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The primary purpose of the study was to explore the following question: How do four teams of college English teachers teaching a developmental writing course at the university level experience and perceive team teaching? The study was a naturalistic inquiry and the design borrowed elements from case study methodology. Data were collected via multiple methods: classroom observations, three types of interviews, and syllabi collection. Data from these sources were analyzed to convey a sense of what team teaching was like for these four teams. The researcher was a member of one of the teams in the study, so she included herself in the process. Findings of the study revealed the following: (a) These four dialectic, homogeneous teams perceived themselves compatible and flexible in their interactive behaviors; (b) These four dialectic, homogeneous teams described a pedagogy centered on facilitative teaching and active student engagement; (c) These four dialectic, homogeneous teams perceived there to be consistency within individual teams in terms of curriculum, assessment, and evaluation but an absence of consistency of these areas across the four teams; (d) These four dialectic, homogenous teams perceived teaming as a means to improved student support and teacher development.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Team teaching is considered an important educational innovation at the primary, secondary, and postsecondary levels. Over the past 50 years team teaching has typically been viewed as improving student engagement and learning (Anderson & Speck, 1998; Goldberg & Finkelstein, 2002; Held & Rosenberg, 1983; York-Barr, 2002) and enhancing the quality and experience of teaching (Anderson & Speck, 1998; Crow & Pounder, 2000; Dammers & Reitan, 1980; Eisen & Tisdell, 2003; Held & Rosenberg, 1983; Jarvis & Fleming, 1965; Martin, 1975; McDaniel & Colarulli, 1997). School systems, including higher education, have turned to team teaching to better serve their students through a more diverse and integrated curriculum and instructional setting enhanced by the knowledge and skills of more than one educator (Aden, 1962; Anderson & Speck, 1998; Crow & Pounder, 2000; Dammers & Reitan, 1980; Eisen & Tisdell, 2003; Held & Rosenberg, 1983; Jarvis & Fleming, 1965; Martin, 1975; McDaniel & Colarulli, 1997). Unlike a traditional classroom setting typically isolates disciplines and community of learners, which may be useful for discovery of knowledge, delivery of foundational concepts, and introduction of the specialized methods of the content area, (Anderson & Speck, 1998; Eisen, 2000), team teaching offers students multiple perspectives by having more than one teacher (Crow & Pounder, 2000). Additionally, teaming allows for collaborative learning to be modeled for students (Eisen, 2000; McDaniel & Colarulli, 1997).
Although most people have likely heard of the concept of team teaching, there are various terms associated with the concept: cooperative teaching (Olson, 1967), co-teaching (Harris & Harvey, 2000), interdisciplinary teacher teaming (Crow & Pounder, 2000) or planning-teaching teaming (Gaskell, 1967). The literature on team teaching shows there are three different ways to engage teachers in team teaching. Sequential team teaming is when one teacher teaches followed by the other teacher teaching. As an example, the teachers might divide a class period and each teaches for half of the class. Distinction team teaching is when there is one lead teacher and one supportive teacher. For example, one teacher can do most of the teaching while one helps, assists, or makes comments. Dialectic team teaching requires substantial cooperation because the educators work together to teach with equal responsibilities (Wenger & Hornyak, 1999). For instance, dialectic team teaching involves both teachers equally sharing teaching responsibilities inside and outside the classroom.

When teaming occurs, most schools ranging from kindergarten to colleges or universities use an interdisciplinary or heterogenic design with teachers teaming from different disciplines. The most common disciplines are English and history (Anderson & Speck, 1998; McDaniel & Colarulli, 1997; Crow & Pounder, 2000; Diesman, 1964; Gaskell, 1967; Goldberg & Finkelstein, 2002; Harris & Harvey, 2000; Held & Rosenberg, 1983; Jarvis & Fleming, 1965; Martin, 1975; Perry & Stewart, 2005; Strohschen & Heaney, 2000). Homogenous teams, two teachers from the same discipline, are less common in higher education (Crow & Pounder, 2000; Harris & Harvey, 2000). Although most colleges and universities offer most of their courses with
one instructor, some faculty and administrations are discovering the limits of specialization and are experimenting with alternatives to the traditional format of a single teacher teaching a discipline-based course (Harris & Harvey, 2000; Struhschan & Heaney, 2000; Walter, Schlesinger, & Seashore, 1974; Wenger, & Hornyak, 1999).

Student performance is most commonly the focus of team teaching studies. One study reported that 11th grade United States history students from a dialectic teaming environment (teaming where both teachers teach collaboratively) outscored students from single teacher classrooms on the higher-level thinking standardized tests (Fraenkel, 1967). However, there are some studies that report no difference in standardized test scores based on solitary-teacher taught versus team taught classrooms (Carpenter, Crawford, & Walden, 2007; Cooper & Sterns, 1973).

Besides student performance, team teachers have also been studied across all grade levels, including at the college level (Harris & Harvey, 2000; Jarvis & Fleming, 1965; Lambert, Goodwin, & Wiersma, 1965; Shaplin & Olds, 1964; Smith, 1960). Some team teachers report focusing more on student learning and outcomes as well as making important decisions when working with a teaching partner (Anderson & Speck, 1998; Lehr, 1999; Strohschen & Heaney, 2000; Wenger & Hornyak, 1999). Teachers working in teams also stated that issues of handling student management, behavioral interventions, student assessment, and grouping students were much easier when working with a fellow teacher (Crow & Pounder, 2000). One study focused on both teamed and non-teamed teachers revealed that team teachers reported experiencing a stronger sense of professional growth, work motivation, work commitment, and job satisfaction when team
teaching (Crow & Pounder, 2000). This study noted the possibility that teaming created more opportunities for teacher development, more reflective practices, multidimensional perspectives enhancing student knowledge, and opportunities for more complex problem-solving for both teacher and student (Crow & Pounder, 2000; Perry & Stewart, 2005). Also, some teachers reported feeling more energized and reflective when team teaching (Perry & Stewart, 2005).

The examination of the way teachers actually experience homogenous, dialectic teaming specifically, teaming in which two teachers from the same discipline work together through planning, evaluating, assisting, and actually teaching side-by-side in the same classroom with other teams, has been less often studied (Anderson & Landy, 2006; Eisen & Tisdell, 2003; Perry & Stewart, 2005). A few studies reported studying dialectic teaming, requiring collaboration and cooperation in which both educators work together side-by-side sharing the responsibilities, such as planning, teaching, grading, evaluating, and assessing (Wenger & Hornyak, 1999).

**Statement of the Problem/Purpose of the Study**

The researcher has team taught in two different settings, including one in the context of this study in which she worked with her partner and other team teachers in a university English department. Her interest in understanding more fully the aspects of team teaching resulted in this study. She focused the study around the eight English teachers’ experiences and perceptions of a dialectic team taught class in which teamed pairs of faculty worked with developmental writers and other teams of English teachers at the university. The researcher team taught for three years at the university level before
this study began while teaching other classes that were not team taught. While doing so questions arose about this type of teaching. She realized that teaming required significant commitments in time, energy, and communication with another teacher. The researcher serving as a practitioner researcher (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009) examined team teachers’ perceptions and experiences, including her own to understand how other English teachers experienced and perceived dialectic teaming.

When the researcher began team teaching at the university level, she became intrigued in this facet of teaching. After two years of working with the same partner along with three additional partner teams, she learned several things about team teaching for herself and many she worked with: (a) There are many ways that team teaching can be implemented, (b) Most teams are composed of two or more teachers from different subjects (i.e., interdisciplinary teaming), (c) The purpose of teaming focuses around student learning, and (d) Teachers find teaching rewarding for themselves and their students.

A dearth of literature addressing teachers’ experiences with and perceptions of team teaching led the researcher to consider how the four teams experienced and perceived team teaching. However, because attention to multiple homogenous teams teaching the same college-level course was generally absent from the literature, especially in college-level English classrooms, the researcher with her own experiences and interest with dialectic team teaching designed the study to examine how the team teachers experienced and perceived dialectic homogeneous team teaching. The researcher of this study wanted to explore how four teams of English university teachers
in one English department experienced and perceived dialectic team teaching when working with developmental writers. This study examined how each of the participants in the English university department saw team teaching as well as their perceptions of teaming within the partnership and among the members of the collective group of eight English university teachers.

Although some of the benefits to students may be seen or concluded through the perceptions, language, and behaviors of the teachers in this study, the benefits of team teaching for students was not the focus of this study. Other researchers (Anderson & Speck, 1998; Gaskel, 1967; Goldberg & Finkelstein, 2002; Jarvis & Fleming, 1965; Klausmeier & Wiersma, 1965) have already reported this information in statistical and qualitative studies across many years of schooling (kindergarten through university levels). The lack of research in the area of teachers’ experiences with and perceptions of dialectic team teaching supports the need for this study.

**Significance of Study**

There are various reasons why this study was valuable and important in adding to the academic field. Colleges, universities, and teachers who might consider team teaching need to understand what teaming might be like if implemented. First, the ability to understand, analyze, and interpret experiences and perceptions of dialectic team teachers allows for further college teaching strategies to be examined. Second, colleges can evaluate teachers’ perceptions and experiences to suggest future dialectic team partnerships. Third, studying teachers’ experiences presents knowledge for those educators and administrators considering this type of teaming.
This study provides an opportunity to shed light on dialectic team teaching in one department of eight English university teachers who teach a developmental English course at the university level. Thus, this study may add to the literature on teaming by providing the experiences and perceptions of the participants.

**Research Question**

The study explored the following question: How do four teams of college English teachers teaching a developmental writing course at the university level experience and perceive team teaching?

**Dissertation Overview**

Chapter II provides background information and a review of previous research conducted on team teaching. It begins with definitions of team teaching followed by historical information about team teaching in the United States and the implications of team teaching for students and for teachers as it is applied at various levels of education, including elementary, middle, high schools, and colleges. Team teaching as a method of teacher preparation is also explained. The chapter concludes with information about teaching developmental writers on the college level with the best practices and strategies to use when working with developmental writers.

Chapter III provides a detailed description of the design of the study. The chapter begins with an overview of the theories that influenced the researcher. A discussion of literature about naturalistic research provides the rationale for this type of study. The researcher discusses how she borrowed elements from case study and practitioner research for the study design. The context of the study is provided, followed by a
description of data collection and analysis. The chapter closes with an assessment of the quality of the research, including an examination of trustworthiness and researcher bias.

Chapter IV presents the findings of the study: (a) These four dialectic, homogeneous teams perceived themselves compatible and flexible in their interactive behaviors; (b) These four dialectic, homogeneous teams described a pedagogy centered on facilitative teaching and active student engagement; (c) These four dialectic, homogeneous teams perceived there to be consistency within individual teams in terms of curriculum, assessment, and evaluation but an absence of consistency of these areas across the four teams; (d) These four dialectic, homogenous teams perceived teaming as a means to improved student support and teacher development. This chapter focuses on the participants’ experiences and perceptions of teaming from these eight team teachers.

The researcher‘s interpretation of the findings appears in Chapter V. Findings from this study are compared and analyzed with those of prior studies found in the literature on teaming practices. Implications for practice based on the findings of this study are presented, and future research recommendations are offered and explained. The dissertation closes with final thoughts about how team teachers and those considering team teaching can be affected after considering the perceptions and experiences of the four teams.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The primary purpose of Chapter II is to review the literature on team teaching in K–12 and higher education. It opens with an overview of definitions followed by historical perspectives that provides a chronological portrait of team teaching as practiced in the United States since the late 1950s. Next, a summary of empirical research illustrates the impact of team teaching on both teachers and students. Then, implications of team teaching for students and teachers at various levels of education have been organized as follows: elementary school, middle school, high school, and college levels. Finally, team teaching used for teacher preparation is also addressed because it is another area in which teaming has been implemented.

A review of relevant literature on team teaching was found using a variety of sources. Over 40 different books on team teaching were located at various libraries either in person or ordered using OhioLink or KentLink. The researcher also used several electronic journals and databases when seeking literature reviews. Academic Search Premier, Education Search Complete, Eric, The Chronicle of Higher Education were the databases accessed the most during the review on team teaching. JSTOR was another database used, which assisted in tracking the evolution of team teaching by decade, specifically looking for team teachers’ experiences and perceptions of team teaching. Articles were sorted into three different categories. The first category included many articles defining various styles of team teaching, which is covered in the next section of
this chapter. The second type of research primarily dealt with the “do’s” and “don’ts” of team teaching. This literature was more theoretical and did not deal with specific studies, but rather offered suggestions one should consider when team teaching, so this literature was mostly left out of the literature review. The third type of articles found had empirical studies with a focus on the teachers in team teaching settings from K-12 and even higher education. This was the least saturated area of research. Most of the empirical research studied interdisciplinary teaming or teaming used between a faculty member and a teaching assistant as professional development for the less experienced teacher. Additionally, there was a fourth area of studies that dealt with empirical qualitative and quantitative research that studied student performance; however, since this study was not looking at students or student performance, these were not included in the researcher’s literature review.

**Definitions of Team Teaching**

Team teaching has been defined variously, but the most widely applied definitions suggest two or more teachers (working with or without teacher aides), planning, instructing, and evaluating together, while availing themselves of one another’s talents and expertise (Beggs, 1964). Some view team teaching as an equal partnership characterized by total sharing of responsibility for teaching, grading, planning, and evaluating; whereas others see joint planning outside class as adequate and sufficient characteristics of teaming (Anderson & Landy, 2006; Anderson & Speck, 1998). Others reference teaming as an opportunity to work with trusted fellow teachers and develop a
commitment to strengthen the education experience for both teachers and students (Dyrud, 2010).

The discussion of team teaching has not centered on whether or not team teaching should take place but how to define the concept (Wenger & Hornyak, 1999). Teaming comes in different styles. Heterogeneous (or also known as interdisciplinary teaching) is more common than homogeneous teaching (two teachers teaching together from the same discipline). Both heterogeneous (across disciplines) and homogeneous teaming (one discipline) can be seen in three different styles: sequential, distinction, and dialectic. Sequential teaming involves teachers taking turns teaching. One teacher presents, and the other continues with the lesson. Distinction teaching calls for one teacher to do most of the work while the other helps, assists, or make comments. Dialectic teaching requires substantial cooperation in which educators work together side-by-side sharing responsibilities for planning, teaching, grading, evaluating, and assessing (Gayton, 2010; Wenger & Hornyak, 1999). This means that both teachers teach collaboratively (taking turns, building off of each other’s discussions, expanding or challenging the other’s ideas, concepts), as opposed to one teacher leading while the other serves as an aide. Although definitions have been reworked and labeled as new, teaming generally occurs in these formats.

Most people are familiar with the concept of team teaching, also referred to as cooperative teaching (Olson, 1967), co-teaching (Harris & Harvey, 2000), interdisciplinary teacher teaming (Crow & Pounder, 2000), and planning–teaching teaming (Gaskell, 1967), but the inability to pinpoint a specific definition has led to a
reliance on operational definitions for clarity in various settings. For instance, most schools ranging from kindergarten to colleges and universities accommodate a heterogenic design with teachers integrating different disciplines. The most commonly occurring teaming is formed between two teachers of these subjects: English, history, and science (Diesman, 1964; Gaskell, 1967; Harris & Harvey, 2000). The homogenous combination, defined as team teaching within the same discipline, exists across the teaching of students of all ages. However, it is a less common configuration (Crow & Pounder, 2000; Harris & Harvey, 2000).

**History of Team Teaching**

After World War II, American schools were reassessed to improve the quality of education, which had at that time reached a low level of public approval. In response to criticism, the Commission of Curriculum Planning and Development of the National Association of Secondary School Principals suggested and promoted new approaches in the 1950s, especially with regard to curriculum development and teaching methods (Beggs, 1964). Since the late 1950s one such approach that enjoyed popularity in many educational settings was team teaching (Bair & Woodward, 1964; Beggs, 1964; Chamberlin, 1969; Lambert, Goodwin, & Wiersma, 1965), in which teachers partnered and drew on one another's expertise to improve instructional opportunities for children (McDaniel & Colarulli, 1997).

In the mid 1950’s, a few team-taught programs were piloted, primarily in elementary schools (Chamberlin, 1969; Shaplin & Olds, 1964), where teachers received assistance to promote team teaching by using action research. In 1956, a publication of
the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) included brief mention of one elementary school participating in team teaching. However, by 1961, over half the ASCD bulletins reported the use of team teaching in schools nationwide indicating that it was highly recommended and encouraged for teachers to implement (Shaplin & Olds, 1964). Team teaching appeared in the Education Index for the first time in 1957, and the technique was first demonstrated during a training seminar for preservice teachers at Harvard in 1959 to illustrate cooperation between colleges and elementary schools (Shaplin & Olds, 1964). Soon reports, research, and teachers’ professional development led to increased exploration, conversations, and use of team teaching. The most meaningful debate surrounding it was whether or not students performed or learned better when in a team learning atmosphere. To some, team teaching appeared to have been designed merely to pack more students into one room so teachers could have more freedom and fewer class periods per day (Fisher, 1962). Chamberlin (1969), however, noted that it was one of the most imaginative and flexible ways to improve teaching in the 20th century.

Team teaching in elementary schools grew in popularity after its introduction in the 1950s. This teaching strategy may have been well received because of the way it was created and piloted. Although team teaching was designed in Florida and Michigan, Franklin School in Lexington, Massachusetts, was actually the first site of implementation; then the Lexington Team Teaching Program, a cooperative project between Harvard University and Estabrook Elementary in Lexington, was launched in September 1957. The primary goals of the collaborative program consisted of (a) groups
of teachers developing better goals for students, (b) better evaluations of pupils by multiple teachers, (c) collective decisions with mutual stimulation of a group of teachers making future plans and goals, and (d) better teaching methodologies, which encouraged the sharing of ideas and techniques (Bair & Woodward, 1964).

References to team teaching have been present in the literature for about fifty years and there is plenty of literature showing how it was used in various contexts. Like the researcher mentioned above, there are different categories of research one can research about team teaching. There are some significant contributors to the field of team teaching from each decade. For example, Bair and Woodward (1964), Martin (1975), Dammers and Reitan (1980), Pugach and Wesson (1995), and Beane and Brodhagen (2001) provided empirical studies that were used by the researcher of this study. After many months of researching, the researcher discovered that there was a gap in the research studies looking at how teachers experienced or perceived working together from the same discipline in higher education.

**Research on Team Teaching**

The literature included much writing concerning teaching teams from a theoretical or practical viewpoint. Generally, the members of successful teams agreed to be part of the team. Second, they were willing to compromise with flexibility being crucial. Third, team members realized they would learn from teaching with other faculty members, especially if they had years of experience. Finally, all members were excited and enthusiastic about serving on a team (Eisen, 2000).
Specifically, Eisen (2000) suggested that team teaching, which generates synergy through collaboration among teachers and students, required the willingness of teachers to form bonds with one another. Consequently, personality, outlook, and style must be compatible in order for teams to function effectively (Dammers & Reitan, 1980). Furthermore, Olson (1967) reported that team teaching in grades K–12 worked well when members of the team remained current with research and best practices and when principals served as leaders, offering continuous support and facilitating planning time and resources. Researchers observed that when teams ran smoothly, they made more productive decisions, problems appeared less frustrating and complicated, and more in-service education was supported. In Olson’s study, teachers at various levels, ranging from elementary to secondary, believed they knew students better when team teaching and were therefore better able to address their needs. The teachers realized their own and their partners’ strengths, producing a sense of personal satisfaction and overall willingness to work harder.

Researchers discovered that unproductive teams led to poor education for the students, friction between teachers, and low morale in the school building (Olson, 1967). Teams were ineffective if educator participants failed to contribute significant amounts of time and effort. Careless planning and unclear goals resulted in failure to attain program objectives (Dammers & Reitan, 1980). Similarly, negative consequences occurred when teams were dominated by one team member or those without proper facilities, planning time, and scheduling; in such cases the experience for the team teachers was consistently negative (Olson, 1967). Berentsen (2006) confirmed Olson’s research on failing teams in
another study, in which some teachers stated that they were uncomfortable with teaming because they preferred working independently and were unwilling to change or adapt in a team teaching format. Shaplin and Olds (1964) reported that those who were opposed to or were undecided about the idea of team teaching may have felt this way because they had not experienced teaming before.

Martin (1975) found that teaming was more difficult for some K-12 teachers to enter into if they had previously taught by themselves. He studied one team’s verbal and nonverbal communication and found that bargaining and negotiation skills were necessary when working with others. When disagreements between team members arose, options included blending ideas, reaching a stalemate, and requiring a cooling off period. The overall consensus of teachers, even with differences occurring, showed that teaming was overall a beneficial experience for both students and teachers (Berentsen, 2006; Martin, 1975).

Despite documented challenges, team teaching has been effectively implemented for several decades, in various settings. Most teachers’ natural inclination to share and work with others at all levels of education (ranging from elementary to higher education) may in part explain why team teaching has been so easily integrated into education (Shaplin & Olds, 1964), in particular at the elementary school level, where it was initially implemented.

**Elementary Team Teaching**

There are numerous studies about team teaching at the elementary level where it was first implemented. Although this study focused on higher education, the researcher
chose to review research at the elementary level because it proved helpful in looking to why teaming was beneficial for both students and teachers. However, it is important to note that research on team teaching at the elementary level showed positive results for both children and teachers that may generalize to higher educational settings. Specifically, Jackson (1964), who studied fifth and sixth graders, found that students in a team-taught environment scored higher on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills in reading achievement than those taught in a traditional setting. Their work–study skills also improved. In other areas such as math and science, however, no significant difference in student performance was apparent. Jarvis and Fleming (1965) studied children affective behaviors in a team-taught learning environment and found that they adjusted quickly, became more interested in school, made more friends, and participated in more school activities than children in traditional classrooms. Jarvis and Fleming (1965) reported that sixth graders enjoyed learning in a team-taught class. Almost all students stated they preferred learning in a team taught class.

Another type of team teaching model often used on the elementary level to assist learners is the team comprised of a subject-matter teacher and a special education teacher (Pugach & Wesson, 1995). Pugach and Wesson (1995) conducted a study in elementary schools with general learners and students with learning disabilities placed together in a team-taught environment. Students with learning disabilities (who were not easily identifiable by the other students in the classroom) reported being challenged more, receiving more assistance, and being more socially accepted; they also expressed their belief that they did better academically than they had when placed in an isolated
classroom with one teacher. Teachers reported good communication with their teaching partners, leading to greater teacher motivation and caring when considering their students, which resulted in the improved educational opportunities for children with learning disabilities (Pugach & Wesson, 1995).

**Middle School Team Teaching**

The literature also includes the positive effects of team teaching for both students and teachers at the middle school level, where exposure to input and knowledge from more than one teacher created a better learning atmosphere for children (Crow & Pounder, 2000). In 1993, a case study conducted in a middle school showed that achievement effects appeared to equalize differences in social class in interdisciplinary team taught environments (Beane & Brodhagen, 2001). Beane and Brodhagen (2001) surveyed more than 5,000 middle school-aged students and found that children experienced greater social bonding with one another and with their teachers in a team setting than in a traditional classroom with a single teacher. Furthermore, the usual method of instruction practiced by teams included lecture, seminar, and study session formats, which addressed various levels of ability and student needs in middle and high school. Overall, they found that teaming offered coherence of content and common skill and concept instruction across areas, as well as more personalized attention from educators (Beane & Brodhagen, 2001).

Middle school teachers have expressed greater motivation and satisfaction with various aspects of their jobs in the team environment than in the traditional classroom setting with one teacher. Specifically, Crow and Pounder (2000) discovered that middle
school teachers enjoyed teaming because it allowed them to acquire additional academic subject knowledge, share their lives and personalities, and increase contact with parents. Beane and Brodhagen (2001) found that teaming allowed for faculty members to support one another in areas such as planning, scheduling, grouping, and other types of decision-making. Many middle school teachers stated that when team teaching was implemented, they experienced an improved work climate, more frequent contact with parents, increased teacher job satisfaction, and higher levels of student achievement (Beane & Brodhagen, 2001, p. 42). Beane and Brodhagen (2001) concluded that teachers benefited from team teaching, such as feeling less isolated, developing higher self-esteem toward their teaching, experiencing professional development opportunities by obtaining new insight and knowledge, enjoying having additional support (both physically and emotionally), and recognizing strengths and weakness in various teaching styles. Teachers also saw value in having another educator present for accurately evaluating and observing student performance (Flanagan and Ralston, 1983). According to Powell and Mills (1994) and Flanagan and Ralston (1983), team members broadened their views of teaching and mentored one another on collaboration, professionalism, academic content, and professional relationships. These results were also noted in other grade levels where teaming occurred.

**High School Team Teaching**

Researchers have consistently confirmed the benefits of team teaching at the high school levels. Students at this level recognized the value of team-taught classes and recommended this method of instruction (Smith, 1960). Diesman (1964) found that
students increased interest in English and literature in the team-taught classroom and received better instruction from placement in small groups in which teachers made connections with other disciplines (Diesman, 1964).

Diesman (1964) studied teams at over 21 high schools and found that teachers planned, created goals, shared accomplishments, evaluated, and reflected together. Teaming was most common in English, history, and science, and often involved sorting out ability levels and specific interests of students. Some studies reported that teaming allowed for ability groups to be formed more easily (Crow & Pounder, 2000; Stevens & Elkins, 1964; Pugach & Wesson, 1995).

Conner (1961) examined homogeneous partnerships among four English teachers at a high school where all four teamed together based on their expertise and interests. This study showed team teaching to be extremely beneficial for various reasons. All four English teachers shared and focused on their specific area of expertise, acknowledging one another’s talents and interests when teaching collaboratively. They strived to achieve unity within the group by meeting consistently with one another, sparking enthusiasm within the team, designing and meeting goals together, agreeing on valuable class material, and listening to student reactions to improve their teaching. After one year of teaming together, the teachers found they worked harder to include more visual aids, conduct extra research, and create new ideas than they did when teaching individually, which stimulated interest and motivation for both the teachers and students (Conner, 1961).
Smith (1960) also found that team teaching within a high school English department allowed teachers to specialize in their areas of expertise and preferences, but serving on a team also required flexibility and willingness to change. Team teachers reported as benefits the time and opportunity to learn from one another and found various forms of instruction easier to implement with more than one teacher, particularly group work. Teaming within the English department was useful when teaching both literature and grammar classes (Fisher, 1962). This was also indicated in other studies of teaming across grade levels (Beane & Brodhagen, 2001; Crow & Pounder, 2000; Diesman, 1964).

**College and University Team Teaching**

Colleges and universities predominantly offer traditional courses taught by a single instructor. Although traditional classes are still useful for the discovery of knowledge, delivery of foundational concepts, and the introduction of the specialized methods of content areas, isolating disciplines has been found by faculty at many colleges and universities to be unsatisfactory as the only means of instruction (Anderson & Speck, 1998; Eisen, 2000). Team teaching served students by drawing connections between disciplines, modeling collaborative discussions, allowed for higher critical thinking, and often times engaged in more active learning (Anderson & Speck, 1998; Harris & Harvey, 2000; Perry & Stewart, 2005). Exposing students to multiple perspectives and teaching styles, emphasizing collaboration across the disciplines and within departments, blurring disciplinary boundaries, and encouraging innovative teaching methodologies, one of the true benefits… lies in the excitement of a new undertaking with trusted colleagues and the ensuing commitment to maximize the educational experience (Dyrud, 2010).
Discovering the limits of specialization, many teaching professionals experimented with team teaching as an alternative to traditional discipline-based courses and found the practice rewarding for students (Harris & Harvey, 2000; Magnan, 1987; Strohschen & Heaney, 2000; Walter, Sikes, Schlesinger, & Seashore, 1974; Wenger & Hornyak, 1999).

