International Journal of Education & the Arts

Editors

Christopher M. Schulte
University of Arkansas

Kristine Sunday
Old Dominion University

Peter Webster
University of Southern California

Eeva Anttila
University of the Arts Helsinki

Mei-Chun Lin
National University of Tainan

Teamplayers: CO4-teaching in Arts Education in Primary Education

Melissa Bremmer
Amsterdam University of the Arts, The Netherlands

Ellen van Hoek
Amsterdam University of the Arts, The Netherlands

Abstract

This article describes the qualitative study of the redesigning of a course based on the Canadian "4CO-teaching method" for student teachers. This method consists of four different phases of co-teaching: co-design, co-execution, co-debriefing, and co-reflection. Through this way of co-teaching, student teachers in both primary education and in arts education (theatre, dance, and visual arts) were taught how to design arts lessons for primary education together, how to carry them out as a couple, and how to jointly reflect on their lessons. The course, called "Teamplayers", aimed to teach these student teachers how to complement their knowledge and skills during the designing and teaching of arts lessons and, thus, enhance the quality of arts education.

This research study evaluated the design of Teamplayers and the students' experience with the method of 4CO-teaching with the aim of improving the course.

Introduction

In recent years, there has been international debate on what should be considered quality arts education, with discussions centring around how, what, and who contributes to that quality (Bamford, 2006; Russell-Bowie, 2012, 2013; Seidel, Tishman, Winner, Hetland, & Palmer, 2009; Wiggins & Wiggins, 2008). In the Netherlands, this debate is still very much alive and focuses specifically on the quality of arts education in *primary* education. The questions raised in this debate by (arts) educators, policymakers, and researchers involve what arts education should be, what the content should be, and how it could be taught. One of the more strongly debated themes is about *who* actually is capable of teaching arts education: the generalist teacher in primary education or the specialist arts teacher (Cultural Participation Fund, 2012, 2018; Haanstra, Van Heusden, Hoogeveen, & Schönau, 2014; Van den Bulk & Beemster, 2017).

Currently, when it comes to teaching arts education, primary schools in the Netherlands are free to work with either generalist or specialist teachers. Both types of teachers are qualified to teach "Arts Orientation", a compulsory subject area in Dutch primary education. The overall goal of this subject area is to acquaint pupils with artistic and cultural aspects of their living environment and to learn to express themselves through artistic means. Yet, whether a generalist teacher can or a specialist arts teacher should teach "Arts Orientation", is being critically discussed. For several years, the Dutch Education Council (2012) has questioned the professionality of generalist teachers in primary education regarding arts education and has recommended professionalisation. Moreover, some of the generalist teachers express that they do not feel confident, lack sufficient content knowledge, and are not well enough equipped to teach quality arts education (National Centre of Expertise for Cultural Education and Amateur Arts, 2017; Nooij, De Graauw, Van Essen, & Van Den Broek, 2018; Van den Bulk & Beemster, 2016). Less prominent in the discussion is the role of arts teachers, although their expertise for teaching in primary education has been questioned, too (Schutte, Minnema, & Bremmer, 2016; Wervers & Van Miert, 2016). Arts academies in the Netherlands have their own teacher training programmes for arts teachers, but they are mainly trained as all-round arts teachers (Bremmer, 2015). Even though these teachers may have sufficient content knowledge, they could lack pedagogical skills that are needed specifically for primary education (Bremmer, 2015; Schutte, Minnema, & Bremmer, 2016; Wervers & Van Miert, 2016).

To overcome the perceived problems of *both* generalist teachers and specialist arts teachers, the Dutch National Centre of Expertise for Cultural Education and Amateur Arts (Van den Bulk & Beemster, 2016) and scholars of the nationally developed "Quality Framework for Arts Orientation" (Haanstra et al., 2014) have advised "co-teaching" to enhance the quality of arts education in primary education. Haanstra et al. (2014) note that co-teaching can lead to quality arts education because the expertise of two domains (primary education and arts education) can complement and strengthen each other. During co-teaching a generalist teacher and a specialist arts teacher partner for the purpose of jointly delivering an arts lesson. During this process, the teachers purposefully draw on their different knowledge and skills (Van Hoek & Herfs, 2017). As such, co-teaching does not stress the perceived *deficits* of generalist teachers (lack of confidence, skills, and content knowledge) or specialist teachers (lack of pedagogical skills for primary education), but draws on their *strengths*.

