

**A SURVEY OF TEAM TEACHING AND ITS  
IMPACT ON THE CHANGING CURRICULUM**

**BY**

**LOUISE DODSON BINKLEY**

A SURVEY OF TEAM TEACHING AND ITS IMPACT  
ON THE CHANGING CURRICULUM

---

A Research Paper  
Presented to  
the Graduate Council of  
Austin Peay State University

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts  
in Education

---

by  
Louise Dodson Binkley R-60  
August 1969

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a Research Paper written by Louise Dodson Binkley entitled "A Survey of Team Teaching and Its Impact on the Changing Curriculum." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Education, with a major in Curriculum and Instruction.

Elsie P. Oakley  
Major Professor

Accepted for the Council:

Wayne E. Stanger  
Dean of the Graduate School



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
The Problem. . . . .	1
Statement of the problem . . . . .	1
Importance of the study. . . . .	2
Definitions of Terms Used. . . . .	2
Team teaching. . . . .	2
Impact . . . . .	2
Curriculum . . . . .	2
Innovation . . . . .	3
Flexible scheduling. . . . .	3
Procedure. . . . .	3
Organization . . . . .	4
II. THE ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF TEAM TEACHING . .	5
The Structure of the Team. . . . .	5
Approach to Establishing A Team Teaching Program . . .	9
III. INCORPORATION INTO THE TOTAL SCHOOL PROGRAM. . . . .	11
Elementary Level . . . . .	11
Junior High Level. . . . .	13
Senior High Level. . . . .	14
College Level. . . . .	16
IV. AN IMPROVEMENT IN THE QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION . . . . .	18
Team Teaching Brings New Approach. . . . .	18
Advantages of Team Teaching. . . . .	21

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS. . . . .	24
Summary. . . . .	24
Conclusions. . . . .	25
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	27

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Recent surveys have revealed that achievement toward desired goals in education have failed to reach realistic levels. What to do and how have provoked not only educators but laymen to spend time and money in search of an acceptable answer of explanation and also an acceptable and reasonable solution to the age old problem of under-achievement. With this alarming problem still facing the schools of today it is worthwhile to investigate what is being done and how successful the new innovations are in serving as possible solutions to the problem.

One realizes that maximum achievement is impossible. One also is cognizant of the fact that higher level of achievement is possible with better teaching. It has become the thinking of noted educators that team teaching has merit and possibility toward achieving this goal.

#### I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It was the purpose of this survey to make an investigation of the team teaching movement from its conception to its present stage of development. A study was made of team teaching in regard (1) to the early approaches to team teaching; and (2) its present level of incorporation into the educational program with a look at both advantages and disadvantages.

Importance of the study. Educating the youth of today is fast becoming one of the most expensive items and is the determinant of the success of the world of tomorrow. The very best methods, the very best teachers, and the very best materials wisely used will perhaps be the answer. It thus becomes the responsibility of those in charge of curriculum change and of the use of new innovations to observe, test, and evaluate changes. Team teaching is being tried in school systems throughout the nation. It has been widely used since 1957 with promising results. It is worthy of close examination by all educators.

## II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Team Teaching. The term, team teaching, refers to a type of instructional organization, involving teaching personnel and the students assigned to them, in which two or more teachers are given responsibility, working together, for all of a significant part of the instruction of the same group of students.

Impact. The term impact is used to designate the force of impression of one thing on another. The effect of this force of impression results in the notable ability to arouse and hold attention and interest.

Curriculum. Collectively, the curriculum is all the courses of study in a school. The modern curriculum's scope includes many

dimensions and a teaching method that is sensitive to the over-all knowledge needs as well as the personality needs of each student.

Innovation. Something newly introduced is referred to as an innovation. In this era of change, educational leaders are responding to the challenge by investigating new ways to prepare teachers, new methods of instruction, and the proper methods of incorporating new technological techniques into our schools.

Flexible scheduling. Flexible scheduling is in a sense the opposite of the old rigid six period day with each period approximately an hour long. A weekly schedule is planned with perhaps three modules of time in mathematics on A day and only two on B day and the possibility of even four on E day. The modules could be for varying time lengths, for example twenty minutes in length. The day is broken into many short periods, with no subject using the same numbers of modules on any given day.