Practically speaking, curriculum should not be presented in subdivided, disciplinary packages; instead, multiple forms of knowledge are necessary to address evolving issues (Anderson & Speck, 1998; Eisen, 2000). The multiple perspectives offered in team teaching have applicability and positive effects when applied to real life issues. Students also benefit from the teacher-to-teacher interaction associated with teaming, resulting in classroom discussions that include two expert opinions and model collaboration and diverse teaching styles (Anderson & Speck, 1998; Eisen, 2000). Team teaching has been used in a variety of ways at the college and university level, including in subjects amenable to interdisciplinary approaches like English, history, math, and in professional specialization areas like accounting, constitutional law, and pediatric nursing. In course catalogues these classes are often called —cross-disciplinary, multidisciplinary, trans-disciplinary, interdisciplinary, and simply . . . team taught course" (Lasher & Manners, 2005).

The rationale for team teaching at colleges and universities has been summarized in terms of three main goals: (a) to give students personalized instruction, (b) to give teachers flexibility with their time, and (c) to focus on students’ needs (Chamberlin, 1969). Furthermore, the writings of researchers and teachers promoting team teaching revealed numerous additional reasons to implement team teaching at the college level.
One study showed how student retention, a sense of belonging, and involvement with learning increased when team teaching was used in college classrooms (Goldberg & Finkelstein, 2002). Goldberg and Finkelstein, who studied teaming at both two and four year colleges, found that older, minority, commuting, and full-time students were more likely to remain in college if they experienced a team-taught, team-based, interdisciplinary curriculum. Another study of a sophomore-level management class showed that students enjoyed higher levels of both social interaction and academic performance. Even though students were not directly asked about team teaching on a class evaluation, they stated that having two teachers made class more fun, sparked their interest, and made them listen more attentively (Wenger & Hornyak, 1999). Wenger and Hornyak (1999) also concluded that team teaching can demonstrate for learners how to interact, disagree, collaborate, evaluate, analyze, and resolve conflicts. Anderson and Landy’s (2006) reviewed their own team taught experience compared to additional studies to report their findings on student learning in team taught classes. They found students’ comments showed enthusiasm about classes with multiple teachers.

However, for over five decades, teachers have been advised that those considering teaming should actually study the literature about team teaching before engaging in this method of teaching. Team teaching required adequate planning time and physical settings to accommodate large groups of students (Anderson & Landy, 2006; Anderson & Speck, 1998; Stevens & Elkins, 1964). Compatibility, teacher experience and expertise, personality, and gender were areas to consider before forming successful teaming relationships (Anderson & Speck, 1998; Crow & Pounder, 2000; Eisen, 2000).
Finding faculty willing to try teaming has been found to be problematic, especially for interdisciplinary teams in higher education (Chamberlin, 1969). Farnham (1996), Goleman, McKee, and Boyatzis (2002), and Shinn (2003) suggested that faculty members who plan on teaming need to consider their own preferences, strengths and weaknesses, conflict resolution skills, comfort level, and emotional intelligence. Partners need to shift between the roles of leader and follower, giving and receiving feedback, agreeing to continuous professional development, committing to both the idea of teaming and to their partner, and compromising with a fellow teacher (Anderson & Landy, 2006; George & Davis-Wiley, 2000). According to Stewart (2005) the following conditions were found to be necessary for successful team teaching at the college level: (a) choosing one’s partner, (b) matching similar teaching styles, and (c) placing an experienced teacher with a less experienced teacher. Based on their own research, Anderson and Landy (2006) offered additional guidelines and recommendations to ensure successful teaming: plan carefully and extensively with partner, attend all classes together, pay close attention to each other’s lectures, refer to each other’s ideas, debate with one’s partner, act as an exemplary student by asking questions of the other instructor, grade consistently, review and reassess goals for the course, ask questions and communicate with each other, and allow the students to actively participate.

The majority of literature studied by the researcher revealed positive attitudes of educators toward team teaching after participating in teaming at the college level (Anderson & Landy, 2006; Eisen & Tisdell, 2002; Hanlon & Thomas, 2002; Perry & Stewart, 2005; Wenger & Hornyak, 1999). Team teachers benefited from planning
together, dividing the work, learning from each other, and striving for consistency of 
grading (Anderson & Landy, 2006; Eisen & Tisdell, 2002; Hanlon & Thomas, 2002; 
studied 14 team teachers and found that they all experienced some form of irritation 
while working together with their partner. Examples of annoyances ranged from 
incompatible teaching styles, inability or willingness to work with another faculty 
member, domination of one individual, territorial attitude, disagreement with curriculum 
decision-making, poor communication skills, lack of friendship, little to no commitment 
level, and different or contradictory partner perceptions of their role in the relationship. 
Stewart (2005) also emphasized the importance of partners sharing a common 
pedagogical philosophy, showing respect toward each other, and having open 
communication as the best ways to overcome some of these problems and increased the 
positive effects in team teaching.

Overall, the foregoing studies have confirmed the potential positive impact of 
team teaching for students at the college level, as well as for the teachers. Researchers 
have looked at interdisciplinary teaming, but fewer studies were conducted with 
homogeneous disciplinary teaming. Of the few researchers who have studied 
homogenous disciplinary teaming, Ware and Gardner (1978) found two psychology 
professors whose enthusiasm increased while teaming because of the opportunity to 
engage in innovative planning, discussion, evaluation, and learning from each other. 
Magnan (1987) found that a graduate assistant and professor team teaching a French class 
enjoyed the collaboration and knowledge sharing they experienced when teaming with
someone in the same discipline. These two studies are among the few that have examined the way college-level teachers experience and perceive team teaching when team members teach in the same discipline. Therefore, to add to the body of literature on team teaching, the researcher conducted a study that examined the way teachers view teaming with a partner from the same discipline.

Team teaching has been taught via in-service training for practicing teaching, as part of the curriculum for pre-service teaching candidates by teaming individuals with various levels of expertise (Polos, 1965; Stewart, 2005). In one study, preservice teachers experienced team teaching in lieu of observations or supervised teaching. They team taught with an experienced teacher in order to become familiar with teaching while learning from a veteran. Results showed that this benefited both the inexperienced and experienced teacher: The new teacher learned from a veteran teacher while the latter gained exposure to the newest methodologies and strategies from the pre-service novice. Together they were able to discuss, plan, make progress, and boost the new-teacher’s confidence through this innovative preservice training model (Stewart, 2005).

Concern for the training of teaching assistants was made clear in the 1980s when contributors of the Holmes and Carnegie Reports proposed more rigorous teacher preparation programs. These reports recommended team teaching to help fulfill this need, while college officials acknowledged it as a cost-effective way to deal with expanding enrollments (Magnan, 1987). Both teaching assistants and professors on teaching teams spoke highly of their experiences (Magnan, 1987). Because the teaching assistants and professors did not team teach side-by-side but instead worked in classes
separately, they noticed that they did not feel as connected with the students and their progress. The teaching assistants stated that students did not always respect them as much as they did the professors. The teaching assistants seemed to benefit the most in developing their own teaching skills and professional behavior. The professors saw this opportunity as being valuable for the teaching assistants and responded favorably to sharing ideas with another professional.

In another study the effect of professional development for team teachers with different levels of experience was assessed. Queens College teamed an instructor and a teaching assistant (TA) to teach college classes to provide a way for teaching assistants to gain experience teaching with the help of veteran teachers. As a result of 103 participants who helped to teach the classes, 99 indicated that they wanted to continue teaming in the future (Held & Rosenberg, 1983, p. 822). The teaching assistants gained self-confidence and experience with team teaching for their future in education (Held & Rosenberg, 1983).

Nokes, Bullough, Egan, Birrell, and Hansen (2008) looked at twenty-six social studies pre-service teachers who were partnered with another pre-service teacher during their student teaching experience in an education program at BYU. Team teaching occurred between the two pre-service students and the mentor teacher in different secondary schools. The student teachers were interviewed at the end of their experience to see how they experienced the partnership with fellow student teachers. Almost all of the students found the experience rewarding in learning about collaboration during planning and instruction. They said they experienced skills in time management,
classroom discipline and management, dialogue, reflection, and collaboration. However, one major weakness was mentioned by the participants. They felt they had not had the experience of solo teaching. Communication with one’s partner was another weakness some partners reported. The assigned mentor teachers felt that the experience was practical and beneficial for the pre-service teachers because teaching often requires working collaboratively and professionally with fellow teachers. The mentor teachers also said that new teachers are often asked to work on a team with other teachers, so it gave them good practice in planning, cooperation, and collaboration (Nokes, Bullough, Egan, Birrell, & Hansen, 2008).

In another study, a researcher looked at a small college English department where two English teachers team taught a year-long stretch Shakespeare class together which united different topics on performance which were originally offered as two different courses (Moffat, 2010). This was created to allow the students to participate in a project across two very different Shakespeare classes. The same college found two English teachers to teach a class on Witchcraft in Salem, which also united two different prior classes. The faculty felt these were successful experiences for both students and teachers (Moffat, 2010).

Summary

The literature review in this chapter has covered the definition and history of team teaching, its various manifestations in elementary, middle, high school, and college levels. Most research has been confined to the impact of team teaching on student learning or how teachers perceive and experience teaming mostly in lower grades. Of all
the studies summarized in this chapter, Conner's study (1961) of homogenous partnerships among four high school English teachers who shared their expertise on a team was the most similar to this study. Ware and Gardner (1978) and Magnan (1987) both focused on single subject (homogeneous) team teaching, even though it was not directly focused on English classes. Only limited research has been conducted in-depth on one specific team or has explored how teams perceive and experience working with other teams. The researcher found few studies about various dialectic homogenous teams working together, especially in college-level developmental writing course. Hence, the researcher's purpose was answer the following question: How do four teams of college English teachers teaching a developmental writing course at the university level experience and perceive team teaching? This research question led to the study described in subsequent chapters, in hopes of enhancing available literature on team teaching.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The literature on team teaching and working with developmental writers surveyed in the previous chapter proved useful in designing this study of four teams of college instructors teaching a developmental writing course. The researcher found in her review that dialectic homogeneous teaming was less common than other forms of teaching and helped narrow the focus of this study around this strategy of teaming. The methods for this study were designed to develop insights into how eight college English teachers experienced and perceived team teaching.

In this chapter, the researcher explains how the study was designed and details its theoretical framework. The naturalistic research described in this chapter supports the rationale for this particular type of study as do case study and practitioner research. Description of the collection of multiple forms of data follows these explanations within the context of this study. Description of the analysis of the data follows. The chapter concludes with an assessment of the quality of the research, including issues of trustworthiness and a discussion of researcher bias.

Research Question

Although researchers have examined students in team taught classrooms, few have studied teachers’ perceptions and experiences with team teaching, especially college English teachers working with developmental writers. Consequently, this study was designed as an initial exploration of how eight team teachers in four teams perceive team
The primary research question addressed in this study: How do four teams of college English teachers teaching a developmental writing course at the university level experience and perceive team teaching?

**The Nature of Knowledge**

John Dewey (1938) held that knowledge is constructed, not discovered. Berger and Luckmann (1967) viewed the construction of knowledge as a fluid process in which an individual continuously reevaluates the way she or he acts and understands knowledge and the world. They wrote that interaction with learning occurs in everyday life and in the environment, the internalization of reality, and socialization in the larger and smaller worlds (i.e., roles) in specific contexts. Vygotsky (1978), writing of what we call social constructivism, explained that an individual makes sense of and understands a certain social environment, which in turn assists in constructing new meaning. Applicable to teacher collaboration, Vygotsky’s (1978) theory of social constructivism suggests that meaning and understanding emerge from social encounters, such as the interaction between teachers and students. Thus, teachers develop their own understanding and perception of their teaching experiences.

The classroom is a complex entity in which all members of the community seek their own understanding of the content and their experiences. A teacher’s reality is socially constructed through knowledge that he or she acquires by examining the world. Although no single absolute reality exists, this study examined the participants’ perceptions and experiences of team teaching.
The researcher considered Dewey's (1938), Berger and Luckmann's (1967), and Vygotsky's (1978) perspectives on the nature of knowledge and understanding and constructed this study (a) to explore the perceptions of eight college English teachers, each with his or her own complex, unique views of the world, team teaching, curriculum, and one another, and (b) to make sense of these multiple views as a whole. Because the researcher understood the nature of team teaching in a constructivist way, an appropriate research paradigm was essential.

**Naturalistic Inquiry as the Research Paradigm**

Because this study dealt with teachers’ assumptions about the world and team teaching, naturalistic inquiry\(^1\) provided a paradigm coinciding with the researcher’s understanding of the context and the intent of her research. Lincoln and Guba (1985) wrote about naturalistic inquiry, a term that shifted to constructivist inquiry over the last 20 years, and defined various dimensions of the paradigm, specifically that naturalistic researchers believe that

- Realities are multiple, constructed, and holistic; knower and known are interactive, inseparable, only time- and context-bound working hypothesis; all entities are in a state of mutual simultaneous shaping, so that it is impossible to distinguish causes from effects, and inquiry is value-bound. (p. 37)

Understanding that the teachers in this study constructed their own realities, the researcher designed a study to take those realities into account (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The researcher intended to understand how the participants described their experiences

---

\(^1\) Naturalistic inquiry has been relabeled constructivism (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009).
and perceptions concerning their participation in team teaching. One caveat Lincoln and Guba offered to researchers implementing naturalistic inquiry regards the degree of "ultimate truth." Researchers should note that people see the world differently through their own perceptions and experiences, and although they can attempt to share these with others, those others may not be able to understand and see the world in exactly the same manner. Lincoln and Guba explained that the possibility of generalization applies only to statements in specific time- and context-bound working hypotheses. This study was specific to the eight teachers' experiences and perceptions of team teaching in a particular location and time. The foregoing aspects of naturalistic inquiry accounted for its choice by the researcher for this study.

Research in a naturalistic frame typically includes the researcher studying a phenomenon in a natural setting, purposeful sampling of human participants, intuition and propositional knowledge, and inductive analysis, allowing for an emerging method with negotiated outcomes using idiographic interpretations. Naturalistic studies can be presented as case studies leading to broad findings, so close attention to trustworthiness in the design and implementation of the study was imperative.

"Qualitative researchers treat the uniqueness of individual cases and contexts as important to understanding." (Stake, 1995, p. 39), seeking to understand how participants perceive what is happening in specific episodes or testimonies by representing events with their own interpretation, which sometimes appear in narrative form (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Because this study was designed to improve understanding of the perceptions of eight teachers who taught in teams, a naturalistic research model allowed
the researcher to understand how the four teams perceived team teaching in the setting where they taught and interacted with other faculty members. The researcher was also a member of one team and felt naturalistic inquiry was most effective in capturing the participants’ multiple realities.

**Research Design**

As Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggested about naturalistic studies, no aspects of the design were absolutely final before the study began, but the following steps occurred systematically: (a) finding a naturalistic location; (b) purposefully choosing participants; (c) choosing methods applicable to inquiry, such as interviews, observations, and artifact collection; (d) using inductive and methods borrowed from grounded theory methodology to analyze the data collected; and (e) maintaining a critical reflective mind for further development of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

The researcher chose this setting because she was familiar with and part of the environment. She considered studying only a few of the teams, but decided that including all four teams provided a broader context from which to understand the various teachers’ experiences and perceptions. She also considered omitting her own team, but also rejected that notion because she felt she was an active participant and saw commonalities between the other team teachers and herself. Because she wanted to hear about the experiences and perceptions of each participant individually, she began with individual interviews, which offered privacy for each teacher to speak with the researcher. But the researcher also wanted to hear dialogue between the team members and felt a partner interview allowed for the team dynamic to be captured. The classroom
observation was used to compare and reinforce the information provided during the interviews. Collecting the syllabi and the group interview allowed for the dynamic between the teams to be revealed. Multiple methods of inquiry allowed for the researcher to use inductive and characteristics of grounded theory when analyzing the data. Thoughtful reflection occurred after each and every interview and observation, which helped to create probing questions for the next interview. This following section includes details about the areas that were borrowed from case study and practitioner research. The context of the study, ethical aspects of research, participant information, data collection techniques, data analysis methods, and research quality are explained in detail.

**Case Study**

Although not a case study of four teams, this study borrowed some aspects of case study methodology, which shares several attributes with naturalistic research. Lincoln and Guba (1985) listed three such elements: (a) both use thick, rich description; (b) both show multiple realities; and (c) both provide a vicarious experience of the setting for the reader. Studying the teachers as members of teams created in a sense four miniature case studies focused on the teams yet still allowed for analysis of the teachers as individuals. Case study researchers typically seek to understand and –preserve the multiple realities, the different and even contradictory views of what is happening‖ (Stake, 1995, p. 12). Thus, the researcher of this study found it essential to hear each individual’s experience in order to gain background of experience and perception of all participants in this study.
Yin (2009) advised that a researcher should ask good questions and interpret the answers; be a good listener and not be trapped by his or her own ideologies and preconceptions; should be adaptive and flexible, so that newly encountered situations can be seen as opportunities, not threats; must have a firm grasp of the issues being studied; and should be unbiased by preconceived notions (p. 69). This researcher adhered to these suggestions throughout the study by putting her experiences of teaming aside while collecting and interpreting data from the participants. Teaming, for a period of time in the setting before this study occurred, allowed the researcher to be knowledgeable and aware of the environment and participants, thus the participants were familiar and supportive of the researcher and willing to discuss their perceptions and experience of team teaching. For example, she conducted verbal interviews to allow each participant to share her or his experience with team teaching. The researcher, who enjoyed a strong relationship with many of the participants before the study, served as an active participant throughout the data collection.

Choosing characteristics from case study allowed the researcher to showcase individuals' experiences (Stake, 1995), in this case those of a set of college English teachers team teaching in a single English department. According to Yin (1994) the willingness of people to share their unique experiences situated in a specific environment provides first-hand data that can be useful to others. In case-study research, a researcher typically reports personal experiences chronologically or thematically in a particular setting to offer an analysis for making sense of what the participants expressed (Yin, 1994); this researcher reported the findings thematically. Another aspect of case study
that influenced the design of this study was the close bond with participants (Yin, 1994); this researcher knew this context very well because she was one of the team teachers.

Finally, conducting initial and later interviews usually allows for a researcher to record any changes in viewpoint or interpretation, any confusion, or evaluation of a specific situation (Yin, 1994); in this research interviews were done individually, in pairs, and as a whole group.

Aspects of case study methods were important to help acquire individual personal insights from the participants and important for the researcher in interpreting the data. Borrowing some aspects of case study methods allowed the researcher to improve her understanding of each teacher’s and each team’s experiences, which could then be examined and retold.

**Practitioner Research**

Practitioner research encompasses multiple forms of research, especially linked to characteristics similar to self-study and action research in which the researcher serves dual roles: a teacher aiming to improve student learning and a researcher engaging in inquiry (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009). It is fundamental for creating change in education. Cochran-Smith and Lytle emphasize components such as inquiry, knowledge, and practice, which are used to present research in higher education in a manner similar to the way they have been presented in this study.

A practitioner–researcher can fulfill various duties, such as—teacher, participant–observer, interviewer, reader, storyteller, advocate, artist, counselor, evaluator, consultant, and others—(Stake, 1995, p. 91). Researchers can even serve as advocates
when they want others to believe and understand an issue the way they do. For example, Cochran-Smith and Lytle (2009) wrote about Sonia Nieto and her practitioner research:

By learning from teachers about what inspires them, how they relate to their students, how they create learning environments that make time and space for thoughtful, engaged work, and what they value about being educators in these times, Nieto’s respectful accounts offered an emic perspective on frameworks that teachers who stay in the classroom use to guide their teaching. (p. 17)

Thus, researchers should seek the assistance of others to present alternative perspectives when analyzing themselves through critical collaboration (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009). Assuming multiple perspectives helps to question the data, shed light on interpretations, broaden thinking, and strengthen support of findings. The purpose of practitioner research is to understand one’s own practice better and make knowledge about teaching available for others to use; moreover, it benefits the researcher through reflective, analytical thinking and may improve the lives of those in the study as well as convey the information to a broader audience (LaBoskey, 2004)

Practitioner researchers present and share experiences with others so that the latter learn from the experience and research (Loughran & Northfield, 1998). Doing so requires more than mere reflective thinking (LaBoskey, 2004). Reflection does not necessarily guarantee that the information will be made public or influence others' lives. Brookfield (1995) explained that reflection becomes critical when two areas are considered:
The first is to understand how considerations of power undergird, frame, and distort educational processes and interactions. The second goal is to question assumptions and practices that seem to make our teaching lives easier but actually work against our own best long-term interests. (p. 8)

To move beyond personal reflection, the information must resonate with others in similar situations; therefore, the researcher must make the findings clear and meaningful to others (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Loughran & Northfield, 1998).

Practitioner research addresses both an enhanced understanding of teacher education and the immediate improvement of one’s practice and the environment in which it happens. It allows for the researcher to better understand and improve teaching (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; LaBoskey, 2004). Understanding and analyzing their own teaching is the primary goal of practitioner–researchers, who make themselves (and oftentimes in collaboration with other participants) the subject to be studied, publicizing the data for others to read, learn from, and interpret. Other factors also entail the practitioner–researcher’s own questions, analytical frameworks, shifts in perspectives, problems, and repeated themes (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009). In turn, this information is useful for many stakeholders, such as teachers, other practitioners, and policymakers. For instance, implications and transformations, such as rethinking practice, questioning assumptions and beliefs, and preparing pre-service teachers, have surfaced on all levels of education (including universities) because of practitioner inquiry; yet some still question whether or not this style of research is as valuable as other forms of research that often look to student performance.
Practitioner researchers can use inquiry when looking at their own environment to confirm or revise interpretive frameworks and approaches (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009). Consequently, teachers become accountable for their own practice through the methods used in practitioner inquiry; moreover, the results are not intended to draw generalizations but to present experiences for others to analyze, resulting in change in practice.

Cochran-Smith and Lytle (2009) wrote of inquiry as stance:

Working from and with an inquiry stance, then, involves a continual process of making current arrangements problematic; questioning the ways knowledge and practice are constructed, evaluated, and used; and assuming that part of the work of practitioners individually and collectively is to participate in educational and social change. (p. 121)

Continuous questioning and analysis of data collected to answer questions both individually and collaboratively further define what is meant by inquiry as stance.

Cochran-Smith and Lytle (2009) explained:

Inquiry as stance is grounded in the problems and contexts of practice in the first place and in the ways practitioners collaboratively theorize, study, and act on those problems in the best interest of the learning and life chances of students and their communities. (p. 123)
Therefore, the researcher engaging in inquiry as stance looks to improve and transform education for teachers and students when considering social, cultural, and political issues (p. 131).

This researcher assumed an inquiry stance before undertaking this study because she was familiar with the educational setting in which the study was conducted and hoped that by examining the team teaching of particular individuals, the lives of all parties involved, both teachers and students, could possibly be improved. The researcher was included as a participant in the study for four reasons. Because she worked with the participants as a member of the bounded system and because her voice added depth to the study, her taking part in the interviews was natural and obvious, further allowing her to capture the essence of the entire team. The researcher took part as an active participant through all the interviews as did the other participants. She asked the questions herself and then replied likewise with the other participants. Her own experience with team teaching considerably influenced her own teaching and better understanding of the study. The research would have been of less depth had the researcher not addressed and revealed the knowledge she possessed alongside the other participants' experiences and perceptions because she was part of one of the teams. Had the researcher not been part of the research, then her partner teacher could not have participated and shared her experience. This partner teacher was a key member to the context of this study and her research.
Context of Study

The yearlong developmental college English course taught by the teachers in this study was originally designed by a part-time adjunct faculty member, a participant in this study, who had team taught a similar course at another university and found it to be beneficial for students. Based on this experience, she suggested its implementation at the university that was the context for this study. She initially thought team teaching would benefit students who struggled with English writing by not only providing them with additional help, like reading and writing tutoring, but they would also become stronger writers in curriculum that had been stretched from one semester into a yearlong course. Hence, the course transformed from a one-semester course taught by one instructor to a yearlong course in which students remained with the same teachers at the same time of day for two consecutive semesters (fall and spring).

At first three teams worked with students in developmental writing sections. Upon the completion of the second year, one team was added. Four teams taught this course during the four years that preceded this study. At the time of the study, the team teaching program was in its fifth year with a total of eight teachers. Three teams changed partners over this time, and one team remained intact for the entire five years. Some of the switching of partners occurred within the group of eight while other changes in teams involved adding new people from outside the group.

The yearlong college course offered students an entire year to learn the fundamentals they would have acquired in the typical one-semester freshman English
course. Students were placed into this course based on what the university considered to be low test scores on their entrance examinations. The writers with the lowest scores were placed into this course to receive additional attention and support by expanding the time in class and by changing the teaching dynamic. The faculty designed the yearlong course in hopes that upon completion students would be able to enroll and succeed in a sophomore-level English course.

During fall 2008 Midwest University\(^2\) enrolled 2,830 students, including 1,864 full-time undergraduates. A 15:1 student–teacher ratio and a 3:2 women–men ratio were in place on campus at the time. Team teaching was used across campus in various disciplines, such as English, history, education, and health. At the time of this study, only one college English course was conducted on campus with four teams. Typically, the team-taught course was capped at 20, that is, 10 students per teacher. Although the course was designed as a team-taught experience, each teacher was responsible for evaluating the work of his or her own 10 students.

The English department used dialectic teaming primarily with students who tested into developmental writing to offer them better instruction and more one-on-one assistance. Two college English teachers worked side-by-side with each other to prepare students for college-level writing. Limiting the teacher–student ratio to 1:10 (sometimes even lower), two college English teachers team taught a developmental writing course, which although costly was successful when considering faculty and student feedback. Both teachers received full pay for their work in this course as if they were teaching a

\(^2\) Pseudonyms for the university and the individuals are used throughout the dissertation.
course individually. This cost multiplied by eight teachers made it the most expensive course at the university. Team teaching within the same discipline on such a large scale as in this situation was uncommon, especially in college English, making it a good choice for providing unique and rich data for study.

A study should involve purposeful selection of location and participants for various reasons (Stake, 1995). The researcher considered this factor before deciding upon her study. First, the researcher’s position as one of the eight team teachers meant that a relationship and entrance into the situation were already established. She had worked in this context for a couple of years and knew the other participants and understood why teaming had been implemented. Second, the location was unique with so many teams in one setting. The researcher understood the dynamic of the four teams and how they had evolved over time. This course was closely monitored by the university because of its unique nature and student performance, yet little consideration about the teachers had been explored. Finally, many of the participants indicated that they were unaware of any other university that implemented team teaching within the same department with developmental writers with such a large number of teachers, thus making it an interesting and valuable study to offer to others in the teaching field. Therefore, upon examination the unique teaching model found in this study may be instituted in similar situations.

**Ethical Research**

The Institutional Review Boards at both the university the researcher attended and the one at which she conducted her research approved this study (see Appendices A &
B). In order to provide a safe environment for all participants to share their experiences, pseudonyms were assigned for each person. Because of the unique nature of individuals, participants in studies often inadvertently identify themselves, but the researcher attempted to disguise identities to outside readers to ensure confidentiality and respect. The name of the university was also changed in the study to provide confidentiality for the participants and the researcher. Because practitioner research normally reveals the researcher’s identity and because the researcher was one of the participants, the partner of this researcher could have been easily identified; therefore, to protect the anonymity of this participant as well as that of the other participants, the researcher also assigned herself a pseudonym.

Participants

**Team 1: Tracy and Morgan**

Team 1 included two females, Tracy and Morgan. In her late 30s, Tracy had 10 years of teaching experience with eight of those at Midwest University. She team taught for five years, partnering with three different people. When she opted for a third partner, Morgan joined the English team. A part-time adjunct faculty member in her early 30s with 10 years of teaching experience, Morgan taught at Midwest University for four years at the time of this study, teaming with Tracy during two of those years. Morgan was the last to join the English team.