The teacher trainers of the teachers' training courses in drama, visual art, and dance education at the Amsterdam University of the Arts and of the teachers' training courses in primary education at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences recognised both the described strengths and deficits in their students: the primary education student teachers (generalists) were strong in pedagogy but showed a lack of confidence and skills in teaching arts education, whereas the student arts teachers (specialists) were strong in content knowledge but gained relative little experience in pedagogical skills for primary education during their teacher training course. Therefore, for the first time, the teacher trainers of the different universities decided to jointly design a course based on co-teaching. The aim of the course was to have student arts teachers work together with primary education student teachers in designing, executing, and reflecting on arts lessons. Through the course, these generalist and specialist students would learn to combine their distinct knowledge and skills during the designing and teaching of arts lessons and would be able to develop a shared language about teaching and learning in the arts. Together, these different aspects might lead to a better quality of arts education.

In this article, we take a closer look at the theoretical underpinnings of the design of the course "Teamplayers", which centers on co-teaching, peer learning and boundary crossing. Furthermore, we will discuss the research methodology for evaluating this course and the findings that could lead to its improvement.

Theoretical Underpinnings of "Teamplayers"

Co-teaching. The method of co-teaching originated in the 1960s but received renewed interest at the end of the twentieth century when classrooms in the United Kingdom and North America became more inclusive (Cook & Friend, 1995). At the time, teachers felt they lacked specialised knowledge for an inclusive classroom and could not meet the needs of all their

pupils (Cook & Friend, 1995). As a result, a plethora of collaborative working forms came into practice between teachers with different areas of expertise, with the central aim of organising, teaching, and assessing inclusive classrooms together (Aldabas, 2018; Cook & Friend, 1995). One of those collaborative working forms was co-teaching (Aldabas, 2018). Within inclusive classrooms, co-teaching was – and still is – often performed by a generalist teacher and a specialist teacher who, by combining their knowledge, create a new working environment aimed to enhance pupils' performance (Aldabas, 2018). By now, co-teaching has become more common and can be implemented at all educational levels, although it is used mostly in primary and secondary education (Nierengarten & Hughes, 2010).

In the course "Teamplayers", the arts and primary education student teachers were taught the principles of a specific form of co-teaching, namely "4CO-teaching". Developed by the Canadian educationalist, Planche (2012), it offers a *systematic* way of collaborating and making both teachers equally and fully responsible for the process of teaching. The concept of 4CO-teaching is based on a teaching cycle which exists of four distinct phases: co-design, co-execution, co-debriefing, and co-reflection (Sharratt & Planche, 2016). During the phase of co-design, teachers from different domains formulate a learning question for a particular teaching situation. Based on this learning question, the teachers design a lesson. During the phase of co-execution, the teachers jointly deliver a lesson, drawing on their different knowledge and skills, thus sharing the responsibility for the lesson. During the phase of co-debriefing, the experiences of the lesson and the learning outcomes of both pupils and teachers are discussed. Finally, during co-reflection, there is a deeper reflection on the whole of the lesson design, the execution, and the outcomes. This reflection is the starting point for a new cycle of 4CO-teaching (Sharratt & Planche, 2016).

Peer learning. In the course "Teamplayers", the choice was made for students to experience 4CO-teaching through peer learning. Peer learning can be defined as "the acquisition of knowledge and skill through active helping and supporting among status equals or matched companions" (Topping, 2005, p. 631). Peer learning seems to add a different quality to learning compared to learning in an unequal relationship (Boud, 1999; Boud, Cohen, & Sampson, 2013; Topping, 2005). Topping (2005) notes that a trusting relationship with a peer who holds no position of authority could elicit the self-disclosure of feelings of incompetency or misconception, enabling subsequent feedback, help, or correction. Furthermore, through dialogue, peers can discuss their ideas, scaffold each other's thinking and learning process, give alternative perspectives, and distribute their collective knowledge (Gardiner & Robinson, 2009).

Although peer learning always has been an informal part of learning in higher education, it can be organised in such a way that it becomes a more formal part of the student's learning

process (Boud et al., 2013). For instance, the process of co-teaching offers a systematic possibility for peer learning. The underlying idea of peer learning during "Teamplayers" was that it could challenge student teachers to communicate their distinct knowledge about teaching and learning, and to experience constant and mutual feedback in a safe environment (Birrell & Bullough, 2005).

