

Original Research Article

School Teamwork and Effectiveness

Ma. Antonette P. Dugang

Department of Education Tagbilaran City Division, Philippines

Corresponding Author: Ma. Antonette P. Dugang, E-mail: m.dugang@yahoo.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received: May 21, 2020

Accepted: June 25, 2020

Volume: 2

Issue: 2

KEYWORDS

School Teamwork, Effectiveness, Cebu, Bohol, descriptive, less performing school, teachers' assessment

ABSTRACT

This study is aimed to assess the school teamwork and effectiveness of selected performing and less performing schools of Tagbilaran City, Bohol, Cebu City and Cebu Province in the academic year 2017-2018. Specifically intended to assess the school heads' and teachers' assessment on school teamwork and effectiveness and determine its significant difference in the respondents' assessment. And if there is a significant correlation between school heads' and teachers' assessment. Based on the assessment and findings, a proposed Enhancement Program for School Teamwork and Effectiveness is proposed. The respondents of this study were the public elementary school heads and teachers of the four selected divisions of Region VII. The descriptive-correlative type of research was employed in this investigation with the aid of the self-made questionnaire in gathering the data to measure the relationship of school heads' and teachers' school teamwork level and school effectiveness. The dissertation then identifies in a detailed finding on the school heads' and teachers' assessment on school teamwork and school effectiveness under review of performing and less performing schools in the four selected divisions in Region VII. There is relatively lesser overall teamwork in problem solving and team processes. For school effectiveness findings reveal an agreement on high effectiveness for four divisions performing and less performing schools excluding one performing school in one of the provincial schools with lesser effectiveness result.

Introduction

The Law of the Catalyst in the 17 Indisputable laws of Teamwork states that winning teams have players who make things happen. None of stakeholders is as smart as all (Blanchard, 2003). Organizations are increasingly relying on team-based work structures to accomplish organizational goals, as teams have been argued to potentially overcome complex problems more effectively than individuals working alone (Anderson, 2001). However not all teams are equally effective (Hackman, 1990), and despite profound research interest in teamwork, researchers continue to disagree on which components subsume the construct (Duel, 2010), and how it relates to team effectiveness.

Teamwork is necessary for school personnel since it is a multidimensional construct that is characterized by a set of flexible and adaptive behavior, cognition, and attitude that interact to achieve mutual goals and adaptation that interact to changing internal and external environments (Duel, 2010). Consistently, teamwork consists of knowledge, skills and attitudes (KSA) that are exhibited in order to support team members, and team goal accomplishments (Bake, Day, & Sala, 2006; and Duel 2010). The significant relationship between teamwork and goal accomplishments has an ultimate impact towards school effectiveness (Duel, 2010). Teamwork is necessary for the productivity of systems.

Niccoli Machiavelli said, "The first method for estimating the intelligence of a ruler is to look at the men he has around him. Leaders who continue to grow personally and bring growth to their organization will influence many and develop a successful

team around him". The better the players, the better the leader. Teamwork is an important component of effective and efficient leadership. It refers to a process where work is performed by a team to achieve a common goal. Within the context of the school environment, teamwork plays a key role in the effort to improve outcomes as it influences the level of motivation and capacity of teachers, as well as the school climate and environment. Research suggests that teamwork can be likened to two kinds of substance that play an important role in modern life. Firstly, it is the glue that keeps the team together and a bond that promotes strength, unity, reliability and support. Secondly, teamwork is the lubricant that makes the team work. It enables smoother movement towards targets, assists forward momentum, and helps teams to overcome obstacles. Hence, learning about the importance of teamwork is one of the stepping stones one needs to be successful in both career and personal life.

Educational leaders and school administrators are engaged in massive quest for continuing professional development for their personnel in ensuring competence in the education profession. The personnel are to plan, craft and propose school-based trainings to support continuing professional development and growth.

With this view, the researcher is moved to further explore on school personnel teamwork looking into each of the eight team effectiveness dimensions, which are purpose and goal, roles, team processes, team relationship, interpersonal group relations, problem solving, passion and commitment, and skills and training. This study also examines how these dimensions impact on school effectiveness. In other words, this study aims to determine the extent to which team effectiveness dimension influence the effectiveness of schools in the four Divisions of Region VII. The findings may be used as input in the conduct of training to enhance teamwork among stakeholders.

Literature Review

When multiple minds sit together, they easily resolve issues and achieve organizational goals. Delarue (2008) maintains that the importance of team working in workplace teamwork has a big role in the organizational performance because teamwork is the key to encouragement, motivation, communication, and brainstorming and ideas sharing.

Tuckman's model is significant because it recognizes the fact that groups do not start off fully formed and functioning. He suggests that teams grow through clearly defined stages, from their creation as groups of individuals, to cohesive, task-focused teams.

