1969

A Survey of the Effectiveness of the Various Sizes of Elementary School Teaching Teams in the Puget Sound Area

Norman L. Standley
Central Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd

Part of the Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons, Educational Methods Commons, and the Elementary Education and Teaching Commons

A SURVEY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE VARIOUS SIZES OF

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHING TEAMS IN THE

PUGET SOUND AREA

A Thesis

Presented to

the Graduate Faculty

Central Washington State College

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Education

---

by

Norman L. Standley

April, 1969

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

_____

William G. Gaskell, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

_____

Lloyd M. Gabriel

_____

Donald G. Goetschius

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his thanks to Dr. William Gaskell, committee chairman; Dr. Donald Goetschius and Dr. Lloyd Gabriel, committee members; who so generously contributed their time and thoughts to this study.

Acknowledgement is extended to the members of the teaching teams for their assistance in making this study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

When considering what is involved in presenting an effective instructional program to one's pupils, attention needs to be focused upon two assumptions: (1) The effective teacher knows his learners. (2) The effective teacher knows the content of the subject areas in which he teaches, and the processes basic to it (11:152). Self-contained classrooms lend themselves quite well to the first assumption, but often are weak in terms of the second assumption. Departmentalization is strong in the area of assumption number two, but not in the area of the first assumption (11:152). Realization of the need for organizational structure which would encompass both of the above assumptions led to one of the most interesting and potentially significant developments in American education in recent years (1:71). Team teaching programs have sprung up throughout the United States with varying degrees of success. What we, as educators, need to do now is start forming some generalizations about successful team teaching programs, so that future programs can be established using these generalizations as guidelines. This thesis will investigate one of the aspects of evaluating team teaching programs.

I. THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study is to discover and analyze the various sizes of teaching teams, on the elementary school level, to determine their relative effectiveness with respect to the following, as perceived by teachers:

1. What team size lends itself to the greatest number of individual teacher competencies?

2. What team size contributes the most to the professional growth of teachers?

3. What team size offers the most to the student's growth and development?

Along with the above thoughts, the writer would like to submit the following hypotheses:

1. As the size of a teaching team approaches a total membership of six professional instructors, correspondingly, a growth will occur in the following areas:

   a. Total number of teacher competencies within the team

   b. Professional growth of the individual team members

   c. Student growth and development

2. The effectiveness of a team is in direct relationship to:

   a. The method by which the team was formed (16:72)

   b. The interaction within the team (16:72)

   c. The team's awareness of behavioral objectives for students (6:27)

   d. The assignment of roles according to the skills of each team member (16:69-70)

II.   THE NEED FOR THE STUDY

Since the late 1950's when the term "team teaching" was first used to describe a specific organizational struc- ture (1:71), several variations of the original and many new forms have been tried with varying degrees of success. Although each elementary school is unique in its own right and requires an instructional program tailored to fit its needs, perhaps the number of failures can be limited if this survey could expose some guidelines for consideration by educators when they set about the task of improving the instructional program.

III.   METHOD OF RESEARCH

With the use of a recent survey and personal contacts, Dr. William Gaskell established a list of elementary school teaching teams in the Puget Sound Area. From this list the writer, with the approval of his thesis committee members, selected the population for the study. Then in February of 1969, the survey questionnaires were sent to all the members of the various teams selected to be a part of the study.

IV.   LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was limited to elementary school teaching teams in the Puget Sound area. From the list of teaching

teams provided by Dr. Gaskell, a population which is repre-
sentative of the Puget Sound area was selected, including
both geographic and population factors. Also, the study of
team effectiveness was limited in the sense that the variables
being investigated included only:

1. Size of teaching team

2. The interaction within the team

3. The team's awareness of, and planning for attain-
   ment of, behavioral objectives

V. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Team teaching. A formal type of cooperative staff
organization in which a group of teachers accepts the respon-
sibility for planning, carrying out, and evaluating an
educational program, or some major portion of a program, for
an aggregate of pupils (1:83).

Size. Indicating numbers, such as three, four, five,
etc.

Effectiveness. Producing a decided, decisive, or
desired effect.

Teacher competency. Particular skills and/or knowledge
resulting from experience and professional preparation.

Professional Growth. Refers to a teacher's progress in the areas of subject matter knowledge and/or instructional methodology.

Student growth and development. Refers to a student's progress in one, or more, of the following areas:

1. Emotional Growth - degree of security, self-concept, adjustment to peers

2. Rate of Learning - receptiveness, attitude, readiness, learning skills, ability to follow directions

3. Mental Growth - acquisition of knowledge, interpretation of new facts, application of concepts

Team interaction. The exchanging of ideas and suggestions among the various members of the teaching team.

Behavioral objectives. Explicit formulations of the ways in which students are expected to be changed by the educative process. That is, the ways in which they will change in their feelings, and their actions.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RELATED RESEARCH

The search to improve the quality of education has
caused educators to develop new methods of organization for
instructional purposes.

There are numerous pilot studies and experimental
projects being carried out today, one of which, team teaching,
is currently attracting widespread interest.

I. BACKGROUND OF TEAM TEACHING

Shaplin brings up the following points in a discus-
sion of team teaching:

> . . . In an explosive era of American education, team
> teaching has been merely one element in a broad pattern
> of innovations and changes, all aimed at improving the
> quality of instruction. In this pattern, certain major
> directions are clear: a search for ways to create for
> teachers attractive new positions with greater status,
> rewards, and responsibility; a search for ways to improve
> the utilization of the present teaching staff and facili-
> ties; a search for ways to revise the school curriculum
> in almost all areas; a search for ways to create smaller
> human organizations within the large-size structures
> which have become characteristic of our schools; a search
> for ways to change existing school organization to pro-
> vide for more efficient instruction in certain areas and
> for continuous pupil progress in others; and a search for
> ways to apply technological innovations in instruction in
> schools . . . (20:54-55)

Team teaching is basically a method of organizing
groups of students for instruction so they will receive the
benefit of instruction from the most capable teacher in a

particular field and will receive the benefit of increased intellectual stimulation by contact with several personalities.

Judson Shaplin (20:1) states, "Team Teaching . . . has rapidly assumed the dimensions of a major educational movement . . ."

Team teaching, with regrouping and large-group lectures, orginated several years ago as an idea in the mind of Francis Keppel, then Dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education (20:19).

A small group of faculty members in the Harvard Graduate School of Education considered some extremely tentative proposals for school reorganization that had been suggested by Dean Keppel. The faculty members found that the proposals brought out some exciting theoretical concepts and a proposed new structure of school organization. The faculty group further developed and refined Dean Keppel's proposals to the point of considering plans for testing the new arrangements.

Early in 1957, the Fund for the Advancement of Education invited Harvard to work with three nearby public school systems to develop new techniques in education (20:51).

Harvard agreed, and with a generous grant from the Fund, established the School and University Program for Research and Development. Known as SUPRAD, this organization joined the school systems of Concord, Lexington, and Newton, Massachusetts, with Harvard's Graduate School of Education.

Dean Keppel then organized and outlined the structure of the teaching teams as they were later to be formed at Franklin School.

