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Abstract: Curriculum development should be a continuous process which is crucial and unavoidable in order to make the education system more relevant in producing human capital which is fit for purpose. This study investigated the level of academic staff involvement in curriculum development in Zimbabwe’s higher education institutions (HEIs). A mixed research design was used. Data was collected from respondents who were drawn from a representative sample of 59 academic staff respondents. Questionnaires were the main data collection instruments and these were pre-tested for validity and reliability using Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients. Face to face interviews were used to gain in-depth understanding of the phenomena from key informants. It was the finding of this study that while academic staff in Zimbabwe were being involved in minor curriculum development matters, they were left out when it came to major curriculum development decisions such as the introduction of Education 5.0, STEM and Minimum Bodies of Knowledge. The study found that if higher education institutions increased the involvement of academic staff in curriculum development, it would lead to staff motivation. The study also found that the involvement of academic staff in curriculum development is positively related to effective delivery of the curriculum. It was recommended that academic staff should always be involved especially when it came to major curriculum development matters. The study drew the conclusion that staff were not keen to implement a curriculum which they were not part of right from formulation, implementation, assessment, monitoring and evaluation.
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1. Introduction

In this study, the words curriculum change and curriculum development are used interchangeably. Kurt Lewin, argues that while change is inevitable, there is a correct way of introducing change lest all efforts may suffer stillbirths. Lewin (1947) goes further to assert that people do not resist change, they resist the way change is introduced and he warns all those who desire to introduce change that they have to do it systematically with the involvement of those who will be affected by it. The same is true when it comes to curriculum issues, especially matters relating to curriculum change. When a curriculum is being developed, stakeholders such as government, industry and commerce, students, parents, guardians and lecturers should be involved. It is in light of this that the study sought to investigate the extent to which academic staffs in universities are involved in curriculum development in Zimbabwe. Higher education in Zimbabwe has undergone transformation like in any other country over the years in response to internal and external factors. Change is inevitable as the adage goes, ‘If you do not change, change will change you’. There is always a need therefore, for the curriculum to adequately respond to the changing environment and the changing circumstances as driven by globalisation, advancements in technology, and the regulatory bodies such as ZIMCHE’s directives, individual university strategic plans, and change in the high school curriculum. Higher education curriculum should also responded to macro and microeconomic fundamentals, global pandemics such as the Coronavirus, the changing profiles of students and lecturers including brain-drain and brain-circulation as well as pronouncements of new government policies and directives. As higher education undergoes changes, the curriculum also transforms to make it fit for purpose.

1ZIMCHE – Zimbabwe Council of Higher Education is the regulatory authority in Zimbabwe which is in charge of quality assurance in higher education.
Institutions of higher education worldwide carry out curriculum development due to the rising demands from stakeholders. Kliebard (2004) investigated the development of the American curriculum and concluded that wide consultations are always carried out first and only those changes which are viewed as progressive are implemented. Hass (2010) noted that in the UK, curriculum development is typically formulated and often presented as policy recommendations, lists of goals, suggested graduation requirements, and general recommendations about the content and sequence in a field of study. Dwamena and Quansah (2020) cited Zargar (2012) studied curriculum development in Ghana and concluded that politics determines and defines the goals, content, learning experiences and structure of the curriculum and this has been the cancer eating into the core of education as curriculum preparation in Ghana has been driven on two political traditions the Nkrumah and the Dankwah Busia traditions. Alusbaine (2016) states that in South Africa’s higher education, researchers first engage in theoretical underpinnings about the intended curriculum development in universities and only after adequate critical analysis and agreement will the changes be implemented.

Ngwenya (2019) noted that in Zimbabwe curriculum development tends to be top-down with each appointed Minister of Higher Education dictating the form of curriculum to be pursued in universities. In justifying the top-down approach used in the introduction of STEM\(^2\) and Education 5.0\(^3\), the Minister of Higher and Tertiary Education, Innovation, Science and Technology Development highlighted that there is a disconnect between higher education and the needs of the country and there was an urgent need for a paradigm shift. The introduction of Education 5.0 with its two additional new pillars of innovation and industrialisation into the higher education curriculum is meant to support Zimbabwe’s strategic vision of becoming a competitive, industrialised and modernised country by 2030. According to Johnson (2011) cited in Alubaine(2016), the goal of a successful education program should meet the needs and current demands of society and the expectations of the population being served.