Tuckman describes working with a team of social psychologists on behalf of the U.S. Navy. The team studied small group behavior, from several perspectives. In doing so Tuckman reviewed 50 articles on group development and noticed that there were two features common to these small groups: the interpersonal or group structure, and the task activity of these teams via four common stages.

Firstly, an orientation testing phase which often leads to a period characterized by a degree of conflict. This stage then generally resolved itself, leading to a more socially cohesive phase. Finally, group settled to a functional phase, during which they focused on role-relatedness. To summarize these four phases, Tuckman coined the oft-quoted terms: "forming", "storming", "norming" and "performing".

Tuckman's theory is best illustrated on a graph which shows the link between group relationships (the horizontal axis) and task focus (the vertical axis). The optimal or "performing" position is reached when relationships have developed within the group and it has started delivering with a clear focus on the task. However, Tuckman's ideas clearly indicate that it takes time to reach the "performing stage" and it is normal for these teams to go through ups and downs as they develop relationships particularly in the early period, which is perhaps why Tuckman's called it the "storming" phase!

The four phases of Tuckman's Teamwork Theory include the following:

- a. **Forming.** The initial stage of team development during which individuals have not yet gelled together. Everybody is busy finding their place in the team, sizing each other up, and asking themselves why they are here!
- b. **Storming.** People begin to see themselves as part of a team. However, at this stage they may challenge each other and the team leader about such things as what the team is doing, and how things should be done. As the

stage title suggests, conflict and confrontation typify this stage as differences surface. This may result in some loss of performance or focus on the task.

- c. **Norming.** This is the phase where team members start to come together, developing processes, establishing ground rules, clarifying who does what and how things will be done. This phase is characterized by a growing sense of “togetherness”.
- d. **Performing.** This is the final stage where increased focus on both the task and on team relationships combine to provide synergy. Performance is delivered through people working effectively together.

The value of Tuckman’s model is that it helps personnel understand that teams evolve. It also helps in considering how personnel encounter different problems at different stages of their development. One limitation of the model maybe that it makes team building appear too linear and sequential. Although it is a useful analytical tool, personnel must remember that some teams may “loop” around in their development. It is relevant to the present study because teamwork is expected to provide underpinnings on which the stage to be observable and measurable.

Another theory which this study is anchored on is the School Effectiveness Theory by Marzano (2012 , cited in Pabalan 2017). According to him, there are five levels of school effectiveness. Movement of a school through these levels is intended to produce a system that has “high reliability” regarding each level for which the school has successfully demonstrated it satisfies the criterion indicators (i.e., lagging indicators). In effect, when a school has met the criterion indicators for a specific level, it consistently monitors those indicators and makes immediate corrections when school performance falls below acceptable levels.

The leading indicators for each level can be considered more qualitative evidence that a school is at or approaching a level. The criterion indicators (lagging indicators) for a given level can be considered the minimally acceptable levels of performance that must be satisfied for a school to be deemed as reliable for that specific level. The five levels are as follows: first, a safe and orderly environment that supports cooperation and collaboration; second, an instructional framework that develops and maintains effective instruction in every classroom; third, a guaranteed and variable curriculum focused on enhancing student learning; fourth, is standard-referenced system of reporting student progress and fifth; a competency-based system that ensures student mastery of content.

As a school moves through the levels, it becomes reliable relative to more variables and becomes more transformational in its approach to educating its students. At the highest level (i.e., level 5) a school has made a dramatic shift in the way it “does business “ and can guarantee that every student has mastered specific content necessary for success in the 21st century. For Hannan and Freeman (2012), a natural measure of the effectiveness of an organizational ecology is that organizational effectiveness depends on the environment in which the organization operates. An organization that delivers adequate performance in a challenging environment must be more effective than an organization that performs well without encountering problems.

Another theory in teamwork is proposed by Belbin (2010). Everybody has a tendency to behave in a particular way when working with other people, which does not mean, of course, that they will always behave like that. Meredith Belbin and her colleagues found that there are common clusters of these behaviors, and these clusters are stable enough to be separately identifiable. Everybody seems to have a preference for one or more of these 'team roles' when behaving naturally in a group. If personnel have more than one 'natural role', then they can switch between them if they (personnel) choose, and this is useful knowledge if they ever need to fill a different role in a team.

The significance is that by observing real teams over a period of several years, Belbin (2010) and his group learned to predict whether a team would succeed or fail, just by knowing the mix of roles within the group. They could also make a failing group succeed by adding somebody with the right-role - or make a successful group fail by taking away a vital supporting role. They also found that if team members identify, share and discuss their team roles then this improves how people work and live together. They refined things as they went along, so some roles have more than one name.

