PRINT: ISSN 0975-1122 ONLINE: 2456-6322
Int J Edu Sci, 14(3): 265-274 (2016)
DOI: 10.31901/24566322.2016/14.03.11

Collective Efficacy and Changes in the School Curriculum: South African Context

Winston Hendricks[1], Nonnie Botha[2] and Emmanuel O. Adu[3]

[1]School of Further and Continuing Education, University of Fort Hare, South Africa
[2]School for Education Research and Engagement, Education Faculty, NMMU, South Africa
[3]School of General and Continuing Education, University of Fort Hare, P.O. Box 1005, East London 5200, South Africa
E-mail: [1]<whendricks@ufh.ac.za>, [2]<nonnie.botha@nmmu.ac.za>,[3]<eadu@ufh.ac.za>

KEYWORDS Collective Efficacy. Grass-Roots. School Curriculum Change. Teacher Efficacy. Quantitative Data

ABSTRACT Changes in school curricula occur from time to time in all countries across the world. Teachers are the grassroots implementers of such change and their real and perceived preparedness for this task vary. This paper reports on an investigation about collective efficacy and the implementation of a new curriculum in South African schools. It focuses on teacher perspectives on the implementation of new curriculum in South African schools. The study was conducted using a sample drawn from three poorly resourced schools in the Eastern Cape, South Africa. Quantitative data were generated through questionnaires and the analysis of these suggests that school teachers believe that collective efficacy impacts on the efficiency with which a new curriculum is implemented in schools. Recommendations were made regarding strategic planning initiatives, empowering teachers, quality control measures and a culture of effective teaching, learning and assessment practices.

INTRODUCTION

In many countries across the world school curriculum changes occur from time to time. Examples of such changes include the English curriculum change in China implemented in 2004 (Wu 2013), the curriculum change process in Cyprus as launched in 2004 (Philippou et al. 2014), the changes in primary school curricula in Turkey during 2004 and 2005 (Altun and Büyüköztürk 2014), curriculum reform in Malawi from 2001 to 2007 (Chirwa and Naidoo 2014) and curriculum changes in South Africa as outlined in this paper.

In 1994 the political landscape of South Africa changed when political power was passed to a democratically elected government. The transition to democratically elected government also brought about reforms of the national school curriculum underpinned by the ideologies and philosophies that are guided by a constitutional democracy. A consequence of that change was a White Paper, published by the National Department of Education (1997), and designed to guide education policy for the coming years. Curriculum 2005 (C2005) was the result of this government-driven change (Aldous 2004: 65). In 1998 the new government decided to phase out the old curriculum, under which different racial groups studied different curricula, and to gradually replace it with a new curriculum (C2005).

Several other curriculum changes occurred in South Africa since then, notably *Curriculum 2005* (C2005), the *Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS)* and the *National Curriculum (NCS)*. The latter was followed by another revised curriculum, namely the current *Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement* (CAPS).

These curriculum changes demanded a high level of commitment and competence from those who were responsible for its implementation, particularly from the teacher in the classroom. Some of the new approaches and strategies teachers had to contend with include the following:

- In C2005, learner-centred outcomes were set that have an activity-based approach to education (DOE 2002: 1). The teacher is regarded, not as a transmitter of knowledge, but rather as a facilitator and provider of experiences from which learners will learn. It also requires learner-centred teaching methods, an approach that requires learners to participate in classroom activities, become more involved in the learning process and take responsibility for their own learning (Sebela 2009: 2).
- New teaching practices, in terms of learner-centeredness, require teachers to give

learners the opportunity to work at their own pace according to individual abilities and levels of cognitive development. The C2005 curriculum advocates teaching practices that are reflective in nature, by letting both teachers and learners reflect on predetermined outcomes that should be achieved during or at the end of each learning process.

- The RNCS identifies goals, expectations and outcomes to be achieved through related learning outcomes and assessment standards. The learning outcomes for each learning area indicate the broad framework a learner should achieve at the end of a learning process, whereby the assessment standards provide detailed skills, knowledge and attitudes requirements to be achieved in terms of the broader learning outcome. The learning outcomes and assessment standards are cognitive and supportive of each other (DOE 2002: 6).