2. Statement of the Problem

World-wide, universities are said to be ‘autonomous’. This autonomy makes curriculum development to take many forms. In Zimbabwe, curriculum development has many players including state and non-state players. In recent times, the appointment of a new Minister has led to new curriculum development initiatives or directives and a change of direction. The much talked about STEM which was popularised during the tenure of the former Minister Professor Jonathan Moyo suddenly came to a halt when the Minister left Government. Currently, higher education is seized with issues of Education 5.0, minimum bodies of knowledge and national qualifications framework and one wonders if all such curriculum changes involved stakeholders let alone lecturers who are at the centre of implementing the curriculum to students. Many scholars of curriculum among them Ndawi&Maravanyika (2011), Ngwenya (2019), Gatawa (1999) and Chipeta, Mazile and Shumba (2000) have studied curriculum in Zimbabwe but there is a knowledge gap in the role of lecturers and the extent of their involvement in curriculum improvement/ development in Higher Education. Time-bound gaps, population gaps and geographical gaps were identified in the previous researches. The purpose of this study was to investigate the level of involvement of academic staff in curriculum development in higher education in Zimbabwe.

3. Research objectives

The study sought to:-

- Examine the level of involvement of lecturers in Developing Higher Education Curriculum for Human Capital Training at Chinhoyi University of Technology
- Determine the benefits of lecturer involvement in Developing Higher Education Curriculum for Human Chinhoyi University of Technology, in Zimbabwe.

4. Hypotheses

H\(_1\): An increase in the involvement of academic staff in the curriculum development increases their effectiveness

\(^2\)STEM - An education system which emphasizes imparting of skills in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics

\(^3\) Education 5.0 is a new way of doing things in higher education which emphasizes on imparting practical skills and production of goods and services. It refers to teaching, research, community engagement, innovation and industrialisation.
in delivering the curriculum to students.

H2: Directives from the top in curriculum development result in reduced commitment among academic staff to deliver the curriculum to students.

5. Literature Review

5.1 Level of involvement of lecturers in Developing Higher Education Curriculum for Human Capital Training

5.2 Benefits of lecturer involvement in Developing Higher Education Curriculum for Human Chinhoyi University of Technology, in Zimbabwe

Meaning of Curriculum RQ1

Many scholars on the curriculum among them John Dewey, Franklin Bobbitt, Ralph Tyler, Robert Gagne, James Popham and Eva Baker came out with its various definitions. Dewey (1902) states that the word curriculum comes from two Latin words ‘currere’ which means ‘I run’ and ‘cursus ‘ which means ‘a track or course’. Therefore, Cole (2003, p. 7) views a curriculum as a programme of studies that a learner runs through to remain on course during the learning process. Tanner (2007) defines a curriculum as a planned and guided learning experience with intended outcomes formulated through the systematic reconstruction of knowledge and experiences under the auspices of a school, college or university for the learners’ continuous and wilful growth. Some authors such as Baker (2012) and Gagne (2009) define curriculum as the knowledge and skills students are expected to learn which include the learning standards or learning objectives they are expected to meet. Cole (2003) agrees with Tanner (2007) when he says that the curriculum is everything that happens under the auspices of formal and informal learning environments. Smithson (2012) states that a curriculum is the sum of all the activities, experiences and learning opportunities for which an institution (such as the society) or a teacher (such as a faculty member) takes responsibility – either deliberately or by default. Tanner and Tanner (2007, p. 12) describe a curriculum as, “That reconstruction of knowledge and experience that enables the learner to grow in exercising intelligent control of subsequent knowledge and experience”.

This study views curriculum as all learning experiences planned and organised by the school (University) and also included are the unplanned learning experiences. It is a body of planned and organised knowledge which is directed at intellectually, physically, socially and morally developing learners into desired citizens.

2.2 Curriculum development

Curriculum development is a systematic and dynamic process sensitive to time and place in which preparation, development, implementation and evaluation of learning processes and steps are involved (Jadhav&Patankar, 2013). According to Ackerman (2003), curriculum, more than ever before, is now viewed as being at the centre of daily life and the responsibility of all stakeholders in the society as a whole. Curriculum development presents both a strategic process challenge as well as a policy challenge. Chipeta (2000) posits that curriculum development involves crafting programs of study (study plans), teaching strategies, resource allocations, specific lesson plans and assessment of students, and faculty development. Curriculum development describes all the ways in which a teaching or training organisation plans and guides learning. This learning can take place in groups or with individual, outside or inside a classroom (http://www.cgiar.org/icraf/toolkit).

