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ABSTRACT

A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF A TEAM-TEACHING CLASSROOM AND A TRADITIONAL ONE-TEACHER CLASSROOM IN AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SETTING

by

Johnny Darrell Thompson

This study describes two heterogeneously grouped second-grade classrooms during the 1998-99 school year. One class featured collaborative team teaching, and the second class was taught by a traditional single teacher. There were 33 regular education students and nine at-risk students in the team classroom and 14 regular education students and eight at-risk students in the one-teacher classroom.

One hundred three interviews were conducted with 21 students in the team classroom and 18 students in the one-teacher classroom, with 13 parents, with three teachers, and with the school principal. The researcher observed the two classes 61 times from September to May.

Data were organized according to the respondents' perspectives and the observation entries on four themes: classroom social climate; instruction and its effects, including provisions for small-group and individual assistance; distribution of teachers' roles and tasks; and information on the practice of teaming. Regular education and at-risk students in both classes reported that school was a highly positive experience, that their teachers provided motivating instruction; and the social climate was one of group cohesion and help from everyone. Parents confirmed the students' perceptions. Teachers reported that they felt confident meeting the needs of nearly all students in both classroom settings. The school principal agreed with the teachers but believed that it was easier for the team-teaching pair to meet their goals. The researchers' field notes supported the interview data.

Results were interpreted by defining the general themes that emanated from the data and by delineating guidelines for effective teaming and elaborating on problems to be avoided in collaborative team-teaching partnerships. In the classrooms included in this study, Collaborative team teaching appears to offer an important alternative to traditional single-teacher models for both regular education and at-risk students.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In attempting to improve education, educators, politicians, business leaders, and lay citizens have suggested a myriad of ways to improve teaching and learning. Such suggestions have included innovative technology, rigorous standards, and assessment programs. However, most critics of education agree that the key to improvement lies in improved teaching methods that will enhance the teaching skills of teachers and the learning process of students.

One common classroom configuration consists of a single teacher who teaches by himself/herself. Another common classroom model of teaching is the teacher who teaches in a technological setting. A third model that is used in many schools is team teaching in which two or more teachers work together to instruct students in a classroom. The focus of this research project will be to examine the third model—team teaching—and to compare it to a more traditional one-teacher classroom.

Although there are many variations, all team teaching is based on the premise that teachers can accomplish more working together than working alone. According to the Northern Nevada Writing Project Teacher-Researcher Group (1996) in a three-year research study of team-teaching practices in Northern Nevada, "The term team teaching is very much like saying house or dog" (p. 3). Everyone forms a different picture in his/her mind depending on his/her experience and perspective. The configuration of teams does often look very different across grade levels and even within particular grades. The basic
concept of team teaching, however, is any form of teaching in which two teachers share 
the same students in the same room all day.

In the Nevada study, four different types of teams were identified. (1) A few 
elementary teams literally divided the room in half with a physical partition. Each teacher 
had his or her own 15 students. In such cases, the team shared the physical space but did 
not teach together; however, issues such as discipline had to be addressed by both 
teachers. Some teams divided subject teaching time as well as partitioning the room. 
One teacher taught from 9:30 to 11:30 a.m. and her partner from 11:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. 
Each was in charge of a different curricular area each week, and whoever was in charge of 
the current science or social studies unit would teach from 2:00 until 3:00 p.m.

“Structures such as these alleviated the need for team members to spend a great deal of 
time planning together” (p. 4).

(2) The majority of teams in the study broke the day into different teaching and 
learning situations. They divided the day into whole groups/small groups/centers. For 
extample, the day might begin with one teacher teaching a whole-group lesson that 
involved all the students and the second teacher serving as a helper to the students and the 
teacher partner. Both teachers planned and worked together. Whole-group work was 
often followed by small-group work with more involvement by the children in the learning 
and with both teachers actively planning, teaching, and evaluating. Small-group work was 
then followed by students going to various centers throughout the room. Parent 
volunteers often helped. The authors of the Northern Nevada Writing Project (1996) 
cited the following observation by a team teacher:
One of us is working with six children in reading and six children in writing, and the other person is working with six children in math and six children in work study. We go back and forth between those groups working, with the follow-through. We have a parent volunteer here in a fifth center every day. (p. 5)

(3) Many schools experimented with classes of two or more grade levels in one self-contained classroom. In these team-taught multilevel classrooms two teachers worked with combined grades. No special allowances were made for the different age groups; all small groups were heterogenous, and groups did not remain the same throughout the year. "Language arts was taught using centers, four groups rotating between seat work, writing workshop, literature study, and word study in roughly twenty minute intervals. For other subjects, such as math, the whole group worked together" (p. 5).

(4) Special needs students were not removed from the classroom for extra help in a "pull-out" program. Those students received special help within the context of the regular classroom. In this "push-in" program, a specialist divided his/her day among several classrooms, teaming with teachers to help students with special needs" (p. 6).

These four forms of team teaching identified in the Northern Nevada Writing Project Teacher Researcher Group (1996) agree with and add to an earlier definition of team teaching. According to Davis (1966) team teaching is any form of teaching in which two or more teachers regularly and purposefully share responsibility for the planning, presentation, and evaluation of lessons prepared for two or more classes of students.
Davis indicates the words “regularly and purposefully” are what makes a teaching team a true team (p. 11). Some schools have the philosophy that students changing classes for different subjects is team teaching. Other schools at the elementary level consider departmentalization to be team teaching. However, changing classes or departmentalization is not team teaching unless two or more teachers regularly and purposefully plan for, present to, and evaluate for one or more classes.

Warwick (1971) defined team teaching in a similar manner by describing it as “a form of organization in which individual teachers decide to pool resources, interests, and expertise to devise and implement a scheme of work suitable to the needs of their pupils and the facilities of their school” (p.18). This definition shows that often facilities help determine the need for different use of space that team teaching logically fits. Teachers and administrators often turn to teaming as a method of solving space or instructional problems in the school.

Team teaching is an organizational pattern that the school can use to improve the quality of its instructional program. A team-teaching model featuring two or more teachers goes hand-in-hand with instructional improvement (1) through better use of staff; (2) through greater flexibility in grouping, scheduling, and the use of space; and (3) through provisions for large-group, small-group, and individual instruction (Davis, 1966).

This study of team teaching had five components. The first was to observe two teachers and 42 students in a synergetic second-grade team-teaching situation at a selected elementary school throughout the 1998-99 school year. The second was to elicit evaluations from parents, teachers, students, and administrators involved with the team-
teaching program at that school. The third was to observe one teacher and 22 students in a second grade, single-teacher classroom during the 1998-99 school year at the same elementary school. The fourth was to elicit evaluations from parents, teachers, students, and administrators involved with the one-teacher classroom. The fifth was to observe nine academically at-risk students in the team classroom and eight academically at-risk students in the one-teacher classroom during the 1998-99 school year and to elicit evaluations from the members of this population as well.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this qualitative study was two-fold: first, to examine team teaching as an instructional process for a heterogeneous group of second-grade students, and second, to compare the opportunities provided for regular and at-risk, second-grade students in a team-teaching situation with learning opportunities provided for regular and at-risk, second-grade students in a single classroom in the same school. The study sought to answer the following research questions:

(1) What was the social climate in the team-teaching and the one-teacher classroom for regular education students and for identified at-risk students?

(2) What were the instructional effects in the team-teaching and the one-teacher classrooms for both regular and at-risk students?

(3) What was the distribution of teachers’ roles and tasks in the team-teaching and the one-teacher classrooms?

The first research question emphasized classroom social climate. In ascertaining
the social climate, four aspects of a classroom climate were used: perceptions of self and school, how to get help, social relationships, and "personality" of the class. The second research question emphasized instruction and its effects. Two issues related to the character and structure of classroom work were identified: varied instruction and small-group assistance. Variety of instructional activities observed included hands-on projects, multi-sensory activities, computer work, cooperative learning, and traditional textbook instruction. Small-group assistance was observed through flexibility in grouping students and through the way students received special assistance individually or in small groups.

The third research question emphasized the various roles the teachers played and the degree to which instruction was coordinated. Roles the teachers played included clearly identifiable instructional leadership such as organizing small-group work, teaching the whole group, and helping individual students. The coordination of work and instruction emphasized how the teachers worked together, how they planned instruction, and how they assigned responsibility for specific subjects.

The focus of the study was to examine how two different teaching arrangements affected regular and at-risk students. The regular and at-risk students in both settings were observed for an extended period of time, and data from classroom observations were recorded. A comparison of the two classrooms was then made from data gathered. The comparison was guided by the three research questions.

After a review of the literature and interviews with educators knowledgeable of various teaching processes, the researcher developed a questionnaire for use in interviewing students, teachers, administrators, and parents who were involved in either
the team-teaching program or the single-teacher classroom in the selected school. The instrument items were divided into three categories: (1) descriptive items concerning the particular program's design, (2) items that were evaluative in terms of outcomes, and (3) items that were evaluative in terms of implementation. The questions focused on (1) interviewee attitudes about the teaching arrangement, (2) student-teacher relationships in the two settings, and (3) overall feelings about time on task, variety of teaching methods, and opportunities for independent work by students in the teaching environments.

Significance of the Study

Much research exists examining team teaching as an organizational pattern in schools that can lead to the improvement of instruction. Some research exists that views teaming as an alternative to traditional graded classrooms. However, little research exists that shows how teaming relates to the teaching of both regular and at-risk students in the same classroom.

This study adds to the body of knowledge concerning how differences in classroom configuration affect at-risk students. Further, collected data from this study may be used to determine the academic programs of at-risk students. This study may have an impact on administrators as they plan school programs for students who do not function at their best within the conventional school framework. An increase in the use of the team-teaching model in the elementary school may result.
Limitations of the Study

The sample was limited to one grade level in one school in an attempt to limit community differences affecting the subjects. The areas of observation were limited to school climate, instructional effects, and teachers’ roles and tasks in the team-teaching and the one-teacher classes.

The School

The selected school is one of nine elementary schools serving students in Tazewell County, Virginia. The elementary school building was built in 1931 and then remodeled in 1993. The school houses approximately 375 students in grades preschool through five.

Classes began at the school in 1932 with an enrollment of approximately 200 students and a faculty of six teachers, including a principal who taught seventh grade. When the school was started in 1932, students attended school for only seven months each year. Enrollment peaked at the school in 1953-54, when 659 students attended classes and the average teacher load was 36 pupils for each of the 18 teachers. Currently, the school year is 180 days, and students are able to attend special summer sessions for remedial instruction in reading and math. Enrollment in kindergarten, first, and second grade classes average 20 students per class, while an average of 24 students are enrolled in each third, fourth, and fifth grade class.

In 1951-52, a hot lunch program was established at the school. P.T.A. members, along with members of other organizations, assisted in serving the students’ lunches each day. The meals were prepared in the janitorial supply closet and pupils ate their lunches in
the classrooms. A cafeteria, housed in a separate building on the school grounds, was built in 1954, and the current cafeteria and food preparation areas were included in the addition to the building that was completed in 1993. Students now receive hot breakfasts and lunches in a fully-staffed, serving cafeteria. Fruit juices and ice cream are also available to students each day.

The school has a large multi-purpose room with a gymnasium and a stage. A new library was included in the building addition completed in 1993, and library automation and computer equipment has been installed during the 1996-97-98 school years.

At the school selected students are assigned to classes through heterogeneous grouping by grade level into self-contained classrooms. There are four team-teaching groups in the school, one each in kindergarten, second, third, and fifth grades. There is also additional instruction in Title 1 reading and math classes for those students who are having difficulty in their regular classroom instructional programs. A learning disabled program and speech therapy services are available for those students who qualify. All students receive physical education, music, and guidance services weekly. In addition to regularly scheduled library classes, students make use of the instructional resource center throughout the day for individual research and study. Students identified as gifted receive enrichment activities from their regular classroom teacher and/or the gifted program coordinator.

There are 20 classroom teachers in the following divisions: class divisions — — preschool class, 3 kindergarten classes, 4 first-grade classes, 3 second-grade classes, 3 third-grade classes, 3 fourth-grade classes, and 3 fifth-grade classes; special teachers — — 4
Title 1 teachers with aides, 1 music teacher, 1 speech teacher, 1 learning disabilities teacher, 1 library media specialist, and 1 guidance counselor; other staff members—1 school nurse, 3 custodians, 2 office secretaries, 6 cafeteria workers, and 2 instructional aides.

The elementary school serves the communities of North Tazewell, Baptist Valley, Adria, Mudfork, Horsepen, Four-Way, Rivermont, and Bishop. This area includes coal-mining operations, farming, and retail merchandising. The community values education and many of the students’ parents and grandparents attended this school. The school serves a moderate to low socioeconomic clientele. Only about 55% percent of the adults in the school attendance area have a high school education. Only 10% percent have a four-year college degree. Sixty-two percent of the student body qualifies for free and/or reduced lunch.

**Definition of Terms**

**Team Teaching**

Team teaching is any form of teaching in which two or more teachers regularly and purposefully share responsibility for the planning, presentation, and evaluation of lessons prepared for two or more classes of student (Davis, 1966).

**Inclusion**

In this study, inclusion is a process in which students have been identified as at-risk and who have spent part or all of the day in a regular classroom.
Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning is an organizational structure in which a group of students pursue academic goals through collaborative efforts. Students work together in small groups, draw on each other's strengths, and assist each other in completing a task (Hilke, 1990).

At-Risk Students

In this study at-risk students are students in a classroom who are eligible for Title 1 remediation services in reading and/or math and students who have been declared eligible for special education services and have an Individual Educational Plan.

Learning Styles

In this study learning styles are defined as the method (such as visual, auditory, tactile, or kinesthetic) by which a student may acquire knowledge.

Teaching Styles

In this study teaching styles are defined as different teaching methods that a teacher uses to assist students in the learning process.

Social Climate

In this study social climate is defined as the atmosphere and social interaction of students in the classroom.

Instructional Effects

In this study instructional effects are defined as provisions by the teacher for whole-group, small-group, and individual assistance in the classroom.
Attention Deficit Disorder

In this study attention deficit disorder is defined as “a behavior in which a child has difficulty in sustaining attention. The student often has impulse behavior that disrupts the learning process. The student often speaks out of turn and usually has excessive activity” (American Psychiatric Association, 1987, p. 50).

Learning Disability

In this study a learning disability is defined as “a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or using language, spoken or written. Due to this disorder the student may not have the ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or to do mathematical calculations” (Virginia Department of Education, 1999, p. 31).
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Both educators and the general public are becoming increasingly concerned over the perceived decline in American educational standards and over the related problem of student alienation. At the same time both public and private school systems have recently had to cope with mounting financial difficulties and have been searching desperately for new ways of conserving their limited resources, particularly through improved staff use. Educators themselves are confronting the problem of how to differentiate among students in terms of ability so that teaching can be geared to individual potential. They are also keenly aware of the growing pressure to reduce the fragmentation of learning that can result from conventional curricular arrangements.

Team teaching is basically a method for using instructional personnel. Its distinguishing feature is the assignment of teaching teams to particular groups of students rather than the more traditional single-teacher classroom. The team arrangement presupposes a definite commitment on the part of each teaching team's members to cooperation and coordination among themselves in all planning, instruction, and evaluation relating to the team's group of students.

The most obvious advantage to this team organization is that individual teachers can be used in the areas of their greatest strengths; this in turn means exposure of the
students to the entire range of strengths within the given faculty or team and thus increases learning opportunities for students as well as staff productivity.

Team teaching also facilitates greater flexibility in course planning and schedules. It becomes possible to employ large-group, small-group, and individual instruction, either simultaneously or at different times, whenever the team as a whole sees fit. This, of course, directly facilitates ability grouping and the setting up of special units both for gifted children and for those in need of remedial help. This type of grouping is always difficult in graded settings and thus team teaching arrangements will normally be found in schools that are either nongraded or committed to some sort of ability grouping. The term continuous pupil progress has frequently been used to refer to the basic objective of the nongraded structure and of all ability grouping, which is to free students to progress in accordance with their individual abilities and interests rather than in rigid stages set up in terms of age and unrelated learning blocks.

Researchers in the area of team teaching must attempt to evaluate both the cognitive and the affective outcomes of team teaching. In most cases, however, team teaching has not yet resulted in startling improvements in academic achievement among the students involved. This is perhaps not surprising, because in most schools using team teaching the team arrangements have not been in effect very long and have not yet been refined. Researchers should, therefore, focus on the affective area and try to determine whether team teaching has improved learning opportunities for students, student behaviors, students' attitudes toward learning, or student-teacher relations.

The development of team teaching has been regarded as a new phenomenon; thus,
many educators and the lay public have not kept pace with the changes in staff use that have been developed in the last century. Through the years, there have been drastic changes in educational programs. The research in this section will trace some of these changes from the Lancastrian Monitorial System originating in England in the early 19th century to modern times.

The literature review is divided into six areas: (1) a historical development of team teaching; (2) team teaching of nongraded and graded classes; (3) the team teaching of at-risk students; (4) the positive and negative ramifications of team teaching; (5) teachers as leaders within the school; and (6) teacher attitudes and personality characteristics needed in teaming.

**Historical Development of Team Teaching**

A teacher's aide working with a master teacher was a team teaching phenomenon that was used by the Lancastrian Monitorial System in the early 19th century. This system was later introduced in the United States where it became widespread as an innovative approach to teaching. Despite some similarities, differences do exist between the Lancastrian system and team teaching as it is practiced in the United States. The Lancastrian system and team teaching both used master teachers and teachers' aides; however, the Lancastrian system was more concerned with principles of economy than with principles of learning. One result of the focus on economy was that teachers' aides in the class was designated as group leader and was given supervisory responsibilities. Each teacher was expected to relate his/her work and that of the students to the activities...
of the other teachers. The students often remained with the same group of teachers for two or three years in order to benefit from the continuity of instruction over a relatively long period of time (Otto, 1954).

In the late 1950s three types of organized groups were recognized: (1) team groups, (2) task groups, and (3) technological groups. The groups were distinguished on the basis of the degree of initiative left to the members of the group in executing their tasks. In the team group the team members themselves may take the initiative in designating the positions to be filled and the people to fill them. Within such a team there may be interchange and rotation of jobs. This study noted that many teaching teams fall within the team group classification. However, the study also observed that where there was an attempt at task differentiation the teaching team falls within the task group classification. The study concluded that rarely in team teaching do we see a technological group (Dublin, 1958).

Goffman (1959) presented a more general case of the team. He wrote of performance teams to refer to "any set of individuals who cooperate in staging a routine" (p. 60). Some of the important qualities in a team performance are cooperation, cohesion, mutual dependance, and familiarity. The concept of a team has widespread application whenever two or more people interact to create some common impression upon others. This concept embraces the informal interchange patterns of teachers which are a part of team teaching.

Klaus and Glaser (1960) distinguished the team from the small group. They noted that teams, on the one hand, were usually well organized, highly structured, and had
relatively formal operating procedures. Small groups, on the other hand, were rarely so formal or have as well-defined specialized tasks. Their definition was very rigid. They indicate that no teaching teams would approach this concept of team principally because of the lack or specificity of tasks which has been made so far.

Freeman (1967) carried out a nation-wide survey of team teaching development. He found that it was often introduced to meet a need—staffing problems, inadequate facilities, a frame work for mixed ability grouping— and not through its own educational merits. His survey showed that the full potential had not yet been reached.

Beggs (1967) noted that team teaching is an organizational environment that encompasses all areas of the teaching-learning experience. Before team teaching can succeed, the process of decision making in the school must be clearly identified and accepted by the staff. Individuals must be able to recognize the need for varying the traditional approach to instruction. Because many decisions need to be made for a team teaching program, the process by which these decisions are determined must be communicated to all members of the team. Team teaching allows teachers to do for a large group those things they do best for a smaller group in a traditional class. Team teaching gives teachers the advantage of working with others in planning, reinforcing the lesson, and instructional evaluation. Many times a teacher has the sense of loneliness in a self-contained classroom when he/she lacks stimulating contact with another teacher. Team teaching breaks down the sense of isolation and allows several teachers to focus on instructional programs. Beggs noted that “if team teaching is to be successful and lasting in schools, it needs more than enthusiasm from the principal” (p. 145). He further stated
that the center of any instructional program regardless of its make up, is its teaching staff.

Rhodes (1971) described the results of a study of the effectiveness of team teaching in an elementary school. One school in the Los Angeles, California, area employed the practice of team teaching. Pupils from this school (147 in all) were compared with those in a comparable school in the same general area. There were 138 students in the second school. The team school had a more active parent organization, with a number of the parents assisting in the homework. All pupils were tested at the beginning and at the end of the year. The two groups were comparable in IQ and initial achievement. Teachers in the team school indicated a significantly more positive attitude, but there was no significant difference in parents’ attitude toward school. Improvement during the year occurred in reading, spelling, and arithmetic with the nonteam school making larger gains in all three subjects; however, only the achievement differences in reading were significant.

Warwick (1971) described team teaching as “a form of organization in which individual teachers decide to pool resources, interests, and expertise in order to devise and implement a scheme of work suitable to the needs of their pupils and the facilities of their school” (p. 18). He stated that team teaching has a theoretical basis of its own. Team teaching allows for a re-orientation of the curriculum so that the needs of both teachers and students are fully met. Warwick stated that teaming takes as its point the needs of the children and attempts to structure them as fully as possible into the work of the school.

Snyder and Anderson (1986) discussed team teaching as having its roots in the work of John Dewey and being a product of the major reform movement that began in the
1950's. These authors gave major credit for much of the early work in team-teaching to the Ford Foundation Fund For The Advancement of Education and the nine universities and 50 school systems that were engaged in pilot projects. J. Lloyd Trump was cited as a major figure in the early development of secondary school team teaching in his role as secretary of the Committee on Staff Utilization of the National Association of Secondary School Principals. Snyder and Anderson pointed out that team-teaching generated numerous configurations, most of which were informal. "Middle and senior high schools have readily institutionalized the department (a team) focus" (p. 190). Principals of elementary schools manage large numbers of individual teachers, "some of whom choose to team-teach together for their own purpose" (p. 191). Yet, Snyder and Anderson noted that "except in rare exceptional schools teachers in virtually all levels actually plan alone, teach alone, and assess students progress alone" (p. 191).

Salvia and Yesseldyle (1988) discussed an interactive team model. In this model a problem-solving team meets to discuss the educational needs of students. Team members try to resolve the students' instructional problems. However, if the problem is not resolved then an interactive teaming approach is used for referral, screening, classification, instructional planning, and evaluating student progress. In interactive teaming measurement is on going and the analysis is focused on how the team can change the progress to increase its effectiveness.

Most authorities agree that the main objects of team teaching regarding student-teacher relations are to increase teacher-student interaction and to facilitate individual counseling. Team teaching allows opportunities for students and teachers to get to know
each other better. The teachers have more time to counsel individual students (Barnett, 1992).

Friend, Reising, and Cook (1993) conveyed the following classroom structures as possible alternatives for implementing team teaching:

(1) Teachers take turns leading the instruction: One teacher leads the whole class and the other teacher observes, makes notes, or offers assistance to students.

(2) The teachers divide the class into cooperative learning groups: The students are placed into heterogenous cooperative learning groups by the team.

(3) Teachers share roles: Both teachers in the team share in discussions, role-plays, or in modeling appropriate strategies such as taking notes.

Team teaching in the 1990s implied collaboration among teachers. Friend and Cook (1996) defined collaboration as “a style for direct interaction between at least two coequal parties voluntarily engaged in shared decision making as they work toward a common goal” (p. 6). The premise of individuals from various subjects and content areas working together toward common goals for students has been a basic tenant of education today. However, in order for collaboration to become a reality Mainzer, Mainzer, Lowry, and Slavin (1993) stated that, “collaborative ethic... which involves the establishment of shared beliefs that students can learn successfully and that together regular and special educators can successfully meet the educational needs of an increasingly diverse student population”, needs to permeate the school environment (p. 43).

Bergen (1994) discussed the movement from individualized teaching to team teaching as a principal component of the school organizational and curricular reform that
is now being supported in journal articles, inservice meetings, and education media. Administrators and teachers are rethinking the one-teacher classroom model that has been pervasive from kindergarten through the university level. The alternative model calls for a team teaching approach where teaches plan and evaluate together.

Harris (1995) stressed the need for training teachers who are able to serve culturally or linguistically diverse students on teaching teams. She stated three skills are needed by teachers: (1) To be able to understand one's own perspectives; (2) To be able to use effective interpersonal, communication, and problem-solving skills that are sensitive to cross-cultural and cross-disciplinary interactions; and (3) To be able to use strategies that are appropriate for assessment and instruction.