---

3 All names have been changed in order to protect the identity and actual names of the participants.
**Team 2: Connie and Robert**

Team 2, the only female–male team, included Connie, in her 60s, and Robert, in his 30s, the pair with the greatest difference in age. Robert was employed for 10 years at Midwest University, where he began his career. Connie taught at Midwest for nearly 30 years with teaching experience elsewhere before that. She served as department chair, and Robert held additional duties in another division. Having worked together for five consecutive years, they were the only team members who remained together from the inception of the team-teaching program.

**Team 3: Rick and Larry**

Team 3 included two men: Rick and Larry. Rick was in his 40s and Larry in his 30s. Rick taught for 14 years with seven of those at Midwest University and in the team situation for five years with two different partners—Larry for the four years preceding this study. Larry taught for 13 years, four of these at Midwest. He joined the team during his first year of teaching at Midwest at the invitation of Rick, his only partner.

**Team 4: Kim and Patricia**

Team 4 included two women, Kim and Patricia, both in their early 50s at the time of this study. Kim had over 24 years experience teaching, 16 years at Midwest and five of those years teaming. She had two partners: first Tracy (of Team 1) and then Patricia, who taught for 25 years with 10 of them at Midwest. Patricia teamed with Kim for the three years preceding this study.
Table 1 shows how many partners each participant had, the number of years of team teaching, and whether they taught on a team prior to this experience.

Table 1

**Summary of Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Partners Over Past Five Years</th>
<th>Years of Experience Teaming Year-Long English Course</th>
<th>Prior Experience Teaching English in a Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document Collection and Recording Techniques**

The researcher made initial contact with each participant asking for their cooperation via a consent form (see Appendix C). Each participant signed a teacher consent form (see Appendix D) and an audio tape recording consent form (see Appendix E). The researcher collected and recorded data through individual interviews, partner interviews, group interviews, observations of classroom teaching, and artifact collection. The following section contains a chronology of data collection and recording, beginning
with the individual interviews, followed by classroom observation, partner interviews, and finally the group interview and collection of syllabi. The researcher sent email follow-ups after both the individual interview and the group interview to address any questions that needed additional clarification. Two participants had to leave early during the group interviews and did not have the opportunity to answer the last few questions, so follow-up email allowed the researcher to ask these questions that were missed.

**Initial Interviews**

Rubin and Rubin (2005) discussed the value of responsive interviewing for depth and flexibility to meet research needs. Specifically, responsive interviewing offers the flexibility to ask unplanned and spontaneous questions of the participants that can perhaps lead to a better understanding of their experiences and perceptions. This model of interviewing allows the researcher to consider the emotions, biases, and interests of the participants (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). Interviews are the best way for the researcher to attempt to hear multiple views from participants (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009). Case reporting requires the researcher to consider all the above facets as well by using various levels of questions: questions about the interviewee; questions about individual case; questions asked of the pattern of findings found across multiple cases; questions about the entire study, and normative questions about policy recommendations and conclusions (Yin, 2009, p. 87).

Isolating each participant for the first conversation was purposeful: A teacher might be guarded and more cautious of answers when sharing certain thoughts in the presence of his or her colleagues. Their experiences about how they first agreed to
collaborate with a fellow faculty member and about critical incidents in teaming constituted valid information in determining the rationale and motivation for their participation. Each faculty member entered into team teaching for various reasons, so an interview was most logical in locating similarities and differences in their experiences (Yin, 2009); therefore, the researcher developed questions focusing on their reasons for entering team teaching and the manner in which they actually enacted the team teaching process.

One individual interview with each participant was necessary to elicit the type of information that typically emerges from the questions noted above. One-on-one interviews with participants took place on campus for approximately one hour either in faculty offices or on the top floor of the student center in a quiet corner. The researcher arranged separate interviews with each of the seven other participants within a two week period from the beginning to the middle of February 2009. She interviewed herself first, using the same method of audio recording to be used with the other participants to prevent her from changing or altering her answers after hearing the other participants’ information. She asked follow-up and additional questions of participants in the other seven interviews and then added them to her own interview because she had not considered these questions during the initial interview. For instance, originally the researcher had not intended to ask about consistency, so she did not address that topic during her own interview; yet she went back to her interview and provided her thoughts on the topic because it developed into a major theme.
After completing and transcribing the individual interviews with the first three participants (the researcher and two others), the researcher added the follow-up questions to the list of interview questions asked of remaining participants. The first few interviewees answered the additional follow-up questions through email or in person in the faculty members’ offices or the upper level of the student center in a quiet corner. Within three weeks the researcher completed and transcribed all interviews.

The researcher designed a protocol with open-ended questions for the initial interviews (Yin, 2009). She gave the participants the questions ahead of time so they could process the questions and compose appropriately detailed answers (Stake, 1995). The researcher asked a variety of questions (see Appendix F), ranging from how participants teach when team teaching to whether they plan to team again. Specifically they were asked: How long have you been teaching? What was your perception of team teaching before you started doing it? How has your perception changed? What does team teaching mean to you? Explain to me how you first entered team teaching. Why did you decide to team teach? Was it voluntary or required?

After the initial interview, emails were sent out to all eight participants, asking for more detailed information about their background. The email asked for their age, number of years teaching, educational background, whether they had team taught, and how many partners they had teamed with in the past. The researcher also used this email to verify information that remained unclear during the interviews (Yin, 2009). The participants responded quickly, answering all questions asked of them.
Observations

At the outset of this study, the researcher planned to conduct more than one observation. Unfortunately, her teaching schedule overlapped with the other three teams’ class time, making the observations difficult to coordinate. However, in the end, one completed observation for each of the four teams proved sufficient for developing questions for the partner interview. Each observation lasted the entire class period, which was an hour and fifteen minutes. Three of the participants did not wish to be videotaped. So, instead of video recording, during the single observation, the researcher recorded thick, rich description in writing. She recorded minute-by-minute summaries of the teachers’ actions along with nonverbal communication and interaction both between the two teachers and with their students. For example, the teachers facilitated group work by both moving around to various groups of students during a group activity. Another time one teacher nodded to the other teacher and they took the cue to record the other’s directions and concepts on the board to assist the students take notes. The researcher recorded a description of the room layout and proximity of teachers with students and acted as a nonparticipant observer (Yin, 2009). All four observations occurred in square rooms with desks put in rows with about 15 to 18 students. A computer with an overhead projector was in each room and used by three of the four teams. The researcher sat in the corner of each room as not to distract the teachers or students.

The researcher could not act as a nonparticipant observer in her own classroom because she was teaching as a member of one of the teams under consideration in this study. She dismissed video recording her own class because her partner did not want to
be recorded. Instead, the researcher took field notes multiple times in her own classroom to guarantee sufficient data on her own team’s teaching. She completed observation notes both during and after her class, capturing as much as possible in her own classroom. Unlike the single observation of another classroom, observations of her own classroom took place throughout the semester, thus ensuring that she had gathered enough data to acquire a thorough picture of her own classroom. Capturing all details or recording notes while teaching proved difficult.

The researcher attempted to observe the other three teams on “typical” days of teaching, when both teachers were present and working on a lesson that they claimed to be a good representation of their own and their students’ typical behavior. Observations allowed the researcher to see interactions between the two teachers during teaching and provided insight into how the partners work together in real time with students. The researcher observed the teams teaching before the partner interviews so that she could apply her observations about their interaction to her composition of the questions for the partner interviews. The researcher was able to add to the depth of research by witnessing for herself the teachers’ classrooms. This helped her see what the teachers discussed in the individual and partner interviews.

**Partner Interviews**

Following the observations, the researcher conducted audio-taped partner interviews (see Appendix G), which took place within a two week period beginning in mid-February 2009. These interviews were conducted to gather additional information about how the team interacted, communicated, and felt about working together. After
completing the first partner interview, the researcher immediately transcribed the tape in order to determine what additional questions she needed to add to the protocol for the remaining three partner interviews. She then conducted the second partner interview with her partner. Some of the same or similar questions were asked again during the partner interview to see how they responded compared to when they had answered during the individual interview. Unfortunately, the fourth team had to participate in their partner interview on the same day as the group interview because of scheduling conflicts. The researcher asked some questions from the individual interview again during the partner interviews (which lasted on average between one to two hours) and the group interview (which lasted an hour and a half) to compare their answers over time and in the presence of their partners and other team teachers. Therefore, asking the identical question again with both teachers present allowed not only for cross-referencing of original responses, but also it provided an opportunity for the team to talk back and forth, leading to additional data.

Some questions focused on what the researcher witnessed during the observation. Such questions focused on interactions and reactions to one another as noted in the observation; for example, the researcher asked the team members whether they believed the class session the researcher observed was typical. The researcher asked the teams to provide examples and rationales for their answer.

Other questions in the partner interviews dealt with topics covered during the individual interviews about their relationships, including critical incidents (Yin, 2009). Specifically, the researcher asked the following two questions: Please explain to me how
you best complement each other. Please describe for me a conflict or disagreement you
faced working with each other.

Each team participated in one partner interview, which provided sufficient time
for the researcher to obtain necessary feedback. Information recorded during the
observations provided the instructors an opportunity to analyze and interpret their actions
while teaching. For example, the researcher asked team members whether they noticed
how they consistently added information to the end of one another’s comments.
Questions also involved how they physically interacted with each other.

**Group Interview**

The researcher met with the participants in a group interview format on Thursday,
February 26, 2009, in a conference room on campus to collect more data (Yin, 2009).
The purpose of the group interview was to see how the entire four teams worked together
and viewed their experience not only about their own team but also about their perception
of team teaching, thus specific questions were asked (see Appendix H). All eight
participants were present. Two faculty members arrived a few minutes late and two
faculty members had to leave before the 90-minute meeting concluded. Emails were sent
with the last few questions to offer those who left early an opportunity to answer
questions they were unable to answer in person (see Appendix I). Both participants
offered feedback on the questions they missed. The researcher did not follow up via
email with the two teachers who arrived a few minutes late because the transcription
analysis revealed that they had missed only questions that they had answered extensively
during the one-on-one and partner interviews. Both supplied answers as a participant and
asking the questions as the author of this study, the researcher took part in the discussion, which was audio recorded.

**Syllabi Collection**

Originally, the research plan had included an online discussion forum for participants to communicate with one another and the researcher. Few teachers showed an interest and stated that because of time constraints associated with other obligations, they preferred not to engage in this type of communication. In order to keep data collection consistent among all participants, the researcher abandoned the idea of an online discussion.

Because the online discussion proved unworkable, the researcher devised another method to gather data to add to her understanding of the teachers’ team-teaching experiences. She collected the course syllabi from all participants and analyzed specific requirements to understand similarities and differences among the four teams regarding curriculum, course themes, assignments, tutoring requirements, and forms of assessment. She decided to collect document because the participants discussed the topic of consistency at length during the various interviews. She had never previously seen the syllabi from the other three teams. She cross-referenced the information on the syllabi with information stated in all one-on-one interviews, partner interviews, and the group interview. Dates were not provided for interviews to assist in keeping the researcher’s identity anonymous. Therefore, citations were labeled as individual interview, partner interview, and group interview to specify the type of interview. For example, (Partner Interview- Rick) indicates Rick’s comments during the partner interview. Groups
interviews are labeled as (Group) without specific names since it involved all eight participants. Citations in Chapter IV contain the same coding system.

**Data Analysis and Interpretation**

Researchers whose designs derive from the naturalistic paradigm often turn to grounded theory methodology in order to analyze data, present—multiple realities, and make transferability dependent on local contextual factors (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 205). Grounded theory analysis requires the researcher to use inductive analysis to show emerging instead of predetermined findings (Lincoln & Guba). Researchers use open coding, which derives from grounded theory, while examining data instead of designing a preplanned list of codes to apply to the data. Consequently, many more codes than the researcher will actually apply are listed; many codes emerge that the researcher does not intend (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). Reestablishing codes, combining codes, and even redefining each category commonly occurred throughout the study (Stake, 1995).

Open coding entails identifying, labeling, and categorizing the data, including the process of integrating and refining categories (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 143). The researcher recoded the interviews five times once similarities and broader labels could accommodate two or three narrower topics. The most common type of coding was narrative codes, applied to participants telling their unique personal experiences. Secondly, processing codes were helpful when categorizing sequences of events and changes that surfaced between the time of initial interviews and follow-up interviews. Finally, relationship and social structure codes proved beneficial in capturing the
interaction among the participants (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Using this coding system allowed for cross-analysis within teams and across teams.

The researcher analyzed field notes from the observations, compared them with the data gathered from individual interviews and used the information to help craft questions for use in the partner interviews. She then analyzed the teachers’ interaction with each other and with their students, including both verbal and nonverbal interaction. She compared this information to what participants stated during the individual interviews. Again, as with the individual interviews, the researcher analyzed, coded, and compared this data with the individual interviews to detect differences and omissions; for example, the theme of consistency was not originally listed in the protocols yet was a common topic mentioned and discussed.

After reading through the data, the researcher looked for repetitive material, restructuring and compressing the coding categories. Referring back to the research questions helped to generate setting and context categories. She created a definition and explanation for each of the coding categories (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). As an example, she applied the code “relationship with partner outside the classroom” to name how the two partners interacted outside the classroom with regard to planning, assessment, evaluation, and reflection. The researcher expanded, changed, and redirected preliminary coding categories based on themes found by and discussed with a peer debriefer, a fellow graduate student also working on a dissertation about teachers. This peer debriefer assisted in reorganizing and reevaluating categories on three different occasions. Additional categories emerged, dealing with personal experiences and perspectives of the
participants, thoughts about other participants, perspectives on team teaching, and communication and collaboration with a partner.

The group interview provided an opportunity to further explore the themes derived from the data through discussion among all eight participants. The researcher analyzed data with the readjusted codes, and a second, third, and fourth level of coding subsequently served to narrow the data with the help of a peer debriefer. The researcher reviewed the fourth set of codes and finally decided on a fifth coding system. The discussion during the group interview was audio taped so that the researcher could compare it to the observations and interviews for similar codes. The group interview included questions asked during the interviews as well as new questions, which again offered a means to compare answers over time and setting. Although she repeated some questions, the researcher found it necessary to compare information conveyed during the other stages of data collection in order to affirm or revisit codes across the data from all individuals. Coding was based on similar categories that emerged from all the data.

Once coding was complete, the researcher analyzed the data from the eight participants both as individual teachers but also as four teams for the purpose of cross analysis by individuals, teams, and as one large team. Commonalities and differences existing among the four partnerships were useful in developing findings. These findings were discussed and evaluated with a peer debriefer, who offered assistance weekly face-to-face, over the phone, and via email to assure accuracy of interpretation and analysis. Even before the data collection began, the researcher shared ideas, plans, and intentions with the peer debriefer in order to solicit additional advice. Numerous phone
conversations served as a forum for discussing and reevaluating the coding system used to analyze the data.

The five axioms discussed by Lincoln and Guba (1985) were applicable to this study and logically considered before coding began. The axioms included: —the nature of reality, the relationship of knower to the known, the possibility of generalization, the possibility of causal linkages, and the role of values‖ (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 37). The researcher was cognizant of the nature of the participants’ multiple constructed realities, the relationship of researcher to participants, the possibility of generalizations, analysis of causal linkages, and the role of values in inquiry. The researcher used selective coding borrowing from grounded theory allowing for theories to emerge directly from the data using analytical induction (Rubin & Rubin, 2005) to reach her four findings.

Modification of coding occurred to clarify and develop themes. The researcher revisited her data and carefully checked each piece of information in the data to be sure that the four themes were in fact answering the research question.

Open coding occurred as soon as the individual interviews were transcribed. The researcher used coding and analytical memos to interpret and analyze the data as well as personal thoughts (Bogdan & Biklin, 2007; Maxwell, 2005). Using open coding (identifying concepts to represent the raw data), the researcher identified 13 codes (Corbin & Strauss, 2008): (a) relationship with partner outside the class, (b) positive and negative aspects of team teaching, (c) relationship in the classroom with partner and with students, (d) aspects learned from partner, (e) perception of team teaching before and after team teaching, (f) group communication (g) definition of team teaching, (h) roles in
partnership, (i) similarities/differences in teaming vs. solo (j) teacher's theory of teaching, (k) similarities/differences between partners, (l) consistency among the partnerships and within entire team of eight, (m) gender roles. After reevaluating, she went from codes to categories of codes, which assisted her in discovering her findings. Table 2 lists the codes the researcher came to after analyzing the transcripts, observations, and syllabi collection.

Table 2

*Open Coding*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Codes from Open Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relationship with partner outside the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Positive/Negative aspects of team teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relationship with partner and students in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Aspects learned from partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perception of team teaching before and after teaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Group Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Definition of teaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Roles in partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Similarities/differences in teaming vs. solo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teacher's theory of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Similarities/differences between partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Consistency among the partnerships and within entire team of eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Gender roles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second time she revisited the research using axial coding (Corbin & Strauss, 2008), which means relating concepts to other concepts and finding the best way to define the category (as seen in Table 3). This time she began to see relationships with partners as a broader category that incorporated four of the original codes: relationship with partner outside the classroom, relationship with partner and students in the
classroom, roles in partnership, and gender roles. The second category was labeled positive and negative aspects of team teaching that incorporated three of the codes: positive and negative aspects of teaming, aspects learned from partner, and similarities and differences in teaming vs. solo teaching. The researcher noticed that the teachers saw aspects of learning from their partner as a positive aspect of teaming. The similarities and differences in teaming vs. solo teaching were either perceived as a positive or negative aspect of teaming for each teacher. The third category was teachers' changed perception toward team teaching, which incorporated the original code about teacher perceptions about teaming as well as the how teachers defined teaming and their own theory of teaching. The researcher believed that all three of these categories dealt with how the teacher's perceptions had changed. The last category was called “consistency and group communication within the individual teams and across teams.” This final category included two of the original codes: group communication and consistency among the partnerships and within the entire team of eight teachers. Communication was essential to consistency, hence the reason for combining into one category. Table 3 represents a summary of the emerging categories.
Table 3

*Emerging Categories and Related Codes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging Categories and Related Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The relationship among teachers and with their students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• relationship with partner outside the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• relationship with partner and students in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• roles in partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• gender roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Positive and negative aspects of team teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• positive and negative aspects of teaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• aspects learned from partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• similarities and differences in teaming vs. solo teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers’ changed perception toward team teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• teacher perceptions about teaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• how teachers defined teaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• their own theory of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Consistency and group communication within the individual teams and across teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• group communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• consistency within the teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• consistency across the teams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher refined her categories by using contrast comparative analysis (Corbin & Strauss, 2008) where the researcher compared the data for similarities and differences for the third time resulting in three categories: (a) communicative relationship between partners and with their students, (b) teachers‘ perceptions of team teaching, and (c) consistency and group communication within the individual teams and across the four teams (as seen in Table 4). The researcher believed that communication and relationships had a similar connection, thus could be combined. She also decided to combine all
aspects of teachers' perception of teaming to include the positive and negative aspects as well as how it had changed. Consistency and group communication continued to be a clear category and remained the same. Table 4 represents a summary of the refined categories.

Table 4

**Refined Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refined Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communicative relationship between partners and with their students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- communication between team partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- communication between team and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- communication between teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teachers' perceptions of team teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- positive and negative aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- how their perceptions changed over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Consistency and group communication within the individual teams and across the four teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- group communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- consistency within the teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- consistency across the team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher studied the data again a fourth time using constant and theoretical comparisons (Corbin & Strauss, 2008) and identified four categories with a slightly different angle: (a) communicative relationship within the team, (b) how teachers make team teaching successful, (c) teachers’ perception of team teaching, and (d) consistency and group communication within the individual teams and across the four teams (as seen in Table 5). The first category was slightly changed because there was a stronger focus on how the teams actually communicated and enacted teaming together, more so than a
communicative relationship with students. The second category emerged because teachers spoke of how teaming was successful for various reasons. The last two categories remained the same and were again confirmed. Table 5 shows how the categories were revised with more analysis.

Table 5

Revised Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communicative relationship within the team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication between team partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication between team and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication between teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How teachers make team teaching successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one integrated unit over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilitative teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active student engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers’ perception of team teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive and negative aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how their perceptions changed over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Consistency and group communication within the individual teams and across the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistency within teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistency across teams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher changed the last set of categories again after more time for analysis, or as Corbin and Strauss call evolving interaction with the data (as seen in Table 6). Finally the categories emerged that helped explain the perceptions and experiences of threes team teachers: (a) flexibility, confidence, commitment, and compatibility, (b) communication and interactive methods between teachers, (c) student support and teacher development, and (d) one integrated unit over time. The researcher noticed that teachers
perceived their team teaching experience to be successful because of their positive working relationship that included being flexible, confident, committed, and compatible. The second category was similar to the category called communication within the team, but this time the researcher noticed that it also included how they interacted with one another. The third category labeled as student support and teacher development was more descriptive than how teachers perceived teaming or how they thought it was successful. The fourth category was another way the teachers perceived and experienced teaming.
Table 6

Final Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Categories that Became Findings and Related Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Flexibility and compatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• flexibility of interactive behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• flexibility in contrasting teaching personas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• compatibility of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• pedagogical similarities and differences of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• gender of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• friendship between teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communication and interactive methods between teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• communication between team partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• communication between team and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• interactive behaviors within the teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• facilitative teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• active student engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. One integrated unit over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• sharing ownership of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• consistency within the teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• consistency across the teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student support and teacher development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• building a supportive student community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• teacher development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher sought to answer the following research question: How do four teams of college English teachers teaching a developmental writing course at the university level experience and perceive team teaching? In answering this question and by using the final categories, four findings emerged. The researcher saw that the teachers perceived themselves as compatible and flexible in how they communicated and worked with one another - thus, Finding 1 developed: These four dialectic, homogeneous teams perceived themselves compatible and flexible in their interactive behaviors. The second category looked at how teachers communicated and interacted in the classroom, which
lead to Finding 2: These four dialectic, homogeneous teams described a pedagogy centered on facilitative teaching and active student engagement. All four teams perceived that they experienced a similar pedagogical belief that centered on facilitative teaching and active student engagement. After analyzing how the four teams worked together as a unit with their partner but not with the other teams, Finding 3 emerged: These four dialectic, homogeneous teams perceived there to be consistency within individual teams in terms of curriculum, assessment, and evaluation but an absence of consistency of these areas across the four teams. The last category looked at how the teams perceived there to be student support and teacher development from team teaching, thus Finding 4 emerged: These four dialectic, homogenous teams perceived teaming as a means to improved student support and teacher development.

**Research Quality**

All researchers approach their studies with experiences and knowledge that influence the study; hence this section addresses research quality. Lincoln and Guba (1985) explained that conventional qualities of trustworthiness (internal validity, external validity, reliability, and objectivity) are not workable for naturalistic inquiry. Instead, credibility, transferability, dependability, and conformability are more appropriate. Maxwell (2005) suggested testing for intensive, long-term involvement, rich data, respondent validation, discrepant evidence and negative cases, triangulation, and comparison, all of which this researcher considered. There are four areas the researcher discussed. Explanations of these features appear below as do aspects of the design of this research that ensure a high quality study resulting in trustworthy findings.
**Researcher Bias**

An active participant in the study, the researcher was the newest member of the team under consideration in this study, thus including her own experience was important. Moreover, the participation of all members of the team in discussions with their partners as well as with the entire group meeting was beneficial in gaining an understanding of the operation of each of the four teams individually and in comparison with one another. The researcher made every effort to report her personal experience and perception clearly and distinctly with the same integrity and honesty as the rest of the individual experiences. The researcher was careful to complete her individual interview and partner interview before hearing all of the other participants’ experiences and perceptions. Discussion with the peer debriefer assisted in maintaining a researcher’s lens throughout the study.

**Rapport Building**

Before embarking on this study, the researcher spent over two years teaching with the same partner, developing her own perspective toward team teaching. Doing so helped to create trust between the researcher and the participants in the study, increasing their willingness to participate. All of the participants were familiar with the researcher; thus, contact was easily accessible based on the researchers’ teaching position. Conducting a classroom visit and three interviews (individual, partner, and group) was convenient and comfortable for both the researcher and participants.

**Peer Debriefer**

Lincoln and Guba (1985) asserted, “Peer debriefing is an effective way of shoring up credibility [and] providing methodological guidance” (p. 243). During the
process of analyzing the data for this study, the researcher consulted a peer debriefer to check for trustworthiness and confirm her coding system. She met with the peer debriefer every two weeks and held weekly telephone conversations. The peer debriefer assisted the researcher in reflecting on methodology, coding, and findings to ensure that the researcher made thoughtful and deliberate decisions.

The selection of a peer debriefer requires careful consideration. The researcher should pay serious attention to choosing—particular persons- or kinds of persons- who could best discharge the reviewer’s responsibility‖ (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 243). The researcher did consider various doctoral candidates to pursue as her peer debriefer, but finally she picked someone who was also collecting data about working with college teachers and had a similar methodology in her own study. The peer debriefer was familiar with the researcher's topic. Plus, the researcher recognized this individual to be credible because she was knowledgeable, candid, insightful, and trustworthy.

**Triangulation**

Collecting multiple, rich pieces of data, using a variety of methods from a variety of sources facilitated triangulation (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Maxwell, 2005; Yin, 2009), one means to increase the trustworthiness of the study design and findings. Participants answered numerous questions on three different occasions: individual interviews, partner interviews, and group interview; thus, they had an opportunity to add to their stories while reevaluating their answers, but few chose to do so (Yin, 2009).

Each faculty member had an individual rationale for agreeing to team teaching, and teacher interviews and observations provided a means to study the way all members
experienced this teaching technique. During the individual, partner, and group interviews, the researcher asked some questions two or even three times in order analyze and compare the answers given on different occasions for thematic similarities and differences. The partner interviews helped to shed light on team members’ relationships and revealed valuable information about interaction. Next, the group interview offered an opportunity to hear all participants expand, challenge, or accept statements. The classroom observations allowed the researcher to see how the teachers interacted and worked together and to compare that to what they stated during their interviews. Finally, the researcher analyzed course syllabi, comparing and looking for consistency among teams and across teams.

**Strengths of the Study**

The strength of this study derives from the researcher's choice of a setting that was familiar and easily accessible. Her acquaintance with all participants and their willingness to participate allowed for this case report to occur in a positive environment with friendly, supportive participants. The eight participants who taught in teams at Midwest University yielded a case report that included the entire population of eight team teachers in the English department. There was also an interdisciplinary team in the English department which paired an English teacher with a history teacher. Although the study could have been conducted with two, four, or even six of the eight participants, involving a broader population facilitated exploration by having all eight participants. Plus, the researcher was able to complete some cross-analysis between how the teams compared from one another.
Bringing all eight participants together during the group interview allowed the entire staff to engage in dialogue and address several topics of importance. Some team members discovered that although they believed they followed similar themes of study, they actually did not; hence, their discovery led to some adjustments, thus making the teams more consistent. The group interview allowed for discussion of additional topics, including the concept of team teaching.

Limitations of This Study

Entering this study, the researcher was aware of possible limitations to overcome. First and foremost, the researcher chose to be a participant in the study. Consequently, at times she had to switch roles between researcher and participant. During the individual interview she asked herself the interview questions; doing so seemed awkward yet manageable. The researcher completed her interview before any other interviews in hopes that the voices of the other seven participants would not affect her answers. She asked herself a few additional questions after creating follow-up questions for the other participants. A better technique may have been to ask another colleague to conduct the researcher's interview to probe additional questions that the researcher may not have adequately asked of herself.

The researcher's partner was asked during the interviews to reveal information about not only herself but also about her partner (the researcher), which may have led to less depth in the responses. During the partner interview, the researcher found herself in a situation similar to the individual interview; she had to ask the questions and answer as a participant. This dilemma was similarly present in the group interview, yet the
researcher felt the need to share her answers to the questions instead of exclusively maintaining the researcher role.

