Teacher Efficacy in Primary Schools.

A survey of three selected schools in the Western Cape, South Africa.

Sandra. V. Daniels: PGRSAN001

A minor dissertation submitted in PARTIAL fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Masters of Education

Faculty of the Humanities

University of Cape Town

2010

COMPULSORY DECLARATION

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works, of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.

Signature: Signed by candidate Date: **05 February' 2010**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and thank the following people:

Dave Gilmour, my supervisor and academic mentor whom I respect and on whom I could depend. Thank you for challenging, questioning and guiding me. I deeply appreciate the time, patience, support and input you have afforded me throughout this project. Thank you for all the 'special extras' you have taught me along the way.

My husband Alan and daughters Alaysha and Donne' for their consistent and constant love, support and encouragement. Thank you for believing in me, and granting me the space to fulfill my dream.

The principals and colleagues (respondents) at the three sample schools for allowing me to explore your experiences and perceptions in my effort to conduct and complete my research. My dissertation would not have been possible without your time and co-operation.

The WCED (Research Department) for granting me permission to work in the three selected schools and for being so professional and accommodating in the process.

Last but not least, I would like to give thanks to My Lord God who made it possible for me study at UCT, and for giving me the ability and strength throughout my studies.

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the concept of teacher efficacy which has its origin in Bandura's (1977) self efficacy theory, which is examined in his social cognitive theory. Teacher efficacy beliefs (individual) which are hypothesized as the "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (Bandura, 1997:3) with the different dimensions which underpin this concept are examined. Since this study also wanted to establish the efficacy levels of the schools as a unit, the concept of collective efficacy was explored.

The purpose of this research is two-fold. Firstly, the aim is to construct a better understanding of the conceptual underpinnings of teacher efficacy, and secondly, it aims to measure and compare teachers' levels of efficacy in three selected schools. The selection of these schools for this study was based on the results these schools obtained in the Literacy and Numeracy Systemic Evaluations conducted by the Provincial and National Departments of Education. The rationale is to determine whether or not a relation exists between teachers' levels of efficacy, and by extension whether or not it influences what they do in their classrooms and their learners' achievements.

Tschannen-Moran *et al's* (1998) original 31-item instrument probing the aspects of teacher efficacy was used to measure (individual) teacher efficacy, and Tschannen-Moran and Ban's (2004) instrument, The Collective Teacher Belief Scale, was used to measure and determine the schools' collective sense of efficacy.

The research showed a relationship between teachers' levels of efficacy, what they do in their classrooms and their schools and by extension their learners' achievement. Although the causal mechanism of this relationship was not established, nor was it part of the study, the research confirms that even though teachers' sense of efficacy is not necessarily homogeneous across the various types of tasks they are asked to perform, each of the aspects of teacher efficacy is positively related to teachers' levels of confidence about their capabilities at each of the three schools. At the schools where teachers seem to be positively inclined and more efficacious, the results are better, while the converse is applicable at the school where the propensity towards negativity is more prevalent. What is also clear is that the beliefs teachers have about their abilities (teacher self efficacy), influences their persistence when things do not go smoothly, and that ultimately this affects the learners.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COMPULSORY DECLARATION I
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS II
ABSTRACT III
TABLE OF CONTENTS IV
LIST OF TABLES vi

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION 1
1.1 INTRODUCTION 1
1.2 GENERAL STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH QUESTION 2
1.3 SUB-QUESTIONS OF THE STUDY 2
1.4 LOCATING THE STUDY 2
1.5 OVERVIEW OF THE DISSERTATION 5
CHAPTER 2 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY 6
2.1 INTRODUCTION 6
2.2 LITERACY AND NUMERACY ASSESSMENTS 6
2.2.1 Studies conducted in South Africa 7
2.2.2 Studies conducted in the Western Cape 8
2.2.3 School Awards for improved and excellent results 9
2.3 SCHOOL SELECTION 10
2.3.1 School 1[LPS] 11
2.3.2 School 2 [MPSI] 11
2.3.3 School 3 [MPS2] 12
2.4 RATIONALE FOR SELECTING THESE SCHOOLS 12
2.5 CONCLUSION 12
CHAPTER THREE RESEARCH ON TEACHER EFFICACY 14
3.1 INTRODUCTION 14
3.2 UNDERSTANDING EFFICACY 16
3.2.1 Self-Efficacy: Conceptual Underpinnings 16
3.3 TEACHERS' SELF EFFICACY 18
3.3.1 Conceptual Underpinnings 18
3.3.2 Types of Efficacy 20
3.3.2.1 Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) 21
3.3.2.2 General Teaching Efficacy (GTE) 21
3.4 COLLECTIVE EFFICACY 22
3.4.1 Conceptual Underpinnings 23
3.5 FACTORS INFLUENCING TEACHERS' SENSE OF EFFICACY 25
3.5.1 Proximate Efficacy Sources 25
3.5.2 Remote Efficacy Sources 28
3.6 EFFICACY, TEACHING AND LEARNING 32
3.6.1 Teacher efficacy, Teaching and Learning 32
3.6.2 Collective efficacy, teaching and learning 35
3.7 CONCLUSION 36
CHAPTER 4 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 37
4.1 INTRODUCTION 37
4.2 METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION 37
4.2.1 School Sampling 37
4.2.2 Research Instruments 38

4.2.3 Questionnaire Design 38
4.2.3.1 Individual Teacher Efficacy Questionnaire 38
4.2.3.2 Collective Efficacy Questionnaire 40
4.2.4 Piloting the questionnaires 41
4.2.4.1 Individual Teacher Efficacy 41
4.2.4.2 Collective Efficacy 41
4.3 DATA COLLECTION AND CAPTURING METHODS 41
4.3.1 Questionnaire distribution 42
4.3.2 Data Capturing 42
4.4 ETHICAL ISSUES 42
4.4.1 Application to Conduct Research 42
4.4.2 Ethical issues at school level 43
4.5 LIMITATIONS 43
4.5.1.1 Limitations intrinsic to the methods 44
4.5.1.2 Limitations of questionnaires 44
4.5.2 Limitations of the fieldwork 44
CHAPTER 5 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS 46
5.1 INTRODUCTION 46
5.2 TEACHER EFFICACY 46
5.2.1 Efficacy to influence decision-making 47
5.2.2 Efficacy to influence school resources 50
5.2.3 Instructional Efficacy 51
5.2.4 Disciplinary Efficacy 56
5.2.5 Parental involvement 58
5.2.6 Efficacy to enlist community involvement 59
5.2.7 Efficacy to create a positive school climate 60
5.3 PERSONAL TEACHER EFFICACY AND GENERAL TEACHING EFFICACY 63
5.3.1 Personal Teacher Efficacy (PTE) 63
5.3.2 General Teacher Efficacy (GTE) 66
5.4 COLLECTIVE EFFICACY 71
5.4.1 Instructional Strategies 71
5.4.2 Student Discipline 74
5.5 CONCLUSION 75
CHAPTER 6 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE RESEARCH 77
6.1 INTRODUCTION 77
6.2 FINDINGS 77
6.2.1 Teacher Efficacy 78
6.2.2 Collective Efficacy 82
6.3 CONCLUSIONS 82
REFERENCES 84
APPENDICES 91
Appendix 1: Teacher Efficacy Scale 91
Appendix 2: The Collective Teacher Belief Scale 92
Appendix 3: Efficacy levels at the three primary school 93
Appendix 4: Collective Efficacy levels at the three primary school 94

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Grade 6 LITNUM RESULTS (2003-2007) 3
Table 1.2 Grade 3 LITNUM RESULTS (2002-2008) 3
Table 1.3 Award Category 2 (a) Improvement in overall performance 4
Table1.4 Award Category 2 (b) Improvement in Literacy (WCED, 2003-2007) 4
Table 4.2.1.1 Total teacher respondents 37
Table 4.3.1.1 Return rate of questionnaires 42

Table 5.2.1.1 Management Issues 47
Table 5.2.1.2 Teacher capacity 49
Table 5.2.1.3 The current atmosphere in education 49
Table 5.2.2.1 Impact of lack of resources 50
Table 5.2.3.1 Teachers' competence for Learning Areas 51
Table 5.2.3.2 Teachers' workload 52
Table 5.2.3.3 The working environment 52
Table 5.2.3.4 Teachers' attitude towards their learners 53
Table 5.2.3.5 Teachers' job satisfaction 55
Table 5.2.4.1 Social interactions with Colleagues, and Parents 57
Table 5.2.4.2 Social interaction with Learners 58
Table 5.2.5.1 Parental involvement in schooling 59
Table 5.2.6.1 Teaching and community involvement 60
Table 5.2.7.1 Teachers relationships with others 61
Table 5.2.7.2 Teaching as a job 62
Table 5.3.1.1 Social Relations 63
Table 5.3.1.2 Teaching as a job 65
Table 5.3.2.1 External Limitations 67
Table 5.3.2.2 Attitudes toward teaching as a job 68
Table 5.3.2.3 Attitudes to Learners and Parents 69
Table 5.4.1.1 Instructional Strategies and Student Learning 72
Table 5.4.2.1 Student Discipline and School Rules 74

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"Classroom teaching and the class teacher is at the heart of education"
Muijs & Reynolds (2001:1).

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This research study focuses on primary teachers and is located in the field of school effectiveness and the relationship between efficacy and teacher performance and, by extension, learner achievement The study looks at three public primary schools located in the Western Cape and measures and analysizes teachers' sense of efficacy, both as individuals and as collectives. The hypothesis is that teachers' sense of efficacy influences that which they do in their classrooms at their schools, and ultimately impacts on their learners' levels of achievement. The efficacy concept which has consistently been related to effective teaching and learning (see Bandura, 1977:191-215 and Woolfolk and Hoy, 1990: 81-91 among others) is investigated and measured in an endeavour to gain insight in terms of how teachers' sense of efficacy influences their beliefs about their teaching and ultimately their learners' learning. These included general teaching efficacy (GTE), personal teaching efficacy (PTE), as well as collective efficacy (CE) at the selected schools.

To gain a better insight into the dimensions and complexity of the concept, the study therefore investigated these different types of efficacy. According to social cognitive theory, human behaviour "is mediated by our efficaciousness", and "self-efficacy beliefs influence our choices, our effort, our persistence when facing adversity and our emotions" (Henson, 2001, p. 4). As pointed out by Bandura (1977:191-215), efficacy is considered to be crucial for effective teaching and successfully influencing learners' learning and their levels of performance. He notes though, that teachers' are not necessarily equally efficacious across the vast types of tasks, roles and responsibilities which teachers are required to perform and fulfill.

The study wishes to make a contribution based on the analysis of the findings of the research conducted. The aim is to present the primary teacher with valuable insight regarding her role in relation to her learners' learning and their level of achievement, while offering a methodology for examining (self-evaluation) their own beliefs and commitment (efficacy) to the mission of education.

1.2 GENERAL STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH QUESTION

With respect to the analysis of the primary teacher's sense of efficacy, an analytical treatment of data deploying a quantitative methodology was undertaken. The research problem is formally expressed as follows:

- What are the levels of primary teachers' sense of efficacy?

1.3 SUB-QUESTIONS OF THE STUDY

There are two sub-questions relating to the research problem.

- What levels of efficacy, exist and operate in the different schools?
- Do the different levels of efficacy relate to the different levels of performance?

1.4 LOCATING THE STUDY

The fieldwork was conducted in late 2008 and early 2009 after the release of the Western Cape Education Department (WCED) Grade Six LITNUM results (WCED, 2008). The concern with teachers and their sense of efficacy arises because, as stated by Alexander "it is the teacher more than anyone (or anything) else who defines the child, who defines children's attributes, who determines what their needs are, predicts their potential and evaluates their achievement" (1996:2). It could be argued then that knowing oneself and one's belief about one's ability as a teacher, is one of the basic prerequisites for the child-centredness, which is underpinned by the outcomes based education (OBE) curriculum prescribed by the Department of Education (DoE, 2002).

As a practicing primary school teacher and member of the senior management team at my school, I was concerned and motivated by reports released after the announcement of the shocking, failing results obtained in the National and Provincial Systemic Evaluation, testing Literacy and Numeracy (LITNUM). The results of the WCED tests completed by Grade Three learners since 2002 and Grade Six learners since 2003

(WCED, 2008) point directly to the primary teacher and what happens in the classroom as major factors determining learners' levels of achievement. As Fleisch notes in citing The Nelson Mandela Children's Fund Rural Education Report (2005) "irrespective of children's social characteristics, their access to 'social capital', the general state of health and welfare, or familiarity with the dominant language of schooling, the underlying or fundamental problem in South African education is about what happens inside the classrooms of our nation" (2008:121). It was important therefore for me to try to understand teachers' efficacy in this context.

The sites where the research was done were three primary schools located in the Western Cape, previously administered by former House of Representative (HOR) Administration. The schools were selected on the basis of their social profiles and poverty quintiles which are similar, as well as their Literacy and Numeracy test results which are very different. Based on their results, these schools were labelled as follows for the purpose of this study:

(a) School 1: low performing school (LPS), and
(b) Schools 2 and 3: medium performing schools (MPS 1 and MPS2 respectively).

The data below shows the scores the schools obtained for the LITNUM Systemic Evaluations over the period 2002 and 2008. Table 1.1 shows Grade Six performance levels over the period 2003-2007.

Table 1.1 Grade 6 LITNUM RESULTS (2003-2007)

SCHOOL	Lit 2003	Num 2003	Lit 2005	Num 2005	Lit 2007	Num 2007
LPS	22.5	2.5	5.0	0.0	17.6	1.1
MPS1	10.8	0.0	23.1	0.0	58.6	3.4
MPS2	22.5	7.5	62.5	15.0	82.2	12.2

Source: Research Department (WCED, 2009).

Performance levels of Grade Three learners over the period 2002-2008 are illustrated in Table 1.2.

Table 1.2 Grade 3 LITNUM RESULTS (2002-2008)

SCHOOL	Lit 2002	Num 2002	Lit 2004	Num 2004	Lit 2006	Num 2006	Lit 2008	Num 2008
LPS			10.0	10.0	21.4	12.7	41.1	18.6
MPS1	26.0	13.0	11.4	8.6	8.3	8.3	12.8	7.7
MPS2	25.0	38.0	100.0	67.5	72.7	47.9	65.8	46.5

Source: Research Department (WCED, 2009).

My interest in MPS1 and MPS2 originates from their achievements in the WCED Literacy and Numeracy test conducted in 2007. These two schools received awards from the MEC for Education for the Western Cape, for the striking improvement in their L1TNUM test results (WCED awards achievers in literacy and numeracy, WCED, Media Release, 2008). These results are illustrated in the tables below.

MPS2 is one of ten schools in this category to receive awards for showing the greatest improvement in Numeracy and Literacy over the period 2003, 2005 and 2007.

Table 1.3 Award Category 2 (a) Improvement in overall performance (WCED, 2005-2007).

School name	District	Quintile	% Improvement
MPS2	South	5	25.9

MPS1 is one of seven schools that have shown the greatest improvement in Literacy over the period 2003 to 2007 relative to the contexts within which the school operates. Improvement is measured in terms of both pass rates and mean scores.

Table1.4 Award Category 2 (b) Improvement in Literacy (WCED, 2003-2007).

School name	District	Quintile	% Improvement
MPS1	South	4	36.2

LPS I made a 'substantial' improvement (according to WCED: 2008) of 12.6%, in the Literacy test, but still obtained a score far below the required pass rate of 50% (17.6%).

Armed with the above information, this study acknowledges that a child's academic failure cannot be ascribed to one single factor, nor can the problem of the academic failure be solved by one solution. The study therefore explored the rationale behind the different levels of achievement of these schools by measuring and analysing the teachers' sense of efficacy and determining whether or not the different levels of efficacy relate to the different levels of performances and achievement levels.

At the three selected primary schools, all fifty-two teachers on the staff establishment were requested to complete questionnaire surveys measuring both their individual (self) efficacy and collective (staff) efficacy. The staff size at LPS was 25, 7 at MPS1, and 20 at MPS2.

The last section of this chapter is an overview of the complete study.

1.5 OVERVIEW OF THE DISSERTATION

- Chapter Two presents the background of the study. It provides a brief description of the three schools and the results of studies conducted by both the National and Provincial Departments of Education on learner achievement levels in Literacy and Numeracy for Grades Three and Six, since 2002.

- Chapter Three is the conceptual framework underpinning the study, developed through a review of literature related to the development and measurement of the concept of teacher efficacy.

- Chapter Four focuses on the research methods used to conduct the study. The main sets of data for the study were generated through questionnaire surveys with the teachers based at the schools.

- Chapter Five is the link between the data and the literature. It presents the findings, and analysis of the results of the surveys conducted. The data shows quite clearly the link between levels of efficacy and learner performance.

- Chapter Six presents a summary of the findings, and evaluates the significance of this study and some suggestions for future research are made.

CHAPTER 2

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

When faced with obstacles, setbacks, and failures, those who doubt their capabilities slacken their efforts, give up, or settle for mediocre solutions. Those who have a strong belief in their capabilities redouble their effort to master the challenges"

Bandura (2000:120).

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The search for quality education is a worldwide phenomenon, as the "imperatives of globalisation and international competitiveness have placed educational outcomes on the agenda "of the countries around the globe (Skilbeck, 1995:6). Basic quality education is seen as a necessary condition for development. In addition, it is seen as a right for every child. Education is clearly an important element of both social and economic sustainability. A sound education is considered to increase the prospects for employment and entrepreneurial opportunities for the learners later in life (Skilbeck, 1995:6).

In the statement released to the media, the MEC for Education in the Western Cape stressed the importance of proficiency in literacy and numeracy if our learners wanted to compete in the global economic economy (WCED, July 2009). In the quest for quality and equality of education in South Africa, research studies were conducted nationally by the Department of Education, and provincially by the WCED to track primary school achievement (Fleisch, 2008:3).

Since my rationale for conducting this research task stems from the reports of the shocking, failing results obtained in these National and Provincial Assessments that point directly to the primary teacher, and what happens in the classroom as reasons for failure, a brief discussion of these studies is presented below.

2.2 LITERACY AND NUMERACY ASSESSMENTS

Since 2001, research studies have been conducted by the Provincial and National Education Departments by means of assessments in Literacy and Numeracy

(LITNUM) to determine learners' proficiency levels, and the proportion of learners who have attained official curriculum grade-level competence in these core learning areas.

2.2.1 Studies conducted in South Africa

A report by the National Department of Education (DoE) about the Annual National Assessments conducted in 2008 to determine learners' literacy and numeracy levels revealed that most of the learners in Grades Three and Six from eight of the nine provinces in South Africa, achieved scores below the pass rate (50%). The report revealed shocking results, indicating that 60% of the 336 321 Grade Three learners achieved results below 50% for both mathematics (numeracy) and (language) literacy. The report also showed that 75% of the 326 680 Grade Six learners also scored below the pass rate for literacy. This report described the literacy results as 'scandalous', and stated that the numeracy results were even worse (DoE, 2008).

Similar observations were noted in other reports regarding the 'scandalous' results. A report compiled by the Children's Institute of the University of Cape Town (UCT), stated that most primary school learners in South Africa were failing tests for basic language and mathematics skills. Emerging from the report is that of the population of Grade Three learners, only 36% achieved official curriculum grade-level competence for literacy, while only 35% did so for numeracy. Results for Grade Six literacy and numeracy tests were also disturbing. Only 38% of this grade population passed literacy and 27% achieved pass rates for mathematics (Children's Institute, UCT, 2009).

In view of these reports, most learners in primary schools in South Africa do not acquire the skills and understanding that make the right to education authentic. The DoE (2008) report mentions that numerous other studies have also revealed that over the years South Africa's learners were falling behind international standards. A report about a study of reading in South African primary schools, the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) conducted by the University of Pretoria showed that of the 30 000 learners in Grades Four and Five who participated in these tests, only 13,2 % Grade Fours achieved the required levels. Of the Grade Fives, only 18, 2% scored sufficiently (Fleisch, 2008: 1-30).

Results of assessment tasks of reading and mathematics which were administered to representative samples of Grade Six learners from 15 African countries, conducted by a project called Southern and East Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ) showed similar findings. Of the 3 163 randomly selected South African Grade Six learners, over 50% could 'not read for meaning'. Furthermore, the report revealed that the mathematics scores were even lower than those for reading or literacy. More than half the learners from this same sample had not reached the basic numeracy level (Fleisch, 2008: 1-30). Based on similar studies conducted by the WCED (2007, 2008, and 2009) the Western Cape was no exception.

As noted before, reports of the results obtained in both the National and Provincial Assessments will be discussed. Results of the Provincial testing measures are discussed in the following section.

2.2.2 Studies conducted in the Western Cape

In a report prepared for the media in 2009, the MEC for Education in the Western Cape announced that 'not enough learners in the Western Cape were reaching benchmarked levels of literacy and numeracy'. The report makes reference to observations extracted from the extensive research which were conducted in the province to determine learners' competence in literacy and numeracy at official curriculum grade-levels. As indicated earlier, learners' competencies have been measured by means of written literacy and numeracy assessments in primary schools every year since 2002, alternating between Grade 3 (end of Foundation Phase, Grades R-3) and Grade 6 (end of Intermediate Phase, Grades 4-6), (WCED, March 2009). The results of these tests have revealed that the literacy and numeracy skills of the learners in the Western Cape are far below what is required for them to learn and develop effectively, or as the MEC stated, 'for them wanting to compete in the global economic economy' (WCED, July 2009).