In a similar vein, the NCS and CAPS required new approaches to teaching and learning which had to be implemented by the teacher in the classroom. For example, in some documents (DOE 2003a, 2003b) it is assumed that the terms *learner-centred* and *activity-based* were well understood by teachers, which was not the case (Parker 2006: 62). These points to the pivotal fact that it is the *people* along with the *learning process* that ensure that quality teaching and learning materialise (Crick et al. 2007: 272). Effective curriculum implementation is dependent on adequate and appropriate teacher support and development, thus ensuring well-equipped and competent curriculum implementers in the classroom. This is the case in all kinds of schools, but it is even more relevant in schools that are situated in challenging economic and social contexts.

All the changes referred to above are dependent on the competence of the teacher in the classroom. This links with the statement that the "daily lives of South African teachers are encumbered with many of the ailments of an emerging economy in transition" (Ebersöhn 2014: 2) and is an example of the view that integrated human resource practices are crucial to social development in emerging economies (Ncube and Samuel 2014: 267).

In light of the above and other similar curriculum implementation challenges experienced by teachers, it could be of value to determine the role of collective efficacy in effective curriculum implementation, as collective efficacy reflects the collective self-perception that teachers have about their ability to make an educational difference to their learners (Solomon 2007 : 50). The next section provides an exposition of the concept collective efficacy.

Objective of the Study

The objective of this study is to investigate the teachers' perspective on the collective efficacy and changes in the school curriculum. This study investigates more specifically the impact collective efficacy have on the introduction of curriculum changes in South African schools, which have introduced five curriculums since 1994.

Review of Literature

Collective Efficacy and Curriculum Implementation

The concept *collective efficacy* is situated within the theoretical framework of social cognitive theory and also relates to the concept *self-efficacy*. Social cognitive theory is underpinned by the assumption that human choices are based on a combination of personal factors (cognitive, emotional or biological state), behavioural factors (actions and reactions towards stimuli) and environmental factors (social, cultural, religious and economic conditions) (Pajares 2002). Self-efficacy is a major determinant of the choices that individuals make, the effort they expend, the perseverance they exert in the face of difficulties as well as the thought patterns and emotional reactions they experience (Nicolaidou and Philippou 2003 : 3).

The construct *teacher efficacy* was derived from Bandura's (1977) conceptualization of self-efficacy, which is defined as individuals' judgments of their capabilities to accomplish certain levels of performance and the assertion that self-efficacy beliefs govern most of the human functioning and mediates how individuals think, feel, motivate themselves and behave (Swars 2005: 139). Developing from social cognitive theory (Bandura 1997), Henson (2001 : 4) defines teach-

er self-efficacy as a teacher's judgment of his/her capabilities to bring about desired outcomes of student engagement and learning, even among those students who may be difficult or unmotivated. The influence of self-efficacy beliefs for teachers has profound consequences on the manner in which effective teaching and learning take place, especially when the educational setting is surrounded by adverse socio-economic conditions.

Perceived collective efficacy is a construct derived from social cognitive theory that is based on the assumption that the choices that individuals and organisations (through the actions of individuals) make, are influenced by the strength of their efficacy beliefs (Goddard et al. 2004: 4). Bandura (1977: 478) argues that although personal (individual) efficacy and perceived collective (group) efficacy differ in their units of agency, both forms of efficacy beliefs have similar sources, serve similar functions and operate through similar processes.

Studies by Bandura (1986) identify four sources of efficacy information namely: *mastery experience* (a perception that successful performance contributes to the assessment that similar proficiency can be expected in the future), *vicarious experience* (beliefs that are shaped when observers identify themselves with successful performances), *social persuasion* (encouragement or feedback concerning particular performances which depend on the credibility, trustworthiness and expertise of the persuader) and *affective state* (the manner in which groups or organizations interpret and react to changes that they face).

Two other major influences of collective efficacy in schools include the *teaching task* and *teaching competence* (Goddard et al. 2000: 9). These authors also state that the perceptions of a group's ability to successfully educate learners develop when teachers consider the level of difficulty of the teaching task in relation to their perceptions of group competence. The authors further suggests that this process occurs at both individual and school levels as "teachers analyse what constitutes successful teaching in their school, what barriers or limitations must be overcome and what resources are available to achieve success" (Goddard et al. 2000: 9). When studying, teachers' collective efficacy, the focus shifts from the individual to the group. Collective efficacy is an important attribute of a school, hence it becomes an emergent group-level attribute, the product of interactive dynamics of the group members (Solomon 2007: 51).

