TEACHER ADAPTATION OF A
CURRICULUM DURING IMPLEMENTATION

Margaret Mary Childs

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Magister Philosophiae
in the Faculty of Education
at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University

January 2005

Supervisor: Prof. C.A. Taylor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have assisted me during the writing of this treatise. Because of their help and encouragement this process has been a rewarding and enjoyable one.

My thanks and appreciation go to:

- Professor Cedric Taylor, my supervisor, for his professional approach, meticulous attention to detail and extreme patience,

- Colleagues in the Faculty of Education, particularly our former Dean, Professor Wally Morrow and our present Dean, Professor Ana Naidoo. Wally helped me discover the value and joy of disciplined inquiry and Ana helped me to make the time and then take the time to finish this treatise.

- My friends and family, especially my husband Robby and my children Jonathan and Talia. Robby supported me quietly an uncomplainingly and Jonathan and Talia gave me the courage to labour on each time they said, "I love you Mom."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study is to investigate to what extent foundation phase teachers adapt Curriculum 2005. The study was guided by two research questions:
(1) What are the critical components of Curriculum 2005 (foundation phase)?
(2) What are the adaptations that teachers have made in teaching this curriculum?

The specific focus of this study is foundation phase teachers' initial implementation of the revised version of Curriculum 2005, the Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS). An Innovation Configuration Checklist was developed identifying the critical components of the RNCS and the variations of each. Using the checklist, foundation phase teachers were surveyed to establish the adaptations being made during implementation. The findings of this study indicate that there is less active learning and more teacher directed activity than is required by the RNCS. Assessment appears to be a problem area. Most teachers understand what is expected of them in terms of assessment and attempt to put it into practice. Assessment has however, proved to be burdensome and time consuming. Teachers' planning demonstrates a sound understanding of the procedures to be followed. Teachers do however, need support in terms of deeper pedagogical content knowledge. Although teachers comply with the technical aspects of curriculum development they neglect the emancipatory aspects of the RNCS. The situation in foundation phase classrooms might be described as one where much change is taking place, but little transformation is happening at present. Teachers are nevertheless, reflecting on how to improve their teaching and continue to explore ways to adapt and improve the RNCS.

KEY CONCEPTS

Curriculum adaptation

Curriculum 2005

Foundation Phase

Revised National Curriculum Statement

Educational change

Curriculum implementation

DECLARATION

I, Margaret Mary Childs, hereby declare that the treatise *Teacher Adaptation of a Curriculum During Implementation*, submitted to the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University for the degree of Magister Philosophiae, is my own work, that it has not previously been submitted at any other university, and that all the sources I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowleged by complete references.

Margaret Mary Childs
6 January 2004.

CHAPTER ONE: ORIENTATION

- Educational change depends on what teachers do and think – it's as simple and as complex as that [Fullan, 2001: 115].

1.1 Introduction

As part of the project 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 Education and Training Band (grades R – 7) would have implemented the curriculum. The curriculum was named Curriculum 2005 with reference to the expected final implementation date.

This curriculum called for a change in teacher behaviour and understanding. For instance, teachers were required to undergo a role change and become facilitators of learning. The notion of a teacher as "the" authority was challenged. Teachers were now encouraged to develop learner-centred practices based on an emancipatory view of education in which learners take responsibility for their own learning. Previously, the doctrine of Fundamental Pedagogics had a significant influence on teacher education (Taylor and Vinjevold, 1999: 133). Taylor and Vinjevold indicate that this doctrine had a deleterious influence on teacher understanding and practice (1999:132). Enslin as cited by Taylor and Vinjevold (1999:133) maintains that fundamental pedagogics inhibits critical reflection. Enslin also asserts that fundamental pedagogics legitimated authoritarian practice and rendered teachers voiceless as only those "with the science are qualified to speak" (Enslin in Taylor and Vinjevold, 1999:133). Fundamental pedagogics promoted the notion of the adult leading the child to adulthood (Beard and Morrow, 1981: 5). This outlook on education could be described as authoritarian according to Taylor and Vinjevold (1999: 132). The notion of the teacher was one of an informed adult leading the less informed child to maturity. The fact that there was little room for the "uninformed" to critique the "informed" led to liberal and progressive educationalists dismissing