Each person has a number of roles which they can manage comfortably if they cannot, for whatever reason, operate in their most preferred role. If the organization seriously wants to develop the individual, consideration needs to be given to tasks, goals, and jobs that would give the individual the opportunity of working within a role that they can manage. They will face a

developmental challenge by taking up the role but they will not be placed in a situation where they will inevitably fail. Ideally, the individual should be in a position within a team where they are in their preferred roles. If this is not possible, the next best placement is the manageable role. In this situation an individual is made stronger in areas in which they can develop while ignoring areas where they are least or weakest. The worst-case scenario is that an individual is placed in a position of continual 'out of role stress'.

There are two options for this. A team whose members are developing in areas where they have a chance of succeeding in while at the same time delivering the results desired; or teams whose members are struggling to come to terms with significant 'out of role stress' and are failing in their day-to-day tasks. One point to note is that an allowable weakness can become disallowable if it starts to impact negatively on the team's performance.

The K-12 School Effectiveness Framework (2013), a support for school improvement and student success identifies evidence-based indicators of successful practice in a number of components of effective schools. The indicators, with samples of evidence, assist educators in building coherence and aligning practices across and in the entire school. Based on research and practical evidence of what makes schools effective, the following components that impact student achievement have been identified. assessment for, as and of learning; school and classroom leadership; student engagement; curriculum, teaching and learning; pathways, planning and programming; home, school and community partnerships. The framework is designed with two key processes in mind. 1.) The School Self-Assessment Process is a thoughtful inquiry that helps to identify strategies that will leverage improvement and inform implementation of the School Improvement Plan. The School Self-Assessment considers the following questions : 1.1.) Are we reaching our student learning and achievement goals? 1.2.) How do we know? What is the quantitative and qualitative evidence that supports this?1.3.) What actions will we take to ensure continuous improvement? 2. The District Process is to be carried out with integrity and transparency for the purpose of promoting reflection, collaborative inquiry and ultimately improved student learning. The steps in the District Process include: 2.1. review of data and progress from the school self-assessment; 2.2. determination of the scope of the review; 2.3.collection, data analysis and preparation of summary reports with recommendations; 2.4. support for school planning and implementation of improvement strategies; 2.5. capacity building for the professional learning community.

Globally, competitive market's real success lies in the performance of its team. However, teamwork has a rich history. It is not practiced only in the business world today, but is one of the oldest things known to man. Interestingly, mankind has worked in teams and group since the primitive days of civilization. The traces of teamwork are visible everywhere. According to Dyer (2008), the idea of working in a team can be traced back to the late 1920s and early 1930s with the now classic Hawthorne studies. Grayson (2012), on the other hand, states that the earliest formal studies of teamwork took place after World War II and focused on discovering the reasons for the failure of military teams.

Grayson (2012) notes that the first scholarly study of teamwork took place in the 1950s under the direction of psychologists who examined how humans relate to themselves and others. This group also looked at how work influences team interactions and the actions team members take to tap into the talents and skills of other members in order to solve a task or problem at work. Other studies explored the changes that occurred in teams over time and how teams have integrated technology in the completion of tasks.

There are numerous definitions of teamwork. The concept "team" has been widely used in different social sciences including anthropology, sociology, psychology, etc.; hence, it has different definitions based on the field of study. Most scholars (Cardona & Wilkinson 2006); Grayson, 2012; Greenwood, 2012 Phalane, 2012 Medwell, 2009) see a team as a group of individuals who come together to work cooperatively on a task in order to achieve a common goal, while teamwork refers to the activities of a group of individuals which can include effective communication and interaction among the team members to promote knowledge sharing, understanding of each other on a personal level helping others in achieving a level of perfection, building a sense of unity in the team and working towards the achievement of common goals. As Medwell (2009) observes, teamwork is when individual experts gather as a work group and set goals, communicate, cooperate and make decisions together, combining their knowledge and abilities to compile work plans that will enable them to accomplish their goals.

With this background in mind, schools today are largely concerned about learning and are taking every possible step to increase students' performance. One approach that has had a very substantial and positive impact on school performance is teamwork. Effective teamwork is a very important methodology which schools can use to develop teachers' potential to the

fullest. In the context of the school environment there is a theoretical and practical divide. Head teachers seem to know the theory of teamwork, but have failed to put it into practice. The fact is that teamwork as a method has been used so languidly over the years that in some cases it has ceased to be what it stands for and, instead, it has rather become a cliché.

Teamwork is an indispensable element in the success and profitability of organization. Among others, working in a team has the advantage that the workload can be distributed among all the team members. In addition, working as a team can benefit the individual, the team and the organization.

Recent research (Phalane, 2012) findings, reveal that in the school environment improvement and effectiveness can be realized through teamwork. With most continuing professional development programs for teachers, teamwork skills seem to receive little formal attention. Acquiring these skills is critically important, especially for head teachers as they advance and assume supervisory responsibilities for the school management teams (SMTs).