Perhaps the best known of all team teaching projects is the one begun at Franklin School in Lexington, Massachusetts, in 1957-1958. It was probably the first example of an entire school being organized into teams (20:56).

Team teaching started with a few pilot projects in 1956 and 1957 and the movement has now spread to several hundred communities throughout the country and plans now under development suggest increasingly rapid growth.

In the forward of the book, Team Teaching, Francis Keppel makes the following statements:

> . . . the national commitment to exploring the possibilities of new ways of organizing schools is already substantial. Because of its actual and potential relationship to other reform movements in education, it is possible that team teaching will stand the test of time rather than slide into the footnotes of educational history. James B. Conant, who is not easily swayed by current fashion in education, has written the following about elementary education:

> "There is without a doubt a ferment among educators with respect to the conduct of elementary education. The long-standing notion of a self-contained classroom of 30 pupils taught by one teacher is giving way to alternative proposals. One of these proposals is team teaching, which, as we have seen, has advantages in orienting new teachers.
> If the idea of team teaching becomes widely accepted—and many elementary school principals predict that it will—there will be places in classrooms for a wide range of instructional talent. How such schemes will work out over the years in practice remains to be seen, but team teaching seems to many the answer to the question of how

to attract more of the ablest college students into elementary school teaching. The possibility of a teacher's having an opportunity to take advantage of her special field of interest is exciting" (20:ix).

There is no doubt that the concept of team teaching is an interesting one. Team teaching exists in many forms and for a variety of reasons and it is evident that there is considerable flexibility in most team teaching arrangements. Each school system has its own specific reasons for undertaking team teaching and each must work out a unique solution for its own best interest. Arnold states:

> The team idea has distinct possibilities as a very effective means of meeting some of the problems facing schools today, but the basic purpose should be clearly defined and thoroughly understood before a school launches such a program. To rush into it without thorough preparation, particularly of the teachers involved, is to invite chaos. Team teaching is a means designed to attain certain goals, and these goals must be understood and accepted by those involved (4:20).

A variety of reasons are cited for developing new staff organization plans such as team teaching. A few of the more common ones are:

1. Discovering and demonstrating new and more effective ways of utilizing teacher competencies

2. Improvement of the quality of instruction

3. Establishment of a hierarchy of roles in teaching and thereby providing more attractive career opportunities for superior teachers.

II.   ADVANTAGES OF TEAM TEACHING

In speaking of the organization of teaching teams at
Franklin School in Lexington, Massachusetts, R. H. Anderson
states:

> Implicit in all efforts to create more attractive con-
> ditions (economic, social and professional) for teachers
> was the belief that these would lead to better instruction
> for children, through more effective performance of the
> teachers. It was hoped that the team organization would
> permit more flexible and appropriate grouping arrangements
> to meet individual interests. It was believed that
> children would be stimulated by association with larger
> numbers of children and with more than one teacher. It
> was expected that teachers would find more efficient and
> interesting ways of presenting lessons through having
> larger blocks of planning time and through doing more
> group planning. It was thought that the pooling of
> teachers' ideas and observations would lead not only to
> stronger teaching but to better pupil adjustment and more
> adequate pupil guidance (2:72-73).

Teachers on a team must be willing to share responsi-
bility and willing to step aside at times when another team
member has greater competence in a given area.

Teachers are provided with time to plan cooperatively,
exchange ideas, analyze situations and evaluate their program.
Hoopes points out:

> One of the unique features of team teaching is that
> teachers can plan together, see each other teach, talk
> together, analyze what happened, and profit from this
> exchange. Teachers are brought into a close relation-
> ship as they share the responsibility for teaching the
> same group of students; consequently, the teacher must
> learn to work cooperatively with other teachers (14:177).

Team teaching in the elementary school makes it possi-
ble to divide students into different ability groups for each

separate subject and to develop more flexible groupings that can change as children's needs change.

Extensive exploration of a wide variety of criteria for combining students, so that each student may obtain maximum benefit from instruction may be possible in a team teaching program. Arthur Morse states:

> Ability grouping in a conventional elementary school divides youngsters in gifted, average or slow homeroom units and assumes that this pattern holds true in all subjects. Team teaching recognizes that ability in language arts may not insure equal ability in number concepts. At the Franklin School children and their parents are not as conscious of the ability "niche" because the students find themselves in different company in each class (18:14).

Another possible advantage of team teaching is stated by Judson Shaplin:

> Team teaching also provides a way of organizing for the improvement of supervision in the schools. . . . Within teaching teams it becomes possible to assign greater responsibility for the curriculum and for the supervision of other teachers to those teachers who are more knowledgeable, more expert, and more willing and able to accept leadership. . . . (20:19)

Maurie Hillson offers the following list of possible advantages for those participating in team teaching:

1. Superior teachers will be able to exercise greater influence in the school and still remain in classroom teaching.

2. Team teaching facilitates grouping because the basic group is so large that small groups can easily be formed for almost any reason and there are enough really bright students to make advanced projects feasible.

3. Other teachers, during large group teaching periods, are freed for small group work, lesson planning, and parent-teacher conferences.

4. Pupils will spend more of their school time receiving instruction than when they are in self-contained classrooms.

5. There is more efficient use of space, materials, and equipment.

6. There is a greater exchanging of information and viewpoints on various problems.

7. Evaluation is the combined judgement of several teachers and thereby improves the process of pupil appraisal.

8. It furnishes an impetus to improve the curricula.

9. The beginning teacher is not isolated; he has supervision and help from experienced teachers.

10. During a member's illness, the others can fill the void with less loss of instructional time than when a substitute comes into a regular classroom and often merely serves as a "baby sitter".

11. The teacher often works harder on improving the instructional ability of the team (13:165-166).

A few more advantages suggested by Malcolm P. Douglass in his article "Team Teaching: Fundamental Change or Passing Fancy" are:

1. Practical and effective in-service education can occur through frequent team meetings.

2. There can be marked success in inducting new teachers into school systems by using interns as team teachers.

3. Improved guidance will result from the planned exchange of information about students and the atmosphere of fellowship within the team.

4. Through team leaders and team meetings, the iden-
   tification and use of talented citizens and
   other educational resources of the community
   will become possible.

5. Because of their children's common experiences,
   there will be increased interest and involvement
   of parents.

6. The organization to develop sequences of content
   and intellectual process becomes more likely
   since teams can be kept together for more than
   one school year.

7. There is an improved climate of motivation because
   of the accent upon individual identity and team
   spirit.

8. There is greater student interest because of the
   varied groupings and presentations.

9. Teachers can be released from routine duties
   through the use of teacher aides.

Shaplin summarizes some current needs in education

which possibly justify team teaching:

> . . . What is needed within teaching is a method of
> suborganization, a grouping of teachers into small groups
> with common work objectives and shared working space,
> to which the teaching aides and clerical assistants can
> be attached in such a way that a sufficient amount of
> work will be absorbed efficiently from the teachers to
> allow a reduction in the teaching force. One of the
> principle justifications for team teaching may be that
> it answers this need (20:77).

Team teaching is not something that can be done easily.

Only through thorough preparation, planning, coordination,

and dedicated cooperation can it become effective.