fundamental pedagogics (Taylor and Vinjevold, 1999:132). Success in education, according to the fundamental pedagogic philosophy, occurs when the pupil obeys the teacher and ultimately espouses the values of the society that the teacher portrays (Muir, 1981: 141). Apart from the authoritarian nature of fundamental pedagogics, the premises on which fundamental pedagogics was based were also questioned. Enslin (1981:149) investigated the notion of evidence and the appeal to authority of fundamental pedagogics. She questioned the claim of fundamental pedagogics to be a science, stating:

> The muddled and confusing account of science and scientific knowledge reveals a theory of knowledge which is quite inadequate. This must raise serious doubts about the theory of Fundamental Pedagogics as a whole.

In restructuring education after the demise of apartheid education, educational policy makers saw the removal of the philosophy of education of fundamental pedagogics as one of the foremost duties of a new educational dispensation (Taylor and Vinjevold, 1999: 132). Whether learner centred teaching is really possible in the majority of South African classrooms is questioned by some (Brodie, 2000; Baxten and Soudien, 1999; Jansen, 1999). Ultimately teachers have to decide to either implement a curriculum as mandated or to adapt the curriculum to take into account their particular context.

The aim of this study is to investigate teachers' adaptation of a curriculum during implementation. The implementation of Curriculum 2005 requires a great deal of the average teacher in South Africa who battles on a daily basis with the effects of teaching large numbers of learners in an under-resourced context. Classroom teachers are expected to make real the vision of curriculum planners. They must find a way to facilitate teaching, learning and assessment despite difficult conditions. The gap between curriculum as intention and curriculum as reality confronts teachers regularly. The extract from curriculum orientation material below exemplifies this.

> QUESTION:
> How is it possible to make a meaningful assessment in overcrowded classrooms, or even where no classrooms exist?
> ANSWER:
> The new curriculum does not pretend to solve the facilitative problem. That issue is being addressed at provincial and community level. (Department of Education: 1997)

Teachers in the Eastern Cape Province are expected to implement the revised curriculum despite limited support from the province (*Weekend Post*: 2004). Given the high unemployment rate, teachers cannot reasonably expect much support from communities, where in the Eastern Cape Province for example, 67% of the 6,6 million people live below the poverty line. (*Mail and Guardian*; 2004).

Apart from battles resulting from a challenging physical context, teachers face intellectual conflicts too. The emancipatory ideal of the curriculum is at odds with the instrumental reality of curriculum implementation (Bak: 2000; Jansen: 1999; Peters: 2003). The learner envisaged in the curriculum policy is not yet the learner that is found in most foundation phase classrooms. The vision expressed in the Revised Curriculum is of learners who value and act in ways that show a respect for democracy, equality, human dignity, life and social justice (Department of Education: 2002). It may be too soon to expect to find this kind of learner in foundation phase classrooms. However one may hope to find evidence in teachers' planning that this is something that they are working towards. While the directives contained in the teachers' guide have extensive information on how to plan a learning programme, work schedule and lesson plan in the foundation phase, teachers are merely asked briefly to "consider" the principles underpinning the curriculum (Department of Education: 2002). The impression is created that the technical aspects of the planning process are of the utmost importance while issues such as social justice, human rights and care of the environment are of less significance.

Teachers who are required to put a new curriculum into practice have to reconcile the ideas and ideals of the curriculum with the reality of the classroom and the day-to-day demands of being a foundation phase teacher. This may cause teachers to adapt a new curriculum. The ways that teachers adapt a curriculum and their reasons for doing so is of significance. Teachers "epistemological assumptions" (Peters, 2003: 163) may be challenged, their understanding of a new curriculum may have to be supported and developed, but their professional competence also recognised. Many of these issues can be attended to in teacher education programmes. Since the pre-service Bachelor of Education programme (B.Ed.) is

seen as the initial professional teaching qualification, implications of teacher adaptations of the foundation phase of C2005 will be considered with reference to the B.Ed programme and in-service programmes.