The July 2009 report also revealed that results for literacy and numeracy Assessments for both Grade Three and Grade Six for the period 2004 to 2008, that of the 1 034 primary schools where Grade Six learners wrote the tests, 87% of these schools achieved less than 40% pass rate in numeracy at their school. Of the 1 066 primary

schools where Grade Three learners wrote the tests 73.7% of these schools achieved less than 40% in numeracy at their respective schools.

Although an increase was noted in Grade Three literacy levels, only 53.5% achieved more than 50% for literacy in 2008. Emerging from the same report was that the results of the Grade Six study for literacy was even more alarming. Only 44.8% of these learners achieved the literacy pass requirements. In addition, further analysis revealed that more than half of the Grade Six learners were not even able to cope at Grade Five, Grade Four or Grade Three levels for numeracy.

In previous WCED reports (May 2008 and March 2009) the MEC announced that learners' literacy skills and pass rates (literacy) for both Grade Three (WCED, 2007) and Grade Six (WCED, 2008) 'continued to show improvement, but numeracy still seems to be a challenge as it lags far behind'. In an attempt to acknowledge all those responsible for the noted improvement, the WCED launched its first awards ceremony where some schools were honoured for special achievements in either literacy or numeracy, or in both (WCED, May 2008).

Two of the schools in this study qualified for these awards, and in the section following, these awards are briefly discussed.

2.2.3 School Awards for improved and excellent results

The WCED announced to the media (May 2008), that learners in primary schools were making progress in literacy, but were still struggling with mathematics. This announcement was motivated by the results of the literacy and numeracy assessments (2003 to 2007), written by the Grade Six learners. The statement announced that the percentage of learners achieving higher than the set requirements for Literacy across the Western Cape has increased progressively over the past four years from 35 % in 2003 to 42,1 % in 2005 and 44,8 % in 2007. A total of 207 schools in all five quintiles improved results in both numeracy and literacy.

To celebrate this achievement and performance of schools, and reward both excellence and improvement, some schools were acknowledged for their meritorious achievements at a gala function hosted by the MEC for Education on May 22, 2008.

The introductory award ceremony was introduced as a motivation for schools to continuously work harder at improving their results in Literacy and Numeracy (Superintendent General, 2008). Schools received awards for having shown the greatest improvement in Literacy, and Numeracy over the period 2003 to 2007, relative to the contexts within which the school operates, for which two of the three schools in the study, qualified (see Chapter One).

In 2009, a similar report was released to the media, announcing the results of the Grade Three Tests and Awards. The report was presented based on the Grade Three tests, written in October and November 2008. The report showed that Grade Three literacy results improved by 17.8% since 2002 from 35.7% to 53.5% in 2008. Numeracy results have however shown a decline of 2.1% from 37.1% in 2002, to 35% in 2008. The awards which were bestowed on schools were done according to criteria based on excellent and progressively consistent performance in literacy and numeracy (WCED, May 2009).

While circumstances and contexts differed from school to school, the common thread was that of people engaging with this issue, - teachers, principals, officials, parents and local communities — 'to make a difference'. The report indicated that the key message was 'that the success of these schools had demonstrated the power of teachers (principals and officials), who were committed to making a difference' (WCED, May 2008).

With the thought 'making a difference' as my point of reference, I decided to identify three schools with different results, but with similar contexts within which they operate and to investigate teachers' beliefs in their capabilities to organize and execute a course of action required to produce given attainments to determine whether or not it was their sense of efficacy (Bandura, 1997:3) that brought about the differences.

2.3 SCHOOL SELECTION

The schools that were selected for the study have very similar student and socio-economic characteristics and are different primarily in the levels of learner performance. The hypothesis that is developed in this thesis is one that suggests that a

crucial differentiating factor is the differing levels of teacher efficacy. The selection of schools with similar student profiles (as indicated by their school fees) was critical to eliminate variation in performance caused by variation in learner characteristics.

The three primary schools in this study are typical of the schools situated on the Cape Flats within the greater Cape Town area of the province of the Western Cape that form part of the former education department, House of Representatives (HOR). These schools fall within the education district, Metropole South of the WCED. The official languages of learning and teaching (LoLT) of these schools are English and Afrikaans, bearing in mind that these languages are not the mother tongue of most of these learners. The learner population of MPS1 is rather small (250 learners), in comparison to LPS with 979 learners, and MPS2 with a learner population of 899. LPS and MPS1 are categorised in quintile 4 and MPS2 in quintile 5, as determined in terms of the national poverty quintiles into which all schools in South Africa are classified. The majority of the teachers are female, and experienced.
The section that follows, briefly sketches a profile of each of the schools selected as my sample schools in the study, in their context.

2.3.1 School 1[LPS]

The low performing school (LPS) is located in a township of sub-economic concrete blocks of flats, where a vast majority of the community is unemployed, illiterate and unschooled. Most of the learners stem from this low socio economic status, while others come from the predominantly shack, or informal surrounding areas, where the socio economic status is equally low. Many learners are recent migrants (mainly from the Eastern Cape) and more recently, immigrants (refugees) from African states. The school fee at this LPS is R100, 00 per annum, which is often not payable for many parents.

2.3.2 School 2 [MPS1]

MPSI is located in a more established and affluent area. Ironically though, their learners too come from low socio economic areas outside of the area where the school is located. Many of them are bussed in from poverty stricken, informal areas that consist of shack dwellings, and children from labourers of the surrounding farms. They too have many learners who are recent migrants (mainly from the Eastern

Cape). A vast majority of the parents are also unschooled, are in low paying jobs or unemployed, and do not have English as their mother tongue. The annual school fees at this MPSI are set at R70.00, which is also often too exorbitant for parents to pay.

2.3.3 School 3]MPS2]

MPS2 is also located in an area slightly more established than the LPS. Again, the learners and community they serve, stem from similar social backgrounds. The greater part of the population of the school is the children who come from the surrounding townships of sub-economic concrete blocks of flats, where a vast majority of the community is illiterate and unschooled. The school fees of about R120.00 per annum are also problematic due to the unemployment rate amongst the parents and guardians. Just like LPS, the LOLT is parallel, meaning that both English and Afrikaans are taught as primary languages.

2.4 RATIONALE FOR SELECTING THESE SCHOOLS

The study was motivated by, and based on results obtained in the WCED Systemic Evaluation (2007) which pointed to the fact that the Literacy and Numeracy skills of the learners in the LPS are far below what is required of them to learn and develop effectively. As was indicated in Chapter 1, my interest in MPS1 and MPS2, originated from their remarkable achievements in the WCED Literacy and Numeracy tests conducted since 2003 to 2007 which led them to obtaining awards from the MEC Education for their consistent improvement. MPS1 showed an improvement in their Literacy Results, while MPS2 reflected an overall performance improvement in both Numeracy and Literacy over the period 2003, 2005 and 2007. Improvement was measured in terms of both pass rates and mean scores. Conversely, the LPS made a `substantial' improvement (12.6%) in the Literacy test (i.e. according to WCED: 2008 analysis), but still obtained a score far below the required pass rate of 50% (17.6%).

2.5 CONCLUSION

What was striking about the media reports was that the WCED ascribed the success of the award winning schools 'to the power demonstrated by teachers who were committed to making a difference' (WCED, 2009). The reports also highlighted the fact that many of these schools were from poor communities which demonstrated that poverty in itself did not have to be a barrier to learning. This notion corresponds with

the literature reviewed in Chapter Three, with Hamilton stating that "of all the variables, including that of the dreaded dominance of race, class and poverty, the quality of the teacher has the single greatest impact on student achievement" (2003:20). The notion is reiterated by Vacha and McLaughlin (1992:9-25) who advocate that teachers have a more positive impact on their students' school experiences, including their levels of performances and achievements, than all the external factors postulated to affect academic performance. Selaledi (1999:266-270) therefore argues that if the performance of learners is to improve, teachers' performance and efficacy have to improve. He supports the advancement of teachers' efficacy, considering the hypothesis that teachers' sense of efficacy "affects the effort they put into teaching, the goals they set and their level of inspiration" (Cakiroglu, 2003:2).

In the next chapter literature regarding teacher efficacy is reviewed to help shape the frame of reference for the research statement of this study.

CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH ON TEACHER EFFICACY

"If I have seen further it is only by standing on the shoulders of giants"
Isaac Newton (1675).

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The question as to how to ensure that schoolchildren get the best education possible is still paramount (Hamilton, 2003: 20). There are ongoing debates from standardized testing to teacher education; to whom and which factors affect a student's achievement. The one enduring approach has been to focus on teachers. Despite initial studies suggesting a limited role for school inputs in determining student outcomes, there is a growing body of research that suggests that schools do make a difference and teachers play the key role in the process. Parsley points out "no single factor will doom a child to failure, nor is there one solution to the problem of academic failure" (2003:2). She does however advance the argument that although it is impossible for teachers, or even schools, to develop comprehensive programs involving students' backgrounds to incur positive change, there is still much that an individual classroom teacher can do (Parsley, 2003:3). It is hypothesized that by concentrating on the classroom teacher, a part of the solution might be developed.

Teachers, it is argued, are any education system's most important resource. Wayne and Youngs (2003:89122) claim that both intuition and empirical research inform us that the achievement of schoolchildren depends substantially on the teachers they are assigned. Hamilton also concurs "of all the variables, including that of the dreaded dominance of race, class and poverty, the quality of the teacher has the single greatest impact on student achievement" (2003:20).

Vacha and McLaughlin (1992:9-25) extend this notion, saying that of all the factors that affect academic performance, teachers have the most impact on their students' school experiences. Experienced, highly committed, caring teachers effectively promote the academic success of all their students. Mt* and Reynolds' research findings into student learning and achievement also show that "classroom teaching and the class teacher is at the heart of education" (2001:1). They express the opinion

that the teacher in the classroom is the factor that most strongly affects learners' progress in school.

In recent years, the trend in teacher effectiveness has somewhat shifted to an examination of teachers' beliefs, motivation, and self-regulatory factors associated with teaching and learning (Dembo, 2001:23-35; Randi, 2004:1825-1853). Tucker's (2005:29-35) findings reflect similar results, postulating that teachers' influence over the achievement of all students in particular students from low-income (low Socio Economic Status) and culturally diverse backgrounds is paramount. These findings have prompted calls for promoting teacher self-efficacy for working with children from diverse backgrounds (Frey, 2002:116-126), and a large body of studies emerged that connected learner achievement and gains, to teacher self-efficacy (Wayne and Youngs, 200189-122). Isiksal and Cakiroglu reiterate Woolfolk Hoy and Hoy's (1990:81-91) notion that "teacher efficacy is one of the few teacher characteristics that consistently relates to teaching and learning" (2005:12). Cakiroglu (2003:2) suggests that this is so because "teachers' sense of efficacy affects the effort they put into teaching, the goals they set and their level of inspiration"

Conversely, Hargreaves cautions, 'teachers can also degrade the quality of education through error, laziness, cruelty or incompetence' (1995:23). Nuthall (2004:278) refers to the fact that too often the ineffectiveness of teacher instruction is not regarded as influential in ineffective learning. Nuthall further argues that within the professional culture of teaching it is commonly believed that "if something is taught it is automatically learned. If it is not learned, then the problem is presumed to lie with the inadequacy of the learner's ability, motivation or persistence" (2004:278).

However, Selaledi (1999:266-270) postulates that if the performance of learners is to improve, teachers' performance and efficacy have to improve. Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy stress that, "teachers' sense of efficacy is an idea that neither researchers nor practitioners can afford to ignore" (2001:803). Expanding this notion, the critical importance of advancing teachers' efficacy is stressed by Selaledi (1999:266-270). Advancing teachers' efficacy, Selaledi argues, means creating opportunities to develop them professionally, helping them to reflect on their performance and holding them accountable for their actions. Selaledi further advances

his point, arguing that it makes good sense to focus on the promotion of efficacy in teachers since they are the ones who are expected to bring about the positive change, and who are required to produce quality education for their learners. In view of this argument, this study makes a concerted effort to explore this concept of efficacy and determine its influence on teaching and learning.

The sections that follow have three objectives: Firstly, research literature explaining the conceptual underpinnings of what constitutes efficacy is explored. Secondly, literature concerning factors that determine or influence the teachers' sense of efficacy is reviewed. Thirdly, the study examines literature that reveals detailed findings of how teachers' sense of efficacy has a mediating effect on what happens in the classroom.

3.2 UNDERSTANDING EFFICACY

According to social cognitive theory, human behaviour "is mediated by our efficaciousness" and "self-efficacy beliefs influence our choices, our effort, our persistence when facing adversity, and our emotions" (Henson, 2001:4). Self-efficacy grew out of Bandura's (1997) social cognitive theory. He defines perceived self-efficacy as "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (Bandura, 1997:3).

3.2.1 Self-Efficacy: Conceptual Underpinnings

The conceptual underpinnings of self-efficacy are found in social cognitive theory, developed by Albert Bandura (1977:191-215). The inference is that social cognitive theory assumes that people are capable of human agency, or intentional pursuit of courses of action, and that such agency operates in a process called triadic reciprocal causation. Bandura explains:

> "Reciprocal causation is a multi-directional model suggesting that our agency results in future behaviour as a function of three interrelated forces: environmental influences, our behaviour, and internal personal factors such as cognitive, affective, and biological processes" (1997: 477).

This trinity mutually impacts its three interrelated forces, determines what we come to believe about ourselves and affects the choices we make and actions we take. Bandura's theories argue that we are not products of our environment, nor are we products of our biology. Instead, according to the theories, we are products of the

dynamic interplay between the external, the internal and our current and past behaviour.

Bandura (2000) introduces self-efficacy as "a vital personal resource" and explains why it may affect individual's self-motivation and life trajectories:

> "When faced with obstacles, setbacks, and failures, those who doubt their capabilities slacken their efforts, give up, or settle for mediocre solutions. Those who have a strong belief in their capabilities redouble their effort to master the challenges" (p.120).

He argues that, "among the mechanisms of self-influence, none is more focal or pervading than belief of personal efficacy" (2000:120). Bandura (1997) defines self-efficacy as "the belief in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (p. 3). It is theorized as a belief in one's own abilities to perform an action or activity necessary to achieve a goal or task. "Self-efficacy beliefs are referred to in his theories as key mediators for our behaviour, and behavioural change. Self-efficacy is considered the belief one has of one's competence to manage prospective situations" (1995:2).

Self -efficacy differs from 'self-esteem', which is usually considered to be an attribute reflecting an individual's characteristic affective evaluation of self (e.g. feelings of self-worth or self-liking). Bandura explains that the theory of self-efficacy implies that it is distinct from other conceptions of self, such as self-concept, self-worth, and self-esteem, in that it is specific to a particular task. Gist and Mitchell (1992:185) posit that, "self-efficacy is a judgement about task capability that is not inherently evaluative". This thought is reiterated by Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy and Hoy (1998:202 - 248) who refer to self-efficacy, as a concept that has to do with self-perception of competence rather than the actual level of competence.

From the social cognitive theory perspective because human agency is mediated by our efficaciousness, self-efficacy beliefs influence our choices, our effort, our persistence and our emotions when facing adversity (Pajares, 1997: 239-266). Self-efficacy theory is a common theme in current views of motivation (Graham & Weiner, 1996:45-115), primarily because of its analytical ability and application for practically any behavioural task.

The notion of self-efficacy has been applied to many domains, including teaching. Educationally, self-efficacy beliefs are related to academic performance and self-regulated learning (Hackett, 1995 in Bandura: 232-258; Pajares, 1996:543-578; Schunk, 1991:207-231; Zimmerman, 1995:202-234). Researchers have found positive associations between student achievement and different kinds of efficacy beliefs: self-efficacy beliefs of teachers (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998:202-248) and teachers' collective efficacy beliefs about school (Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2000:479-508).

The logic of the next section of the study is to review literature regarding concepts of teacher efficacy, and to understand its application in educational practice, under the following headings:

- 3.3 Teachers' Self Efficacy
- 3.3.2.1 Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE)
- 3.3.2.2 General Teaching Efficacy (GTE) and
- 3.4 Collective Efficacy.

3.3 TEACHERS' SELF EFFICACY

Teacher self efficacy, according to Woolfolk Hoy and Hoy (1990:81-91) is considered as one of the few teacher characteristics that consistently relates to teaching and learning, (see also Tucker, 2005:29-35).

3.3.1 Conceptual UnderpInnings

Influenced by Bandura's self-efficacy theories (1977: 191-215) teacher efficacy is conceptualised as the belief a teacher has about his or her possible capacity to positively influence change in the lives and levels of achievement of students they teach. Consistent with the general formulation of self-efficacy, Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy & Hoy (2002) define teacher efficacy as:

> "The teacher's belief in his or her capability to organize and execute courses of action required to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task in a particular context" (p.233).

According to their theory, teachers' sense of self-efficacy has been recognized as one of the most influential predictors of teachers' performance in classrooms and, by extension, the performance of their students. Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy,

(2001:783-805) explain that self-efficacy in the teaching domain is a powerful predictor of how and whether a teacher will perform. Teacher efficacy belief according to these theorists is the assessment the teacher makes about her capability to manipulate positive outcomes related to students' performance, their behaviour, and the level of motivation in the classroom. Corresponding with their notion is Ashton (1985:142) who refers to teachers' self efficacy as "their beliefs in their ability to have a positive effect on student learning". Ward says that teacher efficacy in its simplest sense, "are teachers' beliefs about their ability to influence student outcomes" (2005:2).

Based on findings of teachers who believe student learning can be influenced by effective teaching despite home and peer influence, Tucker (2005:29-35) concludes that teachers' sense of efficacy, is one of the few teacher characteristics consistently related to student achievement. Inferences are made that those teachers who are confident in their ability to teach would persevere in their teaching efforts, and ensure that the focus in the classroom is academically orientated. Such teachers he argues would give differentiated feedback, and ultimately ensure improvement in student performance and achievements.

Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk & Hoy's (2001:783-805) findings verify that student achievement and teachers' sense of efficacy are related. These findings are echoed by findings of Woolfolk Hoy and Hoy (1990:81-91) that show positive associations between teacher efficacy and student achievement levels. The link here is that teachers who have developed a strong sense of efficacy are open to new ideas and are more willing to explore and experiment with new methods in their endeavours to better meet the needs of their learners. Such teachers they argue also tend to demonstrate greater levels of planning and organization. Hoy (2000:479-508 cited by Hawkins) correlates teacher efficacy to "teachers' adoption of instructional, organisational, and accountability innovations, teacher evaluations and competence attributes, classroom management protocols, and teachers' referrals of students to special education" (2009:11).

Rangraje, van der Merwe and Urbani (2005:38-43) are adamant that efficacy influences teachers' persistence and their resilience when challenges arise and in the

face of setbacks. According to them teachers who have greater efficacy levels are less critical of learners who make mistakes; they persevere with a struggling learner and are less inclined to refer learners (difficult ones or ones experiencing learning barriers) to special education. These authors (Rangraje, van der Merwe and Urbani) strongly convey the view that teachers' sense of enthusiasm and commitment for teaching are related to their levels of efficacy. They maintain that highly efficacious teachers are also more likely to remain in teaching and in their country.

Tucker (2005:29-35) cites Ashton & Webb (1986:141-174) and Gibson & Dembo (1984:569-582), who have identified two types of teacher efficacy (a) personal teaching efficacy, or teacher beliefs about their own ability to bring about change in their students; and (b) general teaching efficacy, or teacher beliefs concerning the extent to which they believe teaching can overcome external influences on student outcomes.

In the section that follows, these two concepts are examined to determine the relationship between the teachers' sense of these concepts, their teaching and their students' learning and achievement.

3.3.2 Types of Efficacy

General Teaching Efficacy (GTE) and Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) are presented as two different, but interdependent concepts of teacher efficacy. Personal self-efficacy according to Bandura's (1977) theory is the respondent's beliefs about him or herself, which is based on theory that postulates that the more self-efficacious an individual feels, the more effort is made to succeed. General self-efficacy in the teaching domain also based on Bandura's theory, refers to the belief in the power of teachers generally to bring about change in students. It represents outcome expectancy, implying the degree to which external factors such as home background are perceived to be malleable by teacher efforts. Ghaith & Shaaban (1999) define "personal teaching efficacy as the teachers' own expectations that they will be able to perform the actions that lead to students learning, and general efficacy as the belief that the teacher populations' ability to perform these actions is not limited by factors beyond school control" (p.488). These two concepts have been identified in research, as having substantial impact on student achievement.

3.3.2.1 Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE)

As noted by Ogah (2006:6-35) Personal Teaching Efficacy emerges mainly from self-efficacy, defined in Bandura's social cognitive theory (SCT). Rangraje, (2002:67-72) explain that PTE implies that a teacher has an internal orientation of 'I can' and a perceived ability to positively impact student learning. Teachers who communicate self-belief in their capability to teach diverse or unmotivated students promote a belief that reinforcement of teaching activities lies "within the teacher's control, or is internal" argue Tschannen-Moran et al., (1998:204). Consistent with Tschannen-Moran et al.'s theory, "teachers, who believe that control is internal', indicate 'confidence in their abilities as teachers to overcome factors that could make learning difficult for a student". Such teachers, these theorists have found, make "a statement about the efficacy of their own teaching, reflect confidence that they have adequate training or experience to develop strategies for overcoming obstacles to student learning" (1998:204). They are of the opinion that these teachers may possibly have enjoyed earlier accomplishments in enhancing students' achievement.

