Gordana M. Stepić, Daliborka R. Popović

PLANNING, REALIZATION AND EVALUATION OF TEAM TEACHING: TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVE

Team teaching is a complex teaching system that depicts the school culture based on cooperation and mutual sharing. The research aims to consider the representation of team teaching in the first cycle of primary education, as well as the advantages and difficulties in its planning, implementation, and evaluation from the teachers' perspective. The research sample consisted of a total of 120 teachers, 104 of whom were teachers with experience in team teaching. Data were collected using a survey questionnaire. The content analysis method was used to process the collected answers. The results show that teachers most often participate in team planning and preparation, occasionally in team implementation, and sporadically in team evaluation of teaching. Teachers presented a large number of positive characteristics regarding the implementation of team teaching, in contrast to a large number of problems regarding team planning and preparation. Teachers are rarely involved in the evaluation of team teaching. They see the advantages of team planning through the resource of ideas for teaching and preparation of teaching content, and the disadvantages through organizational and technical problems and difficulties in the functioning of the team. They see the advantages of team realization in the possibilities of professional development, better designing of the teaching process, and better student learning, while the shortcomings are expressed in the organizational and technical domain and direct work with students. Teachers generally consider the planning and preparation of team teaching concerning themselves, and the realization of team teaching is mostly about students. Creating conditions for efficient and effective planning and preparation of team teaching is a basic prerequisite for the implementation of this teaching system, according to teachers.

Keywords: team teaching; teachers; planning; preparation; implementation and evaluation of team teaching

INTRODUCTION

Each teaching system has a specific structure; it is characterized by a special way of functioning of teaching factors and the establishment of their mutual relations. Team teaching is the result of efforts to overcome the shortcomings of existing teaching systems and to make teaching and learning in school more efficient (Laketa and Vasilijević 2006). Team teaching promotes a school based on mutual cooperation and mutual sharing. Teachers share students, responsibility, planning, preparation, resources, expertise and evaluation, and students share their teachers, experiences of cooperative learning and mutual teaching, teaching materials, equipment, space (Đukić and Španović 2006).

Team teaching came to life in primary schools immediately after its introduction in the middle of the last century. The emergence and basic principles of organizing team teaching are associated with the names of F. Keppel, F. J. Schaplin, R. Anderson and L. Trump, D. Baynhamm and others who are responsible for its further development (Đukić and Španović 2006). The first team teaching is considered to be a cooperative project between Harvard University and Lexington Elementary School, launched in September 1957. Harvard University teachers worked with Lexington management and teachers to formulate, plan, implement and analyze program effectiveness. As the participants of the project *Team Teaching in an Elementary School* point out, the primary goals of this endeavor were aimed at: bridging the gap between educational ideals taught in college and educational realities in schools, lack of quality staff in contrast to the increase in the number of children in schools (there was a belief in this claim that there were too few quality people to choose the teaching profession, probably due to the low economic and social position of teachers and inability to develop professionally in a typical school (Anderson, Hagstrom and Robinson 1960).

This endeavor was followed by great interest of theorists and practitioners in team teaching. According to Thomas (1992), team teaching appeared in Great Britain in the 1960s. Teams of teachers were formed to combine expertise, resource sharing and teaching space. Most of the teams were composed of two teachers who share similar teaching philosophies. In Australia, the introduction of teams into the school context has gained wider acceptance over the past three decades, and then as a key part of

high school reform efforts (Pendergast 2006). As part of the mentioned reforms, teams were imposed from above, by the creators of educational policy, just as was happening in the United States, unlike in Great Britain, where the introduction of team teaching started from the bottom up. In Germany, team teaching began to be applied in 1966, after numerous criticisms from the school at the time. The organization of team teaching was based on the coordination of several subjects through parallelization, group teaching and block classes (Jovan 1987). Team teaching has come to life in Japan since 1970 in the English language teaching. The team consisted of a teacher whose mother tongue is English and a teacher who speaks the student's mother tongue. The emphasis was on language learning, but also on multiculturalism, within which everyone gets to know different cultural patterns, habits and traditions (Jaruda and Takeuchi 2007).

There are many definitions of team teaching in the literature. In reviewing the definitions, we start from the originators of this strategy, Schaplin and Olds (Schaplin and Olds; according to Jovan 1987), who believe that team teaching is a form of teaching organization that includes teaching staff and students who belong to them; an organization in which two or more teachers are entrusted to work together and be responsible for all or a significant part of the teaching for the same group of students. Trump (according to Jovan 1987), who is credited for further developing this concept, believes that team teaching is an organization in which two or more teachers and their assistants work closely together and coordinate their efforts, opportunities and professional competencies in one or more professional areas, in which they plan, implement and evaluate classes intended for one group of students, and within two or more classes, using different technical means and grouping of students.

One of the widely used definitions indicates that team teaching includes two or more teachers (working with or without associate teachers) who plan, implement and evaluate teaching together, relying on mutual talents and expertise (Beggs 1964). The definition is similar to the previous one: two or more teachers who intentionally and regularly share responsibility for planning, implementing, and evaluating classes prepared for a particular group of students (Deighton 1971). Olson (1967) believes that team teaching is a teaching situation in which two or more teachers, who have complementary teaching skills, cooperatively plan and implement classes for one group of students using flexible scheduling and grouping of students to meet students' learning needs.