III. VALIDITY OF TEAM TEACHING

Team teaching allows teachers to turn classrooms into

open learning laboratories and limits or eliminates

unrealistic restrictions on exploration. School becomes a place where anything can be looked at, especially if it is of concern to the young who are a part of it (16:123).

Team teaching provides teachers and other members of the team with more freedom to work. Often in the traditionally organized school, teachers are closed in by time-killing routine that dulls the atmosphere of the classroom and reduces the opportunity for an exciting learning environment (16:124).

Team teaching will serve school systems that are organized and managed in a manner that reflects the multi-faceted modern society, instead of systems steeped in the locus of ordinariness and operating on century old assumptions (16:124).

The use of team teaching, because of its cooperative nature, tends to reduce the possibility of inter-staff feud, since it is more difficult to become involved in petty bickering when the opportunity for cooperation and joint planning is such a worthy substitute (16:127).

The continuous in-service training programs that are a natural requirement of the teams who are involved in team teaching provide a natural environment for those teachers who want to be well informed. These programs are extremely effective when built around things that make sense and are programs that involve the teacher and not programs that are

done for him. This instrument highly supports validation and
is considered particularly valuable if the principal super-
vises and other administrative people are also involved as
co-equal participants in the in-service training programs.
Materials to be dealt with will be built on instructional
and learning problems that come out of the team teaching
program themselves and will utilize student initiative, pur-
pose exploration, and first-hand experience (16:124).

IV.   ORIGIN OF TEAM

Harold Seaton Davis, (Ed.) D. Wayne State University,
in his dissertation, "The Effect of Team Teaching on Teachers,"
concluded:

1.   The need for introducing team teaching in a par-
ticular school should be apparent to teachers
in that school before they are asked to change
teaching methods.

2.   In developing a team teaching program, administra-
tors should join teachers in cooperative,
democratic planning.

3.   While developing a team teaching program, adminis-
trators should provide teachers with substantial
and continuing assistance.

Eugene T. Kelly expresses an even stronger opinion as
to the formation of a team teaching program. He states:

. . . I have not found a single successful program
which was imposed from the top. To be successful,
teachers must be involved in initial planning; they must
have the prerogative of rejecting as well as accepting
ideas. Administrators alone cannot decide what is to be
done and how, and expect successful results (17:25).

V. GROUP INTERACTION

Effective communications are crucial in a team teaching situation. In any school situation communications are important, but in a team teaching situation the importance is highlighted (5:151). Beggs feels that opportunities must exist for frequent formal and informal communications. Failure to notify team members of a change in plans, procedures, or activities will have a deleterious effect on the overall team effort (5:152).

Eugene Kelly, in his article "Why Team Teaching Fails," says:

> . . . programs are in trouble because some teachers will not change or find it difficult to work in the "give and take" of team teaching. . . . Just one uncooperative teacher can negate the effectiveness of the entire team (17:25).

Ultimately, the success or failure of any organizational pattern is dependent upon the amount of communication and the nature of the interaction within the teaching staff. Although physical facilities occasionally play a role, they seldom determine the eventual success of a program (19:84). Instead, positive outcomes are related to the extent to which teachers share their ideas, philosophies, and perceptions about children and their commonly achieved evaluation guidelines (19:84). In team teaching teacher compatibility which encourages communication is a uniquely important requirement.

A study in California's Mt. Diablo Unified School District clearly demonstrated a positive relationship between the important dimension of teacher communication and the effectiveness of team teaching as an organizational technique (19:84).

Teams reflecting flexibility in decision making processes seemed to see their responsibilities to the pupils in a different light. Their team planning sessions found them working out problems in terms of the unique requirements of individual pupils as well as the needs of the total unit. The result was increased individualization of instruction, varying size groups in keeping with the pupil's needs, greater utilization of teacher competencies, and a program in which schedules and the physical plant served the teams and the pupils. An openness to new ideas from within and without found these more creative teams approaching their work with greater experimentation and on-going evaluation than characterized the work of the rigid and departmentalized teams (19:85).

A high degree of interaction and effective communication within a team is not a natural attribute of the organizational pattern. It does not emerge accidentally, nor does it result from direct administrative intervention per se.

The results of the Mt. Diablo Unified School District's experimental program suggest the following ideas:

1. Staff relations with the principal should be characterized by a freedom to express ideas and feelings, to recommend changes and to plan co-operatively. Divergent thinking, constructive criticism, and constant self-evaluation should characterize the work of the various team members and should be encouraged.

2. Teacher competency is obviously vital to the team effort. However, a weaker teacher may grow through the help of supportive team members.

3. Successful team contributors are relatively free from dependency needs. They can and want to help their colleagues without possessing them. They do not need frequent reassurance and personal approval.

4. The effective team member is ego supportive of his partners by giving them recognition for their contributions.

5. Flexibility is reflected in an ability to make changes in program when student requirements appear to indicate that there is a need for revision.

6. Appropriate mental organization leads to a higher degree of reliability in fulfilling commitments.

7. Effective evaluation for instructional improvements is governed by an ability and interest in introspection. Satisfaction with the status quo obviously inhibits improvement (19:85-86).

VI.   INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES

Robert F. Mager, in his book "Preparing Instructional Objectives," discusses three, rather important, reasons for having instructional objectives. First, without clearly defined goals, it is impossible to evaluate a course or program efficiently, and there is no sound basis for selecting

appropriate materials, content, or instructional methods.
Second, instructional objectives make it possible to evaluate
the degree to which the learner is able to perform in the
desired manner. Tests are the mileposts along the road of
learning and they are supposed to indicate to the teacher and
the student the degree to which both have been successful in
their achievement of the course objectives.

The third advantage of clearly defined objectives is
that the student is provided with the means to evaluate his
own progress at any place along the route of instruction and
is able to organize his efforts into relevant activities.
With clear objectives in view, the student knows which acti-
vities on his part are relevant to his success, and it is no
longer necessary for him to "psych out" the instructor (21:3-4).

VII. PUPIL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

Some extensive research on team teaching was done in
the Jefferson County, Colorado, schools. Team teaching was
used in seven schools, and the content areas included social
studies, English, mathematics and science. At the conclusion
of the three year study, the researchers reported the following
observations:

    1.   In comparison to regular classes, as good or
        better results in pupil achievement were pro-
        duced by modified schedules, various kinds of
        teams, and non-gradedness.

2. Pupil placement and use of material and personnel resources were accomplished more effectively in the experimental program than in regular situations.

3. Attitudes and morale of teachers and pupils in the experimental situations were more favorable than those of persons in regular classes.

4. The adaptability of teachers improved as a direct result of participating in the experimental program (22:89).

The Dundee School District, Greenwich, Connecticut, upon completion of a two-year study reported the following conclusions in the areas of student academic achievement, interests, attitudes, perceptions of the teacher's role and creative thinking:

1. Academic Achievement - There was no conclusive evidence provided by the study to refute previous findings that scores on standardized achievement tests are neither increased nor decreased by the team teaching plan of school organization. Although the Dundee mean scores were lower (relative to those of the control groups) during the first year of the study, the differences were offset during the second year by relatively greater gains on the part of the Dundee students. Thus, while the findings suggested that there may be differential effects, the nature of such effects is not clear on the basis of this study.