**Team Teaching of Nongraded and Graded Classes**

Team teaching and the non-grading of pupils have a number of characteristics in common. Both deal with the same problems of staff and program, are concerned with individual pupil progress, and make an effort to increase flexibility and efficiency in the arrangement of instructional groups (Chamberlin, 1969). Non-grading and team teaching are so closely related that the initiation and development of one often leads to the adoption of the other.

In the nongraded school, educators try to eliminate the rigid structure of the present graded school. Nongradedness takes into consideration the wide range of individual differences shown intellectually, physically, and socially within age groups and attempts to develop systems so that pupils can progress at their individual rates. While
some programs emphasize a curriculum geared closely to an individual's interests, needs, and abilities, others emphasize the importance of sequencing the curriculum. Nevertheless, individual pupil progress needs to be monitored in a nongraded school (Goodlad, 1969). The non-graded plan provides for a better structure in dealing with both large and small groups due to its organization. Students benefit when the teacher has received major training in specific areas of the curriculum. With the non-graded plan, a teacher is able to teach in his/her major field of concentration.

Standard achievement tests show there is a wide variation in knowledge and skill of students in the same grade. In the average American public school, students are assigned to grades on the basis of age, not maturity. A consequence of this is that some students may be in a specific grade with students of their own age but some may be functioning above or below grade level. The differentiation in abilities makes uniform instruction and assignments virtually impossible (Goodlad, 1969).

Non-grading is not a new educational approach. Early schools in the United States were predominantly nongraded and task oriented. However, the modern concept of non-graded schools dates back to very recent decades. Only a few nongraded schools existed prior to 1940 with its growth taking place since 1950. Some 30 years ago non-graded education was used to refer to schools that were dedicated to the education of the whole child. Schools practiced social promotion, passing the pupil to the next grade at the end of the year regardless of the student's achievement. Today, the primary concern of the teacher is to see that the student masters what is taught. This method might require a one-to-one relationship with a single student or work with small groups of students (Blair
Many schools are turning to non-graded or team teaching to cope with the disparity of ability and interest. However, an understanding of its meaning and its objectives is necessary if team teaching has merit and is to be implemented in schools. Beggs (1967) wrote:

Team teaching helps to professionalize and individualize instruction. Attention should be given to the improvement of the curriculum. In this respect team teaching should not be a mere method but a means to an important end. If the team works well, curriculum improvements are inevitable. If curriculum improvement is sought, some team work is inevitable (p. 17).

Hopkins, Oldridge, and Williamson (1965) compared pupil achievement in graded and nongraded classes. They noted that grade labels give a misleading picture of a child’s achievement and imply that a given child in the sixth grade is performing at that grade level in all respects. To get away from the dangerous illusion created by fixed grades, ungraded schools have been established. After comparing graded and nongraded classes in several schools, Hopkins, et al. reported that the evidence failed to find any definite advantage for the nongraded school over the graded school.

Gordon and Wilkerson (1966) noted that as an alternative to tracking, a number of compensatory education projects serving disadvantaged children have made use of a nongraded form of organization as a part of “what is loosely called team teaching” (p. 61). They reported that the Norfolk (VA) school system had developed a nongraded block in
three elementary schools for the primary grades in which placement was determined by reading levels. Children were moved from class to class or from group to group within a class according to their readiness for any one of nine predetermined reading levels. In Chicago, a continuous development plan was introduced into grades 1 to 3 in a number of elementary schools. The plan provided for an eight-or-nine-level progression and permitted a child to reach the end of grade three without being stigmatized by failure. Any child not ready to proceed into the fourth grade at the end of three years was retained for a fourth year in the program. Small achievement gains were reported for the students in both nongraded team teaching programs.

Smith (1968) wrote of the practical side of organizing an elementary nongraded school. For two years he and his staff reworked a traditional graded school into a nongraded one. Finding that nongrading and team teaching were natural partners in providing continuous progress for each child, the school’s staff decided to investigate the various schemes of cooperative team teaching to see what possibilities there might be to help eliminate a major problem: although staff had grouped children close together in their reading levels, there was no corresponding reduction in their range of achievement levels in the other skill subjects. The school’s staff defined a team as “a group of two or more teachers who assume common responsibility for the total instructional program of two or more classrooms of children” (p. 84). This definition implied that the children as well as the teachers made up the team and there was a close working relationship between teachers of a team. The staff grouped and regrouped pupils to satisfy the instructional needs of each pupil. Three teams were formed. The team teachers taught the content.
subject to their multi-age, heterogeneous homerooms and then regrouped for the same subjects to meet individual needs of children. Each teacher on the team attempted to help the children assigned her to begin working at their own objective levels and tried to make as much progress as she could with each. At the end of the school year not all of the children had done the same work or completed the same books. After summer vacation each child began where he/she had left off in the spring.

A 1996 study at Travis Heights Elementary School in Austin, Texas, showed that although multi-age grouping may work in self-contained classrooms team teaching was essential to its success. Several aspects of team teaching were particularly critical and beneficial to the teachers and students of multi-age classrooms. First, having another adult in the room provides on-going support for the teachers. Second, teaming allows the teachers to pool their individual strengths for the benefit of the students. Third, a teaming situation models sharing of ideas and conflict management for students (McCarthey et al., 1966).

Other schools are using team teaching models in graded classes to organize and deliver instruction. In general education, graded classrooms a recurring theme is to help the majority of students including those who are poor, disadvantaged, or labeled as disabled to be successful in school. Because in general education classes taught in a traditional manner the needs of the group are the primary focus of instruction, the needs of individual students at either end of the continuum often go unmet. Collaborative team teaching in traditional graded classes appears to often an important alternative to traditional models of special compensatory and enrichment education (Pugach & Wesson,
Inger (1993) identified collegiality to be one effect of teacher collaboration. He suggested that teachers who have worked together see substantial improvements in student achievement, behavior, and attitude. Inger stated that teacher collegiality breaks the isolation of the classroom. He suggested that schools benefit from such collaboration because teachers are better prepared to support one another's strengths and accommodate weaknesses. He also stated that when teachers work as teams, their schools are better prepared to consider new ideas.

Anderson (1993) stated that a "truly nongraded environment is much easier to produce when the philosophy and practice of nongradedness are combined with multi-age approaches and some form of team teaching" (p. 12). He noted that it is almost impossible to find examples of authentic nongradedness within single-age groups of children taught by teachers in self contained classrooms. Anderson also defined nongraded schools by listing the following criteria that "authentic nongraded schools should meet" (p. 12): (1) replacement of labels associated with gradedness, like first grade and fifth grade, with group title such as the primary unit; (2) replacement of competitive-comparative evaluation systems with assessment and reporting mechanisms that respect continuous individual progress; (3) the inclusion of at least two heterogenous age cohorts in all groupings; (4) the development of groups for instruction that are non-permanent and are dissolved and reconstituted as needed; (5) the organization of the teaching staff into teams, with teachers having maximum opportunities to interact and collaborate; (6) the development of a flexible, interdisciplines, whole-child-oriented
curriculum, with grade-normed books and tests used only as resources; and (7) the adoption of official policies consistent with nongradedness in the school and at the school board level, even where waivers of policy may be required (e.g., reporting enrollments by grades).

**Team Teaching and At-Risk Students**

Education reforms of the 1990s and the increased emphasis on improving academic performance have pointed out the need to find solutions to the problems of at-risk students. McDill, Natriello, and Pallas (1985) describe at-risk students as either learners who are not achieving up to their potential or learners who are not meeting teacher expectations. Historically, these students have been referred to as underachievers, disadvantaged, low achieving, culturally deprived, underprivileged, and remedial.

However, the research literature is less than precise regarding what constitutes being academically at-risk. The Council of Chief State School Officers (1987) lists over 67 characteristics that are descriptive of the at-risk student. These characteristics include descriptors such as disciplinary problems, depressed achievement, inadequate parental support, physical problems, excessive absenteeism, lack of social skills, and lack of motivation. A majority of academically at-risk students come from poverty backgrounds, experience social and family stress, are characterized by a lack of control over their lives, have low self-esteem, and are members of minority groups.

Gordon and Wilkerson (1966) discussed the approaches that have been used for more effective teaching and learning and included team teaching as one of the alternatives
used in compensatory education. Team teaching was defined as "a rearrangement of staff which provides support to less effective or less experienced personnel, was well as allowing for the fuller utilization of each teacher’s talents" (p. 60). In a program like New York City's More Effective Schools, a team of four teachers was assigned to three elementary school classes numbering not more than 22 pupils each. In Pittsburgh, as many as 120 students were grouped for instruction under a team of four teachers and a team leader, augmented by a teacher intern and a paid team aide trained in handling audiovisual equipment, duplicating equipment, and classroom supplies. While one or more team teachers are instructing a large group in one room, other members of the team work with groups as small as five or six or even with a single child to provide special work or remedial help.

Can teachers who teach in a team identify academically at-risk elementary students in elementary school classrooms? Payne and Payne (1991) collected data from teachers of 748 lower middle-class elementary school students, kindergarten through grade five, and concluded that teachers were moderately accurate estimators of students likely to be academically at-risk. The data also suggested that teachers may engage in some stereotyping and that there is the potential presence of test bias.

Many at-risk students are identified as eligible for special education services, and their instructional needs are not met in regular education classes. Often there is a sharp dichotomy between special and regular education. Stainback and Stainback (1984) have provided a rationale for the merger of special and regular education into one unified system structured to meet the unique needs of all students. The rationale for merger is
based on two premises. The first is that the instructional needs of students do not warrant
the operation of a dual system. The second is the inefficiency of operating a dual system.
Team teaching offers a ready vehicle for special and regular education to merge into one
unified system structured to meet the unique needs of all students.

Carlson and O'Reilly (1996) indicated that special education and Title 1 programs
exist in about 65% of all public elementary schools in the nation. The integration of the
Title 1 compensatory education program and special education is often achieved either
through cooperative teaching or through blended funding of staff salaries. Cooperative
teaching or coteaching here is seen as “an instructional approach in which two or more
teachers work together simultaneously in a single classroom to deliver instruction to a
heterogenous group of students. They may take turns in leading instruction, with one
speaking while another models note taking on the chalkboard, or other such
combinations” (p. 23).

Whinnery, King, Evans, and Gable (1995) wrote that “researchers and policy
makers have been urging increased inclusion of students with disabilities into general
education” (p. 5). Among the various instructional arrangements that have been
developed to facilitate the regular classroom integration of students are collaborative
consultation and cooperative team teaching. Both types of teaching are designed to
provide teachers with the process and methods to deliver appropriate educational services
to students with disabilities in main streamed classes. Students in the study received
special education services through one of two service delivery arrangements. The first one
was a traditional resource room program. In the second one the students identified as
learning disabled received instruction alongside regular education students in the regular classroom, which incorporated collaborative consultation and cooperative (CC/CT) team teaching. Learning disabled students in CC/CT programs were more likely to have a positive opinion of their intelligence and to feel they were a part of class activities than were learning disabled students in resource programs. Yet 44% of students responded that they would rather work with the learning disabilities teacher in the resource room; students were not completely satisfied with receiving learning disability services in the regular classroom.

Pugach and Wesson (1995) described the perceptions of nine learning disabled students, nine of their non disabled peers, and their three teachers on the instructional program in two fifth grade classrooms with a permanent teaching team. Students reported that school was a highly positive experience. Teachers reported that they felt confident meeting the needs of nearly all students, including those who required enrichment. Pugach and Wesson interpreted results by distinguishing the benefits of collaborative team teaching. They concluded that collaborative team teaching appears to offer an important alternative to traditional models of special and compensatory education.

Positive and Negative Aspects of Team Teaching

The flexibility made possible by team teaching allows the teacher to individualize instruction. The team decides what lessons will be taught by each member. Members of the team are allotted planning time so that the team can individualize the various subjects to fit the needs of each student (Polos, 1965).
The team process involves students as well as teachers. No two teams are alike or work in the same way. It is this flexibility that lends itself to meeting current needs (Polos, 1965).

Certain considerations should be carefully examined before initiating team teaching (Morlan, 1963). Among them are:

1. Does the staff have the necessary skills?

2. Are large group instructions followed by small group activities?

Goodlad (1984) observed that cooperative teaching encourages flexibility not only in setting up initial groups but also in reassigning students and teachers at a later time. He also noted a relationship among educational purpose, group size and membership, and time allocation. Because team teachers are always in close communication and share responsibilities, they can quickly readjust their plans. Team teachers analyze, prescribe, and carry out plans, as well as evaluate, prescribe, and diagnose. Cooperative teaching compels those involved to make professional decisions based on the full range of factors—subject matter, learner interest, pupil characteristics, along with teacher competence.

Lobb (1965) stated the following advantages of team teaching: (1) more preparation time for teachers and hence more detailed and careful lesson planning; (2) use of individual talents of team members and more professional use of teachers' time; (3) more creative teaching because of interaction among team members; (4) increased capability of meeting different educational problems because of flexibility of class size; (5) greater opportunity for inservice training of beginning teachers and those with limited experience; (6) development of esprit de corps; (7) more extensive evaluation of course
content as well as self-evaluation by teachers; (8) greater opportunity to keep abreast of new developments; (9) more enthusiasm for learning and greater learning versatility among the students; (10) better evaluation of individual students and more impartial grades; and (11) increased intellectual stimulation provided by closer association with colleagues.

Lobb (1965) also listed the following problem areas: (1) initial confusion resulting from greater demand for coordination of instruction; (2) insufficiency or unsuitability of facilities; (3) requirements of more time and energy to learn an individual student's characteristics; (4) overuse of large-group instruction; (5) difficulty in modifying instruction to suit the class mood; and (6) wide variation in responsibility shown by students.

Polos (1965) indicated that team teaching as an instrument for learning needs to be sharpened and refined. He pointed out that personnel selection is difficult because there are no criteria to serve as a standard and that friction develops among team members. Polos stated that students have less freedom of choice under team teaching than they would have in the traditional classroom with one teacher.

White (1964) found that student attitudes and opinions concerning their involvement in a team teaching program were positive and preferred it to nonteam teaching. The students reported that the team teachers were more enthusiastic and better prepared in their presentations than nonteam teachers in other subject areas. The students stated that they thought it was an advantage to be taught by several teachers who could present many teaching styles and approaches.
Several aspects of team teaching are particularly beneficial to the teachers and students. Having another adult in the room provides ongoing support for the teachers. Instead of being in separate classrooms that isolate teachers from one another, team teaching allows teachers to develop cooperation and trust among each other. Because they work together, they can discuss student learning and fundamental curricular issues within the classroom. Teaming allows the teachers to use their individual strengths for the benefit of the students. Teaming also allows for subject matter specialization, sharing of ideas, and cooperative conflict management for students (McCarthey et al., 1996).

Teachers As Leaders Within the School

Teachers exhibit leadership within the school in which they work. The qualities of a leader and the ability to exercise authority enable the teacher to cope with problems of classroom integration found in the team teaching model. Teachers who teach in a team situation demonstrate these qualities and abilities of leadership.

To help understand the teacher as a leader, one must accept that leadership is being exercised when a group member is helping the group to define and meet its goals. That individual is the leader who at a given moment is most effectively helping the group. In the language of Benne and Sheats, (1948) leadership is to be conceived “in terms of functions to be performed within a group in helping that group to grow and to work productively” (p. 41).

During the last two decades, a great deal of attention has been given to the study of leadership as it operates in school situations. It is generally accepted that competent
leadership facilitates the process of curriculum improvement; that is, effective leadership somehow creates situations that enable the group to do things that would not have been done in the absence of such leadership. Recent studies, therefore, have been concerned with the meaning of leadership, what the effective leader does, and how he/she does it (Benne & Sheets, 1948).

A common notion is that leadership consists of certain qualities inherent in some individuals. In any situation, the leader will be able to command the confidence and respect of his/her followers and to induce them to follow his/her policies as well as to accept plans and decisions. Research on the nature of leadership has helped to explode this common-sense notion (Chowdhrey & Newcomb, 1952). Today leadership is not conceived as a set of qualities, traits, or abilities inherent in the individual and distinguishing him or her as a leader. Rather, it is conceived as a functional role of a member, played by an individual at a particular time with a particular group of people.

Whenever human beings work in groups, there is a need for leadership. The wise use of human talents requires effective leadership in education as well as in other fields of human thought and action. Human history is filled with illustrations of the degree to which the welfare and success of people have depended upon the intelligence and skill of their leaders (Chowdhrey & Newcomb, 1952).

As problems of living have become more complex, and as individuals have found it increasingly difficult to meet their needs singlehandedly, the problem of group leadership has assumed greater significance. The challenge of the 21st century to the elementary school cannot be met without creative leadership by elementary school personnel.
Instructional leadership is exercised, in a society of free individuals, by those who bear titles indicating their position of status leadership and by those who lead merely because of their knowledge and ability. Among those educational leaders are university presidents, state superintendents of public education, local superintendents, members of the board of education, members of parent-teacher association, school principals, supervisors of instruction, and classroom teachers (Kessler, 1992).

In a profession that emphasizes the application of intelligence to the solution of problems of living, leadership is entrusted to the man or woman who knows. The magnetic personality, the common touch, and the imposing physical stature no longer suffice. The leader needs a thorough grasp of the entire school program, including both historical and social settings, as well as its objectives, the relationship among its parts, and its methods and procedures. In addition, the leader needs to be knowledgeable in the techniques of evaluating the effectiveness of the school program (Kessler, 1992).

Because teaching is modeled better by example than by precept, what the leader does is more important than what the leader knows or what he says. Instructional leadership is based on a high degree of personal integrity. In other words, the leader really stands for certain principles and can be depended upon to see that these principles are observed in staff relationships (Kessler, 1992).

The effective instructional leader is the one who inspires confidence in the members of his/her staff to do things themselves. Instead of keeping himself/herself in the limelight, he/she is constantly calling attention to the accomplishments of the group and
thus building staff morale. It is the function of leadership to help the members of the
group formulate common goals, develop ways of achieving goals, and grow in their
capacities to evolve worthwhile procedures (Anderson & Durant, 1989).

Intelligence and informality are by no means mutually exclusive. Just as the
common touch is no substitute for intelligence, neither is intelligence a substitute for
friendliness and informality in dealing with other members of the staff. By showing an
interest in the hobbies, and skills of each staff member, by inviting the staff to his/her home
for social meetings, and by encouraging the use of first names instead of formal titles, the
leader can help create an atmosphere of friendliness that contributes to smoother human
relations in the school, provided that such informality comes from a genuine interest in
people (Anderson & Durant, 1989).

If teachers have a part in the establishment of the purposes of the school program,
their sense of direction becomes clear. Therefore, a primary step in helping teachers to
become more creative, just as in encouraging teachers to assume responsibility, is to spend
time with the staff to examine the purposes of the school and revise these purposes in
terms of the basic values that the staff holds. Time is not wasted if it is spent in arriving at
an essential, common philosophy (Anderson & Durant, 1989).

Teachers cannot be expected to be creative if the leader believes that there is one
unique method for teaching. If such is the case, teachers bend their efforts toward
discovering and following the method the leader accepts. But creativeness is encouraged
by the leader’s frank admission that the best procedure for any given group must be
developed by that group in terms of its personnel and the limiting factors of the situation.
Also, the best method for any individual teacher will be an adaptation of the basic laws of learning to his/her own personality and particular skills. Much has been learned from research and experience, but teachers must continue to experiment to increase their effectiveness. If teachers are to show leadership, they must be accepted as people who have ability, understanding, and knowledge to prepare the best type of learning experiences for their students. If teachers are not so accepted, leadership is easily stifled (Anderson & Durant, 1989).

Promoting a willingness to try new things is only the first step a leader takes in developing leadership roles in teachers. When this willingness is put into action, the leader must then provide the security and trust that facilitates satisfaction. For example, recognition may be given to those people who are trying new techniques. This opportunity may consist of just having the people who are performing experimental work tell the staff what they are trying to achieve and the results they are obtaining (Anderson & Durant, 1989).

Bennis (1984) reminded us that there are four competencies of leadership: self management, management of meaning, management of attention, and trust. To be competent as an educational leader, the individual must first be able to manage the meaning of schooling. This means that the leader has a clear understanding of the purpose for schools and can manage the symbols of the organization toward fulfilling that purpose, the primary theme about which activity must be organized.

Leadership, in the general sense, then, is necessarily constrained by the situations in which leadership is displayed. Over the past several years much has been learned about
leadership in relation to organizational context. Studies have been conducted using variables that might affect a leader’s effectiveness in different situations (Bennis, 1984).

It is important for a principal to share decision-making authority with teachers. Involving teachers in decision making is crucial in developing a community of leaders. But when a problem arises, such as an angry parent calling the school, a principal must be careful not to violate trust by reasserting his/her authority and making a hasty decision concerning the matter. This is an opportunity for maintenance, not necessarily leadership. The energy, the fun, and the commitment that leadership engenders come from brainstorming solutions and then trying to implement them (Bennis, 1984).

If teachers are to show leadership, they must be accepted as people who have ability, understanding, and sufficient knowledge to prepare the best type of learning experience for their students. Another way of promoting leadership in the teaching staff is by giving recognition to those people who are trying new methods of teaching and a willingness to share these with faculty members. Leadership is a group role; no one is a leader walking down the street by him or herself. He/she is able to exert leadership only through effective participation in groups (Bennis, 1984).

A school should be a community of leaders, a place whose very mission is to ensure that teachers become school leaders in some way at some time. Leadership allows teachers to make their beliefs reality. Everyone deserves an opportunity for leadership. Schools can be organized so that teachers within their walls learn how to earn and enjoy the recognition, satisfaction, and influence that come from serving the common good (Bennis, 1984).
Teacher Attitudes and Personality Characteristics

Teachers who engage in team teaching must be able to work together harmoniously. They should be able to accept the newer educational concept of themselves as resource people and facilitators of learning. Teachers will aid students in assuming responsibility for a large part of what they acquire from their total educational experience. They will involve students in planning their goals and in determining what study is needed to attain those goal (Davis, 1975).

Preparation is a vital element of effective team teaching. The teachers who agree to work as a team must have a mutual understanding of both their general and specific educational objectives. Curriculum planning must focus on what the team knows about students based on the students' abilities, needs, and learning levels. To accomplish well-defined educational objectives, each teacher must function as an integral part of the team. Long range planning is essential for a team teaching situation to be successful (Davis, 1975).

Once team teachers have established their objectives, they must look for means to accomplish them. They must examine their educational goals in relation to available educational materials and instructional space. The team must plan and organize the large group instruction, small group instruction, and individual conferences in terms of space and time. The team must plan the most effective and efficient use of available space for the different student groupings. The team must determine what kind of learning setting they need to create to meet the education objectives they have set for themselves in the team (Davis, 1975).
The team must also determine what atmosphere is necessary to facilitate learning in a specific learning setting and what student activities can and cannot be carried out in that setting. The team must schedule time for various types of learning activities. They must identify an acceptable organizational pattern for instruction. The team must identify the role of each member. Its members must be sure, individually and collectively, that each person understands his/her role as well as the roles of the other team members (Davis, 1975).

Various instructional arrangements have been developed to facilitate the regular classroom integration of students; among the most popular are collaborative consultation and cooperative teaching. Both collaborative consultation and cooperative teaching are designed to provide teachers with the "process and tools" to deliver appropriate educational services to at-risk students (Whinnery, King, Evans, & Gable, 1995, p. 98).

According to Bauwens, Hourcade, and Friend (1989), "team teaching refers to an educational approach in which general and special educators work in a coactive and coordinated fashion to jointly teach academically and behaviorally heterogenous groups of students in educationally integrated settings" (p. 75). The team must take into account whether learning could be acquired best in a large or small group setting. When grouping students in a small groups, they are given more one-on-one attention. This mode of instruction usually involves two to five students at a time. Large-group instruction gives the students an opportunity to adjust their social behavior patterns in a way that is appropriate for being in large groups. The teachers must keep their objectives in mind and must be sure that large group instruction reflects the objectives.
Throughout the planning stages, it is especially important that the teachers have the support of the school administration. Only the administrator can assign school space, school time, educational materials, support personnel, and groups of students in a school system. The administrators have important roles to play in the development of good team teaching situations. The principal, for example, is the person whose duty is to provide leadership for the school building by directing and encouraging staff. This affects the teaching team as well as teachers working in more traditional classrooms. In order for team teaching to be successful there has to be support from administration (Bauwen et al, 1989).