Another limitation related to the possibility of incomplete answers from participants because of differences in power within the organization. One of the participants was the department chair; therefore, during the group interview the other participants answered in the presence of their supervisor, which may have affected their answers. The same occurred in the partner interview, in which the department chair and department chair’s partner were interviewed; but the partner teacher also held a position as a director in another program, so the issue of power may have been less influential. Despite the possibility of power creating an issue, the researcher found the department chair to be an asset in seeing the similarities and differences among the teams when switching from the role of supervisor to research participant. Two of the members in the study were part-time adjuncts, hoping to receive full-time positions, so speaking in the presence of the chair may have been more intimidating for them than for the others who had already earned full-time faculty status. One part-time instructor occasionally stated the need to be careful with answers.

Another problem concerned restructuring the teams. Because all but one team had experienced personnel changes, interviews could have created situations in which some participants could have insulted or offended former partners. Even though these participants decided to find different partners, they continued to communicate, plan, work, and socialize within the department and with the group of team teachers who included former partners. So, the participants may have been cautious of their answers
and openness to share information which could lead to future complications with fellow colleagues. During the partner and group interview, the participants may have filtered themselves even more so than in the individual interview.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

In Chapter IV the findings are presented in detail in answer to the primary research question: How do four teams of college English teachers teaching a developmental writing course at the university level experience and perceive team teaching? Consideration of the data gathered from members of four teams (Team 1: Tracy and Morgan, Team 2: Connie and Robert, Team 3: Patricia and Kim, and Team 4: Rick and Larry) yielded four major findings that help show how these teams experienced and enacted teaming in this context:

1. These four dialectic, homogeneous teams perceived themselves compatible and flexible in their interactive behaviors.

2. These four dialectic, homogeneous teams described a pedagogy centered on facilitative teaching and active student engagement.

3. These four dialectic, homogeneous teams perceived there to be consistency within individual teams in terms of curriculum, assessment, and evaluation but an absence of consistency of these areas across the four teams.

4. These four dialectic, homogenous teams perceived teaming as a means to improved student support and teacher development.

This chapter includes a section on each of the four findings. Selected excerpts from data gathered from individual, partner, and group interviews as well as classroom observations illustrate these findings. The chapter concludes with a summary of the four
findings that emerged from the data, illustrating how these eight teachers perceived and experienced the dialectic team teaching of a developmental writing course at the college level.

**Compatibility and Flexibility in Their Interactive Behaviors**

An examination of the data revealed the perceptions of the participants toward working with their partners. All of them credited their level of compatibility and flexibility as primary factors in the positive working relationships they had achieved with their partners. The participants attributed the compatibility of their relationships to the complementary traits shared with their partners, such as pedagogy, gender, and friendship. They also spoke of flexibility in their interactive behaviors in regards to teaching personas, sharing ownership of teaching, and decision-making in the classroom.

**Compatibility**

All four teams described compatibility as essential in their teaming relationships. Their comments about their compatibility fell into three categories: (a) pedagogy, (b) gender, and (c) friendship. All participants used the word *compatibility* in their responses. The teams described compatibility differently. Pedagogy, one area of compatibility, encompassed teaching style and included classroom strategies and methods. Although all teams mentioned gender of the teachers as an area of compatibility, there was disagreement by the teams if same gender teams or opposite gender teams were more compatible. One team credited one area of their compatibility to be due to their differences of gender. A friendship with the partner was another reason cited for team compatibility.
Pedagogy. One area of compatibility found in great detail across the data collected was the compatibility of pedagogical styles practiced by partners. The researcher has defined pedagogical styles in terms of the strategies and methods the teacher had chosen to use in the classroom. All team members brought their own pedagogical strengths, explaining in part their compatibility in terms of pedagogical similarities and differences with their partner; thus, differences in pedagogical styles meant that each team defined compatibility differently. Interestingly, one member of each team was always viewed as stronger in the use of technology for teaching, and the other had perceived strength in some other aspect of teaching practice. In part, compatibility entailed similar commitments, such as a commitment to student-centered approaches to teaching.

The teams discussed the perceived similarities in pedagogy in their individual teams. Across all four teams the most common aspect of pedagogical style was a focus on student-centered approaches. The researcher saw firsthand how all four teams implemented a student-centered approach to teaching during the classroom observations.

Tracy remarked that her team shared a commitment to student-centered teaching. Speaking of her students, she stated, “Everybody was active, everybody participated, and they got the point. I think it was really just a good class.” (Group Interview). On the day the researcher observed Tracy and Morgan’s class, the students played a review game. Students were asked to take notes when they did not know an answer to assist them review for the test (Field Notes). Morgan expanded upon Tracy’s comment during the group interview:
I think some of our discussion some days [is] good and some [isn’t], but the activities we have, hands-on activities, making them participate, they all have [gone] well. I don’t think we have thought of an activity this semester that they didn’t like or wasn’t student centered. (Group Interview)

In fact, during the partner interview, Tracy and Morgan discussed their continued desire to design even more student-centered activities. Tracy remarked, –The only thing I can think of is how we did this semester and came up with activities for each class– (Morgan & Tracy, Partner Interview)

Rick agreed with Tracy and Morgan during the group interview and stated he and his partner also found student-centered classes best.

If we are serious about helping our folks understand that none of us have all of the answers, . . . we need to put many brains on problems, and we really do need to collaborate to get problems solved. . . . The other thing that [student-centered instruction] does is it hopefully puts us less in the role of the authoritarian right off the bat. It can—I think it does this—can decentralize . . . the authority figure in the classroom. (Group Interview)

Connie also discussed the topic of student-centered pedagogy during the group interview. Connie felt she and Robert made themselves approachable and available to students.

Along with the decentralization of authority is that central advocacy. . . . Students can go to whomever they feel more comfortable to have as an advocate, rather
than being forced to request advocacy from someone with whom they don’t have a comfortable relationship.

During the classroom observation of Rick and Larry’s classroom, the team supervised the students, who worked in small groups and presented their work to the class.

Interestingly, Rick felt strongly that his team shared a similar pedagogical style because he and Larry were the only team to share a similar educational background. Rick identified their commonalities when he said, “I am a composition major, so I mark heavily on writing outcomes, and so does Larry. . . . I knew we had similar research interests” (Individual Interview). Rick also explained how they shared a similar teaching style: “We play devil’s advocate all the time” (Rick & Larry, partner interview). Similarly, Larry believed commonalities in academic discipline contributed to their working relationship. Larry stated that their similar education backgrounds led to common pedagogical teaching styles: “We are both comp specialists. We both follow the new paradigm” (Individual Interview).

Although having similar pedagogical styles and beliefs was listed by all of the teams, much of their compatibility derived from what they saw as complementary aspects of their teaching. All participants reported assisting their partners by offering a variety of experiences and pedagogical approaches with regard to content (literature or grammar), technology, teaching strategies, and backgrounds, all of which they believed accounted for their compatibility. Team members believed that different pedagogical styles resulted in part from the different educational training each teacher possessed, except Rick and
Larry, who shared a similar education background. Other differences in areas such as use of technology and styles and methods of teaching were also discussed.

Tracy described her relationship with her partner as compatible because of their contrasting pedagogical styles. Tracy had a Ph.D. in English, whereas Morgan had a Masters in education. Tracy had completed more coursework in literature and Morgan had post graduate work in education. Morgan felt their team was compatible and spoke of many ways Tracy enriched her own teaching and education. Tracy reported, “I think you [Morgan] add the creative component. . . . I am not the creative type, . . . not as creative as you [Morgan], so I think you add that component‖ (Morgan & Tracy, Partner interview). Morgan had acquired numerous ideas to enliven classroom instruction from her many education courses and learned a great deal about literature from working with Tracy.

Tracy and Morgan noted their differences in knowledge of the use of technology as a teaching tool: One member brought something to the team the other did not, improving the teaming relationship. Morgan was more familiar with and enjoyed organizing group work and various forms of technology, such as PowerPoint presentations, video making, and the use of film, than her partner Tracy, who acknowledged Morgan’s stronger pedagogical background with technology: “Your movie project at the end of the semester worked well last year, and it would be a good project for the other teams to do instead of a traditional paper‖ (Morgan & Tracy, Partner Interview).
Connie noted differences in her team’s pedagogical styles. Robert loves teaching formal grammar, and I do more with literary content and personal connections—(Individual Interview). Even though Robert was a new teacher when initially teaming with Connie, she stated that she had found his training as a tutor compatible with her many years of teaching; furthermore, during the partner interview Connie stated that Robert appealed more to the visual learner, using more graphic organizers than she did, as a result of his prior education and background as a tutor. Nevertheless, she liked Robert's approach. I will brainstorm in a list because it is easy, but he will brainstorm using a web. We will use graphic organizers and Venns. That use of graphic organizers—that would be one of the biggest [ideas I have learned from Robert]—(Individual Interview).

Speaking of compatibility in both subject matter and technology, Robert considered how he and Connie divided roles based on each other’s strengths:

I think we fall into roles. I take the role to do with the computer and electronics and clerical things like having papers ready. But that is OK because I am an organizer, and I have a staff that helps me. She has never been comfortable with computers, and she lets me take over. They see her [Connie] as the senior person if they have a question about developing their writing. She is the com lit person, but my thing is about organization, so I do the grammar. Grammar is a type of mathematical and symbolic language. I mostly teach the grammar lessons. (Individual Interview)
Another pedagogical difference Robert pointed out is the difference in the pace at which they teach their class, assisting each other in either speeding up or slowing down the rate of instruction.

Connie is an excellent teacher in the sense in that she does have so much knowledge, and she is so willing to be detailed and patient. That is something I learned from her. I don’t know if I will ever get there because I come from a family of very impatient people, but she has this patience with spelling out every detail that I don’t always have. At the same time in this fast-paced world as our group gets younger, our kids have a harder time relating to that because to them it seems unbelievably slow and they lose interest. I have to move things along, but that isn’t that easy because Connie by nature doesn’t always want to do that. That part becomes challenging because I know she knows her curriculum, and it is a good teaching method, and I often think about the things she knows or how to approach this students. At other times it proceeds at a snail’s pace. (Individual Interview)

Even though Rick and Larry shared similar educational backgrounds, their pedagogical approaches varied. They offered unique ideas and talents to each other, making their working relationship compatible. Rick stated, ‘I think Larry is marvelous with his creativity. I will often say to Larry, ‘Man, we need one of your cool skit exercises’’ (Rick & Larry, Partner Interview). Larry saw that Rick complemented his teaching by contributing other ways to consider technology and literature: ‘–Rick has
given me new ways to look at technology and literature in the forms of the readings from
the course‖ (Rick & Larry, Partner Interview).

Larry also recognized that his team had applied many teaching methods and
strategies that contributed to their compatibility, such as their handling of course content.
He summarized their methods by appreciating each other's areas of expertise:

[Rick] likes to talk about his pie representation of argumentation: point,
illustration, explanation. I'll lead the lesson on tone where I do my
impersonations of Will Farrell and others. So you'll have certain topics where
one or the other of us will do the lecture. But say we're discussing an assigned
reading with both of us leading the class, we just both jump in when we feel like
it.

Kim and Patricia also discussed their perceptions of the manner in which their
pedagogy had enhanced their compatibility. Patricia perceived capitalizing on their
differences as one of their strengths.

I am more of a literature specialist, where she is a writing specialist. But because
of the nature of the course, that does not characterize our roles. I think it is a role
of equals. . . ; however, anytime anything technical goes wrong, I praise the Lord
for Kim, who is very tech savvy and I am not. . . . I am going to say that when
we have anything technical, she is there, and that is part of the team approach—
bringing our separate strengths into the mix. (Individual Interview) During the
partner interview Patricia reiterated her view: -I think we play to our
strengths. For example, if it is anything technical, Kim always takes over. That is a good
example of playing to our strengths. Kim defined Patricia’s strengths in terms of the talents that worked well with her own teaching methods. Kim explained, “She is good at coming up with role playing and games for the students, a couple that are excellent techniques for learning. I am very good with the exercises and activities. Hers are learning-outcomes oriented; mine are more technical, but that complements and plays to our strengths” (Kim & Patricia, Partner Interview).

**Gender.** Although participants differed in their attitudes toward the composition of teams and whether or not partners of the same gender were more compatible than partners of different gender, the idea that gender plays a role in compatibility emerged throughout the interviews. Two groups, Tracy and Morgan and Rick and Larry, did not see any reason that having two females or males in a team would be detrimental or worse than having a male/female team.

Tracy and Morgan had never experienced working in a team in which the partners were of differing gender, so they had no experience on which to base their perception. However, during the group interview, Tracy disagreed with the idea that Connie and Robert said they could give a better experience to their students by having a female and male perspective in the room. She did not think a mixed-gender team would be better than a team that included two females. Tracy stated,

I think that is stereotypical; I don’t think you have to be a male to give a male perspective on things. I don’t think you have to be female to give a female point of view. We talk about both the feminine and masculine roles. I think it is all in how you handle it. (Tracy & Morgan, Partner Interview)
Rick and Larry, the only all male team, offered their opinion of having no female on a team. Rick did not find gender an important factor in balancing a team. He saw no particular need for a mixed-gender team. Although Rick recalled experiencing a disadvantage when partnering with a female in his first team, he would not reveal negative information about his previous partner but stated that he found gender to be one case for their negative experience. As recalled, he found students usually looked to him first as the authority figure. He believed he was more compatible with his male teaching partner than with his prior female partner.

We are both sensitive New Age guys. . . . The advantage with me teaching with another guy is the built-in power assumptions that come for me. When my other coteacher was a woman, there were so many negation factors not with her but with the students. They always looked at the guy first; that is an issue. That was really hard. I think there aren't gender issues going on for us that are gender biases perceived by the students [meaning commonly held gender stereotypes]. I am a bigger feminist than many people in my department. (Rick & Larry, Partner Interview)

Rick did not see any disadvantages to a team including two males, and rather saw it as a strength, yet Larry mentioned he had occasionally asked the female tutor assigned to the class to offer advice to students on topics he felt uncomfortable discussing.

-Sometimes if we have a theme when we have a female tutor, there will be certain things I read in drafts, and I'm not sure if it is my place to comment on that so sometimes I say, „Ask her what she thinks‘‖ (Rick & Larry, Partner Interview).
Neither Kim nor Patricia had ever worked with a male partner, and they both questioned whether the gender composition of a team influences the way its members teach. Kim stated that they teach a theme on gender: "I think if we look at that [the topic of gender] as a positive, it would be [an] ideal format to have both male and female, but I don’t think it is necessary."

(Group Interview). Patricia also believed that having a male partner might alter the dynamic of her team but expressed some reluctance about the idea because she felt more comfortable working with a female partner. She stated that a mixed-gender team might add to the course but felt it could result in a power struggle and thus preferred to work with another woman (Group Interview). Thus, a same gender team was seen as an important facet of their team.

The only female-male team, Connie and Robert considered the role of difference in gender in creating a compatible relationship. Connie emphasized that a teacher of each gender on a team helped build compatibility and facilitate discussions in class. Robert stated that Connie had said on numerous occasions, "She [Connie] admitted that she could discuss male issues in class but did not feel completely capable of discussing various topics because she was not male."

(Connie & Robert, Partner Interview). Connie concurred, agreeing she appreciated Robert’s male perspective. During the individual interview, Connie described how their gender difference contributed to the classroom dynamic:

If you look at it with a family analogy, . . . one of us can play the authoritative dad and the nurturing mom kind of thing although which role who plays switches
a lot. I think that dynamic is easier for students to understand sometimes than two women or two men. (Individual Interview)

Robert asserted even more strongly than Connie that they were at an advantage and more compatible in part as a result of their differences in gender. Robert claimed that the difference in fact provided a significant advantage for his team, which was appreciated by their students. Robert stated that one of the thematic units discussed in the course involves gender roles, so he believed one female and one male point of view strengthened their team. He stated:

When we discuss gender, if we were all male, how could we speak to the female audience? If we were all female how could we speak to the males? So when we do that [gender] theme, it works out pretty well. Connie can say my experience has been like this, and I can say my experience has been like this. We know our strengths, so we know consciously or subconsciously how to model it so that we are able to teach to our strengths. (Individual Interview)

Friendship. The teams saw friendship, like gender, as a relevant facet of their team; but some perceived a friendship as helpful while others did not. Most teams discussed how having an established friendship before partnering was best, but one group was wary that friendship might not always be necessary or helpful. The members of three teams (Connie and Robert, Rick and Larry, and Kim and Patricia) noted in all of the interviews that a friendship established with a partner before they began teaching together could be a barometer of strong compatibility with the other person, yet members of only three of the four teams were friends before forming a team. Tracy and Morgan barely
knew each other before agreeing to team teach. Connie considered whether knowing each other prior to teaming was important but did not see it as a prerequisite for compatibility; in fact, she stated that some teams worked better for not having a friendship in place before forming a professional relationship because people can become annoyed with others if they are together too much. When members of three teams reconfigured their partnership, six chose partners with whom they were friends; but few of those original teams worked well, and she wondered whether friendship actually hurt the teaming relationship. During the individual interview, she said:

The best of friendships can fall apart over issues unrelated to the course that create rifts, or in other cases a rift that wasn't apparent in the friendship surfaces in the course. Working together professionally and personally are two different things. It was actually those who didn't know each other that in some cases worked out better, which again shows that sometimes personally or professionally you can be with someone too much.

During the individual interview, she stated that the close relationship she had with Robert before working with him was helpful and actually the primary reason for their compatibility (Connie & Robert, partner interview). They discussed the history of their eight-year-old friendship during the partner interview. Connie stated that they were so comfortable teaching together because of their prior friendship:

I think part of the advantage is because of all the teams. I mean Robert and Larry were friends, but we have been friends for a very long time. We have known each other in a variety of contexts. I think that’s part of why we know in advance
where you are going to tread on dangerous ground. (Connie & Robert, Partner Interview)

Rick, much like Connie and Robert, attributed his compatibility with his partner Larry to their friendship, stating, “The friendship obviously [helps, too].” Rick further suggested that his friendship with and respect for Larry enhanced his comfort level as a team member. In fact, Rick had suggested that Larry partner with him after getting to know him on a personal level. Larry, who credited friendship with Rick for their compatibility, appreciated Rick’s recommendation for the team-teaching position at this university:

First and foremost, [I value our] friendship. We were introduced by a mutual friend. . . . , so we first knew each other as friends. That friendship grew, and on his recommendation I was hired here. So our teaching relationship is that of friendship. I think that is number one: We have a friendship. If you’re friends with someone, you already have a lot in common. (Individual Interview)

Patricia and Kim were also good friends before becoming team-teaching partners. Patricia, who credited their friendship for their compatibility, remarked, “I have a friendlier than professional relationship with Kim, which is not to say we don’t respect each other as professionals; but our families are close, and our kids are friends” (Individual Interview). During both the individual and partner interviews, Kim described the friendship she enjoyed with her partner on both the personal and professional levels.
Summary. Members of all four teams viewed themselves as compatible with their teaching partners. They attributed this compatibility to different factors. What these compatibilities—looked like for each team was different, but the three areas that came up across the teams most often were combinations of compatibility based on pedagogy, gender, and friendship. Compatibility for teams came from both pedagogical similarities and differences. For example, similarities in that both members were focused on student-centered activities but differences in that each member brought varied strengths and areas of expertise to the team. Gender was another area that most teams saw as contributing to the members’ compatibility. One team had both a male and a female teacher, and they stated that this mixed gender contributed to their compatibility. The members of two of the teams made up of same-gender (the male team and one of the female teams) instructors cited gender as a possible reason for their compatibility. Friendship was a third factor that across the teams seemed to contribute to their perceived compatibility. Members of three teams entered teaming with their partners after already being involved in a friendship; members of one team regarded themselves only as acquaintances. The researcher found compatibility defined differently by each team.

Flexible Interactive Behaviors

Members of all of the teams perceived themselves to be flexible in their interactive behaviors with each other as another important aspect of their working relationship. All four teams acknowledged that teaming required them to learn to be flexible with their partner, which they defined in terms of teaching personae, sharing
ownership of teaching, and decision-making in the classroom. Throughout the interviews and observation, the participants illustrated their flexibility in their interactive behaviors with their partners while working together to design curriculum, plan lessons and assessments and evaluations. Seven of the eight teachers began their teaching career in a single teacher classroom, teaching in isolation and exercising complete control, each with his or her own teaching persona. Some teachers like Connie and Kim perceived the move from teaching individually to working in a team to be more difficult than they had anticipated. Robert’s first teaching assignment included both team-taught and traditional classroom situations, so he had not grown as accustomed to the traditional classroom as his colleagues. The following three factors were attributed for their flexibility in their interactive behaviors by the participants: (a) teaching personas, (b) sharing ownership of teaching, and (c) decision-making in the classroom. Participants perceived these features to be important and present in the teams.

Connie expanded on these ideas during the group interview, when she stated that partners must learn to be flexible when interacting with people with different teaching personas. One must be flexible and willing to negotiate with one’s partner. Connie felt that teams in which one partner was more flexible than the other tended to work better. She cautioned that two very flexible people might not work. Connie remarked,

You don’t want two people who can’t make up their mind. It is like going to dinner where an hour later you are still deciding and the restaurant is closed. I knew one of the things that can be both a benefit and a drawback of team teaching is the personalities. (Individual Interview)
Teaching Persona. Teaching persona can be defined as the way a teacher’s personality comes across in the classroom. For example, some team teachers assumed the persona of the lead teacher, whereas others were quieter and more reserved. In all four teaming relationships, one partner emerged more clearly than the other as a lead teacher as identified by the participants’ interactive behaviors and witnessed during the classroom observations by the researcher (Field Notes). They all stated they were flexible in dealing with contrasting teaching personas and behaviors. They all stated that they had learned to be flexible in adjusting to their partner’s teaching persona.

The team members discussed their contrasting teaching personas and noted that they required flexibility in their interactive behaviors while teaching; they believed the team experience allowed them to determine how to work with a partner with a contrasting teaching persona (e.g., a more dominating instructor working with a less dominating instructor). Three teams (Tracy/Morgan, Rick/Larry, and Kim/Patricia) perceived one teacher in the teaming relationship to be much more assertive and leading than the other teacher. Robert and Connie, the only original team to remain together, stated that the longer they worked together, the more willing Connie was to allow Robert to lead class. This notion not only emerged in the various interviews but also during the researcher’s visits to each team’s classroom, where she recorded differences in the two teachers, such as teaching responsibility, interaction with the students, method of instruction, teaching styles. Connie and Robert were both actively involved and equally shared asking and answering questions. Both were at the front of the classroom, sharing board space and jumping into the discussion to offer their comments. They both took turns writing notes.
and walking around, working with the groups during group work; yet it seemed as if Connie was a bit more assertive in taking the lead on follow-up questions, giving directions, and even telling Robert to work with a certain group.

Rick and Larry and Patricia and Kim seemed to share the same flexibility in their type of interactive behaviors and relationship where one teacher was more dominate than the other. Rick and Kim were both vocal and assertive with their partner and the students. Larry and Patricia appeared to be flexible in allowing their partner to lead the discussions and comfortable offering their opinion. The researcher observed Tracy's directness in asking questions and telling Morgan to return to a certain slide during the PowerPoint presentation, but Morgan was flexible and did not mind doing what Tracy asked.

During the classroom observation, Morgan logged into the computer and turned on the overhead projector showing her PowerPoint presentation that included 40 slides set up like the television show *Jeopardy*. Tracy commended Morgan for spending time preparing the presentation, admitted in front of the students that she had never used PowerPoint, and asked Morgan to show her how; Morgan agreed to do so. Tracy and Morgan worked together to separate the class into two teams to play the game. Morgan remained near the computer, in charge of navigating through the PowerPoint slides because Tracy did not know how. Morgan asked each question, and students competed to provide an answer. Tracy asked follow-up questions and required the students to expand upon their answers when she was not satisfied with their initial answer. Occasionally, Tracy persisted to get a more thorough answer from the students by asking
probing questions or calling on students (Field Notes). They showed a sense of flexibility of interactive behaviors in their ability in turn-taking, comments, questions, and statements when they saw fit, even if that meant interrupting the other teacher.

Morgan, who said that she was more flexible in her behaviors than Tracy at the beginning of their working relationship, had asked Tracy whether she could incorporate more technology into their class and offered suggestions to Tracy, who welcomed them. Morgan stated:

I think the first year I felt like more the flexible one since I knew you had created [the unit], and I was the new kid on the block. You would say this is how we do it. And I wanted to do a good job, so I was willing to go with the flow, but I feel that [our work] is 50/50 now. (Morgan & Tracy, Partner Interview)

With time Morgan became more vocal, and Tracy said she was willing to give up some control (Morgan & Tracy, Partner Interview). Tracy stated, –I think we’re both flexible. I know that I am, and I think throughout the past two years that Morgan has become much more so─ (Individual Interview).

Morgan and Tracy believed they differed in their teaching personas and how they interacted with the students, both their own and each other’s. Tracy stated: –Although the kids think that I am the –hard─ one of the two of us, we are really quite similar. . . . I think I’m just blunter and put up with less crap from the students─ (Individual Interview).

Morgan considered the difference in the way she and Tracy presented themselves to the students. Tracy viewed herself as more direct than Morgan, yet Morgan thought Tracy was warmer toward the students than she was and made an effort to know them
personally. Tracy touched them on the arm or hugged them; by contrast Morgan was reserved, yet she still offered some personal information to the class, such as information about her family and her own educational experience. Overall, Morgan believed Tracy was more authoritative with students, and Tracy agreed with this analysis.

Morgan and Tracy discussed the difference in their teaching personas. For instance, Tracy admitted that she was more likely to be confrontational with students, whereas Morgan seemed to take a softer tone with students. During the observation, Tracy was direct and blunt with students if they gave wrong answers, but Morgan was a bit gentler in her verbal comments. Tracy and Morgan acknowledged their differences but found a good balance. Describing the difference between them as an enhancement of their relationship (Field Notes), Tracy also appreciated their similarities: “I am definitely considered to be the ‘bad witch’ (although I don’t like that term) by the students. I feel that I am the more strict and dominant of the two of us. However, I also feel that we feed off each other quite well!” (Partner Interview).

When asked to expand on the enactment of duties and specific roles, Tracy mentioned that she perceived an occasional difference in the way she and Morgan communicated in class. Tracy was the vocal, straightforward partner, raising her voice occasionally, but Morgan was soft spoken. Morgan stated that they both voiced their opinions and offered divergent views in the classroom. For instance, Morgan found with experience that Tracy was a better discussion leader and Morgan was more creative in constructing group activities (Individual Interview).
Morgan appreciated Tracy’s assertive approach to teaching; Tracy said that Morgan offered a softer side to the class. Morgan did not want to be too confrontational, so she was thankful that Tracy was more likely to take a stronger tone with the students. Although they recognized their differing teaching personas, they found themselves supportive of each other. Morgan explained their different teaching personas:

I view you [Tracy] as being the disciplinarian if they are not listening. I always count on you to say, —Be quiet.— I do, but I do it in a little bit nicer way, but I know that you will do it. . . . On the other hand, although you might be perceived as the one to yell more, I think a lot of it is your loud voice, more so than mine. I also see you being a little more compassionate than I am. You will be the one to hug a student if they are having a bad day or to ask them what is wrong. (Morgan & Tracy, Partner Interview)

Tracy confirmed Morgan’s perception during the partner interview.

I think they see me as the mean one, so if they get out of line I will put them in their place quicker than you will. You are more nice and quiet, but I think that, you are right, they all respect and will listen to us both the same. (Morgan & Tracy, Partner Interview)

Connie saw herself as the dominant teacher during the first year of their relationship, so she had made an effort to be flexible and allow Robert to take the lead.