Jovan Đorđević considers team teaching an organizational innovation in which the process of collective task execution has imposed a new form of organization in

which teachers closely cooperate and coordinate their efforts to, using their professional and pedagogical qualities, interests and individual capabilities, jointly and organizedly plan, perform and assessed teaching process that meets the needs and abilities of students, and made the school work of more rational and efficient (Đorđević 1980). According to Poljak, team teaching means personal integration, togetherness of teachers and other teaching associates in carrying out a joint program of work with a certain group of students (Poljak 1980).

To summarize these definitions, we will use Olson's statements that the basics of team teaching are most often considered: joint curriculum planning, teaching content and methods, mutual evaluation of teaching by the whole team, flexible scheduling and grouping and efforts to use teachers' abilities and interests (Olson 1967).

In this paper, we will rely on the definition of team teaching, according to which team teaching is a general organizational model of teaching in which teachers work together as a team, talk, collaborate, share responsibility and help each other, combining their abilities and competencies. In order to plan, implement and evaluate teaching process in one or more professional subject or areas intended for a group of students (Piechura-Couture et al. 2006).

At one point, team teaching was abandoned in many institutions (from primary to university education), presumably because team teaching proved to be much more complex than could have been predicted (Thomas 1992). The question is what makes team teaching inaccessible, complicated and rarely applicable. In the literature review (Little 1990), we noticed external and internal factors. External factors include: limited conditions for collaboration among teachers in schools where communication is informal and rare, even in cases where teachers believe they can improve teaching by working with colleagues, centuries old emphasis on autonomy in work, the teacher teaches students independently without collaborations with others, school architecture and structure are aimed at encouraging autonomy, rather than collaboration. Internal factors include: confusion about teachers' responsibilities, extra time and energy needed in collaborative work, interpersonal stress, as well as differences in approaches and conflicts arising from teacher ideologies.

However, during the last two and a half decades, there has been a renewed interest of researchers and practitioners in team teaching and its application at all levels of education. Related to that is our interest in team teaching. More precisely, we are interested in the frequency of its application in the first cycle of primary education and consideration of the advantages and disadvantages of team teaching in the educational process, from the perspective of direct implementers/teachers.

RESEARCH FOCUS

Team teaching, in the true sense of the word, includes three phases: team planning and preparation, team realization and team evaluation of work realized by two or more teachers through a certain degree of collaboration (Vaslijević and Stepić 2016).

Team teaching can be represented in different volumes and in different segments of teacher work. The whole school organization can be based on a team strategy, as it was at the beginning of the introduction of team teaching in primary and secondary schools, it can include a part of the school organization or only a few teachers. In recent years, it is more common for teachers to unite within subject areas or classes or extracurricular activities, on their own initiative, out of the need to solve certain issues and better learning and teaching so that team teaching is not imposed from above, but from below, by teachers themselves.

Based on the study of the literature, consideration of similarities and differences between the existing models of team teaching, categories of team teaching were formed along the continuum – from low to high possibilities of collaboration. Five models were singled out: 1) observation model; 2) coaching model; 3) teaching assistant model; 4) model based on equal status and 5) team model (Baeten and Simons 2014).

In the observation model, one teacher teaches and the other observes. The teacher who observes has a mostly passive role, except when asking questions. It is agreed in advance what he/she should observe and what information he/she should collect. Together, after classes, they analyze and discuss the observed classes.

In the coaching model, the observing teacher is given more responsibilities. He/she is expected to give suggestions, assist and provide support. Usually, a teacher who has work experience and adequate knowledge is a consultant to a novice teacher.

In the model in which one teacher teaches and the other assists, one teacher leads the teaching, while the other helps him/her in his/her work (for example, monitors the work of students and helps those who need it).

In the above models, one teacher is responsible for the teaching process, while the other observes his/her work or helps him in his/her work. On the other side, there are models in which teachers do not have a hierarchical relationship, but equally divided roles. The equal status model includes three submodels: a) partial teaching, b) parallel teaching and c) station teaching.In partial or sequential teaching, teachers share content and/or activities. Each teacher takes responsibility for a certain part of the content. While one teacher is teaching, it is not necessary for the other to attend

classes. In parallel teaching, the department is divided into subgroups according to the pace of work, learning style or previous success. Instructions are planned together, and teachers can rotate between subgroups. In station teaching, teachers jointly plan classes and share content or activities within a group of students. Each teacher works on specific content or activities with a subgroup of students. Students or teachers take turns at stations. Both teachers are present at the class at the same time.

In the previously mentioned models, teachers cooperate, but this is not full cooperation in all three domains (planning, teaching and evaluation). In the team model, both teachers share the mentioned tasks equally and work collaboratively. At the same time, they teach the whole department through interaction and dialogue. They exchange and discuss ideas and theories, while one speaks, the other demonstrates concepts or models and takes notes, and vice versa. The team model is usually applied in the later stages of team teaching because it takes time for teachers to get to know and harmonize teaching styles.

