Correlational Teamwork in Secondary Schools: A Case of Musoma Municipality, Tanzania

Lazarus Ndiku Makewa, PhD[1], Baraka Manjale Ngussa[2]*, Simon Arego[2], Joshua Kuboja[2]
[1]Professor of Educational Communication and Technology, University of Eastern Africa, Baraton, Kenya
[2]Lecturers, School of Education, University of Arusha, Tanzania

*Corresponding Author:
Baraka Manjale Ngussa
Email: ngussathe5th@yahoo.com

Abstract: This study investigated correlational teamwork among Secondary Schools in Musoma Municipality using case study approach. A sample of 10 Secondary schools was randomly selected and 164 teachers, non-teaching staff and school leaders participated in the study by filling the questionnaire. Validity was established through expert judgment and reliability test yielded Cronbach's alpha of .863 for teamwork, .885 for morale of work, .866 for leadership and .875 for communication. Descriptive Statistics, ANOVA and Pearson product moment correlational coefficient were employed to analyse research questions. General mean score of school stakeholders in all aspects of teamwork was between 2.50 and 3.49, meaning they agreed that there is tem work in their schools. Statistics yielded a significant difference in perception of school leaders, teachers and non-teaching staff on teamwork, school leaders having significantly higher mean scores than teachers. Results also revealed a positive and strong relationship between teamwork and morale of work and leadership. Moderate and positive relationship was also found between teamwork and communication. Following these findings, it is recommended that schools under investigation need to enhance good leadership and strive to increase morale of work among school stakeholders in order to increase teamwork spirit.
Keywords: Teamwork, secondary schools, leadership, morale, communication, Tanzania

INTRODUCTION

Teamwork is a state of working together for the purpose of accomplishing set goals in organizations. While there are many variables which can propel proper organizational functioning, teamwork is a key factor that cannot be ignored[1-2]. While teamwork is regarded by management experts as an important factor in organizations, there is a broad consensus in the literature about its defining features. Katzenbach and Smith [3] stated that "... a team is a small number of people with complementary skills who are committed to a common purpose, performance goals, and approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable" (p 45). In addition, regular communication, coordination, distinctive roles, interdependent tasks and shared norms are important features[4-5].

While teamwork is an important ingredient in school operations, it is necessary for educational stakeholders to get acquainted with its correlates and how their mutual or complementary relationships can affect the process of educational leadership. This study sought to investigate teamwork with its correlates in the settings of secondary schools in Musoma Municipality, Tanzania. It sought to answer the following research questions which guided this study:

1. What is the general perception of school leaders, teachers, and support staff about teamwork?

2. Does the perception of teachers, non-teaching staff and school administrators differ significantly in regard to teamwork?

3. Is there significant relationship between teamwork and morale of work, leadership and communication?

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND STUDIES

Review of related literature and studies indicates the place of teamwork in school administration. Teams are social systems of two or more people that are embedded in an organization, whose members perceive themselves as such and are perceived as members by others, and who collaborate on a common task[6]. The total coordinated and cooperative efforts of people who are working together are named teamwork[7]. The advantages of teamwork are taken almost for granted, given the extensive coverage in recent education literature.

According to Cohen and Bailey[8], an employee team is a collection of individuals who are interdependent in the tasks and who share responsibility for the outcomes. Teams enable people to cooperate, enhance individual skills and provide constructive feedback without any conflict between individuals[9]. Teamwork is an important factor for smooth functioning of an organization and for strengthening

leadership. Furthermore, teamwork is necessary for all types of leadership, including school leadership[10]. Team members enhance the skills, knowledge and abilities while working in teams [11]. This enhancement brings about unity of purpose in any organizational leadership, school leadership included.

Organizational leadership, which emphasizes more on teams, has results in increased employee performance, greater productivity and better problem solving at work[8]. Bacon and Blyton [12] highlighted the two important factors i.e. self-management team and interpersonal team skills. These factors enhance the communication as well as interpersonal relationship between team members and also boost the employee performances. Teamwork is a significant tool of new type of work organization. Teamwork is a precise organizational measure that shows many different features in all types of organizational leadership, including schools[13].

Regarding professional and organizational development, teamwork in schools is often seen as a way to support organizational leadership processes, i.e. a simultaneous development of individual and organization[14-15]. The ideal is that the constructive experiences leaders acquire during team collaboration should improve school practice and become deeply rooted in the organizational actions[16].

Studies have indicated that collaboration in teams could be an important resource for workers' professional development and for improving performance[17-23].