At times I have to step back and let him do his thing. At times I will give him more than 50% of the class, and maybe even 90% of the class because I learned about a year or so ago that students could still see me as the one to complain to.
(Individual Interview)

Connie indicated that their level of flexibility of interactive behavior was evident as they worked together and grew accustomed to each other’s teaching personas from day-to-day. She found they were both relaxed and supportive when the other took the lead. Connie discussed their flexible teaching personas with respect to their planning and their working interactively while teaching.

We work out how we are going to do something, so we don’t get there and stare at each other and have no back-up plan. For most of the time for us, it is just a general dynamic . . . who will be lead person, but we both interact and discuss. Whoever is leading the discussion, the other is putting notes on the board; but that will switch, even halfway through. (Partner Interview)

Robert commented on his relationship with Connie in the classroom and suggested that they enacted teaming by counterbalancing each other during discussions. They most often interacted by changing the pace of the other's teaching to keep the lesson moving along. Robert stated:

Our group gets younger and our kids have a harder time relating because to them [the pace of the class] seems unbelievably slow. And they lose interest, and I have to move things along. . . . I know she knows her curriculum, and it is a good teaching method, . . . yet . . . sometimes the kids’ faces will . . . glaze over, so I have to do something; but at the same time she criticizes me for going too fast and assuming they understand. (Individual Interview)
Robert and Connie also perceived their team to have flexible interactive behaviors when enacting teaming, as expressed in the following example witnessed by the researcher during the classroom observation. While Connie was explaining the differences between ethos, pathos, and logos, Connie asked Robert to assist her by writing the information on the board that she was explaining to the class. She also asked him to go to the computer and pull up an example on a power-point presentation. He willingly assisted her in the way she approached the topic. Toward the end of class, Robert asked Connie to get the paper out and assist the students sign up for a presentation while he finished talking with a few students. Both teachers showed how they are able to ask the other to complete an unplanned task, change direction in the middle of the lesson, or add a new idea with the understanding that they supported each other.

Robert also mentioned that Connie tended to allow for more student dialogue than he. Discussing the differences in the way they interacted with students during the partner interview, Robert stated:

She is more willing to let them talk. . . . I'm not as willing. She is willing to take the time to walk them through those arguments. . . . So I will say at times she is often . . . a better facilitator. In fact, sometimes she will shush me when I am talking too much when the kids are trying to talk. . . . Nine out of ten times when she does shush me, I realize I am talking too much and not giving them a chance.
(Connie & Robert, Partner Interview)
Another team also saw themselves as flexible in their interactive behaviors in their ability to share similar interactive behaviors. Rick stated that he saw himself as more dominant and confrontational in the classroom than Larry.

I [Rick] can be the one to guide conversations when it gets tricky. I am the one who deals with class confrontation. I am comfortable with that. I handle the confrontations in class, but maybe that is because I don’t let him. It may be my personality, but he might be fine with that. It isn’t that he isn’t capable, but I say when we are in the rapids, I’ll handle it. I am so comfortable with Larry that I wasn’t worried about his response. (Individual Interview)

Rick saw their contrasting teaching personas as a strength. –Larry is more proactive with the tutors, and I am more reactive. I tend to deal when there are crises. Larry is better at saying, ‘Have you thought about what we need to do with this?’ (Individual Interview). Rick gave a specific example of a time when he relied on Larry’s teaching approach, showing how they accommodated each other’s teaching personas.

I think Larry is comfortable with just listening with conversations, which is a good skill. We did a discussion with a great group on anorexia, which was dominated by the women in the class . . . the leaders, who were smart with it. It is a tough topic for males. I don’t suffer from anorexia. I like to eat. It is a tough topic for me. . . We both walked through the discussion, . . . but Larry is good at being gentle asking questions. I think by the end class we had a few come up to us and say, –Wow! That was an amazing class. We kept tying it back to the reading. (Individual Interview)
Rick and Larry's teaching personas incorporated flexibility during their interactive behaviors and this was apparent during the classroom observation (Field Notes). Rick challenged students' responses more than Larry. Rick tended to lead the discussion and tried to be flexible by pulling Larry in to offer his suggestions if he chose. Larry was flexible and let Rick take the lead in asking follow-up questions, chiming in occasionally or when Rick asked for his contribution (Observation, Field Notes). When we discussed the classroom observation during the partner interview, Larry stated that he initially noticed their differing teaching personas but was flexible with respect to their differences.

I think sometimes he [Rick] will socialize a little more than I am willing to. I'm willing to socialize [get to know them through nonacademic conversation], but there is some cut-off point, where I think he's willing to go a little further in that respect. (Individual Interview)

Kim said that flexibility came after confrontation as experienced in their interactive behaviors. Kim remembered when Patricia was not flexible in her behaviors to Kim's desire to control the classroom. However, she was able to resolve this issue when Patricia dominated the instruction. Kim stated, -You have to be flexible- (Individual Interview). According to Kim, being flexible meant allowing and granting the opportunity for the other teacher in the room to offer her opinion.

There toward the end of the fall semester, Patricia was getting to where she wanted to talk the whole time; so I kept interjecting. I would jump right in and she would back off. We had some nonverbal communication, but we haven't
had that this semester. One thing—at the end of the semester, we are under a lot of pressure, and I think tensions ran high; but that would be the only negative thing I could say. We have been team teaching for awhile now, for three years now. (Individual Interview)

Patricia discussed the differences in Kim’s and her teaching personas, which was characterized as Patricia having a more dominant, direct lead role and Kim in the gentler, less direct role. Although Patricia said that she has had to learn to be flexible, giving up some of the control and organization to which she was accustomed when running her own class, she viewed their level of flexibility as a strength of their relationship.

As far as working together, I think we have a good complementary relationship. It used to trouble me because Kim is a little more causal [than I am]. Kim has a sweeter nature and is more trusting [than I], but I have seen that that works well, too. So I am able to relinquish some of my rigidity. Kim is less rigid in many ways than I am, and I have thought [her demeanor] is pleasant. She is a good teacher, and that works (Individual Interview).

**Sharing Ownership.** Sharing the ownership of teaching entails flexibility in interactive behaviors among team members as they work with their partners. Throughout the interviews, the teachers mentioned that they were no longer teaching in isolation and thus had to be aware, respectful, and flexible in sharing their classroom and students with another teacher. The team members perceived flexibility as sharing ownership of teaching in various contexts, including partners planning with each other and conducting class time. Seven of the teachers had experienced teaching in traditional
classrooms before entering team teaching, so they were accustomed to total ownership of their class and daily operations. For example, taking the lead role during a discussion was natural for some of the team members like Connie and Tracy, so they recognized the need to allow their partner time to have to take the lead role.

According to all of the teams, sharing ownership of the classroom required flexibility in interactive behaviors, one of the most important traits needed as a good partner. Reflecting on her own experience with sharing ownership of teaching, Tracy admitted that she tended to be very vocal and dominant and had to learn to relinquish control at times. She described how a partner must share ownership of teaching:

I used to get all stressed out if I wasn't the one leading the discussion, but I've learned to take a backseat sometimes and let my partner handle things. . . . I've found out that it [is necessary for a teacher] . . . to share, to compromise, to step back when necessary, to give up some control . . . to be successful at teaming. It is not easier than teaching solo. (Tracy, Individual Interview)

In the individual and partner interviews Tracy and Morgan stated their willingness to share this ownership through their flexible interactive behaviors. Tracy stated,

I think that what makes us successful is our willingness to share responsibility for our class and our kids. We work on everything together, and we lead our class together. We never teach our class separately, and I think that our kids have benefitted from this. (Individual Interview)

Robert agreed with Connie during the partner interview that the students in their college English course needed to see their teachers as real people in order for the teachers
to establish the proper relationship with the students. He felt they were already
distrustful of teachers playing the role of experts. Besides sharing their own personal
information, the instructors often referred to themselves by first name. Moreover, Robert
believed that their students viewed them as excellent mentors, whereas in previous years
they were seen as only good mentors. He reported that the students saw them working
well together with each other and with the students in the classroom. Robert stated:

They say we work well together. I have had students say to me that they like how
we taught today. And that we play off of each other well. . . . We have heard that
plenty of times. So that tells me that we are doing something right . . . even the
students see. (Connie & Robert, Partner Interview)

Connie explained that she also equated teaming with sharing all aspects of
teaching, which required a great deal of communication and flexible interactive
behaviors. Listing various ways the teams must work as one collaborative entity, she
spoke of how a team must unite in sharing a classroom, time, and students. She stated,

"To me it's a shared experience. You are sharing classroom, time, resources, and
expertise. You are also sharing students!" (Connie, Individual Interview).

During the researcher's observation of Connie and Robert's class, she saw how
they enacted team teaching in front of their students. They opened class with a
discussion in which they asked for student input in designing a chart to apply to an essay
assigned from the text; students' comments were noted on the chalkboard. Both teachers
interjected comments and many times piggybacked onto what the other had said. They
walked back and forth in front of each other, stood very close to each other, and even
embellished each other's notations on the same graphic. When one spoke, the other
teacher picked up a marker and wrote notes to keep the discussion flowing in a pattern of
continuous interactive teaching (Field Notes).

The researcher also found she could not distinguish Robert’s students from
Connie's (Field Notes). The students were divided into groups and asked to analyze a
story from their text using three ideas presented from the whole class discussion. Both
teachers and students appeared to intermingle. Connie and Robert walked around and
stopped at each group to see how the students were progressing. While at each group,
both teachers asked questions to almost every student in the group, pushing their way of
thinking and stretching their answers to a higher level of thinking. At the end of class,
Robert announced to the students that they needed to sign up for tutoring; while he
assisted students in doing so, Connie collected papers. What the instructors did occurred
in a systematic manner and students received help from both of them before they exited
the classroom, showing their flexible interactive behaviors (Observation).

Rick and Larry explained their relationship as an entity and expressed how they
enacted teaming by designing discussions together harmoniously and respectfully using
interactive behaviors to ensure the participation of both teachers. Rick explained that he
and Larry enacted teaming well in the classroom by playing devil's advocate at times as
noted during the partner interview. Rick reported that they both led discussion even
though he sometimes appeared to dominate; he was conscious of doing so and backed off
at times. Rick explained that their laid-back personalities allowed them to operate class
discussions in that mode. During the individual interview Rick labeled himself as the one
who occasionally dominated and pushed a topic further while Larry tended to listen, yet these qualities counterbalanced each other. Rick stated:

I think we are both even with discussions. . . . I think I can dominate. I need to back off. I tend to pick on things a little bit more . . . while he is a good listener. I handle the confrontations in class but maybe because I don’t let him. (Individual Interview)

Larry described how they collaborated in the classroom:

So we teach kind of as an entity. We don’t do a thing where he teaches one day, I teach another. . . . We kind of both teach, and being that the friendship is there, we . . . feel we can interject at any time . . . almost like a single entity. We have our different personalities, but it’s almost like they come into a single entity.

(Individual Interview)

Kim was certain that her team had developed a good working relationship in their teaching because of her realistic expectations of team teaching from prior experience and flexible interactive behaviors. She knew she would have to be flexible with ownership of the classroom when teaching with another teacher. Kim stated that her experience with teaming led her to see flexibility in sharing ownership as an important requirement of teaming; therefore, she was more willing to do so. Kim stated:

I didn’t like the idea of someone else coming into my classroom and taking over. I think that is the greatest . . . thing you really have to look out for. . . . We are in a sense in control of our classroom for that hour or hour and half, so that
concept and compromising is hard to get used to. . . . But I don't know—if I had never done it before—whether I would have been so agreeable and flexible. . . .

You can't always think you have the best way or the right way. (Individual Interview)

These four teams avoided the model of team teaching in which one of the teachers remained quiet or left the room while the other taught. Even the pair that met separately one of the three days of the week implemented an integrated teaching style. Teachers finished one another's sentences, added comments and follow-up questions, and were aware of their colleague's words and actions throughout the lessons. The ebb and flow of dialogue and interaction suggested that the teachers drew from each other as resources. Members of all four teams reported that generally the students approached the teacher of record first when they had a question. The teachers also believed the students felt comfortable and saw a connection with the other teacher. The teachers worked diligently to create a milieu in which nurturing, friendly communication with their students could occur by sharing ownership of teaching.

Decision Making. Decision making entails choosing specific teaching methods and strategies and handling the daily operation of teaching in the classroom with a partner. Connie and Robert and Tracy and Morgan cited the negotiation necessary when making decisions with a partner. Because Morgan had not been part of the teams when the original curriculum was prepared, she tended to adhere to what was already in place. She said, "Sometimes we take turns creating forms of assessment, yet we always pass it to the other one for review. If I make up a quiz, I send it to her; and she knows she can
change anything she wants‖ (Individual Interview). Morgan discussed decision making with a dominating partner, and Connie and Robert provided insights into decision-making during the lesson-planning stage as well as during the actual teaching. No matter how carefully a team plans to lead a class, the strategy never proceeds exactly as planned. Thus, when adjustments are required, the teachers must be able to make quick decisions that their partners can accept and support. Across the four teams flexibility was seen as positive in preventing areas of conflict. None of the teams reported controversy over making decisions, even those that occurred without prior discussion or agreement.

Morgan provided an example of flexibility in regards to decision making: –One teacher could decide to adjust a lesson at the last minute or allow a discussion to move in an unexpected direction if justifiable without the other teacher objecting‖ (Individual Interview). Also during the individual interview, she explained her position on spontaneous decisions without prior discussion with Tracy:

We are flexible and adjust on the fly. . . . If I decided to throw something in at the last minute or change the course of the discussion, I know that Tracy be will OK with that. Change is good and exciting; it is invigorating. (Morgan, Individual Interview)

Connie advocated the flexibility of teams when determining how to make decisions, specifically allowing one’s partner to make decisions or handle certain issues that arise. Consequently, she equated flexibility with considering a partner’s thoughts and feelings when making decisions. Connie admitted that she and Robert have worked together so long that they are amenable to making decisions because they knew how the
other reacts (Individual Interview). Connie pointed out that she was cautious and flexible when working with Robert, always considering his feelings.

You can have this wonderful idea and the person you are teaming with really doesn’t agree with that, so you have to compromise or negotiate. Or it may happen in the classroom. It isn’t something you could have planned with your teammate in advance, but suddenly you are in a situation where you realize you make the other person extremely uncomfortable. (Group Interview)

**Summary.** Participants acknowledged flexibility in their interactive behaviors as a critical component in establishing strong team relationships. With experience over time, participants identified three manifestations of flexibility, which they revealed in interviews and classroom observations. First, contrasting teaching personas were defined in terms of one partner’s dominance in the classroom. With time and experience, the teammates gradually developed equality in leading the classroom. Another area of flexibility was teachers’ willingness to share ownership of the classroom with a partner. Thus, all eight agreed that they had to share ownership of teaching in the classroom and be flexible, especially with decision making. According to the participants, teaming requires the agreement of two people or at least their willingness to accept a partner’s idea. They cited experience as vital in increasing the level of cooperation between partners, which they deemed crucial to the working relationship. Finally, teams noted the importance of flexibility in decision-making.
Facilitative and Active Engagement

A second finding derived from a review of the data collected involved a description of facilitative teaching and active student engagement. The participants were asked to define their perception of their teaching, and the responses of seven focused on facilitative and active student engagement. (One did not mention this in his definition). Some of the participants incorporated a specific teaching philosophy in their response; for instance, Morgan stated, “I am a constructivist, cooperative teacher now” (Individual Interview). Connie stated that she was “Experiential and existentialist in terms of teaching philosophy” (Individual Interview). The other six teachers did not answer with a specific teaching philosophy but described the teaching strategies they used in the classroom. Members of all four teams stated that they strive to create student-centered classrooms and active learning environments. Active learning, according to the teams, meant students engaging in group work and participating in lessons. They highly encouraged collaboration among students.

Tracy stated her concept of teaching quite simply,

I believe that every student has the capacity to learn. I believe that the classroom should be student-centered. I see teaching as a way in which we can really shape the future of the people with whom we are in contact. I believe that you have to be a special person to teach. (Individual Interview)

In their classroom setting both Tracy and Morgan worked diligently to create and foster a student-centered learning environment. When asked to describe a critical
incident that occurred while team teaching, Tracy referenced a teaching strategy they had tried to implement.

I believe teaching to be similar to coaching. . . . I believe that the classroom should be student-centered. I think this semester provided a moment that affirmed the new things we decided to try. We decided to come up with interactive activities to get the kids involved with the readings and coursework. The first activity we tried was incredibly successful. The kids all participated, and they all seemed to really grasp the concepts we were trying to get across. It was a great class. (Morgan & Tracy, Partner Interview)

Although Morgan had clarified her teaching philosophy throughout her years of experience, she said she remained consistent in her beliefs and mission as a teacher. Reflecting on her own theory of teaching and seeing herself as a facilitator, supporter, and life-long learner, she said she tried to learn with her students and admitted that she was not an authoritative instructor. Looking at issues from multiple angles was always her goal. She thought students needed to be active participants in their learning. –Each year I move farther away from being a traditionalist instructor to more of a facilitator. I am a constructivist, cooperative teacher, and this is fostered in a team teaching construct— (Morgan, Individual Interview).

Tracy and Morgan stated they always see themselves in particular roles: one asked questions, and one pushed the discussion further. Sometimes those roles switched back and forth seamlessly within one class period. Students always laughed and enjoyed the group activities the teachers designed, and the teachers did as well. Morgan stated
when asked to reflect on a day the researcher observed, –And I think yesterday they were pretty typical. The students will speak out if they want to—even sometimes where it might be inappropriate—but it shows the classroom environment we have set up‖ (Morgan & Tracy, partner interview). Morgan discussed specific examples, –We have them do many group discussions, act out skits, complete a group project, and play review games. They seem to be so relaxed with us‖ (Morgan, Individual Interview).

Connie discussed the importance of student involvement in discussion and the learning experience. She regularly called on the students to help lead class and wanted them to offer their experiences as part of the lessons (Connie & Robert, Observation). Robert stated:

She [Connie] is more willing to let them talk and talk it through. She is much more indulgent. She is willing to take the time to lead them through out of the wilderness to that of understanding. In fact, sometimes she will shush me when I am talking too much when the kids are trying to talk. (Connie & Robert, Individual Interview)

During the group interview Connie mentioned that extensively planned lessons are not always best; instead student initiated lessons are best because they allow for students to serve as a vital part of the class. –The spontaneous ones [discussions] that grow out of what the students have brought are more successful because they are student initiated‖ (Group Interview).

Connie stated that part of active learning involves looking at each student and discovering his or her needs. She explained this in an analogy when trying to define her
teaching philosophy, suggesting that active learning entails working with students one-on-one and in group settings after ascertaining their background and knowledge.

[I am] experiential and existentialist in terms of teaching philosophy, but when I teach, [I] take the students where they are in [my] classroom and . . . move them forward. It is like teaching someone to drive a car. You have the child who rode a bike and drove the farm tractor, . . . and then you have the child who never sat behind the wheel of anything or any moving vehicle. I think that is why I do direct teaching. . . . But the theory part of what I do is individualized or small group, so I can work with each of them or pair a more experienced [student] with a less experienced [one]. [Teaching] has to connect with students‘ personal experience. (Connie, Individual Interview)

Robert acknowledged that students preferred learning in an active learning environment; therefore, he and his partner tried to incorporate active, collaborative learning in their plans. At first Robert did not know how to define his theory of teaching. He stated, –Theory about what?‖ (Individual Interview). But then he articulated his idea of teaching using his own experience as a learner to describe how he approaches his own concept of teaching: –Well, I guess I have always really loved to learn, so I guess what I have always done was try to pass on why I love that to people I teach‖ (Individual Interview).

Rick also addressed striving for a classroom in which active learning and facilitative teaching occurred, allowing students to work collaboratively and to witness how two teachers could work together without having all the answers (Partner Interview).
He said this style of teaching matched his hands-on style and his willingness to stir things up in the classroom. “I rarely just talk for minutes. I try to guide students through discussion.” (Individual Interview). During the group interview Larry stated that he always supported active learning, and Rick further emphasized its importance:

We are serious about helping our folks understand that none of us have all of the answers, that we need to put many brains on problems, and we really do need to collaborate to get problems solved. . . . The other thing that [active learning] does is it hopefully puts us less in the role of the authoritarian right off the bat. It can decentralize that authority figure in the classroom. (Group Interview)

Larry and Rick have worked together to foster the learning of writing together with their students. Visiting their classroom, the researcher noticed how Rick and Larry tried to guide students through discussions in a facilitative way (Rick & Larry, Observation). The pair used group work and open discussion to involve their students in classroom proceedings. During the observation of Rick and Larry’s classroom, they appeared to have a very friendly, genuine relationship with their students. Before class Rick chatted about music with a few students, and the conversation appeared to be casual. The students referred to their teachers as “Rick and Larry”; the student of no other teams referred to their teachers by their first names. Although Rick was more talkative than Larry, the students seemed very comfortable speaking out about both course materials and making small talk about music or restaurants at appropriate times (Field Notes).

Larry’s concept of teaching accommodated the value of the perspectives of students of both genders and the importance of an emphatic worldview, valuable when
working with another teacher and students. During a follow-up email, Larry further defined his teaching philosophy, which differed from the other participants’ responses with its basis in an empathic worldview but still focused on students’ being active and having a voice. He did not want to be the authoritative figure in the classroom; instead he wanted to allow students to feel comfortable to share in the classroom. For instance, he further explained his theory:

> It is important to conceptualize experience in terms of role reversal, to put ourselves into the place of others. Through such cognitive awareness, we comprehend the feelings, thoughts, and motives of others. From this comprehension develops heightened sensitivity toward plights in which few people ever really expect to find themselves (Follow-Up Email)

Both Rick and Larry created a lesson that required students to be active. Rick gave students the directions needed to answer questions for an upcoming midterm exam, and Larry discussed a handout, which he had distributed to them. Both instructors moved about the room, offering advice and suggestions and asking additional questions while students worked together to answer questions. After the students had completed the assignment, they came together for a group discussion in which the students were very vocal and supported one another. The teachers sat alongside the students in a horseshoe seating arrangement and served as facilitators, truly listening and expanding on the students’ answers.

Patricia thought it was ironic that the college had just begun to publicly discuss active learning at professional development opportunities because she had thought of
herself as an active learning teacher for years (Individual Interview). Stating that she would have a difficult time planning a lecture because that is not how she taught, she preferred an active, facilitative lesson as opposed to a lecture because the former allowed students to contribute their knowledge. She explained, “I have a very interactive approach. There are the students that can feel that they can bring just as much to the discussion as I can, so that is my big philosophy” (Individual Interview).

Kim defined her beliefs about team teaching and her theory of teaching, explaining how her theory of teaching was actually best carried out in a team setting. Getting and keeping the students involved was her main goal. “We are facilitators. We definitely encourage and plan toward interactive learning in the classroom. We work hard to get them involved, but that is the nature of the course” (Kim, Partner Interview).

The day the researcher observed Patricia and Kim was not typical according to the team because they had done most of the discussing and had to call on the students. Presenting new information that the students were not yet familiar was by nature teacher oriented, so direct instruction was appropriate for this lesson. Regardless, all the students spoke, completed a handout, and took notes; so they were still actively engaged. Kim made sure to express her desire to get the students involved. She explained:

“We do presentations, and we encourage a lot of creativity and flexibility, not only on the delivery of those presentations but [also] putting them together. I always try to engage students, having them do something that is not on the syllabus. They will say, “Where is that?” I say “That is not on the syllabus.” So I do student Q & A. I let them ask questions of one another and they have to do the
reading to do this Q & A, and then they also have to understand what they are reading. To make sure they read and understand and actually ask questions of someone else in the class, I rarely get involved unless the question is erroneous; but they have to keep in mind what they want from that person; and they call on people, and then they lead the discussion back and forth to each other. I use that. We use group and individual presentations. (Individual Interview)

All four teams clearly emphasized facilitative roles in the classroom and required active student engagement. The teachers did not use an authoritative tone and were confident enough to show the students they were not experts. The teachers sat alongside the students during group work and created an environment where students freely asked and answered questions. Students even called one team of teachers by their first name, thus showing the lack of teacher-student hierarchy in the classroom (Observations).

**Consistency Within and Across the Teams**

Another finding that evolved from the study involves the way members of these four teams viewed the individual teams to be mostly consistent. The researcher is defining the word consistency to mean a high degree of sameness when it came to curriculum, assessments, and evaluations. The team members perceived consistency with their teaching partner but less consistency across the four teams. The common language the group used was standardization. However, standardization means a set of universal or professional standards set forth by an outside institute. None of the teachers had standardized tests material or measures used in the classroom. In the context of this study, no outside institute forced specific standardized items upon the teachers. Rather,
the teams were referring to a sense of consistency, such as the set number of essays, readings, method of instruction, assessment, and evaluation. Based on their experiences with each other, the members of the four teams recognized the importance of consistency in their own team teaching of developmental English, which was perceived positively by all eight teachers when team members discussed their individual team. Three teams stated they did not feel enough consistency was in place in their team teaching of developmental English across the teams. It is important to note that each teacher was responsible for the grading of half the class. Class size was capped at 20, so each teacher was the teacher of record and completed the grading for 10 of the students. Although this was the case, all of the teachers discussed how they attempted to be consistent in the way they graded, the assignments they gave, and the curriculum within their team.

Rick and Larry constituted the only team to say they thought consistency was sufficient across all the teams. Consistency was defined by the teachers as maintaining sameness in terms of curriculum, assessments, and evaluations. Thus, to determine the extent of consistency in place, the researcher analyzed specific ways the four teams structured their classes, the consistency across all teams, and the teams’ syllabi, which included assessments and evaluations.

**Consistency Within the Teams**

Most teams were fairly consistent within their team in terms of planning, evaluation, and assessing. The members of only one team, Kim and Patricia, reported ever giving different assignments, which were rare and minor in importance. Most of the eight teachers stated that they were consistent in the grading methods and the learning
outcomes they had established. For example, all four teams noted the consistency within their team because each team shared one syllabus, gave the same assignments, designed curriculum, and attempted to assess and evaluate in the same manner. They exchanged graded papers and other student work, so they gained the advantage of consistent grading. Tracy and Morgan took turns grading all the students’ (not just their own students’) weekly forum postings, which required students to reflect on a concept they had learned during the previous week. Tracy also recommended that they establish one person to grade all of the midterms and one person to grade the final to ensure consistency and fairness in grading. They also exchanged essays throughout the semester to make sure they were consistent in evaluating essays. Tracy commented, “I think that helps us, and it is better for the students, and that is the way it is supposed to be” (Morgan & Tracy, Partner, Interview).

More alike than different in every aspect of the class, Tracy and Morgan aimed for consistency in various methods, sharing one syllabus and making identical journal and essay assignments to all of their students. They met regularly to ensure all students received the same information. Grading was the most significant area in which they tried to achieve consistency. Morgan stated:

We not only grade our own students’ writing but also exchange papers, so we can get a feel of how the other students are performing. This allows for us to be exposed to all of the students’ writing but also make sure that we are grading on the same scale. I graded the midterm, so [Tracy] will grade the final. (Individual Interview)
Connie said that her team also aimed for consistency, especially with regard to grading. Asked whether they actually wrote on each other’s students’ papers, she stated that they did so. She felt exchanging papers was important because no teacher can find every mistake in an essay. They were the only team to both grade and offer suggestions on essays written by each other’s students. They tried to reword sentences as a form of instruction for students.

