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ABSTRACT

This study focuses on the effective implementation of C2005 by the Grade 7 teachers in the Motherwell area. For teachers to meet the demands of the new curriculum, in-service training is needed to develop them to be competent in all the aspects required for the use of the OBE approach. The main research question is: How have Grade 7 teachers in Motherwell implemented C2005 in their classrooms?

Questionnaires and interviews were used as tools to collect the data. The data was collected from five selected primary schools in the Motherwell area. The teachers’ responses obtained from questionnaires and interviews were analyzed both statistically (using tables) and descriptively (telling teachers’ stories). Responses determined the competence of teachers in four areas, namely, teaching methods, content, classroom organization and assessment of learners. An account of in-service training courses attended by teachers is provided. These courses revealed the problems encountered by teachers during the implementation process and the subsequent assistance they received.

The data provided in this study is in line with the research done by the Review Committee (Chisholm, 2000) in the Eastern Cape. Recommendations of the Review Committee gave rise to the establishment of the Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS). The responses from this study confirmed the need for re-training of teachers to develop their competences.

This study urges the Department of Education to focus on establishing methods of training that will develop teachers in their teaching experience. The SMTs should also be able to assist teachers with the problems they encounter in their schools. Teachers should be able to take responsibility for their learners’ competence and take ownership of changes in their schools.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE FIELD OF STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a brief history of the South African education system from the 1980s to the present. This history provides the background for the study.

The delimitation of the research is stated where the boundaries are explained in terms of the five chosen schools. New concepts are then defined to develop a common understanding of terms. Assumptions are also given, followed by the importance of the research. The brief review of literature provides the reader with a glimpse of theory on which the study is based, while the research methodology states the research question and sub-questions. The chapter concludes with an overview of chapters that follow.

1.2 CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Up to 1994 there were differences between Black, Coloured, Indian and White education. As a result provincial education departments developed their own subject curricula, and education and training were regarded as separate and incompatible areas of schooling. Politically, administratively and educationally, there was a need for integration and innovation (Malan, 1997, p.3; Le Grange and Reddy, 1998, p.1).

In the 1980s ‘People’s Education’ was developed. Political activists viewed the classroom as a central site of the struggle against apartheid. In the period 1985-1990 this phenomenon came to represent a radical pedagogic alternative to that of ‘Bantu Education’. The focus was on critical thinking, interdisciplinary curriculum content, learner-centredness, participatory teaching methods and community involvement (Jansen and Christie, 1999, p.22-24; Mashaba, 1991, p.25-27; Kraak, 1998, p.2).

Although the National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI) was initiated by the National Education Co-ordinating Council (NECC) in early 1991 and it
completed its work in 1992 (Jansen and Christie, 1999, p.24), this was still done within an apartheid system of government. On the one hand, the aim of the NECC was to develop education ‘policy options’ for the broad democratic movement. The NECC believed that real education must not be an authoritarian system in which teachers tell the learners what they should learn, and the authorities tell the teachers what they must teach – it should come from the people (Mashaba, 1991, p.27). On the other hand the NECC supplied a basic system for thinking about democratic education after apartheid (Jansen and Christie, 1999, p.4).

South Africa experienced political changes in 1994 with the transformation to a fully democratic government. These changes also influenced the education sector. The National Training Strategy Initiative (NTSI) was published in 1994. This arose from the ashes of the previous government's unilateral and premature attempt to reform industrial training via the aborted 1991 NTSI (Jansen and Christie, 1999, p.30). The significance of this initiative was that it was the first multipartite stakeholder forum (including both the ANC/COSATU alliance and government departments of the previous regime) to formally propose the creation of an integrated Education and Training System. The NTSI argued for a paradigm shift “from thinking about education and training as separate entities to thinking about learning as a lifelong process” (Jansen and Christie, 1999, p.20).

At the same time the African National Congress (ANC) published a number of additional policy documents prior to the 1994 elections that consolidated its commitment to the idea of an integrated Education and Training System. The most important of the documents were A Policy Framework for Education and Training released in January 1994, and the manual An Implementation Plan for Education and Training released just before the April 1994 elections. Both documents supported a vision of an integrated Education and Training system premised on the idea of lifelong learning (Jansen and Christie, 1999, p.34).

In March 1995 the publication of The White paper on Education and Training gave official state sanction - for the first time - to the idea of an integrated Education and Training system. The state then enacted the South African
Qualifications Act in October 1995, which provided for the establishment of a single national South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA). The primary responsibility of SAQA was to oversee the development and implementation of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) and to set up the necessary governance structures (Engelbrecht, 1995, p.160).

This was followed by the release of the first public document of the National Department of Education on its approach to curriculum development and learning in March 1997. The document was entitled *Curriculum 2005: Lifelong learning for the Twenty-First Century*. It endorsed the ideas of an integrated system, the emphasis on lifelong learning, and the development of the NQF with 8 levels comprising three bands (General Education and Training, Further Education and Training and Higher Education and Training) (Jansen and Christie, 1999, p.35; Pretorius, 1998, p.8; Olivier, 1998, p.41-51).

Although South Africa had developed a new curriculum, there were many flaws in it. The Minister of Education and other education officials gave reasons in different newspapers for the problems encountered by schools in the implementation of the new curriculum (Vally 2000: April-June p.13; Potenza, 2000, 15 June p.14; Chisholm, 2000, p.10-12). Various critics such as Jansen and Christie (1999, p.30) and those who contributed to newspapers such as *The Teacher* and *The Teacher’s Voice* expressed concern about possible flaws in the new curriculum. Their concern was about what should have been done before the implementation of the new curriculum took place (Jansen and Christie, 1999, p.9-17; p. 145-154).

I spoke to teachers from various schools in Motherwell on problems that they had experienced when trying to implement what they were exposed to at training workshops. These conversations took place in the staff room at my school and in the bus when going to and from work. Their concern was linked to the process of implementing OBE. They found that they always went back to the old syllabus and the way that they taught in the past. This happened in all the learning areas that they taught. I then developed an interest in the matter and decided to research it. I was aware of the research that was done nationally but
I felt that the voice of the Motherwell teachers had not been heard in that survey. Hence, the sample chosen for my research is a group of teachers from five schools in Motherwell. This work is an attempt to address the problems encountered by some of these teachers, in the implementation of Curriculum 2005 (C 2005).

1.3 DELIMITATION OF RESEARCH

While the Report of the Review Committee (Chisholm, 2000) dealt with implementation of C2005 on a national basis, this study will focus on only five selected teachers of Grade 7 classes in five Motherwell Primary schools. These schools are in an urban area of the Eastern Cape. The problems encountered in rural schools in this Province may differ from those in the sample. Further, the schools in the sample are those classified as ‘previously disadvantaged’ schools. An implication of this is that their problems will again differ from those experienced by the teachers in well-resourced schools.

The study will determine and evaluate factors that resulted in the ineffective implementation of C2005 in Grade 7 in these schools. It is limited to the context of primary schools. Problems in teaching, experienced at this level may differ from those of high school teachers. The study will not evaluate factors that are beyond education limits such as social problems and health problems. The focus will be on the teacher and not the learner.

1.4 DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS

Outcomes-based education (OBE) - this is the new system that deals with the outcomes at the end of a series of lessons. This is achieved when the learners demonstrate that they have reached the desired outcome or goal (Chisholm, 2000, p.27). According to Spady (1994, p.11) OBE involves focusing and organizing everything in an educational system around what is essential for all students to be able to do successfully at the end of the learning experience.
Curriculum 2005 (C2005) - the new education system that has been adopted in South Africa to be used in South African schools (Oliver, 1998, p.5; Spady, 1994, p.27; Killen, 2000, p.vii). C2005 is defined as: “OBE curriculum derived from nationally agreed on critical cross-field outcomes that sketch our vision of a transformed education and the role it has to play in creating it. C2005 is a vehicle to deliver the critical outcomes defined in the NQF” (DoE, 1997, p.16).

Review Committee – a committee elected by the Minister of Education to evaluate the implementation of C2005 (Chisholm, 2000, p.22)

1.5 ASSUMPTIONS
Assumptions may be regarded as true facts that may not be researched but thought to be existing.

The first assumption is that teachers are qualified to teach. The perception is that teachers have been trained for two or three years before they teach in their classrooms. They were expected to understand the theories of learning and the methods of teaching. Although they received training, they were trained during the apartheid era where they were expected to be subserviant. Teachers were not supposed to add to what was designed or change it in any way. They accepted what was provided for them and implemented it as stated.

A second assumption is that teachers buy into the new system. Judging by the activities done by the teacher organizations it is assumed that teachers are keen to change. They accept that the change is needed and they want to move towards a democratic South Africa. The apartheid era was not accepted by all teachers at the time. Only those who had the heart and the elements of apartheid were in favour of the government of the time.

Finally it is assumed that training was provided to teachers for the new curriculum. The Department of Education provided a one-week in-service training session for all schools nationally. In these sessions ‘experts’ were used to train teachers. Most of the teachers attended training but some did not, and for those who did not attend, the ‘cascade model’ of passing on information was
used. Certain teachers were trained to facilitate during training or to train the others. This model assumed that all the teachers received some form of training.

1.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESEARCH

The focus of change in South Africa was the establishment of the new curriculum. Curriculum 2005 focuses on lifelong learning and outcomes. The process of implementing C2005 was problematic in Motherwell, a suburb of Port Elizabeth in the Eastern Cape, where the researcher is a teacher. Many teachers seem to me unable to implement C2005.

The Review Committee attempted to uncover problems but this was done over a broad spectrum nationally. A small number of schools was chosen in the Eastern Cape. The teachers in the Motherwell area were not aware of the Review Committee’s workings. This study will focus on how teachers are implementing C2005 in a small area in Motherwell. The findings of this study are significant to both teachers and the department officials because it will help with the future planning of teacher training for implementation of the recommendations of the Review Committee.

This study is also significant because it will allow for a smooth transition to OBE. It will also enable teachers to cope better with the new methodologies. Teaching and learning will be improved because innovative methods could be suggested as a result of the study. If teachers take ownership of the implementation process, schools could operate at optimal levels.

1.7 A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Jansen and Christie (1999) have a strong concern about the relevance of the new system in the South African context and the manner in which it was introduced. Their work will guide this study to find the flaws that exist in the implementation process of C2005 in the five schools. By looking at Pretorius’ work (1998) one can place the current situation in a historical perspective.
The Report of NEPI (1992) provides a well-structured history of the South African education system during the apartheid period. All the related organisations and structures that helped to restructure, reform and transform education in South Africa are well illustrated. The NEPI report will give the background of the South African education system and place this study in perspective. Sparg and Winberg (1999, p.27) provide teachers with an extremely useful tool for understanding the historical context in which new curriculum concepts have emerged in South Africa since 1994.

The new curriculum is integrated in Garson (1999, p.12) and ideas on the classroom, evaluation of lessons and related issues are clearly illustrated. This study will provide information and guidance about the classroom practice. The Report of the Review Committee (2000) stresses the need for the evaluation of C2005 in the Eastern Cape’s selected schools with the results generalised to all Eastern Cape schools. The report will guide this study in terms of the difficulties encountered by teachers in the implementation process of C2005. It will also allow for a comparison of what was found with schools in general in the Eastern Cape with the results from five chosen schools.

Policy documents from the national Department of Education (1997) will enable the reader to understand the significance of legislation in this study. Such documents provide an insight into what the Department of Education expected in the implementation process. This study, in turn, provides a view of how the implementation process was actually carried out.

1.8 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research is the scientific process applied with the purpose of discovering unknown facts, that is, to discover the undiscovered so as to bring the unknown to the fore (Leedy, 1989, p.5). A descriptive approach will be used to determine the implementation problems in the Grade 7 classes in some Motherwell primary schools. Descriptive research describes the characteristics of an existing phenomenon (Salkind, 1999, p.11). The problem being researched is the way in which C2005 was implemented in Grade 7 by Motherwell teachers. The
A descriptive approach lies within the qualitative research methodology paradigm. This approach will focus on narrating the experiences of the teacher.

1.8.1 Method

According to Leedy (1980, p.133) the normative descriptive survey method requires the researcher to observe with intense accuracy, the phenomenon of the moment and to describe precisely what is being observed.

Questionnaires and interviews were designed as tools for the collection of data from the population. The questionnaire is a widely used and useful instrument for collecting information and providing structured data, and often being comparatively straightforward to analyse (Wilson and McLean, in Cohen and Manion, 2000, p.245).

In this study I plan to work with five schools so that I will be in a position to personally administer the questionnaires. Cluster sampling was used to choose teachers who took part in the data collection (Salkind 1999, p.93) from five schools in Motherwell.

1.8.2 Research question

This study will provide a description of the factors that led to the way Grade 7 teachers implemented C2005 in their classes. The perception is that teachers are key components in the education field concerning delivery in class. Qualified teachers are expected to perform well in their duty, namely, educating a child. If they cannot comply with the basic rule, ‘to teach effectively’ people start-posing questions such as: Why are they unable to teach? Were they well trained? Did they master the content of the course?

Implementation of the new curriculum will not be effective if teachers are not supported and motivated by the government and the relevant structures. Therefore, teachers should be obliged to develop themselves so as to make an impact on their learners and their community. The emphasis will be on in-
service training, the implementation process and future plans of the education department so as to make certain proposals in this regard.

The main research question is: **How have Grade 7 teachers in Motherwell implemented C2005 in their classrooms?**

In order to answer this research question three sub-questions were developed.

**1.8.3 Sub–questions**

A. What in-service programmes were implemented to provide support for the teachers?

B. What strategies from the literature could be utilised to determine whether effective teaching is occurring within C2005?

C. How does the implementation process in the Motherwell Primary schools compare with what can be considered to be ‘good practice’?

**1.9 OUTLINE OF THE RESEARCH**

Chapter 1 provides a background to the field of study. It also indicates the direction of the literature survey and the methodology to be used.

In chapter 2 the history and transformation of education in South Africa will be the focus. This chapter will trace the need for change in the education system in South Africa. The literature gives an account of the new curriculum and the reason for the need in this country. Literature on OBE implementation will be consulted and reviewed on different aspects that led to change in the education system in South Africa.

The methodology underpinning this research is dealt with in chapter 3 together with a brief description on how the data will be collected. In chapter 4 the data from questionnaires will be analysed and supplemented with the transcript from interviews held with the teachers. How C2005 was implemented in the Motherwell primary schools will be determined by questionnaires that were distributed to 5 primary schools and interviews that were conducted with
selected Grade 7 teachers to obtain their stories on the implementation process. In this chapter the data will also be analysed by referring to the tools that were used to collect it as well as the literature that assisted with the analysis.

Chapter 5 deals with a summary of the findings obtained from the analysis in chapter 4. These findings lead to recommendations for future implementation.

