Null Hypotheses

This null hypothesis was formulated to guide the study.

H_{01}. There is no significant difference between the academic performance of UG II students taught using Team teaching approach and UG II students taught with Single teacher approach

H_{02}. There is no significant difference between the academic performance of male and female UG II students taught using Team teaching approach

METHOD

In this study pre-test and post-test quasi-experimental design was used. The population of this study is the entire UG 2 students from faculty of education which are 285, the sample of this study are one hundred sixty two (162) UG 2 students. The sample was selected in conformity with Krejcie and Morgan (1970). Stratified proportionate random sampling technique was used in the selection of sample from the various departments. The sample involves two groups that are experimental and control groups by gender.

Table 1. Distribution of the UG 2 Populations, Grouping and Sample across Gender

Gender	Population	Experimental	Control	Sample
Male	191	55	54	109
Female	94	26	27	53
Total	**285**	**81**	**81**	**162**

Source: Admission Office, August, 2019.

Instrumentation

The study used self constructed questionnaire as data collection instrument which was constructed on a four (4) point rating scale of Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (DA), and Strongly Disagree (SD). The students were pre-tested before receiving any kind of treatment by the researcher. The post-test were also administered after the experimental and control groups have undergone their separate treatment; Team teaching approach in the case of experimental group and Single teacher approach in the case of comparison group. The outcomes of the various encounters in the form of test scores were the subjected to appropriate statistical analysis.

Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

The questionnaire was validated by two research experts in the Faculty of Education Kebbi state University of Science and Technology, Aliero. The reliability was determined by Cronbach's co-efficient alpha (r) which was used to analyze the scores after the pilot study, which was not part of the study area with a reliability of 0.81 which indicated that, the instruments was statistically reliable.

Data Collection Procedure

The researcher with the help of a research assistants administered pre-test to both controlled and experimental group. The essence of the pre-test was to determine the status of the learners.

In treatment phase, one group experimental group was taught by a team-teaching approach. In the same time the control group was taught by the single teacher approach.

Thereafter, at a close interval of one week, post-test was administered on the same group of students. The data collections have covered the whole second semester.

Statistical Analysis Procedure

The data for the study were the scores of the teacher made-test obtained from the pre-test and post-test administered to the control and experimental groups. The study used simple percentage and frequency counts in analyzing and presenting the bio - data variables of the study participants. However, independent samples t-test was used in testing the research hypotheses. All hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance.

FINDINGS

Test of Null Hypotheses

Data analysis and study results are presented after each hypothesis testing as follows:

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the academic performance of UG II students taught using Team teaching approach and UG II students taught with Single teacher approach

Table 2: Two sample t-test on mean academic performance in UG II students taught using Team teaching approach and UG II taught using Single teacher approach

Method of Instruction	Mean	Std. Deviation	Df	t-value	P
Single Teacher Approach	40.29	4.852			
			160	6.923	.001
Team Teaching Approach	45.75	3.570			

t-critical = 1.96

The Independent t-test statistics in table 2 shows that there is significant difference in the mean academic performance of UG II students taught using Team teaching approach and UG II students taught with Single teacher approach. This implies that the calculated t-value (6.923) far exceeds the critical t-value (1.96 at p value of .001 < 0.05) under 160 degree of freedom. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the academic performance of male and female UG II students taught using Team teaching approach

Table 3: Independent t-test statistics between the academic performance of male and female UG II students taught using team teaching approach

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Df	t-value	P
Male	81	44.32	3.407			
				160	1.110	0.210
Female	81	46.35	3.920			

t-critical = 2.000

The independent t-test statistics in table 3 reveals that there is no significant difference between the academic performance of male and female UG II students taught using Team teaching approach. This implies that the calculated t-value (1.110) is less than the critical t-value (2.000 at p value of .210 > 0.05) under 160 degree of freedom. The null hypothesis was therefore retained.

RESULT, DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS

From the results obtained, the following conclusions were drawn:

The study has proved that team teaching approach is superior to single teacher approach. This has therefore provided empirical basis for improving classroom teaching and learning process. This is evident from the fact that the group taught with team teaching approach performed significantly better than the groups that were taught with single teacher approach. Again, the female students perform better in team teaching approach than their male counterpart.

In hypothesis I, the effect of team teaching on the students' academic performance was conducted by comparing the mean scores of the group that were exposed to the use of the team teaching approach in teaching and learning with students who were exposed to the use of the single teacher approach. The two sample t-test was used for the test. The result revealed that students who were exposed to the use of team teaching approach scored higher and were significantly different from those who were taught with the single teacher approach. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected. This means that the use of team teaching approach in teaching and learning increases students' academic performance on the subject.

Corroborating the current findings, Jang (2006) study the effects of team teaching upon two 8th-grade teachers in the field of mathematics. The research findings showed that the average final exam scores of students receiving team teaching were higher than those of students receiving traditional teaching. The two teaching methods showed significant difference in respect of students' achievement. More than half of the experimental students preferred team teaching to traditional teaching. The discrepancy between team teachers' expectations of team teaching and its implementation was apparent. The differences in the teaching strategy also exposed team teachers to challenge and being compared with each other by students in class.

