
   ___________________________________________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________________________________________
12. Have you offered topics of school, family, and community partnerships or involvement as a component of your courses? _____No  _____Yes

If yes, please check the topic(s) you included and the course(s) code(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>COURSE CODE</th>
<th>BRIEFLY EXPLAIN HOW YOU COVERED THE TOPIC (readings, activities, materials, assignments, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General family engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific FE (Special Ed., Early Childhood, ELL, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of school, family, and community partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research with families and communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed &amp; state laws and regulations on school &amp; family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to learn about students' family cultural and linguistic background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to identify &amp; using family strengths to support positive student outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming and implementing partnerships with families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to communicate with parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to conduct open house events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to conduct a parent-teacher conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing data about student progress &amp; performance in an accessible, understandable, &amp; actionable manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to design &amp; produce a newsletter for parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing families with strategies and activities to help their children learn inside and outside the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to involve parents and other volunteers at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to design interactive homework (involves parents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent teaching children at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical issues Facing Families and Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding diverse families: families in transition, in poverty and homelessness, in abusive situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please indicate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Have you used any methods below to teach family engagement? (Please check all method(s) you have used.

- [ ] Discussion
- [ ] Required reading
- [ ] Lecture
- [ ] Other homework (specify ________)
- [ ] Case method
- [ ] Video/multimedia
- [ ] Optional reading
- [ ] Direct work with parents
- [ ] Guest speakers
- [ ] Role play
- [ ] Self reflection
- [ ] Community experience
- [ ] Cultural immersion with classroom visitors
- [ ] Students attending community events
- [ ] Research with families and communities
- [ ] Other (indicate: ____________________________)

14. Are there any family engagement activities you would like your teacher candidates to know about and/or implement in their teaching?

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________
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15. In your view, how much support do teacher candidates receive in their teacher education program to promote family engagement in schools? Please circle your choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no support</th>
<th>little support</th>
<th>some support</th>
<th>much support</th>
<th>a lot of support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. What kind of support have you received as a faculty member to promote family engagement in schools? Please list below.

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

17. In your opinion, what kinds of barriers will teacher candidates most likely face in implementing family engagement in schools?

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

18. Are there any areas about family engagement that teacher candidates do not learn about in their studies at the COE that you think they should learn about?

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

19. Are there any ideal family engagement practices you would like your teacher candidates to try but think it is difficult for them to implement? [Why?]

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

20. Please add your comments, questions, or examples on ways to improve the preparation of teacher candidates regarding family engagement.

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

Mahalo for taking this survey!
APPENDIX C

PILOTING TEACHER CANDIDATE PRE-SURVEY

Date__________________

1. What is your name?___________________

2. What is your age? ________

3. What is your cultural/ethnic/linguistic background? _________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________________________

4. How many years have you lived in the U.S.______ and Hawai‘i_______?

5. Did you go to school (K-12) in the U.S./Hawai‘i? ____No. ____Yes.

6. What degree are you currently pursuing? ________________________________________

7. Where are you in the teacher education program:
   _____first semester   _____second semester   _____third semester   _____fourth semester

   _____________________________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________________________

9. What kind(s) of family engagement have you observed in schools? Please list below.
   _____________________________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________________________

10. What courses have you taken that covered topics related to family engagement?

    | Course | Topics |
    |--------|--------|
    |        |        |
    |        |        |

11. What are other ways you’ve learned about family engagement? Please explain.
    _____________________________________________________________________________
    _____________________________________________________________________________
    _____________________________________________________________________________
12. Please rank the following according to order of importance: 1 is least, 5 is most important; don’t use the same number more than once.

_____ Common Core Standards
_____ Differentiated instruction
_____ Family engagement
_____ General learner objectives (GLOs)
_____ Student achievement

13. What kind(s) of support from your teacher education program have you received to promote family engagement in schools?

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

14. What kind(s) of family engagement activities have you implemented in your field placements? Please list below.

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

15. What kind(s) of barriers have you faced in implementing family engagement in your field placement schools?

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

16. Are there any family engagement practices you would like to try, but have not been able to? Why? Please explain.

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

17. What are some things about family engagement that you would like to learn in your teacher education program?

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX D

TEACHER EDUCATOR FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW

Code # ____________    Today’s date: ________________

1. Briefly explain how you piloted the modules (i.e. how it was presented to the candidates and the tasks that were given to them).

2. How did you like the modules?

3. How did your piloting go?

4. How did your students react to the family engagement modules? (e.g., what they liked, what they learned, and what kind of wish-list of things to add)

5. What are your suggestions to improve the modules?

6. Could you share your ideas about ways in which we can effectively pilot and/or distribute the modules to more COE educators?