2. Attitudes, Interests and Perceptions of Teachers

   a. The Dundee students tended to mention more frequently the social aspects of school life and give work-oriented responses less frequently than did the control students. This difference may have resulted directly from the larger number of peer contacts in the team teaching situation.

b. There was some evidence, though inconclusive,
    that Dundee students had a somewhat
    broader range of interests than the control
    students, possibly because of acquaintance
    with additional and more diverse activi-
    ties.

c. The Dundee students indicated that a greater
    proportion of their peer friendships were
    formed outside of the school, as compared
    with the control pupils. Also, a larger
    proportion of the Dundee students tended
    to prefer friends whom they had met away
    from the school.

d. The data suggested that there was a relatively
    greater emphasis on behavior in the Dundee
    school than in the control schools. Per-
    haps the greater emphasis on freedom and
    flexibility in the Dundee program required
    increased attention on behavior and disci-
    pline.

e. There was some evidence, also inconclusive,
    that Dundee pupils tended to depend more
    on peers (rather than adults) for assis-
    tance with immediate problems than did
    students in the control groups.

3. Creative Thinking - The Minnesota Tests of Creative
    Thinking (Abbreviated Form VII) yields scores on
    four aspects of creative thinking: fluency,
    flexibility, originality, and elaboration. Al-
    though differences between the Dundee and control
    schools were not entirely consistent, Dundee
    pupils generally had higher mean scores on
    fluency and flexibility than did the control
    pupils. This result seems to support the con-
    tention that the greater flexibility and in-
    creased peer and teacher contacts under team
    teaching tend to reduce rigidity and to encourage
    more creative and imaginative thought (15:297-298).

CHAPTER III

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

I. STATISTICAL METHODS

The statistical methods which were employed in the tabulation of the data are as follows.

Simple chi-square. For those items which call for frequency data which compares the effects of two variables and there are two groups on both variables.

Complex chi-square. For those items which call for frequency data comparing the effects of two or more variables and there are more than two groups per variable. The chi-square subscript value listed for the various items indicates the probability of a real difference existing. In order to find the probability that the obtained difference is due to chance alone, simply subtract the given subscript value from 1.00, e.g., 1.00 - .95 = .05.

Point-value correlation. Responses to some of the items are in terms of subject areas. When applicable, a numberical value is provided for each of the various items and a mean score computed.

Percentile ranking. For ease of comparison, much of the data is expressed in terms of percentages.

Contingency coefficient (C). The contingency coeffi-
cient indicates the significance of the data. Significance
increases as the (C) value increases from 0 towards 1.00.

II. QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

Prior to discussing the questionnaire items, the
writer will statistically introduce the various sizes of
teams involved in the study.

TABLE I

GENERAL INFORMATION

	Team Size					
	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven
Average age	34.13	30.61	32.36	41.88	39.46	34.00
Experience	8.00	8.39	9.36	14.63	8.86	5.88
Years in building	3.53	3.03	4.21	4.63	4.57	3.63
Years as team member	1.07	1.16	1.36	1.88	1.79	1.00
Pupils per teacher	28.63	27.72	27.39	29.75	30.89	28.57
Qtr. hrs. after BA (Ed)	47.60	45.10	40.36	48.00	56.43	19.50
Total M (Ed)	2	0	1	6	1	0

Item #1 presents a comparison of the number of subject
areas in which members of the various teams feel they have

progressed since incorporating team teaching. Note that team sizes four and seven show the greatest significance.

TABLE II

SUBJECT AREAS OF GROWTH PER TEACHER PER TEAM

	Team Size					
	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven
Average	2.37	2.35	3.29	2.75	2.43	3.75

Item #1: In which areas do you feel that you have made sub-stantial professional growth, as compared to your degree of competency in each area prior to your team teaching experience?

Although the following is significant only at the .75 level, there is an indication that the majority feel their instructional methods have improved. Also, there is evidence of a lower percentage of progress at the extremes.

Items numbers four and five (See Tables V and VI, pages 26 and 27) are intended to give some insights into student growth and development in both tangible and intangible areas, as perceived by the various instructors.

TABLE III

INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS

	Team Size						Chi-Square
	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	
Effective	63%	74%	86%	88%	79%	43%	
Ineffective	37%	26%	14%	12%	21%	57%	7.563*
							.28**
N = 90	16	31	14	8	14	7	

* Probability of real difference is .75
** Contingency Coefficient (C)

Item #2: How do you perceive your instructional methods now, as compared to those which you possessed prior to your team teaching experience?

TABLE IV

INCREASING STAFF

	Team Size						Chi-Square
	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	
Effective	56%	74%	79%	50%	71%	14%	
Ineffective	44%	26%	21%	50%	29%	86%	11.68*
							.34**
N = 90	16	31	14	8	14	7	

* Probability of real difference is .95
**Contingency Coefficient (C)

Item #3: In your opinion, what effect would adding another competent teacher to your team have upon your professional growth?

TABLE V

STUDENT ACADEMIC GROWTH

	Team Size						Chi-Square
	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	
Areas per teacher	2.00	3.17	4.38	1.67	2.14	2.67	
% Indicating improvement	44%	52%	93%	75%	71%	29%	
Ineffective	66%	48%	7%	25%	29%	71%	13.36*
							.36**
N = 90	16	31	14	8	14	7	

* Probability of real difference is .975
**Contingency Coefficient (C)

Item #4: Comparing your previous instructional program with your present team teaching program, has there been any noticeable improvements in student academic achievement? If "Yes", in which areas?

TABLE VI

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

	Team Size						Chi-Square
	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	
Relative point value	2.59*	2.76	2.83	2.24	2.59	2.70	
Present	61%	80%	89%	63%	64%	70%	
No Change	36%	16%	5%	20%	31%	30%	
Previous	3%	4%	6%	17%	5%	0%	48.14**
							.30***
N = 495	83	173	81	46	102	10	

* Point values: Present = 3, No change = 2, Previous = 1
** Probability of real difference is .999
***Contingency Coefficient (C)

Item #5: Under which program do/did your students seem to be the strongest with regard to the following areas?

Self-concept
Adjustment to Peers
Ability to follow instructions
Attitude
Receptiveness
Acquisition of knowledge
Interpretation of new facts
Application of concepts

Items numbers six and seven (See Tables VII and VIII, pages 30 and 31) are intended to give some insights into the origin of the various teams. If the responder indicated that either the teacher, or both the teacher and the principal, were responsible for the decision, the item was judged to be effective.

The data from item eight will not be included in this study because some of the teachers reported their total planning and preparation time per week, and others reported only that which occurred during the regular school hours.

Obtaining data relating to sufficient planning and preparation time was the writer's intention when he included items numbers eight and nine in the questionnaire. While the writer is unable to report results for item eight, the data from item number nine shows a strong relationship between adequate planning and preparation time and team effectiveness (See Table IX, page 32).