1.2 Problem statement

This research will investigate teacher adaptation of a new curriculum in practice. More specifically, the study will seek to determine to what extent teachers adapt the new foundation phase of Curriculum 2005, i.e. whether a discrepancy exists between an intended curriculum, namely the foundation phase of Curriculum 2005 and as it is implemented by teachers.

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

(1) What are the critical components of Curriculum 2005 (foundation phase)?

(2) What are the adaptations that teachers have made in teaching this curriculum?

1.3 Clarification of concepts

ADAPTATION

Adaptation implies adjusting to a new situation or environment. In the context of this treatise we will look at the adjustments that are made to a curriculum and related teaching practice. Mutual adaptation is the term Berman (1981: 271) uses to describe a situation where both the innovation and the institution adapt. Effectively implemented innovations are usually characterised by mutual adaptation.

CRITICAL COMPONENTS

Critical components are the components or elements that are essential for the operationalisation of a curriculum. Heck, Stiegelbauer, Hall and Loucks, (1981:12) describe critical components as that which can be observed when an innovation is in use. Critical components describe what teachers should be doing, the materials that should be used, the teaching behaviours, and processes that are required, as they "use" an innovation.

CURRICULUM 2005: REVISED NATIONAL CURRICULUM STATEMENT

Curriculum 2005 (grades R – 9) was developed in 1997 and classroom

implementation began in 1998. A draft Revised National Curriculum Statement was published in July 2001 and public and professional comment was encouraged. In 2002 the Revised National Curriculum Statement grades R – 9 (Schools) was published. This study will focus on the revised version of Curriculum 2005, the Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS) published in 2002.

EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

Change is a generic term referring to alteration, mutation and transformation. The term innovation refers to more radical or complete change, according to Fullan (1982: 246). Educational change will be viewed not as a happening or event, but rather as a complex process. Whether change is intentional or not, welcome or unwelcome, it involves aspects of uncertainty, challenge and intricate social reactions.

IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation refers to what really happens in practice when an innovation is in use. This is not necessarily what was intended to happen (Fullan, 2001: 10). For implementation of a new curriculum to take place, Posner (1995:191) contends that there has to be a change in what actually happens as teachers, learners and learning content intersect. According to Fullan (2001: 69) "implementation is the process of putting into practice an idea, programme, or set of activities and structures new to the people attempting or expected to change".

1.4 Research methodology

A descriptive survey will be the primary method used in this study. The sample will consist of foundation phase teachers selected from the Port Elizabeth district who have been trained to teach the Revised National Curriculum Statement. Data will be collected by means of a checklist supplemented by observations and interviews with grade R to 3 teachers from a number of different schools.

1.5 Outline of the study

A justification for the study and a statement of the problem to be addressed is given in chapter one. In chapter two literature related to the study will be reviewed. Chapter three will focus on an operational description of the foundation phase of Curriculum 2005 in terms of what teachers and learners should be doing in classrooms when the curriculum is being implemented faithfully. The fourth chapter will describe the research methodology used in the study. A presentation and discussion of the data collected will follow in chapter five. The final chapter will include conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of teacher adaptation of a curriculum can be placed beneath the over arching concept of educational change. This literature review will not give an exhaustive account of change in education, but will situate the concepts of curriculum implementation and the more specific aspect of teacher use of a new curriculum within the framework of educational change. The shaded areas of Figure 1 indicate the focus of the literature review.

EDUCATIONAL CHANGE				
IMPLEMENTATION				
IMPLEMENTATION PHASES:				
MOBILIZATION	ADOPTION	INITIATION	**TEACHER USE** *[IMPLEMENTATION]*	INSTITUTION-ALIZATION

FIGURE 1. LITERATURE REVIEW

Various aspects of educational change will be discussed. Thereafter the discussion will move to focus on implementation of a curriculum as a particular instance of educational change and then more specifically to teacher adaptation of a curriculum.

2.1 Educational change

The complexity of change is mentioned by various authors (Bascia and Hargreaves, 2000; Berman, 1981; Dalziel and Schoonover, 1988; Edwards, Dunham and Dick, 2000; Fullan, 2001; Fullan, 2002; Fullan, 2003*).* The nature of change is multidimensional and takes place in a particular context that includes political, social, economic and moral aspects. The organisations, individuals involved and particular contexts are just a few of the mitigating factors 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 the change:

> When those who have power to manipulate changes act as if they have only to explain, and when their explanations are not at once 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.