Boundary crossing. During the course "Teamplayers", a primary education student teacher and an arts education student teacher worked together to teach arts education in primary education. One assumption was that these students had developed different and complementary knowledge in their domain, which combined, could improve the design and execution of arts lessons. To be able to work together, these students did have to cross the boundary of their own domain and, in part, enter the unfamiliar territory of the other's domain (Tsui & Law, 2007). The educational researchers Akkerman and Bakker (2011, 2012) have found that crossing boundaries can elicit a learning process, and they identified four learning mechanisms that occur during boundary crossing (Akkerman & Bakker, 2011, 2012): 1) identification - gaining new insights into how different practices differ from each other; 2) coordination - using new or alternative means and procedures to enable effective coordination between practices; 3) reflection - definition and exchange of perspectives from different practices; and 4) transformation - forming new practices or identities. Interestingly, Akkerman and Bakker (2011) note that boundary crossing should not be seen as "a process of moving from initial diversity and multiplicity to homogeneity and unity but rather as a process of establishing continuity in a situation of sociocultural difference" (p. 5). Thus, the aim of 4CO-teaching was not for the students to develop the *same* expertise but to complement, understand, and use each other's knowledge and skills in a meaningful way, and to develop a shared language about arts education.

The concepts of 4CO-Teaching, Peer Learning, and Boundary Crossing Applied in the Course "Teamplayers"
The design of the course "Teamplayers" was based on the concepts of co-teaching, peer learning, and boundary crossing. Students participated in the course on voluntary basis that consisted of two European Credits (totalling 56 hours of education). Its main goals are described in Table 1.

Table 1

Main goals "Teamplayers"

- As a couple, students create an inspiring and artistic learning environment for their pupils.
- As a couple, students formulate learning objectives for their four arts lessons, describe the classroom activities per lesson, and structure the four lessons in a coherent way.
- Students execute the four lessons as a pair and determine their roles according to the principles of 4CO-teaching.

The course consisted of ten sessions. During the first session, students were introduced to 4CO-teaching and the couples that would work together were formed (eleven specialists consisting of four visual art, four theatre, and three dance student teachers were each paired with a primary education student teacher). During the second session, the student teachers visited each other's universities and demonstrated their arts educational practices: they showcased their arts lessons and projects but also visited the art studios at the teacher training course for visual art education. During the third session the couples visited their internship school and started *co-designing* their four lessons (varying between 45 minutes to 90 minutes per lesson) in the discipline in which the arts student teacher was trained. *Co-designing* the lessons was the main activity of the fourth session, supervised by teacher trainers of both universities. The fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth sessions consisted of *co-executing* the four arts lessons. A teacher trainer visited at least one of these lessons. To facilitate the *co-debriefing* after each lesson, the teacher trainers offered the student teachers the choice between two formats for reflection. They could either complete a structured written reflection developed by the teacher trainers or they could structure their own short video reflection. During the ninth session, the couples *co-reflected* on parts of the video recordings of their arts lessons and prepared a presentation about their experiences with 4CO-teaching. In the final session, the student couples gave these presentations to the teacher trainers and other students of the same discipline. Finally, the students from each university formulated their key findings and presented these to the whole group.

Methodology. Aim of the study. The goal of this research study was to evaluate the design and students' experiences of "Teamplayers", and to gain insight into the perceived learning outcomes of the participating students. At a local level, this study aims to provide information for improving the course for the following academic year. Taking a broader outlook, it aims to be relevant for (arts) educational institutes beyond the Netherlands who want to develop a similar course and to understand its theoretical background and possible learning outcomes. In this study the following three questions were addressed:

- How do the student teachers experience the design of "Teamplayers" and what recommendations would they make to improve the course?
- What do student teachers learn by designing, carrying out, and reflecting on arts lessons according to the method of 4CO-teaching?
- What do students learn when designing, carrying out, and reflecting on arts lessons according to the method of 4CO-teaching in the perception of the teacher trainers from the Amsterdam University of the Arts and the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences?

Research design. This research study was set up as qualitative evaluation research. Within this type of research, the purpose is to evaluate the impact of an intervention, such as a newly developed educational programme (Calidoni-Lundberg, 2006). Through qualitative methods e.g. interviews and observations, researchers explore how the intervention was perceived by different groups and individuals (Calidoni-Lundberg, 2006; Powell, 2006). The results of the research are used to modify or adapt a programme to enhance the success of its design (Calidoni-Lundberg, 2006).

With regard to the participants, all teacher trainers and students involved in "Teamplayers" took part in this research study: two teacher trainers of the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences (one female visual arts teacher trainer and one male teacher trainer theatre and dance), four teacher trainers from the Amsterdam University of the Arts (one male teacher from the dance academy, one female teacher from the visual arts academy and two female teachers from the academy of theatre), eleven arts education student teachers (four female visual art student teachers, four female theatre student teachers, one female and two male dance student teachers) and eleven female primary education student teachers from the related institutes. These students came from various years of their four-year Bachelor programmes. Concerning the ethics, all of the teacher trainers and students consented to taking part in the research study.