The authors conclude that PTE has to do with one's own feelings of competence as a teacher. The beliefs teacher hold that teaching can make a difference in the lives of children despite their external factors are defined as teachers' GTE. This notion is explored in the section below.

3.3.2.2 General Teaching EffIcacy (GTE)

GTE is defined as the belief teachers encompass that teaching can influence student learning even in the face of external limitations (Ogah, 2006:6-35). As explained by Tschannen-Moran et al., (1998:231), "the potential of teachers in general to be successful in spite of various external limitations", is determined by their GTE. GTE reflects "only a partial analysis of the teaching task, focusing on the external constraints that might hinder teaching". A teacher's sense of the complexity of the teaching task, of the limitations in the environment or context that can challenge a teacher's attempts, is reflected by their GTE, as observed by Tschannen-Moran et al'. (1998:232).

A postulation is derived from these authors' findings that teachers who reflect high scores on both PTE and GTE beliefs are active and assured in their interaction with their students. Their reports also reveal that such teachers persist longer, provide a greater academic focus in the classroom, and exhibit different types of feedback than those teachers who reflect lower expectations of their ability to influence student learning (Tschannen-Moran et al., 2006: 6-35). They also express the opinion that teachers who have strong negative GTE beliefs on the other hand, demonstrate that environmental factors overwhelm any power that they can exercise in schools. These teachers emerged as having a belief that reinforcement of their teaching efforts lie outside their control and are external to them.

Efficacy beliefs are best measured in degrees from high to low. Bandura (1977:191-215) as cited by Rangrnje, van der Merwe and Urbani (2005:38-43) points out that teachers have many different types of tasks that they are asked to perform and that their sense of efficacy is not necessarily uniform across all of these tasks. Individuals with high efficacy beliefs about their ability to successfully complete given tasks will generally perform well on these tasks while others with lower efficacy beliefs for specific tasks tend to become idle or give up when faced with these tasks (Schunk, 2000:207-231).

The following section extends the concept of teacher efficacy to the organizational level since it emerged as a significant factor in school productivity. The study explores collective teacher efficacy, its conceptual nature, likely variables that may influence teachers' sense of collective efficacy and its effects on teaching and learning.

3.4 COLLECTIVE EFFICACY

As noted by Schechter and Tschannen-Moran (2006:480-489) the notion of collective teacher efficacy has emerged as a characteristic factor related to school productivity and learner achievement. They consider the notion of collective teacher efficacy significant, especially in teachers' attempts to fulfill their professional mission in an uncertain and turbulent environment.

3.4.1 Conceptual Underpinnings

Bandura (1993:117-148) was the first to show the relationship between a sense of collective efficacy and academic school performance, a relationship that existed in spite of low socio economic status (SES). He refers to collective efficacy as the self-perception teachers in a given school as collective have that make an educational difference to their students over and above the educational impact of their homes and communities". His theory advocates that:

> "Schools in which staff members collectively judge themselves capable of promoting academic success imbue their schools with a positive atmosphere for development that promotes academic attainments regardless of whether they serve predominantly advantaged or disadvantaged students" Bandura (1997:43).

Collective efficacy takes self-efficacy to the social level. Even though individual (self) and collective efficacy are different concepts, they nevertheless influence one another in reciprocal ways (Goddard and Goddard, 2001:1-12). Social cognitive theory is concerned with human agency, or the ways that people exercise some level of control over their own lives. However, social cognitive theory acknowledges that "personal agency operates within a broad network of socio-structural influences" (p. 6) and thus the theory "extends the analysis of mechanisms of human agency to the exercise of collective agency" (p. 7) - people's shared beliefs that they can work together to produce effects. Bandura (1997:43-66) suggests that collective teacher efficacy is an emergent group-level attribute, the product of the interactive dynamics of the group members. He argues that this emergent property is more than the sum of the individual attributes. Collective teacher efficacy, according to these authors, "is a group-attribute rather than the aggregate of individual teachers' self-efficacy beliefs". Bandura (1997) defined collective efficacy generally as "the groups' shared belief in its conjoined capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to produce given levels of attainments" (p. 477).

Extending Bandura's theory to teachers, Goddard et al. (2000) define collective teacher efficacy as:

> "A construct measuring teachers' beliefs about the collective (not individual) capability of a faculty to influence student achievement; it refers to the perceptions of teachers that the efforts of the faculty of a school will have a positive effect on student achievement" (p.486).

Schechter (2005:197-206) explains that collective teacher efficacy differs from teachers' individual sense of efficacy in that collective teacher efficacy is a characteristic of the school. Collective efficacy is a specific form of self-efficacy in which the target of the beliefs is the organization to which the individual belongs, that is, "the perceptions of teachers in a school that the efforts of the staff as a whole will have a positive effect on students" (Goddard, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 2000: 480). Collective efficacy corresponds with self efficacy in that it is associated with the tasks, level of effort, persistence, shared thoughts, stress levels and achievement of groups (Bandura, 1997:469).

"Teachers' efficacy beliefs", defined by Goddard et al., (2000:3-13), "are based on perceptions of individual classroom performance that determines the collective teacher efficacy beliefs, which are social perceptions based on an assessment of the capability of the school as a whole". Goddard, Hoy and Woolfolk Hoy, (2000:479-508) advocate a similar notion in that they regard teachers as members of schools as learning organizations. Within an organization, they argue, that perceived collective efficacy represents the shared perceptions of group members concerning "the performance capability of a social system as a whole" (Bandura, 1997:469). Hoy, Tarter and Hoy (2006:425-446) share the principle that the strength of efficacy beliefs affects the choices individuals and schools make about future plans and actions. Bandura (1997:43-66) reiterates this notion, stating that within schools, perceived collective efficacy represents judgements about the performance capability of the social system as a whole. He notes though that that within the organization, teachers not only have efficacy beliefs about themselves, but as the entire learning organization also. Simply put, perceived collective efficacy is the judgement of teachers that the learning organization as a whole can organize and execute the actions required to have positive effects on students (Goddard, Hoy, & Woolfolk Hoy, 2004:3-13). These authors express the opinion that the shared beliefs of teachers in school organizations influence the social ethos of schools.

The difference between these two alternatives (individual teacher efficacy, and collective efficacy) is represented in the following sample items about teacher competence:

- Individual orientation: "I am able to get through to the most difficult students."

• Group orientation: "Teachers in this school can get through to the most difficult students."

Collective teacher efficacy according to Goddard, Hoy, and by (2000:479-507) can contribute to our understanding of how schools differ in the attainment of their most important purpose, which is the education of their students. Collective teacher efficacy as a concept measuring teachers' beliefs about the collective (not individual) capability of a learning organization to influence student achievement is explored in the succeeding section of this study.

3.5 FACTORS INFLUENCING TEACHERS' SENSE OF EFFICACY

Understanding teachers' efficacy beliefs has been identified as one way to understand teacher practices (Quach, 2004:19). Hence, the increasing urgency to better understand teacher efficacy in the particular classroom context of mainstream classroom teachers with culturally and linguistically diverse learners. According to Quach (2004:19), understanding what factors influence, and how they relate to the efficacy beliefs of teachers working in multi-cultural contexts are of added importance. These are discussed below.

3.5.1 Proximate Efficacy Sources

Adams and Forsyth (2006:625-642) reason that if the environmental context is one component of the triadic relationship affecting behaviour as suggested by social cognitive theory and social learning theory, it seems logical to also define environmental conditions as sources of efficacy, as it affects the "here and the now" of teaching. In view of the fact that contextual conditions have a day in and day out influence on the teaching tasks, the authors propose that they be defined as proximate efficacy sources. The examination of these proximate factors informing teachers' sense of efficacy is the focus of the following section.

• Effects of the environment / context on efficacy

Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998:231) suggest that proximate factors include the leadership of the principal, the climate of the school and the supportiveness of other teachers. Research reveals that principals have the ability to improve teacher perceptions overall by simply attending to fundamental components inherent in

quality relationships. Walsh's theory is, "as teachers begin to feel better about themselves and what their collective missions are as a result of significant interactions with their principals, they become more effective in the classroom" (2005:125).

Research by Rangraje, van der Merwe and Urbani (2005:38-43) established that teachers, who felt that their principals were sufficiently influential with their superiors within the district, had higher PTE. These authors argue that principals, who draw on their leadership position to provide resources for teachers, shield them from disruptive factors and allowed teachers flexibility over classroom affairs, created an environment that allowed efficacy to develop. Their findings advance the promotion of a greater sense of efficacy in schools where student disorder was kept to a minimum. Furthermore, when the principal of a school presented appropriate behaviour and provided rewards on merit of performance, both PTE and positive GTE beliefs were higher. Seyfarth found that "when a principal exhibits a balanced and flexible concern for both the needs of the individual members of staff and the goals of the school, a happy atmosphere exists" (1996:14). The role of the principal and his / her ability to create a happy and healthy environment is reiterated by Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998:220). They advocate that the principal's ability to inspire a common sense of purpose among teachers was tied to more positive GTE beliefs.

Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998:221) also noted that teachers who actively participated in the decisions that affect their work lives also bears on teachers' sense of efficacy. The greater autonomy teachers felt with regard to decision-making affecting their own classrooms, the greater was their positive GTE. Teachers who felt they had a greater influence on school-based decision-making and perceived fewer barriers to teaching had a stronger sense of PTE. According to Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998:221), good management practices, for example classroom management and school management have a direct bearing on the quality of teaching and learning. Receiving positive feedback on teacher performance, collaboration with other teachers, parental involvement in the school and school wide co-ordination of student behaviour are factors significantly associated with teacher efficacy.

• School context effects

In Bandura's (1997:43-66) theory, the environment a person develops for living and working is created individually and collectively. His theory hypothesizes that the belief systems of a staff can be revitalizing or demoralizing to the schools' social system. As Deal & Petersen (1999) note, "teaching in a school is profoundly influenced by that school's culture, rituals and traditions" (cited in Hawkins 2009:12). They suggest that schools where teachers dwell on the overwhelming difficulties of educating their learners, teachers are likely to undermine their sense of efficacy. Conversely, schools where teachers are working together to find ways to address the learning, motivation and behaviour of their learners, feelings of efficacy are likely to be enhanced. According to by (2000:479-508) the more support teachers get, the greater the increase in their sense of teacher efficacy. In addition, by argues, teachers' knowledge of instructional innovations, their classroom management strategies and the depth of their content knowledge, all contribute to their ability to sustain their levels of efficacy.

However, as was noted previously, teachers do not feel equally efficacious in and for all teaching situations. Teacher efficacy is therefore context specific. Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998:228) observed teachers feeling efficacious for teaching particular subjects to certain students in specific settings and that they may feel more or less efficacious under different circumstances. Even from one class period to another, they noted, teachers' levels of efficacy may change. It is therefore cautioned that when making an efficacy judgment, a consideration of the teaching task and its context is required.

Rangraje, van der Merwe and Urbani's (2005:38- 43) survey of teacher efficacy in a number of selected schools in the KwaZulu-Natal province of South Africa, showed that teachers' perceived that school context factors prevented them from functioning efficaciously, and that the respondents tended to place the blame their non-achievement, on the environment and on others. The survey also revealed that their personal teaching efficacy (PTE) beliefs were not as strong as could be expected, and that their GTE and PTE beliefs did not allow them to perform the tasks generally expected of an effective teacher.

Bandura (1986:1389-1391) extends the hypothesis regarding influences on self-efficacy as a teacher. His hypothesis implies that self-efficacy beliefs are developed in response to four sources of information, which he describes as mastery experiences, vicarious experience, social persuasion, and emotional and physiological arousal. Gibbs (2000:1-22) appends a fifth source (imaginal-symbolization) to Bandura's list.

In view of the fact that the above-mentioned sources occur at some time in the past and are called to mind in the present to influence beliefs about future performances, Adams and Forsyth (2006:625-642) suggest that they be defined as remote efficacy sources. Each of these sources is discussed in the following section.

3.5.2 Remote Efficacy Sources

- Mastery experiences/ Performance accomplishments

Bandura (1997:43-66) hypothesizes that mastery experiences, or as described by Gibbs (2000: 1-22) performance accomplishments, are the most influential source of efficacy information. Bandura draws attention to the fact that even though mastery experiences are considered the most powerful influence on efficacy as they provide direct feedback regarding capabilities, the feedback must be processed and weighed through self-referent thought (Bandura 1997:43-66). Successes perceived as genuine, build a vigorous sense of self-efficacy. On the other hand, failures perceived as genuine, undermine self-efficacy. Consequently, they suggest, teachers ought to be able to realistically and constructively perceive and attribute their successes and failures (Gibbs, 2000:1-22).

Bandura's (1999:285-298) premise assumes that when a performance has been successful, efficacy beliefs are raised, which contributes to the expectations that performance will be proficient in the future. The theory expands the perception that when one's performance has been a failure; efficacy beliefs are lowered, which contributes to the apprehensions that future performances will also be incompetent. The level of arousal either of anxiety or excitement, adds to the feeling of mastery or incompetence. Bandura contends that attributions play a role, as well. It is argued that if a success is attributed to internal or controllable causes, such as ability or effort, then self efficacy is enhanced. However, if success is attributed to luck or intervention

of others, then self efficacy may not be strengthened (Bandura, 1993:117-148; Pintrich & Schunk, 1996:247-253).

- Vicarious experience

Woolfolk (2001:389) defines vicarious experiences "as those in which someone else models the tasks in question". The degree, to which the observer identifies with the model, moderates the effect on the observer's self-efficacy (Bandura, 1999:285-298). According to Bandura, it is assumed that the more closely the observer identifies with the model, the stronger the impact on efficacy. When a model with whom the observer identifies performs well, the efficacy of the observer is generally enhanced. Conversely, when the model performs poorly, the efficacy expectations of the observer decrease. Research by Schunk (1986:216-327) reiterates this, explaining that modelling the behaviour of significant others can strengthen self-efficacy. Emerging from the research was that even though vicarious experiences are usually weaker than direct experiences, they are further strengthened by deliberate strategies that encourage the observer to self-reflect on their personal beliefs about competence and capability in similar situations.

It was found that the impact of the observer's vicarious experience is determined by perceived similarity with the model, perceived influential power of the model and the similarity between the observed and new situations and tasks (cited by Gibbs, 2000:1-22). Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk, and Hoy (2001:783-805) conclude that teachers do not rely on direct experience as the only source of information about their personal [or collective] efficacy. Their research shows that teachers listen to stories about achievements of their colleagues as well as success stories of other schools. Just as vicarious experience and modelling serve as effective ways to develop personal teacher efficacy, so too, do they promote collective teacher efficacy.

- Social (Verbal) persuasion

Gibbs (2000:1-22) refers to Bandura's (1982: 122-147) social persuasion as verbal persuasion that may strengthen teachers' self-efficacy. Gibbs articulates that teachers, who are socially persuaded by means of verbal interaction, acquire the capabilities to overcome specific difficulties and are likely to mobilise greater effort and persist longer. These persuasions can be done through talks, workshops, professional

development opportunities and feedback about achievement (Ross and Gray, 2006:179-199). Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, and Hoy's (2001:783-805) conjecture is that social persuasion may entail a pep talk or specific performance feedback from a supervisor or a colleague, or it may even involve the general chatter in the teachers' staff room or in the media about the ability of teachers to influence students. Like Gibbs, Tschannen-Moran et al concede that although social persuasion alone may be limited in its influence to create enduring increases in self efficacy, it can however contribute to successful performances to the degree that a person would instigate an undertaking or project, endeavour new strategies, or try harder to succeed as a result of a persuasive advancement in self efficacy.

Bandura (1982:122-147) cautions though that occasional setbacks may emerge that would instil enough self-doubt to interrupt persistence. Also, he argues, the persuader's credibility, trustworthiness and expertise, are significant determinants for the effectiveness of persuasion. Bandura further argues that occupational stress can be significantly reduced by social persuasion in the form of social support systems. He says that social persuasion in terms of verbal feedback and specific help, as well as encouragement, praise and norms of persistence, and achievement can help create a supportive social environment. On the contrary, the lack of feedback, non-responsiveness from colleagues, criticism and norms of neglect can create an unsupportive and unproductive environment.

- Emotional and physiological arousal

In judging self-efficacy, people evaluate their emotional and physiological arousal in given situations (Gibbs, 2000:1-22). Emotional and physiological stimulation can either prejudice or enhance self-efficacy beliefs, and in so doing influence subsequent performance. Tschannen-Moran et al (2001:783-805) explain that teachers' emotions and moods could be considered as influential sources of information that impacts on self-efficacy judgements. They list mood despondency, anxiety, and depression as likely factors to have a negative effect on self-efficacy. In this frame of mind and emotional state, they argue, teachers would be less likely to believe they that are capable of making a difference in challenging situations.

• ImagInal-symbolization

Imaginal symbolisation, according to Gibbs (2000:1-22) occurs when teachers visualise or imagine themselves performing in particular situations. Imaginal symbolisation provides a source of information for teachers, which affects their self-efficacy and by this means, their performance. Gibbs further argues that when used intentionally in teacher developmental programmes, imaginal symbolisation can serve as a potentially powerful way to enhance self-efficacy (Gibbs, 2000: 1-22).

As noted by Goddard et al., (2000: 479-507) these sources reviewed above, can be used to provide essential knowledge that would allow individuals to form judgments about their ability to execute behaviour resulting in the achievement of a desired aim. The theorists postulate that past experiences, whether they are mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, or verbal persuasion, physiological and affective states, or imaginal-symbolization, present information relevant to the formation of such judgments. Despite the relevance of each source, information acquired from each source differs in significance and importance, depending on levels of personal efficacy (Bandura, 1997:43-66; Goddard et al., 2000: 479-507). Their reason being that individuals weigh past experiences differently, implying that a teacher may attach more credibility to a masterful teaching performance or indicators of student achievement than to modeled effective teaching practices or to the receipt of positive, persuasive feedback from a colleague. Conversely, another teacher might place more value on feedback from former students and parents rather than test scores. Social cognitive theory suggests that information acquired from these past experiences is cognitively assessed according to the circumstances in which a future task will be performed (Bandura, 1997:43-66).

In the section below, teacher efficacy and its relation to teaching and learning is reviewed.

3.6 EFFICACY, TEACHING AND LEARNING

3.6.1 Teacher efficacy, TeachIng and Learning

According to Gibbs (2002:1-22) effective teachers believe that they can make a difference in children's lives, and therefore teach in ways that demonstrate this belief. The hypothesis is that what teachers' believe about their capability is a strong predictor of teacher effectiveness, and is illustrated as follows:

People who hold strong self-efficacy beliefs tend to:

- be more satisfied with their job and demonstrate more commitment (Trentham, Silvem, & Brogdon, 1985:343-352), and
- have lower absenteeism (McDonald & Siegall, 1993:465-475).

Teachers, who have high self-efficacy, tend to:

- persist in failure situations (Gibson& Dembo, l984:569-583)
- take more risks with the curriculum (Guskey,1988:41-47)
- use new teaching approaches (Gibson & Dembo, 1984:569-582)
- get better gains in children's achievement (Brookover et al. 1979, cited by Gibbs, 2002:1-22),
- have more motivated students (Midgely et al. 1989:247-258).

Given research findings regarding relationships between teacher efficacy, teacher behaviour, and student achievement, the following section looks at teacher efficacy as a modifiable variable that can yield meaningful changes in the classroom and in student outcomes. Unsurprisingly then, it follows that there are important behavioural differences between teachers with high and low efficacy, and differences that may create variation in student achievement, see also Tucker (2005:29-35).

In particular, as the following examples show, teacher efficacy impacts on factors such as pedagogy, special needs students, socio economic status (SES) and race; factors often held up as reasons for failure. For example, using classroom observations, Gibson and Dembo noted that low-efficacy teachers spent almost 50% of their observed time in small-group instruction, whereas high-efficacy teachers spent only 28% of their instructional time in small groups. They also observed that high-efficacy teachers spent more time monitoring, checking seatwork, and providing

whole-group instruction. These findings are reiterated by Tucker (2005:29-35) who regards it as important because research demonstrates that effective teachers use more whole group instruction and maintain higher levels of student engagement. Additionally, Good & Brophy's (2003:9) research notes significant differences in teacher feedback patterns following incorrect responses from students. When providing a student with an opportunity to respond, they found that low efficacy teachers were more likely than high-efficacy teachers to provide the correct answer, call on another student, or even allow another student to call out the answer before the student could successfully give the correct response.

Tucker (2005:29-35) reflects on Soodak and Podell's (1994: 44-51) research findings to further align the notion that teacher efficacy also has a relationship with teacher beliefs about difficult-to-teach students and the decisions they make regarding those students. Soodak and Podell provided teachers with a case study of a difficult student. Results of their case study indicated that teachers with higher personal teaching efficacy or belief in their ability to reach even the most difficult student, were more likely to make teacher-based suggestions to meeting the needs of the student than teachers with low personal teaching efficacy. Similarly, Ashton (1985:141-174) found that teachers with low personal teaching efficacy were more likely to look for solutions outside of their own classroom. These conclusions she considers as important because teachers who look to solutions outside their own classroom and who feel the cause is due to external factors are more likely to refer students to special education.

Soodak and Podell (1994:44-51) assert that referral to special education and bias in referral decisions have also been linked to teacher efficacy. This notion is based on their investigation regarding the influence of teacher efficacy and student problem type on teachers' placement and referral decisions. Results revealed that both general and special education teachers who scored high on both general teaching efficacy and personal teaching efficacy were likely to agree that the student *was* correctly placed in general education. In other words, this study manifests that those teachers who were confident of their own teaching and the effects of teaching, agreed to retain difficult students in general education.

