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SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the implementation of the National Curriculum Statement (NCS) in a few selected Grade 1 classrooms of the Limpopo Province. The investigation was carried out in 2007 and was guided by the following three sub-problems:

1. What are the concerns of teachers about the NCS?
2. What are the teachers' levels of use of the NCS?
3. What are the adaptations that teachers have made in teaching the NCS?

The research design used was a descriptive survey. The unit of analysis were Grade 1 teachers. Criterion sampling was used to define the group of teachers to be polled. 50 Grade 1 teachers in Zebediela Area of Capricorn District were polled. An Innovation Configuration Matrix was developed to identify critical components of the NCS. Teachers were surveyed through the use of questionnaires, checklists, interviews and observations to corroborate findings.

The majority of teachers (58%) were found to have impact concerns, which means that they were implementing the curriculum as intended. A considerable number of teachers (42%) were found to have self and task concerns. This means that they were still struggling and starting to implement the NCS.

Through the use of checklists, interviews and observations, it was found that 47% of teachers complied with the requirements of the NCS. This means that 53% of teachers were still struggling to implement the curriculum. It is found to be a course for concern if one has to consider the fact that the curriculum is in its tenth year of implementation in Grade 1, albeit in a revised form.

Support strategies such as the development of a coherent management plan to...
address teachers' concerns and various teaching strategies such as small group
work to help improve the implementation of the NCS in line with an outcomes-
based education, were recommended for use in classrooms.
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CHAPTER ONE
ORIENTATION

1.1 INTRODUCTION
As part of transforming South Africa in a post apartheid era, a new curriculum was introduced in 1997. It was envisaged that this curriculum would be implemented in Grade 1 in 1998 and that by 2005 all grades in the General and Further Education and Training bands (Grades 1-12) would have implemented the curriculum. The curriculum was named Curriculum 2005 (C2005) with reference to the expected final implementation date.

The adoption of C2005 in South Africa should be viewed against the backdrop of the country’s political, economic and educational history prior to the advent of a new democracy in 1994. It was a history characterized by division and alienation between the various racial and cultural groups that constitute the population of this country. Prior to 1994, there were nineteen racially defined education departments and nine examining bodies in the school system (Behr, 1998).

In view of this history and its legacy of inequality, it was deemed necessary to restructure these separate educational departments under one umbrella equally for the entire nation. The National Department of Education (NDoE) has now restructured all the previous education departments into nine provincial departments coordinated centrally.

The new curriculum was put forward by the Department of Education (DoE) as a radical move away from the school curricula of the apartheid dispensation. Blignaut (2005: 1) attests to this by stating that in official documents, the so-called “old” curriculum and the “new” curriculum are contrasted in a language of binaries: one is teacher-centred, the other learner-centred; one is content-based, the other skills-based, etc. and frequent references to a “paradigm shift”. Blignaut (2005: 3) captures his experiences of the past as a student studying
Fundamental Pedagogics, by saying, according to the philosophy of Fundamental Pedagogics, a teacher was viewed as an adult and the learner as a child that has no experience and knowledge and has to be led to adulthood. He goes further by stating that this view of the learner and the teacher that was promoted in the pre-1994 era is diametrically antithetical to the learner as meaning maker and the teacher as facilitator as espoused by progressive education documents (Blignaut, 2005: 3). Taylor and Vinjevold corroborate this statement by saying that the fact that there was little room for the "uninformed" to critique "the informed" led to liberal and progressive educationists dismissing Fundamental Pedagogics (1999: 132). Beard and Morrow (1981: 50) also contend that Fundamental Pedagogics promoted the notion of the adult leading the child to adulthood. Enslin in Taylor and Vinjevold (1999: 133) concurs by asserting that Fundamental Pedagogics legitimated authoritarian practice and rendered teachers voiceless as only those "with the sciences are qualified to speak".

Within the school system, the most significant development was a radical departure from apartheid education through an outcomes-based curriculum reform, known as C2005. Outcomes-based education (OBE) is the underpinning philosophy for the new education system and can be described as a global educational curriculum reform phenomenon whose origins and evolution can be traced to competency based debates in Australia, New Zealand, Scotland, Canada and limited circles in the United States. Although OBE has been referred to differently in these countries, it has common or similar practices (Cross, Mungadi and Rouhani, 2002). The competency debate coalesced with debates within the trade union movement in South Africa (COSATU), gained expression in the National Training Board (NTB) proposals, dominated the National Qualifications Framework (NQF), and the new curriculum framework, C2005 (Blignaut, 2005: 3). The adoption of C2005 not only signaled a dramatic departure from the apartheid curriculum, but also represented a paradigm shift from content-based teaching and learning to outcomes-based practices. It also
marks a departure from Fundamental Pedagogics to progressive pedagogy and learner-centred teaching and learning strategies. As in many other examples of outcomes-based curricula, the assumption was that outlines of content or traditional subjects are not an adequate basis for framing everything that the curriculum should teach (Blignaut, 2005: 4).

Underlying C2005 is also the integration of education and training. Integration was seen as important to bridge the divide between mental and manual work or academic and vocational education in the old curriculum. Cross et al. (2000 as quoted by Blignaut, 2005: 4) link integration to the debates around the changing mode of knowledge production, which emphasizes the shift from Mode I (disciplinary knowledge) to Mode II knowledge (applied interdisciplinary knowledge).

C2005\(^1\) identifies eight learning areas. These are regarded as a way of breaking away from strict boundaries between traditional school subjects and ensuring integration within and across the different disciplines as well as developing and organizing the core curriculum. The traditional subjects are subsumed by eight learning areas: Language, Literacy and Communication (LLC); Arts and Culture (AC); Economic and Management Sciences (EMS); Human and Social Sciences (HSS); Life Orientation (LO); Mathematical Literacy, Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences (MLMMS); Natural Sciences (NS) and Technology (TECH) (DoE, 1997a: 9).

An important departure from the traditional objectives-model is the emphasis on critical outcomes in C2005. These are broad generic cross-curricular outcomes that have been developed to encourage further integration between the different learning areas and to give an integrated approach in all teaching and learning. These outcomes should enable learners to:

---

\(^{1}\) C2005 has since been revised and replaced by the Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS).
- Communicate effectively using visual, mathematical and/or language skills in the modes of oral and/or written presentation;
- Identify and solve problems using creative and critical thinking;
- Organize and manage themselves and their activities responsibly and effectively;
- Work effectively with others in a team, group, organization and community;
- Collect, analyze, organize and critically evaluate information;
- Use science and technology effectively and critically showing responsibility towards the environment and the health of others;
- Understand that the world is a set of related systems. This means that problem-solving contexts do not exist in isolation (DoE, 1997b: 24).

In 2000 the National Department of Education, in response to reports about implementation problems, appointed a committee to review certain aspects of C2005. These included technical aspects such as the design of the curriculum as well as the programme of implementation. The underlying philosophy and outcomes-based approach of education was, however retained.

The Review Committee made certain recommendations and the Council of Education Ministers agreed that C2005 should be in accordance with the recommendations of the Review Committee to streamline and strengthen it. On 30 July 2001, the Draft Revised National Curriculum Statement for Grades R-9 was released for public comment (DoE, 2002a: 2) and subsequently accepted.

From the beginning of 2004 the RNCS was implemented by all Foundation Phase teachers and the process will continue until it is phased in at Grade 12 level in 2008. Training for the Intermediate Phase has also been conducted, and implementation took place in 2005. As a consequence of the phased implementation process, parts of the system remain concerned with the
traditional curriculum, while other parts are concerned with RNCS, and yet other parts are concerned with the NCS.

Teachers, who are the front liners of implementation, are caught up in the middle of these far reaching changes. There are already signals that indicate that teachers are struggling to implement the RNCS at the classroom level yet they are also expected to implement the NCS. These are some of the reasons that aroused my interest to put forward an investigation to establish whether the NCS is implemented as intended. I intend focusing on the teachers’ concerns, their level of use and their adaptations of the NCS.

With such a changing, uncertain and turbulent curriculum landscape it becomes necessary to investigate how teachers implement the NCS, given that it is based on entirely different epistemological assumptions than the traditional curriculum. The notions of what it means to be a teacher and what it means to be a learner are different for the two curricula.

As a result a great deal of time, money and effort may be wasted, as good ideas are never translated into classroom reality. I strongly concur with Blignaut (2005: 11) when he says that: “South Africa is in danger of falling into this trap”. Whilst the policy documents themselves contain many visionary and educationally sound ideas, the implementation of these ideas is proving to be much slower and more difficult than anticipated. Recent research (Khusis Management Services, 1999; Review Committee Report, 2000) suggests that the whole process of the implementation of C2005 was hopelessly underestimated and inadequately resourced and supported.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT
The purpose of this study is to ascertain how Grade 1 teachers implement the NCS. More specifically, the study will seek to determine to what extent are Grade
1 teachers implementing the NCS, i.e. whether a discrepancy exists between the intended curriculum and as it is implemented by teachers?

This study will be guided by the following sub-problems:

- What are the concerns of teachers about the NCS?
- What are the teachers' levels of use of the NCS?
- What are the adaptations that teachers have made in teaching the NCS?

1.3 CLARIFICATION OF CONCEPTS

1.3.1 EVALUATION
Many definitions of evaluation can be found in the literature. They are among others the following:

- Evaluation is the systematic investigation of the worth or merit of some object (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1981).
- Educational evaluation is an act of collecting systematic information regarding the nature and quality of educational objects (Nevo, 1995: 11).
- Evaluation is a systematic study that is designed, conducted, and reported in order to assist a client group to judge and/or improve the worth and/or merit of some object (Stufflebeam and Shinkfield, 1986: 47).
- Evaluation is the process of delineating, obtaining, and providing descriptive and judgemental information about the worth and merit of some object's goals, design, implementation, and impacts in order to guide decision making, serve needs for accountability, and promote understanding of involved phenomena (Stufflebeam and Shinkfield, 1986: 159).

For the purpose of this study, evaluation will be described as a purposeful attempt to collect information regarding the nature and quality of an innovation as
advanced by Nevo (1995: 11). This study will focus on the nature and quality of
the extent of implementation of the NCS.

1.3.2 IMPLEMENTATION
For the purpose of this study, implementation will be defined in terms of Fullan’s
(2001: 69) conceptualization of implementation as consisting of the process of
putting into practice an idea, programme or a set of activities and structures new
to the people attempting or expected to change. Bringing about change does not
occur "... at a point in time as a result of some sort of profound decision,
legislative act or cataclysmic event" (Rutherford, Hall and Huling, 1983: 133).
Change is a process and not an event. The implementation of a curriculum
moves through phases and takes time. Berman (1978: 164) identified two levels
of implementation, namely macro-implementation and micro-implementation.
Micro-implementation entails adoption by teachers, teacher use of a new
curriculum, and institutionalization of the curriculum. This study focuses on
teacher use of the NCS.

1.4 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
A descriptive survey will be the primary method used in this study. The
population that will be involved in this study are Grade 1 teachers in the Limpopo
Province state schools. Constraints due to geography, time, and finances made it
impossible to poll all Grade 1 teachers in the province. A section, or sample, of
Grade 1 teachers was used to obtain data for this study. Criterion sampling, one
of the types of purposive sampling was used to define the group of teachers to
be polled. Data was collected by means of questionnaires, checklists, interviews
and observations.