Collective efficacy is also the perception by teachers in a school about the extent to which the efforts of the school as a whole will have a positive impact on student learning (Brinson and Steiner 2007: 1). Research on the wellbeing of South African educators found that educators did not experience their work places as positive and therefore experienced a negative organisational climate (Jackson and Rothmann 2006: 75-95). All the stakeholders in a school must jointly work and grow together to achieve defined goals for teachers and learners. Hord (2004: 8) mentions that "administrators, along with teachers, must be learners – questioning, investigating and seeking solutions for school improvement and increased student motivation."

Goddard (2002: 18) indicates that the more teachers are given the power to influence school decisions concerning the instructional programme, the greater are their levels of perceived collective efficacy. McGuigan (2005: 55) found that one dimension of teacher empowerment was "impact", defined as "the degree to which one's behaviour is perceived as producing intended effects on one's task environment."

Research by Roberts and Roach (2006) indicates that shared vision and staff co-operation feature high amongst the key factors that have been associated with effective schools. Hord (2004: 9) defines a shared vision as a strong mental image of what is important to the individuals and the organization, and thus an organization that functions for the common good is "on par with personal ambition". Teachers are therefore encouraged to get involved in defining and sustaining the vision of schools and accept accountability for decisions they make on the basis of those visions and values (Mawhinney et al. 2005: 11). An understanding of teachers' commitment in accomplishing the goals of the school is important, because it reflects their personal interpretation of how absorbing and meaningful their work experiences are (Solomon 2007: 31).

A school culture in which teachers collaborate around teaching and learning is beneficial for both teachers and learners (Puchner and Taylor 2006: 922). Previous research (Huffmam and Kalnin 2003) has noted that collaboration among teachers has been identified as one of the most important features of a school culture that fos-

ters professional development, teacher satisfaction, teacher's effectiveness and learner achievement within a school. Hoy and Miskel (2005: 179) also point out that research shows that "a strong culture of efficacy seems to promote high learner achievement, in part, because it leads to the acceptance of challenging goals, strong organizational effort, and a persistence that leads to better performance". Puchner and Taylor (2006: 931) claim that the link between collaborative work, collegiality and positive outcomes in schools is well established.

Classroom practices that include effective teaching, effective learning and effective assessment activities contribute to an academically demanding classroom climate, an orderly classroom atmosphere and practices that ensure academic success of learners (McGuigan 2005: 74). *Classroom climate* describes more specifically the atmosphere wherein interaction between learners and the teacher takes place and differs from classroom to classroom (van der Westhuizen et al. 2005: 89).

METHODOLOGY

The empirical research aimed to investigate whether there is a link between collective efficacy in under-resourced schools and the perspectives of the teachers about the effective implementation of school curriculum changes. As an exploratory study has as one of its major aims to indicate relationships between events (Babbie and Mouton 2010: 81), this kind of investigation was deemed appropriate for this purpose.

Research Design

A quantitative non-experimental survey research design was employed. Surveys are mainly used in studies that have individual people as the unit of analysis and could be viewed as the best research design available to the social scientist for collecting original data from a population too large to observe directly (Babbie and Mouton 2010 : 232), as was the case in this study. Surveys are usually quantitative in nature and aim to provide a broad overview of a representative sample of a large population (Mouton 2004: 152). Surveys are also excellent vehicles for measuring attitudes and orientations in a large population, by summarising the aspect to be measured in a brief statement, presenting that statement to respondents who should then indicate whether they agree or disagree with it (Babbie and Mouton 2010 : 232).

Population

The target population for this study was teachers of secondary schools, situated in previously disadvantaged communities in one particular education district, in the Eastern Cape of South Africa, who were subjected to curriculum changes under challenging socio-economic conditions.

Sample

The sample of participants for this study consisted of teachers who have already dealt with curriculum changes, as they could be deemed to have the knowledge and the experience about the issue under investigation. The participants were attached to Schools A, B and C (as referred to previously). These teachers, because of socio-economic surroundings in which their schools are located, have insight into how those conditions influence effective teaching, learning and assessment practices at their respective schools. The research was conducted with all the teachers who were teaching in the sample schools at the time (n=100). In School A, 32 teachers participated, in School B, 36 teachers participated and in School C, 32 teachers participated.