Earlier, investigations by Podell and Soodak (1993:247-253) revealed that teachers with low efficacy considered general education placement inappropriate for the underachieving students from lower SES families. Teachers high on teacher efficacy did not differentiate students by SES. Thus, teachers' referral decisions appear to be biased by variables other than the specific academic difficulty experienced by the student. Podell and Soodak (1993:247-253) regard this as important to note in efforts to educate diverse student populations.

Pang & Sablan (1998:45-65) claim that teacher efficacy is also related to racial attitudes and perceived ability to work with diverse students. They argue that many teachers feel ill-equipped to teach students from culturally different backgrounds. In-service teachers, in particular, reported lower efficacy for teaching diverse students, thus indicating the need to offer training to teachers already in the field. Emerging from Gibson & Dembo's (1984:569-582) research regarding teacher behaviours, teachers who are efficacious, persist with struggling students longer, and are less critical of students who offer incorrect answers. They are also more likely to be of the opinion that a low SES student should be placed in a main stream education setting and are less likely to refer students for special education (Meijer & Foster, 1988:378 - 385; Podell & Soodak, 1994: 44-51; Soodak & Podell, 1993:247 - 253). They found that teachers with high efficacy tend to experiment with methods of instruction, seek improved teaching methods, and experiment with instructional materials (Allinder, 1994:86-87; Guskey, 1988:63-69; Stein & Wang, 1988:171-187). Other findings revealed that efficacious in-service teachers also evidenced higher levels of professional commitment (Coladarci, 1992:323-337).

Evidence has consistently documented differential teaching effectiveness between teachers who have a high sense of efficacy beliefs and those who have a low sense of efficacy beliefs. Teachers' high sense of self-efficacy has been associated with a high level of planning and organization (Allinder, 1994:86-87); high persistence; less critical behaviour toward students (Ashton & Webb, 1986:141-174), greater displays of interest for teaching (Allinder, 1994: 86-87); and stronger beliefs that student motivation and learning are in their hands (Armor et al., 1976).

3.6.2 Collective efficacy, teaching and learning

Collective teacher efficacy powerfully influences the social norms of school and teacher behaviour, and actions are evaluated in the context of these norms (Goddard and Goddard, 2001:807-818). Thus, the relationship between teacher attitudes and teacher behaviours is critical to educational outcomes. By influencing teacher behaviours, collective efficacy beliefs influence student achievement (Goddard et al., 2000:479-507). The collective teacher efficacy of a school organization influences how teachers teach students, manage their classrooms, and inculcate motivation. Collective teacher efficacy influences student achievement because greater efficacy leads to greater effort and persistence that result in better performance (Allinder, 1994: 86-87; Ashton and Webb, 1986:125-144; Guskey, 1988:63-69; Stein and Wang, 1988:171-187). Numerous researchers have observed that collective teacher efficacy is significantly related to student achievement in elementary, middle and high schools (Bandura, 1993; Goddard, 2001: 807-818; Goddard et al., 2000: 479-508; Hoy et al., 2002; Slab and Goddard, 2002; Tschannen-Moran and Barr, 2004: 187-207).

Most of the authors mentioned above, postulate that teachers with a low sense of individual self-efficacy might perform differently in a high collective efficacy environment as opposed to a low one, and vice-versa. Extracted from research findings, they concur that school staffs with a high level of collective teacher efficacy firmly believe that students can be taught and can be motivated to achieve at high levels based on national or state tests of academic competence (Bandura, 1993:117-148). Once the collective efficacy of a school is established, whether it enhances student learning or obstructs it, it becomes a stable component of the culture. Teachers in schools with high collective efficacy do not accept low student achievement as an inevitable consequence of low socio-economic status, lack of ability, or family background (Goddard et al., 2000:479-507). They roll up their sleeves and get the job done.

Goddard, Hoy, &Woolfolk Hoy, (2000:479-508) support the role of collective efficacy in promoting school achievement in schools, but caution that schools affect students and their achievement differently. Bandura (1993:117-148, 1997:43-66) too, argues that one powerful construct that varies greatly among schools and that is

systematically associated with student achievement, is the collective efficacy of teachers within a school. These theorists reiterate each other saying that schools in which the staff had a strong sense of collective efficacy flourished, whereas those in which the staff members had serious doubts about their collective efficacy declined in academic performance or showed little academic progress. Furthermore, they posit, the reputation of certain student populations as underachievers can influence collective teacher efficacy creating a vicious descending spiral.

3.7 CONCLUSION

The literature reviewed in this study reveals that the concept 'teacher efficacy' has become sufficiently refined to be used as the theoretical foundation for an empirical survey. The primary purpose of this review was not only to identify and examine existing literature on efficacy, but to bring into focus a more expanded, dynamic view of what constitutes efficacy. In particular the aim was to define this expanded view of efficacy and how it impacts across a broad range of contextual and organizational contexts. By building on this strong conceptual and empirical foundation, the intent is to stimulate and advance efficacy research with individuals (self efficacy) and staff within organizations (collective efficacy).

It is very clear from the literature that efficacy is more than self-opinion and that it manifest in teacher behaviours that enable schools (as collectives) and teachers (as individuals) to deal with 'external' factors such as class, race and ability in positive ways. This is critical in understanding why some schools consistently underperforms and it is for this reason that the schools described in Chapter 2 were selected as research sites.

The questionnaire surveys, used to measure their efficacy are found and explored in the Methodology Chapter (Chapter 4) of this study. These instruments were constructed for the purpose of making findings with regard to Teacher efficacy, GTE, PTE, and Collective Efficacy and the impact of school level effects.

CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The more ways we look at a problem, the more voices we listen to and actually hear, the more eyes beyond our own we use to see with, the greater the depth of understanding"
Christopher Hodgkinson.

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the research methodology and research instruments which were employed to conduct this survey.

4.2 METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

The research was conducted as a survey using pre-designed questionnaires that had undergone validity tests to ensure authenticity (see Chapter Three). This method of data collection was therefore considered most appropriate since it has been demonstrated that these questionnaires may be used to measure teachers' levels of efficacy.

4.2.1 School Sampling

Fifty-two (52) teachers at the three primary schools, formed part of this survey, and each were requested to complete two questionnaires; the first, measuring self-efficacy, and the other measuring collective efficacy.
The full sample consisted of 52 teacher-respondents, as shown below:

Table 4.2.1.1 Total teacher respondents

SCHOOLS (n = 3)	TEACHERS (n = 52)	LPS	MPS1	MPS2
Teacher efficacy	**52**	25	7	20
Collective efficacy	**52**	25	7	20

These schools where the data for this research were collected, were selected on the basis of their results obtained in the Grades 3 and 6 Literacy and Numeracy (LIT/NUM) Tests, conducted in the National and Provincial Education Departments' Systemic Evaluations, (2003-2007), and the awards they received from the MEC Education, for the improvement they showed over the same period (see Chapter Two).

The motivation being, that despite their contextual similarities (backgrounds of learners, socio economic status, and language among other aspects) their Literacy and Numeracy achievement levels were very different from each other. As indicated in Chapter Two these schools are designated LPS (Low Performing School), MPSI and MPS2 (Medium Performing Schools).

4.2.2 Research Instruments

This research project was carried out as a survey employing quantitative methods. Two questionnaires were used: one, measuring teacher efficacy (see Appendix 1) which consisted of thirty one statements. The other, measuring collective efficacy (see Appendix 2) covered twelve statements. Teacher respondents could exercise choices according to sets of questions, and these responses were quantified. The instruments relied on to measure teachers' efficacy levels were:

(i) Teacher Efficacy: Tschannen-Moran et al's (1998:205) original 31-item instrument probing the aspects of teacher efficacy was used to measure (individual) teacher efficacy, and

(ii) The Collective Teacher Belief Scale: Tschannen-Moran and Barr's (2004) was used to measure and determine the schools' collective sense of efficacy

The advantages of using the questionnaires as the research instruments were that they were time efficient. The questionnaires could be personally delivered and the respondents could complete it in their own time (within the agreed timeframe). Since pre-designed questionnaires were used, there was no need to draft questions and all the questions were 'standardised' (the questions were all the same), Munn and Dreyer (1995:19). Information could be collected from different groups of different sizes, (three schools with different staff sizes) over the same time period. The return rates were fairly high, as reflected in Table 4.3.1.1.

4.2.3 Questionnaire Design

4.2.3.1 IndivIdual Teacher Efficacy Questionnaire

Bandura (1997: 28:117-148), points out that "teachers' sense of efficacy is not necessarily uniform across the many different types of tasks teachers are asked to perform". In response to this, Tschannen-Moran *et al.*, (1998:205) constructed an

original 31-item instrument with the aim of probing the following aspects of teacher efficacy (see Appendixl):

- efficacy to influence decision making (items 3, 8, 9, 10, 12,14, 18, 26),
- efficacy to influence school resources (15),
- instructional efficacy (6,7,8, 12, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31),
- disciplinary efficacy (4, 17, 25 28, 29, 31),
- efficacy to enlist parental involvement (4, 5),
- efficacy to enlist community involvement (10, 11,19), and
- efficacy to create a positive school climate (I, 2, 5, 7, 8, 12, 17, 22, 23, 24, 29, 30).

Tschannen-Moran *et al.*, (1998:205) also constructed the instrument with the purpose of establishing General Teacher Efficacy (GTE) and Personal Teacher Efficacy (PTE) and the impact of school level effects. The following items in this instrument measure teachers' GTE and PTE respectively, as indicated in the columns below:

GTE	PTE
3, 4, 9, 10, 15, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30	5, 6, 20, 22, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31

The questionnaire was structured in such a way that respondents could exercise their choice to each question /statement according to a three-point Liken-type scale (agree, disagree, uncertain). Some of the formulations were negative in order to increase the reliability of the instrument (Tschannen-Moran *et al.,* 1998: 233). The full questionnaire which was modified to include space for comments and personal data appears in Appendix 1.

The Tschannen-Moran et al (1998:205) research instrument was subjected to a test of construct validity (see Jaeger, 1988:326-327). A draft questionnaire was scrutinized by Leedy & Ormrod (2001:99) and after some changes the instrument was approved as reliable to measure teacher efficacy and from which authentic conjectures could be made from its utilization with regard to GTE, PTE, influence of contextual factors and the different tasks normally expected from teachers. Leedy & Ormrod were also in agreement that the experimental procedures were based on a theory about what teacher efficacy comprise. Furthermore they indicated their satisfaction that on the basis of this theory any other researcher would be able to determine and distinguish

between respondents with positive or negative GTE beliefs and/or respondents who are strong or weak on PTE beliefs. (see also Borg, Gall & Gall, 1993: 122).

4.2.3.2 Collective Efficacy Questionnaire

Social cognitive theory holds that "personal agency operates within a broad network of sociostructural influences", and "collective efficacy takes self-efficacy to the social level" Bandura (1997:6-7). Goddard et al (2000: 486) explain collective teacher efficacy as "a construct measuring teachers' beliefs about the collective (not individual) capability of a faculty (staff) to influence student achievement; it refers to the perceptions of teachers that the efforts of the faculty (staff) of a school will have a positive effect on student achievement".

This study made use of 'The Collective Teacher Belief Scale' (Tschannen-Moran and Barr, 2004) that was developed using the general structure of the teacher sense of efficacy scale (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 2001: 783-805), which was based on Bandura's unpublished teacher self-efficacy scale. This scale measures the whole staffs belief about its collective capability to influence student achievement, so items are worded to measure efficacy as a school-level attribute. Thus, the measure seeks to capture individuals' perceptions of school capability (Goddard, 2001:807-818). In this way the scale differs from other teacher efficacy scales as teachers are asked about their perceptions of the collective, rather than their personal beliefs about their own individual efficacy. The Collective Teacher Belief Scale (Tschannen-Moran and Ban, 2004) is a 12-item measure that has two subscales: instructional strategies (six items) and student discipline (six items). Teachers were asked to rate items on a nine-point scale with anchors at 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9, (nothing, very little, some degree, quite a bit, a great deal). The following are examples of each subscale.

- Instructional strategies:

  How much can teachers in your school do to help students master complex content?

  How much can teachers in your school do to produce meaningful student learning?

- Student discipline:

How much can school personnel in your school do to control disruptive behaviour?

To what extent can school personnel in your school establish rules and procedures that facilitate learning?

The full questionnaire measuring Collective Teacher Efficacy is found in Appendix 2.

4.2.4 PilotIng the questionnaires

4.2.4.1 Individual Teacher Efficacy

A pilot study with the questionnaire as the research instrument was performed at the LPS to ensure that teachers in the selected schools would be able to interact with it in order to reflect a true observation of teacher efficacy when completing the finalized instrument. The questionnaire was tested in advance by asking four teachers (Head of Departments) from LPS to participate. In response to the feedback gained, a section was added where the respondents were given the option of explaining / justifying certain choices by providing comments (qualitative data). They were given a three day timeframe in which to study and complete the research questionnaire.

4.2.4.2 Collective Efficacy

The instrument was also piloted. Six teachers of LPS were asked to complete, and give feedback regarding the clarity of instructions, length of the instrument, appropriateness of the questions, and any other responses they had to the instrument. The teachers who participated in the pilot test noted no difficulties or concerns with the instrument. The instrument was therefore used in its original design.

4.3 DATA COLLECTION AND CAPTURING METHODS

The study was done during the latter part of 2008 after the schools' LIT/NUM results of the systemic evaluations were released. Visits were arranged with the principals to explain the study purpose in general terms and to request permission to use their schools. Dates were set for collecting the completed questionnaires from the schools. Since anonymity and confidentiality are important for the protection of respondents' privacy, teachers in the sample were assured that their responses would remain confidential and that they could remain anonymous. Respondents were guaranteed that they would not be identifiable in any way from the results of the investigation.

4.3.1 Questionnaire distribution

With the assistance of the principals the questionnaires were distributed among all the teachers of the three schools. The importance of sincere / honest responses was stressed and clarified by me (the researcher) so that the data could be authentic. The questionnaires were collected on the set due dates. Follow up visits were conducted in early 2009 to confirm staff sizes (to correlate with return rates) and learner populations.

A summary of the data collected revealed that not all the teachers submitted their questionnaires. The response rates are indicated in the table below.

Table 4.3.1.1 Return rate of questionnaires

SCHOOL	STAFF COMPONENTS	TEACHER EFF1CACY	COLLECT1VE EFFICACY
LPS	25	24 (96%)	24 (96%)
MPSI	7	7 (100%)	5 (77.7%)
MPS2	20	17 (85%)	16 (80%)

4.3.2 Data Capturing

The data collected was captured on EXCEL Spreadsheets to reflect the respondents' answers to each of the statements on the questionnaires. These were captured in tables reflecting different hypothesis about teachers' levels of efficacy at the different schools.

4.4 ETHICAL ISSUES

4.4.1 Application to Conduct Research

Prior to my conducting the research permission was sought from The Director of Research Services at the WCED to visit the identified schools and the respective teachers in their classrooms. This process of requesting permission was done in compliance with the ethical procedures as prescribed by UCT and the WCED. My application to conduct the research in schools in the Western Cape was approved subject to the following conditions:

- ✓ Principals, educators and learners were under no obligation to assist in the investigation.
- ✓ Principals, educators, learners and schools should not be identifiable in any way from the results of the investigation.

- ✓ All the arrangements concerning the investigation had to be made by the researcher.
- ✓ Educators' programmes were not to be interrupted.
- ✓ No research could be conducted during the fourth term as schools were preparing and finalizing syllabi for examinations (October to December).
- ✓ A photocopy of the letter was to be submitted to the principal where the intended research was conducted.
- ✓ The research was limited to the list of schools forwarded to the Western Cape Education Department.
- ✓ A brief summary of the content, findings and recommendations is to be provided to the Director: Research Services.
- ✓ The Department should receive a copy of the completed report / dissertation / thesis.

All of the above conditions were met.

An issue that arose may have been that my being both senior staff member and researcher might have influenced the data that was collected. Respondents were assured that there were no correct or incorrect answers and that the questionnaires were not about managerial issues, but that the interest was only in their frank opinions for the purpose of my conducting a survey for personal reasons. They were assured that their responses will remain confidential and that they could remain anonymous.

4.4.2 Ethical issues at school level

An issue that arose may have been that my being both senior staff member and researcher might have influenced the data that was collected. Respondents were assured that there were no correct or incorrect answers and that the questionnaires were not about managerial issues, but that my interest was only in their frank opinions for the purpose of my conducting a survey for personal reasons. They were assured that their responses would remain confidential and that they could remain anonymous.

4.5 LIMITATIONS

Limitations intrinsic to the methods as well as in the field work were experienced while conducting the survey. They are briefly discussed below.

4.5.1.1 Limitations intrinsIc to the methods

This dissertation surveyed teachers' beliefs using a quantitative methodology. While the survey instrument used has been tested and validated elsewhere and is an accepted instrument for gauging teacher efficacy, there is nonetheless the shortcoming that due to possible misinterpretations of questions that firstly, actual beliefs may not be captured and secondly, that the espoused beliefs may not be evidenced in action. A further difficulty is the problem of establishing a causal link between teacher efficacy and learner performance. What would have been desirable would have been to conduct classroom observations and interviews with teachers to further explore what it is they actually do in their classrooms and how this relates to their learners' achievement.

4.5.1.2 Limitations of questionnaires

Some limitations were experienced using a questionnaire survey to collect the data for this study. McDonough and McDonough (1997, 57-73) note three primary limitations of questionnaires. Firstly, their findings indicate that questionnaires are descriptive rather than explanatory because there is no interviewer to explain or probe questions for the interviewee. Secondly, they found that the information can be 'superficial', hereby suggesting that a questionnaire may need to be followed up with a structured interview by the researcher. Thirdly, they note that the preparation, drafting and piloting of questionnaires take a lot of time. They caution that if a questionnaire is not drafted properly questions may be ambiguous or even offensive for the respondent. A questionnaire assumes that a respondent has the knowledge to answer a question, or is actually willing to answer a question honestly which is not always the case especially if questions are probing, threatening or technical.

4.5.2 LImitations of the fieldwork

A limitation was experienced when a respondent found one or two of the statements somewhat ambiguous. Upon collecting the questionnaires, they had to be clarified. Since the interaction about conducting the research in the three samples happened with the principals of the schools, no contact was made with the teacher respondents. I had to rely on the principals to convey the proper information and collect the questionnaires from the respondents.

The results obtained from the data collected using the research methods described here, are analysed and discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 5

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The ultimate measure of a person is not where they stand in moments of comfort & convenience, but where the stand in times of challenge & controversy.
Martin Luther King, Jr. (1963).

5.1 INTRODUCT1ON

In this chapter the results obtained from the data reflected in the measurement tools, are analysed, compared, and discussed. The analysis demonstrates the two alternatives to teacher efficacy. The difference between the two alternatives is represented in the following sample items about teacher competence:

- Individual orientation: "I am able to get through to the most difficult students", as was discussed in the previous section, and
- Group orientation: "Teachers in this school can get through to the most difficult students" (Goddard, Hoy, and Hoy, 2000:479 —508).

The results are discussed in terms of: (i) Teacher Efficacy (Individual orientation), and (ii) Collective Efficacy (Group orientation). In each part, the first section of the discussion will cover the results of three schools together (ALL), while the latter part will be a comparison of the efficacy levels at the different schools respectively. For the sake of clarity, and discussion, some of the items will be clustered.

5.2 TEACHER EFFICACY

Given the differences observed in the LITNUM results at the three schools, (see Ch.2) their efficacy levels are compared to determine whether the levels at the LPS, is different to the levels at the MPS1, and MPS2, or not. This discussion is based on the responses reflected in the tables (5.2.1 to 5.2.7), covering the relevant items under each aspect.

5.2.1 Efficacy to influence decision-making (items 3, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 18 and 26),

5.2.2 Efficacy to influence school resources (item 15),

5.2.3 Instructional efficacy (items 6,7,8, 12, 13, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31),

5.2.4 Disciplinary efficacy (items 4, 17, 25 28, 29, 31),

52.5 Efficacy to enlist parental involvement (items 4, 5),

5.2.6 Efficacy to enlist community involvement (items 10, 11, 19) and

5.2.7 Efficacy to create a positive school climate (items 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 12, 17, 22, 23, 24, 29 and 30).

5.2.1 Efficacy to influence decision-making

The results reflected in this section deal with efficacy to influence decision-making, and three issues within this aspect, which in all probability manipulate it, were identified. These were (i) management issues (items 3, 9, 14 and 26), (ii) teacher capacity (items 8, 18), and (iii) the current atmosphere in education (itemsl 0, 12).