1.5 OUTLINE OF THE STUDY
An orientation for the study, a statement of the problem, clarification of concepts
and research methodology are given in chapter one. In chapter two literature
related to the study will be reviewed. In chapter three a description of the
research methodology will be outlined. The fourth chapter will consist of a presentation and discussion of data collected. The final chapter will include conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION
The literature review aims at sketching the necessary conceptual framework within which the study will be carried out. It helps to establish the context of the problem and provides the background for the study. The review will focus on educational change as background to an understanding of implementation and evaluation of the implementation of a curriculum.

2.2 EDUCATIONAL CHANGE
Educational change is described by various authors as a complex phenomenon that is uncertain, turbulent, chaotic, messy, unpredictable and multidimensional (Bascia and Hargreaves, 2000; Berman, 1981; Dalziel and Schoonover, 1988; Edwards, Dunham and Dick, 2000; Fullan, 2001; Fullan, 2002; Fullan, 2003). The multidimensionality of change clearly indicates that change takes place in a particular context that includes political, social, economic and moral aspects. The organizations, individuals involved, and particular contexts are some of the factors that need to be considered in any change effort.

Apart from the fact that change is a complicated process, it is also a slow process, often with different stages or phases (Cox, 1999; Edwards et al., 2000). Marris (as quoted by Fullan, 2001: 31) reminds us that we should respect the fact that it takes time to change and that individuals may be at different places in relation to change.

When those who have power to manipulate changes act as if they have only to explain, and when their explanations are not accepted, shrug off opposition as ignorance or prejudice, they express a profound contempt for the meaning of lives other than their own. For the reformers have already assimilated these
changes to their purposes, and worked out a reformulation that makes sense to them, perhaps through months or years of analysis and debate. If they deny others the chance to do the same, they treat them as puppets dangling by the threads of their own conceptions (Marris as quoted by Fullan, 2001: 31).

Besides the fact that change is a complex and a slow process, is the fact that change impacts on both individuals and institutions. In this study the focus will be on the individual in relation to change. It is however an artificial delimitation, for in essence individuals operate within institutions. When an institution is not ready for change this can impact on the individual’s efforts to change (Dalziel and Schoonover, 1988: 51). Looking at how change affects the individual, Fullan (2001: 32) describes it as the subjective meaning of change. Fullan (2001: 33) quotes the work done by Huberman and Crandall regarding the nature of teachers’ work and the impact it has on them. Teachers focus on the immediate rather than the long term, have limited interaction with other adults, are often overwhelmed by the demands of the job and only rarely get to think about how they do their job. Crandall (as quoted by Fullan, 2001: 330) states that: “... teachers tend to function intuitively and rarely spent time reflecting on how they carry out their jobs”. The work of various authors (Koekemoer and Olivier, 2002; Fullan, 2001) shows the importance of acknowledging the subjective meaning of change in the change process. Loucks and Hall (1979: 2) stressed the concerns of teachers with regard to an innovation. These researchers found that teachers were concerned with how change in the curriculum would affect them personally. Loucks and Hall (1979: 6) developed a measurement tool to evaluate teachers’ concerns about an innovation. They identified seven stages of concern of teachers that can be experienced with regard to an innovation, namely awareness, informational, personal, management, consequence, collaboration, and refocusing. Rogers in Carl (2002: 14) identified five categories ranging from enthusiasts to antagonists to describe teachers’ attitudes towards change.
Even if those who resist change are often referred to negatively as being “antagonists” (Rogers in Carl, 2002: 14), “habitually disgruntled” (DoE: 1997c) or as being “unfamiliar with an innovation and being ignorant” (Koekemoer and Olivier, 2002), or even as “heretics” (Morrow, 2000), there may be times when resistance is the best course of action. Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991: 18) have identified four different scenarios that could occur. An innovation can be of acceptable value and quality. It can either be implemented (scenario 1), or not implemented (scenario 2). An innovation can also be of unacceptable value or quality. This innovation can be implemented (scenario 3), or the recipients of the change effort may decide not to implement the innovation because of its poor quality (scenario 4). In the case of a curriculum that is poorly designed and badly managed, an experienced teacher may decide to implement only aspects that he/she deemed valuable.

Having noted the aspects of the subjective meaning of change, the objective reality of change also needs to be considered. In discussing the objective reality of change, Fullan (2001; 38) indicates that it is necessary to distinguish the essential aspects of an innovation. If users are unaware of these dimensions of the innovation they may only implement certain aspects of the innovation and neglect others. Thus, while the subjective meaning of change relates to the meaning of change to the implementers of change, the objective meaning of change relates to the actual components or dimensions of change. Fullan (2001: 39) identifies these as the possible use of new or revised materials, the possible use of new teaching approaches, and the possible alteration of beliefs.

The multidimensional nature of change should also be considered. Apart from the subjective and objective aspects of change, change also consists of a number of activities. Hargreaves (2000: 289) points to the fact that change does not proceed though clear and discrete stages, meaning that it is much more messy than that. Berman (1981: 261) also contends that the educational change process consists of a trio of processes that are loosely connected rather than
being linked in a consecutive manner. He identifies mobilization, implementation, and institutionalization as the three processes of educational change. Carl (2002: 80) emphasizes the process of design, dissemination, implementation and evaluation. All of the above statements echo the same sentiment that change is a complex and a multidimensional process that takes time to be realized.

2.3 IMPLEMENTATION

Fullan (2001: 69) states that implementation consists of the process of putting into practice an idea, program, or set of activities and structures new to the people attempting or expected to change. Rutherford, Hall and Huling (1983: 133) also contend that bringing about change does not occur “... at a point in time as a result of some sort of profound decision, legislative act or cataclysmic event”. It shows therefore, that implementation is a process and not an event. This process, the implementation of the NCS, takes time and moves through a series of phases.

If the institutional setting within which implementation takes place is at the national or regional level, implementation consists of the execution of policy by an authority so as to influence local delivery organizations to behave in desired ways. Taylor (2000: 4) refers to this as macro-implementation and identifies the following chain of four passages in this process, namely administration (translation of a policy decision into a specific government programme), adoption (the adoption of the programme at the regional/district/local/community level), micro-implementation (the delivery of the programme at the school and classroom levels with the support of the local authority) and evaluation (determination of success of the programme).

Accepting that the process of change is an implementation-dominant process consisting of a time-ordered flow of events involving many people and activities, it becomes necessary to research this problem and plan for successful implementation. Berman (1981: 261) has therefore identified three sub-
processes, namely mobilization, implementation and institutionalization. As this study focuses on the implementation of the NCS at the level of the school, these sub-processes will only be applied to the passage of micro-implementation, i.e. the process whereby a locally adopted NCS leads to an implemented practice in school. Taylor (2000: 4) provides an adapted exposition of the implementation process as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macro-implementation (Passages)</th>
<th>Micro-implementation (Phases)</th>
<th>User-implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>Teacher use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation of a policy decision into a specific government programme</td>
<td>Adoption at the school level</td>
<td># Monitor degree of personal concerns regarding new programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td>User implementation</td>
<td># High level of mastery of programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adoption of the programme at the regional/district/local/community level</td>
<td>Implementation at the classroom level by the teacher</td>
<td># Limited adaptations of new programme as operationalised in practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-implementation</td>
<td>Institutionalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The delivery of the programme at the school and classroom levels with the support of the local authority</td>
<td>Sustained implementation of the innovation within the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.1 MOBILIZATION/ADOPTION
Adoption is the process that leads up to and includes a decision to adopt or proceed with a change (Fullan, 1982: 39). In this case the school takes a decision to adopt the NCS. Hall et al. (1973: 148) contend that individuals have concerns in themselves with regard to a new curriculum. If teachers are overly concerned and insecure, they may resist adopting the programme. Resistance at this stage can either be psychological or practical, normative or authoritarian.

2.3.2 TEACHER USE
The implementation of the NCS must ultimately be put into practice at the school level. Such implementation is in the last instance brought about by individuals (Hall, Wallace, Dorsett, 1973 in Taylor, 1988: 11). Hall and associates identify three variables that conceptualize the progressive actions of users, implementers or beneficiaries of a new curriculum. These are: Stages of Concern (SOC), Levels of Use (LOU) and Innovation Configurations (IC). SOC pertain to perceptions, motivations, attitudes and feelings that users experience in connection with the use of a new curriculum. LOU describes the degree of mastery of a new practice by the users (Taylor, 1988: 12). IC refer to the variations or different patterns of a new curriculum, which occur when it is put into practice by users (Hall and Loucks, 1978 in Taylor, 1988: 12).

Teachers might fail to implement the curriculum due to lack of knowledge and skills required, negative feelings about implementation, and the unavailability of particular resources (Leithwood, 1982: 10). A change in teaching methods or approaches, teacher beliefs and behaviour, assessment procedures and
organizational structures are basic requirements during this stage of the implementation of the NCS.

2.3.3 Institutionalization

Taylor (1988: 14) alerts us that implementation of a curriculum does not end with having it adopted, put into practice by teachers in classrooms and continued for two or three years. Institutionalization occurs once the curriculum is stabilized and routinized after it has either been piloted or tried out. Van Heerden (1990: 47) also asserts that teacher commitment to use the curriculum is a prerequisite for implementation. Curriculum becomes routinized or institutionalized once it becomes a constituent part of everyday teaching in an institution.

Successful implementation of the NCS will therefore depend on how well the processes of adoption, use and institutionalization function. It will also depend on the quality as well as the amount of support or assistance the teachers receive. Fullan (1993) argues that successful change depends on a balance of pressure and support. Taylor (1988: 12) represents support facilitation as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMME ADOPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMME DELIVERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMME INSTITUTIONALIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Support in the context of implementation (Taylor, 1988)

Hall and Hord (1984: 25) contend that the development of organizational resources, moral and material support, finance, training, consulting and reinforcing, monitoring, disseminating information, and external communication are all kinds of assistance that can be provided to users implementing a new curriculum. In addition to these, specific assistance that can be made available to Grade 1 teachers implementing the NCS are teachers' centers, demonstration sites, media centers, technical assistance teams and help lines.
2.4 EVALUATION

Many definitions of evaluation and how to evaluate educational entities can be found in the literature. In order to clarify the process of evaluation, the approach by Nevo (1995) will be briefly outlined. With reference to Nevo’s (1986) conceptualization of evaluation in the form of ten dimensions which represent the major issues addressed by an evaluation, this study will focus on the following four dimensions and then apply these to implementation: the function or purposes of evaluation; the object of evaluation; the kinds of information to be collected; and the criteria to be used to judge the merit and the worth of the object of evaluation.

The purpose of evaluation: Evaluation can serve more than one function and it is important to establish why an evaluation is being done at a very early stage of planning (Nevo, 1986: 17). In this instance the purpose of evaluating the implementation of a curriculum has to be clarified.

The object of evaluation: It is important in planning an evaluation to identify and describe the object to be evaluated. In this study the implementation of a curriculum, that is, the NCS is the object of evaluation. Various definitions of curriculum are found in the literature but will not be discussed here. It will be assumed that a curriculum is a written plan setting out the goals and content of an educational programme in a structured way. Different conceptualizations of implementation however are possible and these have been considered when describing implementation as an evaluation object. Stufflebeam’s (Stufflebeam and Shinkfield, 1986: 166-168) emphasis on the improvement function of evaluation is evident from the role he assigns to evaluation in affecting system improvement and therefore in an institution’s change process. According to this view, also accepted for this study, implementation cannot be divorced from the broader context of educational change. Educational change has been briefly described as background to an understanding of implementation. This is in accordance with Berman’s (1981: 261) view that educational change typically
involves an implementation-dominant process. As this study ultimately focuses on the evaluation of implementation of the NCS, the basic components of this programme have to be described in operational terms.

