AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.17 (2), January-April, 2026; https://ajemates.org

AN EVALUATION OF TEAM-TEACHING POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN FEDERAL UNIVERSITIES IN THE NORTHEAST ZONE OF NIGERIA

Prof. Akor, Abbah Innocent[13]
ssaintakkor@gmail.com
innocent@fuwukari.edu.ng
08036002735
&
Dr. Ibrahim Abdullahi[2]
iabdullahi@fuwukari.edu.ng
08037819573
&
Dr. Abubakar Musa[3]
abubakarmusa@fuwukari.edu.ng
07034581209
Department of Science Education, Faculty of Education, Federal University Wukari[1, 2 & 3]

ABSTRACT

This study evaluates the implementation of team-teaching policy in federal universities in Northeast, Nigeria. Team-teaching, a recognized pedagogical approach, offers benefits such as diverse perspectives, enhanced student engagement and improved instructional quality. However, successful implementation depends on careful planning, adequate resources and institutional support. The study employed a sequential explanatory mixed methods design to collect and analyze both quantitative and qualitative data sequentially. The population of this study comprised of 6,295 academic staff of the seven (7) Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria. The sample size of 357 was drawn using the Research Advisor (2006). Data was collected using an adapted instrument titled "Team-teaching Implementation Questionnaire (TTIQ)," and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). The validity of the TTIQ was established by a panel of experts. The reliability of the TTIQ was computed using Cronbach Alpha statistics and a coefficient of 0.80 was obtained. The Trustworthiness of the qualitative data was ensured through triangulation, member checking and auditing. The quantitative data were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics such as mean and Standard Deviation to answer the research questions, and independent sample t test to test hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance, while the qualitative data were thematically analysed. Data collected were transcribed, coded and categorized in themes according to emerging variables from each question in line with the research objectives and questions. Results showed that team-teaching policy is moderately implemented and widely perceived as beneficial in Federal Universities in Northeastern Nigeria, with station teaching and teaming models most commonly practiced, while implementation is constrained by administrative, interpersonal and

time-related challenges, and is more practiced in newly established universities than in old-generation institutions. It was concluded that although team-teaching enhances collaboration and instructional effectiveness in federal universities, stronger institutional support and improved coordination mechanisms are necessary to overcome persistent implementation challenges and achieve optimal outcomes.

Keywords: Team-teaching, Collaborative Teaching, Higher Education, Implementation, Teaching Models

Introduction

Recently, there has been a gradual shift in the Nigerian higher education system from a model in which one lecturer handles a course to team-teaching, in which multiple instructors share the delivery. And therein lies a very important expectation: teaching quality should improve and student outcomes rise, indeed a trend that several studies have supported, including Akpan et al. (2010) and Padilla (2020). Other research, such as that by Yanamandram and Noble (2006), Esomonu et al. (2015), and Muza (2021), also indicates that team-teaching results in a significantly better performance by students than the traditional single-instructor model.

This movement isn't peculiar to Nigeria. In Australia, lecturers and students seemed to look upon team-teaching positively, particularly for improving academic writing skills (Lee, 2013). However, in Aotearoa New Zealand the picture is different: Robinson (2019) observed that many courses combine single-teacher and team-teaching approaches, highlighting a gap between policy and practice. Osuala et al. (2015) noted that even when teaching teams are assigned, collaboration is often minimal in practice. Muza (2021) corroborates this viewpoint for Nigeria: whereas team-teaching could increase student performance, the benefits derived from it are not usually fully realized in the normal classroom settings.

Team-teaching approaches or models have been identified by many scholars such as Reinhardt and Egan, (2016); Padilla, (2020); Maldonado, (2022, para. 2); and Grell, (2022) as follows: One teach, one observe model is a teaching approach where one instructor instructs while the other observes to learn from their senior colleague. Station teaching, also known as rotational teaching, divides content based on specialization and students based on faculty, department, or programme. This is useful being practiced in general study courses where every student is expected to register for the courses. Parallel teaching divides students in half, with each teacher teaching the same lesson to one half of the students. This helps decongest classrooms and decreases the student-teacher ratio. Alternative teaching re-teach at-risk students while providing accelerated content to the remaining students. Both teachers work with at-risk groups and provide accelerated

instruction to the remaining students. Teaming involves both teachers sharing delivery of the same instruction to a whole student group, which is often preferred by co-teachers. Lastly, one teach, one assist model involves one teacher becoming the primary educator and the other monitoring the room and providing quiet assistance to students who need it.

The implementation of the team-teaching notwithstanding is faced with many challenges as identified by Osuala (2015); Padilla (2020); Lynch (2020); Davis (2021); Reddy (2022) to include difficulty in team lesson preparation among others. Money and Coughlan (2016) opined that content overlap, conflicting messages are also some of the weaknesses of team-teaching. Lynch (2022) asserts that team-teaching makes it difficult to share responsibilities among team members. Personality conflicts among team members was also identified by Davis, (2021); Reddy, (2022) who are of the opinion that a dominant person will dominate others in team-teaching. It is obvious that the place of team-teaching in bringing about quality academic achievement in Nigerian University system cannot be undermined. It is on this premise therefore, that the researchers decided to carry out this research in a bid to evaluate and proffer solutions to the approach of team-teaching policy in our educational system.

Problem Statement

The researchers as lecturers within the Nigerian university system, particularly in the Northeast zone have observed inconsistencies in pedagogical approaches, often relying heavily on traditional lecture-based methods. While these methods have their place, they sometimes fall short in fostering deep learning, catering to diverse learning styles and promoting collaborative skills among students. The researchers have personally experienced the challenges of managing large classes single-handedly, struggling to provide individualized attention and effectively assess student understanding across a broad range of abilities. Furthermore, they have noticed a gap in structured mentorship and peer learning opportunities among lecturers, which could be significantly enhanced through collaborative teaching models.

Although team-teaching is promoted as a potential solution to these issues, its implementation based on the researchers' experience has been sporadic and inconsistent. Existing policies, where they exist, often lack clarity regarding implementation guidelines, resource allocation, and evaluation metrics. This has led to ad-hoc arrangements, varying interpretations of team-teaching and a lack of systematic integration into the curriculum. The researchers have observed instances where team-teaching is implemented in name only, with little genuine collaboration or shared responsibility for instruction. This inconsistency raises concerns about the effectiveness of current policies and their potential to address the pedagogical challenges facing the system of education in

Nigeria. Therefore, this study seeks to evaluate the implementation of team-teaching policy in federal universities in the Northeast zone of Nigeria, aiming to identify the factors that facilitate or hinder its effective implementation and ultimately improve the quality of teaching and learning in our institutions.