The effectiveness of team teaching depends upon the interrelations of team members. Personality conflicts, conflicting educational philosophies, and conflicting interpretations of individual roles can create confusion in the learning situation. Tension or hostility on the part of the members of the teaching team can make it difficult or impossible for them to teach. It is important that the team members make a continuing effort to keep open the lines of communication so that small misunderstandings and confusions do not become major problems (Bauwen et al., 1989).

Team teaching is not a panacea, but it is a flexible and exciting means to improve instruction. A team relationship can develop only when a group of teachers and students accepts and carries out decision-making responsibilities. The heart of the concept of team teaching lies not in details of structure and organization but in the essential spirit of cooperative planning, constant collaboration, close unity, unstrained communication, and sincere sharing (Bauwen et al., 1989).
CHAPTER 3
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the methodology and procedures used to study the role of a team-teaching pair and a traditional classroom teacher working with both regular education students and at-risk students in the second grade at an elementary school in Southwest Virginia. It includes a discussion of the research design and a description of the content of the study and sample selection. It also describes the development of the interview questionnaire and depicts the data collection methodology. Finally, a description of data analysis methods is included.

Research Design

The first part of the research was designed to elicit participant thoughts and ideas on a team-teaching program model and a traditional classroom model at an elementary school in Southwest Virginia. A second part of the research was to observe students and teachers in team-teaching and one-teacher classrooms for one school year and to record data based on an observation instrument.

The researcher concentrated on both regular education students and selected academically at-risk students in the classroom observations as data were recorded. As specific observation tasks were undertaken, the at-risk students were observed in the
context of the entire class. The social climate of both classes was observed and analyzed in terms of how the at-risk student sample responded in comparison to the remainder of the class. Also, provisions by the teachers for whole-group, small-group, and individual student assistance were observed and analyzed in both types of classes. The at-risk student sample was compared to the total class in terms of these instructional effects. Finally, the teachers performance of classroom tasks and the roles that they took were observed and analyzed as they appertained to both the at-risk student sample and the entire class of students.

The researcher also conducted interviews with two second-grade teachers in a team-teaching situation as well as with a second-grade traditional classroom teacher. In addition, the researcher interviewed the principal and randomly selected parents and students to elicit the pros and cons of team teaching as compared to teaching in a traditional one-teacher classroom.

Context for the Study

Qualitative research methods are used in this study. According to Rummel and Bellaine (1963) the qualitative method is an in-depth analysis of a total situation. It is described by a sequence of events leading to a particular organizational behavior. Goals of a research case study are to permit an in-depth study of an organizational process, clarify those events relevant to the problem that may permit a greater understanding of causality, and examine a situation in more depth than is permitted by standardized measurement procedures (McClintock, Brannon and Maynard-Moody, 1979).
McClintock et al. (1979) described a case cluster method as a means of purposeful sampling. The case cluster method has three features: (1) the identification of the units of analysis within the case that are meaningful and represent the event or subject being studied by informants who are knowledgeable; (2) a sampling of data sources based on theoretical grounds and on features of the case is crossed with a sampling of the units of analysis; and (3) an optional quantitative data set may be created, consisting of standardized codes for variables pertaining to each unit of analysis, and may be gathered for systematic analysis. The researcher chose to compare units of analysis as described in number one above.

In summary, the case study was a year-long observation of second-grade teachers and students in a team-teaching and in a traditional classroom setting. The research case method allowed for an in-depth comparison of how regular education students and at-risk students were taught by a team-teaching pair and by a traditional teacher. The study involved analysis of teaching in both the team-teaching and traditional classrooms. The study was also organized around a set of interview questions and participant observations.

**Reasons for Selecting This Study**

As a career professional educator with more than 20 years as a teacher in elementary school classrooms, grades 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7, the researcher began the dissertation topic selection process by thinking of possible studies that in some way pertained to classroom teaching. As a somewhat traditional one-teacher working alone in one classroom with 20 some students each year, the researcher had long been interested
in team teaching as an alternative to the one-teacher classroom. He had also known professionally an elementary school principal who had long been a proponent of team teaching in the elementary school and who had developed several excellent team-teaching pairs in her school. Finally, he had heard good things about the classroom work that two teachers who were teaming in a school near his home were doing.

After taking a qualitative research class with Dr. Russ West, a professor at East Tennessee State University, the researcher realized that he definitely wanted to concentrate his research on a qualitative study for the dissertation. As he began thinking of possible classroom-related research topics, a study of team teaching soon pushed other possible topics out of his mind. The more he thought, read, discussed, and studied team teaching as a possible topic, the more logical it seemed.

Team teaching was selected as a research topic for the following reasons: (1) strong interest in the topic, (2) personal knowledge of several team-teaching proponents and practitioners, (3) a nearby school where research could be completed, (4) comparatively little research completed on the topic, and (5) the topic strong implications for modern educational practices.

Sample Selection

To develop a sample for the study, the following criteria were considered: (1) proximity, (2) a team-teaching program, (3) a principal interested in research related to team teaching, and (4) a population of at-risk students. The school chosen was located two miles from the researcher’s home school. The principal at the selected elementary
school is a strong proponent of team teaching and has team-teaching pairs in kindergarten, grade one, grade two, and grade three. The principal was willing to have her school participate in a qualitative study of team teaching.

Following the initial investigation of the team-teaching model used, the researcher determined that the second grade pair was considered to be the best example of team teaching in practice. The two teachers, Mrs. B. and Mrs. S., both agreed to participate in the study. In order to have a comparison model, the researcher asked Mrs. A., a second-grade teacher who taught in a traditional one-teacher classroom, to participate in the study. Mrs. A. was selected because she is the only other second-grade teacher at the school. Mrs. A. willingly agreed to participate in the study.

In a 1992 study, Glesne and Peshkin observed the open nature of qualitative study precluded the ability to know either all of the meaningful selection criteria or the number of interview sessions necessary to gather adequate data. The selection strategy evolves in the data collecting process. Glesne and Peshkin also noted that thinking in terms of important stratification criteria offers a good initial approach to the problem.

In addition to the principal of the school and the selected teachers, parents and students were selected and interviewed until clearly emerging themes surfaced. These individuals were selected by means of a purposeful sampling, as described by Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996). This technique involved identifying variations within the population and intentionally including members of these groups in the study.

There were two academically at-risk student populations being served in the target school: Title 1 reading and math remedial students and special education students served
under an Individualized Education Plan (IEP). In the second-grade classrooms there were a total of 15 Title I students being served. There were eight students selected from the team-teaching classroom. Four of the students were males; four students were females. All eight students were receiving both math and reading Title I remediation. There were seven students selected from the traditional one-teacher classroom. Four of the students were males, and three of the students were females. All seven students received math and reading remediation through the Title I program.

This first group of academically at-risk students in the team-teaching and the traditional one-teacher classrooms were selected by using the Title I Student Needs Assessment and Referral Form and the point system that classroom teachers use in referring students for remedial reading and mathematics instruction. A sample of the referral form is found in Appendix A. Classroom teachers list all students in their classroom and answer questions such as, is the student functioning below his/her appropriate basal text level in reading? A “yes” answer gives the student zero points; a “no” answer gives the student five points. After all questions have been answered, the Title I director tallies the point totals for each student. Students with the lowest point totals are eligible for Title I services.

The second group of academically at-risk students in the two classrooms was identified special education students. There were two identified special education students with IEP’s in the two second-grade classrooms. There was one male student in the team-teaching classroom. There was also one female special education student in the one-teacher classroom. The male student was categorized as learning disabled; the female
student was labeled as Attention Deficit Disorder.

The researcher adopted a strategy to determine when a sufficient number of interviews had taken place. Lincoln and Guba (1985) identified four criteria for determining the appropriate time for data collection, and, subject interviews, to end.

(1) Exhaustion of sources—it is definite that nothing else can be discovered from additional discussion and interview.

(2) Saturation of categories—categories used to code data have appeared to be established.

(3) Emergence of regularities—there are enough replications of similar data that the researcher can develop an understanding of what phenomena occur consistently and what phenomena seldom occurs.

(4) Over extension—the researcher discovers new data distant from the central tendency of categories that have occurred.

Both the team-teaching classroom and the traditional one-teacher classroom were heterogeneously grouped. The student population included identified gifted students, students who were working above grade level, students who were on grade level, and students who were below grade level. The researcher decided to compare and contrast regular education students in both classes and the identified academically at-risk students in both classes. Close scrutiny of both regular education and at-risk students would be the first object of the classroom observations. The second objective in classroom observations would be to record the work of the teachers so that students could be studied in the context of the total class situation.
Development of the Participant Observation Process and the Interview Questionnaire

Jorgensen (1990) wrote that participant observation is “viewed positivistically as useful during the preliminary stages of scientific inquiry for exploration and description,” and is “a special form of observation, a unique method of collecting data” (p. 7). In the participant observation process that evolved, the researcher went to the selected elementary school two days a week for one school year to observe the two teaching models. The focus of the observations was three-fold: (1) The three teachers who taught in the two classrooms, (2) The regular education students in both classes, and (3) The at-risk students in both classrooms.

Fine and Sandstrom (1988) wrote that “The adult participant observer who attempts to understand a children’s culture cannot pass unnoticed as a member of the group” (p. 13). Adults who observe children assume two types of role relationships (1) the scope of the positive contact between adult and child and (2) The scope of authority the adult has over the child. The authority measure separates research with adults from research with children. “Only in research with children can authorities legitimately conduct ethnographic work with their changes” (p. 14). Four types of participant observation roles are supervisor, leader, observer, and friend. Fine and Sandstrom emphasized the friend relationship for adults observing children and believed that the researcher should become a friend to one’s preadolescent subjects and interact with them in the most trusted way possible.

Classroom observations were conducted throughout the 1998-99 school year. Observations began in September and continued at least twice a week until the school year
ended in early June. The timing of the classroom observation sessions varied with approximately one half of the observations taking place during the morning instructional schedule, and the other one half of the observations taking place in the afternoon. All observations lasted at least one hour. Six half days were also spent observing in the two classrooms.

Observation time was divided between the team-teaching classroom and the one-teacher classroom. Direct observation was used as the primary method of gathering information. Field notes recorded an account of what transpired in the classrooms. Both teacher and student actions were noted.

Glense and Peshklin (1992) wrote that in the interpretive tradition "the interview can be the sole basis of a study...the opportunity to learn what you cannot see and to explore alternative inquiry" (pp. 64-65). Kahn and Cannell (1957) characterized the interview technique as a "conversation with a purpose" (p. 149). Marshall and Rossman (1989) observed that qualitative researchers should examine a few general themes for developing insight, but should otherwise consider how the interviewees "frame and structure" (p. 82) their responses.

Next, interview protocols for the teachers in the study were developed. Items on this protocol were divided into three categories: (1) descriptive items concerning the program’s design, (2) items that were evaluative in terms of outcomes, and (3) items that were evaluative in terms of implementation. The questions focused on (1) interviewee attitude about the teaching arrangements, (2) student-teacher relationships in the two settings, and (3) overall feelings about time on task, variety of teaching methods, and
independent work by students in the teaching environments. Because the interview questionnaire was to be used with diverse populations, changes in wording and content were made so that the protocol was appropriate to be used with students, parents, teachers, and administrators. Four interviews were scheduled with the teachers. The first was early in the school year, the second and third were in middle of the year, and the fourth closer to the end of the year. Facsimiles of these forms are included as Appendix B.

McCracken (1988) promoted the long interview as “The method of choice when cultural categories, assumptions, and themes are objects of investigation, and when total immersion in the studied scene is impractical or impossible” (p. 5). Four steps are used in the long interview process. The first step reviews the academic literature, the second is a cultural review, the third is construction of the questionnaire, and the final step is the interview itself. The interview should be taped, and an observer (auditor) should also listen to the tape. The interviewer and the observer(s) then confer, identify key passages, and analyze the notes that were transcribed. The investigator manages the four-step method and uses the interview process to experience the situation as the respondents do.

Third, an interview protocol for the students in the study was developed to ascertain the social climate within the classroom. A model protocol developed by Pugach and Wesson (1995) was modified to meet the needs of the study. Another similar protocol was then developed for the students in the traditional one-teacher classroom. Two interviews were scheduled with students. Copies of these protocols are found in Appendix C. In addition, a letter was written to request permission from parents to
interview student subjects. A copy of this letter is found in Appendix D. A permission form for parents to sign was included with the letter. A copy of this form is found in Appendix E.

Fourth, an interview protocol was developed to be used with the parents of students in both classrooms in the study. The protocol elicited comments on the parents' perceptions of the social climate, instructional effects, and teachers' effectiveness in the team-teaching and the traditional classroom. This protocol is found in Appendix F.

Fifth, two interview protocols were developed to be used with the administrator of the school. These protocols focused on the categories of: (1) descriptive items concerning the program's design, (2) the establishing of team-teaching pairs in the school, (3) the evaluation process of team teaching, (4) the social climate in the team and one-teacher classroom, (5) the instructional effect of the two settings, (6) roles and tasks of the teachers in the two settings, and (7) the benefits/non benefits of team teaching. These protocols are found in Appendix G.

Assimilation and evaluation of data collected from the initial interviews served to refine the questions used in subsequent interviews. Bogdan and Bilken (1992) compared qualitative data collection to a "funnel" (p. 154), meaning that data should be collected on a broad basis, pursuing different subjects and issues, in order to develop a research focus. Having done this, based on what is feasible to do and of interest to the researcher, the scope of data collecting may be narrowed.

Merriam (1991) examined the importance of researcher characteristics during case study research. She suggested that the case study researcher should have an "enormous
tolerance for ambiguity,” be sensitive to the context of the study, and be a good communicator (p. 37). Because the research design, data collection, and data analysis have no rigid procedures, the researcher must be able to “enjoy searching for pieces to the puzzle and tolerate uncertainty for an indefinite period of time” (p. 37).

Qualitative inquiry “can capture whatever significant outcomes occur because the design is not locked into looking at only predetermined variables and outcomes” (Patton, 1987, p. 14). The inquiry considers processes, variations, and individual differences between those being investigated and the outcomes. Certain advantages are associated with qualitative research methodology. For instance, a distinguishing feature of qualitative research is that it emphasizes the context of a total situation by employing a detailed and extensive investigation from multiple perspectives. The descriptive nature of the study allows for data that are thick, rich, and holistic (Merriam, 1991).

Because of the detailed description, other researchers may be able to draw their own conclusions based on experience and research. In addition, the potential of research results that expose new relationships, stated in the form of hypotheses, may be examined by statistical techniques in the future (Rummel & Bellaine, 1963).

Lancy (1993) suggested that the process of developing theory begin early on so that confounding evidence may be sought. He called this “grounded theory” (p. 243) and suggested that it be the focal point of data collection during the balance of the study.

Data Collection

With interviews being conducted on school premises, permission for doing so was
secured from the superintendent of the school system in which the teachers were employed and from the principal of the school. A letter was used as a means of introduction and to secure permission. A facsimile of this letter is included as Appendix H.

In order to see how the students responded to the classroom teaching models, students were interviewed near the end of the first semester and again near the end of the second semester. Parents' interviews were conducted half way through the year. Teacher interviews were scheduled twice during the year. Finally, the principal interview was conducted near the end of the school year.

Each subject interviewed was asked to sign a consent form. This consent form explained that any comments made could be used verbatim in the study, the names of individuals interviewed would not be divulged, and that any person involved in the study could choose to withdraw from participation by contacting the researcher. A facsimile of this form is included as Appendix I.

Three questions served as a guide for collecting data: (1) What was the social climate in the team-teaching and in the one-teacher classrooms for regular education and for identified at-risk students? (2) What were the instructional effects in the team-teaching and the one-teacher classrooms for both regular and at-risk students? (3) What was the distribution of teachers' roles and tasks in the team-teaching and the one-teacher classrooms? Classroom observation data were collected biweekly throughout the 1998-99 school year. The researcher kept field notes of weekly classroom observations and conversations with teachers. The researcher began the observations in September shortly
after school began and finished the observations early in June when school closed for the year.

The interview part of the data collection made use of the interview instrument already described. The interviewees were told of the purpose of the interview and their involvement in the research project. Open-ended interviews were conducted in a way that permitted information to emerge freely without prompting.

The researcher examined and transcribed interviews conducted with administrators, teachers, parents, and students immediately following interview sessions. The interviews were audio taped by the researcher. As each transcription was completed, it was studied for identifiable patterns and specific answers to the research questions.

Data Analysis

Patton (1990) and Lincoln and Guba (1985) stated that the appropriate method of data analysis in qualitative research is that of inductive analysis. Inductive analysis means that the patterns, themes, and categories of analysis come from the data; they emerge out of the data rather than being imposed on them prior to data collection and analysis. The researcher analyzed data gathered during the interviews and observations using the method recommended by Patton and Lincoln and Guba.

The Microsoft Word processing software program was used to transcribe tape recorded interviews in the ASCII format and then transferred into the NUD-IST qualitative data analysis software program. The parameters of the NUD-IST system were used to create an index system. Interviewees words were identified, indexed, and grouped
together for analysis.

Validity

The inductive analysis framework of qualitative research does not accept the concept of validity particularly well. Because of the weakness of the fit, Lincoln and Guba (1985) substituted the word credibility for internal validity. To achieve credibility the researcher used triangulation methods using more than one person to verify information, audio taping all interviews to obtain referential adequacy, and using a peer debriefer to insure the accuracy and correct reporting of the investigator. At the elementary school site prolonged observation of the team teaching and one-teacher classrooms was possible at both the unit of analysis and organizational levels.

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), the peer debriefer needs to be someone who is familiar with the topic, similar in age range to the researcher but not an authority figure, and serious about the debriefer role. Linda Baker, doctoral student and friend, met these requirements. Mrs. Baker is knowledgeable and has an interest in the area of team teaching. She and the researcher are about the same age, share many interests, and have a professional relationship. Mrs. Baker agreed to serve as peer debriefer and met with the researcher numerous times throughout the study. She helped the researcher in a number of ways. First, she questioned the procedures and methods throughout the research process; she also discussed aspects of personal bias, challenged ideas and working hypothesis, and helped keep the researcher focused on the unfolding study.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) also wrote that transferability, which is somewhat similar
to external validity, is virtually impossible in qualitative research. The most satisfactory thing that can be done by the researcher is to provide a full and comprehensive description so that the reader may use his or her own judgement about whether transfer is possible.

Reliability

Lincoln and Guba (1985) argued that reliability must be determined before validity. They substituted the term dependability for reliability and suggested triangulation, replication, and an inquiry audit as techniques.

An inquiry audit is an examination of the research process and data collected that is conducted by an independent auditor who confirms that accuracy of the reported findings. The audit materials included taped interviews, and other relevant documentation. Dr. Marvin E. Winters conducted an audit by examining both the process and content of the researcher on methodology and research activities, discussed transcripts and documents, and evaluated the researcher’s explanations of categories and reconstruction and analysis. (See Audit Report, Appendix J).
CHAPTER 4

DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBJECTS, DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERVIEW GUIDES, AND CREATION OF ANALYTIC CATEGORIES

Introduction

This chapter presents the data-gathering process of the study. Data collection was a year-long process that began soon after school commenced in the fall and ended shortly before school concluded in the spring. The collection process is detailed in four sections which include an introduction, a brief description of the subjects, the interview guide, and the development of the analytic categories.

Discussion of the Subjects

Four groups of subjects were interviewed. These groups included the school principal, three classroom teachers, 13 parents, and 38 students. Interviews were conducted individually with each subject.

The first subject interviewed was a 56 year-old elementary school principal. A female, she began her teaching career in Virginia in 1964. She taught elementary grades for seven years in Virginia and in Tennessee, where she moved and continued her teaching career. She then became a reading supervisor in a federally funded position in Tennessee. She held that position for six years. After moving back to Virginia she taught two years in the middle school as a Title 1 math teacher.
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For the last 16 years she has held an administrative position as an elementary school principal, the past four years in her present school. She earned her bachelor’s degree in elementary education from Tennessee Wesleyan, a master’s degree in curriculum and instruction from the University of Tennessee, and an education specialist degree in administration with a cognate in early childhood education from Tennessee Technological University. She has served on numerous curriculum committees and on a health advisory committee and has also worked with a head start program.

The second group of interviewees consisted of three classroom teachers; two were team teachers and one was a teacher in a one-teacher classroom. The first interview was with a 43 year-old second-grade team teacher. A female, she began her teaching career working in private Catholic schools in North Carolina and Louisiana. For the past 16 years she has taught in the same public school system in Virginia. She has taught in three different elementary schools in Tazewell County. During these 16 years she taught first grade for six years, second grade for four years, third grade for one year, fourth grade for three years, and fifth grade for one year. Her last five years’ experience has been in a team-teaching situation. Her bachelor’s degree is from Lenoir Rhyne College, and she has earned 12 hours of graduate credit in a master’s program at Radford University. She has served on and chaired several curriculum and school renewal committees within her school. She is a mentor teacher who has supervised student teachers. She has been honored as a “Teacher of Influence” at Bluefield College and is listed as a Who’s Who Teacher. She is also an Eisenhower Math Presenter.

The second subject interviewed was a 36 year-old second-grade teacher. A
female, she has taught in the same school all nine years of her teaching career. She taught in a Title 1 remedial program for one year, first grade for four years, and second grade four years. These experiences have included a first-to-second grade “loop” and a total of five years of team teaching in the second grade. She graduated magna cum laude from Bluefield College with a bachelor’s degree in elementary education and graduated as a member of Phi Kappa Phi with a master’s degree in educational leadership from Radford University. She was the recipient of the 1998 Teacher of the Year award from the local Rotary Club and was the December 1998 Tazewell County Employee of the Month. She has chaired several committees within her school and has worked on county and regional curriculum committees. She has been a member of Virginia Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development since 1996.

The third teacher interviewed was a 29 year-old second-grade teacher in a one-teacher classroom. Another female, she has worked for six years in the same school system and in the same school. During first three years of her educational experience she worked as an instructional aide before getting her first teaching job. She taught third grade one year and has spent the last two years teaching second grade. Her bachelor’s degree, cum laude, came from Bluefield College.

The third group of subjects were parents of students in the two classrooms used in the study. Interviews were conducted with 13 parents. Six parents had children in the team teaching classroom. All six of these parents were female; five were homemakers who did not work outside of the home, and one was an elementary school teacher. Two of these parents were college graduates, three were high school graduates, and one did not
finish high school. One of these six mothers had only one child. The other five had more than one child. The youngest of these parents was 30 and the oldest was in her mid 40s.

Seven of the parents had children in the one-teacher classroom. Six of these parents were female; the seventh was a male. The male was a college graduate who works in an office job. One of the six female parents was a community college graduate who works as a legal secretary, one was a nurse who has a bachelor’s degree, and four were homemakers. One of the homemakers was a community college graduate and three were high school graduates. These seven parents ranged in age from 28 to 40. All seven of these parents had more than one child.

The fourth group of subjects interviewed was composed of 38 students from the two second-grade classrooms in the study. Twenty of the 42 students in the team teaching class were interviewed. Eight of the interviewees were boys; 13 were girls. Five of the students were seven years old at the time of the interview; 14 were eight years old; and two were 10 years old. Two of the students were repeating second grade. Eight of the students interviewed were in Title 1 remediation, and one was a learning disabled student served in a special education resource program. Twenty of the students were Caucasian; one was African American. Over 50% percent of the students were eligible for free and/or reduced price lunches.

Eighteen of the 22 students in the one-teacher classroom were interviewed. Nine students were boys and nine were girls. Seven of the students were seven years old, eight were eight years old, and three were nine years old at the time of the interviews. Of the 18 students in the one-teacher classroom one was a second-grade repeater. All 18 were
Caucasian. There were no African-Americans in the classroom. Seven of these students were tutored in Title 1 reading and math classes. Again, more than 50% percent of the students were eligible for free and/or reduced lunches.

**Interview Guide**

Subjects were interviewed privately, with each session recorded on audio tape. In order for each interview session to have continuity, an interview guide was used. The interview questions consisted of a series of questions that developed and evolved as the interviews with subjects increased over time. Each subject had prior knowledge as to the nature of the interview. Subjects being interviewed were given a list of questions prior to the interview.

The researcher decided to divide the areas of investigation into three broad areas:

1. Social climate of the classroom
2. Instructional effects in the classroom
3. Roles and tasks of the teachers in the team teaching and the one-teacher classrooms.

Following are the 10 initial questions that were asked of the school administrator.

1. Why have you established team teaching pairs in this school in the second grade?
2. How long have you had team teaching in the second grade?
3. What do you do to prepare teachers to team teach?
4. What do you do to prepare students and parents for assignments to a team
teaching classroom?