Table 5.2.1.1 Management Issues

			1	2	3
Item	**STATEMENT**	**School**	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Uncertain**
3	My principal often asks my opinion on professional matters.	**ALL**	**45.8**	**35.4**	**18.8**
		LPS	33.3	37.5	29.2
		MPS1	85.7	14.3	0.0
		MPS2	47.1	41.2	11.8
9	I am well informed of management decisions.	**ALL**	**56.3**	**27.1**	**16.7**
		LPS	33.3	41.7	25.0
		MPS1	85.7	0.0	14.3
		MPS2	76.5	17.6	5.9
14	The management structure at my school is bureaucratic by nature.	**ALL**	**45.8**	**20.8**	**33.3**
		LPS	37.5	12.5	50.0
		MPS1	57.1	14.3	28.6
		MPS2	52.9	35.3	11.8
26	At school, I feel that my views count.	**ALL**	**37.5**	**50.0**	**12.5**
		LPS	25.0	66.7	8.3
		MPS1	57.1	28.6	14.3
		MPS2	47.1	35.3	17.6

An immediate sense of negativity regarding management issues was observed, amongst the respondents at the three schools. On the issue of management decisions (item 9), only 56.3% indicated that they were well informed. This is perhaps why only 45.8 % agreed that the principal asked teachers' opinions about professional matters (item 3), and why only 37.5% felt that their views were counted (item 26). These negative views are echoed in their overall view that management is largely bureaucratic (45.8%), although 33.3% were uncertain. The hypothesis based on the above findings is that teachers' attitude in these three schools as a group are negative, because management decision-making about management issues is not collegial.

The analysis of the scores of the three schools individually, presents a somewhat different impression. Scores at the LPS have a propensity towards being more

negative than positive. The hypothesis is that the negativity stem from the respondents' inclination of blaming others for their non-achievement. This observation is based on the fact that only 37.5% considered their management structure as bureaucratic (item 14), in comparison to the 57.1% at MPS1, and 52.9% at MPS2. This notion is extended with 41.7% admitting that they were not well informed of management decisions (item 9), but expressed feelings that they were not consulted or valued. 37.5% said that their principal did not ask their opinion on professional matters (item 3), while 29.2% were uncertain about whether they consulted or not, and 66.7% felt that their views were not counted (item26). Based on these findings, it is assumed that their disapproving opinion about the management decision-making issues and weak efficacy may be related to their negative tendencies.

The scores at the two medium performing schools, is remarkably different. A notable 52.9% at MPS2 considered the management structure at their school as bureaucratic. Their scores to statements 3 and 26 correspond with this view. Only 47.1% felt that their opinions were asked about professional matters, and the same percentage felt that their views were counted. These perceptions may also be related to the fact that a significant 76.5% said that they were well informed about management decisions.

The high scores (85.7%) for items 3 and 9 at MPS1 may possibly be related to the small staff size, compelling them to greater collaboration, with regard to decision-making about management matters.

Issues, associated with how teacher capacity impacts efficacy to influence decision-making are discussed in the next section.

Table 5.2.1.2 Teacher capacity

Item	STATEMENT	School	1 Agree	2 Disagree	3 Uncertain
8	My principal endeavours to develop the capacity of his/her staff on a continuous basis.	**ALL**	**52.1**	**25.0**	**22.9**
		LPS	45.8	29.2	25.0
		MPS1	57.1	14.3	28.6
		MPS2	58.8	23.5	17.6
18	My duties and responsibilities as a teachers are clearly defined.	**ALL**	**64.6**	**20.8**	**14.6**
		LPS	58.3	25.0	16.7
		MPS1	71.4	14.3	14.3
		MPS2	70.6	17.6	11.8

The data reveals that more than half (52.1%) of the respondents indicated the principal's role in their development and 64.6% of agreed that their roles and responsibilities were clearly defined.

The two medium performing schools reflected significantly higher scores for these statements than the LPS. In contrast to these schools, the LPS has relative lack of clarity (item 18, 58.3%), and relative low development (item 8, 45.8%), compared with MPSI and MPS2 who scored above 70% for item 18, and above 50% for item 8. The better gains witnessed in children's achievement could be as a result of teachers engaging in staff development, and clarity of their roles and responsibilities.

Table 5.2.1.3 The current atmosphere in education

Item	STATEMENT	School	1 Agree	2 Disagree	3 Uncertain
10	I am coping well with the changes in education.	**ALL**	**29.2**	**60.4**	**10.4**
		LPS	16.7	75.0	8.3
		MPS1	14.3	71.4	14.3
		MPS2	52.9	35.3	11.8
12	In the teaching profession, there is so much uncertainty.	**ALL**	**87.5**	**6.3**	**6.3**
		LPS	87.5	4.2	8.3
		MPS1	87.5	4.2	8.3
		MPS2	94.1	5.9	0.0

The majority (857.5%) of the respondents strongly agreed that the profession is characterized by uncertainty. However, only the better performing school (MPS2) teachers said that they were coping (52.9%).

This negative propensity about the changes taking place in the profession could be ascribed to the respondents' inability or unwillingness to adapt to the process of change, and or to their overall lower efficacy.

In summing up this section, the differences between the efficacy levels of these schools are very clear. Based on the above findings, MPS1 emerged to be more positive about management issues, teacher capacity and the current atmosphere in education, in comparison to LPS where the propensity toward negativity exists. The small difference between MPS1 and MPS2 on management issues is most likely related to the small staff size of MPS1. The fact that MPS2 coped better with the current atmosphere in education could be related to their sense of professionalism (see Table 5.2.1.1, item 9 and Table 5.2.1.2, item 18).

In the section following, the respondents' levels of efficacy regarding resources in their schools are analysed.

5.2.2 Efficacy to influence school resources

The issue of resources and how these, or the lack thereof influence efficacy are shown in Table 5.2.2.1 below.

Table 5.2.2.1 Impact of lack of resources

			1	2	3
Item	**STATEMENT**	**School**	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Uncertain**
15	The lack of resources at school is frustrating.	**ALL**	**68.8**	**22.9**	**8.3**
		LPS	75.0	20.8	4.2
		MPS1	71.4	14.3	14.3
		MPS2	58.8	29.4	11.8

Respondents are generally of the opinion that the lack of resources at school is frustrating. However, teachers at MPS2 appear to be less frustrated about this issue (58.8%) than the other schools, reflecting scores of above 70%. Their (MPS2) response could be attributed to their positive attitude, which directed them to experiment with whatever resources (instructional materials) were available to them.

Responses to statements highlighted under the aspect of Instructional Efficacy are analysed in the section below.

5.2.3 Instructional Efficacy

Five aspects incorporated in sixteen statements were examined to determine the respondents' levels of Instructional Efficacy. These five aspects thought to be influential to teachers' instructional efficacy, are described as (i) teachers' competence for Learning Areas (items 6 and 8), (ii) their workload (items 16, 18, 20 and 21), (iii) the working environment (items 7 and12), (iv) teachers' attitude towards their learners (items 13, 25, 27, 28 and 31) and (v) their perception of teaching as a profession (items 23, 24 and 30).

Table 5.2.3.1 Teachers' competence for Learning Areas

			1	2	3
Item	**STATEMENT**	**School**	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Uncertain**
6	I have taught only subjects which I am qualified for.	**ALL**	**33.3**	**66.7**	**0.0**
		LPS	25.0	75.0	0.0
		MPS1	57.1	42.9	0.0
		MPS2	35.3	64.7	0.0
8	My principal endeavours to develop the capacity of his/her staff on a continuous basis.	**ALL**	**52.1**	**25.0**	**22.9**
		LPS	45.8	29.2	25.0
		MPS1	57.1	14.3	28.6
		MPS2	58.8	23.5	17.6

The data shows that within each of the sample groups, teachers indicated that they have taught subjects for which they were not qualified. However, LPS reflected the highest score (75.0%) regarding the issue, compared to MPS2 with 64.7% and MPSI with 42.9%. Based on this observation, the postulation exists that opportunity for teacher capacity to be developed is manifest. At the two medium performing schools more than 50% of the respondents stated that their principals do endeavour to develop their capacity on a continuous basis, while at LPS only 45.8% said so.

Two key issues which in all likelihood impact on teachers' workload and consequently on their ability to influence Instructional Efficacy are highlighted in the table below. The issues are firstly, clearly defined duties and responsibilities which ultimately explain teachers' expectations for their learners and demand accountability from them. Secondly, their workload and how it impacts on schools' mission and goals, and consequently their learners' achievement levels.

Table 5.2.3.2 Teachers' workload

Item	STATEMENT	School	1 Agree	2 Disagree	3 Uncertain
18	My duties and responsibilities as a teacher are clearly defined.	**ALL**	**64.6**	**20.8**	**14.6**
		LPS	58.3	25.0	16.7
		MPS1	71.4	14.3	14.3
		MPS2	70.6	17.6	11.8
16	Staff reductions have led to an increased workload for teachers.	**ALL**	**83.3**	**12.5**	**4.2**
		LPS	95.8	4.2	0.0
		MPS1	71.4	0.0	28.6
		MPS2	70.6	29.4	0.0
20	I sometimes take a huge load of work home.	**ALL**	**89.6**	**6.3**	**4.2**
		LPS	95.8	4.2	0.0
		MPS1	71.4	0.0	28.6
		MPS2	88.2	11.8	0.0
21	I am required to perform extra-curricular activities after school hours.	**ALL**	**66.7**	**18.8**	**14.6**
		LPS	75.0	8.3	16.7
		MPS1	57.1	28.6	14.3
		MPS2	58.8	29.4	11.8

What is striking here are the differences between the LPS and the two medium performing schools. At the LPS, only 58.3% said that their duties and responsibilities were clearly defined compared with 71.4% and 70.6% at MPSI, and MPS2 respectively. This lack of clarity may relate to staff reductions, and consequent changing roles (95.8% at LPS said that their workload increased because of staff reductions). 95.8% said that they take huge workloads home compared to 71.4% at MPSI, and 88.2% at MPS2. This may have been increased by the burden of extra-curricular activities (75.0% said they had extra-curricular activities, compared with 57.1% at MPS1, and 58.8% at MPS2.

These workload pressures coupled with unclear role definition detract from a healthy working environment as Table 5.2.3.3 below shows.

Table 5.2.3.3 The working environment

Item	STATEMENT	School	1 Agree	2 Disagree	3 Uncertain
12	In the teaching profession, there is so much uncertainty.	**ALL**	**87.5**	**6.3**	**6.3**
		LPS	87.5	4.2	8.3
		MPS1	87.5	4.2	8.3
		MPS2	94.1	5.9	0.0
7	The environment in which I work is conducive to healthy work performance.	**ALL**	**33.3**	**50.0**	**16.7**
		LPS	20.8	66.7	12.5
		MPS1	71.4	0.0	28.6
		MPS2	35.3	47.1	17.6

The majority of teachers experience a general sense of uncertainty in the teaching profession. This uncertainty is reflected in item 7 where only 20.8% at LPS and 35.3% at MPS2 thought the work environment was conducive to healthy work performance.

The theory that efficacious teachers visualise / imagine for themselves the ideal working envIronment is demonstrated by MPS1 with 71.4% of them responding positively to the statement that their environment is conducive to healthy work performance. The hypothesis is that as a result of their small staff component, they are compelled to apply their positive qualities to create this environment. Strategies to obtain this status may have included developing greater collaboration and adopting a deeper sense of collegiality. The opposite may possibly be applicable to the LPS, where the staff establishment is much bigger, hence the differences observed regarding efficacy to influence instructional efficacy.

The respondents' attitude towards their learners, integrated by five statements, is probed to determine how it influences instructional efficacy.

Table 5.2.3.4 Teachers' attitude towards their learners

			1	2	3
Item	**STATEMENT**	**School**	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Uncertain**
13	I spend most of my time assisting weaker students.	**ALL**	**58.3**	37.5	4.2
		LPS	62.5	33.3	4.2
		MPS1	28.6	57.1	14.3
		MPS2	64.7	35.3	0.0
25	I become annoyed with students who display a poor attitude to their work.	**ALL**	**68.8**	**18.8**	**12.5**
		LPS	79.2	16.7	4.2
		MPS1	42.9	28.6	28.6
		MPS2	64.7	17.6	17.6
27	I become annoyed when students fail to answer simple questions.	**ALL**	**58.3**	**35.4**	**6.3**
		LPS	62.5	33.3	4.2
		MPS1	42.9	28.6	28.6
		MPS2	47.1	47.1	5.9
28	My attitude towards my students is dependent on their behaviour.	**ALL**	**43.8**	**45.8**	**10.4**
		LPS	37.5	58.3	4.2
		MPS1	42.9	28.6	28.6
		MPS2	52.9	35.3	11.8
31	The large number of students in my class places me under severe pressure.	**ALL**	**56.3**	**29.2**	**14.6**
		LPS	66.7	20.8	12.5
		MPS1	57.1	28.6	14.3
		MPS2	41.2	41.2	17.6

A trend to spend most of their time assisting weaker learners (item 13) was observed within the groups, except the MPS2 where only 28.6% alluded to this practice. Levels of annoyance with learners who fail to answer simple questions at LPS (62.5%) are similar to that of the group (58.3%). The two medium performing schools reflected a range parallel to each other, with 42.9% and 47.1% respectively, but lower in comparison to the sample as a group and the LPS.

Items 25 and 27 are indicators of teachers' expectations of learners. Interestingly, both LPS (79.2%) and MPS2 (64.7%) said they were annoyed by poor work attitudes by contrast with MPS I where only 42.9% said this was the case. The latter may again be a consequence of the "provider capture" referred to. Significantly, these attitudes did not translate to 'taking it out' on the students (item 28) which indicates a possibility of progress.

A general tendency of blaming external factors for non / low achievement was observed in the response to statement of being placed under pressure by the large class sizes (item3l). The data revealed that the LPS reflected the highest score (66.7%) here, while at the best performing school (MPS2) only 41.2% said that class size affected their performance, an indicator of higher efficacy.

In conclusion, MPSI and MPS2 responded more positively to the items postulated to influence teachers' attitude towards their learners and ultimately the quality of their teaching. The rationalization is that the teachers' attitude towards their learners and their abilities may have been one of the determining factors for the improvement observed in their LITNUM results. This attitude may conceivably be influential in these teachers' level of job satisfaction.

Table 5.2.3.5 Teachers' job satisfaction

			1	2	3
Item	**STATEMENT**	**School**	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Uncertain**
23	My work as a teacher helps me to realize my full potential.	**ALL**	**52.1**	**33.3**	**14.6**
		LPS	37.5	50.0	12.5
		MPS1	58.8	23.5	17.6
		MPS2	58.8	23.5	17.6
24	Teaching is a rewarding task.	**ALL**	**43.8**	**33.3**	**22.9**
		LPS	29.2	45.8	25.0
		MPS1	85.7	0.0	14.3
		MPS2	47.1	29.4	23.5
30	I derive immense pleasure from my work.	**ALL**	**50.0**	**33.3**	**16.7**
		LPS	37.5	37.5	25.0
		MPS1	71.4	0.0	28.6
		MPS2	58.8	41.2	0.0

Respondents within the all the sample groups declared that they gained satisfaction (of different levels) from their jobs as teachers. 52.1% said that their work helped them realize their full potential; 43.8% said that teaching was a rewarding job, and 50% said they derived pleasure from their work.

Within these categories though, the differences between the LPS and the medium performing schools are striking. The data revealed noteworthy findings about the smaller of the schools that is, MPSI. The staff derived greater personal satisfaction from their jobs. More than half of them (58.8%) stated that their work helped them realize their full potential, while a striking 85.7% claimed that teaching was a rewarding job and a significant 71.4% derived pleasure from their work. At the LPS only 37.5% said that their work helped them realize their full potential; 29.2 % said that teaching was a rewarding job and only 37.5% derived pleasure from their work.

In summing up this section, the negative responses observed amongst respondents generate the impression of the respondents' omission to analyze their own attitudes and behaviours with regard to their learners' level of achievement. It appears that they place the blame for their non- achievement and learners' underachievement on the external factors in their environment and on others. Factors such as: inadequate salary (item I), insecurity of the job (item 2), unsavoury media reports (item 11), uncertainty in the profession (item 12), staff reductions and increased workloads (item 16), unappreciative communities (item 19), learners' attitudes and large class sizes (items

25, 28 and 31) were seen to impact negatively on teaching as a profession and by extension learner performance.

The next section looks at the data to determine how these opinions regarding teaching as a profession influence their beliefs that ultimately empower (disempower) them to perform the tasks generally expected from a disciplined teacher.

5.2.4 Disciplinary Efficacy

Disciplinary efficacy concentrates on the issue of teachers' social interactions with others. As used in the literature, it refers here to the effective, disciplined teacher having a strong belief in her capability to exercise control over her emotions, behaviour, and thinking, and is secure in her beliefs about her capacity to teach effectively in culturally appropriate ways.

Six statements are analysed in the following section to determine how these social interactions with others that is (5.2.4.1) colleagues and parents, covering items 4,17 and 29 and (5.2.4.2) learners (items 25, 28, and 31) correspond with their levels of disciplinary efficacy.

Table 5.2.4.1 Social interactions with Colleagues, and Parents

			1	2	3
Item	**STATEMENT**	**School**	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Uncertain**
17	Personal conflicts with colleagues are a common occurrence at school.	**ALL**	**50.0**	**37.5**	**12.5**
		LPS	70.8	20.8	8.3
		MPS1	28.6	42.9	28.6
		MPS2	29.4	58.8	11.8
29	Due to the disharmony amongst staff members, I prefer to keep to myself.	**ALL**	**33.3**	**58.3**	**8.3**
		LPS	45.8	45.8	8.3
		MPS1	0.0	71.4	28.6
		MPS2	29.4	70.6	0.0
4	Parents should have more say in the running of schools.	**ALL**	**56.3**	**29.2**	**14.6**
		LPS	50.0	29.2	20.8
		MPS1	100.0	0.0	0.0
		MPS2	47.1	41.2	11.8

Remarkable differences have been noted between the schools. 70.8% of LPS agreed that personal conflict is a common occurrence in their school, compared with 28.6% at MPS1, and 29.4% at MPS2. These poor relationships at LPS are reflected in the high need to 'keep' to themselves (45.8%) compared with none at the small school, MPSI and 29.4% at MPS2. The premise is formulated that the common occurrence of conflict in LPS may be associated with the insufficient collaboration regarding management decision-making issues (see Table 5.2.1.1).

Social interactions within a small staff component (MPS1) seem less problematic than at the two bigger schools. The remarkable observation that none of them preferred to be by themselves and that 100% agreed that parents should play a bigger role in schools, serve as a demonstration of their strong sense of efficacy, and their ability to be collegial in a social setting. The high negative scores (70.8%) for item 17 (personal conflict at LPS is consistent with their other negative scores (see items 7, 19, 22 and 25) that involve interaction with others. This situation is exacerbated by poor managerial relations and confirmed by the fact that nearly half (45.8%) preferred to keep to themselves.

The hypothesis based on results at the MPS1, is that parental involvement in the school is a factor significantly associated with teacher efficacy. Not acknowledging the value of parents' role (item 4) could be attributed to a sense apprehension of exposing their inability to control their emotions, and or a level of insecurity in their

beliefs as teachers. However, the premise does exist that respondents at the MPS2 have a stronger sense of their own professionalism.

Teachers' levels of social interactions with their learners are analysed in the section below to determine how it impacts on Disciplinary Efficacy.

Table 5.2.4.2 Social interaction with Learners

			1	2	3
Item	**STATEMENT**	**School**	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Uncertain**
25	I become annoyed with students who display a poor attitude to their work.	**ALL**	**68.8**	**18.8**	**12.5**
		LPS	79.2	16.7	4.2
		MPS1	42.9	28.6	28.6
		MPS2	64.7	17.6	17.6
28	My attitude towards my students is dependent on their behaviour.	**ALL**	**43.8**	**45.8**	**10.4**
		LPS	37.5	58.3	4.2
		MPS1	42.9	28.6	28.6
		MPS2	52.9	35.3	11.8
31	The large number of students in my class places me under severe pressure.	**ALL**	**56.3**	**29.2**	**14.6**
		LPS	66.7	20.8	12.5
		MPS1	57.1	28.6	14.3
		MPS2	41.2	41.2	17.6

As was noted before, teachers' levels of annoyance with learners were rather intense. In addition to the reasons mentioned before (see Tables 5.2.3), another could be the respondents' ability / inability to socially interact with them. The tendency toward negativity or enthusiasm is transferred onto learners through social interaction. The quality of this social interaction could also be considered as a contributory factor for the development of an environment conducive to performance. The large number of students portrayed as placing the respondents under severe pressure does not advance matters to socially interact with them to ultimately influence disciplinary (corrective) efficacy.

5.2.5 Parental involvement

Parental involvement in the school is a factor significantly associated with teacher efficacy (see Table 5.2.4.1). The notion is analysed in the following section to determine how the interaction with parents at the three schools influenced their levels of efficacy.

Table 5.2.5.1 Parental involvement in schooling

			1	2	3
Item	**STATEMENT**	**School**	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Uncertain**
5	I enjoy a healthy relationship with parents.	**ALL**	**83.3**	**12.5**	**4.2**
		LPS	75.0	16.7	8.3
		MPS1	85.7	14.3	0.0
		MPS2	94.1	5.9	0.0
4	Parents should have more say in the running of schools.	**ALL**	**56.3**	**29.2**	**14.6**
		LPS	50.0	29.2	20.8
		MPS1	100.0	0.0	0.0
		MPS2	47.1	41.2	11.8

An astonishing 83.3% of the respondents stated that they enjoyed a healthy relationship with parents. This score corresponds with the findings that they enjoy social interactions (see Table 5.2.4.1, item 29). However, only 56.3% are of the opinion that parents should have more say in the running of schools. This might stem from them knowing that parents are illiterate, or unschooled, but it also may be because they feel the relations are already sufficiently healthy.