Data Collection Instrument

A25 item Likert scale questionnaire was used to collect data, each item consisting of a statement with five-point multiple performance indicators ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The 25 items of the questionnaire were divided into six sub-sections, thus covering the attributes of collective efficacy, namely the effectiveness of the school (five items); the attitude of the learners (five items); classroom practice (five items); teaching, learning and assessment strategies (two items); professional development support (three items) and leadership and management (five items). This questionnaire focused on the quality of teachers' professional experience that covered issues related to collective efficacy.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

The data were analysed using STATISTICA computer software and presented as descriptive statistics in the form of multi-item analysis. Descriptive statistics present quantitative descriptions in a manageable form, providing a description of the association that connects one variable with another (Babbie and Mouton 2010: 459). In this study, the data showed the nature of the link between the variables collective efficacy and effective curriculum implementation.

Reliability of Instrument

Five of the six sub-sections in this survey questionnaire rendered coefficients ≥ 0.8. The exception was the sub-section with only two items. Table 1 shows the Cronbach's alpha scores for internal consistency across all six sub-sections of the survey questionnaire. The consistency coefficients give an indication of the consistency of how the teachers have scored the Likert-scale instrument, for example, if a teacher scored low on issues in one sub-section, he/she scored low on similar issues raised in other categories and vice versa. The high consistency coefficients are therefore an indication that there were very few contradictions in the data.

Table 1: Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the survey sub-sections

Collective efficacy (survey) sub-sections	*Cronbach's alpha*
CE1	0.91
CE2	0.84
CE3	0.88
CE4	0.55
CE5	0.83
CE6	0.92

RESULTS

The data in Table 2 present the responses of the teachers of the sample schools to the 25 statements (CE1.1 to CE6.5) in the survey.

To render the data in Table 2 more accessible, it was further condensed across the Likert indicators from five to three indicators, to show a lower interval, a middle interval and an upper interval. The data were also further condensed within the sub-sections to see in which of the sub-sections the teachers were more efficacious

Table 2: Descriptive statistics: All schools CE1.1 – CE6.5

	Strongly disagree		*Disagree*		*Neither*		*Agree*		*Strongly agree*	
CE1.1	6	6%	27	27%	28	28%	26	26%	13	13%
CE1.2	9	9%	23	23%	31	31%	26	26%	11	11%
CE1.3	13	13%	27	27%	29	29%	23	23%	8	8%
CE1.4	13	13%	43	43%	18	18%	24	24%	2	2%
CE1.5	21	21%	21	21%	23	23%	27	27%	8	8%
CE2.1	24	24%	39	39%	23	23%	12	12%	2	2%
CE2.2	16	16%	37	37%	26	26%	19	19%	2	2%
CE2.3	3	3%	23	23%	27	27%	45	45%	2	2%
CE2.4	12	12%	26	26%	30	30%	29	29%	3	3%
CE2.5	7	7%	29	29%	26	26%	27	27%	11	11%
CE3.1	11	11%	21	21%	33	33%	28	28%	7	7%
CE3.2	4	4%	24	24%	30	30%	34	34%	8	8%
CE3.3	7	7%	33	33%	30	30%	25	25%	5	5%
CE3.4	4	4%	15	15%	39	39%	34	34%	8	8%
CE3.5	3	3%	19	19%	30	30%	40	40%	8	8%
CE4.1	4	4%	29	29%	27	27%	36	36%	4	4%
CE4.2	18	18%	27	27%	22	22%	19	19%	14	14%
CE5.1	8	8%	24	24%	27	27%	36	36%	5	5%
CE5.2	10	10%	18	18%	27	27%	38	38%	7	7%
CE5.3	12	12%	17	17%	36	36%	28	28%	7	7%
CE6.1	9	9%	29	29%	23	23%	36	36%	3	3%
CE6.2	10	10%	28	28%	31	31%	25	25%	6	6%
CE6.3	15	15%	27	27%	29	29%	25	25%	4	4%
CE6.4	14	14%	25	25%	27	27%	25	25%	9	9%
CE6.5	26	26%	33	33%	22	22%	13	13%	6	6%

and in which they were less efficacious. Table 3 summarises this condensed data.