Another feature of change, apart from its complexity and the pace of change, is that change impacts both on 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 reality 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). In discussing how change affects the individual, Fullan refers to the subjective meaning of change. He looks at change as it impacts on a teacher. Fullan (2001:33) cites the work done by Huberman and also by 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 in Fullan, 2001:33) states that "… teachers tend to function intuitively and rarely spend time reflecting on how they carry out their jobs". The work of various authors (Koekemoer & Olivier, 2002; Fullan, 2001) demonstrates the importance of acknowledging the subjective meaning of change in the change process. Loucks and Hall (1979: 2) emphasised the concerns of teachers with regard to an innovation. These researchers found that teachers were concerned with how a change in the curriculum would affect them personally. Loucks and Hall developed a measurement tool to evaluate teachers' concerns about an innovation. They identified six stages of concern of teachers could experience with regard to an innovation, namely awareness, informational, personal, management, consequence, collaboration and refocusing concerns. Rogers in Carl (2002:144) identified five

categories ranging from enthusiasts to antagonists to describe teachers' attitudes towards change.

Although those who resist change are often labelled negatively as being "antagonists" (as above), "habitually disgruntled" (DoE: 1997) 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 Stigelbauer (1991:4) make the distinction between change and progress. Change is not necessarily improvement. In looking at the implementation of a curriculum and teacher adaptation thereof, it may be useful to remember this. Resisting certain change may sometimes be more responsible than adopting that change. 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, for instance, that is poorly designed and badly managed, an experienced teacher may decide not to implement the curriculum or to adapt the curriculum and only to implement aspects that she deemed valuable.

Having noted 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 for individuals, from the initiators and managers 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 new or revised materials, new teaching approaches, and alteration of beliefs.

The multidimensional nature of change should be considered. Apart from the subjective and objective aspects of change, change also consists of a number of activities. Berman (1981: 261) 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 institutionalisation as the three processes of educational change. Carl (2002:80) emphasises the process of design, dissemination, implementation and evaluation. Taylor (2000:4) explains the implementation process as including macro-implementation and micro-implementation. Figure 2 provides an adapted exposition of Taylor's view of the implementation process.

DIAGRAMME OF THE IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS		
MACRO-IMPLEMENTATION (Passages)	**MICRO- IMPLEMENTATION (Phases)**	**USER IMPLEMENTATION**
Administration *Translation of a policy decision into a specific government programme*	Mobilization *Adoption at the school level*	Teacher use *Minor degree of personal concerns regarding new programme* *High level of mastery of programme* *Limited adaptations of new programme as operationalised in practice*
Adoption *The adoption of the programme at the regional/ district/ local/ community level*	User implementation *Implementation at the classroom level by the teacher*	
Micro-implementation *The delivery of the programme at the school and classroom levels with the support of the local authority*	Institutionalization *Sustained implementation of innovation within the school*	
Evaluation *Determination of success of the programme*		

FIGURE 2: IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS (Taylor, 2000)

This study will focus on the user implementation phase of implementation and more specifically on the adaptations teachers make to a new curriculum when teaching it.

2.2 The fidelity and adaptive perspectives on the implementation of change

In this study the focus is on the process of implementation, and more specifically teacher use and adaptation of a new curriculum as an instance of educational change. Implementation is more than a mechanical process that follows the introduction of a new or revised curriculum. It may include the learning of new skills, concepts, views, beliefs and attitudes. This learning takes place within individuals (Berman, 1981; Peters, 2003) but also between individuals (Fullan, 1982; Leithwood, 1981) and within organisations (Huberman and Miles, 1984; Fullan, 2003) in order to bring about a change in practice.

> 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. The change may be externally imposed or voluntarily sought; explicitly defined in detail in advance or developed and adapted incrementally through use; designed to be used uniformly or deliberately planned so that users can make modifications according to their perceptions of the needs of the situation (Fullan, 2001:69).