### III. PROCEDURE

The purpose of the project was to review current literature written concerning team teaching. The material for the solution of the problem was taken from various educational journals and books.

The articles were closely read for data pertaining to the problem. Much of the literature on team teaching projects is in the form of the "testimonial," and such is often subjective, personal,



and not always significant as field research. An annotated bibliography was made of the articles found on the subject. Numerous notes were taken. When the survey was completed the material was organized and an attempt has been made to present it in a systematic and related fashion.

#### IV. ORGANIZATION

The following chapters of this paper involve a summary of several articles concerning the team teaching approach in the schools. Chapter II of the paper is concerned with the basic assumptions and various approaches of team teaching.

Chapter III is a discussion of some ideas used in incorporating team teaching into the present school program. It was found that it is used in all levels, but on an experimental basis in most instances.

Chapter IV is a discussion of team teaching as a new approach to improve the quality of instruction. The advantages of team teaching to both the teacher and the pupil are discussed.

Chapter V contains a summary and conclusions regarding the study. A complete bibliography follows.

## CHAPTER II

### THE ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF TEAM TEACHING

The data cited concerning the organization and administration of the team teaching approach in the curriculum will be an attempt to support the basic assumption that team teaching is worthy of consideration in the organization of a school schedule. Basically the material will explain the various approaches to team teaching.

#### I. THE STRUCTURE OF THE TEAM

There are many variations to an organizational pattern for team teaching. Some basic factors remain constant with any pattern. Some of these would be cooperative planning, instruction, and evaluation, student grouping for special purposes, flexible daily schedule, perhaps teacher aides, and recognition and utilization of individual teaching talents.

Beggs pointed out three types of structure in team teaching. In his book, Team Teaching, he discussed these. They are the single-discipline team, the interdisciplinary block of time, and school-within-school.

The single-discipline team usually consists of two or three teachers from the same department, teaming together to instruct a common set of students. The suggestion of using teacher aides was made to allow teachers time for continuous curriculum planning and

revision based on student and teacher needs. This particular type of organization can be fitted into a conventional schedule with ease.<sup>1</sup>

In Hurricane (Utah) High School it was found that this type of organization worked well in English. Oliver suggested that the utilization of talents of teachers was enhanced by this. For instance, Teacher A seemed more secure in the teaching of literature, whereas, Teacher B preferred teaching grammar, Teacher C was strong in composition and creative writing, Teacher D was a specialist in speech, and the forte of Teacher E was reading.<sup>2</sup>

Beggs defined the interdisciplinary team as consisting of teachers from different disciplines. They were given a common block of time to use as they saw fit for the instruction of a common set of students. Classes were flexible in size and in duration of time.<sup>3</sup>

Roosevelt (California) High School revealed that this approach to team teaching can be used in a small school. The entire eighth grade (125 pupils) was included in one large group.

---

<sup>1</sup>David W. Beggs, Team Teaching (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1967), p. 16.

<sup>2</sup>Albert I. Oliver, Curriculum Improvement A Guide to Problems, Principles, and Procedures (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1965), p. 443.

<sup>3</sup>Beggs, loc. cit.

Four teachers were assigned three periods of the school day for the project. One period was used for planning and preparation. Through a redeployment of teachers and a versatile grouping of pupils based on needs, interests, and abilities special competencies were made available to more pupils.<sup>4</sup>

The school-within-school team consists of teachers from all disciplines responsible for the instruction of the same body of students over an extended period of time, usually two to four years. This allows flexibility in class size and scheduling.<sup>5</sup>

The primary purpose of this type of team, wrote Becker, was to encourage a closer relationship between teacher and student within any and all disciplines. In a large school, the loss of identity suffered by some students might be compensated by placing them in a smaller "division" of the larger school.<sup>6</sup>

The Claremont Graduate School in Claremont, California, has sponsored experimentation with the small, integrated school-within-school teaching team.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>Glen F. Ovard, Administration of the Changing Secondary School (New York: MacMillan Company, 1966), p. 178.

<sup>5</sup>Beggs, op. cit., pp. 19-20.

<sup>6</sup>William K. Richards, "The Norwalk Plan, Team Teaching Is a Privilege," Scholastic Teacher, LXXXVIII (March 25, 1966), pp. 13-15.