Having provided a background to this study, the next chapter will look at literature related to how the new curriculum was intended to be implemented.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the selected literature aims to substantiate the facts relevant to the research. The literature used in this study helped to reveal the facts about the history and the changes to the curriculum in the South African education system. Literature is reviewed under the headings, curriculum development; the emergence of outcomes-based education in South Africa; factors affecting curriculum development and change; teaching and learning methods; content; classroom organization; assessment of learners; and Curriculum 2005.

The literature review included in this study provides information about the history of South African education and how it developed to where it is now. It also reveals various authors’ perceptions about the new curriculum. All the headings dealt with in this chapter are significant for the study and provide information that helps understand the problem that led to the research.

The emergence of Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) in South Africa deals with how OBE appeared here and how it is managed in this context. While factors affecting curriculum development aim to show what made things difficult to implement OBE in South Africa, the next section focuses on aspects that influence curriculum development. Here, teaching and learning methods that teachers can use when they teach the new curriculum are considered, together with an understanding of assessment of learners.

Finally, a focus on Curriculum 2005 (C2005) provides details of the new curriculum, the relationship between C2005 and OBE, pitfalls of OBE, the remedial process and the role of the Department of Education in the implementation process.
2.2 CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

When change takes place in a government, different sectors or departments are affected either directly or indirectly. Change in South Africa has also impacted on the national curriculum. The planning of learning opportunities intended to bring about certain changes in pupils and the assessment of the extent to which these changes have taken place is what is meant by curriculum development (Nichols and Nichols, 1983, p.14).

Carl (1995, p.40) states that curriculum development is regarded as an umbrella and a continuing process in which structure and systematic planning methods figure strongly in design and evaluation. It comprises a number of phases, namely, those of curriculum design; curriculum dissemination; curriculum implementation; and curriculum evaluation. He further states that the final goal of curriculum development is to bring into being more effective education by means of more meaningful curricula. For that reason any change requires thorough consideration. Curriculum development is considered in terms of principles as well as issues of reform.

2.2.1 Principles of curriculum development

There are two aspects to be considered when dealing with principles of curriculum development (Carl, 1995, p.71). The first is that change is unavoidable when dealing with curriculum development, because life grows and develops through change.

Curriculum changes, which have taken place earlier, may continue together with changes brought about at a later stage. Changes may take place over a long period of time and even overlap newer developments. Older content may still be dealt with even though more recent content has been added. The relevance and importance of older content is not lost as soon as more recent changes take place. A review of older design can lead to a new perspective.
The second issue is that curriculum change is a result or consequence of change that takes place in society. The 1976 unrest because of so-called Bantu Education, where people were against the dominance of so-called White Education, is an example of this. Curriculum developers must, therefore, try to change those people who will eventually influence curriculum change. Teachers must be involved with curriculum development so that they may be bound to it. In this way changes and renewal may be internalized. All stakeholders involved must have the maximum opportunity to have input in the envisaged changes, because their support during the implementation phase may be needed.

According to Carl (1995, p.73) curriculum development should be based on specific and accountable principles. A summary of some of these principles appear below:

- Purposefulness is an important aspect of effective curriculum development;
- The rationale must be clear and communicable;
- Curriculum development must be based on sound accountable curriculum theory;
- Methods are an important characteristic;
- Effective and ongoing evaluation from the design phase to the evaluation phase is essential;
- Effective leadership must occur;
- A particular level of curriculum development ability is necessary for all those involved;
- Effective time utilization and orientation allows for effectiveness;
- Adequate learning must be an important point of departure;
- Relevance is an important characteristic of effective curriculum development;
- Meaningful connection between the various elements is necessary throughout the whole process;
- Individualization must be considered during planning;
- The claims of subject content must be taken into account; and
- Applicable educational principles for learning are essential (Carl, 1995, p.68).
Having listed these principles above, other principles also contribute to assist in the process of renewal and change. Co-ordination can contribute to curriculum development taking place on a planned basis. Skilled persons can process and utilize information countrywide to the benefit of education departments and education institutions.

The above principles state clearly that curriculum development needs teamwork, dedication and knowledge of the field with which one is dealing. The team should have a goal and should be able to use co-ordinated and co-operative skills. Also the team should be innovative in nature and be able to link the previous curriculum with the new so as not to overlook important facts from the previous one. It is a known fact that change involves controversy (Pretorius, 1998, p.v). Furthermore, it is pointless even to try to improve a school if the leader is not open to change. This aspect will be pursued when analyzing how the training workshops were conducted.

### 2.2.2 Curriculum reform

In order for curriculum developers to be effective some of the history of education reform of the 1980s and 1990s mentioned in Chapter 1 must be considered. These can be integrated within four phases (Vally, 2000, p.7). These are design, dissemination, implementation and evaluation.

Curriculum design is the phase where a new curriculum is planned, or where an existing curriculum is reviewed and re-planned. This is done after a full re-evaluation has been carried out. In the period directly after our democratic election there was a great need for re-curriculation.

Curriculum dissemination is the phase when curriculum clients are prepared for the intended implementation, and information is distributed. This is done through either the distribution or the publication of information, ideas and notions during in-service training in order to prepare all those involved and to inform them of the proposed curriculum.
Curriculum implementation is the phase when the relevant design is applied in practice. This is the stage where we are now in South Africa.

In curriculum evaluation it must be remembered that not only must the success and effectiveness of the curriculum be evaluated but also the effect of the curriculum on pupils. Aspects of this nature were considered by the Review Committee (Chisholm, 2000, p.14).

In South Africa the new curriculum was designed by the government and other stakeholders in an attempt to equalize education for all races living in the country. The old curriculum was evaluated and changes were made to suit current needs. After that, policy documents were designed nationally and distributed to all provinces for the in-service training of teachers. Curriculum implementation was intended for all schools after the training was done. During the implementation process the government mandated the Review Committee to do research to determine the success of the programme. Thereafter the Review Committee made recommendations for the revision of the curriculum. The Revised National Curriculum Statement (DoE, 2002) was designed to assist teachers with effective implementation.

2.3 EMERGENCE OF OUTCOMES-BASED EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

Jansen and Christie (1999, p.14) state that Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) did not emerge as an easily followed and complete curriculum reform in South Africa. They further state that its origin lies in a number of desperate influences. They are both internal (for example, the competency debates in labour) and external (for example, the Spady version of OBE in the United States); both historical (the apartheid legacy) and contemporary (managing the contradictory claims of reconstruction, redistribution and reconciliation); both educational (performance-based learning) and economic (globalization pressures to participate meaningfully in competitive economies).
The emergence of OBE in South Africa was primarily because of political pressures. “The historical account further suggests that politics remain a primary force in shaping the timing, focus and content of curriculum policy in democratic states” (Jansen and Christie, 1999, p.15). Before 1994, the entire South African Education system was organized along racial lines (Pretorius, 1998, p.1). As an apartheid state South Africa managed a centralized curriculum policy system, which was variously described as racist, Euro-centred, sexist, authoritarian, prescriptive, unchanging, context blind and discriminatory (Jansen and Christie, 1999, p.4).

After the 1994 democratic elections there was in principle a non-racial education system which was based on the principles of equity and which provided for central as well as provincial and local organization of education. In respect of organization, the South African education system changed from a racially differentiated system to a geographically differentiated system, eliminating some of the duplication of the past government (Pretorius, 1998, p.1). This implies that education now focuses on the needs of learners according to area and not race. The needs of learners in the Eastern Cape urban areas may not be the same as those in rural areas in the same province. Education content may be the same for the whole of South Africa but each region has to design a curriculum relevant to the community it serves.

The NECC, itself a nominal alliance of progressive education and labour stakeholders, initiated NEPI to develop education ‘policy options’ for the broad democratic movement, in effect the African National Congress and its allies (Jansen and Christie, 1999, p.4). What NEPI did was to provide a broad values framework for thinking about democratic education policy after apartheid. This framework emphasized non-racism, non-sexism, democracy, equality and redress as the platform for post-apartheid education policy (Report of the NEPI, 1992, p.3). Although there was great endeavor to change, some writers like Jansen and Christie (1999, p.3-17) and Henson (2001, p.824-825) believe that change will take time to be in place. Lindsay (1992, p.86) in Henson (2001, p.825) wrote:

If educational apartheid is to be dismantled, concrete innovative policies and practices must be initiated rather than the perpetuation of ingenious methods of stagnation, which characterize the legislative and educational policies of the White South African government. This necessitates the clear recognition
for a constitutional change leading to a new government with a unitary system of education with equal provision for all students. In the interim and during a transitional period, local school administrators and structures can play pivotal roles in moving toward effective schooling in a post-apartheid period.

Although endeavors had been made in the past to come up with the relevant education system there were obstacles that made things difficult to achieve the people’s goal. Pretorius (1998, p.1) states that when people experience change they develop fear and suspicion. That is what took place in South Africa when the new education system appeared.

2.4 FACTORS AFFECTING CURRICULUM CHANGE IN SOUTH AFRICA

Earlier, principles of curriculum development advocated by Carl (1995) were focused on. The focus is now on a few factors that affected curriculum change in South Africa. Vally (2000) noted three particular issues and, in addition, the role of the teacher which should also be considered.

2.4.1 Implementation Issues

It is clear that the conditions and context for effective implementation of C2005 are not in place in most schools. “The neglect of implementation issues in the new education policies is a fundamental flaw which has severely comprised the capacity of these policies to deliver change” (Vally, 2000, p.4). The Department of Education did not plan the implementation process accordingly. Vally (2000, p.4) argues that the department should have focused on the “point of practice on the ground, rather than ideal type statements of intention, blueprints or magic bullets”. The implication is that the Department of Education is dealing with the theory rather than with practice. Teachers have to invent for themselves classroom implementation after training. They should have been able to rely on information obtained from facilitators to support them.
2.4.2 Issues on Learning Support Material

The availability, quality, use, evaluation of and tendering for Learning Support Material (LSM) for C2005 is described by Vally (2000, p.8) as “messy”. Teachers are facing a problem of insufficient LSM for learners to use in the classrooms. Further, the quality of OBE textbooks produced is compromised by the lack of appropriate levels of complexity for each grade. Suggestions from different trainers state that teachers can make their own support materials. That is true only if teachers were able to understand what was done during training.

2.4.3 Policy Issues

The redeployment and rationalization policy and the decentralization of the financial affairs aggravated the extreme resource shortage and teacher unpreparedness. The oversupply of policies went uncoordinated. This resulted in uncertainty and contradictions in the policy process itself (Vally, 2000, p.5).

C2005 is a new education system that needs to be developed and understood by both teachers and Department officials. Teachers need to be in a position to implement a new education system but at the same time some of them had to prepare to be redeployed to other schools. With rationalization the whole system had to be re-organised, resulting in a reduction of the number of employees. Teachers were not aware of the strategies used in the rationalization process. Employees were found to be tense while waiting for the announcement of the decision-makers. Such insecurities are not conducive to change.

Further, the decentralization of the financial affairs made things even worse because money is the primary factor in the changes to curriculum development. Training, training material, implementation and the functioning of the whole process depends on the availability of funds to be successful. Also, schools need guidance in a new education system. This guidance was in the form of documentation, and these documents needed to be replicated for all the schools in a certain area. Making copies for many schools needs material, which in turn requires that funds
are available. In the Eastern Cape the points at which material had to be duplicated reported budgetary constraints.

2.4.4 The Role of Teachers

Pretorius (1998, p.3) states that the White paper on Education and Training (DoE, 1997, p.21) supports Lifelong Learning. This implies that learners should have the desire and the ability to continue to learn, to adapt and to develop new knowledge, skills and technologies, to move flexibly between occupations, and to take responsibility for personal performance. The provision of lifelong learning goes well beyond the provision of schooling and implies the provision of an increasing range of learning opportunities, offering learners greater flexibility in choosing where, how and at what pace they learn. That is fundamental to an outcomes-based approach.

What Pretorius states for learners is also applicable to teachers. Teachers also have an opportunity of learning and reading about the new curriculum, at their own pace. For those who have difficulty in interpreting certain concepts, knowledgeable people in schools should be available to explain those concepts.

There is a need for development and change in school curricula in every country. As the curriculum programme begins, the question arises, ‘who shall participate in curriculum planning?’ According to Doll (1996, p.415), the key issues concerning participants’ roles include some the following. What responsibilities should various personnel take in planning and improving the curriculum? What special backgrounds, skills, and abilities do they need? How may the talents of participants be used in co-ordinated ways? Also those closest to the curriculum in the day-to-day working are teachers, pupils, principals, supervisors, counselors, and others in individual schools. Of these, teachers and principals are the most closely involved in curriculum decision-making because they constitute the core elements in the teaching and learning environment (Doll, 1996, p.416).

Although in theory and in practice they are considered to be closest in curriculum decision-making, this is not necessarily what is practiced in the South African
context. Perhaps because of the legacies of apartheid, teachers and principals were unable to perform tasks they were supposed to perform. It is as if the past had created a 'lameness' in them.

Being closely involved in curriculum decision-making is not enough. What is also needed in curriculum development is the mastering of the field (being an expert) before being able to develop the curriculum. Both national and provincial departments acknowledge the lack of staff in curriculum development and support units, and the lack of administrative support for and training of these staff (Vally, 2000, p.10). Teachers and principals need training in order to be able to develop their own curriculum in their schools.

"Unless teachers are empowered to deliver high quality, there is little chance that meaningful educational improvement will occur" (Henson, 2001, p.14). Teachers need to be given control of their profession; they should be prepared to be researchers in the practice that they control. “21\textsuperscript{st} century teachers at all levels will need to be involved with research, which has been noticeably neglected by many teachers" (Henson, 2001, p.17).

In order for teachers to be successful, the aspects that influence curriculum development must be considered. These include teaching and learning methods, the classroom organization and assessment.

2.5 ASPECTS INFLUENCING CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

2.5.1 Teaching and Learning Methods

Cornesky and Lazarus (1995, p.121) maintain that in quality classrooms there is never an absolute end to learning. Learning experiences develop one from another, and the flow of knowledge continues to develop new ideas. These are introduced in a wavelike manner. This differs from traditional classroom methods.
In the traditional classroom only one idea is introduced. Lessons are directly connected to it, and work is allocated to develop an understanding of this one idea. The learners then take a test to determine if they have learned the material. Some learners pass while others fail and the teacher then moves on to the next idea. The problem with this approach is that many learners do not understand the basic idea and lag behind those who do. No provision is made to ensure that all learners gain the necessary information to move on. In addition, those learners who grasp the information quickly are forced to wait until the idea has been tested before they can go to the next learning activity. In this situation the curriculum gets in the way of learning.