Mary (2014) defines curriculum development as a purposeful, progressive and systematic process to create improvement in the education system. This study views development as making something better. Therefore, curriculum development is any attempt that is undertaken to make the curriculum better and more responsive to the needs of the students and society at large. Alubaine (2016) highlighted that lecturers/ academics are the central cogs in curriculum development in Higher Education.

2.3 Types of Curriculum

Curriculum can take many forms. It can be formal/official, informal/social, actual/operational, hidden/collateral, and extra-mural or core-curricula (Vitray&Gammit, 2010, p. 13). This study placed emphasis on formal/official
curriculum as it is planned and intentional with clear objectives (minimum bodies of knowledge - MBKs) of what is to be achieved. This is illustrated in Figure 1 below:

**Figure 1: Types of Curriculum**

![Curriculum Types Diagram](source: Own source)

2.3.1 Formal/ Official Curriculum

Formal or Official Curriculum is sometimes referred to as the core curriculum because it covers the specifics of every course and that part of knowledge which is viewed as most important. It is planned, intentional and measurable by means of tests, assignments and changes in skills, values, attitudes and norms. It is what makes learners to progress from pre-school, to primary, secondary, high school, college right up to university ([http://coefaculty.valdosta.edu/stgrubbs/Definitionsof curriculum.htm](http://coefaculty.valdosta.edu/stgrubbs/Definitionsof curriculum.htm)). A certain set of skills and competencies are expected at each level of the curriculum.

2.3.2 Informal/Social Curriculum

A student who gets zero in an exam under the formal curriculum is still said to have learnt a lot from attending school. Learning how to discuss, play with others, share, convince others and argue are critical skills required in life to develop a complete human being ([http://findebookece.com/p/posner](http://findebookece.com/p/posner)). This is what an informal curriculum is all about. It is not planned, it simply takes place as the learners mix and mingle. Wilson (2004) calls it the hidden or collateral curriculum. Good manners, thievery, cruelty, promiscuity and vulgar language can be learnt unconsciously in a learning environment through informal curriculum because of what happens between learners and their lecturers.

2.3.3 Actual/Operational Curriculum

This is what remains in students when the learnt material has been forgotten (Eisner, 1994). Actual or operational curriculum is when students acquire the intended learning outcomes as planned. It is closely related to official curriculum.

2.3.4 Extra mural curriculum or Core Curricula

Chikumbu and Makamure (2000) explained extra-mural or core-curricula as a planned curriculum aimed at attending to other human requirements as in ‘a healthy mind in a healthy body’. Even if the students are enrolled to study for a BSc in Mechatronics Engineering or BSc in Accounting, there has to be time for sports, clubs etc. This is extra curriculum or co-curriculum because it is planned to happen side by side with formal curriculum.

2.4 Curriculum development in Zimbabwe

2.3.1 Precolonial Education Curriculum

During the pre-colonial era education on the continent was purely informal although in some parts of North Africa and West Africa there were Islamic schools (Adeyemi&Adeyeyika, 2002). Different approaches that symbolised the traditional curriculum where old men and women were selected from their social circles to impart knowledge to the young men, young women, boys and girls. In this case, a traditional curriculum refers to one that
focuses on the accepted way of life which is passed on from generation to generation through various methods such as initiation for young boys and girls entering puberty or through among the Shona of Zimbabwe a ‘padare and papfihwa’ arrangement where boys and girls would gather around a fire in the evening to listen to educative stories and testimonies from the elderly. These men and women were traditional advisors who were naturally skilled in advising the young generation about the traditional practices in their societies. The indigenous curriculum was mainly centred on roles of men and women, boys and girls, and other areas such as marriage, values, norms, farming and courtship.

2.4.2 Colonial Education

Using the curriculum the colonial masters got an upper hand in destroying and condemning the African values and norms as they referred them as demonic (Rodney, 1972).