According to the literature, one of the things which helps to make a team effective is the assigning of leadership responsibilities to teachers in their own areas of academic preparation. Item number ten was an attempt to investigate this criterion (See Table X, page 33).

The measurement of the team's effectiveness in the area of group interaction was accomplished by items numbers eleven, twelve, and thirteen (See Tables XI, XII, and XII, pages 34-36).

TABLE VII

ORIGIN OF TEAM

	Team Size						Chi-Square
	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	
Effective	69%	71%	71%	50%	71%	100%	
Ineffective	31%	29%	29%	50%	29%	0%	4.62*
							.22**
N = 90	16	31	14	8	14	7	

* Probability of real difference is .50
**Contingency Coefficient (C)

Item #6: Whose decision was it that your school would adopt
a team teaching program?

TABLE VIII

FORMATION OF TEAM

	Team Size						Chi-Square
	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	
Effective	69%	87%	79%	50%	36%	100%	
Ineffective	31%	13%	21%	50%	64%	0%	17.68*
							.41**
N = 90	16	31	14	8	14	7	

* Probability of real difference is .995
**Contingency Coefficient (C)

Item #7: Who assumed the responsibility for the formation of your teaching team?

TABLE IX

PLANNING AND PREPARATION TIME

	Team Size						Chi-Square
	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	
Always	0%	0%	22%	0%	0%	0%	
Usually	25%	23%	14%	50%	22%	14%	
Occasionally	6%	16%	14%	13%	28%	43%	27.17*
Never	69%	61%	50%	37%	50%	43%	.48**
N = 90	16	31	14	8	14	7	

* Probability of real difference is .975
**Contingency Coefficient (C)

Item #9:   Do you feel that sufficient planning and preparation time is scheduled for your team?

TABLE X

SUBJECT AREA RESPONSIBILITIES

	Team Size						Chi-Square
	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	
Effective	31%	42%	57%	63%	57%	0%	
Ineffective	69%	58%	43%	37%	43%	100%	9.72*
							.31**
N = 90	16	31	14	8	14	7	

*Probability of real difference is .90
**Contingency Coefficient (C)

Item #10: In which of the following areas have you, or will you have, team leadership responsibilities?

    Reading
    Language Arts
    Math
    Social Studies
    Art
    Physical Education
    Health
    Science
    Music
    Library

TABLE XI

GROUP INTERACTION

	Team Size						Chi-Square
	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	
Always	31%	61%	86%	0%	14%	0%	
Usually	44%	19%	7%	88%	57%	14%	
Occasionally	0%	13%	0%	12%	21%	43%	
Never	25%	7%	7%	0%	8%	43%	53.57*
							.61**
N = 90	16	31	14	8	14	7	

*Probability of real difference is .999
**Contingency Coefficiency (C)

Item #11: Do you feel that there is a free exchanging of
ideas during your team meetings?

TABLE XII

GROUP INTERACTION

	Team Size						Chi-Square
	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	
Always	44%	58%	71%	13%	21%	0%	
Usually	38%	35%	29%	87%	64%	43%	
Occasionally	18%	7%	0%	0%	15%	57%	
Never	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	32.58*
							.52**
N = 90	16	31	14	8	14	7	

* Probability of real difference is .999
**Contingency Coefficiency (C)

Item #12: Do you feel that you are able to successfully com-
municate your ideas to the other members of your
teaching team?

TABLE XIII

GROUP INTERACTION

	Team Size						Chi-Square
	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	
Always	69%	68%	93%	25%	29%	0%	
Usually	13%	23%	7%	75%	50%	43%	
Occasionally	0%	3%	0%	0%	21%	57%	
Never	18%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	57.61*
							.62**
N = 90	16	31	14	8	14	7	

*Probability of real difference is .999
**Contingency Coefficient (C)

Item #13: Do you feel that all the members of your team make a contribution to the team's program?

Items fourteen and fifteen (See Tables XIV and XV, pages 38 and 39) were designed to measure the relative effectiveness of the various sizes of teaching teams in the area of instructional goals for students.

Item sixteen was included solely for the purpose of obtaining data relating to some of the possible problems encountered by the members of the various teaching teams.

As a further measurement of effectiveness, the writer gave the teachers an opportunity to indicate what they felt was the proper size for a teaching team (See Table XVI, page 40). It was presupposed that if they felt that their team was sufficiently effective, they would choose their own team size.

TABLE XIV

INSTRUCTIONAL GOALS

	Team Size						Chi-Square
	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	
Yes	13%	16%	50%	38%	14%	0%	
Most of them	31%	23%	36%	38%	43%	0%	
Few of them	31%	26%	7%	0%	14%	29%	
No	25%	35%	7%	24%	29%	71%	29.36*
							.50**
N = 90	16	31	14	8	14	7	

*Probability of real difference is .99
**Contingency Coefficiency (C)

Item #14: Have the instructional goals for your students been stated in terms of performance criteria? Such as-- "When presented with a list of nouns and pronouns, the student will be able to label each word correctly."

TABLE XV

INSTRUCTIONAL GOALS

	Team Size						Chi-Square
	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	
Always	19%	26%	50%	38%	29%	14%	
Usually	63%	35%	50%	38%	43%	0%	
Occasionally	13%	23%	0%	12%	21%	43%	
Never	5%	16%	0%	12%	7%	43%	22.90*
							.45**
N = 90	16	31	14	8	14	7	

*Probability of real difference is .90
**Contingency Coefficient (C)

Item #15: Are student performance criteria included in your
planning of the instructional program?

TABLE XVI

TEAM SIZE PREFERENCE

| | Team Size | | | | | | Chi-Square |
	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	
Own	17%	31%	80%	0%	45%	0%	
Other	83%	69%	20%	100%	55%	100%	17.90*
							.44**
N = 73	12	29	10	6	11	5	

*Probability of real difference is .995
**Contingency Coefficiency (C)

Item #17: If you were given the opportunity to establish a team teaching program, how many teachers would you want to have on the team?

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

While there are nine areas of investigation in the
questionnaire, most of the data can be given a supportive
role to one of two basic areas.

1. Professional growth of teachers

    a. In-service growth

    b. Instructional methods

    c. Origin of team

    d. Group interaction

2. Student growth and development

    a. Student academic growth

    b. Student development

    c. Instructional goals

    d. Individual leadership responsibilities

Professional Growth of Teachers

Table II, page 24, Subject Areas of Growth Per Teacher
Per Team, indicates that the team sizes of four and seven
members experienced the greatest growth, while the others
reported similar averages.

Table III, page 25, Instructional Methods, shows that,
generally speaking, all the teams felt they had improved in

this area. Therefore, the writer decided to investigate the possibility of a significant correlation between the above areas.

TABLE XVII

INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS

	Improved	Unimproved	Chi-square
In-service growth	91%	50%	
No In-service growth	9%	50%	16.70*
			.40**
N = 86	66	20	

*Probability of real difference is .999
**Contingency Coefficient (C)

NOTE: There is a significant correlation between In-service growth and improved instructional methods.

Table VIII, page 31, Formation of the Teams, shows that in most cases the teachers were given the opportunity to participate in this decision. However, the data for team sizes five and six indicates that, for the most part, the formation of these teams was handled by a school administrator.