The same position exists amongst the three schools respectively with each of them having a score of 70% and more, with regard to the healthy relationships. These results are an indication that social interactions are enjoyed for the most part. However, it is seemingly more so with adults (see Table 5.2.4.2, annoyance with students), and merely on a platonic basis. This postulation is based on previous observations of their inability to control their emotions (see Table 5.2.4.1, conflict issue), and therefore the preference to keep parents out of administrative scholastic matters (item 4). As noted in the discussion in Table 5.2.4.1, only MPSI is cognisant of the conjecture that parental influence is not limited to learners' behaviour at home (or their community), but also in school.

To determine how aspects relating to the development of efficacy to procure the involvement of the community are therefore explored next.

5.2.6 Efficacy to enlist communIty involvement

This section explores three statements related to efficacy to enlist community involvement. The issues covered in these statements are how teachers respond to change, how they react to the media reporting on it, as well as the teachers' perceptions about the community they serve.

Table 5.2.6.1 Teaching and community involvement

			1	2	3
Item	**STATEMENT**	**School**	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Uncertain**
10	I am coping well with the changes in education.	**ALL**	**29.2**	**60.4**	**10.4**
		LPS	16.7	75.0	8.3
		MPS1	14.3	71.4	14.3
		MPS2	52.9	35.3	11.8
11	Unsavoury media reports often bring the teaching profession into disrepute.	**ALL**	**68.8**	**6.3**	**25.0**
		LPS	79.2	0.0	20.8
		MPS1	0.0	14.3	85.7
		MPS2	82.4	11.08	5.9
19	The community appreciates my efforts at school.	**ALL**	**41.7**	**20.8**	**37.5**
		LPS	16.7	33.3	50.0
		MPS1	85.7	0.0	14.3
		MPS2	58.8	11.8	29.4

Regarding the changes taking place in the teaching environment (item10), only 29.2% stated that they were copying, while 60.4% disclosed that they were not copying. 68.8% seem to think that the media bring the teaching profession in disrepute, and 41.7% hold the opinion that the community does not appreciate their efforts.

More than 70% of the respondents at the LPS and MPS1 , said that they were not coping with the changes, compared with 52.9% at MPS2 who said they were better with changes, indicating a higher level of efficacy. LPS (79.2%) and MPS2 (82.4%) teachers thought the media was negative about the profession and felt largely unsupported by their communities (16.7% and 58.8% respectively). By contrast, MPSI teachers, perhaps bolstered by the strong sense of collegiality showed the opposite. None of them saw the media as negative and 85.7% said they had community support.

These views in all probability are instrumental in the creation of the climate that prevails at the respective schools. This is discussed below.

5.2.7 Efficacy to create a positive school clImate

Two integrated issues are discussed in this section. These issues are clustered in two parts (i) Teachers' relationships with others, and (ii) Teachers' perception of teaching as their job. The following items 5, 7, 17, 29 and 22 are discussed in part one, while items 1, 2, 8, 12, 23, 24 and 30 are analysed in part two.

As was previously observed (see Tables 5.2.4.1 and 2), social interactions were imperative for the development of efficacy, and the respondents expressed a need for them.

Table 5.2.7.1 Teachers relationships with others

			1	2	3
Item	**STATEMENT**	**School**	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Uncertain**
5	I enjoy a healthy relationship with parents.	**ALL**	**83.3**	**12.5**	**4.2**
		LPS	75.0	16.7	8.3
		MPS1	85.7	14.3	0.0
		MPS2	94.1	5.9	0.0
17	Personal conflicts with colleagues are a common occurrence at school.	**ALL**	**50.0**	**37.5**	**12.5**
		LPS	70.8	20.8	8.3
		MPS1	28.6	42.9	28.6
		MPS2	29.4	58.8	11.8
29	Due to the disharmony amongst staff members, I prefer to keep to myself.	**ALL**	**33.3**	**58.3**	**8.3**
		LPS	45.8	45.8	8.3
		MPS1	0.0	71.4	28.6
		MPS2	29.4	70.6	0.0
22	I trust my colleagues.	**ALL**	**39.6**	**20.8**	**39.6**
		LPS	29.2	12.5	58.3
		MPS1	85.7	0.0	14.3
		MPS2	35.3	41.2	23.5
7	The environment in which I work is conducive to healthy work performance.	**ALL**	**33.3**	**50.0**	**16.7**
		LPS	20.8	66.7	12.5
		MPS1	71.4	0.0	28.6
		MPS2	35.3	47.1	17.6

Overall only 33.3% of the respondents agreed that the environment in which they worked was conducive to healthy work performance (item7). Only 39.6 % said that they trusted their colleagues and 50% said conflict was common. These are indicators of a poor school climate and sub-optimal efficacy. Two patterns stand out here. Firstly, LPS teachers experienced the highest levels of negativity and this clearly influences learner performance. Secondly, MPS I were most positive, again a function of their small size and consequent collegiality, a factor which does not however, convert to learner performance. All said that they had a healthy relationship with parents, but this clearly does not exert enough pressure to change performance levels.

All of these factors impact on attitudes towards the job, which are discussed below.

Table 5.2.7.2 Teaching as a job

Item	STATEMENT	School	1 Agree	2 Disagree	3 Uncertain
1	My salary is adequate for my basic needs.	**ALL**	**10.4**	**81.3**	**8.3**
		LPS	12.5	79.2	8.3
		MPS1	14.3	71.4	14.3
		MPS2	5.9	88.2	5.9
12	In the teaching profession, there is so much uncertainty.	**ALL**	**87.5**	**6.3**	**6.3**
		LPS	87.5	4.2	8.3
		MPS1	87.5	4.2	8.3
		MPS2	94.1	5.9	0.0
2	Teaching is a secure job.	**ALL**	**47.9**	**35.4**	**16.7**
		LPS	50.0	29.2	20.8
		MPS1	42.9	57.1	0.0
		MPS2	47.1	35.3	17.6
8	My principal endeavours to develop the capacity of his/her staff on a continuous basis.	**ALL**	**52.1**	**25.0**	**22.9**
		LPS	45.8	29.2	25.0
		MPS1	57.1	14.3	28.6
		MPS2	58.8	23.5	17.6
23	My work as a teacher helps me to realize my full potential.	**ALL**	**52.1**	**33.3**	**14.6**
		LPS	37.5	50.0	12.5
		MPS1	58.8	23.5	17.6
		MPS2	58.8	23.5	17.6
30	I derive immense pleasure from my work.	**ALL**	**50.0**	**33.3**	**16.7**
		LPS	37.5	37.5	25.0
		MPS1	71.4	0.0	28.6
		MPS2	58.8	41.2	0.0
24	Teaching is a rewarding task.	**ALL**	**43.8**	**33.3**	**22.9**
		LPS	29.2	45.8	25.0
		MPS1	85.7	0.0	14.3
		MPS2	47.1	29.4	23.5

Most of these items have already been discussed and what is clear overall, are low levels of satisfaction, material as well as professional. Only the teachers at MPS I, for reasons already discussed, predominantly thought teaching rewarding (85.7%) or took pleasure in their work (71.4%). This satisfaction may have stimulated concern about learner performance and / or low levels of expectations, since teachers at their school may be "happier" in their work, they may also be able to face the struggle to raise learning standards.

The second half of this section (Individual Teacher efficacy) looks at two distinct, but interdependent, additional dimensions of teacher efficacy, namely Personal Teacher Efficacy (PTE) and General Teaching Efficacy (GTE).

5.3 PERSONAL TEACHER EFFICACY AND GENERAL TEACHING EFFICACY

As discussed in Chapter 3 (Section 3.4) personal efficacy refers to teachers' beliefs in their personal teaching skills, while general efficacy (Section 3.5) is the belief in the power of teaching to overcome external student factors. PTE refers to an internal orientation of the teacher ('I can') and a teacher's perceived ability to positively impact student learning. Conversely, GTE is the belief that teaching can influence student learning in spite of external constraints. These two dimensions are considered significant determinants of learner achievement.

5.3.1 Personal Teacher Efficacy (PTE)

As indicated, PTE refers to an internal orientation of the teacher, an 'I can', attitude versus an 'I can't' attitude, implying that a teacher has or does not have the confidence that he/she can overcome factors that could make learning difficult for students. The inference here is student achievement levels are indicative of the degree of these teachers' confidence. A number of these issues have been discussed earlier (see Sections 5.2). The combinations of statements referred to here are directly concerned with personal issues. These issues are integrated and interconnected and are discussed with respect to social relations and attitudes towards teaching as a job.

5.3.1.1 Social Relations

This embraces relationships with others (parents, colleagues and learners), trust, and social interactions (items 5, 22, 29 and 27).

Table 5.3.1.1 Social Relations

			1	2	3
Item	**STATEMENTS**	**School**	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Uncertain**
5	I enjoy a healthy relationship with parents.	**LPS**	75.0	16.7	8.3
		MPS1	85.7	14.3	0.0
		MPS2	94.1	5.9	0.0
22	I trust my colleagues.	**LPS**	29.2	12.5	58.3
		MPS1	85.7	0.0	14.3
		MPS2	35.3	41.2	23.5
29	Due to the disharmony amongst staff members, I prefer to keep to myself.	**LPS**	45.8	45.8	8.3
		MPS1	0.0	71.4	28.6
		MPS2	29.4	70.6	0.0
27	I become annoyed when students fail to answer simple questions.	**LPS**	62.5	33.3	4.2
		MPS1	71.4	14.3	14.3
		MPS2	47.1	47.1	5.9

As noted before, the majority of the respondents (ranging from above 70% to almost 100%) in each of the sample groups enjoyed healthy relationships with parents (item 5). In terms of collegial trust (item 22), both LPS and MPS2 showed low levels of trust. At LPS, only 29.2% said that they trusted their colleagues, with 58.3% being uncertain, and at MPS2, only 35.3% trusted their colleagues. By contrast, at MPS1 85.7% said they trusted their colleagues. The size of the different staff components could possibly be the explanation for these results. MPS1 being a small school is probably more concerned with social cohesion than the other two schools where the staff size is bigger.

A corresponding result was observed at MPS I, with none of them preferring to keep to themselves, (item 29). Very few (29.4%) at MPS2 indicated that they wanted to be by themselves, while a significant 45.8% at LPS said that that was what they preferred. This result at LPS corresponds with the high score reflected in response to item 17, (see Table 5.2.4.1) about personal conflict amongst staff.

Respondents in these sample groups seem to have a general tendency of becoming annoyed with learners who fail to answer simple questions (item 27). The LPS and MPSI presented scores of 62.5%, and 71.4% respectively. MPS2's score (47.1%) was more positive. These results are consistent (a) with LPS who would externalise blame and (b) with MPS1 where "provider capture" seems to operate.

These social relations are part of how the respondents perceive teaching as a job. This aspect is evaluated in the section below.

5.3.1.2 Perception of teaching as a job

This encompasses teachers' confidence regarding their ability with regard to the curriculum, workload and job satisfaction. These factors are highlighted in the table below.

Table 5.3.1.2 Teaching as a job

			1	2	3
Item	STATEMENT	School	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
31	The large number of students in my class places me under severe pressure.	LPS	66.7	20.8	12.5
		MPS1	57.1	28.6	14.3
		MPS2	41.2	41.2	17.6
6	I have taught only subjects which I am qualified for.	LPS	25.0	75.0	0.0
		MPS1	57.1	42.9	0.0
		MPS2	35.3	64.7	0.0
20	I sometimes take a huge load of work home.	LPS	95.8	4.2	0.0
		MPS1	71.4	0.0	28.6
		MPS2	88.2	11.8	0.0
26	At school, I feel that my views count.	LPS	25.0	66.7	8.3
		MPS1	57.1	28.6	14.3
		MPS2	47.1	35.3	17.6
30	I derive immense pleasure from my work.	LPS	37.5	37.5	25.0
		MPS1	71.4	0.0	28.6
		MPS2	58.8	41.2	0.0

Teachers in all the sample groups, regard the large students numbers as a stressful factor (item 31). Their responses were suggestive of previously noted attitudes; a propensity toward negativity at LPS, while MPS1 and MPS2 were more positively inclined. At the LPS 66.7% declared that, that was what they endured, while 57.1% at MPS 1 and only 41.2% at MPS2 shared that opinion. An extension of these attitudes was evident with regard to the other items relating to teaching as their job (items 6, 20, 26 and 30). A prominent 75.0% at the LPS, in comparison to the 42.9% at MPS1, and 64.7% at MPS2 indicated that they have taught subjects that they are not qualified for (item 6). The majority of the respondents (95.8% at LPS, 71.4% at MPSI and 88.2% at MPS2) emphatically noted that they took huge workloads home. The response at LPS about taking huge workloads home, could possibly be ascribed to fact that they are teaching subjects they are not qualified for, their relative lack of clarity, and relative low development (see Table 5.2.1.2, items 8 and 18). These matters are in all likelihood also, contributory factors to only 37.5% attesting to the notion that they derive pleasure from their work (item 30). The circumstances regarding the above issues at the other two schools are probably viewed more positively. This postulation is made based on their response about deriving pleasure from their work. An exceptional 71.4% at MPS I said that they derive pleasure from the work, while 58.8% at MPS said so.

The issue of teachers' views being counted also evoked an assortment of responses, yet each corresponded with previous scores at the respective schools. At the LPS, 66.7% disagreed with this statement, while 57.1% at MPS1 and 47.1% at MPS2 indicated that their views did count. The function of size, and knowledge about management matters (see Table 5.2.1.1 item 9) could be the contributing factors to this state of affairs.

As noted in Chapter 3 (Section 3.8: Proximate Factors) factors such as teachers' knowledge of instructional innovations, and their confidence that they have adequate training or experience to develop strategies for overcoming obstacles to student learning, contribute to their ability to sustain efficacy. Based on the results reflected in the tables above, a direct link between these factors and the respondents' PTE has been observed. If teachers are under-qualified, or teaching subjects that they were not trained in, it is likely to (a) impact their workload (b) make large classes more stressful (c) lead to a devaluating of their opinions and (d) result in no satisfaction. MPS1 seems to derive satisfaction from collegiality.

Taking into account, that PTE has to do with one's own feelings of competence as a teacher, the conclusion made here serve as verification that the correlations between personal attitudes and quality of teaching and learning do exist. The LITNUM results of the three schools respectively, can be used to verify the postulation. Respondents at MPS 1 and MPS2 demonstrate a more confident attitude and belief about their ability as teachers (PTE) to overcome those factors that could make teaching and learning difficult, which evidently impacted more positively on their student learning, than the respondents at the LPS.

Respondents' GTE is analysed in the section of the discussion about the additional dimensions of efficacy.

5.3.2 General Teacher Efficacy (GTE)

GTE is different to PTE, in that GTE suggests that *teaching* can influence student learning in spite of external limitations. Certain conditions in schools such as class sizes, extra-curricular activities, parents' non-involvement or staff reductions, are issues about which teachers can do very little. The issue is how these are allowed to

over-ride teachers' sense of efficacy (see Chapter 3: Section 3.8). The findings based on the scores in the tables below, revealed that teachers tend to depend on, or blame the environment (external limitations/ conditions listed above) for their own and for student (non-) achievement. There are three main areas comprising GTE. These are external limitations, teachers' attitudes toward teaching as a job, and teachers' attitudes towards learners and parents.

The data in Table 5.3.2.1 shows that different levels of functionality were evident. Although some levels of negativity about certain aspects were noted at the other two schools, the propensity toward negativity evident at the LPS was made manifest.

Table 5.3.2.1 External Limitations

			1	2	3
Item	STATEMENT	School	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
17	Personal conflicts with colleagues are a common occurrence at school.	LPS	70.8	20.8	8.3
		MPS1	28.6	42.9	28.6
		MPS2	29.4	58.8	11.8
3	My principal often asks my opinion on professional matters.	LPS	33.3	37.5	29.2
		MPS1	85.7	14.3	0.0
		MPS2	47.1	41.2	11.8
26	At school, I feel that my views count.	LPS	25.0	66.7	8.3
		MPS1	57.1	28.6	14.3
		MPS2	47.1	35.3	17.6
9	I am well informed of management decisions.	LPS	33.3	41.7	25.0
		MPS1	85.7	0.0	14.3
		MPS2	76.5	17.6	5.9
10	I am coping well with the changes in education.	LPS	16.7	75.0	8.3
		MPS1	14.3	71.4	14.3
		MPS2	52.9	35.3	11.8
15	The lack of resources at school is frustrating.	LPS	75.0	20.8	4.2
		MPS1	71.4	14.3	14.3
		MPS2	58.8	29.4	11.8

A conspicuous 70.8% at LPS said personal conflict with colleagues was common (iteml7) in comparison to the scores below 30% at MPS1 and MPS2. Causal factors affecting this scenario at the different schools could be propensity toward negativity (LPS), staff size (MPS1) and sense of professionalism (MPS2). The premise is that these poor relations noted at LPS are further reinforced by feelings of being overlooked by management. Only 33.3% agreed that the principal asked for their professional opinion (item 3), while 66/% felt that their views were not counted (item 26). Conversely, at MPS1 where collaboration is evident, 85.7% said that their principal often asked their opinion on professional matters and 57.1% agreed that their

views do count. That 85.7% could say that they were well informed of management decisions (item 9) possibly helped matters with regard to being consulted, in comparison to the 33.3% at LPS who could attest to that fact.

The propensity toward negativity evident at the LPS was intensified by 75.0% reflecting an inability to cope with the changes in education (item 10), in comparison to 35.3% at MPS2. The same negative feelings at LPS seemed to be exacerbated by the lack of resources which caused them frustration (75.0%), while at MPS2 only 58.8% seem to be frustrated about it. The possibility that these feelings and perceptions may be transferred to their attitude toward teaching as a job is explored in the next section.

Table 5.3.2.2 Attitudes toward teaching as a job

			1	2	3
Item	STATEMENT	School	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
18	My duties and responsibilities as a teacher are clearly defined.	LPS	58.3	25.0	16.7
		MPS1	71.4	14.3	14.3
		MPS2	70.6	17.6	11.8
20	I sometimes take a huge load of work home.	LPS	95.8	4.2	0.0
		MPS1	71.4	0.0	28.6
		MPS2	88.2	11.8	0.0
23	My work as a teacher helps me to realize my full potential.	LPS	37.5	50.0	12.5
		MPS1	85.7	0.0	14.3
		MPS2	58.8	23.5	17.6
24	Teaching is a rewarding task.	LPS	29.2	45.8	25.0
		MPS1	85.7	0.0	14.3
		MPS2	47.1	29.4	23.5
30	I derive immense pleasure from my work.	LPS	37.5	37.5	25.0
		MPS1	71.4	0.0	28.6
		MPS2	58.8	41.2	0.0
29	Due to the disharmony amongst staff members, I prefer to keep to myself.	LPS	45.8	45.8	8.3
		MPS1	0.0	71.4	28.6
		MPS2	29.4	70.6	0.0

The premise of their characteristic negativity at LPS was extended and confirmed by factors listed in this table. These include issues related to their perception and confidence in teaching as a job. As mentioned before, 58.3% had relative low clarity regarding their roles and responsibilities (item 18). The hypothesis is that this low clarity could possibly be a causative factor for 95.8% taking huge workloads home (item 20), only 37.5% saying that teaching could help to realize their potential (item 23), and a mere 29.2% verifying that teaching is a rewarding task (item 24). A corresponding 37.5% said that they derived pleasure from their work (item 30).

However, despite the noted unenthusiastic attitude toward teaching as a job, a notable 45.8% declared that they did not wish to keep to themselves.

A different scenario exists that the other two schools. Their scores of above 70% is an indication that they have greater clarity pertaining to their roles and responsibilities. They too take huge workloads home (MPS1, 71.4% and MPS2, 88.2%). However, contrary to LPS this does not seem to influence the other issues relating to their job so negatively. As noted before, MPS1 seem to be the more positive group in comparison. A striking 85.7% at MPSI is of the opinion that their work as a teacher helps to realize their potential, while at MPS2, 58.8% share that view. Teaching is considered a rewarding task by 85.7% at MPS1, and a less prominent 47.1% at MPS2. Accordingly, 71.4% at MPS I stated that they derive immense pleasure from their work, in comparison to the 58.8% at MPS2. The sense of collegiality at MPS1 is reiterated with none (0%) of them expressing a preference to keep to themselves (item 29), while only 29.4% at MPS2 showed a preference to do so.

The attitude the respondents have toward their job may in all likelihood be transferred and manifested onto their learners and parents. In the section following, the possibility thereof is analyzed.

Table 5.3.2.3 Attitudes to Learners and Parents

			1	2	3
Item	**STATEMENT**	**School**	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Uncertain**
25	I become annoyed with students who display a poor attitude to their work.	**LPS**	79.2	16.7	4.2
		MPS1	42.9	28.6	28.6
		MPS2	64.7	17.6	17.6
27	I become annoyed when students fail to answer simple questions.	**LPS**	62.5	33.3	4.2
		MPS1	71.4	14.3	14.3
		MPS2	47.1	47.1	5.9
28	My attitude towards my students is dependent on their behaviour.	**LPS**	37.5	58.3	4.2
		MPS1	42.9	28.6	28.6
		MPS2	52.9	35.3	11.8
4	Parents should have more say in the running of schools.	**LPS**	50.0	29.2	20.8
		MPS1	100.0	0.0	0.0
		MPS2	47.1	41.2	11.8

The sense of negativity at the LPS continued to the realm of their learners and parents. A worrisome sense of annoyance towards their learners was noted amongst these teachers. 79.2% acknowledged that they got annoyed with learners who displayed a

poor attitude towards their work (item 25) in addition to 62.5% of them being annoyed with learners failing to answer simple questions (item 27). Despite this, 58.3% claim that their attitude was not determined by their learners' behaviour (item 28).