Teamwork is a tool that can be used to improve the quality of teaching and learning. This is demonstrated, for example, which facilitates more interaction between teachers and that may result in an improved quality of teaching and learning. With teamwork, teachers' strengths are combined and their weaknesses are remedied, while underperforming teachers can be observed, critiqued and advised about how to improve by other team members in a non-threatening, supportive context.

Cardona and Wilkinson (2006) argue that each team member has his or her own personality and brings to the task particular skills, knowledge and experience, which are different from those of other team members. According to them, teamwork reduces teacher isolation, increases collegiality, facilitates the sharing of resources and ideas, and capitalizes on teachers' individual and shared strengths. It also enables schools to achieve their goals within a predetermined time frame by using their knowledge of administration and uniting the physical power, will power and intellectual power of participants to be the same in teamwork (Catharine, 2009).

Teamwork and school leadership have a symbolic relationship. Schools, as organizations, require leaders to motivate, direct and drive teachers as well as administrative personnel in order to move the schools forward. Strong team leadership that motivate, develop and guide teachers' administrative personnel can result in lower costs for the organization (Ostar 2012). A high level of job satisfaction among teachers and administrative personnel leads to lower employee turnover and higher productivity. Hence, teamwork plays an important part in successful organizational operations. Productive teams help build businesses and create effective organizations.

Greenwood (2012) contends that teamwork can compel people to expand their skills and to learn from one another in ways that might never have occurred had they not been placed on the same team. In addition, it can encourage members to learn respect and appreciate each other as well as promote a sense of belonging.

According to Ostar (2012), teamwork has become an essential element in the success and survival of a business. He maintains that teams are able to reach their goals when they have inspiring leaders, well-qualified team members and well-defined goals or missions Research (Phalane, 2012).

Greenwood 2012) shows that team members should have the following attitudes: 1) a common purpose and clear goals; 2) the necessary skills and resource; 3) a common approach to work; 4) the willingness to share information; 5) trust and support in each other; 6) the ability to work through conflict; 7) the willingness to take responsibility for team actions.

Moreover, Aquino (2013) said on previous research of school effectiveness that teachers' commitment emerges as a significant factor towards school effectiveness. Several researches consistently have shown that teachers' commitment has positive relationship with organizational performance. Two types of commitment regularly discussed school effectiveness research (i.e. individual commitment and organizational commitment). Organizational commitment can be described as the teachers' effort towards the school. These efforts will have a positive impact on students.

School effectiveness researches have shown that school culture is related to student achievement (Sackney, 2008). A study by Sweetland (2000) demonstrated that, after socioeconomic status, school culture had a more powerful effect on student achievement than any other variable. Teachers who felt empowered and part of a team, and who felt supported by their

principals and colleagues, enjoyed a sense of collective efficacy and higher achievement scores were the result. Administrators and teachers with a shared belief in the power to produce effects through collective action promote higher levels of academic progress.

A review of school effectiveness literature shows that different levels of school level achievement are linked to differences in school characteristics and especially to school culture (Louis, Toole, & Hargreaves, 2009). Furthermore, researchers observed that organizational structural arrangements and the set of cultural elements within an organization are central to effectiveness and productivity (Kelley & Peterson, 2002). For example, Brown et al. (2003) developed an initial framework for a conceptual definition of curricular culture as a school-level characteristic impacting overall school effectiveness.

Many of the early school effectiveness studies have emphasized differences between effective and ineffective schools. Hoy, Sweetland, and Smith (2002) noted that “such school effectiveness studies are post hoc comparisons; in fact, very few of these studies made a priori predictions about what organizational properties were related to school effectiveness or student achievement, and that remains the case today. Even fewer studies describe the processes and mechanisms that link school properties to student achievement, that is, provide a theoretical explanation of why certain school characteristics promote achievement.” Recently, there has been an emphasis on measuring school effectiveness through the monitoring of student outcomes to develop comprehensive school accountability systems. These systems use standardized test scores to measure student progress and achievement to make comparisons among schools. Heck (2000) reported that “school effectiveness research, in part, has been a driving force behind such [school accountability system] efforts, determining that school structure and the quality of educational processes can make a difference in student achievement”. Because of this, it is important for researchers and practitioners alike to understand the relationships among these school level variables and school effectiveness.

Potter, Reynolds, and Chapman (2002) urge researchers and practitioners to carefully consider any potential interrelationships among these school characteristics and any mediating factors such as state accountability systems that may contribute to school effectiveness.

Deal and Peterson (2000) suggested that principals should work to develop shared visions rooted in history, values, beliefs of what the school should be, hire compatible staff, face conflict rather than avoid it, and use story-telling to illustrate shared values. Finally, and most important, principals must nurture the traditions, ceremonies, rituals, and symbols that already express and reinforce positive school culture.