Similarly, Gerst (2012) examines the effects co-taught classes have on students' academic and social development. The majority of current co-teaching research has found positive results for students in academic achievement, social development, and emotional well-being. Students perceive co-teaching to be beneficial to their learning and do not report drawbacks for their learning.

Hypothesis II tested for gender difference on the effectiveness of the team teaching approach on students in relation to their academic performance. The hypothesis was aimed at determining whether male and female students exposed to the use of the team teaching approach would differ significantly in their

academic performance. The independent sample t-test procedure was used for the test. The result did not reveal significant difference in the academic performance of the female and male students in the experiment. The null hypothesis was therefore retained.

This finding is in collaboration with that of Ezenwosu, Esomonu, Akudolu (2015) who discovered that gender affects the academic performances of male and female students taught using team teaching approach in favour of female students. The female students achieved higher when taught with the team teaching approach than their male counterparts.

Suggestions

The following suggestions are suggested as a result of the findings of the study:

i. Lecturers in the faculty should be encouraged to adopt team teaching approach for their students for optimum academic performance as the approach has proven to be the best;

ii. The use of single teacher approach of teaching should be minimized so that UG II students should benefit from the goodness of team teaching approach to instruction.

REFERENCES

Bayer, A. S. (1990) *Collaborative-apprenticeship Learning:* Language and Thinking Across the Curriculum, K-12 (London, Mayfield).Be or Not to Be.

Brandenburg, R. (1997). *Team wise school of knowledge: An online resource about team teaching*. Retrieved on 21/01/2019 from http://www.uwf.edu/coehelp/teachingapproaches/team/

Cook, L. (2004). *Co-teaching: Principle, practice, and pragmatics.* Albuquerque, NM: New Mexico Public Education Department, Quarterly Special Education Meeting

Cook, L., & Friend, M. (1995). Co-teaching: Guidelines for creating effective practices. Focus on Exceptional Children, 28(3), 1–16.

Darma, I. A., (2018). *Effects of team teaching approach on academic performance of social studies students in colleges of education*. A Thesis Submitted to the School of Postgraduate Studies, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria Nigeria

Darma, I.A. (2010). Social studies education, as an instrument for civic responsibility, Economic efficiency and national rebirth. *Badala Journal of Arts and Social Sciences,6.*

Ezenwosu, N. E., Esomonu, N.P.M. & Akudolu, L.R. (2015). A comparison of the effect of team teaching approach and single teacherb teaching approach on senior students' essay/letter writing performance.*Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies (JETERAPS) 6(4): 314-320.*

Francis, J. B. (2000). *Team teaching: What, why and how*. An Online Resources Retrieved on 09/04/2020 from http://www.amazon.com/team-teaching-what-whyhow/dp/0761907440

Gerst, S. (2012). Co-teaching effect for students. An online resource, retrieved on 21/03/2020 from https://higherlogicdownload.s3.amazonaws.co

Goets, K. (2000) Perspective on team teaching. An online resource retrieved on 10/03/2020 from http://people.ucalgary-ca/egallery/goetz.html

Hughes, C.E. &Muwaski, W.A. (2001). Lessons from another field: Applying co-teaching strategies to gifted education. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 45*, 195 -209.

Iheagwam, A.W. (2006) *Teacher collaboration: A new direction for quality education in Nigerian schools.* Paper Presented at the Annual National Association for The Advancemen of Knowledge (NAFAK) at River State College of Education, Port Harcourt 12th -16th , 1-12.

Jang, S. J. (2006). Research on the effects of team teaching upon two secondary school teachers. *Educational Research, 48(2): 177-194* Doi: 10.1080/0013188600732272

Krejcie, R.V. & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurements*, 30, 607-610. New York: McGraw-Hill

Nkechi, Lilian & Ngozy (2015). Effects of team teaching on students' academic achievement in english language comprehension. *IOSR Journal of Resaerch & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME) e-ISSN: 2320 7388,p-ISSN: 2320-737X Volume 5, Issue 5 Ver.III.PP 06-12*

Tobin, R. (2005). Co-teaching in language arts: Supporting students with learning disabilities. *Canadian Journal of Education, 28(4), 784–802.*

Tobin, K., Roth, W.-M. & Zimmermann, A. (2001) Learning to teach science in urban schools. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38(8), 941 – 964.*

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press).

Waimer, M. (2013), Teacher-centered, learner-centered or all of the above. Retrieved on 20/02/2020 From www.facultyfocus.com/article/teachingprofessor.blog/teachercenteredlearnercenteredorallottheabove
Walther-Thomas, C., Bryant, M. & Land, S. (1997). Planning for effective co-teaching: the key to successful Inclusion. *Remedial and Special Education, 17, 255 – 265.*