With the new OBE approach to learning, learners start with an understanding of the competencies they are expected to achieve during a time frame. The teacher determines the list of competencies with input from stakeholders and learners. Although the outcomes may be listed, they must be flexible enough so that learners who go beyond what is expected are not punished or put into a ‘holding pen’ but can move forward. With the new style of learning, various teaching and learning methods are used. Murphy (1999, p.122) refers to Vygotsky’s idea of the role of the teacher as a supporter rather than a director. This approach can be linked to the concept of ‘scaffolding’. Murphy (1999, p.123), uses Woods metaphor of ‘scaffolding’, where the teacher provides the scaffold for a building but that building may be built by the learner.

Group work is one of the teaching and learning methods that supports ‘scaffolding’. The teacher and learners in a classroom should see themselves as part of a single unit. Group work allows for information to be shared amongst learners and groups can be formed for the smooth running of the learning process (Pollard, 1997, p.147).

Biott and Nias (1992, p.24-27) stipulate that the size and stability of the group enables learners to share an experience, which imitates that of belonging to a primary school. These groups have members who come from different socio-cultural backgrounds. “Differences of perspective emerge, norms develop and in time the group develops its own culture” (Biott and Nias, 1992, p.25). Whichever
developmental pathway the group follows, it will offer its own members an experience of group membership that they can use to understand the relationship between individuals and groups.

The normal procedure, on the one hand, is that these groups spend most of their time engaged in tasks related to the particular theme under review within their course of study. Tasks may be carried out individually, but a regular part of each session is sharing and discussion.

On the other hand, the teacher’s main role is to enable the group to develop and to function, so that all members are able to participate and to work with both silent and dominant members. The teacher should avoid taking a directing role due to learners’ behaviour because that will cause learners to avoid the responsibility of active membership and they will adopt passive ‘follower-ship’ and emphasize dependence on the teacher (Biott and Nias, 1992, p.26).

Furthermore the group functions best with only four or six members. They also have to rotate often so that several groups in class have the opportunity to take part. The group members work together to determine who will take responsibility for specific duties, what type of information needs to be collected, what form it will take and when and how it will be reported to the class (Cornesky and Lazarus, 1995, p.84).

Another important aspect when working with groups is to develop the learner's listening skill. This will enable learners to be attentive and co-operative. Listening is a skill on its own, but it is always used in conjunction with other teaching and learning methods. Geddes, (in Johnson and Morrow, 1981, p.78-79), states that “our purpose in listening will affect how we listen and what we select from the stream of sound”. By making the learner listen with a purpose, the teacher will be able to manage the class and groups effectively and learners will also communicate effectively as a group. When learners listen with a purpose, they will also be able to integrate what they learn with real life situations.
Creative work is another method of teaching and learning. Children remember best what they enjoy most, and if the creative activities are satisfying to them then they carry home the thoughts as well as the results (Chahin, 1988, p.55). Creative work is in line with the new curriculum because learners are also encouraged to develop skills in it as well as knowledge and positive attitudes.

The project method is also regarded as a teaching and learning method. It may be described as a centre of interest in which many aspects of learning are included. It is an integrated piece of work, involving the use of basic skills and creative work. The teachers’ stimulation and direction are vital because learners cannot work on their own in a primary school. Chahin (1988, p.58) encourages teachers to pursue the method of project work. Although project work may be given as individual tasks, the development of group tasks further shows the value of group work.

As a teacher, one should be aware that learners rarely see a link between whatever they do in the classroom and their real life, especially the young ones. A good teacher may be able to persuade some of the learners to become involved because they work so hard at making ‘it’ interesting.

Cornesky and Lazarus (1995, p.65-66) state that most learners are eager to learn when they start schooling. By the time they reach the second, third or fourth grade, many say they hate school. Learners do not lose their eagerness for learning – they simply lose their enthusiasm for being told what to learn, when to learn it, how to learn it and where to learn it. The interesting thing about teaching and learning styles is that a teacher may be teaching, but some learners are not learning because the approach may seem like a foreign language to them. These are the learners who have experienced failure so may times that they are stripped of their self-esteem and then drop out of school.

We then experience what Cornesky and Lazarus (1995, p.66) call “unmotivated learners”. These are learners who may have been denied the right to learn in ways that are “interesting and exciting”. They are often very active learners outside of class, but are not afforded the opportunity to learn in ways that meet their favoured
learning styles. For this situation, Cornesky and Lazarus (1995, p.66-67) have three ways, listed below, on how to attach every learning experience to the learner's world.

- Based on the required and recommended competencies, have learners consider ways they would like to learn so you can co-create the learning experiences together. A competency is a goal: therefore, ask them to define the ways that they would like to demonstrate that they have achieved the goal, that is, the operational definition.
- Interact with colleagues and create a cross-curricular approach to learning, thus making each learning experience meaningful to the learners. This focuses on a ‘learning community’ approach to teaching.
- Be prepared to answer the why question as it relates to why learners need to learn your subject matter; be certain to ask learners why they are in your class.

Another interesting suggestion made by Cornesky and Lazarus (1995, p.89-90) as well as Biott & Nias (1992, p.98) is that the teacher should make use of peer tutoring in class. It helps to have learners co-operate with each other in class. It provides a strong, positive experience for all learners, especially those who have difficulty in understanding.

They also state that another advantage of using peer tutors is that many times learners respond better to their peers, or in one-on-one situations. This is also true for learners who do not understand in class because they are intimidated by the teacher. Studies have shown that learners are more patient with their peers and can achieve far better results (Cornesky and Lazarus, 1995, p.90). The problem with getting learners actively involved in a lesson is being able to manage the lesson very well.

Managing a class is not an easy task. A classroom is “the most important formal arena where teachers have the opportunity to encourage pupils to behave in accordance with the school ethos” (Badenhorst and Scheepers, 1995, p.24). They
(ibid. p.29) further maintain that the teacher should never insult, embarrass or humiliate a pupil.

2.5.2 Classroom Organization

Concerning the classroom organization, good education reform uses those practices considered essential by constructivists and multiculturalists. One of these common practices is the use of small groups. The constructivists say that small group activities enhance the development of social skills and even increase learners' self-confidence because all the group members recognize the value of each of the group members (Henson, 2001, p.5-6). This can only happen if the setting in the classroom has changed, that is, learners are made to sit in small groups and not in rows as was done previously. Group learning prepares them for work situations. Shepard (in press, p.10) maintains that the ideas about social mediation of learning can be extended to groups, especially if learners are socialized into the ways of talking in a community of practice and become accustomed to explaining their reasoning and offering and receiving feedback about their developing competence as part of a social group.

Henson (2001, p.6) also states that one quality that helps us to understand the positive contact that a co-operative small group work has on learning is learners’ discourse, that is, learners talking and sharing strategies. Discourse in the classroom pulls together concepts, ideas, and conclusions. He further states that instead of traditional step-by-step formula-driven problem solving, many current education reform programmes favor a more flexible, non-linear approach because such an approach takes learners from the simple, recall learning level to higher-order thinking.

Spady (1994, p.81-83) gives details about a classroom reform approach to OBE. He states that this classroom reform is widely known as 'Mastery Learning' and has lengthy literature on its design, implementation, and effectiveness. He also calls it the other ‘face of OBE’. A key competence that teachers need to possess is how to manage group work in their classrooms.
2.5.2.1 Classroom Organization for group work

According to Pollard (1997, p.209) group work is often recommended for developing social and language skills and is a means by which pupils can support, challenge and extend their learning together. That is done through problem solving or working on a creative task.

Certain criteria are used to formulate groups. These criteria may help clarify certain issues. Possible criteria may include those listed below.

- Age Groups – these may be used as a basis for specific teaching points because of an unavoidable spread of interests and needs.
- Attainment groups – these are used for setting up specific and well-matched tasks and they are also disruptive if used as a permanent way of grouping.
- Interest groups – children need to be given an opportunity to share interest and work together from time to time. That may help in building social relationships in the class when they are of different attainment, sex, race and social class.
- Friendship group – children are fond of these as they create opportunities for social development. Though they may be helpful on the one hand, on the other they may disrupt status hierarchies among them or support stereotypes about gender, race or abilities (Pollard, 1997, p.210-211).

A teacher may use all these types of groups but try to change them more often to avoid disruption of the class. As stated they are used for specific tasks and not as permanent features.

Spady (1994, p.81-83) covered all the points touched on so far, as well as the one that is to follow, namely, assessment. For him, the education system has not changed totally. Certain issues that used to cause discomfort for learners and lead to their failure have been replaced by methods that now bring pleasure and interest in the learning process. When learners are in a non-threatening environment, it is
easier for them to succeed. This success is determined through a form of assessment.

2.5.3 Assessment of Learners

McMillan (2001, p.9) defines classroom assessment as the collection, evaluation, and use of information to help teachers make better decisions. He further states that there are four essential components to implementing classroom assessment.

- Purpose – why am I doing this assessment?
- Measurement – what techniques should I use to gather information?
- Evaluation – how will I interpret the results?
- What performance standards and criteria will I use?
- Use – how will I use the results?

Taking it from the roots of OBE, Spady (1994, p.82), believes that many who support the fundamental reform of our education system find the purpose, premises, principles, paradigm thinking, and results of OBE system exciting for several reasons. He advocates the philosophy that “all can learn and succeed”. In order to achieve this, teachers need to create conditions for all learners to experience success. OBE goes beyond the vague symbols, labels, and scores used as indicators of student learning and achievement by the traditional system. Instead it focuses on and documents the substance of what students have actually learned and what they can do. It gives teachers, parents, colleges and future employers a more accurate picture of student capabilities.

Many contemporary education reformers have continued to use assessment to hold learners, teachers, administrators, and even schools, districts and state education systems accountable, yet, have endorsed the use of authentic assessments. The difference is that authentic assessment requires learners to use the information they have learned to solve lifelike problems. Furthermore, the assessment instruments are being used in a continuous manner, unlike the traditional method of testing at
the end of the instruction, when it is too late to adjust methodologies to enhance learning (Henson, 2001, p.6).

Research by Sherpard (in press, p.11) shows that many teachers rely on a traditional, pretest-posttest design to document student progress, but then do not use information from the pretest instruction. At the same time, other teachers especially in reading, language and arts, have used prior knowledge activation techniques but without attending to the assessment insight provided. This research motivates teachers to use all the aspects of assessment as evidence during the students’ progress.

Scott (2001, p.41) defines assessment as a 'pervasive phenomenon'. It is a defining feature of social life and a fundamental tool for human beings used to make sense of both the natural and the social world. It is a necessary element in the reasoning process that must be gone through in order to map out a trajectory of action to achieve a desired goal.

Assisting learners to learn and knowing what steps need to be taken to assist them individually to obtain a given learning goal requires the same kind of assessment process to be undertaken. Teachers and learners, together or separately, must work out what they need to do if they desire to obtain a given learning outcome.

Research by Malan (2000, p.1) shows the uncertainty of teachers’ understanding of assessment in the new education system. He states that not only are they unsure of how to collect evidence but also about how to record, interpret and report this evidence. During interviews with teachers he asked them why they used continuous assessment. All the teachers insisted that that was what they were told to do at in-service training workshops. The fact that none of them explicitly mentioned assessment when referring to the ways in which they planned their lessons suggested that that was also conveyed to them at workshops. According to Malan the teachers’ perception is that ‘in an outcomes-based system, no learner is allowed to fail’ (ibid. p.5).
So the problem now is: if Malan sees teachers as uncertain about assessment in the new education system, how are they going to apply what McMillan has stipulated above? McMillan (2001, p.52-75) uses an interesting term concerning assessment – High Quality Classroom Assessment (HQCA). He states that the quality of classroom assessment was determined by the extent to which specific psychometric standards of validity, reliability, fairness and practicality and efficiency were met. These standards were originally derived for large scale, published, and standardized objective tests and are still very important, at least theoretically, for most types of assessments.

McMillan (2001, p.52–75) further explains that HQCAs are technically sound and provide results that demonstrate and improve target learner learning. He says that they also inform instructional decision-making. He suggests that our understanding of learning and motivation, and our realization that much more is demanded of students than demonstrating simple knowledge, has changed how we define HQCA. Seeing that assessment is an essential part of instruction, high quality teaching and learning is impossible without resonance and trustworthy assessment.

It is also advisable that assessment is done in pencil and not in ink, so that tasks may be repeated until the performance achieves the desired standards (Pretorius, 1998, p.102).

It is important to note that features of assessment, as mentioned above, were included in the questionnaire given to teachers in the Motherwell schools. The aim was to determine if these teachers understood the new requirements of assessment.

In the next section attention is paid to what the teachers had to grapple with in the classroom. This involved understanding the philosophy underlying OBE and how it impacted on Curriculum 2005: this had to be delivered in the classroom.
2.6 CURRICULUM 2005

The emergence of the present curriculum needs to be considered in conjunction with the historical development of Curriculum 2005 (C2005) as well as some of the pitfalls experienced during the implementation process. The report of the Review Committee should also be considered in this section as it influenced the changes that have occurred.

2.6.1 The development of C2005

South Africa has attempted a major paradigm shift in education, a shift from learning and teaching focusing on content, to learning and teaching focusing on outcomes. It was decided in 1998 that a new outcomes–based curriculum would be implemented in South African schools (Malan, 1997, p.1). Curriculum reforms initiated by South Africa’s democratically elected government have resulted in the launching of C2005 (Morrow and King, 1998, p.49) in 1997.

C2005 was designed to transform and abolish the legacy of apartheid education and push South Africa, forcibly, into the 21st century. Its design plan was both bold and revolutionary. “No longer would curriculum shape and be shaped by narrow visions, reproduce the limited interests of any one particular grouping at the expense of another. It would bridge all, and encompass all. Education and training, content and skills, values and knowledge: all would find a place in C2005” (Chisholm 2000, p.3).

In the past there were differences between Black, Coloured, Indian and White education systems. Provincial education departments developed their own subject curricula, and education and training were regarded as separate and irreconcilable types of schooling. Politically, administratively and educationally, there was a need for incorporation and improvement (Le Grange and Reddy, 1998, p.1; Malan, 1997, p.3). Accordingly, development took place in the following manner:

- Opportunities needed to be created for all South Africans to become lifelong learners;
Theoretical and practical learning and teaching was integrated, giving rise to the removal of artificial boundaries between education and training;

- Education and training was made relevant to the needs of the country and of its learners;
- Credible standards and qualifications, which would be recognized and accepted nationally and internationally, were established;
- There was access to education and training to all who wish to learn; and
- A flexible education and training system offering different learning pathways where learners could accumulate credits and gain qualifications was established (Malan, 1997, p.3).

The new education programme follows a certain pattern. The government, in 1995, took the first step. A ministerial task team was appointed to prepare a discussion document on the development and implementation of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) in South Africa. This document, “Lifelong Learning through a NQF” (DoE, 1996), led to the establishment of the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) in March 1997. The second step was the development of the twelve critical cross-field outcomes (CCOs) initiated by SAQA. These CCOs encompassed life roles that could meet the needs of our country at this stage of its development.