Research methods. To evaluate the student teachers' experiences with the design and their perceived learning outcomes of "Teamplayers", all twenty-two student teachers had to write a reflection report at the end of the course, based on open questions formulated by the researcher in cooperation with the teacher trainers. These questions were:

- How did you experience the four phases of 4CO-teaching?
- What have you learned about the teaching practice of your duo-partner?
- What are your overall learning outcomes of "Teamplayers"?
- What are your recommendations for improving "Teamplayers" next year?

Semi-structured interviews were carried out at the end of the course to gain insight into each of the teacher trainer's perceived learning outcomes of the students. Each interview lasted approximately one to one and a half hours, was audiotaped and transcribed verbatim. The main questions of these interviews were:

- Which learning outcomes of the students did you perceive during the four phases of 4CO-teaching (co-design, co-execution, co-debriefing, co-reflection)?
- Which results did you perceive in the classroom (e.g. the roles and the division of the teaching tasks, the applied teaching methods)?
- How did you perceive the process of boundary crossing (e.g. the development of a shared language, the use of complementary teaching methods, using each other's knowledge and skills)?

The researcher made observations of the student teachers and teacher trainers throughout different sessions of the course to be able to triangulate the findings of the students' reflection reports and the teacher trainers' interviews. The researcher observed the explanation of 4CO-teaching and the formation of the couples during the first two sessions. Furthermore, three arts lessons of different couples were observed (teaching the disciplines visual arts, dance, or theatre), with observations focusing on the cooperation between the two student teachers: their roles and the division of the teaching tasks, the applied teaching methods, the mutual consultation during the lesson, and the co-debriefing afterwards. The final session in which the student teachers reflected on their learning outcomes was observed too.

Data analysis. Deductive thematic coding was applied to identify themes in the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). During this process, the coding is mainly aided through a pre-existing thematic framework (Bremmer, 2015). The main themes of the pre-existing thematic framework for coding the reflection reports were: experience four phases 4CO-teaching, working together as a team (boundary crossing), perceived learning outcomes, and recommendations. The pre-existing framework for coding the interviews of the teacher trainers was similar: perceived learning outcomes of the students during the four phases of 4CO-teaching, results in the classroom, and working together as a team (boundary crossing). In line with the ideas of Braun and Clarke (2006) regarding analysis within qualitative research, the keyness of a theme was not necessarily dependent on quantifiable measures but on whether it captured important information that could shed light on the design and possible improvement of "Teamplayers".

Findings: Students' experiences with the four phases of 4CO-teaching. In general, the findings of the reflection reports showed that the students' experience with 4CO-teaching was positive, or as a visual arts student exclaimed, "I thought it was an incredibly special and

exciting project!" Looking more specifically at the phase of *co-design,* in the process of 4CO-teaching, students noted that, although they designed the four arts lessons together, they reported that the arts education student teacher mostly provided the artistic content of the lessons and the primary education student teacher formulated learning goals and structured the lesson activities.

As for the phase of *co-execution*, students described this as a process of trial and error. They observed that during the teaching process they had to adapt the content of their lessons from too many activities to fewer ones, or had to alter non-coherent learning activities to a more coherent and suitable content. A primary education student teacher teaching dance remarked: "In advance we had made an extensive lesson plan together. During the lessons it became clear that we had too many activities. This class is not the easiest group, the pupils need a lot of clarity and structure". Concerning the process of teaching, they remarked that it felt like a reciprocal process in which they supported and provided each other with feedback. They also felt that together they were better able to find adequate solutions for classroom problems and had a better sense of what was happening in the classroom. Overall, students felt stronger as a couple, because they could draw on each other's expertise. Students did feel, however, that by the time they had gotten used to teaching together, their four lessons had already finished. It took time, according to the students, to fluently share instructional responsibilities.

With regard to the phase of *co-debriefing*, students described they often only reported their direct impressions and feelings about the taught lessons and felt the format for the written reflection did not help them enough in making the most out of this phase. Some students, however, noted they benefited from making video reflections as a form of co-debriefing as suggested by the teacher trainers. Lastly, students remarked they experienced *co-reflecting* as a smooth process but one visual arts student teacher noted that peers could have been more critical towards each other: "Reflecting went really easy, and we were able to talk about the lesson and how things had gone. For instance, we gave each other suggestions for improvement and compliments. But perhaps we should have reflected more critically on each other".