The kinds of information: A decision has to be made regarding the various aspects and dimensions of the object that should be evaluated, the information pertinent to such aspects that should be collected and the means whereby this should be done (Nevo, 1986: 19). From the thesis of this study it is clear that the study concerns a process evaluation, namely the process of implementation. By means of an analysis of this process the kinds of information will be determined which need to be collected.

The criteria: It is a very difficult task in educational evaluation to choose the criteria whereby the merit of an entity or object will be judged. In this case, standards set by experts for implementation behaviour will be the basis for evaluation criteria.

2.5 INVESTIGATIONS INTO THE EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A CURRICULUM

For a curriculum to be implemented with fidelity, teachers need clear information regarding the curriculum to be implemented. Looking at the curriculum in terms of its critical components provide teachers with a clear understanding of what is expected of them. These components are also useful sources of information when drawing up assessment criteria to evaluate actual curriculum implementation. Different researchers have described different models to identify the critical components or operational aspects of a curriculum, namely Hall and associates (1981), Leithwood (1981) and Wang and associates (1984).

Hall and associates (1981: 1) focused most of their attention on the role of the teacher during the implementation process of the curriculum. The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) puts more emphasis on understanding the
change process as experienced by persons who are the implementers of a new innovation within an institution (Heck, Stiegelbauer, Hall and Loucks, 1981: 1). The CBAM was originally developed in 1973 (Rutherford, Hall and Huling, 1983: 133). This model has however formed a conceptual base for a number of evaluation instruments and includes various dimensions, namely stages of concern about the innovation (Rutherford, Hall and Huling, 1983: 136), levels of use of the innovation (Rutherford, Hall and Huling, 1983: 138), innovation configurations (Rutherford, Hall and Huling, 1983: 141) and an intervention taxonomy (Hall and Hord, 1984: 283). Heck, Stiegelbauer, Hall and Loucks (1981: 11) describe in detail how to measure the innovation configurations.

The CBAM has been widely used to examine the process of the implementation of curriculum innovations. Anderson (1977: 331) has however critiqued this model, arguing that more theoretically based research, rather than applied research should be conducted in order to refine the CBAM. According to Anderson (1997: 338) the CBAM had not yet reached fully developed theoretical status by the mid-1980's. Anderson further highlighted the fact that although the CBAM provided the most fundamental framework for describing teacher implementation of curriculum innovations, it was in effect not yet sufficient for this model to be considered a theory.

It is appropriate to ask whether a conceptual model for describing teacher change (albeit under limited circumstances) warrants the status of "theory" unless the model also enables predictions about teacher change, and explains variation in teacher change dependent upon the characteristics of and relationships between key variables in the model (Anderson, 1997: 338).

This author further examined educational change research from various countries like the United States, Australia and Canada and highlighted instances and opportunities for further refinement and development of the CBAM. One of
the developments indicated by Anderson (1997: 343) is the work of Van der Vegt and Vanderberghe (1992), which looked at the use of concerns theory, investigating changes in school settings as a result of externally imposed reform initiatives. It was then discovered that the original CBAM focuses on teacher change rather than whole school change. Anderson then suggested that the CBAM is an effective means of investigating teacher change, but warned that researchers should be more critical in their use of the CBAM (Anderson, 1997: 363).

This study will utilize the innovation configurations (IC) dimension of the CBAM. This stems from the notion of the researchers at the University of Texas who noticed that people used parts of an innovation in different ways. When these parts were put together various patterns became obvious. Each of these patterns represent a different use of the innovation. The patterns were described as innovation configurations. When using the IC model the researcher has to identify the basic elements of an innovation. The behaviours and processes used by individuals as they implement the innovation need to be identified. The basic elements of the innovation are termed critical components. In the case of the NCS, key components may be teacher behaviours, learner activities, and the materials associated with the NCS.

A checklist is the instrument used to specify the components of the innovation and their variations (Heck et al., 1981: 15). The components necessary for the implementation of the NCS will be listed along with the variations that are most likely to be found. Data will be collected by means of a checklist and produce the innovation configuration that depict the operational patterns that arise as a result of teachers using different component variations.

Leithwood (1981: 25) agreed that Hall and his associates made a valuable contribution to the study of curriculum innovations in developing the CBAM and more specifically the idea of the level of use. However, Leithwood maintained
that each component of an innovation had various stages of development. He used a two dimensional matrix to depict use of an innovation (Leithwood, 1981: 26). He referred to this as an innovation profile. On one axis the stages linked to the different levels are represented. On the other axis, the different dimensions of the programme appear.

Leithwood identified nine possible curriculum dimensions. They are derived from various sources such as official guidelines, curriculum materials and their use in practice, curriculum theory, curriculum analysis tools and suggestions or instructions for curriculum development (Leithwood, 1981: 27). These dimensions are platform or image, objectives, student entry behaviours, assessment tools and procedures, instructional materials, learners’ experiences, teaching strategies, content and time. Leithwood (1981: 34) contends that curriculum innovations are often adapted to suit existing practice. Aspects of the innovation that are similar to existing practice become the focal point, while new or unique features are disregarded (Leithwood, 1981: 34).

By making use of curriculum dimensions as a means of analyzing and describing an innovation, teachers can be assisted to consider all aspects of the curriculum. Nevertheless, Leithwood (1981: 36) warns that the dimensions chosen should be harmonious with the teachers’ understanding of their task. Thus, aspects such as teaching and learning strategies and curriculum content must be explicit with more novel aspects of the innovation. Using the matrix of curriculum dimensions and stages of use, a picture could be obtained of actual teacher use of the curriculum referred to as a user profile. This can then form the basis of a support strategy to assist teachers in implementing the innovation more effectively and with fidelity.

Other researchers, namely Wang, Nojan, Strom and Walberg (1984: 21) have also developed instruments to measure the degree of the implementation of a programme. They distinguished two critical programme dimensions, namely an
action domain and a structural domain. The action domain consists of programme dimensions connected to the roles and behaviours of teachers and learners that are necessary for effectual use of teaching and learning materials. The structural domain on the other hand included programme dimensions that are related to resources such as space, facilities, teaching and learning materials and classroom rules and procedures.

The procedure to determine the extent to which the implementation of a new programme was progressing is derived from performance indicators linked to the programme’s action and structural domains. Six instruments were utilized to collect information on the degree of programme implementation. They are the following:

- a checklist for physical design of the classroom;
- a checklist for classroom records;
- a teacher observation form;
- a learner observation form;
- a teacher interview form;
- and a learner interview form.

The checklists focus on the static components of the programme such as the physical layout of the classroom while the observations were concentrated on the dynamic components such as the pupil learning processes. The interviews, on the other hand, were designed to evaluate performance indicators that were not easily observed. Wang et al. (1984: 249) stressed the importance of successful implementation in that it requires explicit information about the programme’s operating features and implementation conditions, hence these action and structural domains.

All three models of evaluating curriculum implementation outlined above are accurate and precise models in providing teachers and administrators with clear
information regarding an innovation and are also useful tools for determining the extent to which the new curriculum is implemented. This study will make use of a combination of these models and the researcher's twenty years experience as a primary school teacher to construct critical or operational components of the NCS for data collection and analysis as outlined by curriculum experts in various curriculum materials.

2.6 CRITICAL OR OPERATIONAL DESCRIPTION OF CURRICULUM DIMENSIONS FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RNCS IN GRADE 1 CLASSROOMS

In order to describe Grade 1 teachers' use of the NCS, it is important to establish exactly what teachers should be doing when teaching Grade 1 of the NCS. To this end, an operational description of the NCS has to be developed. This description needs to indicate the behaviours and processes that should be observed when the NCS is being implemented.

Using the information gained from Leithwood's (1982) nine curriculum dimensions and knowledge of the sources from which they were derived as well as Hall and his associates' (1981) basic component of the innovation which may be the teacher's behaviours, learner activities and materials associated with the innovation all combined with the researcher's experience, the operational components of the NCS are therefore assumed to be the following: the role of the learners, the role of the teacher, teaching methods, integration, classroom arrangement, assessment and inclusive approach. Each component will be briefly discussed below in order to sketch the background for the process of data collection and analysis.

Role of learners: Learners are expected to be actively involved in the teaching and learning process. The emphasis is on "learner-centredness" according to the NCS (Department of Education, 2002a: 8).
Role of the teacher: The NCS envisions teachers as mediators of learning, interpreters and designers of learning programmes and materials, leaders, administrators and managers, scholars, researchers and lifelong learners, community members, citizens and pastors, assessors and learning area specialists (Department of Education, 2002a: 9). In the classroom setting the facilitative role of the teacher will be explored.

Teaching methods: The NCS stresses the importance of both competence and content focused teaching methods (Department of Education, 2003: 15). For the purpose of this study competence refers to what learners should be able to do. The focus here is on methods that promote active learning such as group work. Content focused methods are regarded, in this study, as those that focus on what the learner must know. These would be methods where the learner is relatively passive, receiving knowledge from the teacher in a predominantly whole classroom situation.

Integration: Integrated learning is central to outcomes-based education (Department of Education, 2002a: 13). In order to overcome the historically fragmented nature of knowledge, attention should be paid to integration both within and across learning areas.

Classroom arrangement: The seating of learners should facilitate active learning, with the arrangement of furniture and facilities dependent on a particular learning situation. Grade 1 teachers are encouraged to arrange their classrooms so that learners can work with each other in groups (Tiley, 1997: 4). Tiley (1997: 4) suggests that learners should not be seated in ability groups, but should rather be grouped according to “friendship, needs, interests, age or random choice”. Typically in Grade 1 classrooms, learners move from their desks at times to work with the teacher or other learners on the mat area or some other convenient space in or outside the classroom.
**Assessment:** For the purpose of this study, assessment will be subdivided into three categories referring to different aspects of assessment namely, purpose, method and time.

**Purpose of assessment:** Various purposes of assessment are described namely, baseline, diagnostic, formative, summative and systemic (Department of Education, 2002b: 126). In this study formative and summative assessment will be considered. Formative assessment is used to provide teachers and learners with information regarding the learners' progress in order to improve learning (Department of Education, 2002b: 126). In this regard assessment means teaching and determining whether the required outcomes have been achieved. Summative assessment gives a general gestalt of a learner's competence at a particular time, for example, at the end of the term or the year (Department of Education, 2002b: 126).

**Methods of assessment:** Criterion-referenced assessment is the most preferred form of assessment where learners' individual achievement is measured by determining whether a learner achieves the assessment standards of each learning outcome. Learners should be informed about the criteria that will be used for assessment, before the assessment takes place. Criterion-based assessment is described as being open and fair to all involved because learners are aware of what is expected of them in terms of the set criteria for the activity (Department of Education, 2003: 32). Teachers are encouraged to use a variety of assessment strategies to assess learners, including observations, projects, practical exercises, tests, self and peer assessment (Department of Education, 2003: 32). Learners must in all instances be assessed against criteria instead of being compared with each other, as is always the case with norm-referenced assessment.