Condensed data relevant to the three Likert indicators in Table 3 show the following:

- The lower interval of strongly disagree and disagree are condensed to disagree (negative), now including the range between the minimum value and the median (1.0 - 2.6) as the negative responses are to the left of the median.
- The middle range or the undecided column represents the range between the median and the upper quartile (2.6 - 3.4) which renders a middle value of 3, which was the score indicated on the questionnaire for neither disagree nor agree.
- The upper interval (3.4 - 5.0) now includes the range between the upper quartile and the maximum value which includes the two groups of agree and strongly agree and is now referred to as agree (positive), as these values lie to the positive side of the upper quartile in the grouped data.

Condensed data relevant to the six sub-sections in Table 3 show that the teachers scored on average the highest in sub-section 3 (Classroom Practice) with a mean of 3.3 and a standard deviation (SD) of 0.84. Sub-section 6 (Leadership and Management) reflected on average the lowest score with a mean 2.78 and an SD of 0.98.

Condensed data relevant to the six sub-sections in Table 3 further show the following:

- Teachers scored most positively in sub-section 4 (Teaching, Learning and Assessment) with 39 percent most negatively in both sub-sections 4 (Teaching, Learning and Assessment) and 6 (Leadership and Management) with 43 percent each and most undecided in sub-section 2 (Attitude of Learners) with 44 percent.
- In sub-section 1 (Effectiveness of the School) and sub-section 2 (Attitude of Learners) the responses were more positive overall (3.4 - 5.0), and all the negative responses (1.0 - 2.6) fall within the other four sub-sections.
- Teachers therefore scored positively in only two sub-sections, negatively in four sub-sections and were most undecided (2.6 - 3.4) in sub-sections 2 (Attitude of Learners) and 3 (Classroom Practice).
- The mean scores for all the sub-sections are above 2.60. The teachers therefore score on average more positively on all the sub-sections.

Subsequently, the data were grouped as shown in Table 4.

Grouped data in Table 4 show the following:

- The data suggest that sub-section 3 (Classroom Practice) has the highest median (Q_2) of 3.00 with a 0.40 difference to the lower quartile (Q_1) of 2.60 and a difference of 0.60 to the upper quartile (Q_3) of 3.60. This im-

Table 3: Condensed data: All schools: Levels of efficacy

Sub-section	*Level of efficacy*	*Mean*	*SD*	*[1.0-2.6]*		*[2.6-3.4]*		*[3.4-5.0]*	
CE3	Most efficacious	3.13	0.84	23	23%	41	41%	36	36%
CE5		3.07	0.94	26	26%	37	37%	37	37%
CE4		2.96	0.97	43	43%	18	18%	39	39%
CE1		2.89	0.99	36	36%	34	34%	30	30%
CE2		2.79	0.81	37	37%	44	44%	19	19%
CE6	Least efficacious	2.78	0.98	43	43%	27	27%	30	30%

Table 4: Condensed grouped data: All schools

	CE1	*CE2*	*CE3*	*CE4*	*CE5*	*CE6*
N	100	100	100	100	100	100
Mean	2.89	2.79	3.13	2.96	3.07	2.78
S.D.	0.99	0.81	0.84	0.97	0.94	0.98
Minimum	1.00	1.00	1.20	1.00	1.00	1.00
Quartile 1	2.15	2.15	2.60	2.00	2.33	2.00
Quartile 2 (Median)	2.80	2.80	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.80
Quartile 3	3.60	3.40	3.60	3.50	3.67	3.60
Maximum	5.00	4.60	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00

plies that the data is slightly positively skewed to the right with a difference of 0.20.

- The sub-section with one of the lowest medians is sub-section 2 (Attitude of Learners), having a Q_2 of 2.80, with a difference of 0.65 to the lower quartile (Q_1) and a difference of 0.60 to the upper quartile (Q_3). This implies that the data is slightly negatively skewed to the left with a difference of 0.05.
- The data in the remainder of the sub-sections are more or less symmetrical with small differences in their ranges to both sides of the median (Q_2), both towards the lower quartile (Q_1) and the upper quartile (Q_3).

Analysis of the grouped data therefore shows close similarity with the ungrouped data as the median and the mean are very close respectively, which suggests that the teachers of all the sample schools were collectively more positive than negative in terms of their collective efficacy beliefs.