Teamwork among school teams is important for several reasons: First, it makes teaching more than a process experienced by professionally isolated individuals in their respective classrooms. Secondly, it enables a professional growth process in which employees work together and share knowledge and expertise[24]. Team-based organizations are characterized by shared control; opportunities for participation based on knowledge; and enhanced autonomy that allows for better adaptability and continual adjustment[25]. Third, leadership has become more complex and sophisticated; therefore, effective leadership requires the synergy of employees from different points of view.

In schools, perceptions of team culture may be expressed as the basic assumptions, norms, values, and cultural artifacts that are shared by team members, who influence their functioning at school and play a significant role in enhancing school effectiveness[26]. Quinn's [27] model as applied to the school context reflects the extent to which: (a) the school vision is shared by the team members and they participate in decision making (b) the teachers plan their pedagogical activities according to the school vision in professional teams (c) the team members have an open attitude towards change and (d) the rules and regulations that characterize the school bureaucratic structure make the team members more bureaucratic in their behaviours.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed case study research design. Case study is explained by Ahuja [28] as a study of a case which may be an individual, an institution, a system, a community, an organization, an event or even the entire culture. It is an approach whereby individuals are studied in their natural environment. According to Mugenda and Mugenda [29], case study is viewed as an example of a class of events or a group of individuals. The study aimed to investigate on the correlates of teamwork in secondary schools located in Musoma Municipality. A sample of 10 out of 25 Secondary schools was randomly selected through systematic sampling procedures. A total of 164 teachers, non-teaching staff and school leaders filled the questionnaire, which was the only source of information. The questionnaire was self-constructed and validated by researchers.

Through expert judgment, the researchers looked into questionnaire items against research questions and subsequent hypotheses and adjusted them as deemed necessary before the actual data collection. Reliability test yielded Cronbach's alpha of .863 for teamwork, while that of morale of work was .885 and communication .878 as seen in Table 1.

Table 1: Reliability Results

SN	Variable In Question	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alfa
1	Teamwork	6	.863
2	Morale of Work	9	.885
3	School Leadership	6	.866
4	Communication	9	.878

Before actual data collection permission was sought from relevant authorities in Mara Region and Musoma Municipality. Upon receiving the permission, the researchers, with the help of one research.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section was guided by three research questions that guided this study.

What is the general perception of school leaders, teachers, and support staff about teamwork?

This research question was analyzed by Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) through Descriptive Statistics in order to determine general perception of school stakeholders on teamwork in their respective schools, as seen in Table 2. The mean score results were interpreted as follows: 3.50-4.00 = Strong Agreement , 2.50-3.49 = Agreement, 1.50-2.49 = Disagreement and 1.00-1.49 = Strong Disagreement. The findings in the Table indicate that the general mean score of respondents in all aspects of teamwork was between 2.50 and 3.49, meaning agreement.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Teamwork

SN	Item	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
1	There is good teamwork and cooperation in my school.	3.0671	.74415
2	School tasks are done collaboratively	3.0061	.69615
3	Employees cooperate with each other to get the job done	3.0188	.65849
4	There is cooperation between employees and school administration	2.9689	.77800
5	There is cooperation between teachers and non-teaching staff	3.1534	.83580
6	There is good working relationship between leaders and subordinates	2.9503	.73994

This means that teachers, non-teaching staff and school leaders generally agreed that there is good teamwork and cooperation in schools (M =3.0671, SD=.74415), school tasks are done collaboratively (M=3.0061, SD=.69615), employees cooperate with each other to get the job done (M=3.0188, SD=65849), there is cooperation between employees and school administration (M=2.9689, SD=.77800), there is cooperation between teachers and non-teaching staff (M=3.1534, SD=83580) and there is good working relationship between leaders and subordinates (M=2.9503, SD= 73994).

Is there is significant difference in perception of teamwork among school stakeholders categorized according to their position?

This research question called for testing of a null hypothesis which states*: There is no significant difference in the perception of teamwork among school stakeholders categorized according to their position.*

In answering this research question, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied. The sig of .014 in Table 3, which is lesser than the *p-value,* (.05) suggests a significant difference in perception of school leaders, teachers and non-teaching staff on teamwork. The mean score results for school stakeholders were interpreted as follows: 3.50-4.00 = Strong Agreement; 2.50-3.49 = Agreement; 1.50-2.49 = Disagreement and 1.00-1.49 = Strong Disagreement.

Table 3: Analysis of Variance Table on Teamwork

TEAMWORK					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.738	2	1.369	4.363	.014
Within Groups	50.529	161	.314		
Total	53.267	163			

Table 4 indicates mean scores for school leaders (3.3796), teachers (2.9638) and Non-teaching Staff (3.0595). The group of school leaders had the highest mean score than its two counterparts: teachers and non-teaching staff, though all three groups were within the agreement zone that there is teamwork in their respective schools.