**Time assessment:** By time assessment is meant continuous assessment where learners are assessed continuously and at the end of a teaching and learning
sequence. Continuous assessment is the main method by which assessment takes place in the NCS (Department of Education, 2002b: 127). It takes place throughout the year.

**Inclusive approach**: The NCS assumes an inclusive approach to teaching, learning and assessment (Department of Education, 2003: 7). Learning programmes need to address any barriers that learners for whom the programme is being developed may experience. Teachers need to be aware of the social, emotional, physical and other needs of the learners as they develop their learning programmes. Consequently, to ensure that matters of inclusivity are addressed, teachers need to consider any particular barriers to learning and/or assessment that exist in different learning areas and make provision for this when developing learning programmes.

The research design that will be used to evaluate Grade 1 teachers’ use of the NCS in terms of these nine critical components will be outlined in the next chapter.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter gives a detailed description of the research methodology that was utilized in this study. It will cover in essence, particulars of the sampling procedure, data collection, reliability of data and conclude with data analysis.

3.1 BROAD RESEARCH DESIGN
The broad research design that was used in this study was a descriptive survey. According to Leedy (2001: 191) one of the aspects of a descriptive survey is that it involves distinguishing the characteristics of something. The phenomenon is described as it is which means that there is no attempt to change the phenomenon or to discover cause-and-effect relationships. He further indicates that this method is suitable for data obtained from observations. These observations can either be performed directly or indirectly from questionnaires (Leedy, 1989: 89). Leedy (1989: 142) has identified four characteristics of a descriptive survey.

Firstly, the descriptive survey method is appropriate for contexts that require observation as the primary means of data collection (Leedy, 1989: 142). In this study the focus is on the implementation of the National Curriculum Statement (NCS). In order to obtain a picture of teacher practice when implementing the NCS, Grade 1 teachers in Zebediela Area of Capricorn District of Limpopo Province were surveyed by means of questionnaires, checklists and interviews. In analyzing responses to questionnaires, checklists and interviews a representation of Grade 1 teacher practice emerged. In order to provide a more intensive image or a richer description of teacher practice, teachers were also observed in classroom situations.

The second characteristic of an effective descriptive survey is that the population for the study should be carefully selected and delimited (Leedy, 1989: 142). The
population of the study were Grade 1 teachers in Capricorn District of Limpopo Province. The population was delimited in the following manner: only Grade 1 teachers in state schools were used in this survey. Time and resources did not permit the inclusion of all Grade 1 teachers in the entire Capricorn District and therefore, only Grade 1 teachers in Zebediela Area were used to collect data for this study.

The third characteristic of descriptive survey as emphasized by Leedy (1989: 142) concerns a negative aspect of survey namely, bias. Leedy (1989: 142) warns that data should be protected from the influence of bias. Classroom observations and interviews using the same categories as the checklists were undertaken in order to provide for triangulation of data and thereby obviate the possibility of bias.

The fourth characteristic of a descriptive survey as identified by Leedy (1989: 142) is that data should be classified and presented in an ordered manner. Responses to questionnaires, checklists, interviews and observations were classified in various categories, which were thereafter converted into percentages and interpreted in terms of scores in those categories.

3.2 SAMPLE
The population involved in this study were Grade 1 teachers in Limpopo Province state schools. Constraints due to geography, time, finances and other considerations made it impossible to poll all Grade 1 teachers in the province. A sample of teachers was used to obtain data for this study. Purposive sampling was used to select a sample of teachers. Criterion sampling, one of the types of purposive sampling was used to define the group of Grade 1 teachers to be polled. Grade 1 teachers in state schools of Zebediela Area of Capricorn District of Limpopo Province were selected in this study. The Capricorn District Early Childhood Development (ECD) officer was requested to provide the researcher with the numbers of Grade 1 teachers who have received NCS training in their
area of jurisdiction. Using this list, questionnaires and checklists were sent to all teachers. For convenience sake, local district teachers were surveyed. Follow-up observations and interviews necessitated the use of schools within reasonable traveling distance.

3.3 DATA COLLECTION

In this study implementation was identified as the object of evaluation. The macro-phases of the process of implementation were then defined and the phase that specifically pertains to the school, namely micro-implementation consisting of the sub-processes of adoption, teacher use and institutionalization was described. Based on this analysis specific behaviours and attitudes which apply to these sub-processes were assumed to be the following:

- teacher concerns about the NCS,
- teacher mastery of the NCS,
- teacher adaptation of the NCS.

These behaviours indicate the kind of information to be collected. Existing evaluation instruments were identified and adapted for this purpose. The criteria were based on standards set by experts for implementation behaviour when the NCS is fully operational. Data were collected by means of questionnaires, checklists, observations and interviews.

3.3.1 TEACHER CONCERNS ABOUT THE NCS

The instrument developed by Hall (1979) to determine the concerns that individuals experience with regard to the use of an innovation was adapted and used to collect data on this aspect of the behaviour of teachers involved in the implementation of the NCS. The most formal and precise measure of Stages of Concern (SOC) is the Stages of Concern Questionnaire (SOCQ) (Hall, George and Rutherford, 1979). The questionnaire consists of thirty-five items, each of which has a Likert scale on which respondents indicate their present degree of
concern about the topic described in the item. There are five items for each of the seven Stages of Concern. The SOC according to Taylor (1988: 15-20) are: 0 awareness, 1 informational, 2 personal, 3 management, 4 consequence, 5 collaboration, 6 refocusing.

3.3.2 TEACHER MASTERY OF THE NCS
Critical components of the NCS as described in chapter two of the literature review were used to construct a focused interview to measure teachers’ level of use of the NCS. Each component had two to four descriptors for teachers to indicate those that best described their practice. The following components of the NCS were identified: role of learners, role of teachers, teaching methods, integration, classroom arrangement, assessment purpose, assessment methods, assessment time and inclusive approach.

3.3.3 TEACHER ADAPTATION OF THE NCS
Critical components of the NCS were used to construct a checklist. An innovation configuration matrix portraying critical components of the NCS with various dimensions was used. The preferred responses in terms of fidelity of implementation were highlighted for teachers to tick their most relevant answers that are also most descriptive of their teaching. An innovation configuration matrix with all identified critical components was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITICAL COMPONENTS</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROLE OF LEARNERS</td>
<td>Learners active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLE OF TEACHER</td>
<td>Teacher acts as facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING METHODS</td>
<td>Teacher uses group work most of the time (regularly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATION</td>
<td>Focuses on integration within and across all the learning areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSROOM ARRANGEMENT</td>
<td>Dependent on particular learning situation (flexible groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT PURPOSE</td>
<td>Used both in a summative and formative way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT METHOD</td>
<td>Using criterion referenced assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT TIME</td>
<td>Learners are assessed continuously and at the end of a teaching and learning sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCLUSIVE APPROACH</td>
<td>LSEN² are accommodated and assisted within the classroom situation at all times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LSEN are withdrawn from class to give assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Innovation Configuration Matrix

3.4 RELIABILITY OF DATA

Literature shows that there are problems associated with data collected by means of self-report and reliability of data when a checklist or questionnaire is used (Heck et al., 1981: 51). Heck et al. (1981: 51) contend that user completed data are valuable “descriptive measures that capture the overall gestalt of what an innovation is like”. Information from the self-report data and the data collected by means of classroom observations and interviews with teachers provided for triangulation to corroborate findings. In this study, classroom observations were conducted immediately after interviews with teachers. Classroom observations were also based on the innovation configuration matrix mentioned above. In this way, a rich description of local Grade 1 teacher implementation practice was developed.

² Learners with Special Educational Needs to be accommodated in mainstream classrooms.
3.5 DATA ANALYSIS

Data with regard to stages of concern was used to address the first sub-problem, namely teachers' concerns about the NCS. Responses were recorded according to stages as indicated in Figure 4. The raw scores for each stage were totaled and converted into percentages. Data was analyzed in terms of scores and stages as suggested by Hall et al. (1979: 116).

With regard to checklists, interviews and observations data was used to address the second and the third sub-problems, namely teacher mastery and teacher adaptation of the NCS as exhibited by Figure 5, 6 and 7. Responses were recorded according to critical components of the NCS. Row scores were totaled and converted into percentages. Data was analyzed in terms of row scores. They were further compared and contrasted. Average scores were analyzed, compared and contrasted. Total averages were also interpreted (see Figure 8).

Having described and motivated the research methodology that has been used in this study as well as how data has been analyzed, the following chapter will focus on the presentation and discussion of data collected.
CHAPTER FOUR
PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

Data collected will be presented and discussed as follows: teacher concerns about the NCS, teacher adaptation of the NCS, and finally teacher mastery (level of use) of the NCS. Data collected by means of classroom observations will also be presented and discussed to provide for triangulation to corroborate findings.

4.1 DATA ON THE CONCERNS OF TEACHERS ABOUT THE NCS
Responses of Grade 1 teachers (n = 50) to statements indicating their stages of concern in the implementation of the NCS were found to be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGES OF CONCERN</th>
<th>TEACHERS (n = 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Awareness</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Informational</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Personal</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Management</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Consequence</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Collaboration</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Refocusing</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Data on stages of concern of teachers.

From Figure 4 it becomes very clear that 8% (n = 4) of teachers have little concern about or involvement with the NCS (stage 0), 8% (n = 4) again have a general awareness and interest in learning more detail about the NCS (stage 1). Teachers at this stage (stage 1) seem to be unworried about themselves in relation to the NCS. They are interested in substantive aspects of the NCS such as general characteristics, effects and requirements for use (stage1), 12% (n = 6)
are uncertain about the demands of the NCS. This includes analysis of their role in relation to the reward structure of the school, decision making and consideration of potential conflicts with existing structures or personal commitment (stage 2), 14% (n = 7) of teachers' attention is focused on the process and tasks of using the NCS and the best use of information and resources. At this stage (stage 3) issues related to efficiency, organizing, managing, scheduling and time demands are very important, 18% (n = 9) of teachers' attention is focused on impact of the NCS on students in their immediate sphere of influence. The focus is on relevance of the NCS for students, evaluation of student outcomes, including performance and competencies, and changes needed to increase student outcomes (stage 4), 22% (n = 11) of teachers' focus is on co-ordination and co-operation with others regarding the use of the NCS (stage 5), and 18% (n = 9) focuses on exploration of more universal benefits from the NCS, including the possibility of major changes or replacement with a more powerful alternative (stage 6) (Hall et al., 1979: 116).

From the data above, it is clear that 28% (n = 14) of the teachers have self-concerns (stages 0 – 2) about the NCS. This means that 28% of the teachers are merely implementing the NCS mechanically without actually taking ownership or thinking about the curriculum. Taking into consideration the fact that it is now ten years since the inception of this new curriculum, it should be noted that for 28% of teachers who are still not implementing the curriculum as intended is a very serious problem and worrying factor. According to Fuller in Hall et al. (1979: 324) "a respondent with relatively intense personal or self concerns may, in effect, operationally block out more substantive concerns about the innovation" and therefore, urgent attention should be paid to the 28% of teachers who are implementing the NCS mechanically without actually taking ownership or thinking about the curriculum after nine years of experimentation with the curriculum.
It is also worth noting that 14% (n = 7) of the teachers have task concerns (stage 3). This is indicative of intense concerns about management, time and logistical aspects of the NCS. Although this stage indicates the starting point of the use of the NCS, it is worrying that 14% of the teachers were just beginning to use the NCS after such a long time since implementation of the curriculum began.