It is in this light that school personnel teamwork looking into each team’s eight effectiveness dimensions on purpose and goal, roles, team processes, team relationship, intergroup relations, problem solving, passion and commitment, and skills and training were explore determined corrections as well as identified how these influenced the effectiveness of the school based on their perception of school effectiveness instrument. All of these call for the importance of school heads and teachers because he or she is the key to an enduring, sustained, effective delivery of educational service.

The Department of Education is the principal government agency responsible for education and manpower development. It continually pursues the mandate of the 1987 Philippine Constitution ensuring peoples’ right to education. Article XIV, Sec.1 of the Constitution provides that the state shall protect and promote the right of all citizens to quality education at all levels and shall take appropriate steps to make such education accessible to all. It states that everybody has a right to be educated. So, one must fight for it. It is the government’s obligation to address it, because education is the basis of democracy. Government should prioritize education, not debts payments (Ismael, 2008).

Republic Act 7784, Section 1 states that “it is the declared policy of the State to protect and promote the right of all citizens to quality education at all levels and shall take appropriate steps to make such education accessible to all. It is likewise universally recognized that the teacher is the key to the effectiveness of the teaching-learning process by drawing out and nurturing the best in the learner as a human being and a worthy member of society.” Thus, this Act aims to provide and ensure quality education by strengthening the education and training of teachers nationwide.

R.A. 9155 provides that the Department of Education is vested responsibility for ensuring access to, promoting equity in, and improving the quality of basic education. Section 2 states that the school shall be the heart of the formal education system. It is where children learn. School shall have a single aim of providing the best possible basic education for all learners. While

section 3 of the same act states (d.) To ensure that schools and learning centers receive the kind of focused attention they deserve and that educational programs, projects and services take into account the interests of all members of the community.

In summary, the self-made questionnaire adapted from “Team Effectiveness” created by London Leadership Academy, National Health Service provides the framework of assessing the teamwork of the selected four divisions. The components of the team effectiveness questionnaire such as purpose and goals; roles; team processes; team relationship; intergroup relationship; problem-solving; and skills and learning.

As of school effectiveness were explored in this research using the School Effectiveness instrument which is based on the K-12 School Effectiveness Framework that focused on the following: assessment for, as and of learning; school and classroom leadership; student engagement; curriculum, teaching, and learning; pathways, planning and programming; home, school and community partnership were adapted in the formulation of the research tool and in the measurement of variables.

Methodology

This study is a descriptive-correlational type of research. This research design was employed in this investigation with the aid of the self-made questionnaire in gathering the data to measure the relationship of school heads’ and teachers’ school teamwork level and school effectiveness. The present school teamwork is correlated with the school effectiveness. The study involved four divisions in Region VII. The research environment of the study were the performing and less-performing schools in City and Provincial schools in each divisions of Tagbilaran City, Bohol Province, Cebu City, Cebu Province. The criteria in determining the performing and less performing schools in each division is based on their PBB (Performance-Based Bonus), which is a top-up bonus in an amount equivalent to a percentage of the employees’ monthly basic salary to be granted to government personnel in accordance with their contribution to the accomplishment of the departments’ over all targets and commitments, performance categories are as follows: best delivery unit; better delivery unit; good delivery unit. The final identification of schools in every division is closely coordinated with their respective planning officer and Schools Division Superintendents with the researcher. The study involved the school heads and the teachers of elementary schools from the identified schools by each division as to performing and less-performing schools for the school year 2017-2018. Respondents are from two city schools and two provincial schools. Statistical procedures were applied for more objective interpretation of data such as weighted mean and composite mean. For the relationship between teamwork effectiveness and school effectiveness, Pearson Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation was used.

Results and Discussion

The result shows that another overwhelming agreement of effectiveness is observable. Agreement on effectiveness in terms of curriculum, teaching and learning is relatively highest in Item 3, on differentiating instruction in response to student strength, needs and prior learning as shown by the composite mean of 2.64. The next highest mean response is on Item 2 “complementing instruction with adequate learning resources with a composite mean of 2.59.

This result suggests that both school heads and teachers in the performing and less performing schools answer the call of differentiated instruction to foster students’ strengths, meet their needs and tap prior learning complemented with adequate learning resources. This perception of effectiveness can be observed in terms of curriculum teaching and learning both respondents regardless of school know that students readiness, interest and learning styles should be considered by providing activities in which students make sense of what they need to learn how they will get across to the learning process; complementing instruction with more meaningful and deep learning experiences by using adequate learning resources.