Table 4 :ANOVA Descriptive Statistics Table on Teamwork

TEAMWORK				95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
School Leader	18	3.3796	.42705	.10066	3.1673	3.5920	2.50	4.00
Teacher	118	2.9638	.58895	.05422	2.8565	3.0712	1.00	4.00
Non-Teaching Staff	28	3.0595	.50351	.09516	2.8643	3.2548	1.67	4.00
Total	164	3.0258	.57166	.04464	2.9377	3.1140	1.00	4.00

According to Jones et al. [9] teamwork enables people to cooperate, enhance individual skills and provide constructive feedback without any conflict between individuals. Teamwork, further, is an important factor for smooth functioning of an organization and for strengthening leadership.

Table 5 :Post Hoc Multiple Comparison Table

TEAMWORK LSD

(I) What is your Position?	(J) What is your Position?	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
School Leader	Teacher	.41579[*]	.14176	.004	.1358	.6957
	Non-Teaching Staff	.32011	.16925	.060	-.0141	.6543
Teacher	School Leader	-.41579[*]	.14176	.004	-.6957	-.1358
	Non-Teaching Staff	-.09568	.11776	.418	-.3282	.1369
Non-Teaching Staff	School Leader	-.32011	.16925	.060	-.6543	.0141
	Teacher	.09568	.11776	.418	-.1369	.3282

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Post Hoc test in Table 5 indicates multiple comparisons between groups to ascertain existing differences. The Table indicates significant difference (Sig. . 004, Mean Difference .41579) between school leaders and teachers, meaning that school leaders perceive existence of teamwork to a greater extent than teachers.

Is there significant relationship between teamwork and morale of work, leadership and communication?

This research question called for testing of a null hypothesis which states*: There is no significant relationship between teamwork and morale of work, leadership and communication.*

This hypothesis was analyzed by Pearson product moment co relational coefficient. The intent was to find out factors that correlate with teamwork in order to give necessary recommendations. Table 6 indicates a number of factors that correlate with teamwork.

As the Table indicates, there is a positive and strong relationship between teamwork and morale of work (.729) and teamwork and leadership (.701). This means that the more school stakeholders appreciate school leadership, the more they are motivated to work in teams. The more their morale of work increases, the more the teamwork increases. Therefore, there is need for school leaderships to increase morale of work and improve leadership approaches in order to increase teamwork spirit among school stakeholders.

Table 6 :Correlates of Teamwork

		MORALE	LEADERSHIP	COMMUNICA TION	TEAMWORK
MORALE	Pearson Correlation	1	.814**	.735**	.729**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164
LEADERSHIP	Pearson Correlation	.814**	1	.792**	.701**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164
COMMUNICATION	Pearson Correlation	.735**	.792**	1	.686**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	164	164	164	164
TEAMWORK	Pearson Correlation	.729**	.701**	.686**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	164	164	164	164

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 6 further indicates a moderate positive relationship between teamwork and communication (.686), suggesting that proper communication in schools enhances the spirit of teamwork among school stakeholders. This calls for school administration in respective schools to establish and/ or maintain proper channels of communication in order to enhance teamwork among school stakeholders.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study employed case study research design to investigate on the correlates of teamwork in secondary schools located in Musoma Municipality. A sample of 10 out of 25 Secondary schools was randomly selected through systematic sampling procedures. A total of 164 teachers, non-teaching staff and school leaders filled the questionnaire, which was the only source of data. Validity was established through expert judgment and reliability test yielded Cronbach's alpha of .863 for teamwork, .885 for morale of work, .866 for leadership and .875 for communication. Research questions were analyzed by Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) through Descriptive Statistics, ANOVA and Pearson product moment correlational coefficient.

General mean score of school stakeholders in all aspects of teamwork was between 2.50 and 3.49, meaning they agreed that there is tem work in their place of work, schools. The sig of .014, however, which is lesser than the *p-value,* (.05) suggested a significant difference in perception of school leaders, teachers and non-teaching staff on teamwork, school leaders having significantly higher mean scores than teachers.

Results also revealed a positive and strong relationship between teamwork and morale of work (.729) and teamwork and leadership (.701). Moderate and positive relationship was also found between teamwork and communication (.686), suggesting that proper communication in schools enhances the spirit of teamwork among school stakeholders.

Following these findings, it is recommended that schools under investigation need to enhance good leadership and strive to increase morale of work among school stakeholders in order to increase teamwork spirit.