It is encouraging though to note that 58% (n = 29) of teachers have impact concerns (stages 4-6) about the NCS. This means that more than half of the teachers who have been evaluated are indeed implementing the NCS. Nevertheless, 42% of the teachers are still struggling and some are starting to implement the NCS. This is a factor that needs to be considered and speedily remedied if one takes into account the number of years since implementation of the curriculum commenced. 58% of teachers who were found to be implementing the NCS are also less than expected if one takes into account the number of years since the inception of the curriculum. Support mechanisms such as meetings, training sessions and follow-ups at school and cluster levels need to be intensified.

4.2 DATA ON TEACHER ADAPTATION OF THE NCS

Heck et al. (1981: 51) contend that checklists completed by teachers, as the users of the curriculum, are useful tools that provide a general picture of what the curriculum looks like in practice. Although there may be problems linked to self-report data, the use of checklists and accompanying classroom observations and interviews provided a rich description of teacher use (mastery) of the curriculum. Classroom observations and interviews were based on the same critical components as the checklists and provided space to describe these critical components of the curriculum as observed and used in interviews with Grade 1 teachers.

Responses of Grade 1 teachers (n = 50) to statements indicating their level of adaptation of the NCS were found to be as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITICAL COMPONENTS</th>
<th>TEACHERS (n = 50)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of learners</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of teacher</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom arrangement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment purpose</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment method</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment time</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive approach</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGES</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,4</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,4</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,9</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Data on teacher adaptation of the NCS.

In general the teachers’ responses indicated that they were implementing the NCS as required. This is reflected by the majority of teachers choosing the preferred responses in the following critical components: the role of learners 60%, teaching methods 70%, integration 52%, assessment method 82%, assessment time 90% and inclusive approach 52%. There was a discrepancy between what the teachers said they were doing and the required practice in three instances. The critical component related to the role of the teacher was the first area where the majority of teachers (70%) indicated in varying degrees that they were doing something other than what was required. Most of the teachers (40%) stated that they were “usually facilitators of learning, while the required response was that they should act as facilitators of learning, mediating the construction and production of knowledge” (Department of Education, 2002a: 9). Teachers sometimes chose to relinquish the role of facilitator and assume more direct control of learning.
The second area where the majority of teachers’ responses (64%) differed from the required response was for the critical component describing the classroom arrangement. Most respondents (54%) indicated that learners were seated in ability groups. However, the preferred response was that the classroom arrangement should be “dependent on the particular learning situation” allowing learners to move in flexible groups. The focus on learner-centred activity in the NCS implies that the seating arrangement has to accommodate a range of learning situations. Seating young learners in groups has been used extensively in Grade 1, long before the NCS was implemented. This did not necessarily lead to the children being involved in many learner-centred activities. Learners would often be seated in a group arrangement, but be engaged in mainly whole class activities. The practice of seating Grade 1 learners in groups may thus be linked to traditional practice, rather than to enable them to work effectively with others as members of a team or group, as mentioned in the Critical Outcomes of the NCS (Department of Education, 2002a: 11).

The third area where most of the responses (76%) differed from the preferred response was for the critical component related to the purpose of assessment. The majority of teachers (60%) indicated that assessment was used “to inform teaching and learning” while the ideal response was that assessment is used “to inform teaching and learning and to determine whether the required outcomes have been achieved”. This may indicate that teachers do not yet fully accept the interconnectedness of teaching, learning and outcomes.

The general picture sketched by the averages of figure 5 is that there is some degree of fidelity of implementation. The average of the first column is 54, 4% and represents the preferred responses. The second column has an average of 32,4% denoting an adaptation of the curriculum by almost a third of the teachers. The third column has an average of only 12,9% and the last column 5.5%. These averages sketch a positive picture. The fact that the majority of responses occur in the first two columns is a positive indicator and suggests that teachers know
what is expected of them. The relatively high degree of adaptation in certain cases indicated by responses from the second column is reassuring in that teachers are not implementing the curriculum slavishly, but appear to be adapting the curriculum to suit their contexts.

4.3 DATA ON TEACHER MASTERY (LEVEL OF USE) OF THE NCS

Responses of Grade 1 teachers (n = 50) to a focused interview based on the same critical components as the checklist were found to be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITICAL COMPONENTS</th>
<th>TEACHERS (50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of level of use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of learners</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of teacher</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom arrangement</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment purpose</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment method</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment time</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive approach</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGES</strong></td>
<td><strong>44,4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Data on teacher mastery of the NCS.

In general, the responses indicated that teachers were not implementing the NCS as intended by curriculum experts. There are many discrepancies between what the teachers were doing and the preferred practices. This was made evident by the following five critical components:
In the critical component of the role of learners, the majority of teachers (70%) indicated in varying degrees that they were doing something different from what was required. Most of the teachers (50%) stated that their “learners were usually actively involved, but at times were passive listeners”. However, the preferred response was that “learners should be actively involved in the teaching and learning process most of the time” as espoused by the NCS which emphasizes “learner-centredness” (Department of Education, 2002a: 8). This gives a sharp contrast to the teachers’ self-report data in the checklist where the majority of teachers (60%) indicated that: “learners were actively involved in the teaching and learning process most of the time” (cf. Figure 5). This contrast confirms the insights contained in the literature that there is often a disjuncture between what teachers say they are doing and what they actually do.

The second area where the majority of teachers (76%) displayed different responses from the required response was for the critical component describing the role of the teacher. Most respondents (40%) indicated that the “teacher is usually the source of knowledge, but sometimes helps learners to construct their own knowledge”. However the preferred response was that the “teacher should always act as the facilitator of learning (helps learners to construct/develop their own knowledge, mediating the construction and production of knowledge)” (Department of Education, 2002a: 9). This also confirms data obtained from checklists where the majority of teachers (70%) in varying degrees indicated that they were doing something different from what was expected (cf. Figure 5). Most of the teachers (40%) also indicated that they were “usually acting as facilitators of learning”, while the required response is that they “should always act as facilitators of learning” (cf. Figure 5).

The third area where the majority of responses (70%) differed from the preferred response was for the critical component related to the purpose of assessment. The majority of teachers (58%) indicated that assessment was used “to inform teaching and learning” while the preferred response was that assessment is used
"to inform teaching and learning and to determine whether the required outcomes have been achieved". This is a requirement of the NCS which also clearly states that "assessment is thus teaching and learning and also to determine whether the required outcomes have been achieved" (Department of Education, 2002b: 126). The data in this regard is confirmed by data from self-reports (checklists) by teachers (cf. Figure 5).

The fourth area where the majority of teachers (90%) gave totally different responses to the one expected was for the critical component describing the time for assessment. 90% of the teachers indicated that: "learners are assessed only at the end of a teaching and learning sequence". However, the preferred response was that "learners are assessed continuously and at the end of a teaching and learning sequence". This contradicted data collected by means of checklists where the majority of teachers (90%) indicated that: "learners are assessed continuously and at the end of a teaching and learning sequence" (cf. Figure 5). This contradiction confirms the statement made by Heck et al. (1981: 51) that warns against the problem linked to self-report data that should be corroborated either by observations and/or interviews to get a richer description of teacher-use of the curriculum.

The above data makes it abundantly clear that it is far more difficult to put ideas into practice. McLaughlin (2000) underscores this point when he states that "policy can't mandate what matters", because "what matters" requires local capacity, will, expertise, resources, support and discretionary judgment. This means that what happens as a result of policy depends on how policy is interpreted and transformed at each point in the process, and finally on the response of the individual at the end of the line (McLaughlin, 2000: 72). Fullan (1993: 24) concurs by stating that when complex change is involved, people do not and cannot change by being told to do so.
The fifth area where the majority of teachers’ responses (60%) differed from the preferred response was for the critical component describing an inclusive approach. A considerable number of teachers (30%) indicated that “Learners with Special Educational Needs (LSEN) were accommodated and assisted within the classroom situation, but are removed at times”, while the preferred response was that “LSEN are accommodated and assisted within the classroom situation at all times”. This also contradicted data from self-reports (checklists) where the majority of teachers (52%) indicated that “LSEN are accommodated and assisted within the classroom situation at all times” (cf. Figure 5).

There were only four areas where the majority of teachers reflected implementation of the NCS as intended compared to data collected by checklists where there were six areas which reflected that implementation took place as intended. These areas are found in the following critical components: teaching methods (70%), integration (50%), classroom arrangement (64%) and assessment method (82%).

The data suggests that implementation seems to go well with regard to the following critical components: teaching methods, which scored 70% in both checklists and interviews, integration which scored 52% and 50% respectively and assessment method which scored 82% in both instruments.

The general picture sketched by the averages of figure 6 is that the degree of implementation of the NCS is lower if it is compared to figure 5. The average of the first column of 44.4% does not portray a very positive picture because this column represents the preferred responses. The fact that column 2 and 3 together still have the majority of responses is a negative indicator. Teachers seem to know very little of what is expected of them.

The difficulty of translating curriculum policy into the classroom practices of teachers can be explained inter alia, in terms of the policy-practice dichotomy
prevalent in the implementation of curriculum change. Elmore (1999: 263) underscores this point when he states that:

We can produce many examples of how educational practice could look different, but we can produce few, if any examples of large numbers of teachers engaging in these practices in large scale institutions designed to deliver education to most children.

Figure 6 sketches a somewhat different picture from the one portrayed in figure 5. This confirms the statement made by Heck et al. (1981: 51) that checklists completed by teachers as the users of the curriculum are useful descriptive tools that provide a general picture of what the curriculum looks like in practice yet there may be problems associated with self-report data. Therefore, the use of classroom observations and/or interviews must be considered to provide for triangulation and thereby get a richer description of teacher-use (mastery) of the curriculum.

4.4 DATA ON TEACHER OBSERVATIONS
Responses of Grade 1 teachers based on the observation form consisting of the same critical components as the checklist and interview forms were found to be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITICAL COMPONENTS</th>
<th>TEACHERS (n = 50)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (n)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of learners</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of teacher</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom arrangement</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment purpose</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment method</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive approach</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGES</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,2</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Data on teacher observations.

Observations also indicated that the majority of teachers were not implementing the NCS as required. There were five areas in which the majority of teachers indicated a discrepancy between what they were doing and what the curriculum requires them to do.

The first instance where the majority of teachers (86%) displayed a discrepancy from the required practice was for the critical component describing the role of learners. Most of the teachers (48%) have shown that “learners were usually made passive recipients of knowledge, but at times were actively involved”. The preferred response should have been “learners should be actively involved in the teaching and learning process most of the time”. It is interesting to note that this gives a complete different picture as portrayed by checklists and interviews (cf. Figure 5&6). This could stem from the fact that there is still confusion between the outcomes-based approach and the traditional approach of whole classroom instruction. The majority of teachers (86%) preferred whole classroom instruction that could be explained in terms of their acquaintance with the approach. In teachers’ self report data (checklists) the majority of teachers (60%) have indicated that “learners are usually actively involved, but at times are passive listeners”, but in observations “learners were found to be passive recipients of knowledge, but at times were actively involved” by the majority (48%) of teachers. This confirms the insights contained in the literature that there is often a disjuncture between what teachers say they are doing and what they actually do.
The discrepancy between the requirements of the NCS and teachers’ classroom practice clearly indicates why policy is so difficult to be mirrored in the classroom realities of teachers. Miller (2000: 542) attests to this difficulty by stating that:

Changing roles and cultures is no easy task. It is the result of long and continuous `redesign conversations’ that lead to the examination of practice, the articulation of beliefs, and the enactment of firmly held and consensual values”.