5. How do you evaluate the team situation?

6. In comparison, how do you evaluate the one-teacher classroom?

7. What are some of the most effective things you see coming out of the team-teaching classroom in second grade?

8. What are some of the least effective things you see coming out of the team-teaching classroom in second grade?

9. What are some of the most effective things you see coming out of the one-teacher classroom in second grade?

10. What are some of the least effective things you see coming out of the one-teacher classroom in second grade?

Subsequent interview questions for the school administrator are found in Appendix G.

Shown below are the 13 initial questions that were asked of the team teachers:

1. Why did you become part of a team-teaching endeavor?

2. How long have you been teaching?

3. What did you do to learn about team teaching before you started?

4. What are some of the most effective things you see coming out of your teaming?

5. What are some of the least effective things you see coming out of your teaming?

6. How do you and your partner organize for planning, instruction of the lessons,
discipline, and communication with parents?

7. How do you evaluate your team situation?

8. Tell me about partner compatibility.

9. What advice would you give to someone wanting to team with another teacher?

10. What are some of the obstacles you have encountered as a team?

11. In what ways have you had administrative support in your teaming situation?

12. In what ways has your teaming benefitted students?

13. In what ways has your teaming hindered students?

Subsequent interview questions for the team teachers are found in Appendix B.

Below are the 11 initial questions that were asked of the teacher in the traditional classroom:

1. Why did you become a teacher?

2. How long have you been teaching?

3. What was your educational preparation to becoming a teacher?

4. Have you ever thought you would like to team teach?

5. What are some of the most effective things you see coming out of your teaching?

6. What are some of the least effective things you see coming out of your teaching?

7. How do you organize for planning, instruction of the lessons, discipline, and communication with parents?

8. What are some of the obstacles you have encountered in a one-teacher
9. In what ways have you had administrative support in your teaching?

10. In what ways has your teaching benefitted students?

11. In what ways has your teaching hindered students?

Subsequent interview questions for the traditional teacher are found in Appendix B.

Following are 14 questions that were asked of the parents in the team teaching and the one-teacher classrooms:

1. Tell me about your child’s year in second grade.

2. What has your child told you about his/her classroom this year?

3. How does your child feel about himself/herself?

4. What words does your child use to describe school this year?

5. Do you feel that your child has made academic progress this year, can you give specifics as to the success or failures he/she has had this year?

6. Does your child enjoy his/her class?

7. Does your child enjoy his/her teacher?

8. Do you feel that your child has received individual help from his/her teacher this year, can you give examples?

9. Have you talked with your child’s teacher this year?

10. Do you feel that all of your questions were answered regarding your child?

11. What has the teacher done in the classroom that has helped your child to learn, can you give specific examples?
12. Does your child get up easily and seem to want to go to school each day?

13. Do you feel like your child would have benefitted more by having been in a team-teaching/one-teacher classroom this year, why?

14. How would you sum up your child’s year in second grade?

Below are the 12 initial questions that were asked of the students in the team and the one-teacher classrooms dealing with social climate of the classroom:

1. Tell me what you like about your classroom this year, and tell me what you don’t like.

2. What is different about your class this year than last year?
   
   2a. Which do you like better?

   2b. Why?

3. Does your teacher seem to like you?

4. Does your teacher want you to ask questions?

5. Do you like asking your teacher for help?

6. How do you feel about yourself?

7. Do you have many friends in your classroom?

8. What do you like to do with your friends?

9. Does anyone in your classroom really “bug” you?

10. Do you like to come to school each day, why or why not?

11. Have you made any new friends this year in your classroom?
   
   11a. Tell me about them.

   11b. Are you still friends with some of the same kids you were friends with
last year?

11c. How do you know?

12. Do you play with any of your classmates after school?

Subsequent interview questions for the students are found in Appendix C.

Classroom Observations and Field Notes

The researcher observed in both the team-teaching classroom and the one-teacher classroom from September through May of 1998-99 school year. The original schedule called for two visits per week with each visit to be at least one hour in length. Five half-day visits were also scheduled. In actuality, some changes were made in the schedule, and some weeks three visits were made while other weeks saw only one classroom visit. Thirty-six observation sessions took place in the team-teaching classroom, and 25 visits were made to the one-teacher classroom.

Students and teachers were very accepting of a stranger coming into their midst, and acceptance occurred quickly and naturally. Students were so comfortable with this new adult in their midst that they did not hesitate to ask him questions or to show him their work. Teachers also were satisfied with this arrangement and acted quite naturally when the researcher was in the room.

Field notes were taken during each visit to the classrooms. Direct observations were made of the total classroom experience, and notes were recorded that described the classroom and the activities that took place. The teachers were observed as they taught, and the students were viewed as they reacted to the lessons that were taught. The field
notes were a faithful interpretation of what occurred in the classroom. They did not capture every single thing that happened, but they did reflect the classrooms in action and did describe what took place in each classroom throughout the school year.

Development of Analytic Categories

NUD-IST, which stands for Non-numerical Unstructured Data Indexing Searching and Theorizing, is a software database program that allows the user to take passage selections of qualitative data and “tag” them for the purposes of comparing them to other passages of data. The program also permits the researcher to categorize data. By categorizing data the researcher is able to identify similar themes of thought that occurred throughout the interviews.

The NUD-IST program allows the researcher to analyze interviews by constructing a system of ideas or topics that emanate from the interview responses. These ideas are classified as “nodes” or analytic categories. Every time a specific topic appears, that section in the conversation is assigned to a corresponding category. When a new concept is discovered, a new category is created.

Analytic categories were created for indexing the 103 interviews conducted. As the taped interview sessions were transcribed, categories and sub-categories were created. Twelve categories and 196 sub-categories were eventually developed. A listing of all categories and sub-categories from which the analytic categories were developed can be found in Appendix K. The categories generally reflected the questions asked in the interview guide. Analysis of the data resulted in the development of four general analytic
categories: social climate, instructional effects, roles and tasks, and the teaming experience.

Development of Category One: Social Climate

The concept of social climate in the team teaching classroom was first described as perceived by students in the class. Students were asked to reflect on questions dealing with the social climate in their classroom. The first two sub-categories defined the aspects of classroom climate as perception of self and school. Questions supporting this concept were directed at ascertaining how the students felt about themselves, what they liked about their classroom, what they did not like about their classroom, what was different about their classroom, and which they liked better a one-teacher classroom or a two-teacher-team classroom?

The second facet of social climate dealt with the personality of the class. Questions supporting this analysis were directed at how well the students liked the class and how they felt about asking the teacher questions. Comments varied, but one common thread was that students liked the class. One student, when asked how he knew his teacher liked him, answered, “Because she smiles every time I look at her”.

The third phase of social climate examined was how to get help in the classroom. This analysis dealt with whether or not the teacher wanted students to ask questions, whether students liked to ask their teachers for help, and whether the teachers answered questions. The basic idea was to ascertain how open or closed the classroom setting was to a free exchange of information and how comfortable students felt participating in the “give and take” of the teaching-learning process.
The next part of this analytic category dealt with social relationships within the classroom, friends in the classroom whom they saw and played with after school, and how students felt about coming to school each day. Students generally reported they liked to come to school each day because they did fun things and got to see their friends. A follow-up question was asked about whether anyone in the class “really bugged them”. Responses varied, but several students indicated that no one bugged them; however, some students indicated that certain classmates did bug them. An immediate follow-up question was whether the students told the teacher about the classmates who bugged them. The purpose of this series of questions was to ascertain how friendly the classroom environment was for student-to-student relationships.

The concept of social climate in the one-teacher classroom was also defined by students in the class. Subjects were asked to respond to questions related to social climate in their classroom. The first variable related to classroom climate was perception of self and school. Like questions asked of students in the team teaching classroom, questions supporting this concept were aimed at how students felt about themselves, what they liked about their classroom, what they didn’t like about their classroom, what was different about their classroom, and whether they liked a one-teacher or a two-teacher classroom better.

The next facet of this analysis centered around social climate and the personalities of the class. Questions supporting this idea were directed at how well students liked the class and how they reacted to asking the teacher about instructional topics. Reactions varied, but in general students were positive about the environment in the classroom.
The next phase of social climate developed was how to get help in the classroom. These questions, like those asked by students in the teaming situation, dealt with whether or not the teacher wanted students to ask questions, whether students liked to ask their teacher for help, and whether the teacher answered students’ questions. Again, the questions were designed to measure the openness or closeness of the classroom.

Next, the analysis dealt with social relationships within the one-teacher classroom, friends made, and attitude toward school. Again, students were positive in their responses to friendship questions. The environment in the one-teacher classroom was a friendly one. Although follow-up questions revealed some friction and aggravation between students, behavior was typical of second-graders. For example, one male student, when asked if anyone in his class really bugged him, answered with a girl’s name and explained that she bugged him by “getting around me and says that she loves me”.

The next part of the analytic analysis indexed the concepts gleaned from discussion of experiences the parents of second grade students in the team-teaching classroom had with their children and the team-teaching situation during the 1998-99 school year. Parents interviewed volunteered to take part in the research project and freely answered interview questions. Parent questions were created following student and teacher interviews and classroom observations. Because the parents, unlike the students and teachers, had little or no time in the classroom observing the team process, questions were more general in nature. However, parents appeared knowledgeable of team teaching and the differences between it and a traditional one-teacher classroom.

The parents’ analysis was somewhat general and centered on descriptions of the
classroom, the school, the students' academic progress, and the students' enjoyment (or dislike) of school and the teachers. The parents' views of students' self image as a part of a team-teaching classroom and their views of students' receiving individual help from teachers added to the concept of social climate.

Then, the comments of parents of second-grade students in the traditional one-teacher classroom were reviewed. Again, the questions were more general in nature, indicative of the lack of time actually spent by parents in the one-teacher classroom. The parents of these students also were knowledgeable of their child's educational experiences in the second grade. These parents comments centered on descriptions of classroom, school, academic progress, enjoyment (dislikes) of school and teacher, and students' self image as it was reflected by the one-teacher placement.

The principal's responses to several questions were also used to add to the analysis of social climate. Finally, the concept of social climate as it was recorded in the field notes for both the team-teaching and the one-teacher classes was analyzed. The perception of self and school, getting help from the teacher, and the social relationships in the classes were observed as were personality of the classes and students' noise levels, work habits, and attentiveness. Other categories looked at students' engagement in learning in the classrooms, rules for behavior and instruction, classroom situations conducive for learning, and the teachers' efforts to praise students.

Development of Category Two: Instructional Effects

The second area of analysis emphasized instruction and its effects upon the
students and learning. Subjects were asked questions dealing with instructional effects in the classroom. The first series of questions dealt with the way the classroom was organized for learning. The purpose of these questions was to determine how students worked in relationship to other students in the class. Questions related to discovering time spent in total-group work, small-group assistance, individual instruction, teacher-led classes, student discussion, and self-paced instruction.

The development of the next analytical phase dealt with the teachers' instruction in the classroom. Students were asked whether they thought their teachers explained things so they could understand, whether the teachers would come to their desks to help them, whether they understood the directions teachers gave, how they would describe their school, how they would describe their class, or how they would describe their teachers. Students reported a variety of activities taking place. One student, in describing the class reported, "We do a lot of fun stuff, like the butterflies, and we have a frog in our classroom."

The next group of questions emphasized instruction and its effects upon students and learning in the one-teacher classroom. Subjects were asked questions that related to instructional effects in their classroom and their perception thereof. The development of this facet of the analysis dealt with the way the single teacher organized the classroom for instruction. The purpose of this list of questions was to understand how students worked in relationship to their peers in the class. Whole-class instruction, small-group work, and individualized instruction within the class were explored.

The creation of the next series of questions centered on the teachers' method of
instruction in the classroom. These questions sought to define the teacher as a facilitator, a director, and an explainer. Questions were also designed to see how students described their school, their class, and their teacher.

After the interviews with the team-teaching pair were completed, development of the analysis centered around students and the effect of instruction in the team-teaching classroom. The first aspect dealt with the benefits and weaknesses of teaming for students and the potential of teaming for stimulating student creativity. Other phases centered around organization of the class for instruction and expanded the research question related to varied instruction and group assistance. Interview questions dealt with organizing for small-group, whole-group, and individual instruction. Teachers also shared their planning for hands-on projects, computer work, cooperative learning, and traditional textbook learning. A look at how a team planned for handling routine classroom tasks such as collecting lunch money and taking class role was also a feature of these analysis. The final part of this analysis centered on evaluation. In particular, emphasis was on discerning the teachers’ view of team teaching and its impact on both student achievement and non-academic issues. Questions searched out effective results and non-effective results in teaming.

The next questions were created to represent the views of the teacher in the traditional classroom. Analytical topics dealt with the personal teaching history of the subject and self-perceptions of teaching effectiveness. Other topics included the input planning component of classroom instruction, teaching obstacles and administrative attitudes, and meeting the needs of students within the classroom. Benefits, hindrances,
and creativity or lack thereof were also explored. Also analyzed were teaching styles, the teacher's handling of down time, and the teacher's leadership role. An analytic look at the parameters of the teacher's organizing for small-group and whole-group instruction was also developed. The teachers' perceptions were analyzed to examine parent involvement in the education of the second-grade students with communication and conferences being the key points. The next aspect helped to analyze the handling of routine tasks by the teacher in the one-teacher classroom. These tasks included the collection of money, the taking of attendance, and the mundane chores that can clutter a teacher's day.

The final facet of the development of category two indexed the concept related to instructional effects that were recorded in the field notes. The analysis further defined the instructional effects. The first group dealt with the variety of instructional activities observed in the classrooms. The second recorded examples of hands-on projects, multisensory activities, computer work, cooperative learning, and traditional textbook instruction respectively.

Additional analysis showed the flexibility in grouping students and highlighted small-group work, individual assistance, and whole-group instruction. Students at work and on task, students working independently, students' using higher level thinking skills, students comfortable enough to ask questions, students' understanding of classroom procedures, and students' understanding objectives and being prepared for class each day were other topics analyzed in the development of this analytic category. Finally, the monitoring of students by teachers, the seating of students for instruction, and the questions asked by students and by teachers were included. Also, the responses of parents
of the students in the two classes and the school principal were analyzed to explore the
instructional effects of both the team-teaching class and the one-teacher class. Parents
were not very knowledgeable of the nuances of grouping or cooperative learning;
however, they were satisfied that their children were getting sound instruction in both
classes. The school principal was also somewhat vague in her analysis of the instructional
effect.

Development of Category Three: Roles and Tasks of Teachers

This analytic category cataloged the teachers' roles that the teachers played in
instruction in the classrooms. The topics analyzed depicted the degree to which
instruction was coordinated by the teachers and presented examples of clearly defined
instructional leadership. Other observations from the field notes expounded on teachers’
organizing for small-group, whole-group, and individual work. An in-depth look at the
coordination of work and instruction showed how teachers worked together, how
teachers planned together, and how teachers assigned responsibility for teaching specific
subjects. The last aspect of this analysis indicated how teachers asked students to take on
leadership roles in the classroom and in the learning process.

The responses of students, parents, and the school principal dealing with the roles
and tasks that teachers had in the two classrooms were also analyzed. Students viewed
their teachers as subject-matter specialists and understood in general how work and
instruction were coordinated. Parents were not very cognizant of the roles teachers
played, yet they felt comfortable with their children’s teachers. The school principal did
not add a great deal to the development of this analytic category. She indicated that whole-group, small-group, and individual instruction was properly handled by all three second-grade teachers.

The three teachers themselves added a great deal to the development of category three. The team teachers clearly planned their respective roles in the classroom and changed areas of responsibility periodically. The traditional teacher gave clear responses to questions about her role. She understood that instructional responsibilities in her class covered a wide variety of roles that were centered on what she did each day.

**Development of Category Four: The Teaming Experience**

The final category was developed by indexing the interviews with the two teachers in the team-teaching classroom. Subjects were asked to reflect on team teaching and its varied ramifications on their professional lives and its impact on their students. The first part of the analysis centered around the concept of teaming. An exploration of the two teachers' definitions of teaming led to questions dealing with how they had learned about teaming, the implications of partner compatibility, obstacles of teaming, advice on teaming, and how teaming had influenced their concept of their roles as educators. Fundamental questions about what team teaching is and how to team teach were raised.

Further analysis looked at the roles of two key participants in this study. The first was the principal of the school and the support she gave the team for the team-teaching endeavor. The second was the traditional second-grade teacher who, with the team-teaching pair, made up the second-grade faculty in the school. These ideas explored both
the administrative role of the principal and the involvement of the traditional teacher in the team-teaching situation.

As the logical approach to interviewing the two team teachers, sub-categories were developed to look at the planning, organizing, communicating, and leadership roles of the team. To have effective instruction in the classroom, teachers should exhibit effective planning, organization, communication, and leadership skills. Responses to questions in this section revealed the descriptions the teachers had given about these variables and helped to define the teaming experience.
CHAPTER 5
FINDINGS

Introduction

A recurring theme in the discussion of school restructuring is how to organize and deliver instruction so that a majority of students are successful in school. The press to develop more effective models for teaching students has been an ongoing process since A Nation at Risk was published in 1983. As suggested in the opening chapter of this dissertation, one alternative that is actively being pursued by educators is collaborative team teaching. This study was designed to see how effective a team teaching situation was in comparison to a traditional one-teacher model. A key part of the study was to solicit second grade students' perceptions of their year-long experiences in a classroom taught by a two-teacher team and to compare these perceptions to those of second grade students in a class taught by one teacher. Perceptions of parents of these students were also sought. The school principal was also interviewed. In addition to the students' reports of life in their classrooms over the course of the year, interviews and observations were used to determine how the teachers characterized their work and their perceptions of its effects on students. The findings are presented in two sections: a description of data analysis procedures and a discussion of the four analytic categories. The first three analytic categories—social climate, instructional effects, and roles and tasks—are each developed through a discussion of student, teacher, parent, administrator, and field note
perceptions. The fourth category— the team experience— is developed through a discussion of the team-teachers responses.

Data Analysis

Transcripts of interviews with 38 students, 13 parents, three teachers, one administrator, and the year-long classroom observations of the researcher were analyzed using content analysis which was aided by the NUD-IST software program. The researcher avoided using predetermined categories. A set of tentative categories was developed through exploration and discovery that reflected the research questions established in chapter one. Constant comparisons between potential categories and the actual transcripts were made, then coding was completed to run the NUD-IST program. A tentative set of categories was created. Additional tentative categories were developed after continued comparison between potential categories and the actual transcripts.

The researcher and the auditor reread the transcripts individually to code for specific instances of the categories and to look for the relationships between categories. A joint reading followed to validate the categories gleaned from the first two readings and to settle any disputes regarding coding. The interview transcripts were used to identify comments related to themes gleaned from the student, parent, teacher, and administrator interviews.

Results

Three general analytic categories were derived from the transcripts of students and
parent interviews, teacher and administrator discussions, and field note entries: (1) classroom social climate, (2) instructional effects in the classrooms, and (3) the distribution of teachers' roles and tasks in the two classrooms. The fourth analytic category that emerged was what amounts to a practitioners' guide to teaming. Through these categories, a picture of these two classrooms emerged.

**Classroom Social Climate**

The first analytic category evident from the interviews was the positive climate in the two second grade classrooms. The perceptions of climate were ascertained from comments about students' attitudes toward self, peers, teachers, and school; receiving assistance; peer relationships; and school affect. Data were broken down into team students' and one-teacher classroom participants' responses; then the two classrooms' data were divided into regular education students' and at-risk students' responses. Teachers' responses, parents' statements, the principal's views, and the researcher's field notes also provided data for this analysis.

**Students**

**Self Image.** Students in both the team-teaching and the one-teacher classrooms had positive self-images. All students interviewed indicated that they felt "good" or "fine" about themselves. There was no difference in the responses of the at-risk students and the regular education students in both classrooms. Again, "great", "O.K.", or "good" were adjectives these students used to describe how they felt about themselves. Also,
unanimously, students in both classes said that their teachers liked them. All students, regular education and at-risk, answered "yes" when asked if their teachers liked them. When quizzed further as to how they knew, replies included, from a regular education student, "because she smiles every time I look at her," and from an at-risk student, "because she calls on me to run errands." One regular education student in the one-teacher classroom did acknowledge that his teacher liked him only "a little bit, because sometimes I accidentally get on her nerves."

Regular education and at-risk students in both the team classroom and the one-teacher classroom indicated they were doing better academically than they had before, even though the work was reportedly harder in the second grade than it had been in the first grade the year before. Most students commented that they liked school very much and that it was more enjoyable than it had been the prior year. Students consistently used the words "fun" and "like" to describe their classrooms. Regular education team students liked their classmates, their teachers, and the size of the room—"it's big, two classrooms in it, and lots of kids." Several of these students liked "two teachers best" and noted that it was "easier for teachers to take turns" and "one doesn't have to teach the whole class." At-risk team students did not comment on the two-teacher aspect of their classroom; instead they said they liked their class this year because of "playing games," "nice teachers and kids," and "fun with science and reading." The regular education students in the one-teacher classroom indicated that their classroom had "more room than last year" and fun subjects like "computers and math," "and outside time." At-risk students in the one-teacher classroom were equally positive. Their class was described as "fun," and they
noted that they “get to go to title,” and they liked “math, art, reading, and parent
volunteers.”

Even when students were asked what they did not like this year about school and
their class, they tended to be positive. Several regular education team students responded
by saying they “liked everything.” Several others said they did not like “picking up trash,”
“the desk was too low,” and “the class was kinda hard.” At-risk students in the team
classroom also were generally positive when asked to be negative. They did say they did
not like “people calling me names,” “people that steal,” and “the teacher yelling at me for
talking and I ain’t.” Only one regular education team class student did not like “team
teaching and ... more kids, and desks for four, and people kick you.” Students in the one-
teacher classroom did not like “work and big words,” “when I have to stay home” (a
positive) and “[the teachers’] yelling.” At-risk students did not like “being a helper,”
“people picking on me,” and “not getting to go outside.” One student summed up the
generally positive attitude by answering the “what don’t you like this year” question with
the word, “nothing.”

Understanding of Teaming. When students in the team teaching classroom were
asked, “What is different about the class?” most did not see anything unusual about their
team situation. Only two regular education students responded by noting the team-
teaching arrangement. One said the class had “two classrooms in it,” and another pointed
out “team teaching and the desks in groups of four.” Two of the at-risk students noticed
the “two teachers” difference; and after the interviewer probed, one additional at-risk
students also commented, “different math and two teachers.” Other students in the team class, both regular education and at-risk, saw mundane differences like “different seats,” “different people,” “harder work,” and “pencils”—“I used to like fat pencils”—speaking of the larger pencil used in the first grade for students whose gross and fine motor skills were not ready for smaller, regular No. 2 pencils. Significantly, one regular education student in the team classroom, when the researcher asked probingly, “What about the difference in teachers?” answered, “There’s not much difference because they are nice.” For second graders, having two teachers in the same room was not an unusual thing worthy of comment. In the one-teacher classroom regular education and at-risk students’ answers to the difference about first and second grade classes were similar to the team students’ answers. “Different desks,” different kids,” “we check our own papers,” it’s much more funner,” and “get to write stories on the board” were some of the reactions given.

Feelings About School. Most students commented on how much they liked school and that it was more enjoyable than it had been the prior year. Team class students overwhelmingly noted that this year was better. However, one student did report that he liked last year better because “we had only one classroom, and my friends were there.” At-risk students were unanimously positive about this year. Two of these students specifically said that the team teaching arrangement helped them. One stated, “last year I had a hard time with math; [this year] the teachers help me.” Another at-risk youngster was unequivocal about liking this year better “with two teachers.” Both regular and at-risk students in the one-teacher classroom also liked second grade better than first grade.
They were impressed with being in a "higher grade," and most just felt this year was "fun."

Clearly, to these students something positive was happening in these classrooms. Students felt challenged, yet successful. They reported that they had increased responsibility, yet school was more fun. The classroom atmosphere in both classrooms seemed to these students to be exciting, stimulating, comfortable, and safe.

**Giving and Receiving Assistance.** Giving and receiving help was an accepted norm in both classrooms. Students indicated that everyone needed help from time to time and that everyone gave help from time to time. A sense of working together for the common good predominated. The classroom provided many sources of assistance, and this contributed to the climate of caring.

Students in both classrooms were emphatically affirmative when commenting on whether they liked to ask their teacher for help or whether their teachers wanted them to ask questions. All regular education and at-risk students in the team classroom said they liked asking their teachers for help. All regular education and all but one at-risk student in the one-teacher classroom answered "yes" to the same question. The student who answered "no" was a shy, quiet student who tended to sit and not be sociable. His personality seemingly had a great deal to do with his negative response.