Objective of the Study

The major aim of this study is to evaluate the implementation of the team-teaching policy in Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria. The specific objectives are to:

1. examine the extent of implementation of the team-teaching policy in Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria.
2. identify the most dominant model of team-teaching being practiced in Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria.
3. identify the challenges facing the implementation of team-teaching policy in Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria.
4. determine the difference in the implementation of the team-teaching policy between old-generation federal universities and newly established ones in the northeastern Nigeria.

Research Questions

The following research questions were answered in the study:

1. What is the extent of implementation of team-teaching policy in Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria?
2. Which team-teaching model is most frequently utilized in Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria?
3. What challenges are encountered in the implementation of the team-teaching policy in Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria?
4. What is the difference in the implementation of the team-teaching policy between second-generation federal universities and newly established ones in the northeastern Nigeria?

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated to guide the study:

1. There is no significant difference in the implementation of the team-teaching policy between second-generation federal universities and newly established ones in the northeastern Nigeria.

Conceptual Framework

The concept of policy can be simply referred to as what people or government or any institution intend to do. Educational policy on the other hand can be defined as "a specification of principles and actions, related to educational issues, which are followed or which should be followed and which are designed to bring about desired goals in the education sector" (Trowler, 2003 in Gondwe, 2018, para. 7). In other words, Karkouti (2020, para. 6) is of the view that "Education Policy is a set of guidelines or rules that aims at improving the quality of

education and the performance of teachers at schools, colleges, and universities." Therefore, educational policy is anything educational managers at all levels formally set out as guidelines of actions for all education stakeholders for the betterment of educational practices and the achievement of educational goals.

Team-teaching policy is viewed as a non-statutory policy that is aimed at creating more flexible teaching and learning opportunities which outlines allowable team-teaching arrangements for faculty and graduate students both within and between departments (Ike, 2016). Ike, further revealed that team-teaching is a non-statutory policy that is aimed at creating more flexible teaching and learning opportunities which outlines allowable team-teaching arrangements for faculty and graduate students both within and between departments.

Team-teaching which is also known as collaborative teaching has been described by different scholars. It has been defined as working together of two or more teachers in order to guide an individual learner or a group of learners toward a set of aims or objectives, (Japanese Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture 1994 in Osuala et al., 2015). Furthermore, Team-teaching (TT) is different from Single Teacher Teaching (STT) because it involves two or more teachers each with distinctive roles, sharing responsibilities for planning, presentation and evaluation of lessons for the same group of students (Osomonu et al, 2015). In other words, Collaborative Team-teaching (CTT) refers to an educational approach to teaching and learning that involves group of teachers working together to solve a problem, complete a task, or create a product and in particular, to plan and deliver instruction to a diverse population in a general education setting (Padilla, 2020).

University education in Nigeria is part of the tertiary education which the national policy on education defined as:

> Tertiary Education is the education given after Post Basic Education in institutions such as Universities and Inter-University Centres such as the Nigeria French Language Village, Nigeria Arabic Language Village, National Institute of Nigerian Languages, institutions such as Innovation Enterprise Institutions (IEIs), and Colleges of Education, Monotechnics, Polytechnics, and other specialized institutions such as Colleges of Agriculture, Schools of Health and

> Technology and the National Teachers' Institutes (NTI) (FRN, 2013, P.39).

Therefore, University education is a postsecondary education in which degrees are issued with the goal of training higher-level manpower for economic development (Ogunode & Musa, 2020; Musa & Vincent, 2022; Musa *et al*, 2022).

Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on teamwork theory, a product of a popular psychologist called Bruce Tuckman (1965) who viewed the theory as focused on connecting a group of people to be on the same page, and all working for one ultimate goal. The theory provides an analytical framework for viewing an organization in general description of group of people working together for common goal with each member contributing to the project. Bruce holds that the cohesive unit of groups in an organization can bring about efficiency and productivity toward the realization and the attainment of organization goals. The theory also puts forth the premise that organizations are made up of different individuals and component that must work together in harmony for the larger system to succeed.

This theory is underpinned by the idea that the success of instructional activities in the University system relies on the synergy, interrelations and interdependence that exist between various human resources (lecturers and non-teaching staff) and environmental variables in order to ensure that the desired knowledge and skill is imparted on learners, and whenever cohesion is absence or poorly provided the whole system suffers a great deal. This implies that university students are greatly influenced by their environment as well as the collaborative effort of their lecturers. This, therefore, calls for adequate team-teaching facilities for effective teaching and learning process which will in turns enhance students' academic performance.

Empirical Review

Empirical research on team-teaching in Nigerian higher education reveals that, while the policy is officially supported, its implementation is inconsistent. A study by Osuala et al. (2015) involving 1,110 lecturers indicated low levels of actual team-teaching during lectures, although team-teaching principles were applied more effectively in student evaluations. This gap stems from inadequate collaboration and structural barriers. Similarly, Musa and Dauda (2023) evaluated the policy in the Faculty of Education at the Federal University Wukari, reporting moderate implementation characterized by stronger collaboration in assessments and planning rather than in real-time classroom co-teaching. Lecturers often resorted to a "turn-taking" or station teaching model instead of fully integrated approaches, highlighting the disparity between policy and practice.

Studies across Nigeria and internationally have identified benefits of team-teaching,

including improved student performance. For instance, Akpan et al. (2010) found that secondary school students taught through team-teaching excelled in performance compared to their peers taught by a single instructor. Similarly, Esomonu et al. (2015) noted higher academic achievement in English language comprehension attributable to collaborative teaching. At the university level, Muza (2021) showed that team-teaching enhanced learning outcomes against traditional methods. Padilla (2020) also affirmed that students exposed to team-teaching gained deeper understanding and diverse expert perspectives in their subjects.

However, multiple challenges hinder effective team-teaching implementation. Money and Coughlan (2016) reported undergraduate students valuing diverse perspectives, yet lecturers struggled with coordination issues and personality clashes. Davis (2021) highlighted time limitations for joint planning, disparities in participation, and insufficient institutional support as significant barriers. Furthermore, Musa and Dauda (2023) and Osuala et al. (2015) described inadequate sanctions for non-participating lecturers and attendance issues as major impediments to effective team-teaching. Literature reviews by Lynch (2020) and Reddy (2022) corroborated that, administrative and interpersonal barriers often overshadow pedagogical factors in team-teaching limitations.