The colonial educational curriculum included skills training at Domboshava and Tsholotsho as a way to create cheap labour for the colonisers. The curriculum focused on activities such as carpentry, metal work and building that were taught for the benefit of the coloniser. The education system further developed into F1 and F2 in the 1960s with the F1 being for those few who were being educated to do white collar jobs for the white colonisers while F2 was for those the colonial system intended to channel towards blue collar jobs (Moyana & Sibanda, 1999). In the colonial state, there were separate schools for Whites, for Indians and other Asians, for Coloureds (mixed race learners) and for Blacks in a form of Apartheid. The curriculum in these schools was different. White schools had the best curriculum while Black schools had the most inferior with subjects such as gardening and handcraft which basically trained them to be labourers for the Whites (Moyana & Sibanda, 1999). Walter Rodney in his book ‘How Europe Underdeveloped Africa’ (1972), gives various strategies used to brainwash Africans using the curriculum. The discriminatory education curriculum and the land question triggered the war of liberation according to Moyana (1981). This underscores the importance of studying curriculum development, because it is the unresolved curriculum question which caused the war of liberation which brought independence in Zimbabwe.

2.4.3 The Curriculum in independent Zimbabwe

At independence, the majority Government announced that Zimbabwe was an egalitarian (classless) society based on Marxist Leninist Scientific Socialism (Gatawa, 1990). Whites and Blacks were to live and learn together in the same schools and the curriculum was the same. The Government introduced an Education for All Policy (EFA) which allowed automatic progression without bottlenecks. This caused massive expansion in all facets of learning to accommodate the huge enrolments especially at secondary school and the country’s then only university, the University of Zimbabwe. (Moyana, 1999). In higher education, the only university at independence, the University of Zimbabwe (UZ), failed to cope with the increased numbers of students and other universities were established progressively over the years. From one university in 1980, Zimbabwe had 20 universities by June 2020.

Gatawa (1990) and Moyana (1999) concur that curriculum development; implementation, monitoring and evaluation are all affected by enrolment figures. If enrolment figures rise sharply, curriculum delivery modes change. Inevitably, increased enrolments triggered curriculum changes from primary and secondary schools, teachers’ colleges, technical colleges and at the University of Zimbabwe. New subjects, new courses, new delivery methods and new assessment methods were introduced after independence.

2.5 Theoretical Framework

Grant and Osanloo (2014) define a theoretical framework as a blueprint or guide for research. It guides based on the existing theory of the field of inquiry that is related and it reflects the hypothesis of the study. They posit that it is a blueprint which is often borrowed by researchers to establish their research inquiry. This study was anchored on theories that are crucial in underpinning the concept on involvement of academics in curriculum development and the participation of academics in programme improvement. The theories include curriculum theory and models of curriculum development.

There are several models of Curriculum Development namely the Tyler model, Hawes Model, Doll’s Model, Process Model, Wheeler’s Model and Lawton Model. However, this study concentrated on the three most prominent models which are relevant in the Zimbabwean higher education context. These are the Tyler’s Model,
The Wheeler Model and the Process Model.

2.5.1 The Tyler or Objectives Model

The Tyler Model is one of the earliest curriculum development models (Cheng, 2001). It was developed by Professor Ralph Tyler of the University of Chicago in the USA in 1949. In this model learning outcomes are stated as objectives e.g. ‘By the end of the lecture, students should be able to demonstrate using a Bunsen burner how heat causes all matter to expand’. This is the most widely used model in the education system in Zimbabwe (Chipeta, Mazile & Shumba, 2000). All MBKs are based on Tylerism. It is very effective and easy to measure. Setting tests/exams is all based on Tylerism. Chipeta, Mazile and Shumba (2000, p. 9) postulate that Ralph Tyler is sometimes referred to as ‘the father of curriculum development’. This is a tried and tested model which has stood the test of time.

2.5.2 Wheeler’s Model

The Wheeler’s Model of Curriculum Development was developed by Professor D.K. Wheeler to challenge the Tyler Model and attend to its deficiencies (Ozmon & Craver, 2003). Wheeler perceived that the process of curriculum planning is not entirely based on objectives and measurement of learning outcomes. He argued that curriculum development consists of four phases which are:

- **Phase 1**: Determination of aims, goals and objectives

- **Phase 2**: Selection of learning experiences.

- **Phase 3**: Selection of content and integration of learning experiences and content with respect to the didactic process.

- **Phase 4**: Evaluation of the effectiveness of all aspects of phase two, three and four in attaining the goals stated in Phase 1. The cycle then starts all over again.