7. Would you be interested in piloting again in the spring semester? If you are interested in piloting, how can the team best support your piloting efforts?
APPENDIX E
PILOTING TEACHER CANDIDATE POST-SURVEY

Code # ______ Date________________________

1. In terms of learning about family engagement with the AFFECT modules, what did you find the most helpful? Why?
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

2. In regards to the AFFECT modules, what would you like to see more of or done differently to help prepare you as a future teacher?
___________________________________________________________________________

3. Which of your views about family engagement have changed as a result of your work with the AFFECT modules or activities? Was there a particular lesson or activity that made you reflect and change your beliefs?
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

4. Is there anything more you would like to learn about with family engagement in schools?
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

5. How do you define family engagement in schools? Please explain below.
___________________________________________________________________________

6. Please rank the following according to order of importance: 1 is least, 5 is most important; don’t use the same number more than once.

   _____ Common Core Standards
   _____ Differentiated instruction
   _____ Family engagement
   _____ General learner objectives (GLOs)
   _____ Student achievement
APPENDIX F

TEACHER EDUCATOR INTERVIEW QUESTIONS: 2-3 SEMESTERS AFTER PILOTING

1. How do you define family engagement in schools?
2. In your view, what is the importance of family engagement in schools?
3. Are there any family engagement activities you think your teacher candidates should know about and/or implement in their teaching?
4. Are there any ideal family engagement practices you would like your teacher candidates to try but think it is difficult for them to implement? [Why?]
5. What kind of support do you think teacher candidates need to receive to promote family engagement in school?
6. In your opinion, what kinds of barriers will teacher candidates most likely face in implementing family engagement in schools?
7. Are there any areas about family engagement that teacher candidates do not learn about in their studies at the COE that you think they should learn about? Could the AFFECT modules help in this regard?

About the implementation of the AFFECT modules
1. Have you been using the modules from the AFFECT project piloting?
   a. If you haven’t, what has prevented you from doing so?
   b. If you have, what content or activities from the modules have you been using?

   (if “b” is chosen for question 1, move to the following questions)
2. How did you go about choosing the content or activities from the modules? Why did you choose those ones?
3. What content or activities were the most effective? Why? What made it/them effective?
4. What content or activities were the most challenging? Why?
5. How much time did you spend on using the modules and/or lessons related to family engagement practices?
6. After piloting the modules from the AFFECT project,
   a. Have your views and beliefs about family engagement changed? How?
   b. Have your practiced changes? How?
   c. What were your students’ reactions to the use of the modules?
APPENDIX G

NON-PILOTING TEACHER CANDIDATE SURVEY

Date__________________

1. What is your name?___________________

2. What is your age? ________

3. What degree are you currently pursuing? ________________________________________

4. Where are you in the teacher education program:
   ____ first semester   ___ second semester   ____ third semester   ___ fourth semester

5. How do you define family engagement in schools? Please explain below.
   ____________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________

6. Do you know anything about the AFFECT modules or website? Please choose.
   No. _____
   Yes. ____ What do you know about them? __________________________________________
   How have you used them? ______________________________________________________

7. Have you done any lessons or activities in your course this semester that made you reflect or change your beliefs about family engagement? Please briefly explain.
   ____________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________

8. Is there anything (more) you would like to learn about family engagement in schools?
   ____________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX H

TEACHER EDUCATOR CONSENT FORM

Activating Educators Focus on Family Engagement as Central to Teaching (AFFECT)

We, [insert names], are professors at the University of Hawai‘i, at Manoa (UH), in the College of Education (COE). We would like to invite you to participate in a research project that we are conducting on the education of elementary pre-service teachers in the area of family engagement in schools.

The purpose of this project is to document the preparation and examine the implementation of family engagement elementary teacher professional development modules. The modules will contain an overview of research-based approaches to each area of family engagement activities for teachers to conduct, and videos of teachers, teacher educators, students, and families engaged in family engagement activities. You have been invited to participate in this study because of your current status as a family member in the Institute of Teacher Education, College of Education, UH Manoa. Approximately 12 teacher educators will participate in this study (including yourself if you choose to participate).

To develop the modules, we will first conduct a needs assessment. We will identify exemplary practices in the literature and align them with the needs assessment to create the modules. To assess the effectiveness of the modules, we will conduct a process to evaluate the project in terms of its stated goals and objectives.

Your participation in the project will entail:
1. Giving us feedback on the design of the modules. This feedback will be done via email and face to face. We anticipate about 3 email exchanges and 2 face-to-face meetings of about 60 minutes each.
2. Implementing the modules with your COE students and sharing your input about the process. This feedback will be done via email and face-to-face meetings. We anticipate about 4 email exchanges and 6 face-to-face meetings of about 60 minutes each.
3. Participating in a 60-minute interview about family engagement and the modules. If you agree to do so, this interview will be video recorded.
4. Participating in two 20-minute surveys about family engagement.

You will receive [insert compensation or benefits] for your participation in the project. Although there are no other direct benefits to you for your participation, the project findings may benefit the education community by documenting effective educational practices and improving elementary pre-service teacher candidates’ preparation for family engagement in schools.

Participation in this research is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw from participation at any time during the duration of this project with no penalty or loss of benefit to which you would otherwise be entitled.