Through still of high effectiveness, mean response is relatively lowest in Items 5 and 4 as indicated by the values 2.35 and 2.52. Item 5 is on organizing out of school activities to further explore students’ interest skills and aspirations; and Item 4 on timely interventions responding to individual student learning needs. The result suggests that although there is an evident perception of high effectiveness respondents might have observed that there is relatively lesser agreement on effectiveness in organizing out-of-school activities to further explore students’ interest skills and aspirations making timely interventions responding to individual student learning needs.

A closer look at the assessment of effectiveness in the area of curriculum, teaching and learning of performing and less performing schools, the four divisions have the same result with that of Tables 12 and 13. Almost all have expressed unified

high effectiveness excluding one performing school category in the Cebu Province. This observation is underpinned by the paired mean 2.65-2.47; 2.84-2.36; 2.65-2.38; and 2.64 respectively.

On the other hand, only one performing school category in Cebu Province expressed effective mean response of 2.19. The result suggests that the respondents' who expressed unified agreement of high effectiveness consistently have observed effectiveness in terms of curriculum, teaching and learning. Moreover, the response indicates that they have school heads and teachers who orchestrate effective classroom discussion, questions and learning tasks that promote higher-order thinking skills.

The effective mean response of one performing school category further relatively low mean response of 2.91 which means further strengthening of effectiveness. The results further suggest that school heads and teachers need to develop, improve and support qualified teachers and effective teaching practices and improve student learning outcomes.

Result shows that high effectiveness agreement is observable. Agreement on effectiveness in terms of pathways, planning and programming is relatively highest in Item 2.B., that opportunities for authentic learning experience exist in schools as shown by the composite mean of 2.64. Subsequently is Item 2A., that opportunities for authentic learning experience exist in classrooms as shown by the composite mean of 2.63.

This suggests that both school heads and teachers believe that in schools and clearer picture in classrooms are opportunities for authentic learning experiences. With this effectiveness, it can be said that both school heads and teachers regardless of school performance believe that provisions of opportunities for students to use all their senses to create meaningful, useful shared outcomes to connect in real life experiences happen in the classroom and in the whole school. Although still of high perception of effectiveness, mean response is relatively lowest in Items 1 and 2.C. as indicated by values 2.37 and 2.38. Item 1 is on career planning programs meeting the learning needs of all students and community program. The result suggests that the respondents might have observed that there is relatively lesser effectiveness in career planning programs that meet the learning needs of all students and providing opportunities for authentic learning experience. A finer analysis of the assessment of effectiveness in the area of pathways, planning and programming in terms of performing and less performing schools of each division shows that Tagbilaran City and Cebu City division agreed there is effectiveness in terms of pathways, planning and programming. The result suggests that both respondents perceived that the school heads and teachers address timely demands of meeting learning needs of the students.

The effective mean response of one performing school category in Cebu Province and one less performing school of the Bohol division reveals a relatively low mean responses of 2.17 and 2.04 respectively. This result means further strengthening of pathways, planning and programming effectiveness in their schools. The result further suggests that planning, programming and provision of authentic learning is not highly effective as that of other schools in the different divisions.

On the result on the respondents' assessment on the effectiveness of schools in terms of home, school and community partnership, it shows that agreement on high effectiveness is visible in all items. Agreement on effectiveness in terms of home, school and community partnership is relatively highest in Item 3, that the school and community build partnerships to enhance learning opportunities for students as shown by the composite mean response of 2.84. Next in track is Item 1 "has a meaningful role in supporting students" as shown by composite mean of 2.78. The result suggests that both the school heads and teachers in the school categorized believe that enhancement of learning opportunities and support for students, the school and community have built partnership where stakeholders have meaningful roles to take. With this indicator it can be said that both groups of respondents regardless of school performance have efforts to forge meaningful partnership between school and community; know the essential effort to expand when, where, how and what students learn, know their meaningful roles in dealing with fragile beings, and motivate to make the learners become academically proficient and thrive as they enhance their learning capabilities.

Despite agreement on high effectiveness, mean response is relatively lowest in the remaining two items, Item 4 and 2 as indicated by the values of 2.69 and 2.77. Item 4 is on resources and support being provided to help productive ongoing parent-teacher-student conversations and stakeholders are valued partners in student learning. The result suggests that despite high effectiveness the respondents might have observed that there is relatively lesser effectiveness on resources and support which are provided to help productive ongoing parent-teacher-student conversations and in the valuing of stakeholders as partners in student learning.

A finer analysis of mean response per division shows that perception of effectiveness is observable in all the divisions in Tagbilaran City, Bohol, Cebu City and Cebu Province. The result suggests that the respondents from the performing and less performing schools perceived that the school heads and teachers' strong identification of the strategic role of home, school and community partnership causes the unified agreement.