Lastly, comparative studies on old-generation versus new-generation universities are scarce. However, Ogunode et al. (2021) noted that newer institutions demonstrated more openness to innovative teaching approaches, contrastingly revealing the rigid bureaucracies of older universities. This aspect remains under-researched, especially in the Northeast Zone, indicating a gap that the current study aims to address.

Methodology

Research Design

The study adopted sequential explanatory mixed method design. A mixed methods research design is defined as "a procedure for collecting, analyzing, and "mixing" both quantitative and qualitative methods in a single study or a series of studies to understand a research problem" (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Creswell, 2012, p. 535). The study adopted the mixed method because it uses both quantitative and qualitative methods which provide a better understanding of the research problem and questions than either method by itself. A basic rationale for this design is that one data collection form supplies strengths to offset the weaknesses of the other form, and that a more complete understanding of a research problem results from collecting both quantitative and qualitative data (Creswell, 2012). In this case, a mixed method design is a good procedure to be used in this study.

Population of the Study

The population of this study comprised of all 6,295 academic staff of the seven (7) Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria. This population comprises of both male and female academic staff between the rank of Graduate Assistant (GA) to Professor. Also,

these population cut across all faculties and departments in the institutions.

Table 1
Distribution of Population and sample

S/N	Institution	Population	Sample
1.	A	830	65
2.	B	870	
3.	C	1248	97
4.	D	476	
5.	E	834	65
6.	F	361	
7.	G	1676	130
	Total	**6295**	**357**

Source: Obtained from Various Universities (2025)

Sample and Sampling Techniques

According to Creswell (2012), sample is a subgroup of the target population that the researcher plans to study for generalizing about the target population. Multistage sampling procedure was employed for the study. First, the study used the purposive sampling to select Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria since they are the target population of interest to the researchers. The sample size of 357 was determined from the population using Research Advisor (2006). The academic staff members were stratified based on old-generation universities (established between 1975-1985) and new generation universities (established in 2011). Two universities were randomly selected from each category of the federal universities. In addition, proportionate sampling was used to determine the sample size drawn from each stratum and institution. Furthermore, random sampling was used to select participants from within each institution. The random sampling gives equal opportunity to all subjects to be selected to form part of the sample which enables the generalization of the findings without being biased.

Instrument for Data Collection

The instrument for data collection was adapted questionnaire from Musa and Dauda (2023) tagged "Team-teaching Policy Implementation Questionnaire (TTPIQ)". It is made up of two sections; A and B, respectively. Section A contains the lecturers' demographic data, while Section B contains four subsections with each targeting a research question. The TTPIQ is a four-point Likert scale which bears the options and weight as Strongly Agreed (SA) - 4, Agreed (A) – 3, Disagreed – 2 and Strongly Disagreed –1 was used to collect data and answer research questions 1, 2, and 4, while, Very Frequently Practiced, Frequently Practiced, Rarely Practiced, and Not Practiced, were used for the research question

3 on the most frequently practiced model of team-teaching. The researchers used qualitative data collection instrument, specifically Focus Group Discussion (FGD) guide, which guided the researchers and the participants in their discussion, to ensure that the discussion remained focus on the key objectives of the study. The researchers organized focus group discussion of 6 members in each of the selected institutions. The researchers used the FGD in order to obtain more data so as to explain more on the topic for thorough understanding.

The validity of the instrument was ensured by a panel of 3 experts, 2 from the Department of Science Education, Federal University Wukari and 1 Measurement and Evaluation specialist. The comments and observations raised by the experts were affected and thus, confirmed the instrument as valid. The validity of the Focus Group Discussion guide was also be validated by the same experts as mentioned in the validity of the quantitative instrument. In qualitative research, "the researchers are the instrument" (Patton, 2001, p. 14, in Golafshani, 2003, p. 601). The trustworthiness of the qualitative data was ensured by the researchers through; triangulation (use of more than one method for data collection), member checking (always summarizing the key points of discussion for the participants to confirm that it is exactly what they said), and auditing (using research assistants to audit the findings) and by so doing the trustworthiness, credibility, auditability, dependability and the confirmability of the data were ensured. Thus, the data is considered valid and reliable. Inuwa (2022) further added that the trends of the responses should be observed on their natural relationship to the attitudinal and behavioural responses for the study credibility and dependability. In this regard therefore, the researchers observed the trends of responses of the participants on their natural relationship to their attitude and behavior during the focus group discussion. The reliability of the quantitative instrument was computed using Cronbach Alpha statistics and reliability Index of 0.80 was obtained after trial testing and the instrument was thus considered reliable for the study.

The data were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics to answer the research questions and test the null hypotheses. The benchmark for accepting or rejecting any variable as significant was set at mean 2.5 for research questions. Therefore, any variable with a mean of 2.5 and above is deemed agreed and of high level while anyone with a mean below 2.5 is not significant and therefore of low level. The hypotheses were tested using independent samples t test at 0.05 level of significance. The qualitative data were thematically analysed. Data collected were transcribed, coded and categorized in themes according to emerging variables from each question in line with the research objectives and questions. The qualitative data collected were triangulated with the quantitative data in order to provide additional information.

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.17 (2), January-April, 2026; https://ajemates.org

Results

Research Question 1: What is the extent of implementation of team-teaching policy in Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria?

Table 2: Implementation of team-teaching policy in Federal Universities in the Northeastern Nigeria

Extent of Implementation of Team-teaching Policy	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Decision
Lecturers are usually paired for teaching and supervision of courses	357	3.52	.744	High Extent
Lecturers usually go in group as a team for lectures	357	1.88	.985	Very Low Extent
Lecturers share topics and time and only go to lectures when it is their time	357	3.36	.946	Moderate Extent
Lecturers share instructional duties during lectures	357	2.50	1.032	Moderate Extent
Senior team mates are always available during lectures	357	2.39	1.045	Low Extent
Senior colleagues adequately mentor junior colleagues in the team	357	2.92	.996	Moderate Extent
All members in a teaching team are involved in setting of assignment, tests and examination items	357	3.27	.890	Moderate Extent
All members in a teaching team share and mark exam scripts	357	3.21	.865	Moderate Extent
Each team member marks only his/her questions in each booklet	357	3.00	1.056	Moderate Extent
Administration of continuous assessments and examination are done as a team	357	3.07	1.006	Moderate Extent
Collation of students' scores is a shared responsibility among team members	357	3.07	.893	Moderate Extent
Team mates usually meet to produce marking guides for marking of assignments, tests and examination scripts	357	2.81	.962	Moderate Extent
Cluster mean		**2.92**		**Moderate Extent**

Source: Field Survey (2026)

Table 2 presents the mean ratings of respondents on the extent to which team-teaching policy is implemented in Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria. The cluster mean of 2.92 indicates that the implementation of team-teaching policy is moderate. This indicates that team-teaching practices are generally adopted in the universities studied. Specifically, lecturers are commonly paired for teaching and supervision of courses (Mean = 3.52), which shows strong adherence to collaborative instructional arrangements. Likewise, respondents agreed that lecturers share topics and teaching time (Mean = 3.36), jointly set assessment items (Mean = 3.27), share marking responsibilities (Mean = 3.21), and collectively handle continuous assessment, examinations, and score collation (Means = 3.07 each). These findings imply effective collaboration in instructional planning and assessment processes.