It is clear that Wheeler’s Model is an improvement of the Tylerian paradigm because it is cyclic. It gives the understanding that curriculum development is an on-going activity. As lecturers teach, they also learn. That is why every lecturer is required to research and reflect on the way they teach in order to be more informed and more ready for the next lesson since no two groups of students are the same. Each student is unique. For instance, in most cases, the notes used in the previous year may not be used in the following year as they may be obsolete or irrelevant. These are the great lessons drawn from the Wheeler Model.

2.5.3 The Process Model

Doll (2001) states that the Process Model of Curriculum Development was popularised by Laurence Stenhouse who argued that activities in education including higher education, are known and can be determined without pre-specifying the behavioural objectives. This model asserts that learning content should not be selected as a means to an end but rather as something with its own intrinsic value (www.slideshare.net/Vangidunda/curriculum_development_in_material_methodology). The process model tries to answer the question, “How is the teacher to handle what?” Ndawi (1999) a proponent of the Process Model argues that education should be seen as a process or a continuum, with on-going and open-ended activities. This model uses general educational aims as opposed to specific objectives. However, this study notes that general aims are more useful in curriculum development when developing syllabi at national level as opposed to the practical curriculum taking place between lecturer and student where interactions and outcomes have to be specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and timed-bound (SMART) for them to be easy to assess.

2.6 Curriculum Development in Universities in Zimbabwe

Universities have been known to be autonomous until recently. Curriculum development in each course has been the preserve of each Faculty/School and its Departments. Before coming up with the curriculum (learning...
content) for each course, Departments and Faculties in universities engage in wide research which involves but is not limited to benchmarking with reputable sister universities. They also undertake needs assessments including stakeholder consultations and doing staff and students exchange programmes. These include going on contact visits and sabbaticals, signing memoranda of understanding (MoUs) with sister universities and relevant organisations. All this in an attempt to widely understand the contents of the degree course before concluding that it is necessary. The Senate Committee on Academic Programmes would finally evaluate to see if all procedures were undertaken and if the Course Outlines and Course Synopsis are of adequate depth.

With the gazetting of the Zimbabwe Council for Higher Education (ZIMCHE) Act (Chapter 25:27 of 2006), it is now a requirement for ZIMCHE to further rigorously view and review the planned curriculum of each course using course experts called peer evaluators. ZIMCHE’s peer evaluators visit the university which intends to introduce a new degree programme to see if there are adequately qualified lecturers to deliver the degree course, the availability of learning space, workshops, laboratories, availability of library books etc. All are reviewed by ZIMCHE before approval to launch the curriculum of the degree programme is given.

Fig. 2. The Conceptual Framework

After going through primary, secondary and tertiary sources of information during literature review, it became clear that while curriculum development in higher education is inclusive, it should be led by academic staff and should involve them right from Needs Assessment which discovers gaps which then lead to Curriculum Formulation. Academics as specialists, together with specialists in Government should lead in determining the aims and goals of human capital training as well as the desired learning outcomes, which will be subject to assessment and evaluation, and it is academic staff who should also lead in teaching/ delivering the curriculum which they were part of developing right from the beginning.

6. Research Methodology

This study was a mixed research study also called Pragmatic research as outlined in Figure 3 below:
Creswell (2003) states that using a mixed research is a practice of collecting, analysing and combining qualitative and quantitative data within a single cohesive study in order to gain a more holistic understanding of phenomena. ‘Researchers increasingly admit that the quantitative research alone cannot reveal all they need to need to know to make smart business decisions’ noted Cooper and Schindler (2011), Saunders, Lewis and Thorn hill (2009) as supported by Sekaran and Bougie (2013) postulated that combining quantitative and qualitative strands offsets their weaknesses drawing on the strengths of both approaches by answering different research questions with one approach explaining findings generated by the other and this enhances the integrity of research findings.

In this study, all the 289 academic staff members at Chinhoyi University of Technology made up the population. The sample size calculator which is obtainable on [http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html](http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html) was used for the study. It gave a sample size of 59 if the calculations allow a 5% margin of error and a confidence level of 95%. Such a sample was viewed as representative which allowed reasonable generalizability of the findings.

7. Results and Discussion

7.1 Level of involvement of lecturers in Developing Higher Education Curriculum for Human Capital Training

7.2 Benefits of lecturer involvement in Developing Higher Education Curriculum for Human Chinhoyi University of Technology, in Zimbabwe

Reliability Tests

The study made use of Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients to test for reliability of data collection instruments.