Connie mentioned that although they tried to be consistent, occasionally their attempts escaped the attention of their students. She reported that sometimes students saw differences in the evaluation done by the two teachers. For example, during the individual interview Connie explored student comments that she and Robert contradicted each other. In reality they merely explained topics in different ways, yet their goal was consistency. Connie remarked,

Now, we don’t really contradict each other, but often we will explain things differently. They think the grade comes by doing what the instructor wants, so if I am giving the directions, . . . Robert’s students think, –Is this really what we are supposed to do?‖ (Individual Interview)

Robert agreed with Connie’s perceived assessment of the consistency of their class in terms of grading student essays as shown in the following statement:

We always do, always, always. We always meet and line the grades up. Because we teach the class together, they are going to talk to each other as a class. So it wouldn’t make sense if I gave someone an A and she gave them a C. (Individual Interview)
The researcher asked Rick how he and Larry taught their class and how they implemented methods of assessment and evaluation. Although they did not exchange and examine each other's students' papers, Rick considered himself and Larry to grade consistently. The two teachers did not exchange papers as other teams did, but they discussed students' grades with each other and believed they offered similar comments perhaps because of their educational backgrounds. The grades they assigned were usually very similar. Larry said, “I think Rick and I would have generally the same comments. I think our assessments are generally the same” (Individual Interview).

One team showed less consistency compared with the other three teams. Kim and Patricia's team was the only one to separate their students one day a week. They met together on Mondays and Fridays and separately on Wednesdays. Kim stated,

I was the one that decided that I know my kids, but I really don't have a clear understanding of each student's personalities. I know them as a whole group but not as a small group. So I wanted to know them better in that way. I wanted to see their personality differences. (Individual Interview)

Kim also noted a difference in grading by her and her partner, believing she was more demanding than Patricia. She stated that they did not exchange papers to check for consistency in their comments even though she had observed some differences. Kim stated:

I am more demanding. . . . She is more. I am more hard core and stickler about some things. . . . She gives quizzes and I don’t. We do other [assignments]
that I grade that [accomplish] the very same thing—that test the fact that they
can do [certain] things. (Individual Interview)

Patricia confirmed Kim’s observations during her individual interview, reporting
differences within their team as Kim had. They met together with all students on some
days and separately with their own groups on others days. Sometimes they graded
differently, and occasionally one gave a quiz when the other did not. Patricia perceived
Kim to be a more difficult grader than she, yet she was unconcerned and viewed Kim’s
grading to present no problem for the team. During the individual interview Patricia
pointed out that an important difference involved quizzes, which Kim did not always
administer even when Patricia gave them to her students. Patricia explained,

We have a little bit more ownership with our own students, so I am tougher in
other ways. I give quizzes every time on reading material, and she tends not to do
that. . . . Kim is a little sweeter nature and little more trusting. But as [far as]
numerical grading [goes,] we are . . . off a little. (Individual Interview)

Although Kim and Patricia reported the foregoing differences in their teaching,
they required the same number of essays, offered the same number of points in class, and
required the same projects and presentations; yet they were the only team to divide the
students into two classes. Consequently, the content and method of instruction probably
varied when the two teachers separated into two different rooms with their own students.
The other teams always taught the same material to a single large group, never dividing
the class.
Consistency Across Teams

Consistency across the teams was difficult for the four pairs of instructors in this study to achieve. How members of all four teams communicated with one another, how their curriculum varied, and how they evaluated their students were issues considered by the researcher. Connie, serving as department chair, reported during the group interview that she was unhappy with the lack of consistency across teams. Most of the other team members agreed with her. Tracy explained why consistency was the most formidable issue facing the entire team of eight.

There are those who just don’t want to [be consistent]. I think a lot comes into play there. . . . A lot has to do with pride, ego, who’s going to give, who’s going to take. There are people who simply do not want to aim for standardization and others who know that you have to, so as the course has progressed over the years, everybody has gone into their own and developed on their own and don’t want to let that go. (Morgan & Tracy, Partner Interview)

Robert agreed with Tracy. He speculated about the difficulty of consistency among eight teachers, indicating that people are generally unwilling to change when they like what they are doing and think it is working well. Connie labeled it ownership and control, and Tracy concurred:

I believe in my situation, it has been an ownership thing since it was mine. So I had a very specific idea about what [the class] should be and how it should be run from the very beginning, then I got sick of the syllabus wars. (Tracy, Group Interview)
Morgan had assumed that she and her partner Tracy were in agreement on all aspects of team teaching. Over the course of the partner and group interview, she discovered how different they were across teams in major areas like assessment, evaluation, curriculum, and teaching styles, yet similar within teams. All eight team members needed to abide by consistency because the course had been designed around some specific requirements. At least six of the eight participants saw the importance of consistency across teams, which could be accomplished through frequent meetings.

Connie noted insufficient communication among the four teams:

No, it really isn’t enough. Ideally we would communicate more. On the one hand, I understand schedule limitation, and it isn’t just teaching schedules. . . . Everyone has their own thing, . . . but we need to certainly meet once a semester. . . . We will meet again in the summer. (Individual Interview)

When Connie was asked why she thought consistency was such a difficult task, she explained it was easier said than done. She revealed that consistency had always been the most difficult task to accomplish across the teams. She stated that teaming required so many compromises both within and across teams that people tended finally to resist giving in altogether. Connie asked, –[At] what point does it become human nature to [say], „No, no, no”?‖ (Individual Interview).

Connie wanted the course syllabus consistent across teams, but her goal remained elusive. Based on her experience as department chair, no set syllabus had ever been adopted. During the group interview she stated that teachers should be able to teach from the standard syllabus and still be able to add their own teaching style and methods of
delivery. She questioned the others: -If this is the syllabus we are supposed to follow, why doesn’t that happen? I can pull the team syllabi, and I can tell you there will be two teams in line and two teams that aren’t- (Individual Interview).

The course was designed around themes suggested in the textbook that all teams use, but Connie asked whether even those were consistent across the four teams. After discussing with each team what they believed to be the themes required for the course, two teams listed four, and the other two teams listed five. Connie was displeased when she discovered this, and Tracy was surprised that all four teams had not listed the same five themes. During the individual interview Connie noted that the four themes allowed for the instructors to interpret them differently. Connie wanted to ensure the same essays but did not require all the specified reading assignments. Connie had tried to avoid this dilemma and confessed, -To be perfectly honest, I haven’t looked at the syllabi after [last summer’s] experience. I didn’t bring us together, and I didn’t want to know- (Individual Interview). Tracy became agitated during the group interview because she thought all the teams had agreed upon five major themes over the course of the semester, but the others assured her that they had agreed on only four themes. In disbelief she realized that although she had advocated consistency, her own team has not been following the set curriculum.

Connie discussed this problem of consistency across groups. She admitted that it was difficult to ensure all four teams met requirements consistently.

We have problems practicing that with the whole group. There is a sense of possession . . . that I didn’t like and think beneficial. I thought it more beneficial
to have everyone happy with what they were doing instead of being standardized.

(Individual Interview)

Nonetheless, having eight teachers agree upon a curriculum and syllabus has been challenging and problematic. Connie used harsh words, such as war and bloodshed, which demonstrated the strong feelings of the participants. During the group interview, she candidly raised the issue for discussion. Connie explained that she had attempted to achieve consistency across all four teams but indicated that people tended to follow directions for a while but ultimately steered away from it.

I might as well bring it up because it has to be, and that is standardization. I think there is a difference between standardization within the team and standardization across teams. . . . Some teams may only have the standardization within the team, but even within the team there is an essential need to grade what you emphasize, how you interact with other participants. Then there is that second layer—that standardization across groups. And we have a rather checkered record on that.

[Now isn’t really the time to go into it], but in the individual interview there is bias in my even being here because I wear two hats. But a part of it is, I might reel you in for a while, but as quickly as I am not requiring to see everything you do, there is a natural drift that occurs, the drift toward chaos. (Group Interview)

Consistency became an even larger issue during the year of the study when some students unavoidably switched teams during the second semester in order to take other classes. Because of scheduling conflicts students found themselves in another team’s classroom repeating some of the same information they had witnessed earlier from their
original team. In addition, Connie reported that the teams needed to become more consistent with the way they graded and in some cases the way they taught. She emphasized the need for all team teachers to impose the same requirements and consistency, so if students must switch teams, they received the same education. —For instance, for us the difference in the higher expectation . . . is grammar. Students are coming to us and don't have a strong enough concept of what they should have with grammar, and grading is a totally different marking system — (Connie, Group Interview).

Patricia mentioned that the year of this study was the first year that students had to switch teams because of scheduling conflicts. Three of Patricia and Kim’s students transferred to Tracy and Morgan’s section, thus Patricia agreed with Connie that consistency was necessary so students would not miss any part of the curriculum. For instance, if Patricia and Kim had planned on doing something second semester that Tracy and Morgan had already taught during the first semester, the students would miss out on that particular lesson.

Rick mentioned that he wished this group of team teachers could be given the opportunity to teach what and how they wanted, based on the needs and interests of the students. Other members disagreed with this statement during the group interview and said that cannot happen because data were needed from all of the students. Connie stated that because of accreditation, specific procedures should be equivalent across all four teams, such as diagnostic testing given at the beginning of the semester, which three teams used and one team did not. She stated that some aspects of the course, such as the syllabus, needed to be discussed and settled during the upcoming summer meeting for the
following year. Another area of consistency was that of assessment and evaluation.
Connie said the teams needed to have specific requirements, such as the midterm and final exams. She stressed that areas of assessment must be measurable and comparable across teams.

We have to be able to measure even with midterm exams. We started out with a standard midterm, but it really wasn’t a standard midterm because one group did not do that midterm from the very beginning. This is an addition to the syllabus war that I got sick of. . . . I am sick of playing a policeman. I am a member of the team and have the same responsibility that everyone else has, so either yes, everyone is an adult and will follow this or no, they won’t, and that is a problem. . . Nobody is [dictating] the teaching approach you have to use. (Connie, Group Interview)

However, some participants were pessimistic when considering whether total consistency would ever occur. Robert illustrated this point during all of his interviews.

I would like to see more standardization. . . . Yes. . . . Will we see it? No, because not only is everybody bent on what they want to do, . . . [but] as a group it is [also] hard to get people to listen who had to do this, that. We had a commitment to the university to have it somewhat unified, but people still don’t. So that part is hard. (Individual Interview)

Robert indicated that without consistency, the program could be in jeopardy. He became the strongest advocate for enforcing consistency across all four teams. In order for the program to survive statistical evidence of student performance using similar
measurements across teams, such as similar writing assignments, exam grades, and diagnostic testing, was required to justify the program to decision makers.

It [consistency] is a necessary evil. And we will be asked to justify remediation, and if I can’t say _because we have this unified approach and produce these unified results_, that will be a problem for all of us.

From day one we liked it [standardization across teams] when it started, . . . and now it is obviously for each of us our own thing, but we have to come back and look at how do we all toe the same line. (Robert, Group Interview)

Rick and Larry were not opposed to consistency yet did not feel performance was radically different among the four teams. Rick was primarily concerned about how instructors graded and evaluated. He thought that becoming more consistent across teams was possible and good for assessing learning outcomes. —I worry about [grading]. I think we have really different standards for grades, but at the end of the day they are better writers and readers. It would be nice to meet with people [to reestablish standards]. (Individual Interview).

Larry was opposed to total consistency, but he was willing to meet with people to address the issue. He recognized that people within the team graded much differently from others. In fact, he viewed the teams as being consistent in their use of the same units, types of assignments, and number of essays, which he perceived to be sufficient consistency. In other words, he viewed there was already a strong sense of consistency across teams and did not wish to force even more.
[Between Rick and me] the delivery and execution is a little different. Some of the execution, I think there is variance the way the assignments are written up or they way Rick and I might lead a discussion. I think it fine exactly the way it is. . . . More standardization would be not only unhealthy but really impossible.

(Individual Interview)

Kim stated that she did not think there was enough communication among all eight college English teachers and although not completely in favor of consistency, she saw it as an important hurdle to overcome. She felt the teams needed to meet and communicate more often; she remembered when the teams used to meet more often, but they had not done so recently. Kim admitted that she liked the idea of having academic freedom but knew that consistency was necessary. Consistency did not mean that everyone lost all forms of individual freedom and flexibility in making decisions in the classroom. Kim said:

I like having some flexibility in terms of how we teach and present the material but see the need for standardization. Everyone does not teach the same thing or [assign] the same essays. I know that the syllabus needs to be the same so anybody can jump in and teach it. . . . In this course it becomes critical for assessment and evaluation, but I think we should always have flexibility in how to teach [the material], present it, and . . . interact with each group, etc. (Individual Interview)

Although Patricia saw the need for consistency across teams, she emphasized that one small change could escalate into a larger issue when the entire group must come into
compliance change. When one adjustment is recommended, ideally all four teams should make the change. Even though she would like to make a few changes to the curriculum, she realized that doing so would mean that seven other teachers would have to agree, which means cooperation and collaboration. The following statement showed Patricia’s concern about consistency across teams.

We can’t make spur-of-the-moment changes that might be good. I mean it isn't a huge complaint, but it is one little thing I have noticed. I do feel that maybe we are pulling in both directions with standardization. We talk about how we give different exams and we do things differently. (Individual Interview)

**Analysis of teams’ syllabi.** The researcher analyzed each team’s syllabus for commonalities and differences after the topic of consistency emerged so prominently from the conversations with the participants. As confirmed in the data from the individual, partner, and group interviews, differences clearly existed across teams. The researcher examined teams’ syllabi for student objectives, number of essays assigned, readings, tutoring requirements, points available throughout the course, other forms of assessments, and technology required.

First, student outcomes stated by all teams were similar, most worded identically. However, one team had six objectives, whereas the other three listed only five. The five shared objectives are listed below.

The goals and objectives of this course are that, by the end of yearlong college English course, you as a student should be able:

- To identify and situate yourself within the process of academic writing
through its basic components: sentences, paragraphs, and essays that utilize a variety of rhetorical modes, along with the grammar and mechanics that form the foundation of these components;

- To develop the close reading skills necessary for success both in and after your university experience;
- To become an effective member of the writing community by improving your ability to review your own writing as well as that of your colleagues;
- To think critically about the world around you and your place within it; and
- To become familiar with the University academic support resources that will help you achieve your potential as a student.

Second, the researcher noted a difference in the number of formal essays assigned. Three teams assigned three papers; the fourth team assigned four. Table 7 lists the themes the teams explored during the yearlong course. Table 8 shows the number of essays each team assigned.

Table 7

*Team’s Curriculum Themes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team 1: Self, Gendered Self, Family, Education, Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team 2: Self, Gendered Self, Family, Education, Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team 3: Self, Gendered Self, Family, Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team 4: Self, Gendered Self, Family, Race</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The researcher examined two additional areas: assigned reading and tutoring requirements. Over the two semesters certain readings were covered during some teams’ fall semester, whereas they were covered during the spring semester for other teams. Therefore, if a student had to switch teams because of scheduling conflicts during the second semester, they could face two dilemmas: They could be asked to read the same story twice, or they could miss the readings the second team had already assigned during the fall semester.

Similarly, all teams required both writing and reading tutoring outside class (as shown in Figure 1). This is a mandatory component of the English curriculum. In fact, Robert is in charge of assigning a designated tutor per team with specific weeks listed for one-on-one writing tutoring or group reading tutoring. Almost half the readings for tutoring sessions were identical across teams because they were determined at an earlier curriculum meeting. The teachers had flexibility to choose additional readings, leading to the differences found in the syllabi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Number of Essays Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team 4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another category listed on only one team’s syllabus showed that points were awarded for the revision of papers. See Tables 9-12 for point distributions as indicated on all teams’ syllabi. Figure 1 indicates the similarities found across all four teams. Figure 2 shows the differences found in the syllabi and revealed during the interviews. Each team listed 1,000 points total per semester. The number of points assigned to various assignments differed. For instance, one team required four essays, which were worth fewer points than the three essays required by the other three teams. The teams did not identify each essay the same (as shown in Tables 9-12). In addition, all teams granted points for tutoring, attendance and participation, the midterm and final examinations, and journal entries. The number of assigned journal entries and whether they were submitted electronically or on paper also varied. Some teams incorporated points for presentations in the weekly online forums.
## Table 9

Team 1: Point Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>50 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narration</td>
<td>50 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example/Definition</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Analysis Essay</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>50 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm</td>
<td>50 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial Sessions</td>
<td>150 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance/Participation</td>
<td>200 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Forum 75 pts; Group work 75 pts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1000 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division/Classification Essay</td>
<td>50 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare/Contrast Essay</td>
<td>50 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentative Essay</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>50 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td>50 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>150 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm</td>
<td>50 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation (attendance/forum)</td>
<td>150 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorials</td>
<td>150 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1000 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10
Team 2: Point Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description Presentation</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay 1 (Description &amp; Narration)</td>
<td>200 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay 2 (Definition &amp; Example)</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay 3 (Summary, evaluation, and process analysis)</td>
<td>200 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals (10 x 10 pts. each)</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm</td>
<td>50 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>75 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance/Participation</td>
<td>75 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1000 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essay 1</td>
<td>150 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay 2</td>
<td>200 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay 3</td>
<td>250 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals (10 x 10 pts. each)</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm Exam</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>75 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance/Participation</td>
<td>75 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1000 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11
Team 3: Point Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary/Evaluation</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description Illustration</td>
<td>200 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Essay</td>
<td>200 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal (10@15pts.)</td>
<td>150 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm</td>
<td>50 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance/Participation/Tutoring</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1000 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Formal Essay</td>
<td>130 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Formal Essay</td>
<td>200 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Formal Essay</td>
<td>200 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal (8 @ 15 pts)</td>
<td>120 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Participation/Tutoring</td>
<td>150 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1000 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12  
Team 4: Point Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 major essays</td>
<td>100 pts each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisions</td>
<td>50 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Presentation</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary / evaluation</td>
<td>50 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal assignments</td>
<td>200 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams – midterm and final</td>
<td>150 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorials, attendance, participation, and quizzes</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In class essays during lab sessions</td>
<td>50 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total= 1000 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 major essays</td>
<td>100 pts each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Presentation (includes a formal essay)</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal assignments</td>
<td>150 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams- midterm and final</td>
<td>150 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorials, attendance, participation, and quizzes</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In class essays and exercises during lab sessions</td>
<td>200 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total= 1000 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Similarities across teams
Figure 2. Differences across teams
Summary

Team members indicated throughout the three interviews (individual, partner, and group) that three teams were consistent within each team. Three teams were exactly the same in their assignments and grading, but one team showed differences within it. For example, sometimes Kim and Patricia decided that Patricia was going to give a quiz to their 10 students while Kim did not, although they mentioned this occurred very rarely. Most of the time, they experienced consistency in all other areas. This was not the case according to the analysis completed across all four teams. The teachers were somewhat surprised during the group interview to discover that they had so many differences across the teams. Most emphasized the importance of having curriculum, objectives, grading, and assignments that were the same across teams; yet a couple of participants repeatedly stated they did not want to see more consistent areas because such a mandate infringed upon their academic freedom. The department chair led the discussion during the group interview asserting how difficult it is to get everyone to be consistent with people’s different ideas, attitudes, teaching styles; she explained that for the students’ sake, consistent items are needed across the teams. She had tried to make the teams more consistent but finally said she stopped enforcing it because she heard and saw teams doing various things in ways different from other teams.

Student Support and Teacher Development

A fourth finding showed that the members of the teams in this study perceived teaming as a means to improved student support and teacher development. All eight teachers made statements that showed they thought two instructors teaching together was
an effective form of student support and teacher development. Based on their own perception and experience with teaming together for years, all teachers stated that teaming was beneficial to both themselves and their students. These teams of teachers expressed that having two teachers helped to create a sense of building a supportive community for students and that the teachers benefited from learning new knowledge, methods, strategies, and teaching approaches from working with fellow colleagues.

**Building a Supportive Community**

A perception existed across all teams that two instructors teaching together in the classroom offered students many benefits. First, participants stated that students can look to two teachers instead of one to assist them. Second, the participants asserted that in a team situation students witnessed two teachers communicating with each other, modeling the reality of working with a coworker.

Tracy had initially suggested team teaching at this university, so the researcher inquired why she had thought it would be beneficial to the students. Tracy considered at-risk students when designing this course. Believing that a yearlong program would ease the transition from high school to college and help them become stronger writers, she proposed team teaching to increase the probability of good results for developmental writers (Individual Interview). She recalled,

I thought Midwest University needed this program because of the numbers of at-risk students who seemed to get lost in the system every year. I believed that this year-long program would help those students make a smoother transition from high school to college and from their first year of composition to their second
year. Once it had gotten all of the necessary approvals, we then had to implement it into the core curriculum and come up with individuals willing to teach it. I decided to team teach because I thought it would be a really good way to reach and help students who would normally do poorly in their first year composition classroom. (Individual Interview)

During the partner interview Tracy elaborated the specific reasons she presented for having two instructors in the same classroom, which led others to share her outlook. The at-risk students in question enrolled in English and math classes together and possibly others as well, so two teachers and a sense of community with fellow students would enhance their educational experience. The following dialogue that occurred during the group interview revealed how participants felt team teachers offered multiple perspectives when bringing with them different educational backgrounds and knowledge.

Tracy: They still get two different perspectives on issues.

Morgan: You have done research on [a particular] author, where I didn’t know... about that author or you will throw in little historical facts that I didn’t know.

I am enlightened and so are the kids.

Tracy: And I think they benefit from the whole sense of community that we have created. We meet together every day from the first day on. Our kids now even refer to themselves as a family, so they benefit from that really tight community feeling.

Kim: I agree. They have that support group. (Group Interview)
Connie agreed that students benefited from two instructors. For instance, students had the option of contacting another teacher if one were unavailable. She mentioned the comfort level a student might experience with one instructor over another. Participants agreed when Connie stated, “Students can go to whomever they feel more comfortable to have as an advocate rather than being forced to request advocacy from someone with whom they don’t have a comfortable relationship” (Group Interview).

Connie offered many examples of the way teaming enhanced student support. She mentioned the bond that teachers can form with students. Various teaching approaches helped to reach and target more students because teachers used their areas of expertise to reach all the students in the classroom. She explained, “The biggest benefit should be a shared expertise, and because you are putting together different personalities, it allows you to bond with a larger group of students, with a group of students who are equally diverse” (Individual Interview). She was very proud of the program and suggested, “I would challenge them to find any other school that gives them the chance that we give them” (Connie, Group Interview).

Connie explained that with an additional teacher in the room, the pair could divide the students to offer them maximum assistance and support. Ability grouping was possible when two teachers were present, and the teachers could disperse themselves to work with several groups at once; two teachers directly and quickly addressed the needs of students. She later referenced the benefits of teacher differences for students, remarking, “The students benefit . . . in our case [from] the male/female, older/younger
view; they get the person who has been in academia for a while, and they get the person who hasn’t. (Connie, Group Interview).

During the observation of their teaching, the researcher experienced how Connie and Robert assisted all students during group work, not just their own, demonstrating that the way that the two instructors interacted in the classroom benefited the students and enhanced their own teaching as they offered continuous support to their students and each other (Field Notes).

Rick emphasized the value of team teaching to students during all interviews. Students gained considerable experience from having two instructors present. He admitted that the course could function more cost efficiently with only one teacher, but the benefit for students outweighed any other factors. Rick stated:

We are doing good work. . . . If it takes two of us in the classroom, then it does. You could do this class by yourself, but it gives them [the students] a better experience, . . . a chance . . . to hear different perspectives. (Individual Interview)

Team teaching shows students how to collaborate with others, according to Rick, who explained that the university had encouraged the faculty to move away from lecture as the primary method of instruction. Teaming fosters a cooperative environment by showing that two teachers can work together as facilitators instead of authority figures. Team teaching models the way people interact and learn together, a concept Rick and Larry mentioned during their partner interview.

Larry spoke of the bond among the students that grew from the team teaching environment. He saw the way the teaming experience created a sense of community
among the students and teachers. Larry recalled seeing groups from his college English classes working together and observing the close bond that formed among them. As highlighted during the partner interview, the team teaching environment was positive and nurturing for the students.

Kim discussed the benefits of team teaching for both students and teachers. Over the years, she perceived that a team approach fostered significant academic improvements in multiple areas for students. She remarked that she had observed and experienced very positive reactions from the students: “This course allows for improvement in so many areas: writing, reading, comprehension, critical skills across the board. It is the best learning for them. . . . It really is” (Individual Interview).

In addition, Patricia further explained how having two teachers could be very productive when working with students. Kim explained that sometimes a certain student might work better or harder for one of the teachers. Generally, all students benefited from having two teachers supporting and motivating them to learn to the best of their ability. Kim explained that an active, student-centered classroom worked best in a team environment because of the smaller class size (Kim, Individual Interview). She stated:

They have two people pulling for them. I think that is part of the philosophy—that they have resources on campus. We are there for the kids. I also think it is a hard audience that we have, so as much as we can pull from one another . . . [is helpful]. What we have going for these students, I think, is perfect. (Patricia, Individual Interview)
Teacher Development

Members of all four teams felt they had benefited from working with another teacher in a team situation. All participants reported having improved their teaching from working alongside another teacher. For instance, the members of the four teams stated their belief that teachers’ weaknesses were strengthened in areas such as content, technology, teaching methods, and efficacy; thus, leading to informal professional development opportunities. Additional benefits included experiences with opportunities to develop innovative and creative approaches and to work collaboratively. Overall, the instructors knew they could count on their partners for support.

The researcher invited Tracy to share what she had learned from her partner and what she thought her partner had learned from her in their two years of working together. Tracy discussed transitioning from lecture-oriented classes to creative lessons after working with Morgan.

I’ve learned to be more creative and to think outside the box. I’ve learned that the students can learn [from more than] lectures. [Morgan is] a very creative person, and I hope that I’ve picked some of that creativity up from her. (Individual Interview)

During the partner interview Tracy brought up a second time how partners learn from each other. According to Tracy, Morgan contributed creative ideas to their team, and she saw Morgan change and grow as a teacher, building confidence and assertiveness in the classroom. Tracy developed confidence in trying new lessons and innovative ideas
with her students after teaming with Morgan, who agreed with Tracy that she had become more assertive during their two years together (Morgan & Tracy, Partner Interview).

Morgan stated the many ways that she had benefited from teaching with Tracy. She saw them offering assistance and support to each other on a daily basis.

If we see one of us struggling, we [help each other]. . . . I don't even know if you know when I am struggling sometimes, but you chip in. . . . When I am in a discussion, I know in the back of my mind if we come to a standstill, you will say something that I will think is a good question, [something] I hadn't brought . . . up. I have learned a lot from simply listening to you—from content knowledge to teaching strategies. (Morgan & Tracy, Partner Interview)

The researcher asked each participant to reflect on how his or her teaching had changed because of team teaching. In agreement with Tracy, Morgan acknowledged that she had become more confident in various aspects of teaching from leading a discussion to grading.

I am more daring to bring things up in discussion. I am more confident with my grading. . . . I think I have become a better facilitator of discussion, learned to be confident with my grading style, and obtained more knowledge about writing, authors, and historical bits of information. (Morgan, Individual Interview)

Morgan said she would like to believe that she had a positive impact on Tracy's teaching as well. She thought it was difficult to say how she had made Tracy a better teacher because she viewed Tracy already to be an outstanding teacher, but Morgan shared comments Tracy had made to her over the previous two years, and apparently...
Morgan had an impact upon Tracy after all. Morgan offered creative ideas and activities based on her high school teaching experience, believing that working with younger students had helped her create appealing activities. In addition Morgan was more technology savvy than Tracy. Morgan created PowerPoint presentations for the midterm and final reviews and designed their year-end student-centered group project that required students to use either PowerPoint or iMovie to create a visual representation of a literary theme (Morgan, Individual Interview).

Considering the difference in the number of years they had taught, Robert appreciated learning from Connie in various ways, in particular gaining from her experience and knowledge. For example, she could discuss what life was like before the Civil Rights Era, before Robert had even been born. He also grew to be more patient and willing to check for student understanding after teaching with Connie. During the individual interview Robert stated that he had improved his grading ability by observing Connie. He acknowledged that he was fortunate to work with the most experienced teacher and to learn how to offer students the best feedback on their papers. He looked to her to develop a more descriptive way of writing comments, transforming himself into a more demanding grader who analyzed students’ writing carefully.