However, some aspects of team-teaching are weakly implemented. Respondents disagreed that lecturers attend lectures together as a

group (Mean = 1.88) and that senior team members are always available during lectures (Mean = 2.39). This indicates that collaboration is more prevalent during the planning and evaluation stages than in actual classroom delivery.

This finding showed that while administrative and assessment components of team-teaching are largely practiced, real-time collaborative classroom teaching and consistent mentoring support require improvement. The findings indicate that the implementation of the team-teaching policy in Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria is moderately high (cluster mean = 2.92). While some aspects of the policy are reasonably practised, others remain weakly implemented, revealing an inconsistent pattern of collaboration.

Qualitative findings revealed that lecturers commonly engage in pairing for teaching and supervision of courses. One respondent noted, "*We are usually paired with colleagues to handle courses together, especially for supervision and setting of questions*" (P2). Similarly, sharing of topics and teaching time is fairly common, with another lecturer stating, "*We divide the topics among team members and only come to class when it is our turn"* (P7). Assessment-related activities also show strong collaboration. Respondents agreed that team members jointly set assignments, tests, and examination items, share marking of scripts, and collectively collate students' scores. A participant remarked, *"All of us in the team contribute questions for exams and we share the marking equally"* (P23).

However, actual classroom delivery of team-teaching is poorly implemented. Lecturers rarely attend lectures together as a group. One lecturer commented, *"We don't go to class as a team. Everyone teaches their own part separately"* (P9). Senior colleagues are also not consistently available during lectures for mentoring. A junior lecturer observed, *"Our senior colleagues rarely stay with us throughout the lecture. They only come when it is their turn"* (P21).

Overall, the implementation of team-teaching is stronger in the planning and assessment stages but weaker in real-time collaborative teaching and mentoring. The policy exists more in structure than in full classroom practice. This suggests that while universities have adopted the team-teaching policy on paper, its practical integration into daily teaching and learning remains moderate and requires significant improvement, especially in fostering genuine co-teaching and consistent senior-junior mentoring.

Research Question 2: Which team-teaching model is most frequently utilized in Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria?

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.17 (2), January-April, 2026; https://ajemates.org

Table 3: Most dominant model of team-teaching practiced in Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria

The most dominant model of team-teaching being practiced in Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria	N	Mean	SD	Rank
One teach, one observe. This model places the responsibility for instruction on one individual, usually the content-area instructor. While a veteran lecturer instructs the class, the other(s) observe in order to learn from the experiences of the senior colleague.	357	2.33	1.004	Rarely Practiced
Station teaching. This is also referred to as rotational teaching. Teachers divide content based on specialization and students based on faculty or department or programme or randomly. Each teacher then teaches the content to one group and subsequently repeats the instruction for the other group(s).	357	2.80	.949	Very Frequently Practiced
Parallel teaching. In this model, the students are split in half and each teacher teaches the lesson to one half of the students. There is no difference in the materials presented to students by each teacher in this model. Each half of the class receives the same information, and there is no rotation of students or teachers.	357	2.24	1.008	Rarely Practiced
Alternative teaching: The purpose of alternative teaching is to re-teach the at-risk students (students with special needs) while providing accelerated content to the remaining students. Based on previous assessments, both teachers will decide which students are at-risk. One teacher works with the at-risk group while the other continues to provide accelerated instruction.	357	2.06	1.026	Rarely Practiced
Teaming: Both teachers share delivery of the instruction to a whole student group.	357	2.78	.939	Frequently Practiced
One teach, one assist. One teacher becomes the primary educator while the other monitors the room and provides quiet assistance to students who need it	357	2.27	.970	Rarely Practiced

Source: Field Survey (2026)

Table 3 presents respondents' ratings on the team-teaching models most frequently practiced in Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria. The results reveal variations in the extent to which different team-teaching models are utilized. The findings indicate that station teaching (Mean = 2.80, SD = .949) is very frequently practiced, which makes it the most dominant team-teaching model in the universities studied. This suggests that lecturers commonly divide instructional content based on specialization and rotate teaching responsibilities among groups of students. Similarly, the teaming model (Mean = 2.78, SD = .939) is frequently practiced, which means that lecturers often collaborate in delivering instruction jointly to the entire class.

Conversely, several models are rarely practiced. The one teach, one observe model (Mean = 2.33, SD = 1.004), parallel teaching (Mean = 2.24, SD = 1.008), alternative

teaching (Mean = 2.06, SD = 1.026), and one teach, one assist model (Mean = 2.27, SD = .970) were all rated as rarely practiced. This implies limited use of observation-based mentoring, differentiated instruction for at-risk students, classroom assistance strategies and simultaneous group instruction. This result showed that team-teaching in the universities is predominantly implemented through content specialization and shared instructional delivery, while supportive and differentiated instructional models are not widely adopted. This indicates that collaboration among lecturers occurs mainly in content distribution and joint teaching rather than individualized or adaptive teaching approaches.

The qualitative findings revealed that team-teaching is practised in Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria, but not all models are used equally. There is a clear preference for certain collaborative approaches over others depending on situations. The most dominant model of team-teaching mentioned during the FGD is Station Teaching (also known as rotational teaching). In this model, lecturers divide the content based on their areas of specialization, and students are split into groups. Each lecturer teaches their portion to one group and then rotates to the next. Many lecturers confirmed this practice. One senior lecturer from one of the universities opined that: *"In General Studies we usually divide the course into modules based on our strengths. I teach my part to one group, then move to the next group. This way, students benefit from different specialists."*(P17).