Among the important determinants of team teaching are the following: teams of teachers together plan, implement and evaluate teaching work (activities and achievements of all subjects of teaching); a precise division of roles in the teaching team has been made, actions are interdependent and coordinated, and success depends on communication and cooperation among team members; the schedule of teaching and other activities is flexible and adapted to the specifics of the work of both large and small groups of students; it can be realized only with the help of modern teaching aids and didactic material for group and individual teaching and learning; rooms for team teaching must be adapted to the rapid regrouping of students, efficient use of teaching aids, library, internet, laboratories, cabinets, workshops and the like (Španović and Đukić 2006).

Team teaching is determined by three characteristics: collaboration, flexibility and the use of modern teaching aids (Vasilijević, Laketa and Stamatović 2013). Collaboration is represented in different degrees and in all phases of team teaching (planning, implementation, evaluation) or only in some, depending on the model used. Flexibility refers to the grouping of students based on different pedagogical principles (interests, types of tasks, abilities), planning of teaching content, time and space. During the preparation of team teaching, the available teaching aids are considered in detail in the light of selected approaches and put into the function of student learning.

Effective teacher partnership is not only a key factor in the quality of the teaching team, but it is also a condition, a means and one of the primary goals of team teaching (Đukić and Španović 2008). Authors S. Španović and M. Đukić use the term personal

integration, and it means "creating a team of two or more teachers (and associates) who have different (but clear) roles in the team, common goal, appropriate communication, built trust and good interpersonal relationships" (Španović and Đukić 2010: 60).

A model for developing an effective partnership between two teachers of an interdisciplinary nature was set up by Stewart and Perry (Stewart and Perry 2005). Their model includes the following steps: 1) starting a partnership; 2) continuation of the partnership; 3) real partnership in the teaching process (joint preparation and planning of teaching, presentation of new teaching contents, repetition, practice, assessment) and 4) realization of an effective partnership. At the very beginning, it is important that the team is formed on a voluntary basis and that the choice of partners is made autonomously, without imposition from the side. However, that is not enough. When they start working together, teachers can notice insurmountable differences, most often in individual characteristics and teaching styles. Each teacher as a member of the team has a certain concept of what teaching should look like, the learning process, the curriculum, but also about himself/herself as a teacher. So they can decide to end the partnership, or continue it. It is further strived to progress from "me and you" to personal integration in "we", i.e. to a real partnership in team teaching (Đukić and Španović 2008). Stewart and Perry conclude that communication between partners about rules and expectations, about experience and knowledge, and about the personal characteristics of teachers is a fundamental factor in developing an effective partnership.

Team teaching can influence: an increase of cooperation, encouragement of the application of new teaching strategies and it can enable observation of colleagues' work and teaching analysis (Sandholtz 2000). The benefits that teachers can have from team teaching are: feeling less isolated, developing self-esteem, identifying opportunities for professional development, support (both physical and emotional) and recognizing the strengths and weaknesses of different teaching styles (Beane and Brodhagen 2001; according to Battershell 2011).

Some general determinants of successful teams are reflected in the following: members of successful teams have agreed to be part of a team; they are willing to compromise, where flexibility is crucial; team members understand that there is an opportunity to learn in collaboration with others; all members are excited to be part of the team (Eisen and Tisdell 2000). A necessary condition for successful teamwork is the acceptance of different practices and different beliefs of others. Teachers collaborate more often with colleagues who teach the same class than with other teachers

at school (Doppenberg, Bakx and Den Brok 2012). Teachers who teach different subjects cooperate more often than those within one discipline (Vangrieken et al. 2015). Cohen and Bailey emphasized the importance of the type of teaching team in considering their results (Cohen and Bailey 1997).

Through the creation of an interactive, collaborative and differentiated learning environment, it has been observed that students find it easier to work and are more interested in learning, which contributes to a more pleasant learning atmosphere and better understanding of teaching materials (McKinley 1996). Such an environment creates opportunities for knowledge construction through interaction, collaboration and debate. Team teaching is an opportunity to create a personalized learning environment through individual consultation and attention, which are in line with the needs of students (Richardson 1993). In addition, student learning styles can be respected through the inevitable differences in teaching styles (Hughes and Murwaski 2001). It has also been observed that team teaching supports a variety of learning and teaching methods that encourage and develop different levels of students' abilities and needs (Beane and Brodhagen 2001; according to Battershell 2011).

On the other hand, research indicates certain characteristics of teams that can negatively affect the effects of team teaching both from the point of view of teachers and from the point of view of students. Martin (Martin 1975) finds that collaboration has been difficult for some teachers, especially if they have worked alone before. He studied the verbal and non-verbal communication of one team of teachers and noticed that negotiation skills are necessary when working with others. Negative consequences occur when teams are dominated by one team member or teams work without planning the time and schedule of activities (Olson 1967). Berentsen (2006) finds that some teachers find it uncomfortable to associate because they prefer to work independently and are unwilling to change or adapt to teamwork. Thomas (1992) notes that the most significant difficulties faced by team members are uncertainty about roles, ignorance of team processes and protocols and the lack of administrative support. Differences in personal characteristics, teaching styles, and pedagogical beliefs also have an impact on the functioning of the team (Kruse and Louis 1997). There is a number of factors in the usual school context that hinder the work of teaching teams: the classroom system, lack of time for meetings and exchange of ideas, teachers' habit of working alone, lack of management support for team teaching (Olson 1967).