Students were affirmative but not quite as positive in their answers when asked, "Does your teacher want you to ask questions?" In the team situation five regular education students answered "yes," three replied "sometimes," and one "didn't know." All six of the at-risk students in the team class answered "yes" that their teachers wanted
them to ask questions. In the one-teacher classroom five regular education students answered “yes” to this question; two said “I don’t know, I guess,” and one said “no.” Four at-risk students in this class said “yes” to the teacher wants you to ask questions query, one said “sometimes,” and one replied “no.”

As the researcher probed deeper by asking about the students’ perceptions of the teachers’ classroom explanations and what would happen if the students did not understand, answers again tended to be positive in nature. All regular education students in the team class said “yes,” the teacher would explain carefully, and all but one at-risk student in the team class also said “yes” to this question. The one exception was the at-risk student who said, “sometimes and sometimes she uses big words I can’t understand; if I don’t understand, I just do it.” In the one-teacher class all students, both regular education and at-risk, answered “yes” to the question.

In a similar vein students in the one-teacher classroom were somewhat more positive about going to the teachers’ desk for help when students were working at their seats and the teacher was at her desk. Five of the team class regular education students answered “yes” to this question; four said “sometimes they could,” but noted that “those times that you can’t go, they are trying to figure out something, and they are doing their work.” One of these students said “no” in reply to the question and explained why by saying “because they are busy.” In the one-teacher classroom six regular education students answered the question “yes” and one said “sometimes.” This student noted that “sometimes she’s busy.” At-risk students in the one-teacher class answered “yes” to the question; however, one did qualify his answer by saying, “if its really simple she won’t, but
if it's hard and she's not doing anything you can go to the teacher's desk for help.” The difference in the answers of students in the team and one-teacher classrooms might be explained more by the difference in the personalities and/or work habits of the teachers than it is by difference inherent in team and one-teacher classrooms.

In response to questions about receiving help from classmates students in both classes were also positive. In the team class all but one regular education student answered “yes” to the question. The one negative student said, “no,” but when asked why he thought that, responded, “I don’t know.” One other student carefully explained that he could ask classmates for help “if it’s not a test.” At-risk team students were unanimous that they could get help from classmates. In the one-teacher classroom all regular education students interviewed on this question replied “yes” as did three at-risk students in that class who were asked the same question.

Students considered all three teachers to be accessible. Having two teachers in the classroom reduced the time it took teachers to respond to a students’ signal for assistance except when the teachers “were busy.” When teachers were busy, however, students reported they could ask a classmate a question.

Social Relationships. Another element of the positive climate in these classrooms was the nature of social relationships among students. The predominant feeling was that everyone got along well. When asked if they had made friends in their classroom this year, students in the team teaching room were unanimous in answering positively. Both regular education and at-risk students reported that they had made friends and that the
"kids were nice" this year. In the one-teacher class all at-risk students replied affirmatively, and only one regular education student believed that she had not made friends in her classroom this year.

When asked to describe school, their class, or their teachers, students in both classes described the positive climate. No major differences were noted between regular education and at-risk students in either class. One regular education child noted, “it is fun, and we have more work than we did last year.” Many others replied that school was “fun”; their class was “nice, friendly, cooperative,” and “nice and they help me”.

Finally, when asked how they were doing in school this year, students were definite that they were doing well. Regular education and at-risk students in both the team and the one-teacher class replied overwhelmingly with the adjective “good” to describe whether they made S’s and O’s on their report cards (S=satisfactory; O=outstanding). One regular education student said, “I like coming to school now, but last year I just didn’t want to. I think school is fun”. And from an at-risk student, “I like coming to school this year, because I like the work that we have, especially science and handwriting. I am learning a lot of good stuff.”

Positive Climate Affirmed. A perusal of the researcher’s field notes corroborated the theme of a positive climate in the two classrooms that was evident from the interviews with students, parents, and teachers. First, the students in both classrooms appeared to be happy. Numerous entries were made by the observer indicating that the students were smiling as they worked and laughter was commonplace. Teachers were also smiling at the
students and reacting to students with a smile. Numerous positive comments made by team teachers and the one-teacher were recorded. In particular, Mrs. A, the teacher in the more traditional one-teacher classroom, tended to be a hugger. She often hugged her students and they often hugged her either in return or separately on their own. For example, an April 7, 1999, entry noted that "Mrs. A was working with a male student who had not written many sentences. He told Mrs. A that he could not think of any more. She then asked him several questions about his topic and gave him some ideas about possible sentences to write. Mrs. A then told the boy that she knew he could do the sentences and gave him a hug. He smiled and returned to his seat and began to work."

**Teacher Praise.** Another very common positive thread that ran through both classrooms was encouragement and praise given by the teachers to the students. In the team classroom on several occasions students and teachers would clap as students successfully answered a question or demonstrated what they had done with an activity. The team teachers gave stickers as recognition for a job well done or for those who were the quietest. The teacher in the one-teacher classroom used treats on several occasions. Once she handed out suckers as students successfully completed their work and on another occasion M&Ms were used to reward the students.

**Class Behavior.** Classes were usually orderly and students generally raised their hands to be recognized by the teachers before they spoke. Seldom did a student just blurt out an answer. In the team classroom students were very good to sit quietly in their seats.
as their classmates were called on to answer questions by one of the teachers. Usually the second teacher was moving through the room so she was near students and helped control them and their reactions. Students in the one-teacher classroom sometimes were more restless than their counterparts in the team classroom. However, Mrs A, the teacher in the traditional classroom, tended to allow her students to move more freely within the classroom than the team teachers did. For example, on March 9, 1999, “Mrs. A encouraged the students to move freely within the classroom, but to make sure that no more than three were on the floor at any given time.”

**Giving and Receiving Assistance Affirmed.** Interviews with students had brought out that giving and receiving help was an accepted norm in both classrooms. Students needing help received help from teachers and classmates readily. Students usually worked well together when in groups. On October 13, 1998, the researcher’s field notes stated, “Students in the team class were creating bar graphs. Students were permitted to share information with students seated at their table. After the students had finished their graph, they were instructed to go to other tables and share their graphs with other students.” In the one-teacher class students were also encouraged to seek help from students in their group or in other groups when such was appropriate.

**Discipline in Class.** Although students usually were cooperative and respectful, there were times that some misbehaved, did not pay attention, or talked when they should have been listening. Teachers handled discipline quietly but effectively. On September 30,
1998, for example, as students lined up to go outside for recess in the team class after a social studies lesson, Mrs. B called out the names of students with whom she needed to have a conference with. After Mrs. S had left the room with the other students, Mrs. B talked to the students who had been asked to remain behind with her. She asked each student why she had taken his/her name. Each student was able to tell her why his/her name was on the list. Mrs. B then spoke to each student about the importance of paying attention when lessons were being taught about not talking and disturbing others who were listening. She then took the students outside where they had to sit quietly in a time-out mode. The teacher in the traditional one-teacher class also used the quiet time out as a method of controlling student behavior. Sometimes students in both classes were a little slow in settling down to work. All three teachers were effective in quieting the students by moving to them and making them aware of their displeasure. Although some students reported that a teacher had yelled at them on occasion, the observer saw no indications of such behavior.

Observations throughout the year confirmed the positive environment in both classrooms. Students were happy and enjoyed being in school. Teachers made the classroom comfortable for teaching and learning.

**Teachers**

**Happy Environment.** The teachers who taught in the teaming arrangement iterated that their classroom had a positive environment and that they worked together to build a
positive climate. These teachers felt that the “support that we have [for each other] makes this classroom a happier environment. The children always seem happy.” They especially emphasized the fact that when one of them became frustrated or out-of-sorts, the other teacher picked up the slack and the students benefitted. As one of the teachers said, “We have more confidence when we deal with the children and the parents because there are two heads, and two heads are better than one.”

The team teachers thought that their students were eager to learn. They attributed this eagerness to “the enthusiasm of the teacher” and said that they were both “extremely enthusiastic.” They also pointed out that they consciously worked to make school “fun” and “We do a lot of fun things.” Perceptively one of the team members noted that their work was “always complementary in that sometimes I’m teaching and [my colleague] is monitoring, but she will actually get into the lesson. I can see if she is enjoying it. I do the same thing with her, and I think that we do try to make things fun because we do have different levels in here and if we can make it fun for the slower students that also keeps the kids at the top level excited too.”

Relationships With Students. The team teaching partners were particularly revealing when they discussed their closeness with their students. As one of the team members said, “I have never had a real problem with being close to students because I love children. I love giving students hugs. I love giving praise to students.” However, this teacher noted that it is more difficult to have as much closeness to students in a teaming room as you have in a one-teacher classroom. She stated that the team had an
average in their classroom of 36 to 42 students in any given year. She noted that “it is a little more difficult to bond with that many, but you just have to make the special effort.” One important aspect of teaming was suggested when one team teacher revealed that “sometimes one partner will bond closer with a child than with another.” Significantly she noted that, “I found in the past years in teaching with Mrs. B a lot of time children I have the least patience with she has the most patience with and vice versa. There are days when maybe I don’t have as much patience as I need she compensates for that [lack of] patience.”

Individual Help. The team teachers also realized that they gave individual help to students quite naturally in the team arrangement. They noted that “even while one person is teaching, if the student needs that immediate attention, the other teacher is always there to attend to those needs.” Interestingly, the team teachers noted that even though they got close to their students it was “impossible to be as close as the one-teacher classroom teacher” could be. As one of the teachers noted, “It’s not the same closeness as when I had a single group. When I had my own kids, they were my kids, and I was extremely protective of them ... In teaming... I don’t have that same closeness. There are certain students that I do feel close to, but I haven’t had the same feelings of when I had it by myself.”

Traditional Class Social Climate. Mrs. A, the single-class teacher in the study, also reported that her classroom had a positive social climate. In interviews with this teacher it...
was evident that one of her goals as a teacher was to have her students like the class they were in because they were more eager to learn and easier for her to teach if she made learning fun. She indicated that she "tried to have a sense of humor with the students." She also said that her "students were happy and liked the classroom."

This teacher also said that her students were not afraid to ask her for help. They were free to come to her desk for help, and at times she pulled students individually to work with her at her desk so that she could make sure they understood the lesson. She noted that she tried to be prepared for each day; she planned for the students, the lower level ones as well as those who were able to move at a faster pace. She did indicate, however, that one of her most difficult tasks was "to be flexible to the many needs of the students, to be understanding to those needs, and to better understand them when they were struggling to learn the material."

This one-teacher classroom teacher indicated that she was close to her students. She tried to let her students know that she was concerned with their progress. She also was a caring teacher who was "constantly giving them hugs and telling them that she liked having them in class." She believed that with a small group of students it was much easier to develop the closeness which she sought. As she said, "I get to know the students better; I know more about their home life, their problems that they might be having, and this helps me to work better with them. Even the shy students seem to open up more if they know you care about them and want to help them."
Parents

Children Feel Good. Parents of children in both the team teaching and the one-teacher classrooms confirmed their children's positive self-images. Three parents of regular education students and three parents of at-risk students in the team teaching class responded affirmatively to the question about self-image. Answers of regular education parents included, "She's responsible. I think she's got a pretty good self-esteem. She feels real confident about herself." "I think [she] is a happy child." "I suppose he has a pretty good self-image." Two parents of at-risk children said their children "feel pretty good" and "feel really good" about themselves now. One parent seemed to attribute her child's placement in the team as a contributing factor in improved self-esteem when she said, "I think he's got better self-esteem than he has had. He used to be a shy, inward child. This year he's come out, got more active." Parents of students in the one-teacher classroom also agreed that their children felt good about themselves. Several parents of regular education children did qualify their assessments with statements such as "she's self-conscious about her teeth." "So there are days she feels good about herself and days she feels bad about herself. She's from a split home. A lot stems from home environment instead of the school environment." One parent of an at-risk child noted that "she's shy but she is O.K. about herself."

A Good Year. When parents of regular education children in the one-teacher class were asked about their children's second-grade year, most agreed that it had been a good
year. However, two parents described some negative feelings about the year. One mother explained that her daughter “has had a very difficult year because she has been at two different schools in the second grade.” Another mother said that “the second grade has had its ups and downs; she has been diagnosed with Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD). Her grades are up and down.” Parents of at-risk children in the one-teacher class believed the year had been good. Quotes like “She has done real good this year, her grades have greatly improved” were typical. However, one mother said, “She’s had her ups and downs with subjects and things; basically she’s enjoying it.” Parents of regular education students in the team teaching classroom used superlatives to describe their children’s year in second grade”. [She] has had a wonderful year; this year has been great.” My daughter “has had a very good year.” “It’s been a good year; he seems to enjoy school.” Parents of at-risk students in the team classroom were complimentary but more reserved as they described the year. Statements made included: “In the beginning she had a lot of problems.... She has made improvements,” “Compared to last year I think he has done really good,” and “Well, he’s improving in second grade; right now he’s beginning first grade level.”

When parents were asked to be specific about the classroom, they pictured the environment as a happy one. Speaking of the one-teacher classroom, regular education students’ parents were complimentary about the teacher and the classroom climate saying, “She enjoys [the teacher]: she jokes with them: she puts humor into learning. It’s not a dull drum day,” and “She enjoys going to school.” Parents of at-risk students in the one-teacher classroom also painted a positive picture of the classroom. One parent noted that
her child “enjoys her class,” “she really enjoys school this year,” and “he likes his teacher.” The parents of students in the team class were equally positive about the classroom environment. One parent of a regular education student described the classroom thusly: “There are a lot of things going on in the room. The teachers keep them thinking all the time. She likes the room. They have a nice environment.” At-risk children’s parents were also pleased with the class and reported that their children liked the class and the teachers. One parent did note that “there are times she doesn’t like her teacher and there are times she does.”

**Teacher Help and Academic Progress.** Parents were also in agreement that the teachers encouraged students to ask for help when they did not understand something. Five of six parents of students in the team-teaching class reported that their children readily got individual help from the teachers. One parent of an at-risk child did not remember hearing her child mention anything about receiving individual help. The typical response of these parents was, “Mrs. B explained this to me and Mrs. S did this, so I believe she has received the attention when she has needed it.” Parents of the students in the one-teacher class were equally convinced that the teacher gave individual help to students as needed. The parent of an ADD child said that the teacher “was very patient and always willing to stay after school and talk with us.... [She] worked one-on-one with [our daughter].”

Parents of regular education and at-risk students in both the team classroom and the one-teacher classroom believed their children made progress academically in the
second grade. In the team class all regular education parents were emphatic that the second grade experience had been fruitful academically for their children. One mother gushed in response, “Absolutely, her spelling words are great words. I mean some of the words are difficult, and she is proud when she achieves at that level.” A second parent noted that “academically he’s doing much better than last year.” At-risk students’ parents were also definite about second grade’s value. Three of the four parents interviewed said, “Yes, progress has been made.” However, one parent noted that “it [progress] doesn’t have anything to do with the teachers, but the Title teachers upstairs have been a really big help to him.” Parents of regular education students in the one-teacher class were totally in agreement that their children had made progress scholastically during the second grade year. One parent answered, “Yes, I do. She does things that I didn’t do till I was older.” Another parent said, “Yes, she got a very slow start when we first came here. She wasn’t doing what they were doing so she was behind on her first report card. I made an extra effort to work with her teacher. She is doing fine now.” Parents of at-risk students in this class also agreed that their children had made good progress in the second grade. One said, “She has made improvements in second grade.” Another answered, “Her grades have greatly improved. She actually enjoys her subjects.”

Attitudes of Regular and At-Risk Students’ Parents. When asked to describe the year, parents of regular education students in the team classroom were effusive in their praise. Comments included: “It has been a very good year. I think it’s probably his best year.” “She has had an excellent year. She has learned a lot, and she’s done really well.”
Parents of team at-risk students were equally positive about the experience their children had had in the team classroom. “Very well; wonderful; and very, very good” were typical of remarks that were made. One parent summed up the team experience for her child by saying, “I think the two teachers in the room, even though they have more kids; two heads to me are better than one. I think they handle their classroom quite well.” Parents of regular education students in the one-teacher class also believed the year was a good one. The parent of an ADD student noted that though “over all its been up and down, we’ve progressed a lot.” Parents of identified at-risk students in the one-teacher class also believed that it was a good year. One noted that her child had “adjusted very well” and that “other than a problem when another student said something about her glasses, she has had a good year.”

Final evidence that parents found the social climate in both classrooms to be positive was seen in reviewing the interview material in which parents were asked to sum up the second grade experience. Parents of regular education students said, “The teachers make learning fun,” “she jokes with them,” and “she does have a lot of patience and she takes a lot of time with students.” Parents of at-risk students in both classrooms zeroed in on specific reasons for liking the second grade. Of the team teachers one parent said, “[They] will help him when he needs it.” Two other parents said of the team teachers, “The one-on-one that the teachers do has helped [him] to learn this year,” and “[He] is a hands-on learner. The type of hands on [activities] that the teachers have done has helped him to learn this year.” A parent of an at-risk student in the one-teacher class believed that the teacher “gets down on their child’s level on things” and she has made the student
"feel that she [the teacher] was talking just to her instead of talking to the whole class as a group."

Clearly these parents perceived that these two classrooms were warm, inviting havens of learning. They stated that the teachers cared about their children and worked to create a friendly atmosphere conducive to good teaching practices and to productive work habits on the part of children. Parents remarked that the teachers were committed to the well being of their children.

Administrator

Interviews with the principal presented additional information on the social climate in the two classrooms in the study. In preliminary planning for the second grade classes the principal worked with parents in the spring before the 1998-99 school year to ascertain parental feelings about placement of students in a team classroom. She asked "parents to tell us if they objected to having their student in a team teaching situation," and she allowed parents to place in writing their request if they chose. The school administrator also looked at individual students to determine ones that needed to be separated from others.

The principal remarked that students in both classrooms seemed to be pretty happy. The teacher in the one-teacher classroom was characterized as "having a very approachable teaching style, interacting well with her students, and being flexible enough to allow boys and girls to question and assist." The teachers in the team classroom were seen by their administrator as "two individuals with two different instructional styles" who
have students who respond well to one or the other or both teachers, who were on task, and who were happy. The principal did note that “for some boys and girls team teaching is so different that it is not beneficial. They don’t adjust; that’s rare, but we do have boys and girls that do not adjust to the team.” However, the principal also pointed out that with two teachers in the team classroom, students and parents sometimes benefitted from being able to relate to one of the teachers if they could not relate to the other. Social climate in the team class was better because in this situation the parties involved were able to work out a problem more readily.

**Instruction and Its Effects**

A second analytic category dealt with the character and structure of classroom work and its effects on instruction. Students, parents, teachers, and the principal mentioned two issues prominently: varied instruction and small group assistance. Features of small group assistance included flexible groups and sites for small group instruction and cooperative learning. Especially with the at-risk students comparisons to being pulled out of the classroom for instruction was also addressed.

**Students**

**Small Groups.** Students in both the team-teaching and the one-teacher classroom acknowledged that they liked to work in small groups as a variation to whole class work. Regular education students in the team class were unanimous in liking to work in small
groups and indicated that they did so frequently. Typical responses noted that small group work was fun, help could be obtained easily, and socially “you can be with your friends.” At-risk students in the team class were equally positive about small group work. All answered affirmatively to the question about working in small groups. One student’s answer was typical of these student’s responses: “yes, because if I don’t understand something I can get help; we can talk to each other.”

Students in the one-teacher class also liked small group work. Both regular education and at-risk students said that they especially liked being able “to help each other” in the group activity. However, some of the students in the one-teacher class cautioned that “most of the time we don’t” work in small groups. The team class students were more aware of and conversant about small group work than the students in the other class.

In a similar vein, students in both classes indicated that they liked to work in small groups inside the classroom when they were having problems with a subject. Regular education students in the team class were equally divided as to whether they would rather work on a problem area inside the classroom with a small group of students or outside in the hallway with a teacher. However, four of the five at-risk students interviewed in the team class said they preferred to be in the class working with a small group of students when they were working on a difficult assignment. These students thought they could get more help from fellow students and teachers if they were inside the classroom. Students in the one-teacher class were even more emphatic about preferring to remain inside the classroom to work in small groups when a problem was encountered with a lesson. Five
of six regular education students and three of four at-risk students wanted to stay inside the classroom. The one regular education student who preferred to be outside of the classroom in the hall noted that there “no one else could hear my problem.” The one at-risk student who wanted to work in the hall by himself said that he “couldn’t concentrate in the room.” Students in both classrooms were comfortable working in small groups and liked it when such instructional approaches were used.

Working Alone. When asked if they liked to work alone on an instructional project, students were positive in their response. Interestingly, students in the team class were less positive than students in the one-teacher class about working alone. In the one-teacher class one regular education and one at-risk student did not like to work alone; all others liked to work alone when such practice was appropriate. Students in the team class tended to answer “sometimes” instead of “yes” to the question about working alone. Only one regular education student said “yes,” six said “sometimes,” and two said “no.” At-risk students also were less positive; two answered with a “no,” three said “sometimes,” and two said “no, I like to work in groups.” Apparently more frequent small group work in the team class helped condition the responses more toward favoring small group work by both regular education and at-risk students.

Help at Teachers’ Desks. One surprising issue sprang from this series of interview questions. When asked if they could go to the teachers’ desk for help, both regular education and at-risk students in the team class overwhelmingly replied “sometimes.”
typical answer was, “Sometimes, if they aren’t busy with their work.” One perceptive at-risk youngster said, “Sometimes, they’re probably working on some stuff about school and they’re too busy or they need some silence on their work, lesson plans.” Students in the one-teacher classroom were almost unanimous in saying that they could go to their teacher’s desk for help or their teacher would come to their desk to help them if they needed help. One at-risk youngster qualified his answer by stating, “Yes, if it’s really simple she won’t but if it is really hard she will.” Another added, “If it’s hard and she’s not doing anything.” All but one of the regular education students in the one-teacher class believed that they could freely go to the teacher for help or she would come to them if they needed her. Two did qualify their answers by adding “if she is not busy” and “sometimes she is doing her work.”

Variety of Instructional Activities. Students in both classes commented positively on the variety of instructional activities planned and taught by the teachers. As eight-year-old second graders, most did not make detailed observation about the variety of activities in the classrooms. Yet several students did point out that hands-on science projects, activity-based math work, multisensory experiential activities, computer time, and cooperative learning were often enjoyable, worthwhile instructional parts of their school day.

Students in the team class described a variety of instructional activities especially in science and math classes. However, social studies activities were almost always singled out positively by students. Regular education students were likely to describe these
activities. In science one of these students noted, “I liked it when we planted flowers. When they grew, we took them to the nursing home and gave them to the people there.” Another youngster commented on the study of weather and appreciated the fact that “we made barometers.” A third regular education student said, “I really liked it when we studied the seasons. We worked in groups with other students. We shared pictures with each other.” Another student enjoyed it as the class “watched butterflies hatch out. We kept them in the classroom butterfly cage for a few days and then we went outside one afternoon and let them go. Our teacher read us stories about butterflies. We wrote stories about the butterflies. Each student had their own butterfly.”

Math was also mentioned by regular education students. One student noted that “I really like it when we use calculators to do math. We work in groups and play games using the calculator. We also use geo blocks and base-ten blocks to help us with our math.” In social studies a regular education student described an excellent unit on Egypt. This student said, “We studied Egypt in the classroom. We read books, drew pictures, and went to the library to check out books. We had a tasting party one day. We had food that people in Egypt eat. Our teacher read us books and showed us on the map where Egypt is located. We had maps that we used to find Egypt on. We colored a map of Egypt.”

At-risk students in the team class also reported a variety of instructional activities. Again science was mentioned as a class in which hands-on and group activities were common. One at-risk student said, “We worked in groups when we did simple machines in science. We did an activity called push and pull.” Another student pointed out, “We do
lots of experiments in our class. I really liked doing the activity using magnets.” Finally, one at-risk student described math as “fun” and pointed out that “we learn playing games such as math bingo.”

Students in the one-teacher class also commented on the variety of instructional activities in their class. Two regular education students especially liked computer work. One said, “We get to do work on the computer. We play learning games when we finish our work. We learn letters on the keyboard.” Another noted, “We can read stories on the computer. We get to put on the headphones when we play games or listen to stories.” Math was also described by regular education students as having small group assignments when he said, “Sometimes we play reading math games. The teacher reads us a story and we have to be able to answer questions when she has finished. We sometimes get in teams to see who can get the answer first.” Only one-at risk student commented on group work. This second grader stated, “I like the art projects that we do. We work in groups. Sometimes when we do art activities we share and help other classmates.”