<sup>7</sup>Medill Bair and Richard G. Woodard, Team Teaching in Action (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964), pp. 26-27.



Within these three basic types of teaching teams, certain hierarchical differences may be noted. Shaplin and Olds wrote that some teams organize into a formal hierarchy of positions based upon ability, responsibility, and specialized training, with greater rewards and prestige assigned to the higher positions. New titles have emerged such as "team leader," "senior teacher," and "cooperating teacher."<sup>8</sup>

The Lexington, Massachusetts team based their program on the "hierarchy-of-teacher-pattern." The team was composed of three teachers, two senior leaders and one team leader. The roster of the team also included three specialist teachers (art, music, and physical education) who provided instructions for pupils in all the groups. Other members of the team included the part-time teacher, interne, the teacher aide, and the clerical aide. In this plan team leaders received a salary supplement since they assumed responsibilities for certain administrative functions and were largely responsible for identifying pupil needs, assigning pupils to groups, giving leadership for developing curriculum and supervising the team.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>Judson T. Shaplin and Henry F. Olds, Team Teaching (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 19.

<sup>9</sup>Albert H. Shuster and Milton E. Ploghoft, The Emerging Elementary Curriculum: Methods and Procedures (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1963), pp. 132-33.

In the Norwalk Plan of Norwalk, Connecticut, primary focus has been placed upon the improvement of the career opportunities for teachers based on the hierarchial approach.<sup>10</sup>

## II. APPROACH TO ESTABLISHING A TEAM TEACHING PROGRAM

Polos felt strongly that team teaching is the best way to use the facilities of a school plant as well as using specific competencies of all faculty members. He gave suggestions for the establishing of team teaching in any school. One should study all available literature and apply it to one's own school situation. Objectives must be defined and agreed upon by faculty members. The variations should be studied and one chosen that fits one's own school. He suggests starting slowly, perhaps one grade at a time. Combine subjects that have common aspects. The team members must be set up and materials secured to successfully carry out such a program. Make a plan for centralizing materials. Community resources must be used. This would include orientation of parents and others with the planned program. New evaluation techniques to meet the objectives should be devised. Student grouping can be done with

---

<sup>10</sup>Richards, loc. cit.

guidance and counseling assistance. Lastly, he suggested the designing of a flexible schedule that is really flexible. Creating large blocks of time with the team together in a solid morning or afternoon program.<sup>11</sup>

Shaplin and Olds summarized the value of visiting schools with team teaching programs with the purpose of copying the set-up as being neither valid nor an efficient and economical approach to setting up a team teaching program. They made very similar suggestions for setting up a team teaching program as suggested by Polos.<sup>12</sup>

It is admittedly more comfortable to remain satisfied with the status quo than to face the uncertainties which inevitably accompany change. The risk associated with doing, however, has always been overshadowed by the satisfaction of successful accomplishment.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup>Nicholas C. Polos, The Dynamics of Team Teaching (Dubuque, Iowa: W. C. Brown Company, 1965), pp. 126-27.

<sup>12</sup>Shaplin and Olds, op. cit., p. 170.

<sup>13</sup>Carl H. Peterson, Effective Team Teaching: The Easton Area High School Program (West Nyack: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1966), pp. 192-93.

## CHAPTER III

### INCORPORATION INTO THE TOTAL SCHOOL PROGRAM

America's power and new responsibilities in the family of nations is revolutionizing American education. The focus is on change and this is quite understandable. In this era of change, educators are investigating new ways to better prepare teachers, new methods of teaching and the proper way to incorporate new techniques into the schools.

#### I. ELEMENTARY LEVEL

The formal beginnings of team teaching in elementary school are usually identified with a cooperative effort of the Concord, Lexington, and Newton, Massachusetts school systems with Harvard's Graduate School of Education. As early as 1956 proposals were being made that resulted in grants to experiment in the area of team teaching.<sup>1</sup> Team teaching in the elementary school is significantly different from teaching on other levels. The idea of the self-contained classroom prevailed. It was this element of isolation, plus the necessity to attract into the profession accomplished teachers and retain them and to redeploy teacher's talents that made elementary

---

<sup>1</sup>Don Parker, Schooling for Individual Excellence (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1963), p. 47.



school a productive ground in which to plant the seeds of team teaching.<sup>2</sup>