Two hundred and twenty teachers participated in a survey of teachers' attitudes about team teaching as a didactic innovation in the Republic of Serbia (Španović and Đukić 2006). The results of the research show that primary school teachers are

interested in team teaching and want to apply it in practice. Subject teachers perceive team teaching differently, but agree that students would gladly accept it. The authors came to the following findings: more than a third of teachers stated that they had acquired some knowledge about team teaching, and less than a third performed it in the direct work; teachers are most interested in organizing team teaching within one class; subject teachers prefer team teaching within one subject, while primary school teachers mostly opt for the organization of team teaching within several subjects of one class; primary school teachers consider a clear and definite division of roles in the team the most acceptable, while subject teachers decide to divide the roles according to the needs of the team without precise definition; primary school teachers emphasize that flexible organization of work is the greatest advantage of team teaching, while subject teachers give more equal importance to other advantages of team teaching (cooperation in the team, correlation between educational areas, application of differentiated teaching, teacher as a programmer and an organizer.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

General Background of Research

A pragmatist qualitative research was applied. This phenomenological approach is aimed at understanding the phenomena under examination, as well as looking at the respondents' self-perception about their own practice (Eatough and Smith 2008; Savin-Baden and Major 2012; according to: Slijepčević and Zuković 2021).

Our research was encouraged by the previously reviewed literature, the desire to understand the situation in our schools and the belief that we know the advantages and limitations of team teaching in a specific context, the first step towards successful implementation of this type of teaching in educational practice.

The aim of the research is to understand the representation, advantages and difficulties of applying team teaching in the first cycle of primary education and upbringing.

Research tasks:
- Determine the representation of team teaching in the work of teachers and the frequency of its application;
- Examine the perspective of teachers on the benefits of applying team teaching in the first cycle of primary education and upbringing;
- Examine the perspective of teachers on the difficulties they encounter in the application of team teaching.

Research Sample

The research population consisted of primary school teachers from the entire territory of the Republic of Serbia. The sample is intentional, given the choice of school administrations, and random, stratified, given the choice of cities/villages, schools and teachers in selected schools. Out of 120 teachers to whom the questionnaire was distributed, 104 teachers had experience in the application of team teaching in educational practice. Thus, in this paper we consider the answers of 104 teachers who applied team teaching (83.65% of females and 16.34% of males). Considering that the results will be mostly qualitatively processed and that this research is of an exploratory character, it can be said that the sample is representative and will enable us to get acquainted with the studied phenomenon. The structure of the sample is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Characteristics of the sample in relation to education and years of service

Professional qualifications	f	%	Years of service	f	%
College	15	14.42	1–5 years	23	22.11
University	66	63.46	6–15 years	25	24.03
Master	23	22.11	16–25 years.	30	28.84
			26–35 years	26	25

Instrument and Procedures

For the needs of the research, a survey questionnaire was constructed. In addition to general data on respondents (gender, education and years of service), the questionnaire contained one closed-ended question and two open-ended questions. The closed-ended question referred to the degree of use of team teaching (never; occasionally - once or twice during the semester; often - two or more times a month) within all three domains (preparation, implementation, evaluation). In the second question, the respondents were supposed to state, based on their experience, the advantages of applying team teaching in the first cycle of primary education, and in the third question - the difficulties they encountered in applying team teaching.

As there are a total of 18 school administrations in the Republic of Serbia, 6 or 7 teachers from each school administration were interviewed, depending on the size of

the school administration and the representation of teachers working in both urban and rural areas.

The research was realized during March 2021.

Data Analysis

The content analysis method was used to process the collected answers of the teachers. The answers from the questionnaire were subjected to a thematic analysis and thematic grouping of data. We applied the inductive approach in the analysis, which means that we did not have predefined categories, but they were formed during the data analysis. We used descriptive and analytical coding. Descriptive coding involved identifying opinions or topics that predominate in the teachers' responses while assigning categories, while analytical coding allowed us to go beyond the level of description, develop categories, and analyze data (Saldaña 2015).

Data coding was performed in two cycles (Saldaña 2015). In the first cycle, the collected data were grouped into three subcategories:
 • Planning and preparation of team teaching;
 • Realization of team teaching:
 • Evaluation of team teaching.

In the second coding cycle, we approached the classification, prioritization, integration, synthesis, abstraction and conceptualization of the obtained findings (Saldaña 2015).

RESEARCH RESULTS

The first task of the research was the experience of teachers in the preparation, implementation and evaluation of team teaching (Table 2). The results show that about a third of teachers have never participated in team implementation, and four fifths of them have never participated in the evaluation of team teaching. Almost all teachers have experience in occasional (once or twice during the semester) preparation of team teaching, about two thirds occasionally implement, while one fifth of teachers occasionally evaluate team teaching. Only about 8% of the teachers often participate in the preparation of team teaching, and the same percentage of teachers stated that they often implement team teaching together.

Table 2. Participation of teachers in the preparation, implementation and evaluation of team teaching

Team teaching	Participation (N=104)					
	never		occasionally (once or twice during the semester)		often (twice or more times per month)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Preparation	/	/	96	92.30	8	7.69
Realization	31	29.80	65	62.5	8	7.69
Evaluation	85	81.73	19	18.26	/	/

Based on the answers of the respondents, it can be concluded that team teaching is occasionally used in the work in the first cycle of primary education and upbringing. The emphasis is on team preparation, followed by implementation, while the evaluation of team teaching is the least represented. Such results are expected, given the complexity of this type of teaching and the conditions of the class-hour system that somewhat hinder its planning and implementation. It is encouraging that about 92% of respondents participated in the preparation of team teaching, and about 62% of them in the implementation of team teaching.