REFERENCE
1. Kadavakollu, T. (2013). Team Work as a Path to Employability – A Case Study. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4 (*5*)*, 121-125.*
2. Hong, S. B., and Shaffer, L. S. (2015). Inter-Professional Collaboration: Early Childhood Educators and Medical Therapist Working within Collaboration. *Journal of Education and Training Studies 3*4 (*1*)*, 121-125.*
3. Katzenbach, J.R. & Smith, D.K, (1993). *The Wisdom of Teams: Creating the High-Performance Organization*, Harper Business, New York.
4. Ducanis AJ & Golin,. A. K (1979). *The Interdisciplinary Health Care Team*, Aspen Systems Corporation, Germantown, Maryland.
5. Brannick, M. T & Prince, C. (1997). An Overview of Team Performance Measurement', in MT Brannick, E Salas & C Prince (eds) *Team Performance Assessment and Measurement*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, New Jersey.

6. Hoegl, M. (2005) Smaller teams—better teamwork: How to keep project teams small. *Business Horizons*, *48,* 209-214.

7. Karakus, M. &Toremen, F. (2008) How our schools can be more synergic: Determining the obstacles of teamwork. *Team Performance Management*, *14*(5) 233-247.

8. Cohen, S.G. & Bailey, D.F. (1999) what makes team work: group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite. *Journal of management,* 23(3) 239-90.

9. Jones, A., Richard, B., Paul, D., Sloane K., and Peter, F. (2007).Effectiveness of teambuilding in organization. *Journal of Management,* 5(3), 35-37.

10. Pfaff, E., and P. Huddleston. (2003). Does it matter if I hate teamwork? What impacts student attitudes toward teamwork. *Journal of Marketing Education* 25:37–45.

11. Froebel, P., & Marchington, M. (2005). Teamwork structures and worker perception: a cross national study in pharmaceuticals, *International Journal of Human Resource Management,* 16(2), 256-276.

12. Bacon, N & Blyton, P. (2006). Union co-operation in a context of job insecurity: Negotiated outcomes from team working. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, *44*(2), 215-23.

13. Mulika. (2010). The Impact of Teamwork on Employee Performance in Strategic Management and the Performance Improvement Department of Abu Dhabi Police, UAE.

14. Elkjær, B. (2005). Nårlæringgårpåarbejde. Etpragmatiskblikpålæring i arbejdslivet. Frederiksberg, Samfundslitteratur.

15. Elkjær, B. and B. Wahlgren (2006). Organizational learning and workplace learning -similarities and differences. Learning, Working and Living: Mapping the Terrain of Working Life Learning. E. Antonacopoulou. London, Palgrave: 15-32.

16. Argyris, C & D. A. Schön (1996). Organizational learning II: theory, method, and practice, Addison-Wesley.

17. Andrews, D. & M. Lewis (2002). "The Experience of a Professional Community: Teachers Developing a New Image of Themselves and Their Workplace." *Educational Research* 44 (3): 237-54.

18. Hindin, A., C. C. Morocco, E. A. Mott & C. M. Aguilar (2007). "More than just a group: teacher collaboration and learning in the workplace." Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice 13(4): 349-76.

19. Lieberman, A. &D. Wood (2002). "Untangling the Threads: networks, communityand teacher learning in the National Writing Project." Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice 8(3/4).

20. Louis, K. S. & H. M. Marks (1998). "Does Professional Community Affect the Classroom? Teachers' Work and Student Experiences in Restructuring Schools."

21. Minnett, A. M. (2003). "Collaboration and Shared Reflections in the Classroom." Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice 9(3): 279-85.

22. Plauborg, H., J. V. Andersen & M. Bayer (2007). Action Learning - Learning in and from practice. Copenhagen, Denmark, Copenhagen University College Press. Practice." Teachers College Record 105(6): 913-45

23. Wilson, S. M. & J. Berne (1999). "Teacher Learning and the Acquisition of Professional Knowledge: An Examination of Research on Contemporary Professional Development." Review of Research in Education 24: 173-209. *American Journal of Education* 106: 532-75.

24. Newmann, F.M., King, M.B. &Youngs, P. (2000) Professional development that addresses school capacity: Lessons from urban elementary schools. *American Journal of Education*, *108*(4) 259-299.

25. Conner, D.S. & Douglas, S.C. (2005) Organizationally-induced work stress: The role of employee bureaucratic orientation, *Personnel Review Volume*, 34, 2: 210-224.

26. Engels, N., Gwendoline H., Geert D., Bouckenooghe, D. & Aelterman, A. (2008) Principals in schools with a positive organizational culture. *Educational Studies*, *34*(3) 157-172.

27. Quinn, R.E. (1988) *Beyond Rational Management: Mastering the Paradoxes and Competing Demands of High Performance*. San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass.

28. Ahuja, R. (2003). *Research methods.* New Delhi: Prem Rawat for Rawat Publications.

29. Mugenda, O. M. & Mugenda, A. G. (2003). *Research methods: Quantitative and qualitative approaches.* Nairobi: ACTS Press.