If you decide to participate in this research, and once all of your questions have been answered to your satisfaction, please sign the next page and return it to me. Please keep this page for your records.

Research data will be confidential to the extent allowed by law. Agencies with research oversight, such as the UH Committee on Human Studies, have the authority to review research data. All research records will be stored in a locked file in the primary investigator’s office for the duration of the research project.

If you have any questions about the study, please contact [insert contact information]. If you have any questions about your role as a research subject, you may call the [insert contact information].
Agreement to Participate in Research Project

TEACHER EDUCATOR
Activating Educators Focus on Family Engagement as Central to Teaching (AFFECTION)

Research Participation
I have read this consent form and I understand what is being requested of me as a participant in this study. In addition, I have been given satisfactory answers to any and all of my questions. I freely consent to participate.

Name of participant (please print):

Signature of participant:

Date:

Video and Photo Release
I agree to allow video and audio recordings made of me for the above project to be reproduced on the AFFECTION modules about family engagement. I understand that the modules will be accessible to teachers and teacher candidates who are learning about family engagement practices. I agree to allow photographs and videos of me to be used for research presentations and for program brochures and websites.

Name of participant (please print):

Signature of participant:

Date:

Video record during interview
I agree to participate in the research project about educating elementary teacher candidates in the area of family engagement in schools. I agree that the researchers in this project may video record me during the interviews and observations for analysis purposes. I am aware that I can request to stop the audio or video recording at any time when I feel it is necessary and there will be no penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I understand that my name and basic information will remain confidential.

Name of participant (please print):

Signature of participant:

Date:
APPENDIX I

TEACHER CANDIDATE CONSENT FORM

Activating Educators Focus on Family Engagement as Central to Teaching (AFFECT)

We are conducting a research project at the University of Hawai‘i, at Manoa (UH), in the College of Education. We would like to invite you to participate in this research project that we are conducting on the education of elementary pre-service teachers in the area of family engagement in schools.

The purpose of this project is to document the preparation and examine the implementation of family engagement by elementary school teachers through professional development modules. The modules contain an overview of research-based approaches to successful family engagement activities for teachers to conduct, and videos of teachers, teacher educators, students, and families engaged in family engagement activities. You have been invited to be a part of this study because of your current status as a student in the Institute of Teacher Education (ITE), College of Education, UH Manoa.

Approximately 60 teacher candidates will participate in this study (including yourself if you choose to participate).

To develop the modules, we will conduct a needs assessment. We will identify exemplary practices in the literature and align them with the needs assessment to create the modules. To assess the effectiveness of modules, we will conduct a process to evaluate the project in terms of its stated goals and objectives.

Your participation in the project will entail:
1. Participating in the implementation of the module pilots with your ITE family and peers.
   With your permission, these sessions will be audio and video recorded. Video or photographs might be used for the modules and/or other dissemination purposes.
2. Participating in a 60-minute interview about family engagement and the modules. If you agree to do so, this interview will be audio recorded.
3. Participating in a 20-minute survey about family engagement.

There are no known risks and no direct benefits to you for your participation. However, we hope the project findings may benefit the educational community by documenting effective educational practices and improving elementary pre-service teachers' preparation for family engagement in schools.

Participation in this research is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw from participation at any time during the duration of the project with no penalty or loss of benefit to which you would otherwise be entitled.

If you decide to participate in this research, and once all of your questions have been answered to your satisfaction, please sign the next page and send it to me. Please keep this page for your records.

Research data will be confidential to the extent allowed by law. Agencies with research oversight, such as the UH Human Subjects Program, have the authority to review research data. All research records will be stored in a locked file in the primary investigator’s office for the duration of the research project.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact

[Signature]

[Date]
Agreement to Participate in Research Project

TEACHER CANDIDATE

Activating Educators Focused on Family Engagement as Central to Teaching (AFFECT)

Research Participation
I have read this consent form and I understand what is being requested of me as a participant in this study. In addition, I have been given satisfactory answers to any and all of my questions. I freely consent to participate.

Name of participant (please print):
_________________________________________________________________

Signature of participant______________________________________________

Date:______________________________________________________________

Video and Photo Release
I agree to allow video recordings and audio recordings made of me for the above project to be reproduced on the AFFECT modules about family engagement. I understand that the modules will be accessible to teachers and teacher candidates who are learning about family engagement practices. I agree to allow photographs and videos of me to be used for research presentations and for program brochures and websites.

Name of participant (please print):
_________________________________________________________________

Signature of participant______________________________________________

Date:______________________________________________________________

Audio tape during interview:
I agree to participate in the project about educating elementary teachers candidates in the area of family engagement in schools. I agree that the researchers in this project may audio tape me during the interviews and observations for analysis purposes. I am aware that I can request to stop the audio or video taping at any time when I feel it is necessary and there will be no penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I understand that my name and basic information will remain confidential.

Name of participant (please print):
_________________________________________________________________

Signature of participant______________________________________________

Date:______________________________________________________________
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