What benefits did they notice and what difficulties did the teachers encounter in applying team teaching? In the analysis, we used the answers of teachers who have experience in team teaching N = 104.

By applying the content analysis, we obtained three categories of responses. In the text below we give a description of categories and frequencies (Table 3). We present the answers of the respondents in parallel in order to see what advantages within each category participation in team teaching provides, and what are the difficulties.

DISCUSSION

The teachers point out that team planning and preparation of teaching provides numerous advantages: answers that emphasize the possibility of more ideas to come up through team planning, that teachers have the opportunity to exchange ideas and introduce innovations, that through the division of roles and responsibilities easier teaching and preparation ("Each member of the team has the freedom to present their ideas, to discuss them with others and to reach an agreement, an innovation that we will realize together."), to distribute teaching contents more flexibly, to establish correlations between teaching contents and cooperate with subject teachers ("Team work

Table 3. Teacher's perspective on planning, implementation and evaluation of team teaching

Category name	Category content	Category content
	Advantages	*Difficulties*
Planning and preparing teaching	The answers indicate: 1) a wealth of ideas for teaching: through team planning a larger number of ideas (f = 24), that teachers have the opportunity to exchange ideas (f = 9), introduce innovations (f = 8); 2) preparation of teaching contents: to make teaching easier to plan through the division of roles and responsibilities (f = 14), to distribute teaching contents more flexibly (f = 8), establish correlations between teaching contents (f = 6), cooperate with subject teachers (f = 6). **Total (f = 75)**	Answers pointing out that obstacles in planning and preparation can be: 1) organizational and technical nature: time required for preparation of team teaching (f = 43), school equipment (f = 10), harmonization of curricula (f = 5); 2) functioning of the team: existence of a superior team member (f = 15), difficulties in harmonizing team members in choosing the content, teaching approaches, methods, forms of work and teaching aids (f = 10), lack of motivation for teamwork (f = 8), passivity of some members = 7). **Total (f = 98)**
Teaching realization	Answers that indicate that team realization contributes to: 1) professional development of teachers: exchange of experiences (f = 23), mutual help and support between colleagues (f = 19), teachers get acquainted with the work of other colleagues (f = 8), with their approaches (f = 7), teachers review their own practice (f = 5), learn from each other (f = 5); 2) the quality of the teaching process: better organized educational work (f = 10), apply different forms of work (f = 10), classes are more interesting and creative (f = 8), apply different approaches (f = 7), teaching is easier to implement as a team than individually (f = 6), a variety of materials are used (f = 6) and teaching methods (f = 6), integrative teaching is achieved (f = 6), teachers share responsibility for achieving goals f = 5); 3) better learning of students: higher motivation (f = 18) and activities of students (f = 16), development of their interests (f = 11), easier to see and meet the needs of students (f = 9), enabling peer learning (f = 6), creating opportunities for meeting subject teachers (f = 5), for socialization of students (f = 5), for differentiated approach (f = 4), for individualization (f = 4), development of students' creativity (f = 4), positive influence on student achievement (f = 3). **Total (f=216)**	Answers that indicate that during the team implementation of teaching there may be problems: 1) organizational and technical nature: in the articulation of the lesson (f = 9), there may be spatial limitations (f = 7), difficulties in harmonizing the schedule of teacher lessons (f = 6); 2) direct work with students: discipline in class (f = 10), difficulties in communication (f = 6), lack of motivation of students to work (f = 5), the presence of several teachers can be uncomfortable for some students (f = 4), it can be difficult to work with students who have learning difficulties (f = 4). **Total (f = 51)**
Evaluation of teaching	Easier (f=2) and more objective evaluation (f = 2). **Total (f = 4)**	Answers that suggest difficulties in monitoring students' work (f = 5). **Total (f = 5)**

1

implies cooperation with teachers from the council, but also cooperation with subject teachers. Thus, we cooperated with history and the Serbian language teachers, studying historical content in the 4th grade.").

The teachers have reduced the advantages of team planning and preparation of teaching to two key points: the richness of ideas and the preparation of teaching content that come through cooperation with other teachers and subject teachers. Thus, the teachers point out the importance of collaboration that represents a means for the co-construction of further knowledge as well as serving as a shared repository for current memories and shared knowledge; thus, in a collaborative context, teachers would have more knowledge to apply in practice than when working alone (Rytivaara and Kershner 2012).

However, they also point out the difficulties in this category. The teachers believe that time is an important, interfering factor in this segment of team teaching, because it is necessary to coordinate time for meetings, some members do not complete tasks on time, joint preparation takes more time than when teachers prepare individually ("When I plan independently I have my own in time in accordance with their obligations, in team work it is necessary to fit in with others in order for team meetings to be realized, also, team meetings can last beyond my expectations.").