Closely following station teaching is the Teaming model, where both (or all) lecturers share the delivery of the instruction to the entire class together. A participant from one of the universities noted: *"Sometimes we share topics among ourselves and teach our part one after the other"* (P2). In contrast, several other models are rarely practised. The One Teach, One Observe model, where one lecturer teaches while others observe for mentoring purposes, is infrequently used. A junior lecturer remarked: *"Our senior colleagues rarely stay to observe us teach. Everyone just comes for their own slot and leaves."*(P4). Similarly, Parallel Teaching (splitting the class into two groups taught simultaneously by different lecturers), Alternative Teaching (one teacher re-teaching at-risk students while the other handles advanced content), and One Teach, One Assist (one leads while the other provides individual support) were all rated as rarely practised. One respondent explained: "*We don't usually split the class or have one person assisting while the other teaches. That kind of arrangement is not common here."*(P19).

Overall, team-teaching in these universities is predominantly implemented through content specialization and rotation (Station Teaching) and joint delivery to the whole class (Teaming). Supportive, differentiated, or mentoring-oriented models are much less common. This suggests that while collaboration exists, it is mainly focused on dividing workload and sharing instruction

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.17 (2), January-April, 2026; https://ajemates.org

rather than providing differentiated support or structured mentoring during lectures.

Research Question 3: What are the challenges facing the implementation of team-teaching policy in the Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone?

Table 4: Responses on the challenges facing the implementation of team-teaching policy

The challenges facing the implementation of team-teaching policy	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Decision
Team-teaching brings together people with diverse personalities, which often leads to misunderstandings.	357	2.69	1.060	Agreed
Some lecturers are usually truant in team-teaching.	357	2.91	.909	Agreed
Rotational team-teaching results to inability to cover curriculum contents.	357	2.33	.981	Disagreed
Inadequate sanctions for non-participating lecturers in team-teaching	357	2.94	.843	Agreed
Lack of Choice of team members by lecturers.	357	2.82	.953	Agreed
Some lecturers lack self-confidence to teach in the presence of their colleagues.	357	2.76	.943	Agreed
Lecturers find it difficult to find time to plan lesson together.	357	2.93	.936	Agreed
Team-teaching causes delay in the compilation of results	357	2.67	1.016	Agreed
Sharing responsibilities among lecturers is a difficult task.	357	2.33	.967	Disagreed
Cluster Mean		**2.71**		

Source: Field Survey (2026)

Table 4 presents respondents' opinions on the challenges confronting the implementation of team-teaching policy in the Faculty of Education, Federal University, Wukari. The cluster mean of 2.71 indicates that respondents generally agree that notable challenges exist, suggesting that several factors hinder the smooth execution of team-teaching. The findings reveal that inadequate sanctions for non-participating lecturers (Mean = 2.94) and difficulty in finding time for joint lesson planning (Mean = 2.93) are among the most prominent challenges, which shows weak enforcement mechanisms and time constraints among lecturers. Respondents also agreed that lecturer truancy (Mean = 2.91), lack of choice in selecting team members (Mean = 2.82), and lack of

self-confidence among some lecturers when teaching alongside colleagues (Mean = 2.76) negatively affect effective collaboration.

Furthermore, respondents acknowledged that diverse personalities leading to misunderstandings (Mean = 2.69) and delays in result compilation (Mean = 2.67) pose operational difficulties in team-teaching implementation. However, respondents disagreed that rotational team-teaching prevents adequate curriculum coverage (Mean = 2.33) and that sharing responsibilities among lecturers is difficult (Mean = 2.33), which means that instructional coordination and task sharing are not major barriers.

This result showed that the major challenges to team-teaching implementation are largely administrative, interpersonal, and time-management related, rather than instructional or curriculum-based issues. The findings reveal that the implementation of the team-teaching policy in the federal universities, faces moderate but significant challenges. With a cluster mean of 2.71, lecturers generally agreed that several factors hinder the smooth and effective practice of team-teaching.

One of the most prominent challenges identified in the qualitative findings is the lack of strong enforcement mechanisms. Many lecturers noted that there are inadequate sanctions for colleagues who fail to participate fully in team activities. A FGD participant remarked: *"Some lecturers simply don't show up for team meetings or joint lectures where applicable, yet nothing serious is done about it. This makes others lose motivation."*(P20).

Closely related to this is the issue of time constraints for joint planning. Lecturers reported difficulty in finding a common time to prepare lessons together. One participant stated: *"We are all very busy with our individual courses and administrative duties. It is always difficult to sit down as a team to plan lectures properly."*(P18).Truancy and irregular participation by some lecturers was also frequently mentioned. A respondent observed: *"Some team members only appear when it is convenient for them. This affects the flow of teaching and puts extra burden on the committed ones."*(P22).

Another notable challenge is the lack of freedom to choose team members. Lecturers expressed frustration that they are often assigned to teams without their input. One lecturer commented: *"You are just paired with people you may not be compatible with. This sometimes leads to tension and poor collaboration."*(P5).

Some lecturers also admitted struggling with self-confidence when teaching in the presence of their colleagues. A junior lecturer shared: *"I sometimes feel nervous teaching alongside senior professors. You worry about making mistakes in their presence, even though it is rarely practiced here."* (P16).

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.17 (2), January-April, 2026; https://ajemates.org

Additionally, participants noted that diverse personalities within teams often lead to misunderstandings and conflicts. One respondent explained: *"When people with different characters and teaching styles are put together, there can be clashes of ideas and egos."*(P24).

Finally, team-teaching was said to cause delays in the compilation and release of results, as coordination among team members takes time. However, two areas were not considered major challenges. Lecturers disagreed that rotational team-teaching makes it difficult to cover the curriculum and they also disagreed that sharing responsibilities among team members is inherently difficult.

In summary, the major challenges to the implementation of team-teaching in the Faculty of Education are largely administrative and interpersonal in nature weak enforcement, time constraints for planning, truancy, lack of choice in team composition, and personality clashes. These findings suggest that while the policy is accepted in principle, its successful implementation is being hindered by structural and human-related factors that require urgent attention from university management.

Research Question 4: What is the difference in the implementation of the team-teaching policy between old-generation federal universities and newly established ones in the northeastern Nigeria?

Table 5: Difference in the implementation of the team-teaching policy between old-generation federal universities and newly established ones in the northeastern Nigeria

Categories of universities	N	M	SD	Mean difference
Old-Generation	195	2.79	.77231	
				0.28
New Generation	162	3.07	.42008	

Source: Field Survey (2026)

Table 5 presents the comparison of the mean ratings on the extent of implementation of the team-teaching policy between old-generation and new-generation federal universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria. The results show a noticeable difference between the two categories of universities. Newly established (new-generation) federal universities had a higher mean score on the implementation of team-teaching policy (Mean = 3.07, SD = 0.42008) compared to old-generation federal universities (Mean = 2.79, SD = 0.77231), with a mean difference of 0.28.This indicates that team-teaching policy is better implemented in newly established universities than in the older ones. The higher mean score among new-generation universities suggests that these institutions are more actively practising collaborative teaching approaches. In contrast, the lower mean in old-generation universities shows

that team-teaching is implemented to a lesser extent in these institutions.