Implementation has been viewed from various perspectives. In 1976 Kritek spoke of a shift in focus that was occurring in the literature about change. Where the emphasis had been on the diffusion and adoption of innovations, there was growing emphasis on how the proposed educational change could be put into practice. Fullan and Pomfret undertook an often-cited investigation of curriculum implementation in 1977. They maintained that implementation was more than merely an extension of the planning and adoption process, that in fact, it was an event in its own right. Fullan and Pomfret identified the *fidelity perspective* and the *process perspective* of implementation. The fidelity perspective stresses the importance of the official curriculum. The assumption is that if a curriculum is soundly researched and prepared that teachers will then implement the curriculum with little or no adaptation. Teachers are regarded as recipients rather than co-creators of the curriculum. The process perspective insists that the particular circumstances at a particular school

will make adaptation necessary. Supporters of the process or adaptation perspective contend that all educational situations are unique and therefore curricula should be modified to suit the particular school environment. Fullan and Pomfret (1977: 158) indicate that it is probably more important to describe the different ways that a new curriculum is being used, than it is to judge the degree of implementation, especially in the early stages of implementation.

Berman (1981: 253) also investigated the nature of implementation He alluded to significant development at paradigmatic levels concerning educational change. He traced shifts in educational change from the 1950s. At that time, there was a belief that education could be improved if tried and tested products were disseminated to schools and that as long as teachers had sufficient knowledge and resources they would implement the required change. This emphasis on replicable products changed to a focus on the process of implementation. The success of an innovation was seen as being dependent on "how it was carried out" (Berman, 1981:263). Berman (1980: 205) identified two different stances regarding implementation. He described these as *programmed implementation* and *adaptive implementation*. The conviction that careful design, planning and prescription can prevent implementation difficulties underpins the programmed implementation view, while the notion that the initial conceptualisation of an innovation can be improved in response to implementation contexts supports the adaptive implementation perspective. Teachers are viewed as "deliverers" who operate in routine ways from the one point of view, and as "active participants" and problem solvers from the other point of view.

While some curriculum authors would opt for an either-or situation, that is, either conformity to the curriculum, or adaptation of the curriculum, Berman looks at implementation as being possible through programmed implementation *and* adaptive implementation. Berman (1981:206) concedes that since implementation contexts are often complex, a combination of programmed and adaptive strategies might be more appropriate. He posits that certain circumstances or "situational parameters" will indicate whether programmed or adaptive implementation or a mixture of both should take place. Given the history of South Africa, it is obvious that there will be significant differences in schools. Rural black schools, for instance, are often poorly

resourced, have an unacceptably high pupil teacher ratio and have a number of under-qualified teachers. It might be more useful to say that schools could be placed on a continuum from worst case scenario to best case scenario. Worst case scenario would be characterised by factors such as:

- unqualified or under-qualified teachers;
- incompetent teachers;
- demotivated teachers;
- absent teachers;
- drunk or abusive teachers;
- disruptive learners;
- extremely large classes;
- multi-age, multi-grade and ability classes;
- non functional schools;
- poorly managed schools; and
- under-resourced schools.

Best case scenario can be characterised by factors such as:

- well qualified teachers;
- highly competent teachers;
- inspired teachers;
- dedicated teachers;
- good teachers / positive role models;
- diligent learners;
- manageable class size;
- homogenous classes;
- well functioning schools;
- effectively managed schools; and
- well-resourced schools.

Another reason why it is difficult to categorise schools is that despite incredible odds, good teaching and learning take place. Or sadly, in fairly well resourced situations, poor teaching and consequently poor learning may take place because teachers are overwhelmed and over-worked, feel unsupported and no longer enjoy their work.

Using the categorisation provided by Berman (1980: 214) the situation type of the South African school curriculum could be described as unstructured rather than structured. Each of the situational parameters identified by Berman will be discussed to substantiate this claim.