Teachers

**Instructional Approaches by the Team.** Teachers in the team class also described a variety of instructional activities that they planned. First of all, the team teachers set up their seating assignments to be conducive to small group cooperative learning activities. Instead of single-student desks that were in the one-teacher second grade classroom, the team classroom had flat top desks which were placed four together to make a natural
group. Every six weeks the students were rotated to a new group.

The team teachers noted that their students worked cooperatively when doing science lessons. They described one unit in which students were involved with the garden club. The club furnished the class with planting supplies. The students planted seeds and grew flower plants that later were shared with patients in a nearby nursing home. Team students often worked in cooperative groups to find words and word families in language arts class. These teachers also described two multisensory units on China and Egypt in which students shared a variety of activities including tasting sessions using the different foods of these countries. Mrs. B did point out that she was not satisfied with what they had done with computer instruction. She said that students were scheduled computer time, but often they did not get their time because of instructional activities in the classroom. Mrs. B indicated that at-risk Title 1 students often had more computer time than regular education students, because they went to the room for Title I math and reading and they used computers in the Title I classroom. Mrs. B also stated that with 42 students it was difficult to get all of the students on the computer in a week. The real problem was that only one computer was placed in the team classroom; the one-teacher classroom also had one computer.

**Instructional Approaches by the Traditional Teacher.** The teacher in the traditional one-teacher class operated instructionally somewhat differently from the team teachers but used many of the same instructional activities. The students in the one-teacher class were seated in traditional rows. Because chalk boards were positioned on an end wall and on a
side wall, the teacher occasionally changed the position of the rows to face either direction. When group activities took place, students simply moved their desks into groups.

The teacher in the one-teacher classroom used several different types of grouping. First, she grouped her students in language arts and reading according to abilities. Three groups—high, average, and low—were worked with individually one at a time while the other two groups were doing assigned work. Second, she planned cooperative group activities, especially in science. Each student in the group of 4 or 5 was assigned a specific role. One student got the materials for the group, one served as the recorder, and one or two observed and discussed the problem. Third, students were paired to work together to read to each other or to study a particular task. Fourth, especially in mathematics, whole group instruction was planned. The teacher observed the class closely. Fifth, the teacher would complete the whole class lesson by calling the students to her individually to work with them.

Whenever students finished their work, students were assigned time to work independently on the classroom computer. The teacher in the traditional one-teacher classroom also planned hands-on activities for her students. She noted that when she had a break while her students were out of the room for library time or physical education she would get her materials ready for the lesson. She also used a parent volunteer from time to time to help with the hands-on lesson and some of the small group activities. Mrs. A believed that she was a structured, yet flexible, teacher in planning for instruction. Her students knew her routine; yet she said that she had to move quickly to avoid downtime while changing from one subject to another, because her students became restless easily.
She noted that her instructional philosophy was to build a strong foundation in reading and mathematics for her second-grade class.

**Pattern of Instruction by the Team.** In the team classroom whole group instruction was noted in one form or another in all 36 observation periods. The usual pattern was for one of the team members to give instruction to the class while the other teacher moved from student to student monitoring individual understanding and giving individual assistance. Some departures from this normal pattern were the showing of a video to the group, the use of an overhead projector and maps, and oral reading by students. Since the team teachers had 42 students seated in groups of four, the whole group lesson frequently moved to small group work with four students working together. A variation of this approach seen less frequently was having the whole group lesson changed to students working in a small group of students in which they were paired to work on a topic or to do an independent individual assignment. The team also taught specific hands-on classes. Students in the team class were not observed doing any computer work with the one computer in the classroom.

To illustrate the above summary of instructional activities several dates and activities in the team class are cited. On November 10, 1998, “the students were working when I entered the room. Mrs. S was instructing the students. Mrs. B was monitoring and helping individual students.” On December 9, 1998, “As I entered the room the teachers were working on a weather sheet. Mrs. S and the students had talked about different weather words. The students sat quietly and matched words with seasons. The
students were allowed after a period of time to work in groups of four to come up with more words related to weather.” On January 20, 1999, a science class was in progress. Mrs. B announced she had “a little experiment about weather. Timothy is going to help me. What do I have in the bowl? Water. Timothy is going to take a paper towel and wad it up and put it in a plastic cup. I’m going to take the clip and press it down. The paper towel didn’t get wet. Why? The students had several solutions.”

The team teachers made extensive use of cooperative group lessons. Eleven times (almost one-third) group lessons were observed. Planned individual student work sessions were seen four times, overhead projector use one time, and hands-on activities four times.

**Pattern of Instruction by the Traditional Teacher.** The one-teacher classroom also was characterized by whole-group instruction. Twenty-one of the 25 sessions observed were whole-group sessions. Only three times were students grouped in small groups of four and only once were they paired for instruction while the researcher was observing. The teacher in the one-teacher class did use the overhead projector several times in instructing the whole group. Hands-on activities were observed four times. Specifically designed individualized lessons, like individual student editing of a composition, was observed five times. Oral reading by individual students was also noted. The one-teacher classroom did have students assigned to use the computer when they completed assigned work. Reading and math software games were used by the second graders to reinforce skills previously taught.

Examples from the field notes that indicated the variety of instruction in the one-
teacher classroom included: on September 20, 1998, "when I entered the room Mrs. A's students were reading silently. Students had paired off and had found a place in the room to read. . . . The students seemed to be very comfortable reading to each other." Then on February 16, 1999, "as I entered the room and sat down, I observed the 22 students involved in group activities. Mrs. A had divided the students in groups of 4 and 5." On March 16, 1999, "Mrs. A was doing an overhead activity with math. She was teaching subtraction facts with regrouping. The students watched as the teacher showed them the process of regrouping. The students would raise their hands and ask questions." On April 7, 1999, "as I entered the room Mrs. A was instructing the students on writing. The students were working on a rewrite of a story. She had given them their sloppy copies, and they were to edit and rewrite to go outside in the hallway. Mrs. A worked with individual students on their papers." Then on May 4, 1999, "Mrs. A was showing the students how to plot numbers on a bar graph. Each student had been given a piece of graph paper and were to do the graph as she did the one on the board. The students were graphing different color M&M's. Each student had been given a pack of M&M's and were in the process of sorting the different colors. As each student sorted his/her candy, Mrs. A sorted hers. The students put the different colors in little piles. After all students and Mrs. A had sorted and made piles, she then proceeded to show the students how they could plot their colors on a graph."
Parents

Parents of students in both the team and one-teacher class did not really describe the variety of instructional activities in their interviews. Parents of regular education and at-risk students did realize that some small group activities and some hands-on projects took place. They commented on computer instruction as well but did not seem to realize that it was limited especially in the team class. Parents did note that their children had had, as one of them said, “many learning experiences.” Otherwise, they believed that the teacher had been able to meet the needs of the students. One parent of a student in the one-teacher class suggested that she had a concern about the team class and the number of students in the class. She said, “I think 42 students in the team teaching classroom [is too many]; specifically requested the smaller class consisting of 25 students.”

A second instructional element was the flexibility in grouping students and the way students received special assistance individually or in small groups. In the team classroom four students were often grouped as needed for instruction in a specific skill or concept, particularly in science and mathematics. Students in the one-teacher class were also grouped in fours or in pairs but less often than in the team class. The team teachers rotated students in the groups of four each six weeks by moving students into new seating arrangements. The teacher in the one-teacher class set up her groups each time a cooperative learning activity was planned. She named the group members, establishing a leader, a recorder, and other roles that she had established. Teachers in both classes were consistent in giving students special assistance individually when such help was needed.
At no time did the researcher observe groups (or individuals) of high achievers being pulled out to work on enrichment activities. However, the teachers reported that they taught enrichment activities while the Title 1 students were pulled from the room for remediation.

Administrator

Interviews with the principal added additional information and a different viewpoint on instructional effects in the team and the one-teacher classrooms. The principal confirmed that instruction was varied and in tune with the needs of students in the team classroom. She noted that when she placed students in a team classroom she consciously “looked at students that need the help of more than one person,” and she also believed that team teaching “lends itself to less down time, because in a one-teacher classroom...she’s got to wait and she doesn’t have someone to pick up the slack.” She described the effects on the students in the team teaching situation as focused and felt time on task for the children was a significant factor. She also said that team teaching was good because team teachers could teach the subjects that they are most skilled in and knowledgeable about. The principal described the fact that the single teacher did not have the advantage of having an extra professional to help.

The administrator also noted that the teaming situation was especially effective in that it allowed at-risk students to be pulled individually or in small groups to be taught skills in which they needed remediation so that they could be more effective as students in
the whole group. The principal did not elaborate in any more detail on flexible grouping and cooperative learning in either classroom. She thought that both situations in the second grade had strengths. The professional in the one-teacher class had a very approachable teaching style and was flexible enough to allow boys and girls to question and to assist. The team teachers were described as knowing "how to organize to focus on what needs to be taught." She said that appropriate learning took place in both rooms.

**Teachers' Roles and Tasks**

A third analytic category dealt with the various roles and tasks that teachers performed in the two classrooms. Data for this analysis came from students, teachers, parents, and administrator interviews and from the researchers's field notes. The two team-teachers and the traditional teacher were the focal points of this section of the study. Numerous examples of clearly identified instructional leadership were identified.

**Students**

**Subject Matter Specialists.** The students' perceptions of teachers' roles showed that they viewed the three teachers as subject-matter specialists. Students in the team classroom saw their two teachers as equal teaching partners whose roles changed from day to day and from class to class. As one regular education student explained, "One teacher doesn't have to teach the whole class; they take turns." Another regular education youngster said that she liked having two teachers in the team classroom, "because they
walk around the room and help us.” When Mrs. B taught, Mrs. S circulated in the room and helped students individually. When Mrs. S taught, Mrs. B was the helping teacher.

Students in the one-teacher classroom also saw their teacher as a subject-matter specialist who taught all of their subjects. Yet they noted that she was also the helper who circulated in their room to provide individual assistance enabling them to finish their work in a more timely fashion. The help Mrs. A provided in the one-teacher classroom included reading parts of assignments to students or explaining them in a way that allowed students to do the work themselves. One at-risk student observed that she was able to break down the tasks so they were easier to understand. However, it is important to note that at least one regular education student mentioned that although the teacher could provide some kind of explanation, “sometimes she’s helping somebody else.”

None of the students in either class noticed that any type of special help was provided for certain students (at-risk) more than for any others. However, one student in the one-teacher class noticed and appreciated the extra help given to students by a parent volunteer. This at-risk student said, when asked what he liked about school, that he liked Mrs. X, “a lady that comes and reads to us.” Students in the team class remarked that their teachers switched roles and “took turns teaching math and reading.” Students in the one-teacher classroom were aware that their teacher had one clearly identifiable instructional leadership role, which was teaching the whole class. She also had primary responsibility for working with small groups.

**Personal Assistance.** In addition to academic help and support, students sought
out the team teachers and the traditional classroom teacher for personal assistance. They noted that their teachers listened to them, helped them, and understood “right away.” Students liked all their teachers and believed they were committed to helping. Students did not see a division of labor in terms of individual needs and academic and interpersonal needs, and in terms of teaching or delivering content. Neither regular education students nor at-risk students made a distinction between teaching content and providing personal help.

**Coordination of Work and Instruction.** A second sub-theme within the domain of teachers’ roles was how work and instruction were coordinated. Students specifically mentioned the coordination of the team teachers’ responsibilities. One at-risk student said that in contrast to her one-teacher class the year before the team teachers jointly carried out instruction with one teacher teaching and the other teacher “moving around the room.” Students in the one-teacher classroom did not note this second sub-theme for obvious reasons. Their teacher had no one with whom to coordinate class work and instruction on a regular basis. They did not realize or understand, for example, that this teacher worked with the Title I remediation teachers to coordinate math and reading instruction for identified at-risk students.
Teachers

Areas of Responsibility. The teachers in both classrooms were clear about their roles and tasks. The team teachers noted that “one of us is usually doing the guided or directed teaching while the other teacher is monitoring or doing one-to-one instruction or small group instruction.” The teachers changed areas of responsibility for instruction each six weeks. One six weeks period one teacher would be responsible for taking the lead in “teaching math, science, and social studies and do the Weekly Reader excerpts for that week and also health. The other teacher would be in charge of teaching the morning work: reading, spelling, and language activities that we do for the day.” Mrs. B further explained the roles: “While one teacher leads the class or gives directed teaching, the other teacher is monitoring or helping individual students. Sometimes I might be editing their work, answering individual questions, reviewing vocabulary. I sometimes take a group of students out of the room to work with them apart from the class to give them extra help on a specific skill. Sometimes I will take a small group of students and give them a test. Or I might do some retesting.”

Planning. When asked how they planned for teaching, the team teachers reported that they “planned these assignments together.” Mrs. S said, “We do divide up the assignments. Each teacher has written plans for the day. As one is doing the guided or directed teaching, the other is monitoring and assisting students with one-to-one tasks or working with students in small groups that are having trouble grasping a skill.”
Another role that the team teachers noted was that of meeting individual needs of students who were having academic difficulty. They said that they followed student Individual Education Plan's (IEP) carefully by keeping objectives from the IEP written in their plan books. They also planned for and gave Title I students individual attention and prepared abbreviated assignments for students who were struggling. Mrs. S pointed out that the team also tried to prepare "more enrichment activities" for above average students. "We do a lot of language skills, a lot of higher thinking skills, and this is a time when we emphasize cooperative learning and group work."

When asked how they planned for and delivered a "hands-on instructional activity," the team teachers again emphasized cooperative planning. Mrs. S said, "We both set up stations for experience learning, and we monitor or give assistance as needed." Mrs. B pointed out that one of the teachers would lead the activity and the other one would act "as an aide, monitoring and helping as needed."

Observations of the team-teachers in action showed that the teachers worked cooperatively together to plan and deliver instruction. They assigned responsibility for specific subjects and switched assignments periodically. The two teachers were equal in sharing responsibilities and made decisions based upon mutual consensus. Each teacher was able to use her own expertise and specific skills in the classroom.

Coordination of Routine Tasks. When it came to daily routine tasks within the classroom, the team teachers reported that they kept separate grade books, reviewed grades together weekly, and both filled out report cards on the subjects that they were
responsible for each six weeks. Students were kept together as a whole group for outside play and art. However, the class was divided into two groups for lunch. Both team teachers felt that a major advantage of team teaching was “in the realm of discipline.” They noted that “while one is teaching the other is monitoring. Even one-to-one that teacher is able to get up and move if in fact she does see a discipline problem.” Even if the teacher has “to take that individual to the side or remove that child from the classroom. . . , there is no down time” in instruction for the rest of the class. The two noted that from 8:00 to 8:30 a.m. one teacher checks attendance and takes the lunch and ice cream count while the other teacher begins the morning work with the students. Every six weeks they switch these duties just as they switch teaching assignments.

The team teachers noted other types of role coordination as well. In setting up parent conferences, one teacher would make contact with the parent either by phone or note. This responsibility usually went to the teacher who was doing the bookkeeping each morning. After the conference was scheduled, both teachers usually met with the parent. Mrs. S noted that “on very rare occasions do we meet the parent alone.” The team teachers have the “philosophy that we are both actively involved in that child’s learning, and we find it necessary for the two of us to meet with the parents.”

The team teachers communicated with parents through weekly progress reports as well. They kept folders for each child to send home to show examples of the child’s work, skill and behavior checklists, and teacher comments. These teachers also used phone calls to communicate with parents, especially if there had been a discipline problem. Mrs. S noted that “being a team partner I do have more time to take care of these things
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[discipline problems] immediately instead of waiting till the end of the day or waiting till I have a break.”

**Areas of Responsibility for Traditional Teacher.** The teacher in the traditional one-teacher classroom was very explicit when asked if she were conscious of the roles that she played as she taught each day. She said, “I feel like I am the decision maker, the pharmacist, the psychiatrist, and sometimes the only caring adult for 22 students I have in my classroom.” Mrs. A realized that she was the sole deliver of instruction to her students when she shut her classroom door and taught her students each day. She did note that when she planned for small group work she often had a parent volunteer to come into her class to help. This approach was often used in reading. She also pointed out that she grouped her students according to instructional level in language arts. However, without help she was stretched thin to meet the needs of three different instructional level reading groups. Again, in planning to teach a hands-on activity Mrs. A pointed out that she had total responsibility for the preparation for instruction including getting materials together. She said that she usually tried to prepare before hand when the students had a break [like library or physical education]. She also used parent volunteers to help monitor and expedited hands-on activities to keep everyone on task.

In discussing her role in meeting the needs of individual students in her second grade classroom, the traditional teacher noted that once again she was totally responsible for planning instructional activities. She said that she used “close monitoring, modification, and . . . tutors.” She had a parent who came regularly to the class to work
with small groups or one child in reading, and she was thinking about beginning some peer tutoring with an upper grade classroom. Mrs. A noted that handling down time when changing lessons could be a problem with just one teacher. She iterated that “with this particular group they do not do well with transition time, so we have to go really quick from one subject to the other.” She said that she planned for both regular and at-risk students in her class and gave very close supervision to the at-risk students.

The traditional teacher handled her routine tasks by herself. She took attendance right after or right before morning announcements. In the event of an interruption such as a parent coming in, she waited until her at-risk students returned from Title 1 remediation to mark the attendance. Mrs. A said that she had started “doing ice cream every day this year, but it got to be such a task and such a time consuming task in the morning that I decided to have ice cream only on Fridays.” She pointed out that a school volunteer came in and did a lot of copying for her, but if she needed to do more, she used the copy machine sometimes during her break time. She tried to record grades as each activity was completed. She worked on lesson plans during her planning time.

Mrs. A said that she tried to keep in close contact with parents and communicate with them as often as possible. She did send home a student folder with samples of work each week. She also had called several parents for phone conferences, and she also often sent notes home giving information or asking parents to come to school for a meeting. She noted that she “had to send home weekly evaluations of students that have had behavior problems.”
Roles Affirmed. From the researcher’s field notes describing the first observation in September until the final classroom visit in May, the predominant instructional model in the team classroom was one teacher clearly taking the leadership role and teaching the lesson to the class. The second member of the team was then a monitor or a helper to individual students or groups of students who needed extra attention. On September 8, 1998, the field note read: “As Mrs. B taught and asked questions, Mrs. S was walking around the room assisting students who had questions or didn’t understand the directions.” Again on September 14, 1998, “Mrs. B instructed students on writing sentences correctly. Emphasis was placed on beginning sentences correctly. Mrs. B went over the directions for the lesson. Mrs. S monitored students as the lesson was being taught. She walked around the room making sure that students were following along as Mrs. B was giving directions.” On September 24, 1998, the same scenario took place with the lead teacher explaining the lesson on medial consonants and the monitoring teacher walking around the room assisting students as they worked. As other observations were analyzed twenty-five other classes were annotated with the teacher-monitor division of tasks by the team teachers.

Variations of Basic Model. One variation of this basic model also was observed frequently in the team class. When the lead teacher finished the whole class instruction, she would then join the monitoring teacher. For example on November 18, 1998, both teachers monitored students and gave individual help as students needed assistance. The field note entry stated, “When I entered the room, Mrs. S was talking about the pilgrims.
The students read a story about the pilgrims and a feast they were having and the reason for a celebration. The students read and talked about the story. 'Why did the pilgrims have a celebration? Why did they invite the Indians?' The students sat quietly in groups of four. The teacher gave each student five strips of paper for them to write things they were thankful for. Mrs. B and Mrs. S walked around the room and monitored the students as they wrote.

Another interesting variation of the teacher-monitor pattern occurred when one of the team teachers was absent and had a substitute teacher in her place. Unlike what one might have thought, the substitute teacher took on the team members' responsibilities and the remaining team member did not assume total responsibility for teaching. On February 9, 1999, the researcher noted, "As I entered the room, students were being instructed by a substitute for Mrs. S. Mrs. B walked around the room giving feedback to the students."

On September 29, 1998, the observer described how the team teachers took turns being the lead teacher and monitoring teacher. "As I entered the room Mrs. B was giving directions for reading a story. Mrs. S sat and watched the students as Mrs. B read the story." When Mrs. B finished the lesson on fiction and non-fiction, Mrs. S then instructed the students on handwriting. Mrs. B monitored as Mrs. S gave instruction. The transition from lead teacher to lead teacher went smoothly as the monitoring teacher helped keep students orderly as they moved to a new subject.

**Ease in Transition.** One characteristic of the team class was the ease with which the teachers moved from whole-group instruction to small-group instruction to individual
instruction. On September 24, 1998, “As I entered the room Mrs. B was working with students on creative writing. The teacher worked with students individually and gave them help with rewriting.” Next, in reading the students read and talked about folk tales. The teacher reviewed story telling with the students, and, “The students watched a program on TV called ‘Telling Tales.’ Then the students saw the ‘Hardy Hard Head and The Two Gals.’ Mrs. B discussed the story with the students. After the discussion of the story, the teacher gave each table (a group of four) a big book to read and share. The students were able to work with a partner using the big books. The teacher talked with the individual groups about their big book.”

On September 30, 1998, another use of the non-lead teacher was observed. Mrs. S finished leading a discussion about Martin Luther King, Jr. and then lined the class up to go outside for recess. Mrs. B was monitoring during the history lesson, but when the students were lined up ready to leave the room to go outside, she called out the names of students with whom she needed to have a conference. After Mrs. S and the rest of the class left, Mrs. B talked to individual students about why she had taken their name down for misbehavior earlier in the day. All students knew why she had their name. Mrs. B then spoke to the students about the importance of paying attention when lessons were being taught.

**Cooperative Groups.** The team also used cooperative groups to facilitate instruction. On October 6, 1998, the observer noted again that “The students were working in cooperative groups. Each group had four students and each student had a
particular job to do (leader, gopher, and two students who would paste). Each student had a task to complete.” The team teachers also worked out some unusual size groups to aid in instruction. On October 5, 1998, “Mrs. B was teaching a math lesson on tens. The students were learning how to group tens. The teacher gave each student three strips of paper. The students were directed to make ten buttons on each strip. The students then joined all links together. . . . Mrs. B silently instructed the students to form groups of ten. Students moved around the room getting other students to join them in making groups of ten.”

Both teachers in the team classroom would assist students when they were working in small groups. On occasion the monitoring teacher would give her individual attention to an at-risk student and leave the rest of the class to the lead teacher for both whole group instruction and individual monitoring. On November 10, 1998, “The students were to read silently to find the answer. As they read Mrs. B walked around the room. Mrs. S helped students with words they did not know. Mrs. B sat in the back of the room assisting an [at-risk] student to read.”

**Hands-On Instruction.** The team teachers also used visual and hands-on aids and experiences in their instructional program. Board work was often used by these teachers. On March 30, 1999, “The students were working on a reading lesson. Mrs. S was instructing the students while Mrs. B monitored and helped students. The students were asked to predict what was going on in the story. Mrs. S brain stormed with the students.
about things they might find in the city. The students were asked where the story took place and to describe in words what they might see there. The teacher (Mrs. S) wrote words on the board as students gave them aloud. The teacher made a list of words that described what you might see in the city.” Worksheets were used on occasion as well. On April 21, 1999, “Mrs. S was conducting a social studies lesson. She was explaining to the students the symbols of Virginia. She was telling the students about Virginia’s state flower, tree, flag, dog, and insect. She had a worksheet for each student to complete at the end of the lesson.” An overhead projector was also used to add to the repertoire of the team teachers. On September 14, 1998, “Mrs. B used the overhead projector to assist in reviewing a story. Mrs. B went over the basic steps of how to make a book. She constantly asked questions of students to see that they understood.”

Predominant Instructional Model in Team Room. The predominant instructional model exhibited by the teacher in the traditional classroom was also observed by the researcher on a consistent basis throughout the school year. Mrs. A had the lead role instructing the class, and she also filled the mentoring or helping roles as time permitted. On March 9, 1999, when the researcher entered the room “Mrs. A was instructing the students on nouns. She told the students what nouns were and their purpose in writing sentences... Mrs. A walked around the room and kept students and groups on task.” A variation of the monitoring role was often used in place of the teacher going to students desks to give help. On September 24, 1998, “Mrs. A was reviewing sentence formation as I entered the room. The students then worked on sentences using capital letters and
correct punctuation marks at the end of sentences. As the students proceeded to work,
Mrs. A worked with individual students at her desk. The teacher called individual
students up to read sentences and check for correct punctuation and capital letters.”

The traditional teacher often planned for different methods of instructional delivery
in the same session. On October 8, 1999, when the researcher entered the room,”
students were working on sentence formation. Students were working in pairs to
complete sentences. The teacher walked around the room and gave stickers to students
who had correct sentences. Mrs. A then made the transition to a science lesson and began
with whole group instruction after explaining key words and concepts.” Mrs. A “passed
out a worksheet for the students to complete.” She then walked around the room and
monitored as the students worked. Finally, Mrs. A read a book about bats to the students
and asked questions and led a discussion as she read.