**Table 4.1: Involvement of academic staff in curriculum development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academics initiate the curriculum process</td>
<td>3.0500</td>
<td>1.17561</td>
<td>0.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics value the curriculum that is developed elsewhere</td>
<td>3.2500</td>
<td>1.08012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics value their involvement in the curriculum development</td>
<td>2.0500</td>
<td>1.25983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is necessary to involve academics in curriculum development</td>
<td>2.1750</td>
<td>1.45333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent to which academic staff were involved when education 5.0</td>
<td>3.1250</td>
<td>1.16327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent to which academic staff were involved when the MBKs were introduced</td>
<td>3.2000</td>
<td>1.06217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.2: Role played by academic staff in curriculum development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Lecturers carry out stakeholder consultations before new course 4.3250 .72986 0.851
Lectures draw up module content for the courses they teach 4.3500 .80224
Individual lecturers draw module outline before they start teach 4.2500 .83972
Lecturers were involved in stakeholder consultation which inform them 2.8500 1.35779
The introduction of Education 5.0 was a top-bottom 4.1000 1.05733
Lecturers were consulted on how many pillars they want to concern 2.8250 1.29075
Lecturers were involved in the evaluation of education 3.0 2.9750 1.22762
Lecturers were involved in content evaluation of the modules they teach 3.7750 1.12061
Students do evaluation of the teaching and learning process 3.9000 1.00766
Academics involvement in curriculum development leads to more effective 4.1100 .74421
Directives about curriculum from top reduce commitment 4.1250 .99195
Students benefit from involvement of academics in curriculum development 4.2250 .76753
There is an increase in academic involvement in curriculum development 3.5000 1.08604
Commitment of academics in curriculum development has a positive influence 4.0500 .98580
Research and development has a positive effect on curriculum development 4.3000 .79097
Valid N (listwise)

Table 4.3: OTHER Stakeholders involved in curriculum development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4.2750</td>
<td>1.03744</td>
<td>0.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and guardians</td>
<td>4.3500</td>
<td>1.07537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former students</td>
<td>4.3750</td>
<td>1.03000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective employers</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.02598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry and commerce</td>
<td>3.7000</td>
<td>1.13680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>4.1750</td>
<td>.98417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary Zimbabweans</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>.84732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Reasons for involving academic staff in curriculum development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers are specialists in the courses they teach</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>1.01274</td>
<td>0.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic staff cannot deliver effectively if not involved</td>
<td>4.2750</td>
<td>.90547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers do R and D assessment measurement and evaluation</td>
<td>4.2750</td>
<td>.87669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers know the learning outcomes they want to achieve</td>
<td>4.3000</td>
<td>.85335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers know what knowledge is relevant and what is not</td>
<td>4.3250</td>
<td>.79703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If lecturers are involved in curriculum development may not deliver</td>
<td>3.4750</td>
<td>1.63280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data, 2021
Table 4.1 indicates a coefficient value of 0.847 on the Cronbach’s Alpha test performed on involvement of academics staff in curriculum development which had 6 aspects measuring it. The alpha coefficient value was 0.847 which is greater than the minimum of 0.7 (Cronbach, 1951). This showed reliability of the aspects measuring involvement of academic staff in curriculum development thus allowing the researcher to make valid and credible conclusions. Additionally, the mean responses were ranging from 2.05 – 3.25 which indicated that the majority of respondent were in agreement that involvement of academics staff in curriculum development has a positive influence on effective implementation of the curriculum. Lastly, the standard deviation value ranged from 1.06 – 1.25 indicating that the responses provided by respondents were similar.

Table 4.2 was a Reliability Test on role played by academic staff in curriculum development. Results of the Cronbach’s Alpha test results on role played by academic staff in curriculum development, where an alpha coefficient value of 0.843 was generated showing reliability of the questionnaire as the value is above the threshold of 0.7. This aspect was tested using 15 variables as indicated on the number of items on the SPSS output table. The standard deviation indicated in the table shows a range of 0.744 – 1.35 thus the role played by academic staff in curriculum development based responses were similar. Moreover, the mean responses indicated that respondents agreed that role played by academic staff in curriculum development has a significant contribution on effective implementation of the curriculum.