On the respondents' overall assessment on the effectiveness of schools in the selected four divisions, the result shows high agreement on high effectiveness in all six items. Agreement on effectiveness by school heads and teachers in the selected four divisions is relatively highest in Item 6, that is home, school and community partnership as shown by the composite mean response of 2.77. Following is Item 3, student engagement as shown by composite mean response of 2.69. This result suggests that both school heads and teachers of the four divisions unanimously agreed that home, school and community partnership together with school and classroom leadership are the top factors where school effectiveness is traceable.

With this effectiveness indicator, it can be said that these selected divisions regardless of school performances agree that home, school and community partnership is an arm of every school that is a very critical partner yet deemed highly effective in every school success and further act ably consistent and diligent with leadership task qualities.

Notwithstanding perception on high effectiveness, mean response is relatively lowest in Items 5 and 4 as indicated by the values, 2.51 and 2.52. Item 5 is on pathways, planning and programming; curriculum, teaching and learning. The result suggests that although there is agreement on high effectiveness the respondents might have observed that there is relatively lesser effectiveness in the aforementioned areas.

A closer attention at the over-all assessment of effectiveness by school heads and teachers on the selected four divisions shows that performing schools of Tagbilaran City, Bohol and Cebu City have expressed high effectiveness in all indicators, while Cebu Province expresses high effectiveness only in indicator 6. Less performing schools of Tagbilaran City, Cebu City and Cebu Province express high effectiveness in all indicators, while Bohol expressed almost all highly effective mean responses excluding one, whose responses go totally opposite with that of Cebu Province who almost rated the six indicators effective leaving only Indicator 6 as highly effective.

The response of one performing school category in Cebu Province suggests effective response in Indicators 1-5 together with one less performing school in Bohol in indicator 5. It can be inferred from the results that the respondents in these divisions have not fully live up to the standards set by the DepEd.

Table 18 presents the difference in the perception on school teamwork and effectiveness of respondents categorized as those from performing and less performing schools. The computed t-values in the variable of school teamwork are 0.525 and 1.773 for school effectiveness whose p-values are accepted. This result indicates the congruence of the assessment of the two groups of respondents, indicating consistency of responses. The two groups of respondents in the study, that is, the school heads and the teachers did not differ significantly on school teamwork and school effectiveness.

Overall, the results would mean the amount of school teamwork and school effectiveness of both group of schools, performing or less performing have been observed by the respondents.

Since the results generally suggest prevailing perception on teamwork, it can be said that the respondents in the performing and less performing schools have experienced cohesiveness and collaboration between the teaching staff and the administration. It can also be said that teamwork is present in less performing schools, thus, there might be other factors that affect the schools' overall performance other than teamwork. Similarly, perception on high effectiveness of the school system as caused partly by teamwork is also prevalent. Respondents from both school categories believed that their system runs like a well-oiled machine. Result reveals the difference in the perception on school teamwork as assessed by school heads and teachers. As shown, school teamwork and school effectiveness have t-values of 1.439 and 0.506 respectively resulting in the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Such result implies that both the school heads and the teachers have similar perception on school teamwork and school effectiveness. Overall, the results would mean that the teachers together with their respective school heads are one in their perception that they share the same experiences in their school teamwork and how their schools achieve its effectiveness. The strong agreement that teamwork has been observed by the respondents from both school categories suggests that the teachers and the school heads were convinced that there is collaborative effort

between them. The results further suggest that the school heads were able to muster support from the teachers who also worked in tandem with the former.

Perception on high effectiveness of the school system is also dominant. The result indicates that the two groups of respondents believed that they were effective in running the school system and in implementing instructional programs. On the correlation between the respondents' perception on school teamwork and school effectiveness, the result shows that there is correlation between the two variables resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis. The result indicates that school teamwork and school effectiveness have moderately strong correlation and that school teamwork is an indispensable element in the effectiveness of the school.

Overall, the results would mean when school teamwork is at its peak it has big positive impact on school effectiveness; on the other hand, when school teamwork is at its low it also has less impact on school effectiveness.

The findings further suggest that although there are other factors affecting effectiveness teamwork is vital in the effective operation of the school system. A system with collaboration has also effectiveness and when the internal stakeholders observed this, they also tend to perceive that the school is also effective in its operation.

Conclusion

Both performing and less performing schools share the same perception on their teamwork, particularly pertaining to the various dimensions of purposes and goals, roles, team processes, team relationship, intergroup relationship, problem-solving, passion and commitment and skills and learning. This homogeneous responses could be attributed to the fact that they adhere to the same mandate as to achieving harmony and order in the organization who share the same belief that teamwork is vital for creating a positive and successful learning environment which is at the heart of every teacher and school head. Perception on teamwork and school effectiveness are significantly, indicating that teamwork is a vital component in achieving school effectiveness in all its operations.