Robert told Connie there was various knowledge he had gained from her expertise during the partner interview. Not having the pedagogical understanding like she does, I can’t walk in with an arsenal and say, “Today we will do it this way and tomorrow we will do it this way” because I haven’t taught that long. So that is one thing she brings to
the relationship. “Let’s try this method; let’s try that‖ (Connie & Robert, Partner Interview). He also mentioned that he has learned to assess writing better from Connie.

Well, certainly I’ve learned to have more patience when it comes to explanation and writing. I have learned to be more descriptive when I make comments on papers. I am still not like her where she will fill an entire page with comments, but I have learned to be more descriptive and explain why. I have learned to be a harder grader and decide if they have what I really asked them to do. I have learned how to encourage students how to talk in class. I learned a lot; I am fortunate to work with the person with the most experience. Because of that I learned. (Individual Interview)

Larry also saw the benefits of team teaching for teachers and listed ways his classroom had evolved, noting that learning the content more thoroughly with the assistance of a partner was important and helpful. He claimed that having two teachers allowed for the invention of creative lessons. Larry indicated that working with Rick provided him with the latest paradigm for teaching writing. “Rick has given me new ways to look at technology and literature in . . . the readings from the course‖ (Rick & Larry, Partner Interview).

During the partner interview Kim and Patricia discussed how they had assisted in improving each other’s teaching during their three years of teaming together. Kim felt she had improved her patience from working with her partner. Kim, who brought her experience in the business world to the classroom, showed Patricia how to increase the level of demands she made on students and her degree of organization. Patricia also
pointed out that she relied on Kim to show her how to correct technological problems in
the classroom. Kim and Patricia dialogued about how they supported each other and
offered their individual contributions in the classroom. Patricia stated that she
appreciated the technological support, whereas Kim complimented Patricia’s ability to
devise activities like role-playing and games to spark student interest and engagement.
Patricia saw their difference as instrumental in strengthening each other’s teaching.

During the group interview Kim mentioned the benefits of trying new ideas with
the support of another teacher and implementing them in all classes, not just in team-
teaching classes. She explained, “I think we learn from one another what works.”
(Group Interview).

Patricia offered another way she had grown as a teacher by working with Kim:
She attempted to be less controlling in the classroom. Before working with a partner, she
claimed she always stayed on task by leading class in an organized manner, following her
syllabus; if she could not stay on schedule, she felt annoyed. Hence, she became more
flexible by teaming with a partner.

As far as something that may have changed a little is that I am a control freak. I
have a schedule, I have a syllabus, and I stick to it. . . . So I am able to relinquish
some of my rigidity. Maybe I have learned to relax a little bit. . . . So that has
been a good learning experience. (Individual Interview)

Summary

Each teacher described experiences with teaming that benefited both students and
teachers. During talk of their experiences, it became clear that the team members were
able to learn from each other; which was apparent in areas of content,
technology, teaching styles and methods, and efficacy. They also saw that the individual strengths they possessed benefited the students because they had two experts, each with their own strengths that were offered to the students.

Conclusion

In this study the researcher sought to answer one main research question: How do four teams of college English teachers teaching a developmental writing course at the university level experience and perceive team teaching? The following specific findings emerged from the data:

1. These four dialectic, homogeneous teams perceived themselves compatible and flexible in their interactive behaviors.

2. These four dialectic, homogeneous teams described a pedagogy centered on facilitative teaching and active student engagement.

3. These four dialectic, homogeneous teams perceived there to be consistency within individual teams in terms of curriculum, assessment, and evaluation but an absence of consistency of these areas across the four teams.

4. These four dialectic, homogenous teams perceived teaming as a means to improved student support and teacher development.

When considering reasons that their relationships worked, every teacher pointed to compatibility and flexibility. This did not mean that both teachers had to have identical or even similar pedagogies. Teams were stronger for blending two differing styles to create a harmonious combined style. The teams viewed differences as assets, not deficits. Members of all four teams acknowledged a friendship with their partner,
another reason for their compatibility. Based on their own experience with a mixed-gender team, members of only one group perceived the gender composition of the group as a reason for their compatibility. Overall, these teams perceived compatibility as one reason they maintained good working relationships.

All the teams experienced a need and willingness to be flexible in their interactive behaviors with their partner; hence, flexibility was another aspect of compatibility. Each team worked so well together that they were able to share ownership. Flexibility was necessary according to the teams and even perceived as normal and necessary interactive behaviors that were practiced with one’s partner. They believed these traits to be important when enacting the process of teaming, both benefiting themselves and their students.

Members of all four teams shared similar teaching strategies, promoting active learning and accomplishing learning outcomes. The teams perceived that students and teachers benefited from having two instructors, two perspectives, and two means of support. The members of the teams also reported that teaming benefited them because they were able to use each other’s strengths and learn from each other, thus underscoring their flexibility.

Members of all four teams stated and demonstrated their support of active learning and hands-on approaches to learning, such as group work, presentations, and discussions. During all four observations, students were vocal both academically and personally. They were involved, thinking critically and analyzing the material; they appeared interested and engaged and asked questions. The teams offered a facilitator
approach to teaching and drew upon the skills and knowledge of two teachers in the same classroom. The four teams supported group work, allowing the teachers to move about the classroom and assist all students. Some team members reported unfamiliarity or discomfort with group work, but with the assistance of another teacher, they implemented a change from a teacher-led to a student-led classroom (Field Notes).

All participants shared commonalities within their teams, reaching for consistency (as shown in Figure 1). For instance, the four teams used the same textbook; assigned similar papers, presentations, and readings; and used the same major forms of assessments. Within each team, the teachers used the same syllabus but different assignments. Three of the four teams met with their students together every day, whereas one team (Kim and Patricia) met with students separately one day of the week. Kim and Patricia’s offered the same number of points as did the other three teams in their course but occasionally administered different forms of evaluation (as shown in Tables 9-12). They discovered their lack of consistency across the four teams. The number of assigned essays differed for one group; the number of points designated per assignment differed; the amount of technology used by teams varied; and the order of reading assignments per semester differed across teams. Other differences occurred in the administration of a diagnostic test, midterm, or final and the teaching of specific skills like grammar.

The teachers also saw how team teaching offered students extra support and teachers an opportunity for professional development. They were able to offer students two teachers in the classroom at all times to assist in learning as well as giving two different teacher opinions. Teachers remarked on the various ways they felt they had
learned from teaching alongside another colleague. Not only did teachers report learning about content, technology, teaching strategies, but they also made comments to indicate that they developed a sense of confidence.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Through this naturalistic study, the researcher sought to answer the following question: How do four teams of college English teachers teaching a developmental writing course at the university level experience and perceive team teaching? After the researcher reviewed the literature on team teaching, she discovered that few researchers have investigated dialectic team teaching at the college level, thus making this study valuable. The researcher implemented naturalistic inquiry and borrowed design elements from the methodologies of case study and grounded theory when developing this study. Data were collected through three types of interviews (individual interviews, team partner interviews, and the entire group interview), observations, and artifact collection.

Four findings resulted from the analysis of the data collected:

1. These four dialectic, homogeneous teams perceived themselves compatible and flexible in their interactive behaviors.

2. These four dialectic, homogeneous teams described a pedagogy centered on facilitative teaching and active student engagement.

3. These four dialectic, homogeneous teams perceived there to be consistency within individual teams in terms of curriculum, assessment, and evaluation but an absence of consistency of these areas across the four teams.

4. These four dialectic, homogenous teams perceived teaming as a means to improved student support and teacher development.
Chapter V contains three parts. First, the findings are discussed in terms of the literature on team teaching in higher education. Second, implications for practice based on the four findings are presented. Third, recommendations for future researchers of university-level team teaching are provided.

**Connection to Literature**

Successful teaching teams share specific characteristics, for example, voluntary participation and willingness to share a classroom, relinquishment of some control to another teacher, and planning or grading with a colleague (Anderson & Speck, 1998; Harris & Harvey, 2000; Perry & Stewart, 2005). This was evident in Finding 1: teams perceived themselves compatible and flexible in their interactive behaviors. The four teams in this study indicated they had the desire to team. They were flexible and compatible within their interactive behaviors with their teaching partner. Although compatibility can be difficult to guarantee, as seen with the reconfigurations of teams in this study, some indicators suggested whether or not two people are suitable partners. For example, choosing a teaching partner with some similar and contrasting (but compatible) teaching styles and methods, teaching philosophies, curriculum goals and purposes, personalities, confidence and experience was shown to be advisable (Berentsen, 2006; Dammers & Reiten, 1980; Eisen, 2000; Martin, 1975). This was also suggested by the participants in this study who drew similar conclusions. People with compatible personalities are generally amenable to compromise, flexibility, and respect as essential to effective teaming and evident in this study.
Most participants pointed to three areas important to compatibility: pedagogy, gender, and friendship. Teams discussed similarities in their pedagogical beliefs and perceived a commonality and compatibility with their partners. By contrast, they also cited compatibility in their differences in pedagogy and teaching styles that helped strengthen their team. For example, having a dominant and less dominant teaching style was actually perceived as a compatible attribute of the teams. The gender of the homogenous team was another area the teams mentioned as a reason for their compatibility, yet there were differing opinions among the eight teachers. No literature was found in prior studies about the gender composition of homogeneous teams. All teams but one in this study consisted of teachers of the same gender. Friendship was another topic highlighted by each team. Six of the eight teachers described how they had established a friendship with their partner before teaming with that individual. All eight teachers indicated friendship as a reason for their compatibility.

Finding 1 of this study demonstrates the importance of compatibility and flexibility in their interactive behavior, which may be more likely to occur if teachers volunteer for team teaching as opposed to being forced into it against their will. The teachers in this study attributed their willingness to work with their partners to their level of compatibility. All four indicated that their compatibility derived from an emphasis on pedagogy and friendship. This confirms what many researchers have already found to be true. Shaplin and Olds (1964) discovered that teachers naturally gravitate to team teaching because they were accustomed to sharing ideas and working with one another. Team teaching requires collaboration among teachers and willingness to form bonds.
(Anderson & Speck, 1998; Eisen, 2000; Lehr, 1999; Strohschen & Heaney, 2000; Wenger & Hornyak, 1999), which was also confirmed in Finding 1 of this study. Researchers have also looked for possible areas of compatibility. According to Dammers and Reitan (1980), teams must be compatible in order for teams to function effectively. This researcher’s findings differ slightly from other studies in the language used by the participants when describing compatibility. For example, the participants pointed to teaching style and delivery rather than personality. However, they discussed the differences in the ways they acted in the classroom, which partially had to do with their personalities.

Martin (1975) examined the way teachers bargained and negotiated when working with others. When disagreements between team members occurred, options included merging ideas, reaching a stalemate, and requiring a cooling off period. The team teachers Martin (1975) studied described experiences that were rewarding for both students and teachers despite small disagreements. The teachers in this study discussed how they compromised and were flexible in their interactive behaviors with their partners. All participants discussed working out their differences, which usually meant blending their ideas or accepting their partners’ ideas. The teachers in this study spoke to the need for compromise and flexibility in Finding 1 and how they learned and benefited by listening to others in Finding 4.

Farnham (1996), Goleman, McKee, and Boyatzis (2002), and Shinn (2003) found that faculty members planning to team teach needed to consider their own preferences, strengths and weaknesses, conflict-resolution skills, comfort level, and emotional
intelligence. Teachers needed to accept times when they must be a leader and other times a follower, giving and receiving feedback, agreeing to continuous professional development, committing to both the idea of teaming and to their partner, and compromising with a fellow teacher (Anderson & Landy, 2006; George & Davis-Wiley, 2000). The findings in this study supported existing research with a few differences. The team teachers in this study spoke of what makes a good team and why they each felt compatible with their partners. Although answers varied, they primarily listed pedagogy, gender, and friendship, as the reasons for their compatibility, although they mentioned how they felt comfortable and tended to work out their differences easily. They did speak of not feeling comfortable and poor conflict-resolution skills with prior partners that led to their finding a new partner. Many noted their prior negative experiences with partners and even their hesitancy with entering teaming again. However, they all decided to team again because they considered areas such as learning from each other and student support that Stewart (2005) and Anderson and Landy (2006) discuss.

This study confirmed findings of other researcher, who noted that the following are necessary for successful team teaching: (a) choosing a partner, (b) teaching with similar or complementary styles, and (c) placing an experienced teacher with a less experienced teacher (Stewart, 2005). One team in this study was formed with the most experienced teacher and least experienced teacher. Other teams were formed because the instructors had similar educational backgrounds. Some teaching teams were formed because the instructors thought they had similar teaching styles to one another. Anderson and Landy (2006) shared that successful team members help, challenge, support, and plan
with each other. Other researchers have shown that team teachers must form bonds with each other and learn to get along for effective team teaching to work (Anderson & Speck, 1998; Lehr, 1999; Strohschen & Heaney, 2000; Wenger & Hornyak, 1999). Personality, outlook, style, effective communication, similar goals, and planning (Dammers & Reitan, 1980) were shown to be necessary for team success and for compatibility and flexibility, consistency within and across teams, student improvement, and teacher development.

All four teams perceived they used a facilitative and active approach to teaching to foster student engagement. Having two teachers offered multiple perspectives on course content and class discussions. The teams also discussed how they were able to offer different forms of instruction, like group work, because two teachers were available to facilitate learning experiences. Group work, classroom discussions, and active student engagement occurred in every observation witnessed by the researcher. The female/male team members also expressed how they thought having different gender perspectives was a strength they could offer their students, especially during class discussions.

The participants in this study perceived that students benefited from team teaching because of the enhanced discussion, interaction, student engagement, and support (Finding 2 & 4). Anderson and Speck (1998) and Eisen (2000) concurred in their studies that multiple perspectives of two teachers help students see how real-life problem-solving occurs. Students can witness how two expert teachers model, brainstorm, and interact, using positive interaction, demonstrating collaboration and team work (Anderson & Speck, 1998; Eisen, 2000). Wenger and Hornyak (1999) also concluded that team teaching can demonstrate for learners how to interact, disagree, collaborate,
evaluate, analyze, and resolve conflicts. In fact, Anderson and Landy (2006) reported that students thought having two teachers created more enthusiastic communication in the classroom.

Finding 3 of this study supports previous research in the way these team members enacted team teaching both within and outside the classroom with their partner and students. The participants discussed the various ways they planned together outside of the classroom: email, phone, and face-to-face. The participants in this study discussed how communication within the team was critical both between teachers and among the students. Anderson and Speck (1998), Beane and Brodhagen (2001), Dammers and Reitan (1980), Eisen and Tisdell (2002) found communication via various media and paths assist in leading to consistency between team partners. This conclusion was echoed by the participants in this study.

As noted, within each team there were clear conversations and value placed within each team on consistency between the two teachers. However, this was not the case across teams. The participants recognized and agreed upon the need for consistency both within and across the teams, but their assent did not guarantee its occurrence. In fact, they admitted that consistency was difficult for them across teams for two main reasons. It requires time-consuming communication among all teachers; and according to some it involves infringement upon academic freedom. The curricular conversations about consistency were critical because they addressed issues like course content and assessment across the teams. Although little research supports the need for consistency in teaming, a few researchers looked at how teams benefit from consistency. For
example, teams benefit from planning together and striving for consistency of grading (Anderson & Landy, 2006; Eisen & Tisdell, 2002; Gaytan, 2010; Hanlon & Thomas, 2002; Stewart, 2005). No prior research has involved a discussion by multiple teams of the importance of and need for consistency across teams, yet it is highly recommended in theory that teachers find consistent grading (Gaytan, 2010).

The eight teachers stated that their communication strategies had assisted in creating consistency within their team, as stated in Finding 3 (These four dialectic, homogeneous teams perceived there to be consistency within individual teams in terms of curriculum, assessment, and evaluation but an absence of consistency of these areas across the four teams). Consistency across teams had neither been emphasized nor frequently attempted across teams. Some teams reported that with each year they needed less face-to-face communication with their partners outside of class when compared to the early days of teaming because they already had the curriculum set in place and knew each other better. The teams stated the goal of striving for consistency in all aspects of teaching across the four teams.

Finding 4 involved the way the eight teachers perceived teaming as a means to improved student support and teacher development. All eight participants in this study also spoke of the way they felt team teaching supported the students. Researchers have found that students in team-taught setting receive more personalized instruction and focus on students’ needs (Chamberlin, 1969; Jackson, 1964; Jarvis & Fleming, 1965; Pugach & Wesson, 1995). Teachers perceived they, too, benefited from team teaching. bell hooks (1994) asserted that teachers must willingly take risks and learn from one another in order
to grow as teachers while also benefiting their students, thus which was indicated in this study. All four teams listed examples of how their teaching had improved because of teaching with and learning from a fellow colleague.

The teachers in this study also spoke of the positive experiences they enjoyed when working with another teacher. They felt they supported each other with content, discussions, and planning. Having different educational backgrounds in some groups allowed the teachers to learn from each other by bringing in their training and prior experience teaching. Beane and Brodhagen (2001) found that teaming allows for faculty members to support one another in areas such as planning, scheduling, grouping, and other types of decision-making. Although not dealing with the college level, a pair of researchers noted how teaming –improved work climate, more frequent contact with parents, increased teacher job satisfaction, and higher levels of student achievement‖ (Beane & Brodhagen, 2001, p. 42). Other researchers like Ashton and Webb (1986) and George & Davis-Wiley (2000) found that teachers feel less isolated when working in a team, and they experience a sense of self-esteem and professional efficacy. Team members broaden their views of teaching and mentor one another on collaboration, professionalism, academic content, and professional relationships (Anderson & Landy, 2006; Ashton & Webb, 1986; Chamberlin, 1969; Conner, 1961; Eisen & Tisdell, 2003; Flanagan & Ralston, 1983; Hanlon & Thomas, 2002; Held & Rosenberg, 1983; Olson, 1967; Perry & Stewart, 2005; Ware & Gardner, 1978; Wenger & Hornyak, 1999).

Successful team members maintain positive attitudes toward teaming, communicating, and interacting with another teacher as well as with students, which are
features that assist in providing the best learning environment for students (Crow & Pounder, 2000). All eight participants entered team teaching with fairly positive perceptions and maintained them because of the benefit for students and themselves. They noted a significant benefit for students taught by two interactive teachers in an improved learning atmosphere. The strong sense of interactive communication between the teachers often revolves around striving to improve student support. Two of the findings in this study support this idea. The teams described a pedagogy centered on facilitative teaching and active student engagement (Finding 2) and teaming was used as a means to improve student support and teacher development. Finding 4 showed that teachers support teaming because their students gained two perspectives: witnessing a model of two people engaged in challenging discussions, and experienced additional opportunities to participate in activities with two teachers.

The teachers in this study stated that they felt they began to work as a unit over time. They perceived they interacted smoothly and worked together in various areas, such as planning and teaching the class. Previous researchers have acknowledged that effective team teachers integrate into a unit over time, an implication addressed by the teachers in this study when discussing their own relationship and defining team teaching. Wenger and Hornyak (1999) defined dialectic team teaching, which requires cooperation, as educators working together side-by-side, suggesting teachers should work so closely that they serve almost as one teacher. Effective teams work systematically to operate classrooms in which the students are instructed by both teachers who teach interactively and support each other with ease and habit, as noted in all the findings in this study from
their compatibility and flexibility, communication, and consistency. This not only leads to student support but also teacher development as shown in Finding 4.

Most of the literature reviewed by the researcher revealed positive attitudes of educators toward teaming after participating in teaming at the college level (Perry & Stewart, 2005; Wenger & Hornyak, 1999). Eisen (2000) stated that because of their education and knowledge gained through experience, team members learned from one another. Of the few researchers who have studied homogenous teams, Ware and Gardner (1978) found two psychology professors whose enthusiasm increased during their teaming because of the opportunity to engage in innovative planning, discussion, evaluation, and learning from each other; the professional development element was also noteworthy.

**Discussion**

**Team Teaching Should Be Used as a Form of Reconceptualized Continuous Professional Development**

This research study shows how team teaching promoted professional development opportunities for teachers. All four teams reported teaming to be an opportunity for teacher growth. Professional development opportunities are possible if both teachers are willing to influence and be influenced by their partner. In other words, teachers must be willing to learn from each other once they observe their strengths and weaknesses. All eight participants confirmed this conclusion. Teaming should be used and continued because of its inherent support of teachers. Professional development can occur through teaming because it provides opportunities for professional growth in content and
knowledge, teaching methods and style, confidence, technology skills, and discussion techniques; teaming revitalizes teachers, reducing teacher burn-out and providing mentorship as in the case of Connie and Robert. Although team teaching most often involves a junior and senior faculty member (Gaskell, 1967; Stewart, 2005; Wilder & Jung, 1969), such was the case for only one team in this study. Nonetheless, all participants, even the experienced teachers, stated that they gained benefits and improved as teachers. Hence, teaming benefits both junior and veteran educators.

Working with a colleague, the participants in this study stated that they learned something valuable from their partner and offered their partner some form of knowledge related to technology, teaching strategies, content (grammar or literature), classroom discipline, or confidence. They acknowledged their partners for adding depth to discussions, offering valuable knowledge to lessons, and challenging them so students could see academic discussion in action. In this model, the teachers developed or strengthened skills that might have remained underdeveloped had they not worked with a colleague.

Pairing teachers for professional development opportunities can occur through two methods. In some cases, teachers can be partnered based on their similarities. For example, both teachers may be very strong composition teachers with similar educational training. They could build upon each other’s strengths. Pairing two teachers with different strengths may also be beneficial for practicing teachers. For instance, two teachers may have different educational training, e.g., one with expertise in literature and another in composition. If two such teachers team, they can share a wealth of knowledge
from each one’s area of expertise. The same can apply to a teacher with a strong technological background pairing with someone who has little or no training in technology. Teachers with various strengths, such as leadership or listening skills, can demonstrate them and positively influence the other teacher. Compiling a list of criteria before forming a team is complex and time consuming, but using an assessment format can assist in the process. A deliberate match of two teachers with the intentional goal of professional growth or development can reward both of them.

In 1960 a comparable study was completed, which produced findings similar to the ones in this study. Smith found that team teaching in a high school English department allowed teachers to specialize in their areas of expertise and preferences, for example, literature and grammar. Another study also supported the idea that one member may teach grammar while the other teaches literature (Fisher, 1962). In some teams in this study, participants with such variations of expertise reported professional growth in teaching methods, strategies, and content knowledge as a result of these instructional partnerships. Each teacher was amenable to change and reported additional time and opportunity to learn from the other.

Previous research showed that teachers felt energized in a team-teaching environment (Harris & Harvey, 2000; Perry & Stewart 2005). Teacher development increased, student perspectives broadened multidimensionally, and opportunities for more complex problem solving multiplied for both teacher and student according to the teachers in this study. Relationships that team teachers negotiated between themselves and with students reformed the classroom (McDaniel & Colarulli, 1997; Olson, 1967).
Teaming fostered a collaborative pedagogy, which motivated critically reflective learners to engage in the ongoing construction of knowledge in a knowledge-creating society (Anderson & Speck, 1998). Seeing another’s expertise and gaining professional feedback when working with another professional increased teacher reflection and the likelihood that teachers adapt and try new ideas, methodologies, and strategies.

Incidental or planned professional development can be the result of teaming. Teachers supported each other in teaching and in conducting classroom research with students about their own learning (Cross & Steadman, 1991). The teaching teammates in this study spoke of trying new methods, strategies, and ideas as a result of working with each other. All team members mentioned and were observed supporting their partners in the classroom.

Instead of searching for professional development from outside experts, teachers can learn much more from working with each other on a daily basis, as described in Finding 4. Finding 4 identified that team teaching would appear to be a method for finding meaningful, authentic professional development in the context of the teachers’ experiences. Researchers suggest that event delivery methods of professional development, such as conferences, workshops, online seminars often lead to a dissonance between the knowledge obtained during the professional development event to what actually is implemented in the classroom (Darling- Hammond & Sykes, 1999; Webster-Wright, 2009). Yet most teachers do attend conferences to learn about content or teaching methods by an expert or provider with the hopes that the knowledge or content will be transferred back to their own teaching. Often content at professional development events
is divided or compartmentalized which makes it difficult to apply to a teacher’s reality (Webster-Wright, 2009). Too many times teachers spend time away from their classrooms to attend a professional development opportunity delivered by an expert who has little knowledge about the context and culture of the attending teachers’ classrooms (Webster-Wright, 2009), nor do they offer the teachers an opportunity to be actively engaged or provide time for reflection. Teachers often walk away from conferences feeling disappointed in the content, presentation, or presenter, frustrated they had to leave their classroom or travel, or dissatisfied that the ideas were interesting but not practical for their own classroom. Factors such as cost and quality of professional development tend to be grave concerns for teachers and administrators, so teachers need to find the experience rewarding, useful, and practical to implement (Webster-Wright, 2009).

Finding 4 showed how the teachers in this study worked together to learn together or teach one another new teaching methods, strategies, and technology. Therefore, the researcher of this study recommends that professional development be reconceptualized to reflect a change for teachers so teachers experience an opportunity for growth throughout the year, not just when they attend a conference. The model for how to do professional development should shift from isolated event training to continuous professional development. Information from an expert or presenter at a conference or workshop might not transfer to the teachers in the audience. Rather, teachers should learn through experience with fellow teachers in the same context, which is exactly what team teaching offers. Dewey (1938) stresses learning that includes broad base knowledge, such as social inquiry which included theory, social practices, and everyday
Experiences. This theory acknowledges the fact that teachers do not learn best when they are exposed to a professional development in isolation with little to no interaction or consideration of the teachers’ classroom. Continuous professional development should stress the continuous, profession oriented learning that turns to teamwork and collaboration which is situated in everyday situations and contexts (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001; Stoll, Bolam, McCahon, Wallace, & Thomas, 2006; Wenger & Hornyak, 1999). This method of continuous professional development means that teachers grow and improve by working together long term in an active, social, practical environment (Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001). Team teaching can be a continuous professional development that allows for a holistic view of learning in the teacher’s own sociocultural community (Webster-Wright, 2009). This is a natural developing model (as reported in Finding 4) since teachers tend to share, talk, reflect, and collaborate often if given the opportunity making it an opportunity for teacher development.

Teachers learning from each other in the same classroom setting can be often more beneficial and practical than attending a formal conference (Knight, 2002). Teachers learn more than they anticipate when learning with a fellow teacher. Teachers, much like students, learn through experiences and teachable moments that do not occur as easily in planned, structured workshops, seminars, and training, the most common forms of professional development. Direct and indirect learning occurs during team teaching, which leads to a wealth of knowledge and experience for both teachers.
Although none of the teachers in this study actually used the word professional development, they highlighted how they developed and grew as a teacher because of their partner. Teachers improve by witnessing another's expertise and receiving feedback when working with another professional; furthermore, teaming may provide additional opportunities to reflect, change, and implement new methods, strategies, and technology as found in Finding 4. Teachers in this study, who teamed with another teacher from the same discipline, experienced professional growth and changed aspects of their teaching. For some, this came as a surprising reward they had not expected. Each teacher improved in specific areas; for example, use of technology, knowledge of course content, and confidence in teaching. Findings 1 and 2 suggest that teaming works if there is compatibility, flexibility, and active student engagement. Finding 4 indicates that effective teaming situations lead to both incidental and planned professional development, resulting in strengthened technology skills, content knowledge, and teaching methods and strategies. The professional development that occurs in a workshop, seminar, or training, which usually occurs in a day or two in an isolated setting by an expert, is less likely to offer a teacher all of these areas of growth. The everyday experience of learning along with another teacher in the classroom content has not been studied or implemented enough, but there needs to be a shift from being taught (like in a typical professional development setting) to learning with others in the actual classroom. Team teaching allows for this to happen.
Academic Freedom and Public Accountability

Some of the teachers in this study discussed the tension of having to give up some of their academic freedom to another teacher in the classroom. Academic freedom in this context is defined as the teacher’s freedom to make decisions about choosing topics, concepts, methods, and grades without external constraints as well as the freedom to teach in a way to reach individual goals and values as long as it supports the higher education institute (Rostan, 2010). Each teacher when deciding to team must be aware that academic freedom may be infringed upon when respecting the other teacher’s ideas, teaching style, or methods. A teacher must also be willing to share how the classroom will operate. The teachers in this study perceived there to be positive experiences with respecting each other’s academic freedom. Daily challenges with academic freedom are more apparent for teachers working in dialectic teams because two teachers share the same class and are forced to work as a unit in order to be successful.