Group interaction is a very important ingredient in any team teaching program. (Refer to Chapter II, section V, page 16.) And Tables XI, XII, and XIII, pages 34-36, show that

the four member teams were, by far, the most effective in this area. The tables also demonstrate that the degree of effectiveness increased as the team sizes grew from two through four. Then effectiveness tailed off quickly.

Inquiry into the possibility of a significant correlation existing between the method used to select team members and the team's interaction provides the following data.

TABLE XVIII

FORMATION OF TEAM

	Effective	Ineffective	Chi-square
Team Interaction	66%	40%	
No Team Interaction	34%	60%	5.03*
			.23**
N = 87	62	25	

*Probability of real difference is .975
** Contingency Coefficient (C)

NOTE: There is a significant correlation between formation of the team and team interaction.

Student Growth and Development

Table V, page 27, Student Academic Growth, demonstrates that a much higher degree of effectiveness was achieved by the four member teams, as compared to the other sizes of teams.

Table VI, page 28, Student Development, indicates a growth in effectiveness from two member teams through four member teams. At this point the degree of effectiveness deminishes.

A correlation between student academic growth and student development is demonstrated by the following table.

TABLE XIX

STUDENT ACADEMIC GROWTH

	Effective	Ineffective	Chi-square
Student Development	84%	48%	
No Student Development	16%	52%	12.25*
			.35**
N = 87	56	31	

*Probability of real difference is .999
**Contingency Coefficient (C)

NOTE: There is a significant correlation between student academic growth and student development.

As to the use of instructional goals, Tables XIV and XV, pages 38 and 39, show that four member teams made the greatest use of instructional goals. The only other team size which made a significant use of instructional goals was the five member team.

If instructional goals are necessary, there should be a significant correlation between student academic growth and instructional goals.

TABLE XX

INSTRUCTIONAL GOALS

	Effective	Ineffective	Chi-square
Student Academic Growth	86%	49%	
No Student Academic Growth	14%	51%	13.33*
			.36**
N = 87	42	45	

*Probability of real difference is .999
**Contingency Coefficient (C)

NOTE: There is a significant correlation between the use of instructional goals and student academic growth.

According to Table X, page 33, team sizes four, five and six demonstrated the highest relationship between team leadership responsibilities and academic preparation on the part of the teachers. Results from two, three and seven member teams indicated that there was no apparent attempt to assign team leadership responsibilities to those teachers who had prepared in the various subject matter areas.

Judging from the information in Chapter II, page 11, there should be a significant correlation between student academic achievement and the assigning of team leadership responsibilities according to academic preparation.

TABLE XXI

LEADERSHIP RESPONSIBILITIES

	Effective	Ineffective	Chi-square
Student Academic Growth	78%	51%	
No Student Academic Growth	22%	49%	5.74*
			.27**
N = 72	37	35	

*Probability of real difference is .975
**Contingency Coefficient (C)

NOTE: There is a significant correlation between the proper assignment of team leadership responsibilities and student academic achievement.

Additional Comments

Reflecting over the data gathered in the study leaves one believing that a team size of four is much the more effective.

The four member teams ranked highest in the areas of:

1. Professional growth

2. Pupil growth and development

3. Planning and preparation time (Several of their
    returns indicated that they scheduled team
    meetings for in the mornings.)

4. Group interaction

5. Instructional goals

In an attempt to rank the teams according to the data,
the writer decided to give numerical values to the various
positions in the rankings. The highest percentage score on
an item received six points, the next highest was awarded five
points, and so on. Thus, the writer was able to establish
the following data:

TABLE XXII

OVERALL TEAM RANKINGS

	Team Size					
	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven
Total Points	40.5	53.0	78.5	48.0	46.0	28.0

Further examination of the data exposes two more
significant sets of data.

First, in the area of team size preference, the writer
tabulated the actual number of responses favoring the various

team sizes. The percentile scores, once again, favored the team size of four.

TABLE XXIII

TEAM SIZE PREFERENCE

	Team Size						
	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight
Total Votes	5	13	36	6	7	4	2
Percent	7%	18%	49%	8%	10%	5%	3%
N = 73							

The writer also attempted to find out if there was a correlation between effective team teaching and team size preference. So first in order to distinguish between the effective and ineffective returns, the writer listed the major areas of investigation.

1. In-service growth of teachers
2. Instructional methods
3. Student growth and development
4. Origin of the team
5. Individual leadership responsibilities
6. Group interaction
7. Instructional goals

Those returns which indicated effectiveness in a simple majority of the areas were determined to be effective. Then the returns were divided into the following four groups.

1. Those which were effective and preferred their own team size.

2. Those which were ineffective and preferred their own team size.

3. Those which were effective and preferred another team size.

4. Those which were ineffective and preferred another team size.

Of special interest is the fact that out of those who preferred their own team size, only one was judged to be ineffective. Also, of those who preferred another team size, the majority were ineffective.

TABLE XXIV

EFFECTIVENESS-TEAM PREFERENCE CORRELATION

	Own Size	Another Size	Chi-square
Effective	(23) 96%	(19) 39%	21.53*
Ineffective	(1) 4%	(30) 61%	.48**

*Probability of real difference is .999
**Contingency Coefficiency (C)

II. CONCLUSIONS

The original hypotheses of this study was that:

As the size of a teaching team approaches a total membership of six professional instructors, cooorespondingly, a growth will occur in the following areas:

1. Total number of teacher competencies within the team

2. Professional growth of the individual team member

3. Student growth and development

However, judging from the following conclusions, the above does not occur.

1. The data indicates a growth in effectiveness starting with the two member teams and continuing on through the four member teams. Then starting with the five member teams, the degree of effectiveness begins to diminish.

2. In the areas of:

   a. Professional growth of teachers

   b. Student growth and development

   c. Planning and preparation time

   d. Team size preference

   e. Use of instructional goals

   f. Team interaction

   the four member teams were the most effective. Therefore, it would seem, according to the data, that a team size of four is the most desirable.

3. The data implies that there is a significant correlation between the various criteria used to measure effectiveness in this study. For example:

     a.   In-service growth of teachers and improved
         instructional methods

     b.   The method used to select team members and
         the team's interaction

     c.   Student academic growth and student
         development

     d.   The use of instructional goals and student
         academic growth

     e.   The proper assignment of team leadership
         responsibilities and student academic
         growth

     f.   Team size preference and overall individual
         teacher effectiveness

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The writer recommends further studies to determine the following:

1.   What is adequate time for planning and preparation?

2.   Does team effectiveness increase on a yearly basis?

3.   What are the effects of the administration determining team composition?

4.   What is the effect of behavioral objectives upon the team teaching program?

5.   What effect would sensitivity training have upon the group interaction of a teaching team?

6.   What is the maximum effective pupil-teacher ratio in a team teaching program?

7.   What advantages are there for students in a team teaching program which are not measured by standard achievement tests?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Anderson, Robert H. Teaching in a World of Change.
    New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1966.

2. Anderson, Robert H., and others. "Team Teaching in an
    Elementary School," School Review, Vol. 68, Spring,
    1960, pp. 71-84.