The second instance where the majority of teachers (80%) displayed in varying degrees that they were doing something other than what was required is with regard to the critical component describing the role of the teacher. Most of the teachers (40%) have shown that they were “usually the source of knowledge, but sometimes help learners to construct their own knowledge” despite the fact that the NCS requires of them to be “facilitators of learning thereby mediating the construction and production of knowledge” (Department of Education, 2002a: 9). It is also worth noting the degree of intensity in connection with the varying levels of implementation with regard to this critical component of the role of the teacher. In self-report data (checklists), 70% of the teachers were found to be doing something different from the preferred practice and in interviews and observations they were 76% and 80% of the teachers respectively. This indicates that it is still unclear to teachers as to which roles they are supposed to play in as far as teaching the new curriculum is concerned. It is astounding, taking into consideration the nine years of experimentation with the curriculum. Something very serious needs to be done.

The third area where the majority of teachers (68%) displayed in varying degrees that they were doing something different to what was expected is with regard to the critical component describing the purpose of assessment. Most of the teachers (60%) have “used assessment predominantly in a summative way”
despite the call by the NCS that “assessment should be used both in a formative and summative way” (Department of Education, 2002b: 126). This could be attributed to teachers’ method of assessing learners in the traditional way which teachers find very comfortable to use as compared to the NCS’s complex and difficult assessment method. It is also important to note that the purpose of assessment does create a problem for the majority of teachers. This is supported by data in the following categories: checklists (Figure 5) have shown that 76% of teachers do find this problematic, interviews (Figure 6) confirmed that 70% experience problems with the purpose of assessment and observations (Figure 7) revealed that 68% of teachers have problems in understanding the purpose of assessment.

The fourth area where the majority of teachers (92%) were also found to be completely doing something different from what was required concerns the critical component describing the time of assessment. 92% of teachers “assessed learners only at the end of a teaching and learning sequence”. However, the preferred response is “learners should be assessed continuously and at the end of a teaching and learning sequence”. This was found to be a problem in both interviews and observations. The majority of teachers (90% and 92% respectively) were found to be doing something other than what was required (cf. Figure 6&7). Checklists portrayed a completely different picture of about 90% of teachers implementing assessment time correctly as required by the curriculum, which casts doubts on its authenticity (cf. Figure 5).

The last instance where the majority of teachers (60%) displayed in varying degrees that they were also doing something different to what was expected, is in connection with the critical component describing an inclusive approach. A considerable number of teachers (30%) were seen to be taking learners with special educational needs to their own separate classrooms to be taught by remedial teachers. Most of the teachers claim that they are not trained to handle
learners with special educational needs. This is also evident from data collected both by checklists (48%) and interviews (60%) respectively (cf. Figure 5&6).

There are four areas where the majority of teachers’ responses reflected implementation of the NCS as intended. Those areas had to do with the following critical components: teaching methods (70%), integration (50%), classroom arrangement (62%) and assessment method (84%). It can be inferred that all is well with regard to the following critical components that were found to have scored high points in all instruments, namely teaching methods, integration and assessment method.

The general picture sketched by the averages of figure 7 is that there is a lesser degree of fidelity of implementation if compared to figures 5 and 6. The average of the first column of 42.2%, which represents the preferred responses, does not portray a very positive picture. The fact that columns 2 and 3 exhibited a high percentage of responses is also a negative indicator.

4.5 DISCUSSION OF THE CRITICAL COMPONENTS
Each of the critical components will be considered in this section. Areas where there was a difference between checklists, interviews and observations will be emphasized in more detail.

Role of learners
The majority of teachers (60% cf. Figure 5) indicated that learners were actively involved most of the time. The researcher found, however, that learners were usually actively involved in the teaching and learning activities, but at times were passive listeners. The ideal practice would be one where learners were actively involved most of the time in constructing their own knowledge (Killen, 2000: xi, Joshua, 2003:6). Some teacher-dominated activities were observed. Based on classroom observations teachers were inclined to be more directive. The nature of the activity also determined how directive the teacher was, for example,
explaining a creative activity or remedying a mathematical problem demanded a teacher directed situation. The language needs of second language learners also played a role in the relative activity or passivity of learners. These was made evident by the teacher who said:

"I feel that our learners lack the necessary communication skills to cope with the demands of the NCS"  (Interview with Grade 1 teacher, 2007).

In one school the predominance of direct instruction was particularly evident where the majority of learners were not learning in their mother tongue. Teachers were often observed using deductive rather than inductive approaches. This was often done as a first step to give learners the necessary knowledge and skills to work with peers or independently of the teacher. Killen (2000, 3) observes that direct instruction can be used to help learners acquire the understanding and skills that will eventually enable them to control their own learning.

**Role of the teacher**

Most of the teachers (40% cf. Figure 5) reported that they were usually the facilitators of teaching and learning, but sometimes supplied knowledge. During classroom observations and interviews teachers were found to be facilitating learning some of the time. In other words, they were able to assist learners to construct their own knowledge at times. This is also substantiated by the remark made by a teacher who said:

"I quite often adapt my teaching to the NCS. It is a more flexible style as it is a learner-centred teaching and learning activity where the teacher is expected to act as a facilitator" (Interview with Grade 1 teacher, 2007).

Certain factors such as the developmental level of the learners and other situational factors necessitated a different approach where the teacher would act
as the source of knowledge. A teacher at another school indicated that "Not all the requirements of the NCS will be complied with at our school". Many of the teachers at different schools concurred with this notion. Another said: "Drill work is of utmost importance at our school. We must do it unreservedly". Another teacher also indicated that many of their learners were not intrinsically motivated to learn. She went further to say: "School is not deemed necessary. Education is not viewed as important in this community. Parents are very reluctant to play an active role in the education of their children". A teacher at another school also indicated that she quite often transmitted knowledge and did not usually act as a facilitator of teaching and learning as espoused by the NCS.

Teaching methods
In the NCS both competence and content focused teaching methods are important. What the learner should be able to do and know is spelt out. The assessment standards indicate the content and skills that should be assessed in each grade (Cameron et al., 2003: 5). Data indicates that the majority of teachers (70% cf. Figure 5) were using competence and content focused methods. Data from both interviews and observations corroborated this finding. Teachers often helped learners to acquire skills and thus become more competent in classroom activities. They also helped learners to discover and construct their knowledge or in certain instances transmitted the content directly.

Integration
The majority of respondents (52% cf. Figure 5) indicated that they focused on the core learning area in each learning programme and integrated other learning areas where relevant. Interviews and observation data supported this finding to a large extent with 50% respectively. 50% majority does not reveal a positive picture. The data thus suggest that integration is neglected by teachers and it does not command the attention that it deserves. Although it is planned for by teachers, it is not incorporated into their teaching.
Classroom arrangement

Linked to the emphasis on a more learner-centred approach, teachers are encouraged to arrange their classrooms in such a way that learners are able to construct their own learning (Killen, 2000: xi). A large percentage (64% cf. Figure 6) of respondents indicated that learners were seated in flexible groups. This kind of classroom arrangement was evident in most cases during classroom observations (62% cf. Figure 7). However, this kind of seating does not necessarily impact on the kind of teaching and learning that was taking place in the classrooms. A variety of teaching strategies were observed, including small group work, co-operative learning, discussion, direct instruction and independent learning. The seating arrangement most commonly observed was a cluster of tables accommodating four or six learners. Learners were engaged in both learner-centred and teacher-directed activities while seated in these groups.

At times learners would be seated on the floor, sometimes working with the teacher and sometimes working with peers. In certain instances learners were seated in fixed rows. In one particular class the teacher had two children out of a class of thirty-five with attention deficit problems. She indicated that the learners were less distracted when they were seated in fixed rows. In other classes learners with behavioural problems were seated on their own rather than with a group. During class visits, many teachers indicated that seating arrangements depended on the particular activity undertaken. In all classes observed, learners were seated in mixed ability groups. Many teachers indicated that they preferred to use homogeneous groups for most reading and mathematical activities and mixed ability groups for project work.

Assessment purpose

A number of purposes of assessment are included in the NCS. Baseline, diagnostic, formative, summative and systemic assessments are mentioned (Department of Education, 2002b: 126). In this study formative and summative assessments were included. 60% of respondents indicated that assessment is
used to inform teaching (cf. Figure 5). This percentage is corroborated by teacher observations (cf. Figure 7). Only 24% of respondents gave the preferred response of using assessment to inform teaching and learning and to determine whether the required outcomes have been achieved (cf. Figure 5). According to the assessment policy, assessment should be “integrated with teaching and learning” (Department of Education, 2002b: 126). Although the theory of outcomes-based education indicates that teaching, learning and assessment should be integrated, this has been problematic in practice. C2005 was published in 1997, but the assessment policy was only published a year later. Although the curriculum was revised in 2000, the assessment policy was not revised until 2007 when schools were provided with assessment guidelines of the revised version effective as from February 2007, which clearly states that:

“This policy repeals the Assessment Policy in the General Education and Training Band, Grade R-9 and ABET of 1998 and the Framework for the Assessment and Promotion of Learners in Grade 9: Interim Policy, 2003. It integrates and consolidates recording and reporting provisions that are contained in the National Protocol on Assessment, 2005” (Department of Education, 2007: 6).

It therefore, becomes abundantly clear that all along teachers teaching the NCS had to align it with the assessment policy of 1998. This underscores the fact that it was practically problematic to integrate teaching, learning and assessment.

Assessment method
The NCS requires teachers to move away from an input based, norm referenced summative approach to an approach that is outcomes-based, criterion referenced and formative (Gultig et al., 1997: 23). Teachers are obliged to use clearly defined criteria to assess learners and give feedback on their progress (Department of Education, 2002b: 125). The majority of teachers had moved away from a norm referenced assessment process to a criterion-based
assessment process. 82% of the respondents stated that they used criterion-referenced assessment and 18% indicated that they used norm-referenced assessment (cf. Figure 5 and 6). From interviews and observation visits, it was apparent that teachers were committed to using a criterion-based assessment approach. There was also a call from other schools for clear guidelines from the Department of Education on how assessment should be carried out in Grade 1.

All the schools that were involved in this study have attempted to put in place an assessment practice that conforms to official policy despite certain problems that persist. Assessment practice was only dealt with in broad terms at both the original C2005 training in 1997 and the orientation training for the revised curriculum. The significant differences in approach and format evident from the learner progress reports at the schools visited are an indication that much effort still needs to be invested in supporting teachers in terms of assessment practice.

**Assessment time**

Teachers are required to assess learners continuously. Continuous assessment demands of teachers that they assess learners regularly and update the records of the learners’ progress throughout the year (Department of Education, 2002b: 127). The vast majority of respondents (90% cf. Figure 5) indicated that learners are assessed continuously and at the end of a teaching and learning sequence. The practice of assessing Grade 1 learners was standard practice even before the implementation of the NCS and therefore, a considerable number of schools made an attempt to use continuous assessment as prescribed by policy.