Students' experiences with boundary crossing. First of all, from the observations and the reflection reports it became clear that the couples varied in the way they divided their roles and responsibilities during co-teaching. Some taught together simultaneously, whilst others divided the teaching of activities beforehand. Again, others started the first lessons with a strict division and then let the role division emerge more organically during the last lessons. Students did feel they had to learn to find a balance when it came to using each other's expertise and allowing themselves to enter the domain of the other. A visual arts student teacher remarked: "[during the lessons] we equally divided the theoretical and visual arts

assignments. So, half of the time we could rely on our personal expertise and, the other half of time, we had to teach in a way that was more unknown to us".

Secondly, from the observations it became clear that couples worked hard to create a safe and structured, yet artistic learning environment for their pupils. The primary education student teachers seemed to focus on classroom management, and the arts education student teachers on the artistic learning process. A primary education student teacher teaching theatre observed: "I tended to focus on classroom order. However, J. [theatre student teacher] actually felt that a loss of classroom structure was something fruitful: chaos may well mean pupils are busy with exploration". Students reported they had to search for a balance between order and clear lesson goals on the one side, and trying to maintain a learning environment suited to arts lessons with room for pupils' self-expression and exploration, on the other side.

Thirdly, student teachers noted that understanding each other's professional language was not a substantial problem, with the exception of a few domain-specific words. A theatre student teacher explained: "In the beginning, there were quite a few terms we used with our theatre faculty that the primary education student teachers don't use. […] But after the first few sessions [of the course] this was hardly a problem anymore".

Students' perceived learning outcomes. The analysis of the reflection reports showed that the primary education student teachers and arts education student teachers described different learning outcomes of "Teamplayers". In general, primary education student teachers reported they had learned to allow for a more open lesson structure for arts lessons, giving pupils more freedom. These students also remarked they *now* felt they did not necessarily need to have a lot of expertise in the domain of the arts to be able to carry out an arts lesson. Furthermore, the students who had formed a couple with a theatre or dance student teacher noted they had learned to use less verbal instruction and had relied more on learning by doing. A primary education student who was teaching together with a theatre student explained: "Through the video reflections we realised we were talking too much. We had to talk less, the pupils had to do more!"

The arts education student teachers noted they had learned to consciously formulate learning goals for their lessons, and had learned that structure and classroom order can be functional in primary arts education. However, they also remarked that there should be enough space for exploration and "structured" chaos.

Students' recommendations for improving the course "Teamplayers". In the reflection report and the last reflection session of the course, the students voiced several recommendations for the improvement of "Teamplayers". For instance, before starting the phase of *co-design*, the

student teachers needed to make an assessment of the level of their pupils. As all arts lessons were carried out in the internship classrooms of the primary education student teachers, who had started teaching there a few weeks earlier, this assessment was performed by these students. Many arts education student teachers remarked this created an unequal starting point: they simply knew the (level of the) pupils less well than their partners. Therefore, these students recommended allowing for more time to get to know the pupils they would be teaching. The students also preferred to have more time during the phase of *co-designing*, with more supervision of the teacher trainers to help them understand and use each other's knowledge. During the phase of *co-execution*, the students reported that teaching four lessons together was too little. As soon as the co-teaching started to become more organic, the lessons had ended. They recommended extending the amount of lessons to be taught and giving more time to adjust to each other. The students highly appreciated *co-reflecting* with their peers who had taught in the same art discipline. However, they recommended that this phase should take place earlier in the course to be able to apply the feedback they received in their subsequent lessons.

Teacher trainers' perceived learning outcomes of 4CO-teaching and boundary crossing. The findings of the semi-structured interviews showed the teacher trainers partially found different learning outcomes for the different student groups. With regard to the primary education student teachers, the teacher trainers found they had learned that arts lessons could be less tightly structured to be able to facilitate pupils' exploration and to enable pupils to actively contribute to the lessons. Furthermore, the teacher trainers observed these students had learned to demand more of their pupils, amongst others by pacing the lesson at a higher tempo. A theatre teacher trainer explained, "they really felt […] that they could 'up' the tempo of the lesson. And then the pupils have to start working harder". Within the visual arts lessons, the teacher trainers found these students had widened their use of (more complex) materials and techniques (e.g. lino cutting) and had expanded the way they use materials (e.g. encouraging pupils to draw on larger paper). Finally, the teacher trainers found these students had developed more self-confidence to carry out an arts lesson.