Situational parameters	Situation type	
	Structured	**Unstructured**
Scope of change	Incremental	Major
Certainty of theory	Certain within risk	Uncertain
Conflict over policy's goals and means	Low conflict	High conflict
Structure of institutional setting	Tightly coupled	Loosely coupled
Stability of environment	Stable	Unstable

FIGURE 3: SITUATIONAL PARAMETERS (Berman,1980)

Scope of change: The extent of change in the South African school system could be described as major, since in moving from a traditional curriculum to Curriculum 2005, teachers are required to focus on outcomes rather than content. Teachers, now referred to as educators, are expected to be facilitators of learning rather than experts who impart knowledge. They are required to make a "paradigm shift" (Department of Education, 1997b:1) from the "traditional aims-and-objectives approach to outcomes-based education". Teachers are thus expected to change their epistemologies. Earl and Katz (2000:100) contend that teachers are more influenced by their own intuitive views of learning than theories of learning. Earl and Katz (2000:100) cite Olson and Bruner (1996) as describing the intuitive views of teachers as "folk pedagogies". Teachers could either have a "mind as container" or "mind as constructor" folk pedagogy according to Earl and Katz (2000:100). Those teachers who have a view of the child as an empty vessel that must be filled with knowledge are required to adjust their view of learning. As "educators" they are

required to "…serve as mediators of meaning by encouraging and stimulating construction and production of knowledge" (Department of Education: 1997:17).

Certainty of theory: Certainty of theory refers to the degree of certainty regarding the legitimacy of the technology or theory underpinning a policy. The theory underlying the South African school curriculum is viewed by some as uncertain. There is limited agreement about what outcomes-based education is, nor is there a common understanding of what the South African version of OBE (Curriculum 2005) is. Malcolm (1999: 77) indicates that there are differences both at the level of theory and at the level of implementation, with respect to a conception of OBE. Apart from this confusion, there was no agreement that OBE in the guise of Curriculum 2005 was suitable for the South African context (Jansen, 1999: 145; Taylor and Vinjevold, 1999: 16).

There appears to be confusion regarding the theoretical foundations of Curriculum 2005. Bak (2000) indicates:

> We need to hold on to the distinction between OBE and Curriculum 2005 – they are not the same thing. OBE can be realised in a variety of different curricula.
> There is great confusion and lack of clarity about the concept of OBE. Different interpretations and misconceptions abound. There is an urgent need to develop a clear, shared understanding of OBE at all levels – from national to provincial departments, academics to teachers.

Steyn and Wilkinson (1998:203) identify a number of theoretical positions underpinning OBE in South Africa. These are behaviourism, social reconstructivism, critical theory, and pragmatism. These authors contend that although there are some areas of agreement between the theories there are also areas of conflict between the theories.

Conflict over policy's goals and means: Education in South Africa has the task of producing learners who can compete in the global market, and of transforming society in order to irradicate the ills of apartheid. The vision stated in Curriculum 2005 (Department of Education, 1997(b): 1) reads as follows:

A prosperous, truly united, democratic and internationally competitive country with literate, creative and critical citizens leading productive, self-fulfilled lives in a country free of violence, discrimination and prejudice

The point of departure of the South African curriculum is explicitly political (Taylor and Vinjevold, 1999:110). The revised National Curriculum Statement indicates that the "goals and values of social justice, equity and democracy" need to be "interwoven across the curriculum" (Department of Education, 2002: 8). The political context of education is accepted by role players in education. An example of the divergent views of the purpose and goals of a school curriculum is reflected in submissions to the curriculum Review Committee.

Official documents, research reports and submissions from various groups were considered by the Review Committee. Chisholm (2003: 1), in reflecting on the reaction to the review of Curriculum 2005, indicates that there are many parties interested and involved in trying to influence the curriculum. Interestingly, she notes that the strongest lobbies during the discussion period (the Christian right and a home-schooling organisation) had little influence on the final version of the revised curriculum. The ultimate nature of the Revised National Curriculum Statement is in Chisholm's words: "a rights-orientated, outcomes-based curriculum". Given the differences in the interests of stakeholders, the nature of the conflict, the curriculum policy goals and means can be described as high conflict.

Structure of institutional setting: The nature of the co-ordination between various policy settings at a national or macro level is categorised as the structure of institutional setting. In a tightly coupled setting, there would be a high degree of co-ordination between sectors. In the case of South Africa, it would probably be realistic to describe the setting as loosely coupled. There is a lack of communication between divisions and between levels.