References

- [1] Anderson, N. (2001). *Handbook of Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology*, London: Sage.
- [2] Aquino, J. (2013). *Adversity Quotient, Leadership Style & Performance of School Head & Commit to Organizational Values*. De La Salle University.
- [3] Baja, S. (2018). *Motivational Synergy and School Effectiveness*. Holy Name University. City of Tagbilaran
- [4] Baker, D. P. Day, R. & Salas E. (2006) *Teamwork As An Essential Component of High-Reliability Organizations*. Health Services Research, 41, 1576-1598 doi: 10.1111/j.14
- [5] Blanchard, Ken. (2003). *Leadership Smarts*. Colorado USA, Cook Communication Ministries.
- [6] Brown et al. (2003). *Ethical Leadership : A Social Learning Perspective for Construct Development and Testing*. The Pennsylvania State University USA
- [7] Cardona & Wilkinson. (2006). *Teamwork Abstract*: IESE Business School, University of Navarra
- [8] Catharine, J. (2009). Using Collaborative Action Teams to Create Community Schools. *National Association of Secondary School Principals, NASSP Bull.* 83(611) : 48-56
- [9] MacNeil, A. J., Prater, D. L., & Busch, S. (2009). The effects of school culture and climate on student achievement. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 12(1), 73-84.
- [10] Delarue, A. (2008). Teamworking and Organizational Performance: A Review of Survey-Based Research, *International Journal of Management Reviews*
- [11] Duel, J. (2010). *Teamwork in Action : Military Teams Preparing for, and Conducting Peace Support Operations*.
- [12] Grayson, L. (2012). Theories on Teamwork. [http:// work. chron. con theories-teamwork-645.html](http://work.chron.com/theories-teamwork-645.html)
- [13] Greenwood, B. (2012). Benefits of Collaboration and Teamwork, <http://work.chron.com/benefits-collaboration-teamwork-3618.html>
- [14] Hopkins, D., Harris, A., & Jackson, D. (1997). Understanding the school's capacity for development: growth states and strategies. *School Leadership & Management*, 17(3), 401-412.
- [15] Heck (2000). *Collaborative Leadership & School Improvement: Understanding the Impact on School Capacity and Student Learning*. University of Hawaii, Manoa, U.S.A.
- [16] Hoy, S, & Smith. (2002). *Teacher Efficacy : What Is It and Does It Matter?* (p.1-4)
- [17] Ismael. (2008). Educational Opportunities & Learning Outcomes of Children in Peru: A Longitudinal Model (pp.245-267)
- [18] Kelly & Peterson. (2002). *Best Practice in Educational Leadership Preparation Programs*, University of Oregon.
- [19] Lazarus, Ndiku Makewa. (2016). *Correlational Teamwork in Secondary Schools; A Case of Municipality, Tanzania*
- [20] Louis, Toole & Hargreaves, (2009). *On School Effectiveness Profound Improvement: Building Capacity to a Learning Community* p.140

- [21] Mackenhnie, P. (2003). *Belbin Team Role Theories*, UK.
- [22] Maxwell , John C. (1993). *Developing The Leader Within You* , U.S.A. Thomas Nelson Publisher, Inc.
- [23] Ostar K.V. (2012) *Teamwok Explained*. <http://work.chron.com/teamwork-explained-8261.html>
- [24] Marzano, R. (2012). *Dimensions of learning: Teacher's Manual*. Alexandria, VA; Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and Mid-continental Regional Educational Laboratory.
- [25] Pabalan, Jose L. (2007). *School Culture and Effectiveness*. Holy Name University. City of Tagbilaran.
- [26] Pitsoe, Victor J. (2014). *How do School Management Teams Experience Teamwork A Case Study in the School in the Kamwenge District, Uganda*, Vol 5 No.3
- [27] Phalane (2012). *Experiences of Secondary School Management Teams on Teamwork in Tshwane North District Schools* Published MEd Dissertation, University of South Africa
- [28] Potter, Reynolds, and Chapman. (2002). *School Improvement for School Facing Challenging Circumstances ; A review of challenging circumstances : A Review of research 7 Practice* .Vol. 22,2002 -Issue 3
- [29] Meredith Belbin. (2010). *Team Roles at Work* Taylor & Francis, New York. USA
- [30] Sackney,L. (2008). *International of School Effectiveness & Improvement* (pp.167-182). University of Saskatchewan.
- [31] Shapira, Orly. (2010). *Team Culture Perception, Commitment and Effectiveness: Team Work Effects*, Vol. 32, No.2 pp 35-36
- [32] Scott R. Sweetland, (2000) *School Characteristics & Educational Outcomes: Toward on Organizational Model of Student Achievement on Middle Schools*. *Journal*. Sage pub. Com /doi/10.1177/00131610121969334
- [33] Turner, John C. (1982). *Equity Theory, Social Identity and Intergroup Relations* p.147.
- [34] Tuckman, B. (2001). *Developmental Sequence in Small Groups*, USA