**Traditional Teacher's Variation of Instruction.** Unlike the team teachers, the
traditional teacher made use of learning centers. Mrs. A had developed learning centers
for individual and/or small group use in reading, math, and computer use. These centers
were used by students as they finished working with the teacher. On September 24, 1998,
students “were allowed to go to the reading center and read books in small groups.”

Mrs. A also planned for various types of small-group instruction. On September
29, 1998, “When I entered the room, Mrs. A’s students were reading silently. Students
had paired off and had found a place in the room to read. The teacher monitored students
from her desk.” Again on October 8, 1998, students were working on sentence formation.
Students had been placed in pairs to complete sentences while the "teacher walked around the room and gave stickers to students who had correct sentences." Then on November 24, 1998, as Mrs. A taught a reading lesson, she announced, "Here's what I want you to do, I'm going to put you in groups of four. I want you to read to each other. I'm going to come around to each group." The students assisted one another with words while the teacher helped various groups as they indicated a need for assistance. Again on February 16, 1999, Mrs. A "divided the students in groups of 4 and 5. The students were writing stories and sharing individual stories within the group." On March 9, 1999, Mrs. A was instructing the students on nouns. She divided the students into cooperative groups. She told each group to have a recorder to write down the words for the group. She grouped slower students with average students and also grouped were high and average students together. The researcher observed many of the at-risk students doing their part in the group, and the other students would help them in spelling words correctly.

Mrs. A also varied instruction by using the overhead projector and the two chalk boards in her room. On September 29, 1998; February 23, 1999; and March 16, 1999; Mrs. A was observed using overhead activities in math, handwriting, and language arts. On January 19, 1999, Mrs. A had rearranged the desks in the room and planned her writing lesson to use the new classroom configuration. "The students were sitting quietly as Mrs. A was giving directions for writing. 'I'm going to use two boards for your work today!' Mrs. A wrote the names of days of the week, months and holidays for the year on the board. Students then began their board work."
Transition Difficulties. Two differences observed between the team classroom and the one-teacher classroom were seen in student behavior during transition time from one class to another and student attention during instruction. Without another professional to help monitor students, Mrs. A had to pay closer attention to student behavior while she was teaching. On February 9, 1999, Mrs. A was ready to start social studies. She said, “Class, it is hard to have a discussion when you are talking and not listening to me.” Then, as she started the class she said to a student, “Get off of the floor.” However, when Mrs. A was able to walk around the room and talk to students individually or help them with a question, the class was much more orderly and responsive and stayed on task much better.

Instructional Leader. The teacher in the traditional classroom clearly was the instructional leader in her room. She organized and taught whole group, small group, and individual work. Although most of her teaching time was with the entire class, she did have frequent small group and cooperative learning activities. She also planned for giving individual students help when she called them to her desk one at a time while the rest of the class were actively engaged in an assignment. Although this teacher did talk with the second grade teachers in the team, with remedial and special education teachers on the school faculty who worked with identified at-risk students in her classroom, with the media specialist, and with parent volunteers, she was usually alone when she closed the classroom door and carried out her daily teaching duties with her 22 second graders. She taught all subjects to all students in her class. If instruction was differentiated for certain
students, she was the person who made the plans and carried them out.

Parents

Parents were not particularly cognizant of the specific roles that the three teachers played in their respective classrooms. They did recognize the team teachers and the traditional teacher as instructional specialists in the second grade. They also indicated that all three teachers fulfilled positively their helping roles for individual students. Parents of regular education students and at-risk students in the team classroom believed that the team teachers worked well together and often complemented each other's strengths in the classroom. These parents did not indicate an understanding of how the team teachers assigned responsibility for specific subjects or how they planned whole-group or small-group instruction. Yet they thought that their children were in good instructional settings. Parents of the children in the one-teacher classroom understood the role of their children's teacher for it was similar to their own classroom experiences in school. They realized that instruction could be provided better for all children in the classroom if they helped, and several volunteered to come into the room and serve as instructional helpers for the teacher.

Parents of regular education students and at-risk students were comfortable with their children's teachers in both classes. They were welcomed anytime they went to the classroom, and they said that they had satisfactory parent-teacher conferences. They also believed that communication lines were open and accessible with the teachers; however, several admitted that they "hadn't had a conference with one of them this year." A parent
of a regular education student in the team classroom said, "If I have a question or problem, they are there to answer it for me. Last year I didn’t feel that way." An at-risk students’ parent noted that “I was satisfied when I left the conference” with the team teachers. The parent of a regular education student in the one-teacher class pointed out that her “questions were answered by [the teacher]; she was able to discuss [my child’s] strengths and areas that she need to make improvements in.” The mother of an at-risk child in the traditional classroom noted that the teacher “was able to give me some helpful suggestions on how I can help [my child] at home.”

Administrator

The principal was satisfied that the three teachers were fulfilling their roles as instructional leaders in their respective classrooms. However, she stated that the team teachers were at an advantage because the teachers were “able to teach a subject they are the most accomplished in.” Also, she thought that the team class provided “an advantage for children, because they are getting the expertise and skill from the teacher while the other one can assist.” The principal was pleased that whole-group, small-group, and individual instruction were properly coordinated by the team teachers. She noted that the roles they took were “identified by the team” because “they devise what task they are going to use in order to accomplish those roles.” She added, “They are almost clearly defined. It’s kinda like an emerging leader. That [leadership] emerging is skill as their subjects evolve, and they . . . work with each other on working that out. I don’t say to them that this teacher has this role or task.” Speaking of the traditional classroom, the
principal noted that the least effective aspect of the instructional program was that students did not have the exposure to the additional professional personnel that they had in the team classroom.

The Teaming Experience

The teachers who taught in the team classroom provided excellent information on the practice of teaming. They noted that they had been the first team formed in their school and in their school system. Their principal had approached them five years before and asked them if they would be willing to team together. The principal had observed their teaching and noted that their styles were compatible. She also observed that their personalities and philosophies were much the same even though Mrs. B was seven years older than Mrs. S. Overcrowding was a problem in the school, and the two were teamed as a solution to the school’s space problem. Mrs. B remembered that the two had been promised that they would never have more than 36 students in the room. However, because of overcrowding in the school they had had 42 to 44 students in their classroom three of the five years they had teamed.

The two teachers had no direct experience in teaming and did not have a model to follow. Mrs. B had taught in a private school where she and another teacher taught together in the same classroom with a group of students. However, they divided the class in half and each taught her half of the students at the same time. She described the class as follows: “It was a first grade kinda open classroom, and I didn’t like it because of the noise level.” The two teachers read some basic materials on team teaching, and they sat
down and met extensively to plan, organize, and discuss what their expectations were for teaming. Also, Mrs. B knew a teacher in another school system who was teaming, and she gathered some information on how that team approached teaming.

The team teachers described the teaming relationship as being like a marriage. Mrs. S said, "It is a give-and-take relationship; it should be a 50-50 relationship; one partner can never seek to have control over the other either." Mrs. B added, "I don't feel like this is my classroom; it's definitely our classroom." The two thought that it was important to have compatible personalities. They also noted that they had similar teaching styles even though sometimes they used different techniques and approaches. The two teachers agreed that they had a mutual respect for each other. Mrs. S stated, "We have mutual respect for each other. I value her opinions; I have her as a teacher and as a friend; we plan together; we set goals together; we talk about the way we will instruct children; and we try to communicate constantly." Mrs. B pointed out that there had been one team in their school whose "personalities didn't mix and it didn't work out."

Interestingly, although the two shared many of the same likes and interests, they noted that they were also different in many ways as well. However, they were careful to point out that the "differences blended together to make [teaming] a more unique experience. Both were willing to try new ideas, and both saw their teaming as "a give and take relationship." Mrs. S also offered this advice: "My advice would be not to pair a weak teacher with a strong teacher. We had that here and it did not work because the one strong teacher is over worked tremendously because the teacher is tending to the needs of the weak teacher rather than to the needs of the students. These two teachers no longer
team teach. Make sure you have two strong teachers to pair together.” However, she did say that if one teaming partner is an excellent science teacher and the other is particularly effective in reading the two can learn from each other and the students benefit.

The teachers reported that they were able “to do more creative and innovative things because of the extra help and support we have for each other.” Mrs. S said, “With one person in the classroom it’s hard to try to get materials and supplies together, but with two teachers it makes that a little bit easier.” Mrs. S also stated, “We share our lesson plans. We don’t have as much downtime in this classroom because one teacher is always in preparation for what will be happening next. The moral support that we have I think makes this classroom a happier environment.” Mrs. S made an especially significant point when she said, “When one person seems maybe a little frustrated, the other teacher picks up the slack. That teacher kinda steps in . . ., and we have more confidence when we deal with the children and parents because there are two heads.”

The two teachers agree that communication is critical to their success. They note that they are constantly communicating with each other, and at times that communication is not actually speaking. Mrs. S said that as they were teaching, “A lot of times I will look to Mrs. B for a reaction. I will look to her for a certain look or body language to let me know how a lesson is going. If she sees a problem with a student, she may cue me with her eyes, not necessarily with her voice.” The two agree that in their five years together they have never had an argument or disagreement. They do sometimes have different ideas, but they “sit down and discuss the best approach.” Mrs. B said that the two have had no real conflicts, because they feel at ease with each other and can discuss anything
The two teachers also reported that they have high standards, want students to enjoy learning, and like active learning. As Mrs. B said, "There are always a lot of activities going on in our room. We both aren't afraid to try new ideas." Mrs. S added, "We have strategies that we maintain through one-to-one instruction and small group instruction as needed."

The two teachers iterated that they often made adjustments in their schedules "especially if one partner needs a little extra time in teaching a certain objective." Mrs. S said, "We always adjust our plans accordingly. I may give her 10 extra minutes in reading to finish her lesson for that day, or I may ask for an extra 10 minutes for that in math. When I'm running out of time." The two agreed that if things did not go well in teaching a class, then one might say, "Well, maybe next year we ought to try this without this. Neither one of us is offended by that. It is constructive criticism. We always take notes and jot things down in our plan books, things that worked well and things that didn't work so well."

The two teachers described team teaching in different ways. Mrs. S said, "I would have to say that team teaching is one of the most neat, exciting experiences that any teacher can have. It is a real opportunity to be able to share yourself with more students and to really learn from some one else in the education field." Mrs. B responded that team teaching was "sharing the teaching of a group of students; splitting all responsibilities; having a partner to share in all areas."
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The conclusion to this research study frames the interpretation of these data according to three questions. First, what are the main themes that emerged from this year-long study? Second, what are guidelines that should be followed and potential problems that should be avoided in developing collaborative team teaching partnerships? Third, what are the implications for practice and research in the future?

Emergent Themes

As the data collected in this year-long research project were analyzed, several themes emerged. These themes described some of the key components found in the research and led to several conclusions regarding the team-teaching and the one-teacher models. Eleven distinct themes emerged and are described in this section.

Positive Social Climate

Both of the second-grade classrooms revealed a positive social climate. Students in the team-teaching classroom and the one-teacher classroom knew that they had good self images and acknowledged that they were doing better academically this year than they had previously. Their social relationships were good. They got along well with each
other, and made friends easily. There was little difference in regular education and at-risk students in this regard. Teachers, parents, and the principal agreed with the students’ perceptions. All three teachers worked to create a positive, caring atmosphere. The researcher’s field notes revealed a great deal of laughter, praise, and displays of affection in the two classrooms. The team teachers did state that they had one advantage over the single teacher. When one teacher was “down” emotionally, the other teacher usually picked up the slack. The traditional teacher had no one to boost her spirits.

**Second Graders Accept Teaming**

Seven- or eight-year-old second graders who might be characterized as immature saw nothing special or unusual about having two teachers in a classroom. A two-teacher team was as natural as a traditional one-teacher model. The few students who noticed the difference in the number of teachers liked the idea of two teachers and even saw that it was easier for the team teachers to take turns teaching. There was no noticeable difference between regular education and at-risk students in the acceptance of two teachers in one room. However, a few exceptions were apparent. Some students did not adjust well to a team class, and the principal was careful not to place them in a teaming situation. Some students did relate better to one teacher in the team than to the other teacher. Team teachers found it harder to get as close to students in their large class than they did to students in their classes when they were the only teacher.
Giving and Receiving Help an Accepted Norm

Giving and receiving help was an accepted practice in both the team-teaching class and the one-teacher class. Regular education and at-risk students had similar attitudes about seeking help from each other or from their teachers. Teachers in both classes were normally available except when they were busy. Having two teachers in a classroom reduced the time it took a teacher to respond to a student. Giving help on the part of a teacher occurred more spontaneously in the team class because one teacher was almost always monitoring students by moving around the room. It was difficult at times for the single teacher to give help or even to realize a student needed help. To her credit, the traditional teacher often planned times to call students to her desk to give help or to ascertain understanding.

Team-Teachers Often More Confident

The team teachers in this study often appeared very confident about themselves in a number of areas pertaining to their teaching responsibilities. This confidence stemmed from their realization that two heads were better than one. The team was confident in dealing with children and their parents. They were confident in their teaching because, as one taught and the other helped with the lesson, immediate or delayed feedback was available from a peer. Both teachers noted that together they could deal better with gifted students at the top of the class and with slow, at-risk youngsters. The traditional teacher was often acutely aware of being alone, the only adult in her classroom.
Differences in Order and Discipline

Both the team-teacher class and the one-teacher class were usually orderly. Students were expected to raise their hands, wait to be called on, and not blurt out answers. All three teachers applied discipline quietly but effectively. Yet students in the one-teacher classroom were often more restless. Students in the team classroom usually sat quietly as classmates answered questions from the lead teacher while the second teacher monitored. Transition from lesson to lesson often appeared to be almost effortless in the team classroom, while more down-time was observed in the traditional classroom during the change from one lesson to another.

Parents Not Very Specific

Information that came from parents was very general in nature and usually lacked specificity. Parents confirmed that both classrooms had positive social climates, students had good self images, and were having a good year. They stated that their children were having many good learning experiences and teachers were able to meet their needs. A few parents realized that there were some small group activities, some hands-on projects, and some computer instruction. Yet parents did not realize, for example, how limited computer usage and instruction were in the team-teaching class. Students in the team had access to only one computer. Parents could rarely give a specific example in reporting on their children's classes.
Both Classes Had a Variety of Instructional Activities

A variety of instructional activities were planned for students in both the team and the one-teacher classes. There was ample evidence of hands-on activities, especially in science. There was activity based math with manipulatives of various types, multisensory experimental activities in social studies, whole group activities, pairing of students in two’s for reading, individual seat work, and the use of audio visual equipment to enhance presentations. The team-teachers planned and carried out more of these instructional activities over the course of the year. It was easier for them to plan the activities and to get materials ready for instruction, because while one teacher was teaching the whole group, the second teacher could plan and get materials ready and help with the transition to the new activity.

More Small-Group Work in the Team Classroom

There was more evidence of small group activity in the team classroom than there was in the one-teacher classroom. The team teachers arranged classroom seating so that students were seated in groups of four. The groups were rotated every six weeks. It was easy for the team teachers to shift from whole group work to small group work. The traditional teacher had her students seated in rows and the movement of desks for group work slowed the transition from whole group to small group work. The monitoring teacher in the team classroom helped facilitate group work and made that type of learning experience a truly effective one. Second graders in both classes handled grouping easily and considered cooperative learning a natural way to learn. There was no discernable
difference between regular education and at-risk children in handling small group activities.

**Team Students More Consistently Engaged in Learning**

As the year progressed it became evident that students in the team-teaching classroom were more consistently engaged in learning activities than the students in the traditional classroom. Two strong competent professionals working together were able to keep students busy working, paying attention, and actively occupied. One teacher served as the lead teacher, and the second teacher moved about the room monitoring students, helping students, discipling students, encouraging students, and keeping students intent about the business of learning. The single teacher, as competent as she was, could not duplicate the efforts of the team. The team teachers also planned together, communicated with parents together, and disciplined students together. They demonstrated that an effective team could develop a symbiotic relationship that delivered high quality instruction.

**Good Teaching Practices**

Many benefits in this team-teaching situation simply represent good teaching and thus might be found in general education classrooms planned for regular education students or in resource classrooms designed for at-risk students. For example, the practices of teacher caring and motivation; cooperative learning; creating a supportive, helping climate; “hands on” activities (particularly in mathematics and science); and
flexibility of grouping could take place in either setting, independent of a collaborative team teaching arrangement.

In both the team-teaching classroom and the one-teacher classroom in this study, many of these examples of good teaching practices were demonstrated. A good teacher or two good teachers can impact positively the intellectual, social, and emotional needs of regular and at-risk second grade students. Good teaching is good teaching, no matter where it occurs, and a great deal of good teaching occurred in these two rooms during the 1998-99 school year.

Benefits of Team Teaching for Students

Certain aspects of instruction appear to be strengthened by the collaborative team-teaching structure. The number of teachers, coupled with a flexible approach to grouping, permitted students in the team classroom to develop a sense that their instructional and personal needs could be attended to in a timely fashion. It also seemed that the individual needs of both regular education and at-risk students were addressed more directly. The two teachers were able to work more one-on-one with students who were having difficulty. Since at-risk students tend to have more difficulty learning new materials, their learning problems were identified earlier and remediation often began immediately. In contrast to the traditional one-teacher classroom, the support that teachers on the team provided to each other appeared to allow each of them to pay more individual attention to all students, regular education and at-risk alike.

Having two teachers in the classroom at one time reduced the time it took
teachers to respond to a student’s signal for assistance. Being able to plan together for teaching, being able to get materials ready while one team member was teaching, receiving the moral support of the second teacher, working with another professional who has a similar teaching philosophy, and having a second teacher in the classroom to give almost instant evaluative feedback to the teaching partner -- all helped make the team teachers attitude toward their work more positive and more proactive. As one of the team teachers said, “Having a partner you always try to present your best lesson. You don’t want to let the other teacher down.”

A number of effective pedagogical practices that were supported by collaborative team teaching were more difficult to use in the traditional single-teacher classroom. Eight such practices were identified: (1) flexible groups for work on specific skills, (2) hands-on mathematics and science activities, (3) cooperative learning with emphasis on helping, (4) multiple teacher perspectives, (5) establishing strong classroom community, (6) teachers sharing instructional roles and responsibilities, (7) cohesive instructional program for at-risk students, and (8) conferencing with parents as a team.

In the terms of the affective, social side of schooling, the team structure seemed to provide at-risk students with stability. These students had numerous opportunities for group belonging. The way individual help from the monitoring teacher was readily available to regular education and at-risk students alike kept at-risk students from feeling singled out, and the creation of a classroom community occurred naturally. Communities that exist solely within resource or general education classrooms often include a limited range of students, and, thus necessarily limit the range of persons with whom at-risk
students may learn to feel comfortable. One of the benefits of team teaching is overcoming structural barriers that limit interaction of higher-and lower-achieving students, both socially and academically.

Communication among teachers regarding the relationship between small-group lessons and large-group activities is less cumbersome when teachers are part of the same team. Teaming makes it more likely that teachers will coordinate instruction. Not only did the team teachers regularly discuss what and how they were teaching, they also regularly discussed students, thus developing a more complete picture of an individual student’s progress, strengths, and weaknesses.

Kohn (1996) described a learner-centered classroom as having several characteristics: chairs grouped to facilitate interactions, comfortable areas for working, evidence of student collaboration, frequent hum of activity and ideas being exchanged, and the teacher typically working with students. A classroom to be concerned about would have different characteristics: desks in rows and chairs all facing forward, the teacher’s voice of the loudest or most heard, and the teacher typically front and center. The team-teaching classroom in this study more frequently exhibited the learner-centered climate in positive ways that were readily observed. Furniture, sounds, location of teachers, class discussion--all were good signs of learner-centered instruction.

Lewis, Schaps, and Watson (1996) wrote about Hazelwood School in Louisville, Kentucky, where The Child Development Project has shown that when students care about one another and are motivated by important, challenging work, they are more apt to care about learning. These researchers noted that schools become “caring communities of
learners” if “warm, supportive, stable relationships” are developed (p. 17). Both classrooms in this study developed into “caring communities of learners” because of the emphasis placed on such relationships by both the team teachers and the traditional teacher.

**Guidelines to Effective Teaming**

A number of good practices to follow in setting up a new team-teaching partnership were evident in this study. An administrator should develop a philosophy of team teaching jointly with the teachers who will be teaming. The teachers who are selected to form a team should be compatible in teaching styles and philosophies, should have personalities that are complementary; and should want to be a part of the team experience. The physical plant should be surveyed carefully to make sure that space is available that is conducive to a team classroom. Appropriate staff development including an opportunity to visit other team classrooms should be arranged. Professional materials on teaming should be obtained, and a professional library on teaming should be developed. Proper funding for the special items needed -- furniture, materials and supplies, books, maps, and computers -- should be obtained. A decision on the number of students to be placed in the class should be made and adhered to so that the teaching situation is a good one for the students and the teachers. Good communication must take place within the school about the teaming situation so that other teachers understand the purpose of moving away from a traditional one-teacher class. The principal also must communicate fully with parents of students to be placed in the team classroom to ensure their
understanding and support. Care should be taken by the principal in selecting students to be placed in the class so that potential problems can be avoided. Central office staff, including the superintendent and instructional supervisory specialists, need to be informed of the move and their support should be obtained. The principal must give direct support and help as well as evaluative feedback to the team teachers.

Several potential obstacles to an effective team-teaching situation were also noted. A principal needs to exercise great a deal of care in developing a team of two teachers who are compatible and can work well together. If the team is established partly or totally because of space problems in the school, which is often the case and was a factor in the school in this study, then the number of students in the classroom and the square footage of the classroom can be a critical factor. If two classes of 20 students are placed in one room with two teachers, then the classroom must be larger than a regular classroom. Forty students or more together can be a problem if special care and planning are not exercised. The team teachers also reported that it was harder for them to develop close relationships with so many students.

In this school the administration (apparently central office) had made the decision to place one computer per classroom for student use. The traditional classroom had one computer for 22 students. The team classroom had one computer for 42 students. Effective schedules of computer time was a problem for the team teachers. Equity in the distribution of learning tools is important. Also, the team teachers need space and furniture so that they can have flexibility in arranging students in the classroom and the potential to move them quickly into small groups.
Implications for Future Practice and Research

The limitations of this study are evident: it illustrates only a single instance of collaborative team-teaching and traditional one-teacher instruction at only one grade level. Still, few such descriptions exist to guide thinking about the practice of team teaching and future research on its effectiveness.

In terms of practice, one important issue is that teachers’ roles and skills change slowly. When general education teachers embark on a teaming structure, it is not necessary that they start out on equal footing regarding either curriculum or attention to individual differences as long as the teachers involved are flexible and capable of changing. Next, teaming does not mean less work per teacher; if anything, collaboration and coordination require more work. In this study the teachers had begun to address curricular issues and innovation. Although the students interviewed saw the teachers’ ready availability as valuable, without sustained attention to curricular improvement and innovation, team teaching could be relied on inappropriately as a means of making existing, narrow approaches to curriculum and instruction more palatable for students. The promise of teaming ought to be its capacity to help teachers transform the curriculum, not simply to be more efficient with the existing one.

Several directions for future research on team teaching also emerged from this study. Because this study is limited to second grade, whether students, teachers, and parents at different grades would have similar views is an important issue to explore. An additional area to study is the effect of teams that do not use cooperative learning and a norm of mutual assistance. To what extent does teaming increase the likelihood that
students will seek help and how might this relate to their feelings of academic success?

Finally, and central to this study, which students do or do not succeed in team-teaching situations, both socially and academically? The classrooms described here illustrate that it is possible for the teacher to create educational environments that foster feelings of success for regular education and at-risk students alike. Based on these results, there is reason to move forward with team-teaching initiatives as further research is conducted. Certainly, team teaching shows promise in helping teachers meet the needs of all types of students including those who in the past have found it difficult to succeed in school. Team teaching appears to offer an important alternative to the traditional single-teacher classroom for both regular education and identified at-risk students.
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APPENDIX A

Title 1 Referral Forms
Directions For Completing
Student Needs Assessment And Referral

List all students in your classroom. Please provide the student's full legal name. (No nicknames please)

Title 1 Reading

PLEASE PLACE YOUR RESPONSES (A, B, C, D, E) ON THE READING SECTION OF THE STUDENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND REFERRAL FORM.