Parker in his book, School for Individual Excellence, pointed out that by opening the self-contained classroom to the sunlight one discovers that the teachers are doing all kinds of things that will not bear scrutiny. Team teaching changes all that. It promotes the exchange of teacher ideas. It puts the teacher in a position where she has to answer her colleagues.<sup>3</sup>

It has been noted that various structures or types of organization have been used at the elementary level. The Carson City, Michigan Elementary School and the Englewood, Florida Elementary School established teams with a lead teacher and several cooperating teachers.<sup>4</sup>

At the elementary level most teams work at more than one grade level and there tends to be a greater emphasis on non-gradedness. It has been found that team teaching on the elementary level leaves more time for planning, observation, and evaluation of the teaching-learning process, for curriculum revision, and individualized instruction.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Nicholas C. Polos, The Dynamics of Team Teaching (Dubuque, Iowa: W. C. Brown Company, 1965), p. 30.

<sup>3</sup>Parker, loc. cit.

<sup>4</sup>Medill Fair and Richard G. Woodward, Team Teaching In Action (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964), p. 63.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

## II. JUNIOR HIGH LEVEL

The junior high school is the transitory link between the elementary school and the high school. The problem facing educators today is to acquaint the junior high schools with the possibilities which team teaching offers in improving the quality of education.

Polos suggested that only a few junior high schools have experimented with flexible scheduling and large group teaching. He discussed briefly the work of the Manhattan Junior High School begun in September, 1959. Basic reading was taught to about 120 students. Later the program was expanded to include mathematics and the language arts. The program left many questions unanswered.<sup>6</sup>

Beggs warned against making the mistake of confusing team teaching with small and large group instruction. He listed four ways team teaching can be done in the junior high school:

- A. All teachers from a single content field.
- B. All teachers from a single content field, but restricted to a grade level.
- C. All or several teachers from a single grade level, but from various content fields.
- D. All teachers working with a narrow span of student ability on one or more grade levels.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>Polos, op. cit., pp. 35-36.

<sup>7</sup>David W. Beggs, Team Teaching (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1967), pp. 63-65.

Team teaching, with its capitalization of knowledge and skills, can alleviate many problems. There is no standard formula for team teaching in junior high schools. Junior high teachers have done a superior job in setting up team teaching guidelines. Beggs reinforced this statement by discussing the work done by the Lakeview Junior High School, Decatur, Illinois. Each teacher group worked out its own operational design.<sup>8</sup>

When one talks about junior high school education for the future and what is hoped to be accomplished, one of the deepest concerns is the professionalization of the teacher. Team teaching presents the teacher with an outstanding opportunity to participate in professional decision making. As team teaching becomes a strong, vigorous element on the educational scene in junior high schools, one can hope to see significant curricular changes take place.<sup>9</sup>

### III. SENIOR HIGH LEVEL

The typical high school of 1955 was not basically different from the high school of 1925. If the forces now at work in education continue to effect kinds of change that have been made in the past five years one will soon find a new kind of senior high school having little in common with even present day schools. When high

---

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 72.

school teachers talk today, many new ideas such as video tape recording, teleprojection, programmed instruction, the ungraded high school, the spiral curriculum, Q-spaces, independent study, movable walls, flexible scheduling, BSCP biology, PSSC physics and MSG mathematics are not uncommon.

Badly needed by today's high school is an organizational pattern into which these and other ideas can fit.

Beggs pointed out the need for administrators designing new organizational plans which are based on sound assumptions regarding the learning process and the nature of individual differences. He suggested the team teaching approach as being the answer to incorporating these new ideas into the curriculum.<sup>10</sup>

Griffin in his article, "Some Ideas and New Patterns at Wayland, Massachusetts, High School," discussed the division of the faculty into six teams on a "vertical" layout, each team contains all the instructors in a specific subject. There is a team leader who is responsible for the planning, co-ordinating and leading the team. He evaluated this project as being successful with the problem of scheduling being the main one. Computer scheduling was planned to remove this problem.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 75.

<sup>11</sup>William M. Griffin, "Some Ideas and New Patterns at Wayland, Massachusetts, High School," The Bulletin, National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLVI (January, 1962), pp. 123-26.