3. Anderson, Robert H., and John I. Goodlad. "Self-appraisal
    in Nongraded Schools: A Survey of Findings and Percep-
    tions," The Elementary School Journal, Vol. 62, October,
    1962, pp. 33-40.

4. Arnold, William E. "Is Team Teaching the Answer?" The
    Education Digest, Vol. 29, March, 1964, pp. 20-21.

5. Beggs, David W. Team Teaching: Bold New Venture.
    Indianapolis, Indiana: Unified College Press, Inc., 1964.

6. Bloom, Benjamin S. (ed.). Taxonomy of Educational Objec-
    tives. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1966.

7. Brownell, John A., and A. Taylor Harris. "Theoretical
    Perspectives for Teaching Teams," The Phi Delta Kappan,
    Vol. 43, January, 1962, pp. 150-157.

8. Bruning, James L., and B. L. Kintz. Computational Handbook
    of Statistics, Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and
    Company, 1968.

9. Cunningham, Luvern L. "When is a Team a Team?" High
    School Journal, Vol. 45, October, 1961, pp. 7-13.

10. Drummond, Harold D. "Team Teaching: An Assessment,"
    Educational Leadership, Vol. 19, December, 1961, pp. 160-
    165.

11. Gaskell, William. "The Inservice Education Potential of
    Team-Planning-Teaching," Peabody Journal of Education,
    Vol. 45, No. 3, November, 1967, pp. 152-155.

12. Hass, Erv, and others. "Design for Team Teaching," The
    Instructor, Vol. 76, No. 9, May, 1968, p. 76.

13. Hillson, Maurie. Change and Innovation in Elementary
    School Organization. New York: Holt, Rinehart and
    Winston, 1967.

14. Hoopes, Ned E. "The Training Process for Team Teaching,"
    The Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 14, June, 1963,
    pp. 177-178.

15. Institute of Field Studies, Teachers College, Columbia
    University, Dundee Team Teaching Project Greenwich,
    Connecticut. New York, February, 1965.

16. Johnson, Robert H., Jr., and John J. Hunt. R_x for Team
    Teaching. Minneapolis, Minn.: Burgess Publishing Co.,
    1968.

17. Kelly, Eugene T. "Why Team Teaching Fails," The
    Instructor, Vol. 75, No. 8, April, 1967, p. 25.

18. Morse, Arthur D. Schools of Tomorrow--Today! Garden
    City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1960.

19. Reasoner, Robert W., and Harvey R. Wall. "Developing
    Staff Interaction in Team Teaching," The National
    Elementary Principal, Vol. 44, No. 3, January, 1965,
    pp. 84-86.

20. Shaplin, Judson T., and Henry F. Olds, (ed.). Team
    Teaching. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

General Information

School System _____ Building _____

Number of teachers on your team ____ Your age ____ Sex ____

Degrees held   B.A.(Ed.) ____ M.(Ed.) ____ Other _____

Number of graduate hours beyond last degree _____Qtr./Sem.

Teaching experience (A) Total number of years _____

                     (B) Total years at present school ____

                     (C) Total years as a member of your

                         team _____

Areas of academic preparation (A) Major _____

                               (B) Minors _____

                                          _____

                                          _____

Total number of pupils instructed by your team _____

Directions

(A) Place a check on the line opposite your desired response.

(B) If none of the possible answers express your opinion,
     please make use of the space marked "Other".

(C) If for some reason you feel unqualified to answer a ques-
     tion, or merely wish to not respond to a certain ques-
     tion, please mark "No response".

(D) Upon completion of this questionnaire, please return it
     to your principal for mailing. An envelope is provided
     for your use.

1. In which of the following areas do you feel that you have
    made substantial professional growth, as compared to your
    degree of competency in each area prior to your team
    teaching experience?

    ____ Reading   ____ Art   ____ Music

    ____ Language   ____ Physical Education   ____ Library

    ____ Math   ____ Health   ____ No
                                                            Response

    ____ Social Studies   ____ Science   ____ Other

2. How do you perceive your instructional methods now, as
    compared to those which you possessed prior to your team
    teaching experience?

    ____ Not as effective   ____ No significant change

    ____ More effective   ____ No response

3. In your opinion, what effect would adding another compe-
    tent teacher to your team have upon your professional
    growth?

    ____ Hamper potential growth   ____ No effect

    ____ Broaden potential growth   ____ No response

    Other _____

4. Comparing your previous instructional program with your
    present team teaching program, has there been any noticeable
    improvements in student academic achievement?

    ____ Yes ____ No ____ No response ____ Noticeable
                                             Decline

    If "Yes", in which areas; if "Noticeable decline", in
    which areas?

_____ Reading	_____ Art	_____ Music
_____ Language Arts	_____ Physical Education	_____ Library
_____ Math	_____ Health	_____ No Response
_____ Social Studies	_____ Science	_____ Other

5. Under which program do/did your students seem to be the strongest with regard to the following areas?

	Present	Previous	No Change	No Response
Self-concept	_____	_____	_____	_____
Adjustment to peers	_____	_____	_____	_____
Ability to follow instructions	_____	_____	_____	_____
Attitude	_____	_____	_____	_____
Receptiveness	_____	_____	_____	_____
Acquisition of knowledge	_____	_____	_____	_____
Interpretation of new facts	_____	_____	_____	_____
Application of concepts	_____	_____	_____	_____

6. Whose decision was it that your school would adopt a team teaching program?

_____ Principal   _____ Both teachers and the principal

_____ Teachers   _____ No response

7. Who assumed the responsibility for the formation of your team?

_____ Principal   _____ Both teachers and the principal

_____ Teachers   _____ No response

8. How much planning and preparation time are you allotted per week? _____ Minutes/Hours

9. Do you feel that sufficient planning and preparation time is scheduled for your team?

   _____Always   _____Never

   _____Usually   _____No response

   _____Occasionally   _____Other_____

10. In which of the following areas have you, or will you have, team leadership responsibilities?

    ___Reading   ___Art   ___Music

    ___Language Arts   ___Physical Education   ___Library

    ___Math   ___Health   ___No response

    ___Social Studies   ___Science   _____Other

11. Do you feel that there is a free exchanging of ideas during your team meetings?

    _____Always   _____Never

    _____Usually   _____No response

    _____Occasionally   _____Other_____

12. Do you feel that you are able to successfully communicate your ideas to the other members of your teaching team?

    _____Always   _____Never

    _____Usually   _____No response

    _____Occasionally   _____Other_____

13. Do you feel that all the members of your team make a
    contribution to the team's program?

    _____Always   _____Never

    _____Usually   _____No response

    _____Occasionally   _____Other_____

14. Have the instructional goals for your students been
    stated in terms of performance criteria? Such as --
    "When presented with a list of nouns and pronouns, the
    student will be able to label each word correctly."

    _____Yes   _____No

    _____For most of them _____No response

    _____For a few of them _____Other_____

15. Are student performance criteria included in your planning
    of the instructional program?

    _____Always   _____Never

    _____Usually   _____No response

    _____Occasionally   _____Other_____

16. If you could, what alterations, additions, or deletions
    would you make in an effort to help your team become
    more effective?