The standard deviation further supports this observation. New-generation universities had a much lower standard deviation (0.42008) compared to old-generation universities (0.77231). This means that lecturers in newer universities have more consistent and uniform experiences regarding the implementation of team-teaching, while responses from lecturers in older universities show greater variability, some departments or faculties may be implementing it well, while others are lagging behind. The mean difference of 0.28, though not extremely large, is meaningful. It suggests that newer universities, which often have more flexible structures, younger faculty members, and less entrenched traditional teaching cultures, find it easier to adopt and practise team-teaching. On the other hand, older universities appear to face more resistance or structural barriers to full implementation.

In summary, there is a moderate difference in the implementation of the team-teaching policy between the two categories of universities, with new-generation federal universities demonstrating a higher level of implementation than old-generation ones. This finding highlights the need for targeted interventions to support older universities in effectively adopting and sustaining the team-teaching policy.

Research Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in the implementation of the team-teaching policy between old-generation federal universities and newly established ones in the northeastern Nigeria.

Table 6 : Difference in the implementation of the team-teaching policy between old-generation federal universities and newly established ones in the northeastern Nigeria

Categories of universities	N	M	SD	T	Df	P	Decision
Old Generation	195	2.79	.77231	-4.1	355	.000	Reject Ho
New Generation	162	3.07	.42008				

Note: M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation, t = t cal, df = degree of freedom p < .05

Table 6 presents the result of an independent samples *t*-test conducted to determine whether there is a significant difference in the implementation of the team-teaching policy between second-generation federal universities and newly established federal universities in Northeastern Nigeria.

The results show that old-generation federal universities (N = 195, Mean = 2.79, SD = .77) differ from newly established federal universities (N = 162, Mean = 3.07, SD = .42) in the level of implementation of team-teaching policy. The calculated *t*-value under equal variances assumed is t(355) = −4.10, with a p-value of .000, which is less than the

0.05 level of significance. Since the p-value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected. This indicates that a statistically significant difference exists in the implementation of team-teaching policy between the two categories of universities.

The higher mean score recorded by newly established federal universities (M = 3.07) suggests that team-teaching policy is implemented more effectively in newly established universities than in old-generation federal universities (M = 2.79). This implies that institutional structure, administrative flexibility, or newer policy adoption mechanisms in recently established universities may enhance the implementation of collaborative teaching practices.

Discussion of Findings

The first finding from this study show that team-teaching is moderately implemented in Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria, with an overall cluster mean of 2.92 on a 4-point scale. This indicates that while the policy is being practised to some moderate extent, its implementation is still partial and uneven. On the positive side, lecturers are frequently paired for teaching and course supervision (Mean = 3.52), they commonly share topics and teaching time (Mean = 3.36), and they actively collaborate in setting examination questions (Mean = 3.27), marking scripts (Mean = 3.21), and collating students' scores (Mean = 3.07). These results suggest that collaboration is working quite well in the planning and assessment stages of teaching. Qualitative responses supported this finding. One lecturer explained, *"We are usually paired with colleagues to handle courses together, especially for supervision and setting of questions"* (P2). Another added, *"All of us in the team contribute questions for exams and we share the marking equally"* (P23). This shows that team-teaching has become a normal practice when it comes to preparing and assessing students' work.

However, the actual classroom delivery tells a different story. Lecturers rarely teach together as a real team. The lowest mean score (1.88) was recorded for the statement "Lecturers usually go in group as a team for lectures," and respondents also disagreed that senior colleagues are always available during lectures (Mean = 2.39). These quantitative findings were strongly confirmed by the qualitative data. One participant stated, *"We don't go to class as a team. Everyone teaches their own part separately"* (P9). A junior lecturer also lamented, "*Our senior colleagues rarely stay with us throughout the lecture. They only come when it is their turn*" (P21).

This reveals a clear gap: team-teaching in these universities is stronger on paper and in administrative tasks than in genuine classroom collaboration and mentoring. Instead of true co-teaching where two or more lecturers are present together in class, what is mostly practised is a "divide and teach" approach lecturers simply share topics and take turns. These findings are consistent with previous studies in Nigeria which found

that although team-teaching is officially encouraged, its full potential is often not realised because real collaborative classroom practice remains limited (Musa & Dauda, 2023; Osuala et al., 2015; Muza, 2021). Similar patterns have been observed internationally, where team-teaching policies frequently exist but are difficult to fully implement due to heavy workloads, large class sizes, and traditional teaching habits (Money & Coughlan, 2016; Davis, 2021; Lynch, 2020). The moderate implementation level recorded in this study implies that students are not yet enjoying the full benefits that well-practised team-teaching can offer, such as exposure to multiple teaching styles and richer classroom discussions. Junior lecturers are also missing out on consistent mentoring from their senior colleagues.

In summary, team-teaching has taken root in Federal Universities in Northeast Nigeria, particularly in planning and assessment, but it is still far from becoming a fully collaborative classroom reality. There is a need for university management to move beyond simply pairing lecturers to creating enabling conditions for genuine co-teaching and structured mentoring. Doing so would help unlock the real advantages of team-teaching for both students and faculty members.

The second finding from this study indicates that team-teaching is practised in Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria, but not all models are used equally. Lecturers clearly practice some approaches over others based on the nature of the courses and students' population. Quantitative results show that Station Teaching (also called rotational teaching) is the most frequently utilised model, with the highest mean score of 2.80. This is closely followed by the Teaming model (Mean = 2.78). In contrast, other models such as One Teach One Observe (Mean = 2.33), Parallel Teaching (Mean = 2.24), One Teach One Assist (Mean = 2.27), and Alternative Teaching (Mean = 2.06) were all rated as rarely practised.

The qualitative data from focus group discussions painted a clear picture of how team-teaching actually happens on the ground. Station Teaching emerged as the dominant model. Lecturers typically divide course content based on their areas of specialization, split students into groups, and rotate teaching their respective modules. One senior lecturer explained: "*In General Studies we usually divide the course into topics based on our strengths. I teach my part to one group, then move to the next group. This way, students benefit from different specialists."* (P17). The Teaming model was also commonly mentioned, where lecturers share the delivery of instruction to the entire class, often by teaching topics one after another. A participant noted: *"Sometimes we share topics among ourselves and teach our part one after the other."* (P2).