Polos pointed out the importance of teacher aides, audio-visual equipment, and flexible planning in a team teaching program in a high school. He used the program at Fremont High School, Sunnyvale, California to substantiate this idea. The program there had been in progress for four years and involved about 500-600 students. The four member social science team planned twelve lecture sessions weekly. The lecture sessions included from 90 to 120 students at a time. At least once a week the group met in sessions of only 15. The Fremont faculty was enthusiastic with their program. This program was also used in Biology.<sup>12</sup>

#### IV. COLLEGE LEVEL

Team teaching has found its way into the colleges on a limited scale. One likely result of the team approach at the college level is greater independence and self-motivated activity on the part of the student. As in the high schools the competencies of individual faculty members can be exposed to a greater number of students.<sup>13</sup>

Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Advancement of Education has several programs being conducted across the country. Some of these are at Austin College, Sherman, Texas, Antioch College, Yellow

---

<sup>12</sup>Polos, op. cit., pp. 44-45.

<sup>13</sup>Joseph M. Stokes, "Shaking Up College Teaching II. Team Teaching in College," Saturday Review, XLIV (July 16, 1966), pp. 64-65.

Springs, Ohio, and the University of Kentucky. They are revising curriculum, promoting independent study, providing large-group instruction, and bringing the use of modern audio-visual equipment and techniques.<sup>14</sup>

The University of Kentucky was faced with teaching 4000 mathematics students with ten full time faculty members and some graduate assistants. They devised a fairly simple and effective program. The senior faculty members taught all the large classes in basic courses. A special study room was set up and more advanced students worked on their own and came into the study room only for help from faculty members.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup>Polos, op. cit., p. 47.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 50.

## CHAPTER IV

### AN IMPROVEMENT IN THE QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

Providing for individual differences is the key to superior teaching. Only when each pupil is taken where he is and challenged to progress as far as he can go will his achievement and the total achievement of the class approach the maximum.

#### I. TEAM TEACHING BRINGS NEW APPROACH

Team teaching is hopefully that new approach which will solve some of the basic problems of providing better instruction for today's youth.

Team teaching provides an organizational vehicle for specialization in teaching. A team for an elementary school may consist of teachers in complementary skills, such as an expert in reading, one in social studies, and one in mathematics and science. At the secondary level teachers of a subject and may become experts in grammar, literature, language, or other disciplines. Such specialization may lead to improvements in instruction and to more effective use of teacher talents.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Judson T. Shaplin and Henry F. Olds, Team Teaching (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 18.

The team teaching program enables teachers to provide all participating students with a degree of individualized instruction. Some students need a great deal more individualized instruction than others, and the type of individual instruction needed by one student would not necessarily benefit another. Some students need only one repetition to absorb a concept clearly. Their ability to grasp abstract ideas is greatly superior to that of other students. Other students' minds work more slowly and in a different way. These students need the benefit of additional repetition before an idea becomes clearly implanted in their minds. And still other students require special tutoring in areas of particular academic weakness. The team teaching program is particularly effective here because they can use the daily study hall to work individually in small groups with students who need additional time for complete mastery, or they can guide students who are sufficiently advanced to go further into the subject matter on their own. With such individualized instruction, students will demonstrate a breadth of understanding impossible to acquire in a regular classroom situation of the traditional setting.<sup>2</sup>

A unique characteristic of team teaching is the way children are encouraged to handle materials. It is not uncommon to see one

---

<sup>2</sup>Carl H. Peterson, Effective Team Teaching: The Easton Area High School Program (New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1966), p. 103.



or two students watching a film, ten or eleven viewing filmstrips through individual filmstrip viewers, and still others using listening centers. Students are also free to preview audio-visual materials in any free time they have, purely for recreational and exploratory information. Children may even go to the library throughout the day on an individual or group basis.

Textbooks are available at different grade levels in one team teaching setup and a student may have in his desk a third-grade arithmetic book, a fourth grade science book, and a fifth grade reader. In some subjects a student may not have an assigned text but will utilize a variety of materials in independent study.<sup>3</sup>

Large-group instruction has proven to be quite effective in the team teaching program. A teacher is inclined to prepare exceptionally well for a presentation to five groups of 30 students simultaneously. It is economically more feasible to make the introduction of technical aids to large groups. Children can also be taught to listen, take notes, and behave when assembled in large groups.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>"Design for Team Teaching," The Instructor, LXXVII (May, 1968), pp. 68-69.