Concerning the arts education student teachers, the teacher trainers found these students had learned to structure a lesson better, improved their classroom management, and had learned that classroom management does not necessarily impede the creativity of pupils. The teacher trainers also observed these students had learned to see arts learning as an integral part of the school curriculum. In line with this observation, the teachers noted these students had learned that schools can work from a specific pedagogical orientation or from themes, which can influence the choices, made for an arts lesson.

Looking at the overarching learning outcomes for both groups of students, the teacher trainers voiced most students had gained an understanding and respect for each other's field of expertise. The theatre teacher trainer noted that prejudices towards each other had disappeared. She found that both student groups – before they embarked on the course – had prejudices, e.g. "primary education teachers are afraid to be creative or artistic" and "arts education students are not realistic". According to the teacher trainers, collaborating with a student coming from a different expertise made students more aware of the strengths and weaknesses of their own pedagogical approach.

Conclusion and discussion. In line with the goal of 4CO-teaching, both student groups experienced learned that they could draw on their expertise: primary education student teachers on their expertise concerning lesson planning and classroom management and the arts education student teachers on their expertise regarding artistic learning processes. Furthermore, students experienced the co-execution of their lessons as a reciprocal process in which they supported each other and felt free to provide each other with feedback. These findings connect to the idea that peer learning allows for more disclosure of feelings of incompetency, enabling feedback, and help from a peer (Topping, 2005). However, the students also remarked that in the first lessons teaching together – who teaches what and when – was a process of trial and error. According to Chitiyo (2017), teachers who are less experienced with co-teaching might encounter conflicts with regard to instructional responsibilities or decision-making. In "Teamplayers", more conscious attention could be given to students' roles and instructional responsibilities during co-debriefing, possibly making this phase more meaningful for students too.

As for boundary crossing, Gulikers and Oonk (2016) mention that learning does not automatically happen when students with different backgrounds simply work together. 4CO-teaching seems to be a structured way to activate boundary crossing because students have to actively draw on their different areas of expertise throughout all four phases. With regard to the learning mechanisms of boundary crossing, students and teachers only referred to its first three learning mechanisms (Akkerman & Bakker, 2011). Concerning "Identification", students and teachers observed that students had encountered alternative views on education (e.g. structured lessons versus freedom in lessons, or verbal instruction versus learning by doing). Collaborating with a student from a different educational background made them more aware of the nature of their *own* pedagogical approach. Regarding "Coordination", students remarked they had to search for a balance between classroom order and room for pupils' exploration, and learned to coordinate these seemingly opposing goals. Regarding "Reflection", teacher-trainers observed most students had gained an understanding and respect for each other's expertise. However, "Teamplayers" was possibly too short to be able to reach

the learning outcomes of the fourth learning mechanism "Transformation", in which the forming of new practices or identities is central.

As for the learning outcomes, the three main learning goals of "Teamplayers" were achieved in the perception of both students and teachers. It must be said, though, that the *first* goal (students create an inspiring and artistic learning environment for their pupils) was mainly a challenge for primary education students, and the *second* goal (students formulate learning objectives for their four arts lessons, describe the classroom activities per lesson, and structure the four lessons in a coherent way), was a challenge for arts education students.

Concerning the improvement of "Teamplayers", one of the main recommendations was to have more time – at least one or two sessions more – during the phase of co-designing, with more supervision from teacher trainers. Gulikers and Oonk (2016) mention that supervision is important to optimise learning through boundary crossing. A supervisor can help students to make their personal distinct knowledge and their partner's explicit. Discovering each other's knowledge is necessary to be able to learn and to make use of it. A second main recommendation was to extend the amount of taught arts lessons. Learning to coordinate roles and instructional responsibilities during co-teaching is not necessarily easy (Chitiyo, 2017). Teachers need enough time to be able to figure out how roles and responsibilities can be divided best to make collaboration more fluent. Thus, extending the amount of lessons from four to a minimum of six seems a fruitful recommendation to enhance the collaboration. A third main recommendation was that *co-reflection* should take place earlier in the course to be able to apply the feedback the students received in their subsequent lessons. Indeed, Hattie and Yates (2014) note when students feel they have received feedback too late in their learning process, it loses relevance for them. To enhance the relevance of co-reflection, it could be applied during the execution of the individual lessons, not after the series of lessons.