The third step was the identification of fields of learning within which the necessary knowledge, skills and values and attitudes had to be developed, while the fourth was the identification and formulation of Specific Outcomes (SOs) for each learning area. These demonstrated Skills, Knowledge, Attitude and Values (SKAVs) to be assessed through competences.

The fifth step was the formulation of Assessment Criteria, Range Statement and the Performance Indicators. The next stage was the responsibility of curriculum developers at provincial, regional and local levels in order to develop learning programmes based on SOs that reflect CCOs identified by SAQA. The seventh stage was intended to take place at classroom level. As developers, teachers were supposed to formulate lesson objectives and design their own instructional programmes, together with assessment criteria. Lastly SAQA would appoint Quality
Assurance Bodies (QABs) to monitor teaching, learning and assessment in all places of learning to ensure that learning programmes are of equal standard (Kraak, 1998, p.18-22; Jansen and Christie, 1999, p.35).

C2005 was conceptualized soon after the 1994 democratic elections in a context of social change and policy reformation. This context shaped the trajectory of implementation in different ways. Initially the period was marked by heightened social pressure for visible change in all areas. Then, the context of belt-tightening constrained considerably, what was actually possible to deliver. C2005 became one of an oversupply of new activities and policies striving for priority regarding resources as well as attention. As discussed earlier the restructuring of national and provincial education departments, the finance and governance of education, rationalization and redeployment of teachers and creation of new legislative frameworks for policy across a wide spectrum were considered to be part of the new curriculum for effecting educational change.

The combination of changes occurred at an extra-ordinary pace and exerted severe pressure on the system. Implementation was not always thought through carefully or piloted properly and, consequently, huge stresses and strains were placed on the already over-burdened principals and teachers in an already divergent educational context. Ironically, the ‘better’ resourced schools complained of “excessive paperwork”. (Chisholm, 2000, p.5), while “Inadequately resourced schools were in addition hampered by poor infrastructure, large classes, and an absence of the technologies of teaching, including educational resources such as textbooks, exercise books, pens and pencils” (Chisholm, 2000, p6).

The Report of the Review Committee (Chisholm, 2000, p.2) highlighted research reports and papers, interviews with teachers, principals, managers, trainers, publishers and departmental officials as well as public submissions made by certain individuals, organizations and institutions. In this study, other sources of information draw on by the Review Committee will be used as points of reference to the problem. While the Review Committee focused on Grades 4 and 8 teachers nationally, this study aims to understand how Grade 7 teachers in the Motherwell
area of the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan have coped with implementing C2005. The focus will be on interviews with those teachers.

As a result of the findings of the Review Committee the strain placed on teachers in trying to attain the large number (66) of SOs was addressed by reducing these to a smaller number. The focus on range statements and performance indicators has also been removed.

The report is also based on the view that curriculum should be clearly guided by principles that promote personal and social development and transformation for the 21st century. “This is the challenge of moving from the past to beyond the legacy of apartheid as well as the challenge of the future and developing a curriculum that will provide a platform for the knowledge, skills and values for innovation and growth, and cultural creativity and tolerance for an African Renaissance” (Chisholm, 2000, p.6).

2.6.2 The Relationship between C2005 and OBE

In the public domain, OBE and C2005 are often fused together and seen as interchangeable. The subtle difference is that C2005 is a curriculum and OBE is an approach to implement C2005. Official documents link the new curriculum to national goals and do not differentiate clearly between C2005 and OBE (DoE 1997: p.4).

According to Spady (1994, p.11) OBE means focusing and organizing everything in an educational system around what is essential for student success at the end of their learning experiences. That means starting with a clear picture of what is important for students to be able to do, then organizing instruction, and assessment to make sure this learning ultimately happens. With OBE the assumption is that all learners can learn and succeed but at a different pace (Spady, 1994, p.9). This assumption requires teachers to give learners enough time and opportunities to reach a particular standard.
From the unofficial perspective, those making submissions to the Review Committee saw C2005 and OBE as being defined in terms of the principles of pedagogy (science of teaching). The basic principles were defined as result-based, learner-centered, experiential and integrated approaches, using new methods such as group work and continuous assessment and as having numerous advantages.

Some teachers see OBE as something that has given teachers in the foundation phase a new energy and tapped a creativity and skill that had formerly been hidden (Chisholm, 2000, p.18). Others value it as an approach, which does not prescribe method, but both facilitates a different approach to knowledge creation and generation as well as brings about new teaching and learning relationships. This is promoted in the Minister of Education’s “call to action: active learning” (Chisholm, 2000, p.6). There are different kinds of OBE. They differ as to how outcomes are designed, specified and assessed. The principal feature common to all OBE is a distinction between inputs and outputs. Outputs are also described as standards and are centrally designed and prescribed. Inputs are discretionary. They are generated and managed locally. They include what teachers and learners bring to learning, indigenous particularities and priorities, textbooks, management and support systems.

Therefore, OBE is generally seen as promoting equity but taking account of differences (Chisholm, 2000, p.22). In reality, the quality of outcomes is heavily dependent on the inputs. The success of OBE depends centrally on the quality of the teachers, their content knowledge, their competence with different teaching methods, and their access to learning programmes and textbooks.

The term “integration” has come into educational debate in South Africa from three different directions (Pollard, 1997, p.152). These are related but not identical. They include firstly, the discussions in the early 1990s around the relationship between education and training. Secondly, a specifically curricular initiative called “integrated studies”, explored in a few independent schools in the 1980s, and thirdly, the view that schooling is preparation for life and for work. These debates all had a bearing on the development of learning areas in Curriculum 2005.
C2005 was designed to make a fresh start for education and to challenge all those involved in the planning and delivery of education to think in a different way about things they had taken for granted. They had to re-think what should be taught and how it should be taught and assessed.

C2005 is regarded as an essential project in the transformation of South African society. It is aimed at achieving a successful, truly united, democratic and internationally competitive country with literate, creative and critical citizens leading productive, self-fulfilled lives in a country free of violence, discrimination and prejudice (DoE, 1997, p.12). Whereas there are these aims and hopes, C2005 appears to have flaws in it.

Spady (1994, p.10) maintains that, a successful outcomes-based approach depends on the creative, consistent, concurrent, systematic application of the operational principles listed below.

- **Clarity of focus on outcomes**: in outcomes-based approach there are no secrets and surprises. Learners need to know what is expected of them in the learning process and how they will be assessed. “Learner success in the fulfillment of outcomes becomes the top priority of planning and evaluation”.

- **Expanded opportunity**: although outcomes are fixed, the methods and opportunities of achieving them and time needed to perform tasks that lead to achievement, vary. Learners should be given adequate opportunities and time and different methods need to be used including remedial treatment, in order to achieve these outcomes. Thorough planning is of the utmost importance.

- **High expectation for learning success**: this means increasing the level of challenge to which learners are exposed and raising the standard of acceptable performance they must reach in order to be called “finished” or “successful.”
2.6.3 The Pitfalls of OBE

There are a number of positive developments that build learner confidence and teacher empowerment. However, these developments have come under critical scrutiny especially concerning teachers and classrooms. In South Africa criticism has begun to focus on the “openness” or lack of specificity of the curriculum. A number of interviews conducted for the C2005 Review Committee, as well as other submissions (Jansen, and Christie, 1999, p.193), have claimed that C2005 has left out or under-specified what is to be taught, how and at what level it is to be assessed. If there is no curriculum document that specifies core content to be covered, then there is a real chance that teachers will miss out key content.

Another problem with C2005 is that outcomes have been designed at phase rather than grade level. This means that there are no grade-based benchmarks against which to assess learner performance. Other countries that have introduced OBE have specified outcomes by levels rather than grades because of the very different competences of learners within the same grade. However, submissions to the Review Committee suggest that, for the foreseeable future, South African teachers require grade-by-grade assessment guidelines and learning outcomes in order to establish a minimum acceptable level of sequence and progression. It is suggested that South African teachers have to design this on their own because curriculum designers seem to have avoided prescribing content.

The orientation, training and support of teachers for implementation of C2005 took place in a unique context of rapid social change. It posed a major challenge that, possibly, was not properly seized. The process of training and orientation for implementation of C2005 began in 1997.

In late 1996 the Heads of Education Departments Committee approved a “broad strategy” for implementation (DoE, 1997). This strategy included a national pilot project and a national in-service programme for teachers. Both were to be conducted between 1st July and 31st December 1997.
The Department of Education used a strategy that was called the “Cascade Model” where it commissioned the Media in Education Trust (MiET), a non-governmental organization, to provide a core of 20 officials from each province with a basic understanding of C2005. These “master trainers” would then cascade the knowledge and understanding that they would have gained to district officials. District officials, in turn, would cascade the information to classroom practitioners and other teachers in their respective districts. This model became the primary means of preparing the majority of teachers for C2005 implementation. It is still the dominant training model, although it has been adapted quite substantially.

2.6.4 Aspects of the Report of the Review Committee

Many public submissions to the Review Committee indicated that the terminology in the C2005 documents created a number of problems (Chisholm, 2000, p.27). Firstly the language used is often vague, it uses more words than are needed, is overly academic and adopts a specialist vocabulary. For example, in the Language Literacy and Communication (LLC) document for the Foundation Phase terms like “kinaesthetic response” and “discourse markers” are used. Secondly, commonly known terms have been replaced with unfamiliar terms that tend to alienate both those with and those without some experience of the education system. For example, “learners” for “pupils”, “educators” for “teachers”, “auditory skills” for “listening skills”, “verbalize” for “say”, “tell” or “write”, “learning support material” for textbooks and other learning materials and resources (Chisholm, 2000, p.28).

In 1998 the Curriculum Management Committee (CMC) organized a two-day workshop to devise strategies aimed at improving the implementation of C2005. Since this workshop, a number of national and provincial initiatives were developed to improve implementation of C2005 (Chisholm, 2000, p.36). The follow-up training by the Department of Education (DoE) took the form of annual training workshops facilitated by DoE officials and attended by provincial and district officials. Officials interacted with draft training manuals prepared by DoE officials as well as non-governmental organisations (NGOs) to help them facilitate workshops in their respective provinces and or district. Officials believe that the quality of the training
they receive from the DoE has improved in the last few years (Chisholm, 2000, p.37).

There is evidence that even though training has been irregular, redeployment policies have created further difficulties. In some schools teachers who had received training the previous year were not given classes they were trained for, instead, teachers with no training were given those classes (Chisholm, 2000, p.39).

A number of submissions expressed concern that the Higher Education sector, colleges and NGOs, are not sufficiently involved in the training process. Where some involvement exists, it appears that mixed messages are being sent.

There is virtually no ongoing support and development from the Department Officials and School Management Team when teachers are back on site after receiving training at workshops. Observation indicates that a single subject adviser for a district in the Northern Province has had to attend to 170 schools, a number which normally requires at least six people.

In 1999 an association of NGOs, supported by the Teacher Trust, produced the Grade 7 support training materials. This association worked with the DoE to design the national training for Grade 7 that was cascaded to all provinces. Draft materials were produced in two weeks. Provincial workshops were held to interrogate these draft materials and to produce final materials. In many cases, these workshops seemed to have had the effect of weakening rather than strengthening these training materials. There is no data yet on the availability and use of these materials by Grade 7 teachers throughout the country (Chisholm, 2000, p.43).

It was in this context that concepts of the macro, meso and micro planning were borne. These concepts now strongly inform the implementation of C2005 in grades 3 and 7 in most provinces, as well as the curriculum support materials that have recently been developed for the training of grades 4 and 8 teachers.
Briefly, macro planning is an approach advocated by the DoE for designing learning programmes in the Senior Phase at school level. It is done by using a grid to cluster SOs according to Phase Organizers and Programme Organizers. Schools have been encouraged to select the same programme organizers (essential themes) for all eight learning programmes in order to facilitate integration. Theoretically, each school selects a different set of programme organizers and therefore has unique needs in terms of learning support materials to support these programme organizers.

The Report found that most teachers think that the effectiveness of implementation of the C2005 curriculum depends on textbooks. On the other hand, the policy of the training offered by both national and provincial departments from 1997-1999 suggests that teachers and learners do not need textbooks. Instead teachers were advised to design and produce their own learning programmes and learning materials.

The Review Committee (Chisholm, 2000, p.11) has observed that the DoE is a delaying factor in the co-operation with publishers and institutions for the supply of books. Furthermore the budget for textbooks and the Learning Support Material (LSM) is only spent towards the end of a financial year. Since there is no clear budget planning for the funding of LSM, this results in ad hoc funding strategies. As a result of this lack of planning, publishers do not know how many books will be required.

A major problem in most provinces, until mid-1999, was that no-one had owned or had accepted overall responsibility for LSM. Provincial officials also have no understanding of the process. Deadlines are not met and they are simply overlooked and re-negotiated. Until recently, textbooks were not delivered to schools at the beginning of the school year. Sometimes reports are given of non-deliveries and even inaccurate deliveries (Vally, 2000, p.5). The same problem is still prevalent in the Eastern Cape.
According to the Report, evaluation and selection of material was not done properly (Chisholm, 2000, p.42). Teachers chose the material they wanted without using any specific criteria. There are indications that the approval process was inconsistent and that significant numbers of poor quality books were approved while many better texts were excluded. A related problem is that once an approved list has been produced, teachers were still required to choose from among the approved titles. Garson (2000) suggested that teachers were generally not empowered to make informed choices because of the inadequate training they had. There has been little focus on the evaluation and selection of textbooks in the context of the C2005 training. Book displays often took place just before teachers had been trained in OBE. In many cases, teachers simply ordered from a catalogue without seeing the materials. These conditions do not affect all schools, as there are well-developed schools that do not experience lack of facilities and have different styles of teaching.

Another major problem in the implementation of C2005 is that of the teachers’ understanding of C2005. Most currently practicing teachers did not come to learn of Curriculum 2005 through formal training, that is, three or four years of pre-service training. The nature and sequence of implementation of C2005 has meant that they have had to rely, largely, on policy documents, workshops, views of education officials and NGOs.

The Review Committee viewed teachers as having a positive attitude to the intent and purpose of C2005 and that they were taking the challenges of implementation very seriously. Teachers at some ex-model C schools are the exception to this rule. The most positive attitude was in evidence at a school where the principal had implemented a personal development programme for teachers (Chisholm 2000, p.49).

The positive attitude occurred because of the change C2005 has brought into the classrooms. Some teachers claim that this change had been brought about by a realization that learners are more capable or resourceful than they had assumed. This resulted in a positive attitude in teachers. C2005 is seen by some people as an arrival of an important system that has provided a fresh challenge for teachers.
and a new driving force for professional development. Although the period of redeployment and retrenchment coincided with the introduction of C2005 most teachers have an interest in the new curriculum.