<sup>4</sup>How to Organize an Effective Team Teaching Program (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966), pp. 46-47.

Small-group discussion is beneficial to students because they are motivated to look, listen, read and think, and they relish the opportunity to express their own ideas. The discussion that takes place improves personal relations among students, promotes problem solving, and develops more effective communication skills. From these small group discussions, a child learns respect for another's point of view. He learns that his own ideas must be presented for review in the court of public opinion. He not only acquires pertinent information, but is a participant in a process that tends to preserve and strengthen democracy. Although each student has complete freedom to express his thoughts, he soon learns that not all talk is good talk and that lack of preparation, ignorance of facts, or irrational remarks will affect his status in the group. A worthwhile contribution, on the other hand, is readily recognized by all and tends to encourage each to do his best.<sup>5</sup>

## II. ADVANTAGES OF TEAM TEACHING

The team teaching program helps students accomplish their own goals. They are able to master any given learning task before proceeding to a new task. This is an important asset to this type of teaching. Children must see themselves as successful learners if teachers are to keep them interested in school.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., pp. 49-50.

<sup>6</sup>Shaplin and Olds, op. cit., p. 351.

The highly flexible schedule of the team teaching program makes possible the use of outstanding teachers who can no longer be in the classroom full time because of home responsibilities. They may have the inclination, the drive, and the abilities needed on a team but be available for only part of the teaching day. This use of talent greatly benefits students in the learning process.

Probably the greatest advantage claimed for team teaching is the opportunity for the members of the team to plan and evaluate together. Cooperative planning results not only in a better educational program for the children involved, but the teachers grow professionally in the process.<sup>7</sup>

Some other advantages of team teaching that greatly benefit the individual student are (1) the planning of field trips for team students in team meetings and the reduction of interference from field trips with other teachers' classes; (2) increased interest and involvement of parents due to their children's common experiences; and (3) the ability, or interest level because of team structure.<sup>8</sup>

Team teaching may not solve all our problems as we attempt to educate the youth of America, but as Emerson wrote, "None can teach

---

<sup>7</sup>Theodore J. Jenson and others, Elementary School Administration (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1967), pp. 85-86.

<sup>8</sup>Robert E. Chasnoff, Elementary Curriculum (New York: Pittman Publishing Corporation, 1964), p. 575.

more than he knows," and that is exactly what the traditional way of teaching has attempted to do.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>Norma E. Cutts and Nicholas Moseley, Providing for Individual Differences in the Elementary School (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961), p. 62.



## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### I. SUMMARY

It is encouraging to find that educators are aware of new innovations. This evidences concern and a desire to do a better job of teaching than ever before. Many writers mentioned this concern and pointed out the need for an examination of the curriculum to see if team teaching is the answer to better teaching.

The study revealed many important things about team teaching. It is relatively new. It has been tried with varying degree of success at schools all across the country. Laymen are concerned about the schools to the extent that large grants have been made available to test team teaching as a major curriculum change.

The study revealed that much research is necessary before a school even attempts to use team teaching. Much planning and inservice on the part of a faculty is necessary to insure success. Merely observing it in a successful setting in one school does not provide knowledge or guarantee success in setting up such a program in another school. Each school must be recognized as being different.

Team teaching has been introduced into the school systems at all levels. It has appeared in different forms. The fact that it is new and different does not lend merit to it. It does not insure

success for it. It has been found across the country in elementary, junior high school, senior high school and even college.

The organization of a team teaching program in itself solves few of the problems which have been too long hidden from the light of day. There must be curriculum revision, and better trained personnel with time to plan, teach, and evaluate if team teaching is to be a success. When team teaching is tried it brings this vividly into focus. It offers an effective vehicle for identifying these problems, for studying them, and for seeking solutions to them. How productively the problems are attacked is partly dependent upon the quality of the personnel involved, their commitment to the task, and the wisdom with which their talents are employed. If one considers the needs of students one will be very interested in giving team teaching serious considerations.

If the educational program remains strong, the very best use of talent and time must be utilized. Unless this sacrifice is made, putting in an innovation such as team teaching will be a waste of time and a dismal failure.