The last issue discussed in this article, is that of quality, the reason why "Teamplayers" came into existence. As mentioned in the introduction, Haanstra et al. (2014) hypothesised co-teaching could lead to quality arts education because the expertise of two domains could complement and strengthen each other. In the perception of students and teacher trainers this was certainly the case: students felt they could draw on each other's expertise and, as such, they felt stronger as a couple. Although this can be seen as a positive outcome, two issues in relation to quality remain. The first issue is whether the actual performance of *pupils* was enhanced – one of the main purposes of 4CO-teaching. From the researcher's observations, it became clear that most of the students' attention was geared towards learning to teach together, and less attention was spent on the pupils' performance. Remarkably, the focus of the teacher trainers was geared towards the learning process of the students, too. As such, based on the cyclic idea of 4CO-teaching it would be a recommendation to do two cycles of

co-teaching: during the first cycle students can get used to teaching together, supervised by the teacher trainers. The following cycle, students and teacher trainers can focus on the enhancement of pupils' performance. Secondly, the teacher trainers realised at the end of the course, that they had not jointly formulated what they considered to be "quality" arts education and each had different perceptions of the quality of the taught arts lessons. Therefore, a recommendation would be to jointly discuss what the teacher trainers consider to be "quality arts education", to make it explicit to their students, to allow them to discuss it, and if necessary, to review it.

Taking the recommendations of this research study into consideration, 4CO-teaching in arts education holds a fruitful possibility for students to experience co-teaching in depth before entering the field of education as professionals and to help improve the quality of arts education.

References

Akkerman, S.F., & Bakker, A. (2011). Boundary crossing and boundary objects. *Review of Educational Research*, *81*(2), 132-169.

Akkerman, S.F., & Bakker, A. (2012). Het leerpotentieel van grenzen: "Boundary crossing" binnen en tussen organisaties. *Opleiding en Ontwikkeling*, *25*(1), 15-19.

Aldabas, R.A. (2018). Co-teaching in classrooms: Literature review of teachers' perspective, readiness, and knowledge. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *9*(9), 156-161.

Bamford, A. (2006). *The wow factor. Global research compendium on the impact of the arts in education*. Münster, Germany: Waxmann.

Birrell, J.R., & Bullough R.V. (2005). Teaching with a peer: A follow-up study of the 1st year of teaching. *Action in Teacher Education*, *27*(1), 72-81.

Boud, D. (1999). Situating academic development in professional work: Using peer learning. *The International Journal for Academic Development*, *4*(1), 3-10.

Boud, D., Cohen, R., & Sampson, J. (2013). Peer learning and assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *24*(4), 413-426.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101.

Bremmer, M. (2015). *What the body knows about teaching music: The specialist preschool music teacher's pedagogical content knowing regarding teaching and learning rhythm skills viewed from an embodied cognition perspective* (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of Exeter, Exeter, UK.

Calidoni-Lundberg, F. (2006). *Evaluation: definitions, methods and models*. Östersund, Sweden: Swedish Institute for Growth Policy Studies.

Chitiyo, J. (2017). Challenges to the use of co-teaching by teachers. *International Journal of Whole Schooling*, *13*(3), 55-66.

Cook, L., & Friend, M. (1995). Co-teaching: Guidelines for creating effective practices. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, *28*(3), 1-12.

Cultural Participation Fund (2018). *Beleidsplan 2017-2020 [Policy 2017-2020]*. Utrecht, The Netherlands: Fonds voor Cultuur Participatie.

Cultural Participation Fund (2012). *Beleidsplan 2013-2016 [Policy 2013-2016]*. Utrecht, The Netherlands: Fonds voor Cultuur Participatie.

Education Council (2012). *Cultuureducatie: leren, creëren, inspireren! [Culture education: learn, create, inspire!]* Den Haag, The Netherlands: Onderwijsraad.

Gardiner, W., & Robinson, K.S. (2009). Paired field placements: A means for collaboration. *The New Educator*, *5*(1), 81-94.

Gulikers, J.T.M., & Oonk, C. (2016). Boundary crossing in regioleren: Actief ondersteunen van student-stakeholder samenwerking. [Boundary crossing in regional learning: actively supervising student-stakeholder collaboration]. In A. Bakker, I. Zitter, S. Beausaert, & E. de Bruijn (Eds.). *Het leerpotentieel van grenzen: Opleiden en professionaliseren in de beroepspraktijk* (pp. 226-246). Assen, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Van Gorcum.

Haanstra, F., Heusden, B. van, Hoogeveen, K., & Schönau, D. (2014). *Kader "Kwaliteit kunstzinnige oriëntatie primair onderwijs"*. Utrecht, The Netherlands: Sardes.

Hattie, J.A.C., & Yates, G. (2014). *Visible learning and the science of how we learn*. London, UK: Routledge.