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

17. If you were given the opportunity to establish a team teaching program, how many teachers would you want to have on the team?

_____ 2 _____ 4 _____ 6 _____ 8 _____ Other

_____ 3 _____ 5 _____ 7 _____ 9 _____ No response

This concludes the questionnaire, and I would like to thank you for your assistance. A copy of the results of this survey will be sent to you.

APPENDIX B

CONTRASTING PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING TWO THEORIES

OF CLASS GROUPING

Team Teaching Approach	Self-Contained Approach
1. Groups of teachers take joint responsibility for instruction of a segment of the school population.	1. Most instruction takes place at the hands of one teacher.
2. Two to eight certified teachers are responsible for 50 to 250 pupils of similar age and grade.	2. Twenty to thirty pupils are assigned to one teacher.
3. Clerical and secretarial needs are cared for by a clerical aide.	3. The teacher performs clerical duties and supervisory tasks of a non-instructional nature.
4. A senior teacher or team leader assumes responsibility for instructional leadership.	4. Each teacher has the same responsibility, regardless of his or her special training, experience, skill or capacity for taking responsibility.
5. There is more flexible grouping as children are divided into different ability or interest groups for separate subjects.	5. The teacher must provide as best she can for the range of individual needs and abilities in her group.
6. Teachers develop further specialization in areas of special interest. Instruction is conducted by the most qualified and competent teacher in each curricular area.	6. The teacher is expected to have the skills and knowledge for competent instruction in virtually all subject-matter areas.

Team Teaching Approach	Self-Contained Approach
7. Teachers plan cooperatively, exchange ideas, analyze situations, and evaluate their instructional program together.	7. The teacher has little contact with other staff members or time to exchange professional views or discuss curricular areas.
8. Students are subjected to a variety of teachers, many of whom are superior teachers.	8. The quality of the education of a student is dependent upon the competence of a single teacher.
9. Evaluation may be a joint responsibility of several teachers. Comparison and discussion will lead to grading.	9. One teacher is responsible for the evaluation of a pupil's work in all areas.
10. Teachers have released time to plan their instructional program.	10. All planning is done by the one teacher in her free time.

APPENDIX C

POPULATION USED FOR THE STUDY

A. Two Member Teams

    1. Bellevue School District; Bellevue, Wash.
Ardmore Elementary School

    2. Northshore School District; Bothell, Wash.
Moorlands Elementary School

    3. Highline School District; Highline, Wash.
Beverly Park Elementary School

    4. Seattle School District; Seattle, Wash.
G. W. Kimball Elementary School

    5. Seattle School District; Seattle, Wash.
South Van Assett Elementary School

    6. Shoreline School District; Seattle, Wash.
Echo Lake Elementary School

    7. Tacoma School District; Tacoma, Wash.
Larchmont Elementary School

    8. Tacoma School District; Tacoma, Wash.
Whittier Elementary School

B. Three Member Teams

    1. Bethel School District; Bethel, Wash.
Chester Thompson Elementary School

2. Coupeville School District; Coupeville, Wash.

    Camp Casey Elementary School

3. Federal Way School District; Federal Way, Wash.

    Nautilus Elementary School

4. Enumclaw School District; Enumclaw, Wash.

    Westwood Elementary School

5. Highline School District; Highline, Wash.

    Beverly Park Elementary School

6. Highline School District; Highline, Wash.

    Gregory Heights Elementary School

7. Kent School District; Kent, Wash.

    Panther Lake Elementary School

8. Kent School District; Kent, Wash.

    Springbrook Elementary School

9. Seattle School District; Seattle, Wash.

    South Van Asselt Elementary School

10. Tacoma Public School District; Tacoma, Wash.

    Point Defiance Elementary School

C. Four Member Teams

1. Bremerton School District; Bremerton, Wash.

    Armin Jahr Elementary School

2. Lake Washington School District; Lake Washington, Wash.

    Redmond East Elementary School

     3.   Seattle School District; Seattle, Wash.

         T. T. Minor Elementary School

     4.   Tacoma School District; Tacoma, Wash.

         Franklin Elementary School

D. Five Member Teams

     1.   Marysville School District; Marysville, Wash.

         Shoultes Elementary School

     2.   Seattle School District; Seattle, Wash.

         T. T. Minor Elementary School

E. Six Member Teams

     1.   Highline School District; Highline, Wash.

         Angle Lake Elementary School

     2.   Tacoma School District; Tacoma, Washington

         Larchmont Elementary School

     3.   Tahoma School District; Tahoma, Wash.

         Shadow Lake Elementary School

F. Seven Member Team

     1.   Tacoma School District; Tacoma, Wash.

         Horace Mann Elementary School

APPENDIX D

OTHER REFERENCES

1. Anderson, Robert H. "Team Teaching," National Education Association Journal, Vol. 50, March, 1961, pp. 52-54.

2. Anderson, Robert H. "Team Teaching in Action," The Nation's Schools, Vol. 65, May, 1960, pp. 62-65, 102, 104, 108, 110.

3. Andree, Robert G. "How to Improve Instruction With Teaching Teams," School Management, Vol. 4, November, 1960, pp. 51-54, 114.

4. Bair, Medill and Richard G. Woodward. Team Teaching in Action. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1964.

5. Clinchy, Evans, (ed. associate). Profiles of Significant Schools: Schools for Team Teaching. New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., 1961.

6. Conant, James Bryant. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.

7. Cunningham, Luvern L. "Keys to Team Teaching," Overview, Vol. 1, October, 1960, pp. 54-55.

8. Dix, John P. "Team Teaching Requires Team Spirit," School and Community, Vol. 49, November, 1962, p. 27.

9. Douglass, Malcolm P. "Team Teaching: Fundamental Change or Passing Fancy," CTA Journal, Vol. 49, March, 1963, pp. 29-56.

10. Goodlad, John I, and Robert H. Anderson. The Nongraded Elementary School. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1959.

11. Greene, Maxine. "Keppel of Harvard," Saturday Review, Vol. 43, November 19, 1960, pp. 68-69.

12. Lambert, Philip. "Team Teaching for the Elementary School," Educational Leadership, Vol. 18, November, 1960, pp. 85-88.

13. Levensohn, Alan. "Team Teaching for the Elementary Schools," School Management, Vol. 2, December, 1958, pp. 45-48.

14. Marsh, Robert. "Team Teaching: New Concept?" Clearing House, Vol. 35, April, 1961, pp. 496-499.

15. Montgomery, Charles D. Team Teaching: A Research Guide for Administrators. Martinez, California: Contra Costra County Schools, December, 1960.

16. Shaplin, Judson T. "Team Teaching," Saturday Review, Vol. 44, May 20, 1961, pp. 54-55.

17. Smith, John Blackhall. "How to Introduce Team Teaching in Your Elementary School," School Management, Vol. 5, November, 1961, pp. 58-62.

18. Trump, J. Lloyd. Images of the Future. Commission of the Experimental Study of the Utilization of the Staff in the Secondary School, 1959.

19. Woodring, Paul. New Directions in Teacher Education. New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1957.