Subsequently the data were analysed per school in a similar manner to the analysis for the whole group. This analysis is summarised below.

Collective Efficacy (CE) of the teachers in School A (n=32)

For the ungrouped data it emerged that:

- The teachers at School A scored on average the highest in sub-section 3 (Classroom Practice) with a mean of 3.28 and a standard deviation of 0.65.
- Sub-section 2 (Attitude of Learners) scored on average the lowest with a mean of 2.74 and an SD of 0.61.
- The teachers scored most positively in subsection 3 (Classroom Practice) with 38 percent, while they scored most negatively in sub-section 4 (Teaching, Learning and Assessment) with 44 percent, and they were most undecided in sub-section 2 (Attitude of Learners) with 59 percent.

  Overall more positive responses (3.4 - 5.0) were given in sub-sections 3 (Classroom Practice) and 5 (Professional Development and Support). All the negative responses (1.0-2.6) fall within the other four sub-sections. The teachers therefore scored positively in only two sub-sections and negatively in four sub-sections, and were more undecided (2.6 - 3.4) in sub-sections 2 (Attitude of Learners) and 5 (Professional Development and Support).
- The mean score for all the sub-sections for the teachers of School A is 2.85. The teachers of School A therefore score on average more positively on all the categories as scores ≥ 2.60 are on the positive side of the scale.

From the grouped data it was clear that:

- Sub-section 3 (Classroom Practice) has the highest median (Q_2) of 3.40 with a 0.60 difference to the lower quartile (Q_1) of 2.80 and a difference of 0.20 to the upper quartile (Q_3) of 3.60. This implies that the data is slightly negatively skewed to the right with a difference of 0.20.
- Sub-section 2 (Attitude of Learners) has one of the lower medians with Q_2 equal to 2.80 with a difference of 0.40 to the lower quartile (Q_1) of 2.40 and a difference of 0.45 to the upper quartile (Q_3). This implies that the data is also negatively skewed to the left with a slight difference of 0.05.
- The data in the rest of the sub-sections are more or less symmetrical or slightly positively skewed with small differences in their ranges to both sides of the median to both the lower quartile (Q_1) and the upper quartile (Q_3).

DISCUSSION

The analysis of the grouped data therefore shows a close similarity with the ungrouped data as the median and the mean ≥ 2.60, which suggests that the teachers of School A were collectively more positive than negative in terms of their collective efficacy beliefs. Research by Katz and Stupel (2015) have found that a professional cooperative community is a potentially powerful organisational context conducive to the development of collective efficacy beliefs that facilitates student learning as an indicator of curriculum implementation.

CE of the Teachers in School B (n=36)

For School B, the ungrouped data and the grouped data were handled similarly to that of School A. In the end, the analysis of the grouped data for School B shows close similarity with the ungrouped data as the median and the mean scores are <2.60 in most sub-sections, which suggests that the teachers of School B were

collectively more negative than positive in terms of their collective efficacy beliefs.

CE of Teachers in School C (n=32)

For School C, the ungrouped data and the grouped data were also handled similarly to that of School A. The analysis of the grouped data shows close similarity with the ungrouped data as the median and the mean scores are respectively > 2.60, suggesting that the teachers of School C were collectively more positive than negative in terms of their collective efficacy beliefs.

Comparative Mean CE Scores by School

The comparative mean scores of the collective efficacy (CE) sub-sections are shown in Figure 1. This bar graph indicates that School C had the highest mean scores for all the sub-sections, followed by School A and lastly School B. This graph also shows that out of the three sample schools, the teachers in School C felt highly self-efficacious followed by School A, whose teachers also felt self-efficacious with mean scores for all the categories > 2.60. The teachers of School B felt very low in their self-beliefs about the collective efficacy sub-sections of their school, with mean scores in the majority of the categories < 2.60. These scores show that the teachers of Schools C and A are more positive than those of School B, whose teachers are more negative about the collective efficacy subsections. Further research by Katz and Stupel (2015) has demonstrated the potentially powerful nature of collective efficacy beliefs to raise students' effort, resilience and learning outcomes as part of mathematics curriculum implementation. Confidence perceptions therefore, those start to appear after teacher collaboration and team formation appear to influence subsequent individual behaviour of students (Tasa et al. 2011).