The teachers emphasize that difficulties in planning team teaching can also occur: if someone is superior in the team, if team members are not motivated for teamwork, due to the passivity of some team members ("In the team work in which I participated, it bothered me that it seemed to me that I was working harder than other members, that I cared more."), if the school is not adequately equipped, in team members coordination of content choosing, teaching approaches, methods, forms of work and teaching aids, in the harmonization of curricula and subjects ("We have spent a lot of energy on harmonization of forms of work, methods and means we will use, how we will change, who will do what.").

The teachers see the shortcomings of team planning and preparation of teaching in two domains: organizational-technical and problems of team functioning, and this is in accordance with the literature which points out that the quality of team teaching can be influenced by the following factors: school administration support, training for team teaching, clearly structured team relationships, length of team membership, team size, time for work planning and ongoing discussions, teacher focus on content and teaching practice, and responsibility for students (Spraker 2003). In order for team teaching to have an effect, teachers need to establish a good relationship, identify their teaching styles, direct them towards establishing cohesion in the classroom, dis-

cuss the strengths and weaknesses of teamwork and strive to establish a high degree of collaboration.

The direct team work of teachers with students can have different modalities and is directly dependent on the previous phase, the planning phase. The perspective of teachers on the realization of team teaching is emphatically positive. The teachers listed a large number of different benefits that we classified into three categories: professional development of teachers, the quality of the teaching process and the quality of student learning. The advantages, from the point of view of professional development of teachers, refer to the possibility of establishing deprivatization of practice and development of reflective practice ("Joint implementation of teaching provides opportunities for teachers to learn from each other and to review their work."). Advantages from the point of view of the quality of the teaching process refer to the applied didactic-methodical solutions during the team realization of teaching ("In the team realization of teaching we are freer to use different methods of active teaching and to adapt forms of work."). The quality of student learning is reflected in the active participation of students in the teaching process that is adapted to their preferences, abilities and affinities ("Two teachers working simultaneously in the classroom, allow greater individualization and differentiation of work, as well as encouraging student creativity.").

These aspects are in line with the statements of Laketa and Vasilijević about the positive characteristics of team teaching: demonstration of many years of experience, flexibility in content selection and use of time in teaching, differentiation and individualization of teaching, better material and technical working conditions, use of various sources of knowledge, higher student activity (Laketa and Vasilijević 2006) and findings that indicate that team teaching is a context for teacher learning and building shared knowledge and that team teaching can support teachers in fulfilling their professional obligations (Rytivaara and Kershner 2012). Effective professional development should be collaborative, based on knowledge sharing, assistance and togetherness. The teacher community is important not only for team support but is a crucial resource for coming up with ideas and for critical review (Jang 2006).

Difficulties within the category of teaching relate to technical and organizational problems when working with a larger group of students ("It is difficult to fit class schedules and provide adequate space for teaching when we merge two classes.") And problems of direct work with students ("Some students feel uncomfortable when they meet a new teacher, also, it is not easy to maintain motivation and discipline in a large group, even though there are two of us, it requires special skill and prepara-

tion."). In order to overcome the difficulties of organizational and technical nature, the support of the school administration is necessary, which is reflected in helping teachers plan and schedule classes, providing support and resources that will enable them to design and study desirable changes in teaching approaches and allowing them to set priorities in their work due to time constraints (Hanover Research 2012). Support of administrative bodies and other bodies of the school staff, clear organization of work and good relations in the team, consistency of team members, team size, enough time to prepare and model teaching content, are important factors that contribute to team teaching efficiency (Španović and Đukić 2010).

Regarding the evaluation as an important part of not only team teaching but teaching in general, we do not have much data. We did not find data on the advantages and difficulties in this phase of team teaching in the studied literature. The advantages in this segment of work, from the aspect of team teaching, in relation to individual evaluation, are perceived within the framework of easier and more objective evaluation, and the disadvantages in terms of the difficulty in monitoring the work of students. Such results are a consequence of the attitude towards the evaluation and self-evaluation of teaching in general, and not just team teaching.

Evaluation usually means evaluating the results of students' work. In team teaching, there are at least three aspects of evaluation that should be considered: evaluation of the learning process, evaluation of student performance and evaluation of the work of the team itself. All three levels of evaluation can be realized from different points of view, from the point of view of team members and students, but also from other intermediary actors: parents, pedagogical-psychological services, principals. Aspects of teamwork that can be monitored and evaluated include: assessment of the team work process, assessment of the product/product of teamwork and assessment of mutual interaction. We conclude that evaluation as a phase of team teaching is very complex and that special attention should be paid to it, especially because teachers do not see its place and importance within team teaching.

CONCLUSION

We can conclude that team teaching is occasionally used in the work in the first cycle of primary education and upbringing. Teachers mostly participate in team planning and preparation, then in team implementation and sporadically in team evaluation of teaching.

The teachers in our research have a very positive view of the team's teaching. They presented a large number of problems for team planning and preparation. Evaluation of team teachers is almost non-existent. The most positive aspects of team teaching, according to teachers, are: division of roles and responsibilities, the ability to come up with more ideas through team planning, exchange of experiences, mutual help and support between colleagues, better environment for learning and student development. The most prominent difficulty is the extra time that needs to be spent in planning and preparing team teaching.

The teachers generally consider the planning and preparation of team teaching in relation to themselves, and the realization of team teaching is mostly in relation to students. They see the advantages of team planning through the wealth of ideas for teaching and preparation of teaching content, and the disadvantages through organizational and technical problems and difficulties in the functioning of the team. In addition, they see the advantages of team realization in the possibilities of professional development, better teaching process and better learning of students, while the shortcomings are expressed in the organizational and technical domain and direct work with students.