Table 4.3 shows outcomes on the Reliability Test on stakeholders involved in curriculum development. The Cronbach’s Alpha test generated a coefficient value of 0.851 which affirmed that the conclusions from the study were reliable. The mean values ranged from 3.70–4.50 signifying that most of the respondents were in agreement to the multiple questions on the stakeholders involved in curriculum development construct. Additionally, the standard deviation values range from 0.84 – 1.07 certifying that there were no outliers in the general responses from the 40 respondents.

Reliability Test on reasons for involving academic staff in curriculum development on Table 4.4 yielded a coefficient value of 0.728 certifying the Likert scale results reliable. The mean values ranged from 3.47 – 4.50 indicating that majority of the responses were strongly agreeing to the questions presented on reasons for involving academic staff in curriculum development in the Likert scale. Also the standard deviation values complement the mean interpretation, by reviewing that most responses were similar from the 40 respondents.

4.2 Correlation Analysis of the nature of relationship

In accordance with the sample, 59 questionnaires were distributed and out of these, 40 were completed and returned giving a response rate of 68%. This is consistent with the views by Creswell (2013) who states that the higher the response rate, the more valid the findings of the research. According to Richardson (2005) for an attractive business research, the response rate must be at least 65% in order to present a higher confidence level in the findings. Borg and Gall (1990) weigh in by supporting this assertion when they say a response rate of approximately 60% should be the goal of any researcher.

Table 4.5: Descriptive statistics from the correlations performed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>TB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.555**</td>
<td>.536**</td>
<td>.485**</td>
<td>.568**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (two-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.555**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.581**</td>
<td>.644**</td>
<td>.659**</td>
<td>.530**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (two-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.536**</td>
<td>.581**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.567**</td>
<td>.617**</td>
<td>.652**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Analysis of responses on involvement of academics in curriculum development.

As shown in Table 4.2, association between involvement of academics in curriculum development and effective delivery of that curriculum was tested using the regression analysis where the coefficient value of 0.555 was generated showing that involvement of academics in curriculum development has some influence of 45% on affecting the outcome on the dependent variable effective delivery of curriculum. This finding shows that 45% influence on effective delivery of curriculum can be explained by other factors which can be the basis for future studies. In response to the question, ‘Do you think there is ownership of Education 5.0 among lecturers, one male respondent aged 45 answered:

‘There is no ownership on Education 5.0 since as it stands a lot of lecturers do not have a clear picture of what it is, so talking of ownership on a curriculum which is vague to them is impossible’.

The findings are supported by literature that states that, organisations function well when they engage in participative leadership styles where employees participate in decision-making processes. Failure to involve employees in decisions that directly affect them results in ineffective service delivery according to Washington (2018).

4.4 Regression Analysis of responses on stakeholder involvement in curriculum development

The study investigated whether stakeholder involvement in curriculum development caused effective delivery of the curriculum. Based on the literature reviewed stakeholder involvement in curriculum development was measured using seven parameters. Responses gathered were presented in Table 4.2 as seen on the output diagram from the SPSS version 25.

The coefficient value of .485 showing that stakeholder involvement in curriculum development influences academics to effectively deliver curriculum by 49% with 51% influence being accounted for by other factors not covered in the present study thus presenting an opportunity for other researchers to investigate on these factors. The findings entail that in as much as CUT engages in stakeholder involvement in curriculum development the result shows that it leads to a positive improvement curriculum delivery by 22% coefficient level. The findings are supported by literature where several scholars including Askdin (2011) and Washington (2018) state that employees always give off their best when they are involved in any development initiative.

4.5 Analysis of responses on role played by academics in curriculum development

This study had an objective to determine the effects of the role played by academics in curriculum development. A number of questions were asked on a five point Likert Scale on the questionnaire. Responses gathered are presented in Table 4.2.
The coefficient value of .693 showing that the role played by academics in curriculum development has an influence of 69% in affecting effective curriculum delivery leaving 31% influence to be explained by other factors not covered in this study. On this basis, a foundation for future studies is laid, to investigate on the other factors accounting for 31% influence. The study also tested a hypothesis on the relationship between the role played by academics in curriculum development and effective curriculum delivery and found out that the role played by academics in curriculum development is positively related to effective delivery of the curriculum. This was supported by Kumar (2015) who states that the t-test should exceed 2. In this study it yielded 2.17. The findings were also supported by other scholars such as Morh and Webb, (2005) who contend that roles played by academics in curriculum development ensure that academic staff effectively implements the curriculum as they feel motivated to do so since they will be part of the curriculum development phase.