CONCLUSION

The empirical research has shown that the way teachers in the sample schools perceive collective efficacy has a strong influence on their ability to implement curriculum changes in the classroom. This implies that education authorities at national, provincial and district level need to put measures in place to improve collective efficacy in schools, as this could be expected to support teachers' ability to implement curriculum changes effectively in classrooms. This finding resonates with previous research that human resources are one of the most important factors that determines the success of curriculum change in schools in an emerging economy, such as South Africa. Improved collective efficacy could be attained through several strategies, to be carried out by national, provincial and district offices as well as school management teams (SMTs).

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommended strategies and relevant entities are indicated below:

- Strategic planning initiatives around curriculum implementation need to be communicated effectively to all participants through effective structures (all entities mentioned above).
- Empowering teachers with appropriate in-service training programmes (provincial and district offices, SMTs).
- Implementing relevant standardised practices and quality control measures (provincial and district offices, SMTs).
- Create a culture of effective teaching, learning and assessment practices, especially in poorly resourced schools (provincial and district offices, SMTs). The role of the principal to provide instructional leadership in policy implementation must be clearly highlighted.

REFERENCES

Aldous A 2004. Science and mathematics teachers' perceptions of C2005 in Mpumalanga Secondary schools. *African Journal of Research in SMT Education,* 8(1): 65-76.

Altun SA, Büyüköztürk S 2014. How elementary school principals' change tendencies are related with their opinion about curriculum change. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 141: 533-537.

Babbie E, Mouton J 2010. *The Practice of Social Research.* Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Bandura A 1977. Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review,* 84: 191-174.

Bandura A 1986. *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura A 1993. Received self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist,* 28(2): 117-148.

Bandura A 1997. *Self-efficacy in Changing Societies.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Belmont Report 1979. The Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research. From <http://www.ohsr.od.nih.gov/guidelines/belmont.html> (Retrieved on 12 December 2013).

Brinson D, Steiner L 2007. Building collective efficacy, how leaders inspire teachers to achieve. *Issue Brief,* 1-5.

Bryman A, Cramer D 1990. *Quantitative Data Analysis for Social Scientists*. London: Routledge.

Carraway JF, Young T 2015. Implementation of a district wide policy to improve principals' instructional leadership: Principals' sense making of the skilful observation and coaching laboratory. *Educational Policy,* 29(1): 230-256.

Chirwa G, Naidoo D 2014. Curriculum change and development in Malawi: A historical overview. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences,* 5(16): 336-345.

Cohen C, Manion L, Morrison K 2007. *Research Methods in Education*. New York: Routledge.

Crick RD, McCombs B, Haddon A, Broadfoot P, Tew M 2007. The ecology of learning: Factors contributing to learner-centred classroom cultures. *Research Papers in Education,* 22(3): 267-307.

DOE (National Department of Education) 1997. Curriculum 2005. From <http://www.polity.org.za/govdocs/misc/curr2005.html> (Retrieved on 13 February 2013).

DOE (National Department of Education) 2002. *Revised Curriculum Statement Grades R-9 (Schools, Policy)*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

DOE (National Department of Education) 2003a. *National Curriculum Statement 10-12 (General) Mathematics*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

DOE (National Department of Education) 2003b. *Revised Curriculum Statement Grades R-9 (Schools)*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Ebersöhn L 2014. Resilience and career counselling: Describing the utility of quadrant mapping. *Journal of Psychology in Africa,* 20(3): 385-394.

Ebersöhn L 2014. Teacher Resilience: Theorizing Resilience and Poverty. Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice. From <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2014937960>. (Reterieved on 16 September 2014).

Goddard RD 2002. A theoretical and empirical analysis of the measurement of collective efficacy: The development of a short form. *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* 93: 467-476.

Goddard RD, Hoy WK, Woolfolk Hoy A 2000. Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and effect on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal,* 37(2): 479-507.

Goddard RD, Hoy WK, Woolfolk Hoy A 2004. Collective efficacy beliefs: Theoretical developments, empirical evidence, and future directions. *Educational Researcher,* 33(3): 3-13.

Henson RK 2001. Teacher Self-efficacy: Substantive Implications and Measurement Dilemmas. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Educational Research Exchange,* Texas, 26 January 2001, Texas A & M University, Texas.