## II. CONCLUSIONS

As a result of having made the study it can be concluded that some progress has been made by using team teaching. There are still many improvements that need to be made, if the full worth of team teaching is realized. This can be done provided the educators,

parents, and other agencies do their part in coping with the problem.

Securing the best educational climate for today's students is the sole aim for the schools of today. Any new idea that will do this is worthy of much study. The training and resourcefulness of the teachers will determine the extent that new ideas are incorporated into the school program.

The researcher finds that team teaching is an exciting and challenging concept to many teachers. When properly organized team teaching can serve students of all ability levels and can meet individual differences much better than the old traditional plan of organization. It was found that most educators are convinced that team teaching aids learning, and that their learning situation is improved because of the stimulation brought about by the comprehensive use of diverse pieces of equipment; the improved performance in the field by teachers who had time to plan properly; and by the prevailing mood for learning which team teaching encourages.

Research points conclusively toward the positive values of a greater intellectual freedom and quality of learning as the natural product of the team system because of the effective utilization of teacher effort and teacher competency. Most educators seem to agree on at least this single point: Increased efficiency is not sufficient justification unless instruction is significantly improved.



# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## A. BOOKS

- Allen, Dwight W. and Robert N. Bush. A New Design for High School Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.
- Bair, Medill and Richard G. Woodward. Team Teaching in Action. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964.
- Beggs, David W. Team Teaching. Indianapolis: Unified College Press, 1964.
- Chasnoff, Robert E. Elementary Curriculum. New York: Pittman Publishing Corporation, 1964.
- Cutts, Norma E. and Nicholas Mosley. Providing for Individual Differences in the Elementary School. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.
- How to Organize an Effective Team Teaching Program. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.
- Jenson, Theodore J. and others. Elementary School Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1967.
- Olds, Henry F. and Judson T. Shaplin. Team Teaching. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.
- Oliver, Albert I. Curriculum Improvement A Guide to Problems, Principles, and Procedures. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1965.
- Ovard, Glen F. Administration of the Changing Secondary School. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1966.
- Parker, Don. Schooling for Excellence. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1963.
- Peterson, Carl H. Effective Team Teaching: The Easton Area High School Program. New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc.,
- Ploghoft, Milton E. and Albert H. Shuster. The Emerging Elementary Curriculum Methods and Procedures. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1963.
- Polos, Nicholas C. The Dynamics of Team Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: W. C. Brown Company, 1965.



## B. PERIODICALS

- Anderson, Robert. "Team Teaching," National Education Association Journal, L (March, 1961), 52-54.
- Dean, Stuart and Clinette Witherspoon. "Team Teaching in the Elementary School," Education Briefs, XXXVIII (January, 1962), 1-6.
- "Design for Team Teaching," The Instructor, LXXVII (May, 1968), 68-69.
- "Designing School for Variability," Educational Leadership, XXV (March, 1967), 505.
- Fraenkel, Jack R. and Richard E. Gross. "Team Teaching: Let's Look Before We Leap," Social Education, XXX (May, 1966), 335-337.
- Georgiades, William. "Team Teaching: A Star, Not a Meteor," National Education Association Journal, LX (April, 1967), 14-15.
- Goldstein, William. "Problems in Team Teaching," Clearing House, XLII (October, 1967), 83-86.
- Griffin, William M. "Some Ideas and New Patterns at Wayland, Massachusetts, High School," The Bulletin, National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLVI (January, 1962), 123-126.
- Jenkins, Kenneth D. "Teaming and Teaching," Clearing House, XLII (October, 1967), 80-82.
- Meyers, James A. "Group Grope: Problems of Team Teaching," Clearing House, XLII (February, 1968), 362-64.
- Olson, Carl O. "Why Teaching Teams Fail," Peabody Journal of Education, XLV (July, 1967), 15-20.
- Richards, William K. "The Norwalk Plan: 'Team Teaching Is a Privilege,'" Scholastic Teacher, LXXXVIII (March 25, 1966), 13-15.
- Stokes, Joseph M. "Shaking Up College Teaching II. Team Teaching in College," Saturday Review, XLIX (July 16, 1966), 64-65.
- Sybouts, Ward. "Supervision and Team Teaching," Educational Leadership, XXV (November, 1967), 158-159+.