Teachers did however indicate that they use a broader range of assessment strategies since the inception of the NCS. A concern for all the teachers interviewed and observed, was that the current assessment practice is by far too time consuming. Teachers indicated that the assessment procedures that they are obliged to use take up too much of their teaching time. A teacher at one school said “We have much less teaching time now. Assessment takes too much
of our teaching time!” The same sentiment was echoed by another teacher at another school who said: “Too much time is spent on assessing and this does not leave enough time for teaching” and that “Outcomes-based assessment is full of paperwork”.

The above statements make it clear that curriculum policy often ignores the classroom realities of teachers. Blignaut (2005: 43) warns against this practice by stating that policy makers need to provide practitioners with “more autonomy” in interpreting and using the curriculum guideline, rather than dictating a “teacher-proof curriculum”.

**Inclusive approach**

During school visits a number of learners with special educational needs were observed. Learners with attention deficit problems, perceptual problems, social and emotional problems, and language and mathematical problems were accommodated in the classrooms. Teachers and peers assisted these learners. However, data also indicated that 38% of respondents assisted LSEN in class but also removed them at times (cf. Figure 5).

Although extra assistance was available at some of the schools visited, in certain schools learners were seen leaving classrooms during observations to be assisted by remedial teachers in their own separate classrooms. Some teachers indicated that learners with special educational needs were accommodated in the classrooms in some cases, in other instances in special classes or received assistance from other professionals.

**4.6 CONCLUSION OF DATA ABOUT THE THREE INSTRUMENTS**

In order to come to a logical conclusion of data about all the instruments with a view to have a clear and more precise picture of the results of data of the three instruments it is necessary to work out total averages of the combined averages
of the three instruments. The total averages of all combined instruments are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUMENTS</th>
<th>AVERAGES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5: Checklist</td>
<td>54,4</td>
<td>32,4</td>
<td>12,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6: Interview</td>
<td>44,4</td>
<td>38,2</td>
<td>20,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 7: Observation</td>
<td>42,2</td>
<td>36,4</td>
<td>24,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AVERAGES</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,0</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,7</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: Summary of the averages of the instruments.

The general picture sketched by the total averages of all the three instruments that were used in this study is that there is a reasonable degree of fidelity of implementation. The fact that the first column is 47% and it represents the preferred responses is a clear indication of a reasonable effort towards implementation. The second column has an average of 35,7% denoting adaptation of the curriculum by almost a third of teachers. The third column has an average of only 19,8% and the last column 4,5%. These averages sketch an encouraging picture.

The fact that the majority of responses occur in the first two columns (as shown by high averages of the two columns) is a positive indicator. Teachers know what is expected of them. The relatively high degree of adaptation in certain cases indicated by the second highest average of the second column is reassuring in that teachers are not implementing the curriculum slavishly, but appear to be adapting it to suit their contexts.

Based on the adaptations observed in classrooms there was a strong trend towards making thoughtful adaptations for the benefit of the learners. Less
adaptation appeared to be as a result of co-optation, where teachers change the curriculum to fit with their existing practice.

4.7 A GENERAL CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the following factors need to be considered. Firstly, the majority of teachers 58% (cf. Figure 4) have impact concerns (stages 4-6). This means that they are implementing the curriculum as intended. Secondly, 47% (cf. Figure 8) are also found to be implementing the curriculum when checklists, interviews and observations were conducted. It can therefore, be concluded that something positive and reassuring is taking place in as far as the implementation of the NCS is concerned.

Nevertheless, 47% does not sketch a very positive picture if one takes into account that the curriculum is in its tenth year of implementation, albeit in a revised form. One would have expected that a higher percentage of teachers would have complied with the requirements of the new curriculum at this stage. Therefore, this means that support mechanisms in the form of a series of meetings, training sessions and follow-ups at both schools and clusters need to be intensified.

It is promising that the Limpopo Department of Education has already embarked on a massive appointment of learning area specialists (curriculum advisors) who are going to be in charge of fewer schools in every circuit with the aim of intensifying monitoring and support mechanisms. This is an indication that the Limpopo Department of Education is fully aware of the lack of monitoring and support mechanisms in the implementation of the NCS. It is commendable that they are making an effort to address this problem.

4.8 SUMMARY OF THE MAIN FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to ascertain how Grade 1 teachers implement the NCS. More specifically, the study sought to determine to what extent were Grade
1 teachers implementing the NCS. Three sub-problems were identified and used to guide the study. The main findings of the study will be summarized in terms of the three sub-problems as follows:

**Teacher concerns about the NCS**

The majority of teachers (58% cf. Figure 5) were found to have impact concerns (stages 4-6). This means that they are implementing the curriculum as intended. However, 42% of teachers are still struggling and some are starting to implement the NCS and require focused support.

**Teacher mastery (level of use) of the NCS**

The general picture sketched by the total averages of all the three instruments (checklists, interviews and observations) that were used in this study is that there is a reasonable degree of fidelity of implementation (cf. Figure 8). The fact that the first column is 47% (cf. Figure 8) and the fact that it represents the preferred responses is a clear indication of a reasonable degree of fidelity of implementation.

**Teacher adaptation of the NCS**

The second column has an average of 35.7% (cf. Figure 8) denoting adaptation of the curriculum by almost a third of teachers. The relatively high degree of adaptation in certain cases indicated by the second highest average of the second column is reassuring in that teachers are not implementing the curriculum slavishly, but appear to be adapting it to suit their contexts.

Based on the adaptations observed in classrooms there was a strong trend to making thoughtful adaptations for the benefit of the learners. Less adaptation appeared to be as a result of co-optation, where teachers change the curriculum to fit with their existing practice.
In this chapter data on teacher concerns about the NCS, teacher mastery (level of use) of the NCS, and teacher adaptation of the NCS were presented and discussed. Chapter five will draw conclusions from the findings and finally recommendations will be put forward.
CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, I draw conclusions and make recommendations. They will be
drawn in terms of the three sub-problems addressed by this study, namely
teacher concerns, teacher mastery and teacher adaptation of the NCS. I will also
indicate possible limitations of the study and suggest areas for further research.

5.1 CONCLUSIONS

5.1.1 Teacher concerns about the NCS
Data on stages of concern of teachers indicated that 28% (n = 14) of teachers
have self concerns (stages 0-2) about the NCS. This means that these teachers
are merely implementing the NCS mechanically without actually taking ownership
or thinking about the curriculum. 14% (n = 7) of teachers have task concerns
(stage 3), which means that these teachers have started making use of the NCS.
58% (n = 29) of the teachers have impact concerns (stages 4-6), which means
that these teachers are implementing the NCS as intended. If one takes into
account the fact that the curriculum is in its tenth year of implementation in Grade
1, one is left with no doubt that focused support is necessary.

5.1.2 Teacher mastery and teacher adaptation of the NCS
Data on teacher mastery and teacher adaptation of the NCS in all three
instruments (checklists, interviews and observations) used, indicated that there is
only fidelity of implementation of the NCS in connection with the following three
critical components: teaching methods, integration and assessment method.
Teachers are still struggling with critical components such as the role of the
learners, the role of the teacher, classroom arrangement, assessment purpose,
assessment time and inclusive approach.
The above data indicates that much still needs to be done to improve the quality of teaching and learning. The words of Killen are instructive in this regard:

If teachers want quality learning to occur in their classrooms, they must deliberately teach in ways that enable and encourage learners to engage in the intellectual activities that promote leaning (2007: 19).

Fortunately, most of the hard work of identifying which approaches to teaching facilitate learning has been done for teachers (Killen, 2007). They just need to understand how to employ the principles, which have been derived from research into effective teaching, so that they can teach in accordance with an explicit set of principles that have order, coherence and relevance in the instructional context.

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

5.2.1 Teacher concerns about the NCS
Teachers are likely to have personal concerns when they are required to teach a new curriculum like the NCS which requires the use of new or revised materials; the use of new teaching approaches; and the alteration of beliefs (Fullan, 2001: 39) as was illustrated by this study. The more support teachers are afforded, the more they will be able to deliver a new curriculum. Killen (1999: 3) reminds curriculum authorities that they are not always expected to personally solve each teacher's problems. Rather, they should understand the concerns and problems a curriculum poses for teachers and provide support that teachers need. Against the background of this study, the following support mechanisms are recommended to help address teachers' concerns about the NCS:

- The formulation of a coherent policy on teacher support for the implementation of the NCS. Such guidelines, principles and priorities will
lay a good foundation for a comprehensive and coordinated support program.

- The development of a coherent management plan for teacher support. A detailed teacher support plan outlining how various support strategies will be organized, monitored, communicated and evaluated.

- Creation of more opportunities for in-service education and training. General workshops should be replaced with more personalized programmes based on the exact needs and concerns of teachers.

- The initiation of professional learning communities to create opportunities for teachers to exchange ideas, solve mutual problems and clarify uncertainties with regard to the teaching of the NCS.

5.2.2 Teacher mastery and teacher adaptation of the NCS

In view of the findings pertaining to teacher mastery and teacher adaptation of the NCS, the following recommendations are made in line with the critical components that were used and found problematic for teachers to implement as intended:

With regard to the role of the learners and the role of the teachers, data indicated that learners were less active and teachers more directive than would be preferred when implementing the NCS. In order to address this problem, teachers need more exposure and practice in teaching strategies like group work, discussion, role-play etc.

In connection with the critical component describing classroom arrangement, it was found that teachers aimed for a physical arrangement that supported group work and learner collaboration. However, in practice collaboration between learners did not always take place. Therefore, teachers need to be thoroughly trained, monitored and supported in classroom arrangement.
With regard to assessment (purpose, method and time), data indicated that teachers complied with the requirements of assessment method, apart from not understanding clearly the purpose of assessment and time of assessment. Teachers however, need help in the management of assessment. At present assessment takes up too much teaching time and is too cumbersome from an administrative perspective. It is crucial though, for teachers to understand outcomes-based principles, because they provide the foundation for the assessment practices recommended in various policy documents. At present policies related to assessment are at odds with the classroom realities of most teachers. A less burdensome system that takes into account the constructivist view of the curriculum is needed.

Most learners were accommodated in classrooms, as policy on inclusive education requires. Classroom observations and interviews revealed that teachers were not always able to cater for the diverse needs of learners, despite their best intentions. This problem can best be addressed at a systemic level with inputs from teachers that are rooted in their practices and experiences.

5.3 CONCLUDING REMARKS
The purpose of this study was to evaluate the implementation of the National Curriculum Statement (NCS) in a few selected Grade 1 classrooms of the Limpopo Province. A sample of 50 Grade 1 teachers of Zebediela Area of Capricorn District was used. The degree of implementation was expressed in terms of teachers’ concerns about the NCS, teachers’ level of use of the NCS and teachers’ adaptation of the NCS. In view of the small sample, conclusions cannot be drawn for the whole of the Limpopo Province.

The innovation configuration matrix can be extended to include critical components such as orientation of the curriculum, learning content, lesson planning, etc. and be used to survey the whole of the Limpopo Province to get a more comprehensive picture of the implementation of the NCS in the province.
Notwithstanding limitations, this study focused on areas of teacher use of the curriculum essential to the successful implementation of the NCS and indicates aspects that require further investigation and attention.