1. Is the student functioning below his/her appropriate basal level in reading?
   A) Yes  B) No

2. Would this student benefit from Title 1 Reading services?
   A) Yes  B) No

* If you answer NO to both questions #1 and #2, DO NOT answer questions #3 and #4 in the reading section or any of the questions under supportive data.

3. What is the student’s projected final grade average in reading?

   Grades K-2
   Satisfactory: Needs Improvement:
   A) A average  B) Good  C) Fair  D) Poor  E) Very Poor

   Grades 3 & UP
   A) A average  B) B average  C) C average  D) D average  E) E average

4. Did the student pass the Literacy Predictor Test? (Fourth grade students only)
   A) yes  B) No

TITLE 1 MATH

PLEASE PLACE YOUR RESPONSES (A, B, C, D, E) ON THE MATH SECTION OF THE STUDENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND REFERRAL FORM.

5. Is the student functioning below his/her appropriate basal level in math?
   A) Yes  B) No

6. Would this student benefit from Title 1 Math services?
   A) Yes  B) No

* If you answer No to both questions #5 and #6, DO NOT answer question #7 in the math section of any of the questions under supportive data.
section of any of the questions under supportive data.

7. What is the student’s projected final grade average in math?

**Grade K-2**

Satisfactory: Needs Improvement:
A) Excellent B) Good C) Fair D) Poor E) Very Poor

**Grades 3 & Up**

A) Excellent B) Good C) Fair D) Poor E) Very Poor

**TITLE 1 SUPPORTIVE DATA**

PLEASE PLACE YOUR RESPONSES (A, B, C, D, E) ON THE SUPPORTIVE DATA SECTION OF THE STUDENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND REFERRAL FORM.

8. How many days has the student been absent from school this year?
A) 0-5 B) 6-10 C) Over 10 days

9. To what extent does the parent(s) attend meetings, communicate with the school, etc?
A) Most of the time B) Some of the time C) None of the time

10. To what extent does the student interact with students, take the initiative and demonstrate leadership qualities?
A) Most of the time B) Some of the time C) None of the time

11. To what extent does the student complete class and homework assignments?
A) Most of the time B) Some of the time C) None of the time

12. Which represents the student’s attitude toward school and assignments most accurately?
A) Positive B) Somewhat negative C) Very negative

13. What is the student’s attention span when working independently to complete assigned tasks relative to his/her age?
A) Average B) Below average C) Very limited

PLEASE REMEMBER TO COMPLETE THE INFORMATION AT THE BOTTOM OF EACH PAGE AND SIGN.
# Tazewell County Title I Program Student Needs Assessment and Referral

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Name (Last Name First)</th>
<th>READING</th>
<th>MATH</th>
<th>SUPPORTIVE DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Benefit</td>
<td>6. Benefit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Final Grade Average</td>
<td>7. Final Grade Average</td>
<td>10. Personal/Social Adjust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Sub-Total</td>
<td>Math Sub-Total</td>
<td>12. Attitude</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLEASE SEE INSTRUCTION SHEET FOR EXPLANATION**

**Classroom Teacher's Signature**

**Date**

**Principal's Signature**
APPENDIX B

Teacher Interview Guides
Initial Interview Guide For Team Teacher

1. Why did you become part of a team-teaching endeavor?

2. How long have you been team teaching?

3. What did you do to learn about team teaching before you started?

4. What are some of the most effective things you see coming out of your teaming?

5. What are some of the least effective things you see coming out of your teaming?

6. How do you and your partner organize for planning instruction, discipline, and communication with parents?

7. How do you evaluate your team situation?

8. Tell me about partner compatibility.

9. What advice would you give to someone wanting to team teach with another teacher?

10. What are some of the obstacles you have encountered as a team?

11. In what ways have you had administrative support in your teaming situation?

12. In what ways has your teaming benefitted students?

13. In what ways has your teaming hindered students?
Initial Interview Guide For The Traditional One-Teacher

1. Why did you want to become a teacher?

2. How long have you been teaching?

3. What was your education and preparation to becoming a teacher?

4. What are the most effective things you see coming out of your teaching?

5. What are some of the least effective things you see coming out of your teaching?

6. How do you organize for planning instruction, discipline, and communication with parents?

7. How do you evaluate your teaching?

8. Have you ever thought you would like to team teach?

9. What are some of the obstacles you have encountered as a teacher?

10. In what ways have you had administrative support in your teaching situation?

11. In what ways has your teaching benefitted students?

12. In what ways has your teaching hindered students?
Second Team Interview Guide

1. Why did you think students in a team might be more confident about themselves and their work?

2. Do you find students in a team to be more creative, why or why not?

3. Tell me about your planning time with the other team member?

4. Why do you think students in a team are eager to learn?

5. Do you think students in a team are happier? If yes, what are some examples?

6. Do you feel your students are better writers when they leave the team? Why or why not?

7. What things do you do to make sure that you are meeting the needs of all students?

8. What do you do to make sure you don’t lose the closeness with the students?

9. How is the one-teacher involved in the planning of the second grade curriculum?

10. What do you do to make sure that the at-risk students are being given extra attention?

11. What are the benefits for at-risk students in a team?

12. How are at-risk students hindered in a team?

13. What do you do to help students that aren’t grasping the material?
Second One-Teacher Interview Guide

1. How are you meeting the needs of individual students in your class?

2. In what ways do you find your students to be creative?

3. Tell me how you and the other second-grade teachers plan for the second grade.

4. Why do you think students in your class are eager to learn?

5. How much time do your students spend on creative writing?

6. Do you feel your students are better writers when they leave your classroom, why or why not?

7. What things do you do to make sure that you are meeting individual needs of students?

8. What do you do to make sure that you don’t lose the closeness with the students?

9. How are you able to do one-on-one with your students?

10. What do you do to make sure that the at-risk students are being given extra attention?
Third Team Interview Guide

1. How much do the two of you spend simultaneously involved with the students?
2. In what ways do you structure that time?
3. What kinds of activities happen during this time? (referring to number 2)
4. How have you adjusted the physical environment of the classroom for the team situation?
5. How do you plan your lessons?
6. Is there a scheduled time that you plan together?
7. How had planning changed as the year has progressed?
8. How and when do you talk?
9. Is there another way you communicate besides talk?
10. Have there been conflicts within the team? If so, how did you resolve them?
11. What have you discovered about each other’s teaching philosophies?
12. What adjustments or compromises have you had to make being in a team?
13. How has team teaching affected the way you view the role as an educator?
14. How are you able to do one-on-one with students?
15. What is team teaching to you?
Third One-Teacher Interview Guide

1. How much time do you spend planning?

2. Do you find yourself having to reteach material that was taught earlier?

3. When do you and the other second-grade teachers get together to discuss curriculum or just school in general?

4. What adjustments have you made for the at-risk students this year?

5. How does your style of teaching help students?

6. How does your style of teaching hinder students?

7. Do you consider yourself to be a structured teacher? If so how would the students pick up on this? (examples)

8. How do you handle down time when changing lessons?

9. Do you feel that you are often left out on decision making in your grade?

10. How has your students being on another floor of the building affected their peer relations with the other second-grade students?
Fourth Team Interview Guide  
Roles and Tasks  

1. Are you and your team member conscious of the instructional leadership role you play as you teach each day? Describe this role. (What are some examples that demonstrate your role?)

2. How do you organize for small group work? (Roles the two of you play in small group work.)

3. How do you organize teaching the whole group? (roles each play)

4. How do you organize for a hands-on activity? (roles each play)

5. How do you plan for conferences with parents? (roles each play)

6. How do you plan for both regular and at-risk students in the same classroom? How do you evaluate how regular and at-risk students achieved in the lesson?

7. How do you handle (plan for) the routine tasks in your classroom?
   a. attendance
   b. lunch count
   c. ice cream
   d. duplication
   e. discipline
   f. getting ready for P.E., outside play, library
   g. getting ready for guidance, music, and art
   h. report cards
   i. eating lunch
   j. grades, grade book
   k. lesson plans

8. How many parent conferences have you had this year that you initiated? Have you had any conferences with parents of at-risk students?

9. Have parents initiated conferences this year?

10. What types of communication have you had with parents this year?
Fourth One-Teacher Interview Guide
Roles and Tasks

1. Are you conscious of the instructional leadership role you play as you teach each day?
   Describe this role. (What are some examples that demonstrate your role?)

2. How do you organize for small group work?

3. How do you organize teaching the whole group?

4. How do you plan for a hands-on activity?

5. How do you plan for conferences with parents?

6. How do you plan for both regular and at-risk students in the same classroom? How do you evaluate how regular and at-risk students achieved in the lesson?

7. How do you handle (plan for) routine tasks in your classroom?
   a. attendance
   b. lunch count
   c. ice cream
   d. duplication of materials
   e. discipline
   f. getting ready for P.E., outside play, library
   g. getting ready for guidance, music, and art
   h. report cards
   i. eating lunch
   j. grades, grade book
   k. lesson plans

8. How many parent conferences have you had this year that you initiated? Have you had any conferences with parents of at-risk students?

9. Have parents initiated conferences this year?

10. What types of communications have you had with parents this year?
APPENDIX C

Student Interview Guides
Student Interview Guide
Questions That Deal With Social Climate
Students in Team and One-Teacher Classrooms

1. Tell me what you like about your classroom this year? What don’t you like about your classroom this year?

2. What is different about your class this year than last year?
   2a. Which do you like better, this year or last year?
   2b. Why?

3. Does your teacher(s) seem to like you?

4. Does your teacher(s) want you to ask questions?

5. Do you like asking your teacher for help?

6. How do you feel about yourself?

7. Do you have many friends in your classroom?

8. What do you like to do with your friends?

9. Does anyone in your classroom really “bug” you?

10. Do you like to come to school each day? Why or why not?

11. Have you made any new friends this year in your classroom?
   11a. Tell me about those new friends.
   11b. Are you still friends with some of the same kids you were friends with last year?
   11c. How do you know you are still friends those kids from last year?

12. Do you play with any of your classmates after school?
1. Let's say you were having problems with your classroom lessons and needed extra help. Would you rather meet in a small group with your teacher(s) outside of the classroom—like in the hall, a small room, or in a small group inside the classroom? Why or why not?

2. Do you like to work in groups? Why or why not?

3. Do you like to work by yourself? Why or why not?

4. Do you have a hard time understanding directions? Why or why not?

5. Do you think your teacher(s) explains things so you can understand the lessons?

6. Does your teacher(s) ask you to answer many questions?

7. Will your teacher(s) come to your desk to help you?

8. Can you go to your teacher's desk for help?

9. Can you get help from any of your classmates? What kind of help can you get from your classmates?

10. What words would you use to describe school this year?

11. What words would you use to describe your class this year?

12. What words would you use to describe your teacher?

13. How do you think you are doing in school this year?

   13a. Do you think you are doing better than last year?

   13b. How do you know you are doing better than last year?
Dear Parents,

I am Darrell Thompson, a fourth grade teacher at Tazewell Elementary School. I am also a student in the graduate program at East Tennessee State University. I am in the process of writing my dissertation to fulfill requirements for my doctoral degree in educational leadership.

My dissertation will be an in depth study of a team teaching classroom and a more traditional one-teacher classroom. As you probably know North Tazewell Elementary School has one of the best team teaching programs in Southwest Virginia. Woodrow Mullins, superintendent of Tazewell County Schools; Jean Nicholson, principal of North Tazewell School; and the three second grade teachers at North Tazewell Elementary School have given me permission to observe instruction in the second grade classrooms during the 1998-99 school year.

I am also conducting a number of interviews as a part of my research. I shall be interviewing the principal and the second grade teachers at North Tazewell Elementary School. I shall also need to interview several second grade students about what they feel about school and what they are learning this year.

Therefore, I am asking permission to interview your son/daughter. The interview will be held in the school in a place and at a time approved by the principal and the teachers. The interviews will last from fifteen to thirty minutes. To ensure accuracy, I shall tape all interviews. All interviews will be confidential.

Attached to this letter of explanation is a permission form which I am asking you to sign and return to your child’s teacher. I am enclosing a copy of possible interview questions. If you have any questions about this interview process, please call me. My home number is 988-6245 and my work number is 988-4441.

Thank you for your help and cooperation.

Sincerely,
APPENDIX E

Parent Permission Form For Student Interview
Parent Permission For Student Interview

Please place a check by one of the following statements and return this form to your child’s teacher.

___________ I agree to allow Darrell Thompson to interview my child as part of his research work at North Tazewell Elementary School.

___________ I do not agree to allow Darrell Thompson to interview my child as part of his research work at North Tazewell Elementary School.

___________________________________________________________________________
student’s name

___________________________________________________________________________
signature of student

___________________________________________________________________________
signature of parent

___________________________________________________________________________
date
Parent Interview Guide

1. What has your child told you about his/her classroom this year?

2. How does your child feel about him/herself?

3. What words does your child use to describe school this year?

4. Do you feel your child is making academic progress this year? Can you give specifics as to successes or failures academically this year?

5. Does your child enjoy his/her class and teacher(s) this year? Why or why not?

6. Do you feel your child is receiving individual help from the teacher(s) this year? Can you give examples of individual help your child has received this year?

7. What is the teacher(s) doing in the classroom that is helping your child to learn? Can you give specific examples of the teacher helping your child to learn?

8. Does your child get up easily and seem to want to go to school each day?

7. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about your child?
APPENDIX G

Administrator Interview Guides
Administrator Interview Guide

1. Why have you established team-teaching pairs in this school in the second grade?

2. How long have you had team teaching in the second grade?

3. What do you do to prepare teachers to team teach?

4. What do you do to prepare students and parents for assignments to a team-teaching classroom?

5. How do you evaluate the team situation?

6. In comparison how do you evaluate the one-teacher classroom?

7. What are some of the most effective things you see coming out of the team teaching in the second grade? What are some of the least effective things you see coming out of the team teaching in the second grade?

8. What are some of the most effective things you see coming out of the one-teacher classroom in the second grade? What are some of the least effective things you see coming out of the one-teacher classroom in second grade?
Administrative Interview Guide
Questions That Deal With The Social Climate, Instructional Effects And The Roles and Tasks Of The Team-Teachers And The One-Teacher

1. How would you describe the social climate in the team-teaching classroom in the second grade?

2. How would you describe the social climate in the one-teacher classroom in the second grade?

3. How would you compare the students social climate in the team and the one-teacher classrooms?

4. How would you describe the instructional effects in the team-teaching classroom in the second grade?

5. How would you describe the instructional effects in the one-teacher classroom?

6. How would you determine the roles and tasks of the teachers in the team-teaching classroom in the second grade?

7. How would you determine the roles and tasks of the teachers in the one-teacher classroom in the second grade?

8. What are some of the strengths of the team in the second grade?

9. What are some of the strengths of the one-teacher in the second grade?

10. As you prepare for each year’s assignment do you allow parents input into placement into a team classroom?

11. What do you look for in a student when you are placing them in a team-teaching or one-teacher classroom?
APPENDIX H

School System Permission Form
School System Permission Form

Principal Investigator: Darrell Thompson
Title of Project: A Quality Study of a Team Teaching Classroom and a Traditional One-Teacher Classroom in an Elementary School Setting.

Please place a check by one of the following statements and return this form in the self-addressed, stamped envelope.

___________ I agree to allow Darrell Thompson to contact three teachers at North Tazewell Elementary School for the purpose of holding taped interview sessions. I understand that questions asked during these interviews will focus on their teaching of students in a team teaching and traditional classroom setting.

___________ I do not agree to allow Darrell Thompson to contact three teachers at North Tazewell Elementary School for the purpose of holding taped interview session. I understand that questions asked during these interviews will focus on their teaching of students in a team teaching and traditional classroom setting.

__________________________________________  __________________________
signature of superintendent                        date
APPENDIX I

Informed Consent Form
East Tennessee State University  
College of Education  
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Principal Investigator: Darrell Thompson

Title of Project: A Qualitative Study of a Team Teaching and a Traditional One-Teacher Classroom in and Elementary School Setting

The purpose of this study is to compare a traditional one-teacher classroom to a classroom taught by a two teacher team. The researcher will be evaluating the social climate of the classroom, the instructional effects of the two types of classrooms, and the distribution of teachers roles and tasks in both settings. Each participant will be interviewed about these topics.

Maximum time for interviews for students will be one half hour. Maximum time for interviews for parents, teachers, and administrators will be one hour. You do not have to answer any questions that make you feel uncomfortable. You may make any statements you want to use in order to answer the question. Your participation is valuable and you may stop an interview at any time.

All interviews will be audio taped and transcribed. All interview transcripts will be kept strictly confidential. No reference to individuals will be revealed at any point during the study or in the final report.

I understand the process to be used in this study. I also understand that participation in this study is strictly voluntary and that I may withdraw at any time by notifying Darrell Thompson.

I understand that if there are any questions or research related problems at any time during this study, I may call Darrell Thompson at 988-6245 or Dr. Russell Mays (dissertation chair) at (423) 439-8567. I consent to participate in this study.

__________________________  _______________________
date  signature of parent

__________________________  _______________________
date  signature of investigator
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APPENDIX J

Auditor's Report
Auditor’s Report

Early in the planning stages of his dissertation, Darrell Thompson asked me to serve as auditor for his qualitative study. Initial discussions centered on topics such as study design, potential pitfalls, the interview process, the possibility of personal bias, and collection and management of data. Discussions occurred through both formal meetings and informal contacts such as telephone conversations.

As the research project progressed, the areas of discussion moved to initial findings access to participants. The researcher’s thoughts and discoveries about his use of the qualitative process. The researcher exhibited a conscientious and reflective demeanor throughout the process.

Mr. Thompson shared chapters as completed giving me the chance to read the study at different phases as well as at completion. I made suggestions for clarification and asked questions in order to determine how the researcher reached stated conclusions. I looked for examples of possible investigator bias as well as “leaps in logic.” I found Mr. Thompson to be aware of possible bias resulting from his prior professional relationship with the three teachers who participated in the study and I know that this issue was considered full throughout the study. Mr. Thompson was well-organized, focused, and meticulous in his approach and included supporting evidence for conclusions reached. Discussions with the researcher about this study and the involved participants led me to believe that the research was conducted ethically with no breech of confidentiality.

Serving as an auditor for this dissertation was an honor. I found the topic to be timely and interesting. The researcher was hardworking, dedicated, professional, and the completed study can add to the professional literature on team teaching.

Marvin E. Winters, Ed. D.
Division Superintendent
Smyth County, Virginia, Public Schools
APPENDIX K

List of NUD-IST Nodes
NUD-IST Nodes

Below is a list of categories used by the researcher to develop analytic data organization for this study. Interviews were transcribed and indexed to the NUD-IST program. Specific statements were indexed by means of assigning them to "nodes" by the researcher. The following nodes were used and a brief description of each is listed in the column to the right.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytic Category</th>
<th>Analytic Sub-Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students’ Perception of Social Climate in the Team-Teaching Classroom</strong></td>
<td>➔self image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔about school this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔what don’t you like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔what is different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔which do you like better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔does your teacher like you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔does your teacher ask you questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔asking questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔does your teacher want you to ask questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔friends in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔coming to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students’ Perception of Instructional Effects in the Team-Teaching Classroom</strong></td>
<td>➔problems with the lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔working in groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔working alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔understanding directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔teacher explanations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔asking teacher for help/teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔comes to desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔teacher asking questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔help from classmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔words to describe school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔words to describe class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Analytic Category

### Analytic Sub-Categories

- words to describe teacher
- doing in school this year
- other comments

### Students' Perception of Social Climate in the One-Teacher Classroom

- self image
- about school this year
- what don’t you like
- what is different
- which is better
- does your teacher like you
- does your teacher ask you questions
- asking questions
- does your teacher want you to ask questions
- friends in the classroom
- friends
- coming to school

### Students' Perceptions of Instructional Effects in the One-Teacher Classroom

- problems with the lesson
- working in groups
- working alone
- understanding directions
- teacher explanations
- asking teacher for help/teacher come to desk
- teacher asking questions
- help from classmates
- words to describe school
- words to describe class
- words to describe teacher
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Analytic Category

Analytic Sub-Categories

- doing in school this year
- other comments

The Teaming Experience

- team teaching endeavor
- what is teaming
- learning about team teaching
- partner compatibility
- advice on teaming
- obstacles on teaming
- role as an educator

Team-Teachers’ Perception of Roles and Tasks

- administrative support
- involving one-teacher
- teaming partner
  - organize/instruction
- teaming and planning
- team communication
- meeting the needs in teaming
- creativity and teaming
- students benefits from teaming
- students hindered from teaming
- students confident
- asking students questions
- students self esteem in teaming
- meeting student needs in teaming
- students learning in teaming
- needs of students
- closeness with students
- simultaneously with students
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytic Category</th>
<th>Analytic Sub-Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-physical environment of the classroom</td>
<td>-becoming a teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-organizing for small group work</td>
<td>-effective things coming out of your teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-organizing for whole group</td>
<td>-least effective things coming out of your teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-hands on activity</td>
<td>-planning, organizing, communicating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-routine tasks</td>
<td>-obstacles in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-parent conferences</td>
<td>-administrative support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-parent communication</td>
<td>-teaching benefitted students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-effective results in teaming</td>
<td>-teaching hindered students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-non effective results in teaming</td>
<td>-meeting the needs of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-evaluation of teaming</td>
<td>-creativity of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-becoming a teacher</td>
<td>-planning in second grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-effective things coming out of your teaching</td>
<td>-students eager to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-least effective things coming out of your teaching</td>
<td>-closeness with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-planning, organizing, communicating</td>
<td>-teaching styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-obstacles in teaching</td>
<td>-down time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-administrative support</td>
<td>-leadership role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-teaching benefitted students</td>
<td>-organizing for small group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-teaching hindered students</td>
<td>-organizing for whole group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-meeting the needs of students</td>
<td>-parent conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-creativity of students</td>
<td>-communication with parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-planning in second grade</td>
<td>-routine tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-students eager to learn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-closeness with students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-teaching styles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-down time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-leadership role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-organizing for small group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-organizing for whole group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-parent conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-communication with parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-routine tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Traditional Teacher's Perceptions
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## Analytic Category

### Parents of Students in Team-Teaching Classroom

- students classroom this year
- students image of self
- words to describe school
- academic progress
- student enjoy school
- student enjoy teacher
- individual help from teachers
- conference with teachers
- teachers and learning
- coming to school each day
- benefitted by being in a one-teacher classroom
- summing up second grade

### Parents of Students in the One-Teacher Classroom

- students classroom this year
- students image of self
- words to describe school
- academic progress
- student enjoy school
- student enjoy teacher
- individual help from teacher
- conference with teacher
- teacher and learning
- coming to school each day
- benefitted by being in a team
- teaching classroom
- summing up second grade
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytic Category</th>
<th>Analytic Sub-Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡establishing teams in the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡preparing teacher to team teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡preparing students and parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡team teachers evaluating teaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡evaluating one-teacher class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡effective things coming out of the teaming in second grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡least effective things coming out of the teaming in second grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡effective things coming out of the one-teacher in second grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡least effective things coming out of the one-teacher in second grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡teaming benefitted students in second grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡ways teaming has not benefitted students in second grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡one-teacher benefitted students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡one-teacher not benefitted students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡social climate in team-teaching classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡social climate in the one-teacher classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡comparing social climate in team and one-teacher classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡instructional effects in the team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡instructional effects in the one-teacher classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡roles and tasks in the team-teaching classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡roles and tasks in the one-teacher classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡full evaluation of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡opinions about team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡meeting the needs of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡strength of one-teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡weaknesses of one-teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡strength of team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡weaknesses of team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡parent concerns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analytic Category

Social Climate From Student Interviews

- perception of self and school
- how to get help from teacher
- social relationships
- personality of class
- students engaged in learning
- rules of classroom
- classroom conducive for learning
- students’ praise

Instructional Effects From Student Interviews

- variety of instructional activities
- hands-on projects
- multi sensory activities
- computer work
- cooperative learning
- traditional textbook
- flexibility in grouping students
- small group work
- whole group work
- special assistance individually
- students kept on task
- students work independently
- students encouraged to use higher level thinking skills
- students comfortable to ask questions
- students understand classroom
- organizational procedures
- students understand objectives each day
- students prepared for class each day
- monitoring students
- seating of students
- directions by teacher
- asking questions by teacher
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytic Category</th>
<th>Analytic Sub-Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roles and Tasks by Teachers in Both Classrooms</td>
<td>degree instruction coordinated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clearly identifiable instructional leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organizing for small group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teaching whole group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>helping individual students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coordinating of work and instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teachers working together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teachers plan together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teacher assigning responsibility for specific subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teacher asking students to take on leadership roles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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