In spite of considerable effort and hard work on the part of new national and provincial departments of education, and often against insuperable odds, the combination of changes occurring at an extraordinary pace exerted severe pressure on the system. Implementation was not always carefully thought through, properly piloted or resourced and enormous stresses and strains were consequently placed

on already over-burdened principals and teachers in widely-divergent educational contexts (Chisholm, 2000:4).

Stability of the environment: Typically programmed approaches are not able to adapt to changes or differences in the implementation environments. In the South African school context, factors such as redeployment of teachers and budgetary crises can be cited as examples of the many factors that impact on the schooling environment. Taylor and Vinjevold (1999:31 -32) indicated that there were severe problems in all levels of the educational system. They maintained that some provincial administrations could be described as chaotic. Newspaper reports regularly confirm that in the Eastern Cape Province is still struggling to address the problem of lack of administrative competence (*Mail and Guardian,* 27 August 2004; *Herald,* 3 November 2004). Given these conditions, the educational environment is more likely to be described as unstable rather than stable. According to the Berman model, an adaptive strategy would be more suitable since the educational environment is relatively unstable. In the light of the preceding discussion it would seem that a system of adaptive implementation, rather than the more prescriptive programmed implementation would suit the South African curriculum context. This would imply that teachers should be encouraged to adapt the curriculum to match their educational situation.

The debate regarding the approaches to curriculum implementation has continued to the present day. Lubisi, Parker and Wedekind (1998: 90) indicate that curriculum can either be viewed narrowly as a *blueprint* or more broadly as a *learning environment.* Similarly, Gultig and Adendorf (2002: 35) describe curriculum as being regarded either as a plan or as a practice. From the 'blueprint' perspective, the teacher has to implement the curriculum designers' plan faithfully without amendment. However, from the more expansive point of view, the teacher interprets the curriculum with insight and professionalism and develops suitable learning contexts for her learners. The hope of an empowered teacher who is able to devise meaningful learning experiences is expressed in the foundation phase teacher's guide:

> These guidelines are geared to assist teachers in accommodating learning outcomes and assessment standards that are prescribed, yet create space and possibilities for

the use of judgements and insights based on particular contexts and a diverse learner population. As insights that are informed by practice, research and refinement, emerge from these guidelines, it is anticipated that over a period of time teachers will develop as curriculum leaders. The majority of teachers within the apartheid education system were not encouraged to be creative, imaginative and lead curriculum development and design. They were controlled followers and were forced to practice through prescription. As a consequence, many teachers were not participants in the exciting process of curriculum development
(Department of Education: 2003b).

The shift from viewing curriculum not merely as a product, but as a process is important, as is the shift to regard the teacher as a change agent rather than a recipient of a non-negotiable product. The success of the process model of curriculum development depends on the ability of the teacher. Stenhouse (2002: 71) indicates that the most significant weakness of the process model is that it relies on the competence of the teacher. The teacher is in a sense, the greatest risk to the curriculum, but also the greatest opportunity. The process model necessitates professional development. Teachers need time and support to develop a deep understanding of an innovation. They also need the opportunity to try out different ways to realise the innovation in their classrooms. Real educational transformation depends to a large degree on whether change occurs in teachers' epistemologies and practice.

Teachers are, however, not merely employees of a school, tasked with facilitating teaching and learning. They are members of society and this impacts on their interaction with an educational innovation. Buckland (2002: 36) makes the point that curriculum cannot be separated from the socio-political situation of the time nor from preceding history. He indicates that curriculum process operates at all levels of education policy from the minister of education to the classroom teacher. The actual curriculum that learners experience is a combination of the interaction between the teacher, the learner and the environment. This environment is influenced by historical, political, social factors and other factors.

The interaction between an innovation and the situation where change is expected to take place is important. McLaughlin (2002: 192) contends that for effective implementation to take place, there needs to be a *mutual adaptation* of the innovation, the institution and the individuals responsible for implementation. Where the innovation is adapted, but no change occurs in place of implementation or persons involved with the implementation, the implementation process is described as co-optation. Non-implementation is the term used to describe an implementation process where an innovation failed during implementation or where an innovation was not adapted by the intended implementers. Berman (1978: 178*)* suggested a similar categorisation of implementation, as shown in figure 4.