4.6 Regression Analysis

Table 4.6: Showing descriptive statistics from the regression analysis performed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Regression coefficient</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Standardized coefficient (Beta)</th>
<th>Sig. value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td></td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td></td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 shows that an increase in the involvement of academics in curriculum development will lead to an increase in their effectiveness to deliver the curriculum. The hypothesis on the association between involvement of academics in curriculum development and effectiveness in delivering that curriculum generated a P-Value of 0.035 as shown in Table 4.5 above. Thus the study accepted the alternative hypothesis and at the same time rejected the null hypothesis given that all the values ranging from 0.000 to 0.5 show existence of the relationship. This proves that a positive relationship exists between involving academic staff in curriculum development and effectiveness of delivering that curriculum. Acceptance of H_1 was shown by the P-value of 0.0035 was significant at 5%. A female interviewee aged 46 remarked:

‘Yes, if I am consulted, I will happily and confidently deliver the curriculum in front of my students’.

Another female interviewee who is aged 50 added:

‘The problem with people at the top is that they want to think for us. Look, I do the course synopsis, draw up course outlines, teach the students, and prepare assessments through assignments and examinations and I mark. If those at the top do not involve me in curriculum development, I really don’t care. It will be business as usual for me’.

4.7 The relationship between academics involvement in curriculum development and staff motivation

This was tested using the regression analysis where a P-value of 0.044 was yielded and this made the study to accept the assertion that involvement of academics in curriculum development has a positive influence on staff motivation. Therefore we accept H_1 and reject H_0 as the P-Value is less than 0.5. Acceptance of H_1 was shown by as the P-value of 0.044 that was significant at 5%. The findings entail an improvement in involvement of academics in curriculum development will ensure an improvement on staff motivation by 56.2% coefficient value. All the interviewees admitted that they were consulted in curriculum development at departmental level, but they were all not consulted when it came to major curriculum development decisions such as Education 5.0 which they said were a policy pronouncement from the top. One male interviewee aged 55 categorically stated:

‘We just heard that we now have five pillars to make Education 5.0 but we were not consulted as to what was wrong with the three pillars of academia which are used internationally. Zimbabwe is not an island. We belong to a community of universities world-wide. For example, to me, Innovation and Industrialisation have always been the outcomes of research and research is already a third pillar. There was really no need to pretend that Innovation and Industrialisation are new but authorities should have simply re-emphasized the need to strengthen research so
The above response shows that academics were eager to be consulted but they were not consulted.

5. Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Summary of findings

The following findings came out of the study:

5.1.1 Academic staff involvement in curriculum development leads to effective delivery of the curriculum.
5.1.2 An increase in academic staff involvement in curriculum development will result in an increase in effective curriculum delivery. This finding entailed that authorities should always endeavour to involve academic staff before any decision to change or develop a curriculum is made.
5.1.3 Increase in the involvement of academic staff in curriculum development leads to increase in staff motivation as shown by 56.2% coefficient value. Therefore, there is an association between involvement of academics in curriculum development and their motivation.
5.1.4 Roles played by academic staff in curriculum development influence effective delivery of curriculum
5.1.6 The study established that academic staff was not consulted when it came to major curriculum development matters such as the introduction of Education 5.0, STEM and Minimum Bodies of Knowledge.

They felt that industrialisation and innovation pillars were already imbedded in the pillar of Research.

5.2 Conclusions

Study drew the following conclusions:

5.2.1 The study drew the conclusion that staff were not motivated to implement a curriculum which they were not part of during its development stage. This negatively affects the effectiveness of curriculum implementation.
5.2.2 It was concluded that the roles played by academic staff in curriculum development have an influence on effective delivery of the curriculum. There is a significant positive relationship between roles played by academic staff and effective delivery of curriculum

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the research findings and the conclusions, the following recommendations were proffered:

5.3.1 Academics staff should always be involved in curriculum development especially on major curriculum issues such as the doctrine Education 5.0, Minimum Bodies of Knowledge and STEM.
5.3.2 Higher education institutions should continue involving academic staff in developing course outlines, doing assessment and evaluation as well as conducting stakeholder consultations because doing so increases their effectiveness in curriculum implementation.
5.3.3 Authorities should avoid the top-down approach to curriculum development which was employed in major curriculum changes as this makes lecturers not to be effective in curriculum implementation. Instead, authorities should always use the bottom-up approach which is also a participatory or consultative approach.
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