There are also indications that teachers involved in the implementation of C2005 have begun to work with and learn from colleagues within and across schools and that teacher talk has begun to centre around whether and what the learners benefit from in their lessons. Teachers in the Foundation Phase seem to be more positively inclined towards the implementation of C2005 than teachers at Grade 7 in the Senior Phase. Senior Phase teachers struggle with several issues such as timetabling and assessment and feel less supported than teachers at Foundation Phase (Chisholm, 2000, p.50).

Available evidence during site visits by the Review Committee indicates that the level of teacher understanding of C2005 is generally weak and that there is a wide gap between what teachers say and know and what they actually do. Most submissions express concern over the likelihood of teachers ever acquiring a deep understanding of C2005 with its associated “dazzling” array of concepts. It is often the case that when these concepts are implemented in the classroom, teachers show evidence of embracing the form rather than the spirit and content of the ideas. Teachers are still providing a great deal of direct instruction and are still pre-occupied with content coverage.

There is also a misunderstanding of what C2005 is and how it differs from OBE. For most teachers, officials and managers interviewed, C2005 and OBE are simply alternative ways of expressing the same set of ideas. There are also several popular myths about C2005 held by teachers. Some of these are: ‘C2005 has nothing to do with content’; ‘in C2005 anything goes’; ‘textbooks are not to be used in C2005’ and ‘group work is compulsory for the implementation of C2005’ (Chisholm, 2000, p.51).

Chisholm (2000, p.52) is optimistic that although there needs to be a greater understanding of the curriculum, there is evidence that much has been gained. It is
a known fact that most schools are grossly under-resourced due to political reasons but that does not keep teachers from implementing C2005. It is possible to produce resources so that the process can continue.

2.7 THE ROLE OF THE DoE IN THE IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

The development and implementation of C2005 has to be understood within the context of the roles and functions of different levels of government as stipulated in the South African constitution and other relevant frameworks. Under the principle of co-operative governance, the DoE is supposed to develop policy, norms and standards in consultation with the nine provinces. The key role and responsibility of the DoE is to develop all aspects of the policy framework for the national curriculum. The key role of the provinces, on the other hand, is to take responsibility for all aspects of the implementation of C2005. In the case of C2005, these aspects include the orientation and training of teachers, school managers and district support staff, the interpretation of C2005 policy into teacher support materials, and the provision of relevant LSM.

The Review Committee has realized that although they have uncovered these problems from teachers, the provincial capacity to implement has been affected by the extremely high turnover of leadership and management at all levels of the system. Many schools also had no principals during the first four years of the newly established Departments of Education. Only in the last few years have school principals been appointed and many of them have not received any orientation to C2005 for them to support its implementation in schools.

There are also two key source problems that affect the implementation of C2005. These are:

- Problems with transport for C2005 support officials and
- Problems with the allocation of funds and access to funds to support C2005.
Transport problems have reportedly caused several C2005 programmes to be either postponed or delayed. Provinces reported that transport is one of the main problems making ongoing support of C2005 rather difficult if not impossible.

While some provinces have allocated funds for the support of C2005, it appears that the main source of funding for C2005 at both national and provincial levels has been the Education Policy Reserve Fund (EPRF) or special grants. Feedback from many of the provinces suggests that without the EPRF, C2005 would not have been implemented at provincial level. Some provinces have a problem with the bureaucratic process required to access EPRF funding. They blame the centralization of the EPRF at provincial level and they observe a lack of a sense of urgency on the part of provincial treasury staff. Some complain of the many forms they have to fill which require the same information when they have to access the EPRF.

2.8 SUMMARY

This chapter dealt with the literature review. The literature focused on the changes that took place during the development of the South African education until the emergence of the new education system, C2005. Implementation issues of the new curriculum were also mentioned and how the policy documents expected the teachers to implement it. The role of the teacher was also mentioned together with the methods s/he is supposed to use during the implementation process. This chapter ended with the role of the Department of Education in the implementation process.

The following chapter will deal with the methodology the study used in detail. The main research question and sub-questions will be stated and discussed. The population used to collect the data will be mentioned and how the sample was selected from it.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

“Methodology concerns what may be called ‘the how’ of social science research” (Mouton and Marais, 1990, p.15). In this chapter various aspects related to research procedures will be discussed. The research methodology section deals with the manner in which the study will take place. This will be followed by the research question where a relation between the research and the methodology will be stated. After that the sub-questions will be discussed with a brief indication of how the study is trying to solve the problem of implementing C2005 in Grade 7 in certain Motherwell schools.

A discussion of the research sample follows. The section on data collection includes the tools used to collect the data. A brief description of how the data was collected is also provided. This chapter should be read in conjunction with the scope and limitations of the study, which have been highlighted in Chapter 1.

3.2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

According to Leedy (1980, p.1-7) research is “the manner in which we attempt to solve problems in a systematic effort to push back the frontiers of human ignorance or to confirm the validity of the solution to the problems others solved”. This study attempts to improve the implementation process of C2005 by using a descriptive method. “The purpose of descriptive research is to describe the current state of affairs at the time of the study and does not include a treatment or control group” (Salkind, 2000, p.192). Thus, the researcher does not try to test the influence of any one variable on another. When readers read a descriptive research report, they should be able to see the larger picture of what happened.

Leedy also states “the method of research that looks with intense accuracy at the phenomena of the moment and then describes precisely what the researcher sees is called the descriptive survey or the normative survey” (1993, p.185).
The name implies that whatever we observe at any one time is normal and under the same condition could be observed again in the future.

In this study, implementing a new curriculum (in this case C2005), is regarded as the norm. This curriculum may change due to political reasons and be observed again in the future. Besides the change of the curriculum other researchers may observe the existing one where different aspects are considered.

Also, descriptive research is where a specific situation is studied either to see if it gives rise to any general theories or to see if existing ones are borne out by specific conditions (Melville and Goddard, p.4). The implementation of C2005 will be studied to see if it gives rise to general theories linked to curriculum change documents and to see how these theories suit the implementation process. The study is concerned with the implementation of C2005 in Grade 7 in Motherwell primary schools in terms of the requirements as stated in the policy documents. The sub-sections of the data gathered from the teachers are in accordance with what is recommended in the literature.

3.3 THE RESEARCH QUESTION

The main research question is: How are Grade 7 teachers in Motherwell equipped to implement C2005 in their classrooms?

This study tries to explain the situation as experienced by Motherwell teachers implementing C2005. The aim is to come up with suggestions of how to eliminate the problems experienced.

3.3.1 Sub-questions

In trying to determine how the sample of teachers implement C2005 one needs to first look at how these teachers were prepared for the implementation process. Next, it is necessary to compare what is being done in terms of what is considered to be ‘good practice’. Then, consideration should be given to steps for improvement. The above research question can be answered by focusing on three sub-questions. These appear below in bold italics.
What in-service programmes were implemented to provide support for the teachers?
Since 1999, different stakeholders such as teacher organisations and unions, publishers and the Department of Education, all tried to assist teachers with improving the understanding of C2005 by organising workshops, seminars and meetings. These were done to support the implementation process.

The in-service training was done in two stages. The initial stage was organized and conducted by the Department of Education. Teachers attended a one-week long session where the presentation was theoretical in nature. Then, teachers went back to school to carry out what they gained from the sessions. When they started implementing the new system, they experienced problems in the process and they approached their OBE co-ordinators for assistance. Teacher unions saw a need for workshops and seminars to assist those teachers who did not understand how to implement an OBE approach after the first in-service training.

The researcher will describe what happened at the workshops and refer to the documents that were used there to provide an understanding of how the training occurred.

What strategies from the literature could be utilised to determine whether effective teaching occurs within C2005?

Researchers and Department of Education officials have been trying to find effective ways of implementing C2005 in South Africa. Local publishers are trying to shape the new curriculum so that it can be effectively implemented.

The researcher referred to both national and international readings to focus on relevant strategies that could assist Grade 7 teachers in Motherwell to implement C2005 effectively. These strategies were developed into questions that the teachers had to answer to determine their perceptions of their competence to implement the OBE approach.
How does the implementation process in the Motherwell Primary Schools compare with what can be considered to be ‘good practice’?

One of the objectives of this study is to try to determine their perceptions of their competence to implement the OBE approach. C2005 has been implemented since the year 2000 but the practice seems to be problematic. The researcher will pose questions to Grade 7 teachers on their ability to implement C2005 in their classrooms. The training manuals will also be consulted to see if the teachers’ practice is relevant. Both ways will show what exists in the implementation of C2005 by Grade 7 teachers in Motherwell. This will lead to suggestions on how to improve the existing process.

3.4 THE SAMPLE

Leedy (1993, p. 201) and Cohen & Manion (1994, p.88) maintain that the composition of a sample is derived by selecting units from those of a much larger population. The population in this study is the teachers of the Motherwell primary schools. Motherwell has 17 primary schools but the researcher selected five schools as the sample. These five schools were chosen because they are close to each other and this made it convenient for the researcher to reach them. It would also have been impossible for the researcher to work with 17 schools. A ‘convenience’ sample (Cohen and Manion, 1994) was used.

Probability sampling known as cluster sampling will be used to select the sample to be interviewed. “The most common type of probability sampling procedure is simple random sampling” (Salkind, 2000, p.87). Within the five schools, random sampling was used to choose one teacher from each school. This allowed for the members to be equal in the sense that there was no bias where one person could be chosen over another. Also they are independent because the choice of one person per school does not bias the researcher for or against the choice of another (Salkind, 2000, p.87). The intention was to have a group of five teachers, each from a different school in Motherwell. The sample can be regarded as representing teachers in the Motherwell area because of the balanced distribution with respect to their socio-economic status, language and ethnicity.
In the five schools all Grade 7 teachers were asked to complete the questionnaire. There were 3, 3, 3, 4 and 3 teachers in school A, B, C, D and E respectively. These questionnaires were then numbered according to the number of Grade 7 teachers in each school. All teachers were asked, beforehand, to keep the number of the questionnaire they had answered so as to identify themselves with that number. Each school's questionnaires were kept separately. Each group of questionnaires were shuffled around at least six times and then the one that appeared at the bottom of the pile was selected for the interview.

3.5 DATA COLLECTION

The two tools used to collect data were questionnaires and interviews. Sixteen Grade 7 teachers in the five chosen primary schools answered the questionnaires. Initially, I approached the principal in each school for permission to address the Grade 7 teachers. I explained the reason for my visit and the purpose of the questionnaire. In some schools the principals were interested and offered to supervise the process, in others I had to stay in touch with the teachers. The teachers were asked to answer the questionnaires during their spare time or at home. They were given a week to complete the questionnaires. This was done in order to obtain a 100% response because most of the teachers in the Motherwell area are busy with part-time studies, choral music practice and teacher organization meetings. Although questionnaires were given to all Grade 7 teachers in the five chosen primary schools, only five of them were interviewed, one from each school.

3.5.1 The Questionnaire

The questionnaire is the usual measuring instrument used to ensure the collection of reliable structured data needed for analysis and interpretation in a research study. "A common-place instrument for observing data beyond the physical reach of the observer is the questionnaire" (Leedy, 1993, p.187). It records and preserves the facts that are part of the observation. There are three methods of using the questionnaire to gather data, namely: the postal survey,
the telephone survey and the personal interview, that is, the self-administered method (Ferreira, in Leedy, 1993, p.291).

According to Salkind (2000, p.136) questionnaires are a paper-and-pencil set of structured and focused questions. He also states that questionnaires save time since they allow individuals to complete them without any direct assistance or intervention from the researcher.

A structured questionnaire, in English, was used to collect data regarding problems encountered by the teachers in implementing C2005. The questionnaire had the following characteristics as specified by Salkind (2000, p.137):

- It requested information that respondents presumably had;
- It contained questions that were straightforward and that could be answered;
- The items of the questionnaire were presented in an attractive, professional and easy to understand format;
- The language was clear; and
- The questionnaire was designed to fulfil a specific research objective, i.e. to find out how the teachers were implementing C2005.

Before handing out the questionnaires, they were discussed with colleagues at the researcher’s school. After correcting them they were given to another colleague to verify the ‘sense’ of the questions. Once the colleague had approved of the ‘sense’ they were distributed to the relevant respondents at the schools.

3.5.1.1 Types of questions

Mainly closed questions were used in the questionnaire. The last question was open-ended to allow respondents to answer in their own words. This question had the advantage of allowing the researcher to discover unanticipated patterns in respondents’ answers. They also prevented the researcher’s selection of response options from biasing answers or concealing information (Mannheim & Rich in Cohen and Manion, 1994, p.6).
While the first two sections focused on the participants’ profile, sections C to F moved the focus to the participants’ competence as teachers. These questions focused on the teaching and learning methods, the content, classroom organization and lastly the focus was on assessment of learners. These questions were compiled from readings in Chapter Two to determine ‘good practice’ in the classroom. Teachers had to indicate how competent they were in the areas listed in each category.

3.5.2 Interviews

Structured interviews were also used in this study to collect data. Teachers who made up the random sampling were telephoned individually to set up an appointment that suited them. The participants chose the time and place. Interview questions in this study were compiled using those from the questionnaire.

Cohen and Manion (1994, p.271) view the interview as a research technique that is normally considered as one of a range of survey methods. They also state that it is a usual method in the sense that it involves the gathering of data through direct verbal interaction between individuals (Cohen and Manion 1994, p.272). Its advantage includes the ability of an interviewer to clarify or restate questions that the respondent does not at first understand.

The interview respondents were again assured of confidentiality when reporting on the interviews. Respondents were notified in advance about the appointment dates and were reminded again when the time arrived.

In each category the concepts were clustered together and only three questions were asked in order to minimise the time that interviewees needed to spend at the interview. In the category ‘teaching and learning methods’ the questions were based on understanding group work, implementation and managing. Under ‘content’ the questions were based on planning, implementation and managing while in classroom organization they focused on the physical appearance, implementation and managing. In the assessment of learners the
questions were on understanding assessment methods, implementation and creativity. The same questions were used in both tools to achieve a form of triangulation.

3.6 DATA ANALYSIS

Through the use of descriptive statistics, a researcher can describe some of the characteristics of the distribution of scores collected, such as the average score on one variable or the degree that one score varies from another. This study is going to analyze the data narratively, that is, telling the stories gathered from teachers during the interviews. Descriptive statistics will only appear when the number of teachers who responded in a particular section in each dimension is given.

Leedy (1993, p.215) states that data are of no value merely as data. Accumulating data is a necessary aspect of research but it is not the objective for which the process of research is instituted. The purpose of the research is to solve problems. It is in order to accomplish that purpose that we accumulate data. The purpose of this research is to solve the problems the teachers of Motherwell primary schools have had when implementing C2005.

3.6.1 Analysing the questionnaires

“People may be more willing to be truthful because their anonymity is all but guaranteed” (Salkind, 2000, p.136). The respondents did not wish their privacy to be exposed. They were assured of confidentiality before the questionnaires were issued.