Hord SM 2004. *Learning Together: Leading Together: Changing Schools Through Professional Learning Communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hoy WK, Miskel CG 2005. *Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Huffman D, Kalnin J 2003. Collaborative inquiry to make data-based decisions in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 19: 569-580.

Jackson LTD, Rothmann S 2006. Occupational stress, organizational commitment, and ill-health educators in the North-West Province. *South African Journal of Education,* 26: 75-95.

Katz S, Stupel M 2015. Enhancing collective efficacy in mathematics through cooperative implementation of a multi solution task in a higher education classroom: A qualitative action research. *Journal of Education*, 5(4): 98-110.

Khumalo VP 2014. *The School as a Curriculum Management Site in an Era of Curriculum Change*. MEd Dissertation, Unpublished. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

McGuigan L 2005. *The Role of Enabling Bureaucracy and Academic Optimism in Academic Achievement Growth*. PhD Dissertation. USA: Ohio State University.

Mawhinney HB, Haas J, Wood W 2005. Teacher's Perceptions of Collective Efficacy and School Conditions for Professional Learning. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration- Democracy in Educational Leadership: The Unfinished Journey toward Justice.* Nashville, TN, 1 November 2005.

Mouton J 2004. *How to Succeed in Your Master's and Doctoral Studies: A South African Guide and Resource Book*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Ncube CM, Samuel MO 2014. Revisiting employee motivation and job satisfaction within the context of an emerging economy: Theoretical representation and developing the model. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences,* 5(9): 267-282.

Nicolaidou M, Philippou G 2003. Attitudes towards mathematics, self-efficacy and achievement in problem-solving. *European Research in Mathematics Education,* 3: 1-11.

O'Grady E, O'Reily J, Portelli JP, Beal C 2014. Putting the learner into the curriculum, not the curriculum into the learner: A case for negotiated integrated curriculum. *International Journal of Pedagogical Interventions,* 2(2): 51-63.

Pajares F 2002. Overview of Social Cognitive Theory and of Self-Efficacy. From <http://www.emory.edu/EDUCATION/mpf/eff.html> (Retrieved on 8 July 2012).

Patton MQ 2001. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Parker D 2006. Grade 10-12 Mathematics curriculum reform in South Africa: A textual analysis of new national curriculum statements. *African Journal of Research in SMT Education,* 10(2): 59-73.

Philippou S, Kontovourki S, Theodorou E 2014. Can autonomy be imposed? Examining teacher (re)positioning during the ongoing curriculum change in Cyprus. *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* 46(5): 611-633.

Porter RE, Fusarelli LD, Fusarelli BC 2015. *Educational Policy,* 29(1): 111-139.

Puchner DP, Taylor AR 2006. Lesson study, collaboration and teacher efficacy: Stories from two school-

based math lesson study groups. *Teacher and Teacher Education,* (22): 922-934.
Roberts L, Roach J 2006. *Leadership Styles and Practice in Effective Schools, Research Series*. Johannesburg: Gauteng Department of Education.
Sebela MP 2009. Using Teacher Action Research to Promote Constructivist Classroom Learning Environments in Mathematics in South Africa. From <http://www.aare.edu.au/01pap/seb01443.html> (Retrieved on 26 March 2013).
Solomon CB 2007. *The Relationship among Middle Level Leadership, Teacher Commitment, Teacher Collective Efficacy, and Student Achievement*. PhD Dissertation. USA: University of Missouri-Columbia.
Statistics South Africa 2001. *Census. Government Information System (GIS)*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
Swars SL 2005. Examining perceptions of mathematics teaching effectiveness among elementary preservice teachers with differing levels of mathematics teacher efficacy. *Journal of Instructional Psychology,* 32(2): 139-147.
Tasa K, Sears GJ, Schat A 2011. Personality and teamwork behaviour in context: The cross level moderating role of collective efficacy. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 32: 65-85.
van der Westhuizen PC, Mosoge MJ, Swanepoel LH, Coetzee LD 2005. Organizational culture and academic achievement in secondary schools. *Education and Urban Society,* 38: 89-105.
Wu W 2013. *Towards a New Intercultural Methodology in Response to Teachers' Challenges from the New Curriculum Innovation in China*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. Edmonton, Alberta: University of Alberta.

Paper received for publication on February 2016
Paper accepted for publication on August 2016