We believe that the solution to encourage the implementation of team teaching is to address issues related to the reasons that hinder teachers, above all, to plan and prepare classes as a team. Namely, if teachers do not have a predominantly positive opinion about this phase of team teaching, it can be a significant factor that hinders its implementation. Therefore, creating conditions for efficient and effective planning and preparation is the basic preconditions for the implementation of this teaching system. The literature emphasizes the importance of teacher preparation at all levels of professional development and the need to practice team teaching (Murawski 2006). Therefore, we see the scientific contribution of this paper in the attempt to shed light on the fulcrums from which we should start towards the reaffirmation of team teaching in the professional development of teachers.

In further research on this phenomenon, it is necessary to answer the questions how to reduce the impact of disruptive factors and what are the most effective measures in encouraging teachers to implement each of the phases of team teaching. The answers to these questions should be sought in supporting students studying at teachers' faculties and teachers in their efforts to apply team teaching by taking measures at the level of higher education and later at schools where they tech in terms of training for teamwork and shifting the philosophy of education from strong individualism to teamwork.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, Robert, Ellis Hagstrom, Wade Robinson (1960), ″Team Teaching in an Elementary School″, *The School Review*, 68(1), 71-84.
2. Baeten, Marlies, Mathea Simons (2014),″Student teachers team teaching: Models, effects and conditions for implementation″, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 41, 92-110.
3. Battershell, Wendi (2011), *Dialectic Team Teaching at the University Level: A Study of Four Teams*, Doctoral thesis, Kent State University
4. Beggs, David (1964), *Team teaching: Bold new venture,* Indiana University Press, Bloomington
5. Berentsen, Lowell (2006), ″Team teaching with academic core curricula teachers: Using aviation concepts″, *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, 43(2), 7-19.
6. Cohen, Susan, Diane Bailey (1997), ″What makes teams work: Group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite″, *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 239-290.
7. Deighton, Lee C. (1971), *The encyclopedia of education*, Macmillan, New York
8. Doppenberg, Jannet, Anouke Bakx, Perry den Brok (2012), ″Collaborative teacher learning in different primary school settings″, *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 18, 547-566.
9. Đorđević, Jovan (1981), *Savremena nastava*, Naučna knjiga, Beograd
10. Đukić, Mara, Svetlana Španović (2006), ″Timska nastava kao didaktička inovacija″, u: Olivera Gajić (ur.), *Evropske dimenzije promena obrazovnog sistema u Srbiji*, Zbornik radova, knjiga 1, Filozofski fakultet, Novi Sad, 277-288.
11. Đukić, Mara, Svetlana Španović (2008), ″Efektivno partnerstvo nastavnika kao činilac kvaliteta timske nastave″, *Nastava i vaspitanje*, 57(3), 259-272.
12. Eisen, Mary Jane, Elizabeth Tisdell (2000), *Team teaching and learning in adult education*. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, Jossey--Bass, San Francisco
13. Hanover Research – District Administration Practice (2012), *The Effectiveness of the Co-Teaching Model Literature Review*. Retrived August 24, 2021 from: http://www.hanoverresearch.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Effectiveness-of-Co-Teaching-Membership.pdf.

14. Hughes, Claire, Wendy Murwaski (2001), ″Lessons from another field: Applying coteaching strategies to gifted education″, *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 45, 195-209.

15. Jang, Syh-Jong (2006), ″Research on the effects of team teaching upon two secondary school teachers″, *Educational Research*, 48(2), 177-194.

16. Jaruda, Krishea Mae, Shigeru Takeuchi (2007), ″Team teaching: A Step to a Better Students Performance″, *Annual report of the Faculty of Education, Gifu University*. Retrieved 2/07/2021, from: http://www.ed.gifu-u.ac.jp/~kyoiku/ info/jissen/pdf/0902.pdf.

17. Jovan, Hicela (1987), *Timska nastava*, Izdavački centar Rijeka, Rijeka

18. Kruse, Sharon, Karen Seashore Louis (1997),″Teacher teaming in middle schools: Dilemmas for a schoolwide community″, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 33(3), 261-289.

19. Laketa, Novak, Danijela, Vasilijević (2006), *Osnove didaktike*, Učiteljski fakultet, Užice

20. Little, Judith Warren (1990), ″The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations″, *Teachers' College Record*, 91(4), 509-536.

21. Martin, Wilfred (1975), ″The negotiated order of teachers in team teaching situations″, *Sociology of Education,* 48(2), 202-222.

22. McKinley, Bud (1996), *An example of team-taught inter-disciplinary classrooms,* Raritan Valley Community College, North Branch, NJ

23. Murawski, Wendy (2006), ″Student outcomes in co-taught secondary English classes: How   can we improve?″, *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 22(3), 227-247.

24. Olson, Jerry (1967), ″Why teaching teams fail″, *Peabody Journal of Education*, 45(1), 15-20.

25. Pendergast, Donna (2006), ″Fast-tracking middle schooling reform: A model for sustainability″, *Australian Journal of Middle Schooling*, 6(2), 13-18.