Considering that MPS I and MPS2 were more positively inclined toward teaching as a job, they also appear to be less annoyed with learners or parents. However, both these schools reflected higher scores (MPSI 42.9%, and MPS2 52.9%) than the LPS, that their attitude towards their students was dependent on their behaviour.

Unlike at MPS 1, where 100% of the respondents stated that parents should have more say in the running of schools, only half (50%) at the LPS realised the value of parental involvement. This could be attributed to their insecurity in their beliefs as teachers. The fact that less than half (47.1%) of the respondents at MPS2 agreed that parents should have more say in the running of schools could be ascribed to their belief in their own ability as teachers and their sense of professionalism.

Emerging from the results, the LPS are perceived to have higher negative GTE scales, in comparison to MPS1, and MPS2. LPS presented evidence of a belief that corroboration of their teaching endeavours laid outside their control, and was external to them. At the two medium performing schools, where the respondents appeared to be more active and assured in their responses to students, they scored high on both PTE and GTE beliefs.

As was reiterated throughout the analysis and discussions regarding teacher efficacy, teacher efficacy beliefs are based on perceptions of individual classroom performance which ultimately determines the collective teacher efficacy beliefs, which are social perceptions based on an assessment of the capability of the school as a whole (collective).

In the ensuing section of this chapter, the respondents' Collective Efficacy is analysed to determine how it influences teaching and learning in the respective schools.

5.4 COLLECTIVE EFFICACY

Collective efficacy, as defined by Bandura (1977, 1986, and 1997) is the group or collective self-perception that 'teachers in a given school make an educational difference to their students over and above the educational impact of their homes and communities'. The findings of the three schools are discussed and compared in terms of instructional strategies and student discipline (see Appendix for The Collective Teacher Belief Scale).

The Collective Teacher Belief Scale (Tschannen-Moran and Barr, 2004) was used to measure the whole staffs belief about its collective capability to influence student achievement at the three different schools. This scale differs from other teacher efficacy scales as teachers are asked about their perceptions of the collective, rather than their personal beliefs about their own individual efficacy. The items were worded to measure efficacy as a school-level attribute, and the measure seeks to capture individuals' perceptions of school capability (Goddard, 2001:807-818).

The first section covers instructional strategies, underpinned by six statements as expressed in the table below.

5.4.1 Instructional Strategies

Two issues embraced within this aspect of instructional strategies are discussed in this section. They include how much teachers in a school can do to help their students master complex content and how much they can do to produce meaningful student learning. These issues are shown in Table 5.4.1.1 below.

Table 5.4.1.1 Instructional Strategies and Student Learning

Item	STATEMENT [Instructional Strategies]	SCHOOLS	1+3 Nothing to very little	5 Some Degree	7+9 Quite a bit to a great deal
C1	How much can teachers in your school do to produce meaningful learning?	**ALL**	**6.7**	**4.4**	**68.9**
		LPS	4.2	20.8	75.0
		MPS1	20.0	40.0	40.0
		MPS2	6.3	25.0	68.8
C2	How much can teachers in your school do to help students master complex content?	**ALL**	**4.4**	**40.0**	**55.6**
		LPS	8.3	33.3	58.3
		MPS1	0.0	80.0	20.0
		MPS2	0.0	37.5	62.5
C5	How much can teachers in your school do to help students think critically?	**ALL**	**8.9**	**33.3**	**57.8**
		LPS	8.3	29.2	62.5
		MPS1	20.0	60.0	20.0
		MPS2	6.3	31.3	62.5
C6	How much can teachers in your school do to promote deep understanding of academic concepts?	**ALL**	**4.4**	**46.7**	**48.9**
		LPS	4.2	37.5	58.3
		MPS1	0.0	100.0	0.0
		MPS2	6.3	43.8	50.0
C9	How much can your school do to foster student creativity?	**ALL**	**6.7**	**31.1**	**62.2**
		LPS	12.5	25.0	62.5
		MPS1	0.0	80.0	20.0
		MPS2	0.0	25.0	75.0
C10	How much can your school do to get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork?	**ALL**	**2.2**	**17.8**	**80.0**
		LPS	4.2	29.2	66.7
		MPS1	0.0	20.0	80.0
		MPS2	0.0	0.0	100.0

Responses to each of the items listed in the table above reflect comparatively high (positive) scores, implying that as respective groups (collective) of teachers, they believe that they can influence student learning. The scores ranging from 50 to 80% infer that they believe that they can do 'quite a bit, to a great deal' about issues pertaining to learners' learning, their thinking and creativity and their (learners') belief that they can do well in schoolwork.

However, in comparison to the other two schools, a conspicuous drop in confidence levels is observed at the MPS1 where previously respondents emerged as the more positive individuals (see individual efficacy tables). Regarding the aspect as to how much they as a group of teachers could do to produce meaningful learning (C1), a subdued 40.0% at the MPSI said that they could do a great deal, in comparison to the other sample groups where positive scores were noted (75.0% at LPS and 68.8% at MPS2). A similar trend was observed at MPS l's response to teachers helping learners master complex content (C2) with only 20% stating confidently that they could do much to help, while 80% said that could help only to some extend. About promoting deep understanding of academic concepts (C6), 100% attested to being confident that

they could to do so only to some degree, while none of them believed that as a group, they could do more. This subdued levels of confidence as a collective, was also evident in their response on the topic of teachers fostering student creativity (C9). Again, a minority (20%) said that they could do a great deal about it, while the rest said they could simply do so, to some extent. However, with reference to getting students to believe that they can do well in schoolwork (C10), a characteristic boost of confidence emerged. Eighty percent (80%) stated that they believed that they could accomplish that to a great extent. The hypothesis that these teachers' change of attitude could be as a result of their social orientation (see efficacy tables) exists. Based on the observed social colorations, the fact that they got to know each other's strengths and weakness, and their learners' contextual backgrounds, could be the cause for the limitations placed upon themselves as a group where their students' learning is concerned.

On the contrary, in the face of the propensity of negativity as individuals, the LPS surfaced as being much more confident in their belief of their ability as a group. Considering their scores (50% to 75%) for each of the statements, they inferred that as a school, they could do quite a bit, to a great deal about helping their students master and understand complex content and academic concepts, think critically, foster creativity and getting their learners to believe that they can do well in schoolwork. Considering the enthusiastic response to the statements about the impact they belief they can make (as a group) on student learning, in addition to the fact that they indicated a preference to be with each other (see Table 5.3.1.1), the possibility exists that this school could be turned around to produce the kind of teaching and learning desired by the WCED.

The scores reflected in the table reiterated the persistent positive tendency previously observed at MPS2. Their sense of professionalism (clarity of roles and responsibilities, staff development, knowledge of management matters, amongst others) could be the contributing factor to this observable fact.

The second component engages with student discipline, focusing on the statements expressed in the table below.

5.4.2 Student Discipline

The issues analysed in this component, include how much the school personnel in a school can do to control disruptive behaviour, and to what extent school personnel in a school can establish rules and procedures that facilitate learning.

Table 5.4.2.1 Student Discipline and School Rules

Item	STATEMENT [Student Discipline]	SCHOOLS	1+3 Nothing to very little	5 Some Degree	7+9 Quite a bit to a great deal
C3	To what extent can school personnel in your school establish rules and procedures that facilitate learning?	**ALL**	**8.9**	**31.1**	**60.0**
		LPS	12.5	37.5	50.0
		MPS1	20.0	40.0	40.0
		MPS2	0.0	18.8	81.3
C4	How well can adults in your school get students to follow school rules?	**ALL**	**8.9**	**40.0**	**51.1**
		LPS	12.5	33.3	54.2
		MPS1	20.0	80.0	0.0
		MPS2	0.0	37.5	62.5
C7	How much can school personnel in your school do to control disruptive behaviour?	**ALL**	**20.0**	**31.1**	**48.9**
		LPS	20.8	16.7	62.5
		MPS1	40.0	60.0	0.0
		MPS2	12.5	43.8	43.8
C8	To what extent can teachers in your school make expectations clear about appropriate student behaviour?	**ALL**	**2.2**	**26.7**	**71.1**
		LPS	4.2	25.0	70.8
		MPS1	0.0	40.0	60.0
		MPS2	0.0	25.0	75.0
C11	How well can teachers in your school respond to defiant students?	**ALL**	**8.9**	**46.7**	**44.4**
		LPS	4.2	50.0	45.8
		MPS1	40.0	20.0	40.0
		MPS2	6.3	50.0	43.8
C12	How much can your school do to help students feel safe while they are at school?	**ALL**	**2.2**	**11.1**	**86.7**
		LPS	0.0	12.5	87.5
		MPS1	20.0	20.0	60.0
		MPS2	0.0	6.3	93.8

Based on the scores regarding the statements on student discipline, reflected in this table, the LPS extended their belief in themselves as a collective. The scores show a continued a drop in confidence at MPSI. Although the MPS2 continued to present immense confidence in their ability to do a great deal about certain issues, namely establishing rules and procedures to facilitate learning (C3, 81.3%), getting their learners to follow school rules (C4, 62.5%), making expectations clear about appropriate behaviour (C8, 75.0%), and helping students to feel safe while they were at school (C12, 93.8%), their confidence levels dropped with regard to statements C7 and C11. With reference to disruptive behaviour, 43.8% said that they could control it to some degree, while the same amount alluded to the fact that they could do a great deal about it. Only 40% were confident that they could respond well (appropriately and effectively) to defiant students.

The postulation here is that teachers are sufficiently confident to develop appropriate policies and procedures to ensure appropriate student behaviour and discipline, but are wary about enforcing it.

Despite the drop in scores as a collective, about issues related to Instructional Strategies, and Student Discipline, the hypothesis is that their (MPSI) beliefs in their ability as individual teachers are sufficiently secure to stimulate learner achievement. The premise is that they are guided by their personal positive attitudes to do what needs to be done, instead of waiting for someone else to do it. Each one is adequately motivated to roll up their sleeves, and get the job done. Their positive (high) scores with regard to their PTE, and GTE, could be aligned to this hypothesis.

5.5 CONCLUSION

In concluding this chapter, the differences between the efficacy levels at the three schools are very clear, and illuminating. Comparisons of these teachers show that high teacher efficacy is associated with greater teacher-student interaction characterized by greater emphasis upon positive reinforcement of student learning. In summarizing the findings, it emerged that the two medium performing schools are stronger in their beliefs about teaching (GTE) and their capabilities as teachers (PTE), than the low performing school. It has become apparent that the teachers at MPS I and MPS2 are better equipped and capacitated to manage the issues, which are described in the subscales of teacher efficacy that evidently influence efficacy. In these schools where teachers in the classrooms possess a high level of efficacy, there appears to be a facilitative influence upon cognitive performance of students, which may be associated with improvement in teaching skills and self-efficacy on the part of teachers.

At MPS 1 where "provider capture" seems to operate, higher levels of efficacy were noted. A strong sense of collegiality was apparent amongst the small staff, with none of them preferring to keep to themselves. A striking sense of trust of their colleagues was exhibited. Being a small school they were more concerned with social cohesion and were not easily annoyed with their learners. They seem to derive great satisfaction from collegiality and by inference exhibit high levels of efficacy.

The low performing school (LPS) tends to present more negativity about most issues regarding teaching. Based on the data, this propensity seems to stem from their inclination of blaming others (external factors) for their non-achievement. They seem to possess more of an "I can't" orientation, than an "I can" orientation, which illustrates their level of insecurity in their beliefs as teachers, their inability to control their emotions, and a limited influence on their learner achievement. The observation is that the students' achievement levels, is indicative of the degree of these teachers' confidence.

However, what is striking is that the Collective efficacy at LPS is stronger than that of MPS1 where teacher efficacy was noted to generally be high across the questionnaire items. Teachers at LPS may have doubts and feel insecure about the influence they may have on their learners as individual teachers (PTE), and what can be accomplished by their teaching (GTE), but their beliefs in their ability as a staff (Collective Efficacy) came across as being very strong. The hypothesis is therefore that with carefully designed intervention and development, much can be achieved with regard to their levels of teacher efficacy, and consequently their learner achievement.

Further discussion of these findings will take place in the final chapter that is to follow.

CHAPTER 6
FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE RESEARCH

An effective teacher is the single most important school related factor responsible for learning"
Schacter and Thum, 2004:413.

6.1 INTRODUCTION

This study set out to explore the of concept teacher efficacy, measure teachers' levels of efficacy in three selected primary schools, and determine whether a relation exists between teachers' sense of efficacy, and by inference the quality of their teaching. In other words, to establish whether the respondents had 'an internal CI can') orientation, or an external CI can't) orientation' (Bandura, 1977:191-215). In order to address the research questions, literature related to the concept efficacy was reviewed, and survey questionnaires were issued to the teachers at the three schools. In this chapter, the research results are summarized in the form of findings, conclusions and recommendations regarding teachers' efficacy, and their teaching. The findings of this study have implications for educational practice, and pave the way for future research.

6.2 FINDINGS

The findings of this research support the hypothesis that there is a positive relation between teachers' sense of efficacy, by inference the quality of their teaching, and consequently, learners' levels of achievement. The study confirms that each of the aspects of teacher efficacy is positively related to teachers' levels of confidence about their capabilities at each of the three schools. However, as noted by Bandura (1977:191-215), teachers' sense of efficacy is not necessarily homogeneous across the various types of tasks they are asked to perform. Comparison of teacher efficacy across these three schools was illuminating because the teaching practices and conditions showed considerable variation in teaching environments and teaching practices which appeared to have influenced teachers' beliefs about their roles and responsibilities (Ho & Hau, 2004:313-323). What is now understood is that the beliefs teachers have about their abilities (self teacher efficacy), influence their persistence when things do not go smoothly, and ultimately affect the learners.

In the sections below, the findings related to teacher efficacy are discussed first, and thereafter findings regarding their collective efficacy.

6.2.1 Teacher Efficacy

This study revealed that:

- At the school (LPS) where teachers evidenced low self efficacy, they were more inclined to attribute their non-achievement and inability to function efficiently to outside factors such as lack of resources, school leadership and other external limitations. These teachers held an overall disapproving opinion about the management decision-making issues at their schools. They expressed feelings of not being consulted or valued, and also said that they were not well informed of management decisions.

  Conversely, at the medium performing schools where the management decision-making issues were positively perceived, teachers indicated that they were well informed about management decisions, and higher teacher efficacy was indicated. Consequently, their GTE and PTE beliefs allowed them to competently perform the tasks normally expected of teachers. This was manifest in their learners' results which were relatively higher than that of the low performing school.

- Lower levels of efficacy were noted at LPS where teachers indicated a relative lack of clarity about their roles and responsibilities and relative low development, in comparison to the higher efficacy levels of the staff at MPS 1 and MPS2 who stated that their roles and responsibilities were clearly defined, and that they were engaged in staff development.

- The fact that the teachers at the better performing school (MPS2) coped better with the current atmosphere and changes in education could be related to their sense of professionalism, and higher levels of efficacy.

  The negative propensity at LPS about the changes taking place in the profession could be ascribed to the respondents' inability or unwillingness to adapt to the process of change, and ultimately to their overall lower efficacy levels.

- Respondents were generally of the opinion that the lack of resources at school was frustrating, confirming their low levels of teacher efficacy.
  However, at the school (MPS2) where teachers had higher levels of efficacy they appeared less frustrated about this issue. Their willingness to experiment with whatever resources were available to them could be attributed to their positive attitude.

- At the schools where teachers evidenced high levels of self efficacy, they were better able to handle situations that challenged their competence to teach. These teachers also took more personal responsibility for their development, success and failures. They were also inclined to be more optimistic about student learning and experienced fewer difficulties with student misbehaviour, and held higher opinions of their jobs.

  However, at LPS where teachers reflected low levels of self-efficacy, they experienced higher levels of job-related stress and lower levels of job satisfaction were noted. They were also pessimistic about student learning and experienced more difficulties with student misbehaviour. Their negative perception of teaching as their job reflects in their learners' results.

- The more efficacious teachers (MPSI) applied their positive qualities to visualise or imagine for themselves the ideal working environment.

  Conversely, the opposite was demonstrated at LPS where teachers had negative tendencies, hence the differences observed regarding their levels of efficacy and consequently learner performances.

- Teachers at the medium performing schools where they scored high on GTE and PTE were active and assured in the responses to their students. They seem willing to persist longer, provide greater academic focus in their classrooms, and exhibit different types of feedback. The constant improvement in their results serves as demonstration to that observation.

The opposite proved to be true for teachers at LPS who scored low efficacy levels. They indicated lower expectations of their ability to influence student learning. They could be expected to give up readily if they did not get results.

- Low teacher efficacy levels at schools were associated with poor social interactions (LPS). This was exacerbated by high negative scores about managerial relations and insufficient collaboration regarding management decision-making which lead to the occurrence of conflict.

  At the school (MPSI) where greater collaboration and a deeper sense of collegiality were noted, teacher efficacy levels were higher.

- Teachers' levels of annoyance with learners were linked to their levels of efficacy. At LPS, where teachers with low efficacy showed an inability to socially interact with learners, they transferred their negative tendencies onto their learners through poor social interactions.

  The quality of the social interactions at the school where teachers had positive attitudes reflected in their environment which was conducive to performance. The large numbers of students did not disadvantage social interaction.

- Parental involvement in the school was a factor significantly associated with teacher efficacy. Teachers who were confident about their beliefs as teachers (MPSI), acknowledged the value of parents' role in their school.

  Conversely, those teachers at LPS who were more negatively inclined did not share the same opinion regarding parents. This could be attributed to a sense of apprehension of exposing their inability to control their emotions, and or a level of insecurity in their beliefs as teachers, which is a further extension of their low efficacy levels.

- As indicated before, teachers who proved to be better able to handle changes (MPS2) signified a higher level of efficacy, derived from their sense of professionalism.

  Similarly, at the school (MPS2) where teachers were bolstered by a strong sense of collegiality, they did not see the media as negative and believed that they had community support, herewith verifying their higher level of efficacy. The opposite was eminent at the school (LPS) where teachers had the propensity of being negative.

- Environments conducive to healthy work performance were more evident at the two medium performing schools, where teachers trusted their colleagues, and conflict was less common. The results and progress is related to this situation.

  The opposite was demonstrated at the school where teachers experienced the highest levels of negativity, which clearly influenced their poor learner performance.

- Teachers at MPS I and MPS2 who showed higher levels of efficacy proved to be the ones who thought teaching was a rewarding job and took pleasure in their work. This satisfaction reflected in their concern about learner performance and / or levels of expectations and their belief to raise learning standards. Qualifying for the awards issued by the education department verifies this.

- Teachers who demonstrated a more confident attitude and belief about their ability as teachers, in other words, teachers who had higher PTE levels, illustrated that they had the ability to overcome factors that could make teaching and learning difficult. This was confirmed by the positive improvement noted in their student learning and achievements levels (MPS I and MPS2) in comparison to the non-achievement at the school (LPS) where there were consistent negative attitudes.

- Teachers who perceived to have negative GTE scales presented evidence of a belief that corroboration of their teaching endeavours laid outside their control and was external to them (LPS), whereas the respondents who appeared to be more active and assured in their responses to students, scored high on both PTE and GTE beliefs.

This research also supports the theory that collective efficacy is an extension of individual efficacy to the organizational level (Tschannen-Moran et al (1998: 202-248). Findings of this dimension of teacher efficacy are discussed in the section below.

6.2.2 Collective Efficacy

The research shows that:

- Despite the propensity of negativity as individuals, evidence surfaced that the teachers at LPS had much more confidence in their beliefs of their ability as a group. Based on this evidence, the possibility exists that the school could be turned around to produce the kind of teaching and learning that is desired.

- High teacher efficacy is linked to the level of collaboration in a school as verified by MPS). The drop of efficacy levels as a collective amongst the otherwise positive group of teachers may be attributed to their lower sense of professionalism. This could be restored with the development of their sense of professionalism as was manifest by the better performing school (MPS2) with the persistent positive tendency and high sense of professionalism.

6.3 CONCLUSIONS

Recognizing that these findings are limited by the need for classroom observations and interviews to enable a deeper understanding of teacher behaviours, the following conclusions have been formulated:

- Teacher efficacy is a multi-dimensional concept and this research task has found each of the dimensions underpinned by this concept to be significantly

associated with teachers' levels of efficacy and consequently the quality of the teaching and learning in the three schools.

- In the presence of low efficacy levels, learner achievement levels were low. Conversely, the opposite was applicable. Where efficacy levels amongst teachers were high significant progress of learner performance was seen and achievements levels were much higher in comparison to LPS.
- This research therefore concludes that teachers' sense of self-efficacy does influence their instructional practices, their enthusiasm, commitment, and their teaching behaviour and is subsequently related to higher levels of student achievement, confirming previous research.
- Environmental factors do influence individual functioning, but self-efficacy is concerned not with perceptions of external obstacles, but with self-referent beliefs about capabilities to carry out a course of action, even in the face of challenging external factors as evidenced by teachers at MPS2.
- The relationship between teacher efficacy and job satisfaction is especially important as was manifest by teachers who were experiencing job satisfaction. Teacher efficacy has been shown to be significantly related to job performance and has proven to be a critical element affecting teachers' attitudes and efforts in their daily work.
- Student motivation and performance can be enhanced when teachers become more confident about their capabilities to successfully engage students in a variety of challenging circumstances.