The types of questions were designed for a particular group of respondents, that is, educators in Grade 7. The focus was on effective implementation of C2005 in the classroom. The reason for such a focus was to find out what problems had been experienced when implementing C2005 in Grade 7 in order to find strategies to solve them.
Responses will be analysed per school according to the four chosen categories. They will also be recorded statistically and descriptively. This will be done to find the common problems in the five schools.

3.6.2 Analysing the interviews

Responses to interviews were recorded under four sections. These were: teaching and learning methods; content; classroom organization; and assessment of learners. Interviews with each teacher were recorded to provide evidence of what they said. This was done using the numbers allocated to the teachers in each of the schools. The selected teachers were assumed to have represented their schools and hence conclusions were drawn on each school’s implementation process.

3.7 SUMMARY

This chapter dealt with the methodology used to collect the data. The research question was stated and the sub-questions that helped to answer it were also stipulated and discussed. A description of the population and the sample was provided. The method for the data collection and analysis was also discussed, briefly, focusing on the tools used to collect the data.

The following chapter will deal with the data analysis in detail and how the questions in the questionnaire were clustered to suit the interview. Teachers’ responses will be shown statistically and descriptively following the order of schools.
CHAPTER 4

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter 3 explained how the questionnaires and the interviews were constructed while Chapter 4 will deal with the description of how the data were collected and analyzed. Problems encountered during data collection will also be mentioned.

During data collection the teachers revealed that they had attended an in-service training course conducted by the Department of Education. A description of the in-service workshops is provided in order to determine what happened at the initial in-service training.

Documents of the National Department of Education used for the in-service training of teachers in Grade 7 were also consulted in order to link to aspects focused on in the questionnaire and the interview stages.

The analysis has two dimensions. Firstly, there are stories of the teachers interviewed in all the schools. Secondly, the description of all the teachers’ competencies in four areas, namely, teaching and learning methods, content, classroom organization and assessment of learners, is given. This description is in the form of statistics followed by an explanation. Tables are drawn in order to show the number of responses indicating the teacher’s perception of their competence in each area. A summary of the analysis is then provided.

4.2 PROBLEMS RELATED TO DATA COLLECTION

Although all the teachers finally returned their questionnaires, there were initial delays at most schools. Some teachers were not at school on the date of return because of workshops and meetings of teacher organizations. These teachers did not leave the completed questionnaires for collection. Others were unable to fill in the questionnaires because of music practice that demanded most of their spare time after school. Schools where there were no problems were those where the school principals monitored the issue, collection and return of questionnaires.
There were difficulties making appointments with teachers. Some were even reluctant to meet the researcher because they were wary of the terms ‘research’ and ‘interview.’ While some asked how they would benefit after the interview others thought they were doing the researcher a favour so that she may get a better job after completing her studies.

A few teachers were unavailable after school because they had to attend teachers’ union meetings. Others told the researcher that they had forgotten about the date even though they were reminded timeously. As a result the researcher had to return to the schools at least twice.

The results concerning the interviews in all five schools show that observation needed to be done together with verbal responses from teachers. The reason for this is that teachers might have merely given the theory from the training documents or from the training itself. Observations would provide a true reflection of what is happening in the classrooms. The methodology chosen for this study did not demand observation. Although there were problems, the process was successful.

4.3 THE DEPARTMENTAL IN–SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMME

Seventeen facilitators conducted the training, one being the programme director. The other sixteen were spread among the eight learning areas and each learning area had two facilitators. Approximately 120 teachers attended the training and it lasted for one week. Each learning area was allocated a room where the respective teachers were trained separately. On the first day there was an introduction to the whole programme done in the hall at a college of education. On the second day teachers were sent to different rooms according to their learning area. Each learning area had a training manual from which the sessions were conducted.

The national documents that were used provided the reader with the information about the in–service training and its aims. They were as follows: Training Materials for Grade 7 in all the learning areas (DoE, 1999); the Senior Phase Policy
The facilitators used the above-mentioned documents to assist educators with the implementation of the new C2005 system. They were designed to give guidance on how to plan the lessons, how to choose the activities for each lesson, how to integrate the learning areas and how to assess learners.

_The School Based Curriculum Management and Planning, Educator Development Manual: Facilitator_ (DoE, 2000, p.14) states that “the success of a school lies in its success in creating a supportive environment for curriculum change”. This was the key document used on the first day. Hereafter it will be referred to as _The Manual_. The facilitators selected activities from it to assist in making the teachers accept the change. Teachers were given topics on their own physical development from childhood. They had to list all the changes they had experienced and how they had accepted them. They also had to narrate the whole process and the support they had obtained from other people. These activities were done in groups where each group had to brainstorm, discuss and then report to the large group. The activities were related to the following headings: understanding curriculum reform; creating a supportive school environment for curriculum change and classroom management and support.

### 4.3.1 Understanding curriculum reform

The facilitator explained the meaning of curriculum change and implications for the elements of this change. The preferences of OBE for certain structures were listed. Both teachers and learners were expected to work towards achieving set outcomes. It was emphasized that the School Management Team (SMT) would be expected to align current practices and plans to strategies, structures and systems, which might bring the school closer to accomplishing the outcomes.

The facilitators asked teachers to perform activities relating to the acceptance of change. These activities were taken from _The Manual_ and they focused on making the individual see the need for the change and its benefit to both learners and
teachers. The activities included teaching the whole class using the chalkboard as well as teaching using groups and learner centered activities that develop knowledge, skills, attitudes and values. These activities were done without giving guidance; teachers had to formulate these activities relating to what they read in the manual.

4.3.2 Creating a supportive school environment for curriculum change

The Manual (DoE, 2000, p.14-41) provides a picture of how the school environment should look in order to cater for curriculum change. It also points out certain issues that are important when dealing with qualitative delivery, namely:

- defining the teaching and learning expectations, that is, spelling out clearly the outcomes for teaching and learning practices;
- rigorous planning at macro, meso and micro levels and at different management levels within the school;
- identifying and developing support strategies and mechanisms;
- defining ways of motivating teachers and learners to accept challenges presented to them by new practices;
- developing monitoring and evaluative strategies which can be used to enhance classroom practice; and
- finding joint ways of stimulating different school constituencies about reform and its implications.

The above points show what is supposed to take place in the schools after the in-service training. The facilitators tried to convey the message to teachers, but they did that theoretically by referring to the document. This process was not conducive to enable teachers to fully understand the new curriculum. The practical aspect of this workshop was lacking. Its absence could have resulted in the problems that teachers faced when they went back to their classrooms.

In most informal discussions held during the breaks, teachers felt that the training needed to be more practical. Notes were kept of these conversations. They also
felt that facilitators should have brought learners from the school and demonstrated how lessons should be conducted. By that they would be setting an example and enabling the teachers to see what was expected of them during the implementation process. I also felt that the training did not address the objectives of the documents. The document assumed that the teachers would be able to perform the activities mentioned. To ensure that this was done properly the facilitators should have demonstrated some of the activities. However more time would have been needed to allow for such demonstrations.

4.3.3 Classroom management and support

_The Manual_ (DoE, 2000, p.42) gives guidelines on how a teacher should manage a classroom and how the SMTs should give support to the teachers for the effective implementation of the new system. These guidelines were given theoretically to the teachers, in the absence such SMTs. The teachers' perception was that SMTs were invited to these training sessions but could not come due to various reasons. The authenticity of those reasons is not known because no SMT was approached to verify the allegations. It was after the complaint by teachers to their unions that the Department promised to train the SMTs separately in the future.

Teachers were participating and that made the facilitators think they understood everything. In my opinion and experience the participation of group members in an activity does not determine whether or not they will follow the facilitator. My perception is that teachers enjoyed the activities but they did not understand their meaning. That became evident when they went back to their classes where they noticed that they were unable to carry out what they had learnt from the facilitators.

In the separate classrooms for the different learning areas activities were also done. These activities were not related to what is going to happen in the classroom. Some related to how to use the policy documents when planning a lesson. Others focused on how to choose or formulate activities in a lesson. The most important section for the facilitators was the recording of learners’ performance. Although this section was done thoroughly, teachers were not shown the steps before the recording process, but merely shown how to use the recording sheets. This was done using new terms such as “rubric”, “portfolio”, and “formative
and summative assessments”. These terms were not easy for most of the teachers to understand.

This section would have been clearer if the implementation issues were addressed initially. These issues are: how to teach effectively in an OBE class; how to arouse interest in learners, the OBE way; and how to involve learners in a lesson, that is, how to make learning learner-centered. Teachers were given teachers’ guides and learners’ handbooks to read for themselves without discussing them in the training class. All the teachers at the workshop attended by the researcher were speakers of English as a second language.

During the in–service training, facilitators introduced the course and the material to be used in the classrooms for the implementation process. They did not mention implementation issues, as I have said previously. My perception is that they took for granted that teachers were aware of the change and could shift to the new curriculum easily. Vally (2000, p.4) maintains that “the neglect of implementation issues in the new education policies is a fundamental flaw which has severely compromised the capacity of these policies to deliver change”.

Although the facilitators tried to explain the new terms they were not clearly understood by the teachers because they were not done in detail for the teachers to be competent in them. They were done to make teachers understand how to deal with them when they read and interpreted them on their own.

After the in-service training, teachers were expected to implement what they had learned in their classes. Some of the teachers had problems concerning the implementation process. They reported the matter to their teacher unions who then arranged workshops for all teachers. This would consolidate what they had learned in the in-service training and assist those who did not understand at all. The publishers of LSM were approached to assist.

**4.4 THE PUBLISHER’S WORKSHOPS**

Two publishers responded and conducted the workshops. Their approach was different from that of the Department of Education. The publishers’ representatives focused on the practical side of the training. They first used teachers as their learners; then they used
learners and conducted lessons to show the teachers how the whole process should be carried out. The teachers commented that the publishers’ workshop was more useful than the one conducted by the Department of Education.

The facilitators at the workshops explained that their duty was to fill the gap created by the Department of Education, that is, classroom practice. They simplified difficult terms such as, Phase Organiser, Programme Organiser, Skills, Knowledge, Attitudes and Values (SKAVs) and requested teachers to play the role of learners in the lessons they presented. The researcher played the role of an observer during these workshops. The facilitator conducted lessons with Grade 7 learners showing all the necessary steps that had to be followed in an OBE lesson.

In one demonstration the facilitator started the lesson by doing interesting activities related to the lesson without stating the lesson topic first. This was done to develop the thinking of learners. The facilitators focused on the Phase Organisers, Programme Organisers, the lesson topics, the teacher’s activities and those of learners in each lesson. The focus on these areas was done to assist teachers to understand the concepts of OBE. Teachers were expected to understand the terms by the way the lesson was introduced and carried out. The style the facilitator used could make teachers understand the meaning of the terms used in the lesson. Terms were not just explained but performed to endorse meaning.

After each lesson, teachers were asked to comment and ask questions if they did not understand. They wanted to know how the steps of the lessons developed and if it was necessary to follow a certain pattern when doing a lesson. The facilitators emphasised that all lesson steps are important but it is not necessary to follow a certain format as teachers can use their own creativity. After the facilitators’ presentation the teachers were allowed to do their own presentations using the learners from the school where the workshop was conducted.

One teacher performed the lesson with the learners while the others observed. Learners performed the lesson activities as directed by the teacher in charge. After their presentations teachers were given the opportunity to critique the lesson and the facilitator gave advice or comments where necessary. The next teacher was expected to present a better lesson than the previous one because of those comments and corrections. The teachers in all five schools in the sample attended
the workshop. The responses to the questionnaires will show how effective the training was.

4.5 TEACHERS’ RESPONSES ACCORDING TO PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

4.5.1 General description of schools in the Motherwell area

Motherwell schools have common characteristics. They do not have resources such as learning aids and rooms for special learning areas like science or arts and culture. They have small classrooms and there is a shortage of both teaching and non-teaching staff. Although some rooms have a photocopier; it is always difficult to maintain them because of a shortage of funds. The unemployment rate of the community in this area is very high which make it difficult for the schools to raise funds through the learners.

The following sub-sections give the responses of the teachers who were interviewed from each participating school. Their exact words are indicated by inverted commas. Teachers are identified according to the number used to select them for the interview.

4.5.1.1 School A

Teacher 3 was interviewed at this school. He was a bit nervous and seemed to be uncomfortable with the term ‘interview.’ Although he gave responses the researcher had to create a warm atmosphere so that he could feel free to talk. He seemed to be comfortable with C2005 and he indicated that he enjoyed using the new methods. Although he enjoyed the new methods he had some problems in teaching especially with implementing group work. He further noted that “Learners won’t speak in the group. If they have to do the same task they usually do it as individuals. Sometimes group work starts off with noise and moving of desks; that is, you have to organize permanent groups.” This teacher needed more support with the implementation of group work.

His main concern was the insufficient time spent on training. He noted “the training period of one week should be extended to three months and certificates should be awarded to those trained... The teacher should be able to accumulate credits
towards a qualification.” He also complained about the complex language in the training manuals: “…the Policy Document should be made simple and easy…also the Specific Outcomes should also be shortened.” These concerns have been addressed in the Revised National Curriculum Statements (RNCS) for Grade R-9 (DoE, 2002). The teachers no longer need to focus on the complex language.

He also commented on other sources that assisted him with competency in teaching OBE: “I would not be competent in teaching OBE if I was not studying the National Professional Diploma in Education.” Those were the studies that gave him confidence in using new approaches in his teaching. He said: “…the skills I acquired from this course enabled me to handle the class well, although I need more practice.” He is hoping to improve in the future and to be able to help others who still have problems with OBE.

4.5.1.2 School B

In school B I interviewed a teacher who had recently qualified and had five years of experience as a teacher. She had encountered the OBE approach at the college where she had trained but had only experienced traditional teaching as a learner. She had attended the OBE training run by the department in 1999. She seemed to have no problem with classroom teaching but she could see that other teachers in her school had problems.

As she observed the learners’ performance in the upper grades she thought the lower grade educators were at fault. She also saw the need for in-service workshops. Teacher 1: “Workshops should be conducted continuously until educators get motivated and confident.” She maintained: “…more time needs to be allocated for in-service workshops.” This teacher was concerned about the problems encountered by other teachers in implementing OBE; such as how to formulate groups; how to go about with assessment during the lessons. Her point of view is that if teachers get enough practice, they may overcome the implementation problem.

The only problem she experienced herself was with communicating with learners in English. She maintained: “the problem is with the learners who cannot respond to the demands of the language. They cannot express themselves the way I need them
to.” She did not like the fact that she had to change to Xhosa (mother tongue) when explaining activities. She felt that it would be better for her if learners could communicate in English in the lower grades so they would be fluent by the time they reached the higher grades.