26. Piechura-Couture, Kathy, Mercedes Tichenor, Debra Touchton, Douglas Macissac, Elizabeth Heins (2006), ″Coteaching: A Model for Education Reform″, *Principal leadership*, 6(9), 39-43.

27. Poljak, Vladimir (1980), *Didaktika*, Školska knjiga, Zagreb

28. Richardson, Ann (1993), ″School-based teams help improve school learning environments″, *Schools in the Middle*, 2(4), 26-29.

29. Rytivaara, Anna, Ruth Kershner (2012), ″Co-teaching as a context for teachers' professional learning and joint knowledge construction″, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(7), 999-1008.

30. Saldaña, Johnny (2015), *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*, SAGE Publications, Inc. Thousand Oaks, CA

31. Sandholtz, Judith Haymore (2000), Interdisciplinary team teaching as a form of professional   development'″, *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 27(3), 39-54.

32. Slijepčević, Senka, Slađana Zuković (2021), ″School Counsellor-Teacher Collaboration in Student Counselling″, *The New Educational Review*, 63, 237-247.

33. Spraker, Jean (2003), *Teacher Teaming in Relation to Student Performance: Findings from the Literature*. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Portland, OR; Retrieved August 19, 2021 from: http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED480034.pdf.

34. Stewart, Timothy, Bill Perry (2005), ″Interdisciplinary Team Teaching as a Model for Teacher Development″, *TESL-EJ*, (9)2, 1-17.

35. Španović, Svetlana, Mara Đukić (2006), ″Nastavnička percepcija timske nastave″, u: Olivera Gajić (ur.), *Evropske dimenzije promena obrazovnog sistema u Srbiji*, Zbornik radova, knjiga 1, Filozofski fakultet, Novi Sad, 289-311.

36. Španović, Svetlana, Mara Đukić (2010), ″Personalna integracija u timskoj nastavi kao faktor demokratizacije obrazovanja″, u: Olivera Gajić (ur.), *Evropske dimenzije promena obrazovnog sistema u Srbiji*, Zbornik radova, knjiga 6, Filozofski fakultet, Novi Sad, 53-72.

37. Thomas, Gary (1992), *Effective classroom teamwork. Support or intrusion?*, Routledge, New York, NY

38. Vangrieken, Katrien, Filip Raes, Elisabeth Dochy, Eva Kyndt (2015), ″Teacher collaboration: A systematic review″, *Educational Research Review*, 15, 17-40.

39. Vasilijević, Danijela, Gordana Stepić (2016), ″Team teaching – opportunities and challenges″, *Proceedings of the Faculty of Teacher Education Užice*, 19(18), 19-32.

40. Vasilijević, Danijela, Novak Laketa, Jelena Stamatović (2013), ″Uticaj timske nastave na stvaralačka znanja učenika″, *Teme*, 2, 611-630.

PLANIRANJE, REALIZACIJIA I VREDNOVANJE TIMSKE NASTAVE: PERSPEKTIVA UČITELJA

Sažetak:

Timska nastava je složen nastavni sistem koji oslikava kulturu škole zasnovanu na međusobnoj saradnji i uzajamnom deljenju. Cilj istraživanja je sagledavanje zastupljenosti timske nastave u prvom ciklusu osnovnog obrazovanja i vaspitanja, kao i prednosti i teškoća prilikom njenog planiranja, realizacije i vrednovanja, iz perspektive učitelja. Uzorak istraživanja činilo je ukupno 120, od čega 104 učitelja koji imaju iskustvo u timskoj nastavi. Podaci su prikupljeni pomoću anketnog upitnika. Za obradu prikupljenih odgovora korišćen je metod analize sadržaja. Rezultati su pokazali da učitelji najčešće učestvuju u timskom planiranju i pripremanju, povremeno u timskoj realizaciji i sporadično u timskom vrednovanju nastave. Veliki broj poztivnih karakteristika učitelji su izneli o timskoj realizaciji nastave, dok za timsko planiranje i pripremanje iznose veliki broj problema. Vrednovanjem timske nastave učitelji se gotovo i ne bave. Prednosti timskog planiranja sagledavaju kroz bogatstvo ideja za nastavu i pripremnje nastavnih sadržaja, a nedostatke kroz organizaciono-tehničke probleme i teškoće u funkcionisanju tima. Prednosti timske realizacije vide u mogućnostima profesionalnog razvoja, u kvalitetnijem oblikovanju nastavnog procesa i kvalitetnijem učenju učenika, dok su nedostaci iskazani u organizaciono-tehničkom domenu i neposrednom radu sa učenicima. Planiranje i pripremanje timske nastave učitelji uglavnom sagledavaju u odnosu na sebe, a realizaciju timske nastave pretežno u odnosu na učenike. Stvaranje uslova za efikasno i efektivno planiranje i pripremanje timske nastave je osnovni preduslov za primenu ovog nastavnog sistema, prema perspektivi učitelja.

Ključne reči: timska nastava; učitelji; planiranje; priprema; realizacija i evaluacija timske nastave

Adrese autorica
Authors' address

Gordana M. Stepić
State University of Novi Pazar
Department of Philosophical Sciences and Art
gstepic@np.ac.rs

Daliborka R. Popović
University of Priština in Kosovska Mitrovica
Teacher Education Faculty
daliborka.popovic@pr.ac.rs