This study also demonstrated that Grade 1 teachers are trying very hard to implement the NCS despite difficult educational circumstances. The attempts that they make to meet the needs of learners in varying contexts need to be supported.
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APPENDIX A
APPLICATION LETTER FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN SCHOOLS

Enq: Kgohlo P.M                                  P O Box 1686
Telefax: 0156620547 (W)                        Groothoek Hospital
                                 0156424497 (H)
E-mail: p.p@telkomsa.net                           0628
                                                  15 September 2006

Attention: Mathews Mhlongo
Department of Education
Private Bag x9489
POLOKWANE
0700

Dear Sir

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH DURING THE LAST QUARTER OF 2006.

1. The aforementioned matter bears reference.

2. I am studying for the MED in Curriculum Planning, Development and Management with Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU).

3. My research topic is: “The evaluation of the implementation of the National Curriculum Statement (NCS) in a few selected Grade 1 classrooms of the Limpopo Province.

4. I have delimited the scope of my research to cover only Grade 1 classrooms in the Zebediela Area of the Capricorn District.
5. Attached please find a copy of a letter from the university for the approval of my research topic and the allocation of my supervisor Dr SE Blignaut to substantiate my request.

6. I hope that my request will receive your immediate attention and approval.

7. Thank you in advance for your continued assistance and support.

Yours faithfully
Kgohlo P.M. (Mr)
APPENDIX B

LETTER OF PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN SCHOOLS

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT

Enquiries: Mokoka M B
Telephone: 015 290 7918
Fax: 015 297 2690
Reference: 2/5/6/1

Kgohlo P M
P.O. Box 1886
Groothoek Hospital
0628

Dear Student

Request For Permission To Conduct Research

1. Your letter of request bears reference.

2. The Department wishes to inform you that your request for permission to conduct research at selected schools in Zebediela Area in Capricorn District is approved. The title of the research is "The evaluation of the implementation of the National Curriculum Statement in few selected Grade 1 classrooms of the Limpopo Province."

3. The following conditions should be observed:
3.1. The research should not have any financial implications for Limpopo Department of Education.
3.2. Arrangements should be made with both the Circuit Office and the schools concerning the conduct of the study. Care should be taken not to disrupt the academic programme at the schools.
3.3. The study should be conducted during the first three terms of the calendar year as schools would be preparing themselves for the final end of year examinations during the fourth term.
3.4. The research is conducted in line with ethics in research. In particular, the principle of voluntary participation in this research should be respected.
3.5. You share with the Department, the final product of your study upon completion of the research assignment.

4. Your Department is expected to produce the accompanying letter at schools/offices where you will be conducting your research, as evidence that permission for this activity has been granted.

5. The Department appreciates the contribution that you wish to make and wishes you success in your investigation.

HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

DATE:
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APPENDIX C
COVERING LETTER FOR QUESTIONNAIRES AND CHECKLISTS

A QUESTIONNAIRE AND A CHECKLIST TO GRADE 1 TEACHERS

I am Piet Maphodisa Kgothlo an MED in Curriculum Planning, Development and Management student with Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU) carrying out research on the evaluation of the implementation of the National Curriculum Statement (NCS) in a few selected Grade 1 classrooms of the Limpopo Province (see Professor M.M Botha's letter attached). I have delimited the scope of my research to cover only Grade 1 classrooms in Zebediela Area of Capricorn District of Limpopo Province. I have also been allowed to carry out the study by Limpopo Province Department of Education (LPDoE) (see the letter attached).

Kindly complete the questionnaire and the checklist and submit them to your respective Circuit Office on or before 20 March 2007. The code of ethics is highly observed by making this questionnaire and checklist anonymous. Therefore, the information obtained by means of this questionnaire and checklist will be used only for the purpose of this research. All information will be dealt with in a strict confidential manner.

Your honest response to this questionnaire and checklist will be highly appreciated. Please read the instructions carefully before responding.

Take note of the fact that follow up interviews and classroom observations with each teacher, will also be undertaken and they will both span a period of not less than an hour.
If you have any queries, please feel free to contact me at:

Work telefax: 015 662 0547  
Home telefax: 015 642 4497  
Cell No: 072 512 0700  
E-mail: p.p.@telkomsa.net

Thank you in advance for your unfailing support.

Yours faithfully
Kgohlo P.M. (Mr)
APPENDIX D
STAGES OF CONCERN QUESTIONNAIRE (Hall et al., 1979) (adapted)

Complete this questionnaire by circling what you feel is the appropriate response.

If a statement is very true of you circle 6 or 7 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
If a statement is somewhat true of you circle 3, 4 or 5 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
If a statement is not true of you circle 1 or 2 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
If a statement seems irrelevant to you circle 0 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>not true of you</td>
<td>somewhat true of you</td>
<td>very true of you now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I am concerned about pupils’ attitudes toward the NCS. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. I now know of some other approaches that might work better. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. I don’t even know what the NCS is about. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. I am concerned about not having enough time to organize myself each day. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. I would like to help other teachers in their teaching of the NCS. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. I have a very limited knowledge of the NCS. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. I would like to know the effect of reorganization on my professional status. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
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8. I am concerned about the conflict between my interests and responsibilities. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. I am concerned about revising my use of the NCS. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. I would like to develop working relationships with both our staff and other teachers using this NCS. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. I am concerned about how the NCS affects pupils' performance. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. I am not concerned about the NCS. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. I would like to know who will make decisions in the teaching of the NCS. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. I would like to discuss the possibility of using the NCS. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. I would like to know what resources are available if we decide to teach the NCS. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. I am concerned about my inability to manage all that the NCS requires. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. I would like to know how my teaching or administration is supposed to change. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. I would like to familiarize other teachers with progress regarding the teaching of the NCS. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. I am concerned about evaluating my impact on pupils. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
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20. I would like to revise the NCS’s instructional approach (i.e. way of teaching).

21. I am completely occupied with other things.

22. I would like to modify our use of the NCS based on the experiences of our pupils.

23. Although I don’t know about the NCS, I am concerned about things in the NCS.

24. I would like to excite my pupils about their part in the teaching of the NCS.

25. I am concerned about time spent working with non academic problems related to the NCS.

26. I would like to know what the use of the NCS will require in the immediate future.

27. I would like to coordinate my effort with others to maximize the NCS’s effects.

28. I would like to have more information on time and energy commitments required by the NCS.

29. I would like to know what other grades are doing in the teaching of the NCS.

30. At this time, I am not interested in learning about the NCS.
31. I would like to determine how to supplement, enhance or replace the NCS.

32. I would like to use feedback from students to change the NCS.

33. I would like to know how my role will change when I am using the NCS.

34. Coordination of tasks and people is taking too much of my time.

35. I would like to know how the NCS is better than what we have been doing in the past.
APPENDIX E
CHECKLIST

Think about your present teaching practice. Please tick one choice, for each of the nine categories listed below that is most descriptive of your teaching.

ROLE OF LEARNERS

[ ] Learners are actively involved in the teaching and learning process most of the time.  
[ ] Learners are usually actively involved, but at times are passive listeners.  
[ ] Learners are usually passive recipients of knowledge, but at times are actively involved.  
[ ] Learners are passive recipients of knowledge most of the time.

ROLE OF TEACHER

[ ] The teacher is a facilitator of learning (helps learners to construct/develop their own knowledge).  
[ ] The teacher is usually a facilitator of learning, but sometimes supplies knowledge.  
[ ] The teacher is usually the source of knowledge, but sometimes helps learners to construct their own knowledge.  
[ ] The teacher is the sole transmitter of all knowledge (supplies learners with all the necessary knowledge).

TEACHING METHODS

[ ] The teacher uses group work most of the time (regularly).  
[ ] The teacher sometimes uses group work.  
[ ] The teacher predominantly (most of the time) uses whole class instruction.
[ ] The teacher sometimes uses whole class instruction.

INTEGRATION

[ ] The focus is on integration within and across all learning areas.
[ ] The focus is on integration within the learning area only.
[ ] There is little evidence of any integration.

CLASSROOM ARRANGEMENT

[ ] Learners are seated in flexible groups, but may move around the class for particular activities.
[ ] Classroom arrangement is dependent on pupils’ ability.
[ ] Learners are seated in fixed rows and keep to their seats most of the time.

ASSESSMENT

* PURPOSE

[ ] Assessment is used both in a formative and a summative way.
[ ] Assessment is used predominantly in a summative way.
[ ] Assessment is used predominantly in a formative way.

* METHOD

[ ] Learners are assessed using criterion referenced assessment (i.e. learner individual achievement is measured by determining whether a learner achieves each outcome).
[ ] Learners are assessed using norm referenced assessment (i.e. learner achievement is based on comparison with other learners and the relative position of a learner in the class).
* TIME

[ ] Learners are assessed continuously and at the end of a teaching and learning sequence.
[ ] Learners are assessed only at the end of a teaching and learning sequence.

INCLUSIVE APPROACH

[ ] Learners with special educational needs (LSEN) are accommodated and assisted within the classroom situation at all times.
[ ] LSEN are accommodated and assisted within the classroom situation, but are also withdrawn from classroom and given assistance.
[ ] LSEN are withdrawn from the classroom to give them assistance.
[ ] There is no provision made to accommodate the LSEN.
## APPENDIX F
### TEACHER INTERVIEW

Kindly tell me which of the following descriptors best describe your practice:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITICAL COMPONENTS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTOR</th>
<th>DESCRIPTOR</th>
<th>DESCRIPTOR</th>
<th>DESCRIPTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROLE OF LEARNERS</td>
<td>Learners active</td>
<td>Learners usually active</td>
<td>Learners passive</td>
<td>Learners usually passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLE OF TEACHER</td>
<td>Teacher facilitator</td>
<td>Teacher usually facilitator</td>
<td>Teacher sole transmitter of</td>
<td>Teacher usually source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td>of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING METHODS</td>
<td>Teacher uses group work most of the</td>
<td>Teacher seldom uses group work</td>
<td>Teacher predominantly uses</td>
<td>Teacher sometimes uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>time (regularly)</td>
<td></td>
<td>whole class instruction</td>
<td>whole class instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATION</td>
<td>Focus is on integration within and</td>
<td>Focus is on integration within</td>
<td>There is little evidence of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>across all learning areas</td>
<td>the learning area only</td>
<td>any integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSROOM ARRANGEMENT</td>
<td>Dependent on particular learning</td>
<td>Arranged according to ability</td>
<td>Fixed (stable) rows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT PURPOSE</td>
<td>Used both in formative and summative way</td>
<td>Predominantly used in a summative way</td>
<td>Predominantly used in a formative way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT METHOD</td>
<td>Using criterion referenced assessment</td>
<td>Using norm referenced assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT TIME</td>
<td>Learners are assessed continuously and at the end of a teaching and learning sequence</td>
<td>Learners are assessed only at the end of a teaching and learning sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCLUSIVE APPROACH</td>
<td>LSEN are accommodated and assisted within the classroom situation at all times</td>
<td>LSEN are accommodated and assisted within the classroom situation, but are removed at times</td>
<td>LSEN are withdrawn from class to give them assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no provision to accommodate the LSEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

84
### APPENDIX G

**CLASSROOM OBSERVATION SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBSERVATION ITEM</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROLE OF LEARNERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLE OF TEACHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING METHODS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSROOM ARRANGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT PURPOSE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT METHOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT TIME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCLUSIVE APPROACH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>