Her problem was that in the lower grades, teachers did not make learners master the basic skills, namely, reading, writing, communication and number concept. She said: “If the basic skills have been mastered from grade 1, teachers would not experience problems in Grade 7 even if they struggle with OBE.” This teacher seemed not to want to accept any responsibility for the learners’ poor performance. She did not focus on what she could do to help the learner. She also did not focus on the content that learners needed to acquire.

4.5.1.3 School C

In school C I found a very busy teacher who is the choir conductor. She managed to fit me in during the afternoon practice. The problem she had with C2005 was that the learners were unable to spell and write in English. According to Teacher 2: “I have discovered that learners missed something somewhere in the lower grades; if learners were competent in basic skills, such as spelling and writing, there could be no problem in the higher grades. If the foundation phase and the intermediate phase educators may stick to those basic skills, learners would not be a problem when they reach the senior phase.” This teacher sees a need for lower grade teachers to make sure that learners in those grades are taught all the basic skills thoroughly to make things easy for the higher grade teachers.

She also said: “The teacher organizations helped me with gaining knowledge of the new education system; I am not competent enough in all the areas listed in the questionnaire but if there was hard work by the lower grade educators, I and my learners would understand OBE better in this phase. I am not blaming teachers only. Parents also are not co-operative with their children. Learners these days are more concerned about TV programmes that are not educational and parents do not make means in stopping them from watching those programmes.” The other concern of this teacher is parental involvement. She thinks parents spoil their children and then put the blame on teachers.
She is also concerned about the follow-up programmes that do not take place in the schools. She says: “training may be improved by doing follow up programmes to check if teachers are on the right track or not. There is no thorough check up…also by organizing cluster meetings/workshops for different learning areas to develop teachers on their own specific learning areas and to find out problems.”

This teacher seems unable to take the initiative to address the problems at her school. She is keen to be involved if someone else provided the teachers with support.

4.5.1.4 School D

The teacher I interviewed in school D had 20 years of teaching experience. She said that, initially, she had resisted change but she was forced to accept it because she was “not living in her own world”. She indicated that she had a slight problem with OBE especially when working with groups and doing assessment. Teacher 1 said that: “some children come from disadvantaged backgrounds, it becomes time consuming for you as an educator to wait for them while they share material like a pair of scissors or Pritt.” She requested special training for teachers in assessment. She said she could not remember assessment being done during the training and in workshops. She also maintained; “In-service training can be improved by doing more workshops especially on assessment; and bringing us Learner Support Material.”

She was also concerned about the “information we provide learners.” She maintained: “Skills are most important in C2005; more time is needed in planning…the resources play the most important role. Workshops should be conducted… clustering of schools could be helpful for the introduction of a new curriculum.” She felt that teachers should provide information for learners that would enable them to achieve the outcomes of the lesson. “If they can meet often and practice what they are supposed to do in class they can be able to achieve the goals of the new curriculum.”
She also said: “...if aspects of training may be done practically there might be no problem in implementing OBE after the training; I am doing assessment only because I have to submit documents for evidence of learning by learners; otherwise I lack knowledge in that area.” Her concern is language from learners: “I have a problem with learners who had developed too much interest in TV programmes that are not educational; these learners always lose the grip of the school language and become unable to interpret the school terms.” This teacher has a problem working with other teachers who also do not understand OBE.

4.5.1.5 School E

The teacher I interviewed here was also a busy person who liked sport. I almost missed him but I promised to take only a few minutes of his sports practice time. He stated that he is coming to terms with OBE although there were problems in the classroom. Teacher 3 believed that: “...a lack of training regarding the new Curriculum 2005 can cause a lot of tension, frustration and even conflict among committed teachers. If teachers/educators are not properly trained to implement Curriculum 2005 it can cause problems in a school such as low productivity and low staff morale.” He also felt he was not confident enough with teaching and learning methods especially when he had to derive something on his own; like designing interesting and challenging activities. “…I only do the activities given in a text-book and try to simplify them for the learners.”

He also had a problem with learners’ understanding. He thought: “if learners might be well developed in the lower grades and be made fully aware of OBE they could even do the activities on their own without the teachers’ assistance.” His assumption was that learners needed good attendance in the lower grades so that they might be competent enough when they reached the senior phase.

He also felt that: “teachers in the foundation phase and intermediate phase needed to spend most of the time with the learners to acquaint them fully with OBE.” The main problem he had was that of planning. He said: “It is a problem to all teachers although they do not always state it. If planning might be done practically for teachers during training, problems encountered in the classrooms would be less. The better a staff member is trained, the more he can do and the higher his productivity.”
The main concern for this teacher is the inadequate training of the teachers including himself. Although he also put the blame on other teachers, he hoped that if they were all well trained, the implementation process would be better for every teacher. He did not see OBE as an approach for the teacher to use but something that learners needed to understand.

4.6 DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVIEWS

My assumption is that teachers are not exposed to research projects and they always see them as something that would expose their incompetence or trap them in one way or another. This assumption is based on the manner in which they responded initially when they were asked to answer the questionnaires. Before they could accept the questionnaires they had many questions to ensure that there would not be any repercussions for them. Many teachers complained about the inadequate time for the training. Teacher 3’s comments at school E were: “an increasing demand or need for more academic and administrative staff can be the result of a lack of or insufficient training”. He also had concerns about follow–up sessions that they need after each training session. Teacher 1 at School B felt that “There is no coherence between assessment policy and practice. I feel that too much time is spent on assessment, overlooking time for classroom work. Teachers need to be trained thoroughly on assessment.” Teachers needed to know about the training of the School Management Team (SMT) and if it was done separately from that for teachers. Teacher 3 in School A remarked that, “If the School Management Team was trained with us we would have direction in the implementation process. It would not be difficult to attend to problems in schools.”

It appears that the teachers perceived that training provided by the Department of Education was not successful. It is understandable that the different phases were trained at different times but at the onset the SMT should have been trained and empowered to conduct workshops so that each school could have had workshops to assist their teachers with problems after the training.

With respect to assessment, teachers were shown how to record progress on the assessment forms but they were not shown how to assess learners during the
teaching process. Terms like “continuous assessment” were spelt out but teachers were not told how to go about conducting this in the practical situation. After training no follow-up was done to ensure that teachers had understood the new curriculum during training. The Department lacked vision and planning regarding the introduction and conducting of the in-service training.

4.7 ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRES

Four focal points in the questionnaire were derived from the literature review. These are: teaching and learning methods, content, classroom organization and assessment of learners. Each section is illustrated by a separate table indicating the teachers’ responses. Since 16 teachers were asked to fill in the questionnaire and each focal point has 3 sub-sections there were 48 responses for each focal point.

The table consists of two parallel sections. The first indicated the teachers’ level of competence while the second indicated the adequacy of the training provided. Next to each question the teachers were also asked whether the in-service training met their needs with regard to the question or statement. These responses were also clustered according to the headings explained below. Here the in-service training could refer to either or both sessions of training discussed in section 4.3 and 4.4 of this chapter.

4.7.1 Teaching and Learning Methods

Table 1 focuses on teaching and learning methods. In analyzing the responses of the teachers further clustering was done to provide three sub-sections for each focal point. The clustering was done to simplify the analysis and because each category contains similar aspects. This method applies to all the tables.

The categories from the questionnaire ‘the use of group activities in the classroom’ and ‘different types of grouping e.g. gender, ability, etc.’ were grouped under the heading “Understanding Group Work” while ‘how to manage learners,’ ‘how to make learners share ideas,’ ‘how to teach learners to respect each other,’ ‘how to assist learners to think and reflect on what they have done and the use of support learning material were all combined under the heading “Implementation.” ‘How to
link your teaching with relevant life situations’ and ‘how to design interesting and challenging learning activities’ and ‘managing large classes’ were clustered under the heading “Managing (the teaching and learning methods)”.

Table 1 indicates each teacher’s response to the questions in section C of the questionnaire. In all three tables C stands for ‘competent’ SC for ‘slightly competent’ and NA for ‘not at all competent’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHING AND LEARNING METHODS</th>
<th>SCHOOL A</th>
<th>SCHOOL B</th>
<th>SCHOOL C</th>
<th>SCHOOL D</th>
<th>SCHOOL E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding group work</td>
<td>C SC NA</td>
<td>C SC NA</td>
<td>C SC NA</td>
<td>C SC NA</td>
<td>C SC NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>2 1 2 1</td>
<td>2 1 2 1</td>
<td>2 2 2 1</td>
<td>2 1 1 2</td>
<td>2 2 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing</td>
<td>1 2 1 2</td>
<td>1 2 1 2</td>
<td>2 2 1 2</td>
<td>1 2 1 2</td>
<td>1 2 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5 4 5 4</td>
<td>7 5 7 5</td>
<td>5 4 5 4</td>
<td>3 6 3 6</td>
<td>3 6 3 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While it appears that 23 responses indicated competence in understanding, implementing and managing group work in the classroom, a similar number of responses, namely 25, indicated the teachers’ perceived competence. The implication of such a finding is that only in 52% of the responses indicated that the teachers believed they were capable of changing from traditional teaching to the new methods (Spady, 1994, 81-83) advocated by the OBE approach.

With regard to the parallel section on training it appears that 31 responses indicated “satisfied” and 15 responses indicated that they are “uncertain” while 2 indicated they were “not at all satisfied.” 31% of the teachers were not certain that the training satisfied them and less than 5% were not at all satisfied. All teachers had to go back to their schools to implement the changes to the curriculum. For the training to be considered successful at least 90% of the teachers should have been satisfied. This percentage was chosen in line with the fact that all teachers should be competent. It does not help if only some teachers are competent.
4.7.2 Content

Clustering was also done in this section providing three sub-sections for each focal point again. The categories ‘planning a learning programme’, ‘interpretation of content into learning activities’, ‘how to create activities using different sources’ and ‘planning activities to promote acceptance, care, tolerance and respect of others’ were grouped under the heading “Planning”, while ‘how to integrate content in different learning areas’, ‘how to increase your knowledge of specific content’ and ‘how to link the content to real life’ were clustered under the heading “Implementation”. The categories ‘planning activities that promote healthy social relationship’, ‘how to help learners to develop creativity’ and ‘how to get information from different sources’ fell under the heading “Managing.” Table 2 also indicates each teacher’s response to the questions in the questionnaire under content (section D of the questionnaire).

![Table 2](image)

While it appears that 18 responses indicated competence in planning, implementation and managing content 27 responses indicated slight competence and 3 not at all competent. The implication here is that even if the teachers possessed content knowledge suitable for the old curriculum, most of them are unable to use this knowledge appropriately in C2005. They are unable to take the content and to interpret it within the context of learning activities required by C2005.

In the parallel section 26 responses indicated that the training satisfied the teachers. 21 responses indicated that teachers were uncertain and 1 response indicated that the training did not satisfy them at all. These indications show that there is a need for further teacher training in this section. This is an important finding since both the teaching and learning section and the
assessments sections are heavily dependent on the teachers' ability to use their content knowledge.

4.7.3 Classroom organization

Three sub-sections were also created in this section for the purpose of analysis. The categories ‘re-structuring of the classroom’ and ‘how to make the classroom inviting for learning’ were clustered under the heading “Physical Appearance” while ‘how to manage time and commit yourselves as requested by C2005’ and ‘how to organize extra work, homework, library work and projects’, fell under the heading “Implementation”. The sub-section “Managing (the classroom organization)” included ‘how to form groups and arrange furniture for effective teaching and learning,’ ‘how to manage groups without disturbing harmony,’ ‘how to display learners' work in the classroom,’ ‘how to make learners perform without competing’ and ‘how to make learners work freely without being forced into activities’.

Table 3 indicates each teacher's response to the questions in the questionnaire under classroom organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOLS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3

It appears that 17 responses indicated competence in managing the physical appearance, implementation and managing classroom organization. 28 responses indicated slight competence and 3 responses not at all competent.

The implication of such a finding is that only 34% of teachers were capable of changing a traditional classroom to an outcomes-based classroom. That
means teachers have not mastered this aspect and they need retraining in order to cope well with OBE. “Classroom reform is widely known as ‘Mastery Learning’ and has lengthy literature on its design, implementation and effectiveness” (Spady, 1994, p.81). Teachers have to master all the aspects of teaching in order to implement OBE effectively. They cannot rely on the understanding of one aspect to be competent.

Again, in the parallel section on Classroom Organisation 33 responses indicated that the training satisfied them. 11 responses indicated that they were uncertain and 4 of them indicated that they were not satisfied at all. A point of concern is that the table indicates that 66% of the teachers were not fully competent in changing their classroom organization, while a much lower percentage found that the training was unsatisfactory. An implication is that many of the aspects in the questionnaire were not addressed in the training and are thus not a focus in the classroom.

4.7.4 Assessment of learners

Clustering was also done in this section and three sub-sections were created as focal points. The categories ‘demonstration of various assessment methods e.g. self assessment etc.’ and ‘practical ideas for assessment suitable to a specific school’s circumstances’ were grouped under “Understanding Assessment Methods” while ‘how to assess skills,’ ‘how to assess attitudes and values,’ ‘how to assess knowledge,’ ‘how to record and keep records,’ ‘how to compile and use portfolios as an assessment tool’ and ‘how to do continuous assessment’ fell under “Implementation”. The last category stood on its own as ‘How to Design an Assessment Grid’.

Table 4 indicates each teacher’s response to the questions in the questionnaire under “Assessment of Learners”.

TABLE 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SCHOOL A</th>
<th>SCHOOL B</th>
<th>SCHOOL C</th>
<th>SCHOOL D</th>
<th>SCHOOL E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>C  1</td>
<td>C  1</td>
<td>C  1</td>
<td>C  1</td>
<td>C  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>C  2</td>
<td>C  1</td>
<td>C  1</td>
<td>C  1</td>
<td>C  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>C  2</td>
<td>C  1</td>
<td>C  1</td>
<td>C  1</td>
<td>C  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>2 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this section it appears that on the one hand 29% of responses indicated competence in understanding assessment methods, implementation and design. On the other hand 71% of responses indicated that teachers were slightly competent. The implication of this finding is that a bigger percentage of teachers are not capable of assessing the learner according to the demands of the new curriculum. Pollard (1997, p.280) writes:

> Notwithstanding the need for subject knowledge and a repertoire of teaching skills, this process is fundamentally dependent on the quality of the teacher’s formative assessment. Without that, an intervention could be easily inappropriate and confuse the child’s attempt to construct a meaningful understanding and evidence.

In this final section, 32 responses indicated that the training satisfied the teachers. 14 responses indicated that teachers were uncertain and 2 indicated that they were not satisfied at all. A bigger percentage here shows that the training was inadequate and that something needs to be done to support the teachers in assessing their learners.

**4.8 SUMMARY**

Judging by the questionnaire and the interview results, it is apparent that the teachers in Motherwell schools need more assistance to implement C2005. Most teachers are concerned with using an OBE approach and are convinced that if their shortcomings could be addressed, they would be able to implement C2005 in all areas listed in the questionnaire. Not all of them are slightly competent or not competent at all, some have areas in which they are
competent. Teachers are unable to state clearly how they use OBE because they lack this confidence.