Finally, founded on the evidence of this research which confirms the literature reviewed for this study, it is clear that teachers' beliefs in their capability do influence the effort they put into their task of teaching and that this ultimately affects the performance of their learners even if the direct causal link is unclear. Teachers are therefore to be encouraged to believe that despite the influence of their context, that they can successfully meet the challenges of the task at hand.

REFERENCES

Adams, C. M. and Forsyth, P.B. (2006). An analysis of the formation of perceived collective efficacy. Poster presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Research Association. San Francisco, CA.

Alexander, R. J. (1996). *Primary Teaching.* University of Leeds.

Allinder R. M (1994). The relationship between efficacy and the instructional practices of special education teachers and consultants. *Teacher Education and Special Education,* 17:86-95.

Armor, D., Conry-Osequera, P., Cox, M., King, N., McDonnell, L., Pascal, A., Pauly, E., and Zellman, G. (1976). *Analysis of the School Preferred Reading Programs in selected Los Angeles minority schools* (R-2007-LAUSD).

Ashton, P. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A motivational paradigm for effective teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 35 (5), 28-32.

Ashton, P. (1985). Motivation and teacher's sense of efficacy. In C. Ames and R. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education: Vol. 2. The classroom milieu.* Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Ashton, P. T. and Webb, R. B. (1986). Teachers' sense of efficacy, classroom behaviour and student achievement. In P. T. Ashton and R. B. Webb (Eds.), *Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement.* New York & London: Longman.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behaviour change. *Psychological Review,* 84, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist,* 37, 122-147.

Bandura, A. (1986). The explanatory and predictive scope of self-efficacy theory. *Journal of Clinical and Social Psychology,* 4, 359-373.

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

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of human behavior.* Vol. 4, 71-81. New York: Academic Press.

Bandura, A. (Ed.). (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies.* New York: Cambridge University Press

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York: Freeman.

Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 2, 21-41.

Bandura, A. (2000). Bandura, Social cognitive theory in cultural context. *Journal of Applied Psychology:* An International Review, 51 269-290.

Bracey, G. (1995). Status and expectancies. *Phi Delta Kappan* 9(9): 727-28.

Brookover, W., Beady, C., Flood, P., Schweitzer, J., and Wisenbaker, J. (1979). *School social systems and student achievement: Schools can make a difference.* New York: Bergin.

Cakiroglu, E. (2003). Pre-service Teacher Efficacy Beliefs Regarding Mathematics Teaching: A Comparison of USA and Turkey. Paper presented at AERA, Chicago, IL.

Coladarci, T. (1992). Teachers' sense of efficacy and commitment to teaching. *Journal of Experimental Education,* 60, 323-337.

Deal, T. and Petersen, K. (1999). *Shaping school culture.* San Fransico, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dembo, M. H. (2001). Learning to teach is not enough. Future teachers also need to learn how to learn. *Teacher Education Quarterly,* 28, 23-35.

Department of Education (2008). Annual National Assessments - Grades Three and Six results. Cited by: The Children's Institute of the University of Cape Town. Literacy, math shocker in SA. Media Release, (June, 2009).

Erdem, E. and Demirel, 0. (2007). Teacher self-efficacy belief. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 35, 573-586.

Fleisch, B. (2008). *Primary Education in Crisis. Why South African schoolchildren underachieve in reading and mathematics.* Cape Town; Juta and Co.Ltd.

Frey, A. (2002). Predictors of placement recommendations for children with behavioral or emotional disorders. *Behavioral Disorders,* 27(2), 126-136.

Ghaith, G. and Shaaban, K. (1999). The relationship between perceptions of teaching concerns, teacher efficacy, and selected teacher characteristics. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 15, 487-496.

Gibbs, C.J. (2000). Self-efficacious teachers: New directions in the reconstruction of teacher education. Professorial Lecture, Auckland University of Technology.

Gibson, S. and Dembo, M.H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 76, 569-582.

Gist, M.E. and Mitchell, T.R. (1992). Self —efficacy: A Theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Academy of Management Review,* 17(2), 183-211.

Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., and Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on academic achievement. *American Educational Research Journal,* 37(2), 479-507.

Goddard, R.D. and Goddard, Y.L. (2001). A multilevel analysis of the relationship between teacher and collective efficacy in urban schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* Vol. 17, 1-12.

Goddard, R., M. Tschannen-Moran, and W. Hoy. (2001). A multilevel examination of the distribution and effects of teacher trust in students and parents in urban elementary schools. *The Elementary School Journal,* 102(1), 3-17.

Goddard, RD.; Hoy, W.K. and Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2000). Collective Teacher Efficacy: Its Meaning, Measure, and Impact on Student Achievement. *American Educational Research Journal,* Vol. 37, No.2, 479-507.

Goddard, R,G., Hoy, W.K., and Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2004). Collective efficacy: Theoretical development, empirical evidence, and future directions. *Educational Researcher,* 33(3), 3-13.

Guskey, T.R (1987). Context variables that affect measures of teacher efficacy. *Journal of Educational Research,* 81(1) 41-47.

Guskey, T.R. (1988). Teacher efficacy, self concept, and attitudes towards the implementation of instructional innovation. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* Vol.4, No.1, 63-69.

Hackett, G. (1995). Self-efficacy in career choice and development. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-efficacy in changing societies.* (New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hanushek, E; (1997). Assessing the effect of school resources on student performance: An Update. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis,* 19(2), 141-164.

Hawkins, Russell M. (1995). Self-efficacy a Cause of Debate. *Journal of Behavioral Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry,* Vol.26, No. 3, .235-240.

Henson, R. K. (2001). Teacher self-efficacy: Substantive implications and measurement dilemmas. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Educational Research Exchange at Texas A and M University, College Station, Texas.

Herman, P., Meece, J. L., and McCombs, B. (2000). Teacher experience and teacher efficacy: Relations to student motivation and achievement. Paper presented at

the annual meeting of the *American Educational Research Association,* New Orleans.

Hodgkinson, C. in *Values and Educational Leadership,* cited by Begley, P.T. (1999). State University of New York.

Ho, LT, and Hau, K.T. (2004). Australian and Chinese teacher efficacy: Similarities and differences in personal instruction, discipline, guidance efficacy and beliefs in external determinants, *Teaching and Teacher Education* 20, 313-323.

Hoy, W.K.; Tarter, C.J.; Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2006). Academic Optimism of Schools: A force for Student Achievement. *American Educational Research Journal,*. 43, 3.

Isikal, M. and Cakiroglu, E (2005). Teacher efficacy and academic performance. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*.

King, M. L, (1963). Strength to love. *Classic Quotes,* Quotation #24973.

Meijer, C., and Foster, S. (1988). The effect of teacher self-efficacy on referral chance. *Journal of Special Education, 22,* 378-385.

McDonald, T., and Siegall, M. (1993). The effects of technological self-efficacy and job focus on job performance, attitudes, and withdrawal behaviours. *Journal of Psychology*, 5, 465-475.

McDonough, J. and McDonough, S. (1997), *Research methods for English language Teachers,* 57-73. London: Arnold.

Midgely, C., Feldlaufer, H., and Eccles, J.S (1989). Change in teacher efficacy and student self- and task-related beliefs in mathematics during the transition to junior high school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81(2), 247-258.

Miller, P. S. (1991). Increasing teacher efficacy with at-risk students. *Equity and Excellence,* 25(1), 30.

Milner, H.R. (2002). A case study of an experienced English teacher's self-efficacy and persistence. *The High School Journal;* 86, 1.

Morganett, L. (1991). Good teacher-student relationships: A key element in classroom motivation and management. *Education*, 112. 21, 260-64.

Muijs, D. and Reynolds, D. (2001). Being or doing: The role of teacher behaviors and beliefs in school and teacher effectiveness in mathematics, a SEM analysis. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *American Educational Research Association, Seattle.*

Newton, I. (1675). Letter to Robert Hooke, February 5. Cited in *Cynical Quotations,* Michael Moncur, Quotation #862.

Niebuhr, K. and R. Niebuhr. (1999). An empirical study of student relationships and academic achievement. *Education,* 119(4), 679-81.

Nuthall, G. (2004). Relating Class Room Teaching to Student Learning: A Critical Analysis of why Research has Failed to Bridge the Theory-Practice Gap. *Harvard Educational Review,* 74, 273-306.

Ogah, J. K. (2006). Teachers' Efficacy to Affect Student Learning: A Literature Review. *IFE Psychologia,* Vol. 14, No. 2, 16-35.

Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research,* 66, 543-578.

Pajares, F. (1997). Current directions in self-efficacy research. In M.L. Maehr and P. R. PintrIch (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement Volume 10,* 1-49. Greenwich, CT: MI Press.

Pajares, F. and Schunk, D. (2001). Self-beliefs and school success: Self-efficacy, self-concept, and school achievement. In R. Riding and S. Rayner (Eds.), *Perception.* 239-266. London: Ablex Publishing.

Parsley, K. (2003) The classroom teacher's role in preventing school failure. *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 1-11.*

Podell, D.M. and Soodak, L. C. (1993). Teacher efficacy and bias in special education referrals. *Journal of Educational Research,* 86(4), 247.

Randi, J. (2004). Teachers as self-regulated learners. *Teachers College Record,* 106(9), 1825-1853.

Rangraje, A. (2002). Promoting efficacy in teachers. (Unpublished D Ed thesis). Umlazi: University of Zululand.

Rangraje, A. van der Merwe and Urbani, G (2005). Efficacy of teachers in a number of selected schools in the KwaZulu-Natal Province of South Africa. *South African Journal of Education 2005* EASA Vol. 25(1)38-43.

Ross, J.A., Hogaboam-Gray, A. and Gray, P. (2004). Prior collaborative school processes, and collective efficacy. *Leadership and Policy in Schools,* 3(3), 163.

Ross, J.A. and Gray, P. (2006). Transformational leadership and teacher commitment to organizational values: The mediating effects of collective teacher efficacy. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement,* 17(2), 179-199.

Selaledi, D. K. (1999). Teacher efficacy in the Free State Province of South Africa. *South African Journal of Education,* 19, 266-270.

Schacter. J. and Thum, Y.M. (2004). Paying for High-and-Low quality *Teaching. Economics of Education Review,* 23, 411-430.

Schechter, C. (2005), Communal deliberation: the art of learning schools, *International Journal of Educational Management,* Vol. 19, No. 3, 197-206.

Schechter, C. and Tschannen-Moran, M. (2006). Teachers' sense of collective efficacy: an international view. *Internal Journal of Educational Management.* Vol. 20, No.6, 480-489.

Schunk, D. H. (1991). Self efficacy and academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist* 206, 207-231.

Shuell, T.J. and Moran, K.A. (1994). Learning Theories: Historical Overview and Trends. In: Husen, T and Postlethwaite, T.N. (Eds). *International Encyclopedia of Education.* 2nd Edit New York: Pergamon.

Skrla, L. and Goddard, R.D. (2002). *Accountability, equity, and collective efficacy in an urban school district: a mixed methods study*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh. PA, November.

Soodak, L.C. and Podell, D.M. (1993). Teacher efficacy and student problem as factors in special education referral. *Journal of Special Education,* 27(1), 66.

Stein, M.K. and Wang, M.C. (1988), "Teacher development and school improvement: the process of teacher change". *Teaching and Teacher Education,* Vol.4, 171-187.

The Nelson Mandela Children's Fund Rural Education Report (2005) cited in Fleisch, B. (2007). *Primary Education in Crisis. Why South African schoolchildren underachieve in reading and mathematics.* Cape Town; Juta and Co.Ltd

Tucker, C. M. (2005). Promoting Teacher Efficacy for Working With Culturally Diverse Students. *Preventing School Failure,* Vol. 50, No.1, 29-34.

Tschannen-Moran M, Woolfolk HA and Hoy WK (1998). Teacher efficacy: its measure and meaning. *Review of Educational Research,* 68, 202-248.

Tschannen-Moran, M. and Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing and elusive concept. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 17(7), 783-805.

Tschannen-Moran, M. and Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2002). *The influence of resources and support on teachers' efficacy beliefs.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Tschannen-Moran, M. and Barr, M. (2004). Fostering student learning: The relationship of collective efficacy and student achievement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools,* 3(3), 189.

Trentham, L., Silvern, S. and Brogdon, R., (1985). Teacher efficacy and teacher competency ratings. *Psychology in the Schools,* 22 (3), 343-352.

Tomlinson, C.A. (2003). Deciding to teach them all. *Educational Leadership,* 61(2), 6-11.

Vacha, E. and T. McLaughlin. (1992). The social structural, family, school, and personal characteristics of at-risk students: Policy recommendations for school personnel. *Journal of Education* 3(3), 9-25.

Ward, RA. (2005). Impact of mentoring on teacher efficacy. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 2-7.

Wayne, A. J. and Youngs, P. (2003). Teacher characteristics and student achievement gains. *Review of Educational Research,* 73 (1), 88.

WCED (2007, May). http://wcedwcape.gov.za/comms/pres2007/49-gr32006.html . Grade 3 literacy and numeracy. Media Release.

WCED (2008, May). http://wcedwcape.gov.za/comms/pres2008/20-linum.html. WCED awards achievers in literacy and numeracy. Media Release.

WCED (2009, March). http://wcedwcape.gov.za/comms/pres2009/36-linum.html. Grade 3 literacy results show continued improvement. Media Release.

WCED (2009, May). http://wcedwcape.gov.za/comms/pres2008/20-linum.html . WCED honours literacy and numeracy achievers. Media Release.

WCED (2009, July). http://wcedwcape.gov.za/comms/pres2009/75-14july.html . Western Cape's literacy and numeracy challenges. Media Release.

Woolfolk, A. E. and Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 81-91.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1995). Self efficacy and educational development. In A. Bandura (Ed.) *Self efficacy in changing societies.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Teacher Efficacy Scale

A number of statements about organizations, resources, people and teaching are presented below. The purpose is to gather information regarding the actual attitudes of educators concerning these statements. There are no correct or incorrect answers. The interest is only in your frank opinions. Your responses will remain confidential, and you may remain anonymous.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate your personal opinion about each statement by placing a tick √ in the appropriate column.

NO	Statement	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
1.	My salary is adequate for my basic needs.			
2.	Teaching is a secure job.			
3.	My principal often asks my opinion on professional matters.			
4.	Parents should have more say in the running of schools.			
5.	I enjoy a healthy relationship with parents.			
6.	I have taught only subjects which I am qualified for.			
7.	The environment in which I work is conducive to healthy work performance.			
8.	My principal endeavours to develop the capacity of his/her staff on a continuous basis.			
9.	I am well informed of management decisions.			
10.	I am coping well with the changes in education.			
11.	Unsavoury media reports often bring the teaching profession into disrepute.			
12.	In the teaching profession, there is so much uncertainty.			
13.	I spend most of my time assisting weaker students.			
14.	The management structure at my school is bureaucratic by nature.			
15.	The lack of resources at school is frustrating.			
16.	Staff reductions have led to an increased workload for teachers.			
17.	Personal conflicts with colleagues are a common occurrence at school.			
18.	My duties and responsibilities as a teacher are clearly defined.			
19.	The community appreciates my efforts at school.			
20.	I sometimes take a huge load of work home.			
21.	I am required to perform extra-curricular activities after school hours.			
22.	I trust my colleagues.			
23.	My work as a teacher helps me to realize my full potential.			
24.	Teaching is a rewarding task.			
25.	I become annoyed with students who display a poor attitude to their work.			
26.	At school, I feel that my views count.			
27.	I become annoyed when students fail to answer simple questions.			
28.	My attitude towards my students is dependent on their behaviour.			
29.	Due to the disharmony amongst staff members, I prefer to keep to myself.			
30.	I derive immense pleasure from my work.			
31.	The large number of students in my class places me under severe pressure.			

Comments:

PERSONAL DATA	
32.	Total years teaching experience.
33.	Grade you teach currently.
34.	Language you teach.
35.	Your Home language.

SCHOOL NO:	

Appendix 2: The Collective Teacher Belief Scale

A number of statements about organizations, resources, people and teaching are presented below. The purpose is to gather information regarding the actual attitudes of educators concerning these statements. There are no correct or incorrect answers. The interest is only in your frank opinions. Your responses will remain confidential, and you may remain anonymous.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate your personal opinion about each statement by placing a tick √ in the appropriate column.

ITEM NO	KEY: Nothing [1], Very little [3], Some degree [5], Quite a bit [7], A great deal [9]	RATING SCALE				
	STATEMENT / QUESTION	**1**	**3**	**5**	**7**	**9**
1.	How much can teachers in your school do to produce meaningful student learning?					
2.	How much can teachers in your school do to help students master complex content?					
3.	To what extent can school personnel in your school establish rules and procedures that facilitate learning?					
4.	How well can adults in your school get students to follow school rules?					
5.	How much can teachers in your school do to help students think critically?					
6.	How much can teachers in your school do to promote deep understanding of academic concepts?					
7.	How much can school personnel in your school do to control disruptive behaviour?					
8.	To what extent can teachers in your school make expectations clear about appropriate student behaviour?					
9.	How much can your school do to foster student creativity?					
10.	How much can your school do to get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork?					
11.	How well can teachers in your school respond to defiant students?					
12.	How much can your school do to help students feel safe while they are at school?					

Comments:

PERSONAL DATA	
13.	Total years teaching experience.
14.	Grade you teach currently.
15.	Language you teach.
16.	Your Home language.

SCHOOL NO:	

Appendix 3: Efficacy levels at the three primary school

Item	STATEMENT	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
1	My salary is adequate for my basic needs.	10.4	81.3	8.3
2	Teaching is a secure job.	47.9	35.4	16.7
3	My principal often asks my opinion on professional matters.	45.8	35.4	18.8
4	Parents should have more say in the running of schools.	56.3	29.2	14.6
5	I enjoy a healthy relationship with parents.	83.3	12.5	4.2
6	I have taught only subjects which I am qualified for.	33.3	66.7	0.0
7	The environment in which I work is conducive to healthy work performance.	33.3	50.0	16.7
8	My principal endeavours to develop the capacity of his/her staff on a continuous basis.	52.1	25.0	22.9
9	I am well informed of management decisions.	56.3	27.1	16.7
10	I am coping well with the changes in education.	29.2	60.4	10.4
11	Unsavoury media reports often bring the teaching profession into disrepute.	68.8	6.3	25.0
12	In the teaching profession, there is so much uncertainty.	87.5	6.3	6.3
13	I spend most of my time assisting weaker students.	58.3	37.5	4.2
14	The management structure at my school is bureaucratic by nature.	45.8	20.8	33.3
15	The lack of resources at school is frustrating.	68.8	22.9	8.3
16	Staff reductions have led to an increased workload for teachers.	83.3	12.5	4.2
17	Personal conflicts with colleagues are a common occurrence at school.	50.0	37.5	12.5
18	My duties and responsibilities as a teacher are clearly defined.	64.6	20.8	14.6
19	The community appreciates my efforts at school.	41.7	20.8	37.5
20	I sometimes take a huge load of work home.	89.6	6.3	4.2
21	I am required to perform extra-curricular activities after school hours.	66.7	18.8	14.6
22	I trust my colleagues.	39.6	20.8	39.6
23	My work as a teacher helps me to realize my full potential.	52.1	33.3	14.6
24	Teaching is a rewarding task.	43.8	33.3	22.9
25	I become annoyed with students who display a poor attitude to their work.	68.8	18.8	12.5
26	At school, I feel that my views count.	37.5	50.0	12.5
27	I become annoyed when students fail to answer simple questions.	58.3	35.4	6.3
28	My attitude towards my students is dependent on their behaviour.	43.8	45.8	10.4
29	Due to the disharmony amongst staff members, I prefer to keep to myself.	33.3	58.3	8.3
30	I derive immense pleasure from my work.	50.0	33.3	16.7
31	The large number of students in my class places me under severe pressure.	56.3	29.2	14.6

Appendix 4: Collective Efficacy levels at the three primary school

		1	3	5	7	9
	Instructional Strategies	**Nothing**	**Very little**	**Some degree**	**Quite a bit**	**A great deal**
1	How much can teachers in your school do to produce meaningful student learning?	0.0	6.7	24.4	46.7	22.2
2	How much can teachers in your school do to help students master complex content?	0.0	4.4	40.0	37.8	17.8
5	How much can teachers in your school do to help students think critically?	0.0	8.9	33.3	42.2	15.6
6	How much can teachers in your school do to promote deep understanding of academic concepts?	0.0	4.4	46.7	37.8	11.1
9	How much can your school do to foster student creativity?	0.0	6.7	31.1	46.7	15.6
10	How much can your school do to get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork?	0.0	2.2	17.8	53..3	26.7
	Student Discipline					
3	To what extent can school personnel in your school establish rules and procedures that facilitate learning?	0.0	8.9	31.1	44.4	15.6
4	How well can adults in your school get students to follow school rules?	0.0	8.9	40.0	35.6	15.6
7	How much can school personnel in your school do to control disruptive behaviour?	2.2	17.8	31.1	37.8	11.1
8	To what extent can teachers in your school make expectations clear about appropriate student behaviour?	0.0	2.2	26.7	48.9	22.2
11	How well can teachers in your school respond to defiant students?	0.0	8.9	46.7	35.6	8.9
12	How much can your school do to help students feel safe while they are at school?	0.0	2.2	11.1	55.6	31.1