Other models were rarely used. Junior lecturers particularly lamented the limited use of the One Teach, One Observe model for mentoring. One junior lecturer said: *"Our*

senior colleagues rarely stay to observe us teach. Everyone just comes for their own slot and leaves." (P4) Similarly, practices such as splitting classes for simultaneous teaching (Parallel Teaching), providing differentiated support for at-risk students (Alternative Teaching), or having one lecturer assist while another teaches (One Teach, One Assist) were described as uncommon. These findings suggest that team-teaching in these universities is mainly viewed as a way of sharing workload through specialization and rotation rather than as a deeply collaborative or mentoring-oriented process. While Station Teaching and Teaming allow lecturers to play to their strengths and expose students to different experts, the limited use of other models means opportunities for real-time mentoring, classroom support, and differentiated instruction are being missed.

This pattern is consistent with earlier studies in Nigerian universities, which found that team-teaching often takes the form of topic division and turn-taking rather than fully integrated co-teaching approaches (Musa & Dauda, 2023; Osuala et al., 2015; Muza, 2021). Similar observations have been made in other contexts, where workload pressures and large class sizes push lecturers toward simpler, more practical models like station or parallel teaching (Padilla, 2020; Money & Coughlan, 2016). Overall, while Station Teaching and Teaming are the dominant models in the Northeast Zone, the heavy reliance on these two approaches shows that team-teaching is still largely practised as a divided workload strategy rather than a rich, collaborative pedagogical method. Greater awareness and training on the full range of team-teaching models could help universities maximise the benefits of this policy.

The third finding of this study reveals that lecturers in Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria experience moderate challenges in the implementation of the team-teaching policy, with a cluster mean of 2.71 on a 4-point scale. While the challenges are not overwhelming, they are significant enough to hinder the smooth and effective practice of team-teaching. The most pressing challenges identified include inadequate sanctions for lecturers who fail to participate fully (Mean = 2.94), difficulty in finding a common time to plan lessons together (Mean = 2.93), and truancy by some team members (Mean = 2.91). Other notable challenges are the lack of freedom to choose team members (Mean = 2.82), lack of self-confidence when teaching in front of colleagues (Mean = 2.76), personality clashes and misunderstandings (Mean = 2.69), and delays in the compilation of students' results (Mean = 2.67).

Focus group discussions brought these issues to life. Many lecturers complained about weak enforcement, with one participant noting: *"Some lecturers simply don't show up for team meetings or joint lectures where applicable, yet nothing serious is done about it. This makes others lose motivation."* (P20) Time constraint for joint planning was another recurring issue. A lecturer explained: *"We are all very busy with our individual*

courses and administrative duties. It is always difficult to sit down as a team to plan lectures properly." (P18) Truancy and irregular participation also came up strongly. One respondent said: *"Some team members only appear when it is convenient for them. This affects the flow of teaching and puts extra burden on the committed ones."* (P22) The inability to choose team members was a major source of frustration. A participant remarked: *"You are just paired with people you may not be compatible with. This sometimes leads to tension and poor collaboration."* (P5). Personality differences and lack of confidence were also mentioned. A junior lecturer shared: *"I sometimes feel nervous teaching alongside senior professors... You worry about making mistakes in their presence."* (P16). Interestingly, lecturers did not see some issues as serious problems. They disagreed that rotational team-teaching makes it difficult to cover the curriculum and that sharing responsibilities is inherently difficult. These findings align with previous research, which has consistently identified time constraints for joint planning, personality conflicts, lack of commitment by some team members, and weak institutional support as common barriers to effective team-teaching (Lynch, 2020; Davis, 2021; Reddy, 2022; Osuala et al., 2015; Musa & Dauda, 2023). The issue of inadequate sanctions and enforcement mechanisms appears particularly pronounced in the Nigerian university context.

Overall, the major challenges facing team-teaching implementation in the Northeast Zone are largely administrative and interpersonal weak enforcement, poor time management for collaboration, forced team composition, and human relationship issues rather than problems with the teaching itself. These challenges explain why team-teaching remains moderately implemented and why its full benefits are yet to be realised. University management needs to address these issues through clearer policies, better scheduling support, training on team dynamics, and stronger accountability measures if team-teaching is to succeed in these institutions.

The fourth finding shows a clear and statistically significant difference in the implementation of team-teaching policy between the two categories of universities. New-generation federal universities recorded a higher mean score ($M = 3.07$, $SD = 0.42$) compared to old-generation universities ($M = 2.79$, $SD = 0.77$), with a mean difference of 0.28. The independent samples t-test confirmed this difference as statistically significant, $t(355) = -4.10$, $p = .000$ ($p < .05$). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

This result indicates that team-teaching is more actively and consistently practised in newer universities than in older ones. The lower standard deviation among new-generation universities also suggests greater uniformity in implementation across departments. Newer institutions, with more flexible structures, younger faculty, and less rigid traditions, appear better positioned to

adopt collaborative teaching approaches (Musa & Dauda, 2023; Ogunode et al., 2021).

Conclusion

Based on the findings, the study concludes that team-teaching policy is moderately implemented in Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria and is widely perceived as beneficial to instructional quality, lecturer collaboration and students' learning outcomes. However, implementation is stronger in planning and assessment activities than in collaborative classroom delivery. Although newer universities demonstrate higher levels of implementation, both older and newer institutions face similar administrative, interpersonal and time-related challenges. Therefore, for team-teaching policy to achieve its full potential, universities must strengthen institutional support mechanisms, improve coordination among lecturers, and address organizational constraints that limit effective collaborative teaching practices.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following practical recommendations are offered to strengthen the implementation of the team-teaching policy in Federal Universities in the Northeast Zone of Nigeria. The suggestions are directed to the key stakeholders responsible for making team-teaching more effective, consistent, and beneficial to both lecturers and students.

I. University management should introduce clear policies on accountability, including appropriate sanctions for lecturers who are habitually truant or fail to participate fully in team-teaching activities, as well as recognition and rewards for high-performing teams.
II. University management should also organise mandatory capacity-building workshops and seminars on effective team-teaching models (especially the full range of co-teaching approaches beyond station teaching and turn-taking).
III. National University Commission should mandate all federal universities to submit annual reports on the level of team-teaching implementation, challenges encountered, and steps taken to address them.
IV. Heads of Departments (HoDs) should allow lecturers some input in the selection of team members whenever possible, in order to reduce personality clashes and improve compatibility within teams.
V. Heads of Departments (HoDs) should also ensure that senior lecturers are deliberately paired with junior colleagues for genuine mentoring during lectures, rather than leaving mentoring to chance.
VI. Lecturers should embrace a spirit of genuine collaboration by attending all scheduled team meetings and joint lectures, and by being open to learning from colleagues regardless of seniority.