Looking at the aspects in the tables 25 teachers are perceived competent with teaching and learning methods and 23 were perceived slightly competent. Only 18 of the 48 responses indicated perceived competence with regard to the content. In classroom organization 17 were perceived competent 28 were perceived slightly competent and again 3 were perceived not competent at all. This confirms the concern of most of the interviewees who complained about inadequate time for training.

In the next chapter the analysis of the interviews with the teachers from the five schools will be correlated in order to draw conclusions in this study.
CHAPTER 5

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter looked at the data collection and analysis. The problems encountered by teachers in the schools during implementation were discussed. This chapter consolidates the findings and then makes recommendations to address the implementation process for the future.

5.2 FINDINGS

From the data it is evident that the teachers encountered problems when implementing C2005. Findings have been deduced from the interviews and the questionnaires. These findings will first be elaborated in terms of the individual schools and then in terms of areas of commonality.

5.2.1 SCHOOLS

5.2.1.1 School A

In this school the teacher interviewed suggested that he needed assistance in content and assessment. He did not feel confident when dealing with the two sections in his classroom. He thought that more help was needed through workshops. His concern was that teachers needed to be reminded time and again after the in-service training so that they might stay on the path suggested by the facilitators.

This teacher is concerned about the Department of Education personnel who do not carry out follow-up visits after in-service training. If there is any change in the curriculum, the Department needs to provide classroom-based support for teachers on a regular basis, so that they can see if they have mastered what they have learned from the training.
5.2.1.2 School B

The teacher in this school had a problem with both teachers and learners. Her problem with the learners was that, on the one hand, they did not respond when she used English as medium of instruction and that she is unable to assist them with their language competence. On the other hand, she does not like to switch to Xhosa when explaining activities to them. This teacher believes that the problem lies with the Foundation and Intermediate Phase teachers. She feels that mastery of language and content should be done in these phases so that it can be easy for her and the learners in the senior phase. She also believes that other teachers need more support through in-service workshops. She suggested that more time should be allocated for in-service workshops.

Looking at these findings this teacher is not willing to take the blame and responsibility as a teacher. The new curriculum emphasizes the outcomes that need to be achieved by the learners. “The role of the teacher changes accordingly to provide guidance for the learners to achieve their outcomes by guiding them through specific learning procedures which are connected to real-life situations and the way outcomes are achieved in the real world” (Olivier, 1998, p.3). Integration of learning areas takes place for such cases. Teachers should be able to assist learners in achieving outcomes whether they are for the previous or the current phase.

5.2.1.3 School C

The teacher I interviewed in this school is concerned about the teachers who teach in the lower grades. Her concern is that these teachers are not competent enough to make learners understand the basic skills that could form the foundation of their learning. She also claimed that she was not competent in some areas listed in the questionnaire. For example, in teaching and learning methods she has a problem with the grouping of learners. She formed groups without considering any criteria.
Her other problem is that she is impatient with learners who do not understand their work easily, those who have spelling problems and those who are careless with their schoolwork. She is also concerned about parents who are not supportive. She thinks that parents also should give guidance to their children on the television programmes that they watch.

Pollard (1997, p.109) maintains: “the appropriateness of the achievement is a matter for a teacher to judge, but the aim should be to encourage all children to accept challenges and achieve success”. I believe that both parents and teachers play an equal role. What is needed here is co-operation in making the child achieve success. He also states (1997, p.15) that reflective teaching requires attitudes of “open-mindedness, responsibility and wholeheartedness”

5.2.1.4 School D

In this school the teacher has a problem with group work and with assessment. Her concern is that learners are from different backgrounds and in the same group yet they do not all have material to work with. She could not work with learners who share equipment because, for her, that retards the progress of the lessons. Beside the shortage of the learners’ equipment there is also an inadequate supply of LSM for the teachers. She thinks that the Department of Education should conduct more workshops and provide teachers with LSM for effective implementation.

Another concern she has is about the content. She suggests that teachers should be well equipped with the knowledge of their subjects so that they would be able to provide learners with relevant information. She is of the opinion that more training for teachers could be the solution.

“Research consistently shows that the lack of clarity in teaching and learning aims is a very significant inhibitor on pupil progress” (Pollard, 1997, p.167) therefore teachers have to spell out teaching and learning objectives to provide learners with relevant content.
5.2.1.5 School E

The teacher I interviewed in this school has a problem with teaching and learning methods. He is troubled by the fact that he cannot formulate interesting activities for learners. He uses the textbook and simplifies the suggested activities for his class. He thinks that teachers need more training and should have access to more LSM. His other concern is with teachers in the lower grades. He assumes that if classes could be “well attended” in the lower grades then fewer problems would be experienced in the senior grades. He puts the blame on the Department of Education for not training teachers adequately.

From the concerns of those teachers who were interviewed as well as the responses on the questionnaires there are similarities in terms of the problems they have experienced.

5.2.2 Common problems

5.2.2.1 Inadequate training period

In all five schools this was a burning problem. All teachers that were interviewed and those who responded in the questionnaires complained about this. To them implementation would not be a problem if teachers were trained for a longer period.

Vally (2000, p.8) states that of the submissions to the committee, more dealt with the inadequacy of training than any other issue. The report further states that criticisms were leveled at the quality of content, training materials and training methodology, the duration of training and the lack of follow-up through onsite support.

5.2.2.2 Relevant guidance

When teachers complained about the inadequate time for training they stated
that the little time spent on these in-service training sessions did not give teachers adequate information concerning content, managing classrooms and assessment. They said that they were referred to textbooks for guidance, yet they could not interpret what was written in those textbooks.

Henson (2001, p.295) also maintains that "unless teachers are empowered to deliver high quality, there is little chance that meaningful educational improvement will occur". Motivation of educators to get more knowledge is essential for the development of each school. Killen (2000, p.99) and (Pretorius, 1998, p.89) introduced what is called ‘lifelong learning’. Everyone has to learn and to get more knowledge in this field to be competent. Each school needs a knowledgeable educator to assist in the clarification of difficult and complex concepts needed to be able to use an OBE approach.

5.2.2.3 More practical demonstrations in a real classroom situation

All teachers complained about not seeing practical demonstrations of what they needed to do. Theoretic experience does not help if its destiny depends on the listeners’ expense, that is, if at the end the listener has to practice and not the speaker. Vally (2000, p.4) reports that the major concern of the Review Committee was that there is a gap between the policy and the implementation.

All the educators interviewed were interested in seeing trainers doing what they were saying should be done. Some did try but not in the actual lessons: instead of using learners they used teachers as learners and this is not the same.

5.2.2.4 More information on LSM and more workshops

This is also a common factor at all the schools in the research. Teachers had a request that the Department of Education should conduct more workshops and provide teachers with LSM. They stated that they were advised to use their creativity without being guided on the manner of being creative. As
Chapter 1 indicated, these teachers have not had the opportunity to be creative in either their training or their teaching. It is, therefore, not easy for these teachers to tap their creativity in the classroom.

Vally (2000, p.8) states that the availability, quality, use, evaluation of and tendering of LSM for C2005 can be described as ‘messy.’ The quality of OBE textbooks produced is compromised by the lack of appropriate levels of complexity for each grade. Other problems include the lack of logical development in the material over consecutive grades and under-specification of content and concept by grades. In many cases the material is received late or insufficient quantities are sent to schools. Also the budget allocated to buy these materials by the government is always inadequate.

5.2.2.5 Teaching Methods

Half the number of teachers say that they are competent in using teaching and learning methods for C2005 yet one of the areas needing greater attention would be adapting the content to suit the new ways of teaching. This seems to be a contradiction since the teaching methods will enable the content to be conveyed to the learner. It could be that teachers lack the subject content knowledge that would give them the confidence to change their methods of delivery. The skills needed for good classroom organization seems to be lacking in the teachers who completed the questionnaires. Most of them could not organize their classrooms for group work to be effective.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

The Review Committee made recommendations (Chisholm, 2000) after a national review of C2005. As a result the RNCS (Revised National Curriculum Statement) was developed in 2002. The Review Committee (Vally, 2000, p.8) suggested that to correct the situation, schools could be grouped into clusters to facilitate training and by training and utilizing a core of expert teachers to co-ordinate each cluster. These ‘lead teachers’ would also provide onsite support. The committee also suggested that each school should identify a teacher who would participate in a six-month accredited
course at a tertiary institution. These recommendations also apply to the sample of schools involved in the research. In addition, from the findings at the five schools, the following recommendations need to be taken into account when providing training for the implementation of the RNCS.

5.3.1 Teachers need to be motivated

Teachers need to take ownership of the changes. They should accept responsibility for their learners’ competence and not always blame previous teachers for the present situation and do nothing about it. Teachers also need to be motivated. The Department of Education should focus on motivating the teachers during the training programmes. It should also provide in-service courses that develop teachers to better understand the content and to improve their teaching skills.

5.3.2 Lead teachers

Schools in close proximity should form support groups. The ‘lead teachers’ or experts suggested by the Review Committee should be practising teachers. They should be appointed by the Department of Education to support teachers in those clusters. These teachers should get the appropriate recognition by the Department and be remunerated accordingly. They can then also invite teachers to their schools and demonstrate lessons so that the teachers needing support observe ‘good practice’. This can be done by focusing on the method of teaching and relating that to the content and assessment. A curriculum involves an inter-relationship between content, method and assessment. Teachers can then work towards some achievable goals that they have developed with the lead teachers. There needs to be a form of ‘buy in’ from teachers at all levels.

5.3.3 The focus of training

Training should focus on a variety of issues. It should focus on content. There should then be methods that could make it easy to achieve this content,
and finally ways of assessing this content should be developed. If teachers do not have an adequate knowledge of the content it would be difficult to assess whether learners are competent or not.

Training should also focus on delivering C2005 to the majority of teachers for whom English is not their first language. Consideration should be given to the fact that the in-service training is not done in the teachers’ mother-tongue. In the past facilitators were mostly first language speakers of English. These facilitators should be equipped by the Department to train ‘ESL teachers’ for whom English was a second language (ESL). Teachers should be motivated to become competent in the language of instruction in order to pass this on to their learners.

Continuing with the idea that English is not the first language of the majority of learners at school, the training offered to teachers should focus on how teachers manage ESL learners in their classroom. Learners are expected to work in groups, read books and other material in English, perform activities and give reports in the same language.

**5.3.4 Schools need to be provided with LSM**

Before in-service training is carried out schools should be provided with enough LSM. The training can then focus on giving teachers support for appropriate LSM use. The Department should also develop the SMTs to be able to support teachers for the appropriate use of the LSM. This development of SMTs could also help with internal workshops that could take place in schools.

**5.5 CONCLUSIONS**

This study indicates that teachers are starting to accept change. The problem seems to be that they are not sure of ‘how’ to change. They need to be guided on how to make the changes in order to achieve ‘good practice’. The Department and the SMTs should assist them in making this happen. Teachers should also be guided on how the integration of the principles of
teaching works and then master that inter-relationship of the aspects of teaching, such as, the content, method and assessment.

The Department of Education needs to acknowledge the challenges that face teachers in poorly resourced schools. Schools from the disadvantaged areas need to be provided with LSM by the Department of Education because it is difficult for these schools to raise funds in these areas in order to purchase LSM.

When resources are provided, they must be accompanied by a support system for their use. The SMTs should be trained for this so they may assist teachers. They should not always be utilized as conveyers of the Department’s messages to teachers, but as helpers during times of crisis.

This support should be an on-going process and not delivered in ‘fits and starts’ and in a haphazard fashion. There are various areas in which teachers need to be guided. One of those is the effective implementation of C2005. The SMTs should be equipped to assist teachers in this area so that they do not always have to look for an ‘expert’ from outside to come and assist with their own development.

The SMTs should ensure that their teachers are assisted in providing the learners with the best that is possible. During in-service training all the SMTs are supposed to attend in order to give support and to equip themselves for internal workshops. They should also do class visits with the aim of assisting the teacher. Learners become more interested in studying when they see that their management cares about them.

If the above recommendations are taken into account during the forthcoming training sessions, at least in the Eastern Cape, then this could result in teachers gaining skills that can be positively used. These teachers will then be in a position to improve their practice in the classroom.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


APPENDIX 1

PERSONAL DATA
Please tick the appropriate block.

Section A

1. What is your age?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Younger than 24 years</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>34-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>Older than 55 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. What is your sex?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. What is your home language?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Xhosa</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Section B

1. What is your post level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Deputy Principal</th>
<th>Head of Department</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Years of teaching experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 –3 years</th>
<th>3-6 years</th>
<th>6 –9 years</th>
<th>More than 9 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. What qualification do you have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STD 10</th>
<th>Diploma</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Postgraduate degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. When did you attend an Outcomes Based Education (OBE) training session?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. What was the duration of the training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2Days</th>
<th>3 Days</th>
<th>1 Week</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

85
6. Who provided the training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DoE-EC</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Section C

TEACHING AND LEARNING METHODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very competent</th>
<th>Slightly competent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The use of group activities in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Different types of grouping e.g. ability, gender etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How to manage learners when working in groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>How to make learners share ideas when working in groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>How to teach learners to respect each other’s ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>How to assist learners think and reflect on what they have done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The use of Learning Support Material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>How to link your teaching with relevant life situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>How to design interesting, challenging learning activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Managing large classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section D

CONTENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very competent</th>
<th>Slightly competent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Planning a learning programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Interpretation of content into learning activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 How to create activities using different sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Planning activities to promote acceptance, care, tolerance and respect of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 How to integrate content in different Learning areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 How to increase your knowledge of specific content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Planning activities that promote healthy social relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 How to link the content to real life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 How to help learners to develop creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 How to get information from different sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Section E

### CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicate how competent you are in each of the areas listed below</th>
<th>Point out to what extent your need was met by the in-service training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Re-structuring of the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How to form groups and arrange furniture for effective teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How to manage groups without disturbing harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>How to display learner’s work in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>How to make learners perform without competing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>How to manage time and commit yourself as requested by C 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>How to organize extra work, homework, library work and projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>How to make learners work freely without being forced in activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>How to make the classroom inviting for learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Section F**

**ASSESSMENT OF LEARNERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very competent</th>
<th>Slightly competent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Demonstration of various assessment methods e.g. self assessment etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Practical ideas for assessment suitable to a specific school’s circumstances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 How to assess skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 How to assess attitudes and values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 How to assess knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 How to record and keep records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 How to compile and use portfolios as an assessment tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 How to do continuous assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 How to design an assessment grid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please write any two ideas for how the in-service training you have attended may be improved.

1. 

2. 

Thank you for your cooperation and support.