National Centre of Expertise for Cultural Education and Amateur Arts (2017). *Basis for Cultural Education. Guide for the future of school-based and extracurricular cultural education.* Utrecht, The Netherlands: LKCA.

Nierengarten, G.M., & Hughes, T. (2010). What teachers wish administrators knew about co-teaching in high schools. *Electronic Journal for Inclusive Education*, *2*(6). Retrieved from https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/ejie/vol2/iss6/9/

Nooij, J., de Graauw, C., van Essen, M., & van den Broek, A. (2018). *Monitor cultuureducatie primair onderwijs 2017-2018. Onderzoek naar de landelijke ontwikkelingen in cultuureducatie sinds 2015-2016 en in relatie tot het programma cultuureducatie met kwaliteit.* Nijmegen, The Netherlands: ResearchNed i.s.m. Onderzoeksbureau Claudia De Graauw.

Planche, B. (2012). *4C's – Practising together changes practice*. Paper presented at the International Association of Technology, Education and Development Conference (INTED), Valencia, Spain.

Powell, R.R. (2006). Evaluation research: An overview. *Library Trends*, *55*(1), 102-120.

Russell-Bowie, D.E. (2012). Developing preservice primary teachers' confidence and competence in arts education using principles of authentic learning. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *37*(1), 60-74.

Russell-Bowie, D.E. (2013). What? Me? Teach dance? Background and confidence of primary preservice teachers in dance education across five countries. *Research in Dance Education*, *14*(3), 216-232.

Schutte, L., Minnema, W., & Bremmer, M. (2016). *Muziekeducatie doen we samen* [Carrying out music education together]. Amsterdam. The Netherlands: NPNDrukkers.

Seidel, S., Tishman, S., Winner, E., Hetland, L., & Palmer, P. (2009) *The qualities of quality. Understanding excellence in arts education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Project Zero.

Sharratt, L., & Planche, B. (2016). *Leading collaborative learning: Empowering excellence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Topping, K. J. (2005). Trends in peer learning. *Educational Psychology*, *25*(6), 631-645.

Tsui, A.B.M., & Law, D.Y.K. (2007). Learning as boundary-crossing in school-university partnership. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, *23*(8), 1289-1301.

Van den Bulk, L., & Beemster, C. (2016). *Review Cultuureducatie met Kwaliteit. Diverse onderzoeken rond cultuureducatie en Cultuureducatie met Kwaliteit 2015-2016 [Review Culture education with quality. Different research studies in relation to culture education and Culture Education with Quality]*. Utrecht, The Netherlands: LKCA.

Van Hoek, E. & Herfs, J. (2017). *Met meer handen meer music* [With more hands more music]. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Lectoraat Kunsteducatie, Amsterdamse Hogeschool voor de kunsten.

Wervers, E., & Van Miert, M. (2016). *De kunstvakdocent in het PO [The specialist arts teacher in primary education]*. Utrecht, The Netherlands: LKCA.

Wiggins, R.A., & Wiggins, J. (2008). Primary music education in the absence of specialists. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 9(12). Retrieved from http://www.ijea.org/v9n12/.

About the Authors

Melissa Bremmer is Professor Arts Education at the Amsterdam University of the Arts, the Netherlands. Bremmer completed her Bachelor in Music Education degree at the Conservatory of Amsterdam, her Master in Educational Science at the University of Amsterdam and she obtained her PhD at the University of Exeter. Her research focuses on embodied music teaching and learning, inclusion in music education and ArtsSciences education.

Ellen van Hoek graduated at the Conservatory of Amsterdam and obtained her Master in Arts Education at the Amsterdam University of the Arts, the Netherlands. Currently, she works as a researcher, musician and music teacher. As part of the Research Group Arts Education of the Amsterdam University of the Arts she published research on co-teaching, assessment in music education and music with elderly people.

Editor

Christopher M. Schulte
University of Arkansas

Co-Editors

Kristine Sunday
Old Dominion University

Mei-Chun Lin
National University of Tainan

Eeva Anttila
University of the Arts Helsinki

Tawnya Smith,
Boston University, U.S.A.

Managing Editors

Christine Liao
University of North Carolina Wilmington

Yenju Lin
Pennsylvania State University

Associate Editors

Shana Cinquemani
Rhode Island School of Design

Heather Kaplan
University of Texas El Paso

Christina Hanawalt
University of Georgia

Shari Savage
Ohio State University

David Johnson
Lund University

Tim Smith
Aalto University

Alexis Kallio
University of the Arts Helsinki

Deborah (Blair) VanderLinde
Oakland University

Advisory Board

Full List: http://www.ijea.org/editors.html#advisory