VII. Lecturers should also actively participate in professional development programmes on team-teaching to build confidence, especially when teaching in the presence of senior colleagues.

REFERENCES

Acacia University. (November 24, 2025). *Benefits of Teacher Collaboration |Strategies*. Retrieved from https://acacia.edu/blog/teacher-collaboration-for-professional-growth/

Akpan, G. A., Usoro, H. S., Akpan, I. G., & Ekpo, A. B. (2010). Effects of team-teaching on students' performance in introductory technology in secondary schools in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. *An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal, Ethiopia, 4 (3b), 41-54.* www.afrrev.com

Bhakta, A. (2018).team-teaching: an effective teaching method. *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews (IJRAR)*, *5*(3), 130-136. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/391443283_TEAM_TEACHING_AN_EFFECTIVE_TEACHING_METHOD [accessed Oct 05 2025].

Buckley, F. J. (6 July, 2022). Team-teaching Advantages, Disadvantages.

Cook, L., & Friend, M. (2004, April). Co-teaching: Principles, Practices and Pragmatics, Paper presented at the quarterly meeting of the New Mexico Public Education Department Special Education Meeting, Albuquerque, NM.https://education.ky.gov/school/stratclsgap/instruction/Documents/Co-Teaching%20Principles%2C%20Practices%20and%20Pragmatics%20Handbook.pdf

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. (3rd ed.)*, SAGE Publications Limited.

Davis, S. R. (2021). Two teachers, one classroom: the challenges and rewards of team-teaching. http://dx.doi.org/10.14288/1.0398181

Esomonu, N. P. M., Akudolu, L. R., & Ezenwosu, N. E. (2015). Effects of team-teaching on students' academic achievement in english language comprehension. *Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME) 5(5), 06-12. www.iosrjournals.org*

Goetz, K. (2000). Perspectives on team–teaching, Egallery, 1, 4. http://www.ucalgary.ca/egallery/goetz.htm (accessed9/11/2009).

Heffernan, M. (2022). Team-teaching; The benefits and challenges. Terenure College

https://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/2493/Team-Teaching.html

Ike, E. A. (2016) Comparative Analysis of the effects of Team-teaching strategies and conventional teaching approach in secondary schools in Imo state, Nigeria. *International Journal of Education and Research. 4*(6), 417-432

Jang, S. J. (2006). Research on the effects of team-teaching upon two secondary school teachers. Educational research, 48(2), 177-194

Lee, S. H. (2013). An Evaluation on a Team-teaching by University Students and Lecturers in Australia. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research,. 4*(5), 914-923. https://doi:10.4304/jltr.4.5.914-923

Lynch, M. (18 May, 2020). Common co-teaching challenges: there are ways to address them https://www.theedadvocate.org/common-co-teaching-challenges-there-are-ways-to-address-them/

Money, A., & Coughlan, J. (2016). Team-taught versus individually taught undergraduate education: a qualitative study of student experiences and preferences. High Educ 72, 797–811. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-015-9976-5

Moss, J. (2017). Practices and Impacts of Team-teaching: A Review of Literature. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334249426_Practices_and_Impacts_of_Team_Teaching_A_Review_of_Literature?channel=doi&linkId=5d1ed5e6458515c11c129823&showFulltext=true

Musa, A. & Dauda, L. S. (2023). Evaluation of team-teaching policy in Nigerian universities: case study of Faculty of Education, Federal University, Wukari, Nigeria. *Dutse Journal of Education*, *2*(1), 403-413.

Musa, A., & Vincent, V. N. (2022). School Plant Management in Public Universities in Nigeria: Challenges and the Way Forward. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning and Neural Network (JAIMLNN) ISSN: 2799-1172*, *2*(03), 23-28.

Musa, A., Gregory, D. M., & Abdullahi, I. (2022). Higher Education in Nigeria: Private Universities' Challenges and Coping Strategies. *Asian Research Journal of Current Science*, *4*(1), 279-286. Retrieved from https://www.globalpresshub.com/index.php/ARJOCS/article/view/1626

Muza, S. H. (2021). Team-teaching Approach on Academic Performance of Students in Faculty of Education. *The Universal Academic Research Journal.* http://tuara.org/frontend/articles/pdf/v2i1/template-team-teachingpdf.pdf

Ogunode, N. J. Akinlade O. M. & Musa, A. (2021). Quality Assurance in Nigerian Public Higher Institutions: Challenges and Way Forward. *Web of*

Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal ISSN: 2776-0979, *2*(7). https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/K9QP5 https://wos.academiascience.org/index.php/wos/article/view/309

Ogunode, N. J., & Musa, A. (2020). Higher education in Nigeria: Challenges and the ways forward. *Electronic Research Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, *3*.

Osuala, R. C., Onwuagboke, B. B. C., Chukwudebelu, C. B. (2015).Implementation of Team-teaching in Selected Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria. Journal of Educational and Social Research, 5(3), 221-227. https://www.academia.edu/18503696/Implementation_of_Team_Teaching_in_Selected_Tertiary_Institutions_in_Nigeria

Padilla, D. D. M. (2020). Collaborative team-teaching (CTT) in major subjects among the program offerings in university: input to 21st century teaching-learning process. Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology, 17(9), 1518-1540. https://archives.palarch.nl/index.php/jae/article/download/3988/5881/11675

Reddy, C. (1 July, 2022).Team-teaching method advantages and disadvantages. https://content.wisestep.com/advantages-disadvantages-team-teaching-method/

Robinson, A. J. (2019). Factors that influence the implementation and practice of team-teaching for English and Social Science teachers in secondary innovative learning environments in Aotearoa New Zealand. [Master of Education (Educational Administration and Leadership), Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand].

Tuckman, B. (1965). Bruce Tuckman's Team Development Model. https://www.lfhe.ac.uk/download.../3C6230CF-61E8-4C5E-9A0C1C81DCDEDCA2

Yanamandram, V. & Noble, G., (2006). Student Experiences and Perceptions of Team-Teaching in a Large Undergraduate Class, *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, *3(*1). 56-74. http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol3/iss1/6