Discussions around a consistent curriculum was another topic studied. When multiple teams are teaching, as in the case with this study, following consistent guidelines or requirements of a course, as described in this study is necessary for not only the students who may have to change teams during the course of the year but also to ensure the same curriculum is offered for all students. All four teams were asked to follow the same syllabus with specific set requirements, although they discovered that all four teams were not consistent. Thus, public accountability to the course, students, and college or institution is of greater importance than individual teacher academic freedom. The researcher is choosing Metz’s (2010) description of public accountability, which contains
three parts: a teacher must show responsibility in supporting the mission statement identified by the college, prove and report that content has been covered effectively, and deal with the ability to respond and be held accountable. The teachers in this study perceived themselves as successful because they were willing to put academic freedom second to public accountability in most cases, except for consistency across teams.

Some of the teachers began to see the need to put more of an emphasis on public accountability. Some of the students in this study had to switch from one team’s class to another team’s class during the yearlong course. Switching teams should have been a smooth transition for the students, but a few of the teachers mentioned that it was confusing for the students because different content and assignments had been covered at different times. It is not fair or practical for students to have to repeat the same content or miss new content because they had to switch teams. Teachers need to consider the greater good of public accountability, which is the student’s learning. Academic freedom can still be present in how the curricula is taught or presented and what methods of instructions are used, yet there needs to be guidelines for consistency in the content. In order for the school to present the course content to outside state assessors, such as the Higher Learning Commission, there needs to be consistent content. This, too, means that public accountability needs to be of importance, along with the individual academic freedom of the teacher.

Finding 1 of this study discussed the compatibility and flexibility of the interactive behavior between teachers. This means that one must be willing to be compatible and flexible (ultimately giving up some academic freedom) when team
teaching to focus on the greater good (or as the researcher is calling public accountability). Together the teachers work to find their own level of academic freedom working as a unit in order to put the students first. Finding 2 describes a pedagogy centered on facilitative teaching and active student engagement. Using this method of instruction supports the notion that teachers are willing and respectful of allowing people’s differences, thus considering more than one’s own academic freedom. Finding 3 indicated that there was consistency within the team, but less across the teams. Teachers worked together as a unit to implement consistency within their team. In order for these four teams to work together as a unit they need to be more focused on the public accountability for the sake of the course, the students, and the college. Finding 4 looked at how the teachers believed that team teaching was supportive for learning both for students and teachers. All four teams stressed the importance of student support achieved through team teaching, so they were in agreement to strive toward public accountability, all while obtaining professional development for themselves from working along with another teacher.

**Team Teaching as a Means to a Student-Centered Classroom**

All four teams in this study attempted to implement a student-centered, active-learning pedagogy, which involved group work, hands-on learning, and engaging lessons with teachers serving as facilitators. Having two teachers present in the classroom allowed for increased opportunities to vary instruction and work with students individually and fulfill their goals.
Anderson and Speck (1998) suggested that teams tend to use more constructivist approaches compared to non-team taught courses. These researchers found that team teaching fostered constructivist teaching. Constructivist assumptions include collaboration and multiple perspectives which can occur more often in team taught classrooms. Brooks and Brooks (1993) discussed experience and reflection as other important constructs of the constructivist perspective. Team teaching in these examples led to a collaborative classroom where students were active participants. Teachers took on facilitator roles while students became more active and responsible for their own education. Thus, teachers abandoned authoritative roles and rejected the title of expert. Anderson and Speck also suggested the connection between multiple perspectives (illustrating that two teachers can respectfully disagree) and a strong constructivist learning atmosphere for students. Although they predicted the possibility of such a connection, the number of teachers who teach from a constructivist paradigm is difficult to determine. Researching the extent to which teachers develop or strengthen their constructivist principles after teaming would be interesting and valuable. Future researchers could ask teachers to compare their teaching methods and strategies before and after teaming to determine whether specific constructivist lessons and activities have been added to this instruction.

If educational professionals encourage and advocate student-centered, active learning, two professionals in the classroom can apply this method of instruction. The upper administration at Midwest University, where this study took place, believed in a constructivist approach to learning. Consequently, they supported team teaching because
it provided students with the best learning environment in their view. In other words, they concluded that team teaching encourages a different style of teaching and extra student support compared to the traditional classrooms. Students in team-taught classes are more likely to be actively engaged, encouraged to voice their opinions, and willing to take risks with their learning (Andersen & Speck, 1998, p. 679).

Anderson and Speck (1998) stated that student learning and support increases when students have compatible, effective team teachers. During their study they found that about 50% of teams reported different teaching styles. These differences contributed to student interest, motivation, and learning (p. 677). The eight participants in this study confirmed their point. Most of the teachers indicated that their compatibility and active learning created a better atmosphere and support for student learning.

**Implications for Practice**

**Regular Conversations About Consistency**

The four teams in this study were consistent within their individual teams as evident in their syllabi, assignments, style of teaching, and assessments, but not consistent in these areas across all four teams. The literature contains scant research on multiple teams’ communication practices, which clearly increase the demands on the teachers. Holding a group interview similar to the one in this study could provide an opportunity for teachers to come together and discuss teaming and specific content-related issues helpful for other team teachers. The eight participants acknowledged that they planned carefully with their partner, but not as a large group. Had the eight members met more often, they could have modeled communication within a large
community despite their disagreements on curriculum. Increased consistency should have been discussed, especially with regard to what the students learned, how to assess their performance, and ideas of professional development. Topics like expectations, goals, policies, curriculum objectives, and preferred teaching methods within teams and across teams would have promoted greater consistency across the four teams.

Team teachers should strive to be consistent in two areas. First, teachers should aim for consistent content. Students were asked to refrain from switching teams because the program is designed to offer a yearlong program with the same teachers. Some students were forced to switch since remaining with the same team for the entire year was not always possible due to scheduling conflicts. Therefore, if students switched to another team because of a schedule conflict, they missed information if their original team scheduled a lesson during the second semester that the second team covered during the first semester. Consistency is, therefore, critical in organizing the curriculum for students and teachers. Furthermore, a required curriculum and syllabus is necessary for those students who switch teams.

Second, when a new team or new teachers enter the team-teaching program, this study suggests that they need a set syllabus so there can be consistency between teams because some students have switched teams through the course. Some teachers in this study wanted more consistency, especially after discovering more than one syllabus in use by the teams. Consistency within the teams as well as across teams is beneficial for the students’ sake, especially if they do have to switch to another team. All teachers may not completely support consistent content, grading, syllabus, and teaching styles; yet they
must be willing to compromise and adhere to the decisions of the teams as a unit. Individuals’ ideas and preferences that are unsupported by the other members may be sacrificed for the greater good—equal opportunities for student learning and support. For example, a teacher may abandon or change the way she or he commonly teaches a concept or lesson and follow the other teacher if the newer way suits the needs or preferences of students better. Members of the Higher Learning Commission (2011) have advocated consistency of curricula at colleges and universities; therefore, teachers must be willing to adapt to change and work collaboratively.

In most cases, the teachers in this study spent time comparing their grading of student assignments. For instance, both teachers on one team wrote comments on student essays, whereas another pair of teammates exchanged papers to see what grade the other teacher would assign. Other team members stated they did not regularly compare student papers but had done so in the past and knew they were very similar in their methods. Professors Anderson and Landy (2006) emphasized the importance of grading consistently, reviewing and reassessing goals for the course, and encouraging students to be active participants. These individual teams attempted to have consistent evaluations of student performance, but they did not attempt consistency across the teams.

The members of each team believed they were successful by working collaboratively with each other and striving for consistency, yet it was difficult to achieve across teams because less communication has occurred among all eight instructors over time. Members of some teams resisted consistency. They did feel that holding curriculum conversations was important and valuable for the teams in order to align their
goals, objectives, curriculum, and assessment. The teachers felt consistency ensured success for all students and must take place within a team and across teams; consistency helped teachers who enter team teaching. In this study, the college was required to show the state a form of consistency for each course taught. In almost every aspect outwardly visible to students—the syllabus, class assignments, method of grading, and other forms of assessment—the individual teams appeared to be consistent in most areas. However, throughout the study some of the participants were surprised to discover that these items were not in fact consistent across teams. Thus, most of the participants saw value in commonalities within and across teams. Changes for the coming year will most likely occur now that the eight teachers have discussed the importance of consistency both for their own purposes and for the students.

Problems associated with consistency can occur within departments outside the realm of team teaching. As teachers talk about their teaching with others, they may discover that their assignments, grading practices, and the concepts and themes they cover differ from those of other educators teaching the same course; therefore, educators should be given the time, support, and encouragement to strive toward consistency, which has been the subject of debate by the Higher Learning Commission (2010) advocating consistency and student performance outcomes. Because of societal demands for data-driven accountability and economic woes, team teaching must be proven effective compared to more traditional instructional models to continue. Specific data and findings are necessary to validate the effectiveness of teachers and programs, which includes consistency issues. For instance, the curriculum and assessment policies should
be established and agreed upon by the teaming teachers, but content presentation can be left up to the individual teachers. Consistency does not mean that teachers must practice identical pedagogy, but goals, objectives, and curriculum must be the same. The eight teachers in this study have not been asked to teach exactly the same every day; they can have a set curriculum and be expected to implement the same assessments, requirements, and expectations.

Team teachers need time, support, and the means to hold regular conversations about curriculum consistency. The teams perceived they needed to plan, grade, and discuss ideas on a regular basis. Conversations must occur both within and across teams, in the same department, or across disciplines. Both homogeneous and interdisciplinary teams must align curriculum, goals, objectives, and assessment in order to maximize the potential of team teaching and be successful.

**Future Research Based on This Study**

**Additional Practitioner Research**

When instructors experience positive aspects of teaching, they are often willing to share their expertise with others. Practitioner research is valuable not only for the researcher but for other teachers as well. In the case of this study, the researcher included herself and focused on her experiences with team teaching and those of her seven participants. She saw herself as part of a unique situation from which others could learn and in which they may find themselves at some point during their career.

Other university-level teachers can look to their own experience team teaching to raise new concerns. Studying oneself and collaborating with others can promote change
Readers of practitioner research can consider similar experiences they have had in higher education, which can lead to reform, reevaluation, and improvement methods serving as continuous professional development. Additional practitioner research studies can offer more insight into and understanding of team teaching. Team teachers can ask themselves how they experience teaming and how they can add to their profession by sharing their own experience with others.

**Studies of Gender and Age**

After examining the data from this study, the researcher eventually concluded that gender roles may have been more important than the actual gender of the participants. For example, some participants had more of an authoritative, dominant personality. Future researchers could investigate the effect of gender and gender roles of team members on team dynamics. Do two women work together differently than two men or a mixed-gender team? How important are the gender roles team members play? Is one partner always more dominant, vocal member of the team? In this study only one team was a female–male partnership; in all other teams partners were of the same gender. Members of the female–male partnership addressed the benefits they felt in the gender composition of their team. The eight participants in this study were asked how they perceived working with someone of a different gender and only indirectly how it affected student learning.

Only Anderson and Speck (1998) looked at the impact of gender or gender roles in partnerships on the success of a team, focusing on how the gender of teachers affects student learning or support. They found that about 50% of teachers surveyed believed
the gender of teachers has an influence on the way students learn. Similar to Connie’s and Robert’s statements, teachers in Anderson and Speck’s study approved of students’ hearing the perspectives of teachers of differing genders; therefore, future researchers may study the effect of gender or gender roles in the team relationship to answer two main questions: Are teams more effective and long lasting when made up of teachers of the same gender or different genders? Does the gender makeup or gender roles of a team affect learning for students and teachers?

**Experienced vs. Inexperienced Teachers**

According to Stewart (2005) one of the necessary conditions for successful team teaching at the college level is placing an experienced teacher with a less experienced teacher. Seven of the eight participants were experienced teachers before entering team teaching; one had teaching experience in another discipline. Participants stated that they valued and preferred an experienced partner. One participant originally partnered with a new teacher, who was not regarded as an equal of this participant by the students but instead as a student teacher or observer in the classroom. Although data were insufficiently rich to draw conclusions, the information caused the researcher to question whether team members need teaching experience to be a strong partner. A future researcher may, therefore, wish to consider whether the level of experience of team members impacts the relationship of partners, interaction within the team, and performance in the classroom. Researchers could compare teams with and without experience to shed light on the most effective combination of partners. Findings from these studies could have a positive impact on organizing teams in the future.
Shift to Constructivist Teaching

Members of all four teams stated their desire to establish student-centered classrooms prior to the research period. Interviews and observations show that they implemented constructivism in their teaching. Their attitudes toward constructivist teaching before/after team teaching can be a subject of interest. Many stated their early and continued use of the student-centered approach, but others indicated they shifted from traditional methods to constructivist techniques after beginning to team teach. Teaming, however, does not guarantee that instructors will necessarily apply become more constructivist in their teaching style. Future researchers may explore the differences between team teachers who use a constructivist approach to teaching and those who use other pedagogical approaches to teaming. In addition, they could seek to answer the following questions: Is a traditional teacher likely to shift to constructivist teaching strategies after teaming? Have teachers considering team teaching already adopted a constructivist philosophy of teaching? Answers to these questions can be instrumental in finding the type of person who should enter team teaching or is likely to head toward a constructivist classroom.

Strengths of the Study

The researcher viewed many strengths of this study that in part derived from the researcher’s choice of an environment that was familiar. First, the researcher had access to the university because she taught there at the time of the study. Second, her established working relationship with all participants facilitated their willingness to
support the study. All of the participants were friendly and supportive, probably because of the established relationship present among fellow colleagues.

Another strength of the study is that all eight participants who team taught at Midwest University agreed to engage in the study, thus providing an comprehensive look at the entire population of team teachers at the school allowing for a cross analysis of all four teams. Even though the study could have been conducted with a smaller population of teachers, involving a broader population facilitated exploration and cross-analysis of multiple teams of team teachers.

The classroom observations and group interview are additional strengths of the study. Conducting classroom observations provided the researcher with valuable insights to confirming the information heard during the individual interviews and sparking discussion during the partner interview. The researcher saw firsthand how the teachers operated in the classroom. During the group interview, the teachers were all engaged in dialogue and addressed several topics of importance. Some team members discovered that, although they believed they followed similar themes, they actually did not; hence, their discovery led to some discussions of consistency. The group interview allowed for discussion of additional topics, including the concept of team teaching.
Conclusion

This study was designed to answer the following question: How do four teams of teachers experience and perceive dialectic team teaching of a developmental writing course on the college level? Because the researcher was a member of one of these teams, she included herself in the collection and analysis of the data. After analyzing the data and drawing conclusions, four main issues emerged: (a) Team teaching should be used as a form of reconceptualized continuous professional development; (b) Public Accountability is more important than academic freedom when team teaching; (c) Team teaching should be used as a means to a student-centered classroom; and (d) Consistency should lead to critical conversations that cannot be ignored. There are a few additional recommendations the researcher would like to make based on this study's findings.

Successful teams share specific characteristics, including voluntary participation; in addition they should be willing, prepared, and realistic with regard to the demands that accompany team teaching. Along the way, teachers may gain valuable professional development opportunities from their partner while sharing their own expertise with colleagues. Enacting teaming requires good communication and interactive skills to use with their partners as well as with members of other teams teaching the same course so that critical conversations about consistency can occur. Furthermore, good communication and collaboration among team teachers can lead to their assuming a facilitator role in a constructivist classroom, where students are the focus and active in their own learning.
Findings in this study and in future research can provide teachers with insight when considering volunteering to team teach. Reading about other teachers’ experiences can equip them with the knowledge necessary for success in team teaching as well as strengthen the position of already effective team teachers. Learning about common experiences, traits, personalities, and teaching situations will help teachers to decide whether or not to engage in cooperative teaching and learning. Shedding light on these teachers’ team experiences may help not only teachers but also university administrators considering implementing team teaching in certain departments and disciplines. This study may encourage other team teachers to share their experiences and perceptions through practitioner research; additional reporting will affirm that team teaching is effective, beneficial, and rewarding for both students and teachers.

Other universities, colleges, and teachers can look to this study to discover what makes a team work and who should volunteer to team. First and foremost, all types of team teaching should be done on a volunteer commitment; forcing someone to team teach will more than likely produce a negative outcome, and the team will not work. Any type of teaming requires hard work, but dialectic teaming is probably the least common, most expensive, and most difficult to enact because both teachers must be active and participatory at all times. The team must, therefore, be designed in a thoughtful, productive, successful way, whether it is in a college English course, as in this study, or in another subject area. The researcher recommends an assessment of possible candidates for teaming before a team is developed, so teachers are partnered with people they will not only be able to teach with but also whom they will enjoy working beside.
The assessment should include questions and discussions about one’s teaching philosophy, examples of collaboration and cooperation working with other colleagues, and a willingness to want to improve one’s teaching. The assessment should also include observing each other’s classrooms to witness the classroom management, teaching style, and personality of both potential team teachers. An opportunity for the two teachers to talk and question each other is also important to see if there is a personality conflict. This is the most critical aspect; otherwise, teaming will not be successful or satisfying. It would appear that students’ awareness of team teachers who do not work well together could lead to an unpleasant learning environment. Personalities must accommodate sharing, open-mindedness, and dedication to teaming and to one’s partner and students.

Moreover, once a team is created there needs to be support, reflection, and communication. The researcher sees this as another area that could be studied. She considered tension and how it contributed to the data that was collected during the study. How do team teachers express frustration, anger, and disappointment at times while teaming? When should a team admit the partners are not working and abandon the idea of teaming with each other? Reconfiguring teams worked for the eight teachers in this study, so that may be a solution when teams need to switch team members. In addition, a change of teachers can lead to additional professional development when working with another partner. Problem-solving and confrontations are other areas that should be explored. How do team teachers who perceive themselves to be successful handle conflict and disagreements?
Another suggestion is the idea of strong leadership. As the department chair indicated in this study, she knew that consistency was not always present across the teams. In-depth conversations are required, even when people do not agree, to establish some consistency in curriculum, course objectives, assignments, not only for the teachers to be able to assist one another but also for the students who may have to switch into another team’s class and find they have not been prepared with the same skills and curriculum. Leadership that draws people in to have a voice and motivate them to share, collaborate, and cooperative with others will support a healthy team attitude, experience, and perception for both teachers and their students.

Finally, and most fundamentally, the benefits to student achievement and retention need to be more clearly demonstrated to support the results obtained via a team teaching approach. All the previously cited variables (teacher affect, criteria for quality teams, leadership, roles, etc.) are pointless if the advantages to students of team teaching are not empirically demonstrated. Yet the scarcity of research about the impact on teachers and their experiences and perceptions begs such future explorations. With the cooperative efforts of current practitioners, as evident in this study, such willingness and commitment to sustained growth can and should clearly benefit the members of the learning community at large.
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Institutional Review Board Letter

February 4, 2009

Wendi Battershell
Curriculum Studies

Re: #09-19: “Team Teaching on a University Level Between English Teachers”

Dear Ms. Battershell:

I am pleased to inform you that the Kent State University Institutional Review Board has reviewed and approved your Application for Approval to Use Human Research Participants as Level II research through the expedited review process. This was approved on February 4, 2009. Approval is effective for a twelve-month period, February 4, 2009 through February 3, 2010.

Federal regulations and Kent State University IRB policy require that research be reviewed at intervals appropriate to the degree of risk, but not less than once per year. The IRB has determined that this protocol requires an annual review and progress report. The IRB will forward an annual review reminder notice to you by email as a courtesy. Please note that it is the responsibility of the principal investigator to be aware of the study expiration date and submit the required materials. Please submit review materials (annual review form and copy of current consent form) one month prior to the expiration date.

HHS regulations and Kent State University Institutional Review Board guidelines require that any changes in research methodology, protocol design, or principal investigator have the prior approval of the IRB before implementation and continuation of the protocol. The IRB must also be informed of any adverse events associated with the study. The IRB further requests a final report at the conclusion of the study.

Kent State University has a Federal Wide Assurance on file with the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP), FWA Number 00001853.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at 330-672-2704 or tfrederick@kent.edu.

Sincerely,

Tonya Frederick, R.N., B.S.N.
Research Compliance Administrator

Cc: Dr. Alicia Crowe
    Dr. Richard Ambrose

Division of Research and Graduate Studies
Office of Research Safety and Compliance
1300 W. High St. Fax (330) 672-2078
P.O. Box 5190, Kent, Ohio 44242-0001
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INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD LETTER
To: Wendi Battershell

Re: HSR proposal 08-09

Your research proposal –Team teaching in the English Department at Midwest University― has been approved by the HSR committee.

Thank you for submitting your research proposal to the HSR committee. If you have questions please contact Dr. Murray at 330-490-7259 or lmurray@midwest.edu. If any changes to your protocol are desired, please stop data collection immediately and submit an addendum for those changes.

Good luck with your project!

Sincerely,

Dr. Leigh Murray
Chair, Human Subject Review Committee
Midwest University
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Initial Contact Letter

DECEMBER 15, 2008

Hello Everyone-

I am writing to ask for your assistance and cooperation. For the past year I have been considering completing my dissertation on our unique team teaching structure after witnessing it first hand. After completing an extensive historical analysis and literature review, I have found a gap in the research. There is plenty written analyzing students in team taught settings; however, there is very little about how teachers experience team teaching. So here are the questions I have decided to focus on during the upcoming semester with your assistance.

My case study will look at how eight English teachers experience team teaching at on a university level. Six sub-questions asked of each participant provide the framework of this study: a) How does each teacher view working with another English teacher? (b) What have been the positive and negative aspects of team teaching? (c) How do they share/divide the responsibility of teaming? (d) Has teaming changed their perceptions of their own teaching? (e) How do they build relationships with students as a team rather than as an isolated teacher? (f) What differences are there between team teaching as opposed to teaching in isolation?

So, in order to finalize my proposal, I need to know if each of you will agree to participate in this semester long research. Your participation would require three pieces: a few interviews separately and possibly collectively, a couple observations of your classes and maybe even your planning/grading meetings (if you meet outside of class), and occasional journal keeping on your part recording any interesting moments you have about your team teaching experience. I am interested in hearing and recording each of your stories showcasing why and how you entered team teaching and what your overall experiences have been like, not just fall semester. I know this may sound like a lot on your part; however, I promise not to inconvenience you too much. And, as a researcher I promise to keep your interviews private and confidential. Additionally, let me assure you that pseudo names will be implemented.

Sincerely,

Wendi Battershell
Study Title: Team Teaming in the English Department.

A. EXPLANATOR TEXT

I want to do research in order to complete my dissertation through Kent State University. I wish to study the English teachers who team teach with other English faculty. I will conduct interviews with you, observe your class, and ask for you to participate in an online discussion group with all other English team members. I am seeking to understand your experience and perception toward team teaching. My focus is to show whether teachers benefit from this unique teaching structure.

Your refusal to participate will not affect you in any manner. You will be able to teach as you normally would. None of the information you provide will be identifiable to others. In order to maintain confidentiality, I will use a pseudonym for your name and the university. Data collection will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in my personal home office. Additionally, if at any time you choose to not continue your participation in my research, you may contact me and I will remove you from this research study. You can contact me at email wbattershell@midwest.edu or call 330-494-6170.

This project has been approved by Kent State University and X University and should conclude no later than May 2009. If you have questions about Kent State University's rules for research, please contact Research and Graduate Studies at 330-672-2704 at Kent or IRB chair L. Murray at 330-xxx-xxx at x. Additionally, you may contact the department of English, Connie X.

You will receive a copy of this consent form. Thanks for your time and support of this project!

Sincerely
Wendi Battershell, Ph.D. Candidate

B. CONSENT STATEMENT

I agree to take part in this project. I know what I will have to do and that I can stop at any time.

Signature_________________________ Date_________________
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Audio Taping Consent Form

Study Title: Team Teaming in the English Department

A. EXPLANATOR TEXT

This form informs you that at times during the interviews I may ask to tape record our conversation. By signing below, that indicates that you agree to allow me to record our conversation.

B. CONSENT STATEMENT

I agree to allow my interviews to be tape recorded.

________________________________________  __________
Signature                                      Date

Choose one of the following:

I wish to listen to the tapes after the interview
   Signature _____________________________

I do Not wish to listen to the tapes after the interview
   Signature _____________________________
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Individual Interview Protocol

1. How long have you been teaching? Here and elsewhere?

2. What was your perception of team teaching before you started doing it?

3. How has it changed?

4. What does team teaching mean to you?

5. Explain to me how you first entered team teaching.

6. Why did you decide to team teach? Was it voluntary or demanded?

7. How do you perceive your relationship with your partner? Who is the good/bad witch?

8. How many different partners have you had? Summarize each of these relationships you have been in?

9. How can you characterize your roles with each other?

10. What specific duties do each of you assume?

11. Can you describe a critical incident that has occurred while team teaching?

12. How do you describe your theory of teaching?

13. Tell me how you have changed, evolved, or developed as a teacher from teaming.

14. Tell me a story about a time when something surprised you about the team teaching process—something that you didn’t expect.

15. How do you plan curriculum and lesson plans as a team?

16. How do you assess, evaluate, and design curriculum with a partner?

17. How do you communicate with your partner?

18. Describe for me how you communicate with students together as a team?

19. Who does the entire team communicate with each other?

20. Do you think there is consistency amongst all team members?
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Partner Interview Protocol

1. Would you say the day I observed was typical? Why/Why Not?
2. How do you perceive both yourself and your partner in the class?
3. What is your relationship with your students like?
4. Can you compare and contrast how you team in the team teaching setting versus individually?
5. Please explain to me how you best complement each other?
6. Please describe for me a conflict or disagreement you faced with working with each other?
7. How did you resolve this issue?
8. How did it help or hurt your teaching?
9. What have you learned from each other?
10. How do you view your partnership?
11. What would you like to improve upon to strengthen your teamwork and teaching?
12. What makes your team work?
13. What does your team do that you think is a specialty that other groups don’t do or have?
14. Do you think your gender influences the way you teach?
APPENDIX H

GROUP INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
Appendix H

Group Interview Protocol

1. Please describe a time for the rest of the group when you and your partner were successful?

2. If there were no constraints, what would be the ideal team teaching situations?

3. What is an example of how we might improve our team teaching either within the partnership or amongst all of us?

4. How do you think faculty benefit from team teaching?

5. Do you think you have benefited from team teaching?

6. How do you think students benefit from team teaching?

7. If you had to sum up your experience with team teaching what would you say. Good/Bad?

8. Did you already have experience with teaching before you team taught?

9. Do you think gender composition of the teams makes a difference?

10. Can I ask each team what the major themes are?

11. How standardized do you think the entire group needs to be?

12. What is the most difficult issue we need to tackle in the group?

13. Can you describe what characteristics one should possess before considering team teaching?

14. What is your perception of team teaching in this department?

15. Do you think team teaching will be in jeopardy?
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Email Follow Up To People Who Left Early

1. What are the major themes in our course?

2. Why is becoming consistent across teams so difficult?

3. Is consistency the biggest problem we as a large whole team face? Or is it something else?

4. Can you describe what characteristics one should possess before considering team teaching?

5. What is your overall perception toward team teaching in this department?

6. Do you think team teaching will be in jeopardy in the future?
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