Outcome of implementation	Description
Non-implementation	No adaptation of the curriculum or deliverer behaviour
Cooptation	No adaptation of deliverer behaviour, but adaptation of the curriculum to accommodate existing routines
Technological learning	No adaptation in the curriculum but adaptation of routinized behaviour to accommodate the plan
Mutual Adaptation	Adaptation of both the curriculum and deliverer behaviour

FIGURE 4: FOUR PATHS OF IMPLEMENTATION (Berman, 1978)

Marsh and Willis (1999) trace the fidelity versus adaptation debate from the 1970s through to the 1990s. They make the point that different approaches, either fidelity or adaptation, may be appropriate in different situations. Particular subjects, places of implementation, levels of experience and teacher commitment might necessitate either a fidelity or adaptation approach. The different stages of the curriculum development process might also call for either a fidelity or adaptation approach (Berman,1978: 157). The adoption of a curriculum by a province or district may require a fidelity approach to ensure uniformity at a macro-level and to facilitate the mobility of learners between schools in the country. At a micro-implementation level,

on the other hand, classroom teachers may be given leeway to customise the curriculum to meet the particular needs of their learners.

2.3 Critical or operational components of a curriculum

In order to implement a curriculum, teachers need explicit information regarding the innovation in question. Looking at a proposed innovation in terms of its critical components, helps teachers to get a clearer idea of what they should be doing. These components are also a useful source when drawing up assessment criteria to evaluate actual curriculum use. Different researchers have described models to identify the critical components or operational aspects of a curriculum namely Hall and associates, Leithwood, and Wang and associates.

Hall and associates (1981:1) focussed on the role of the teacher in the process of implementation. The Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM) places emphasis on understanding the change process encountered by persons who are implementing an 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 formed the 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 innovation configurations.

The CBAM has been used extensively as a methodology for examining the process of the implementation of curriculum innovation. Anderson (1997:331) has critiqued the CBAM model, arguing that more theoretically based research, rather than applied research should be conducted in order to refine the CBAM model. By the mid-1980's CBAM had not yet reached fully developed theoretical status according to Anderson (1997: 338). Although CBAM provided an intricate framework for describing teacher implementation of curriculum innovations, Anderson contended that it was not sufficient for the CBAM 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).

Anderson examined examples of educational change research from the United States, Europe, Australia and Canada and highlighted instances and opportunities for further refinement and development of the CBAM. One of the developments cited by Anderson (1997: 343) is the work of Van der Vegt and Vandenberghe (1992) which looks at the use of concerns theory for investigating changes in school organisation as a result of externally imposed reform initiatives. The original CBAM model focuses on teacher change rather than school change. Anderson suggests that CBAM is an effective means of investigating teacher change, but that researchers should be more critical in their use of the model (Anderson, 1997: 363).

This study will make use of the innovation configurations (IC) dimension of the CBAM model. The researchers at the University of Texas noticed that people used parts of an innovation in different ways. Once 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 a school curriculum, key components may be teacher behaviours, learner activities, and the materials associated with the programme.

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 curriculum are listed along with the variations that are most likely to be found. Data are collected by means of the 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) contended that Hall and his colleagues made a valuable contribution to the study of curriculum innovation in developing the CBAM and more specifically the idea of levels 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 (1981:26). Leithwood referred to this matrix 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. These dimensions were derived from various sources including official guidelines, curriculum materials and their use in practice, curriculum theory, curriculum analysis tools and suggestions or instructions for curriculum development (1981:27). The dimensions identified are: *platform or image, objectives, student entry behaviours, assessment tools and procedures, instructional material, learners experiences, teaching strategies, content, time.* Leithwood 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 (1981:34). By using curriculum dimensions as a means of analysing and describing an innovation, teachers can be assisted to consider all aspects of the curriculum. Leithwood issues a warning, that the dimensions chosen should be harmonious with teachers' conceptions of their task. Thus, aspects such as teaching and learning strategies, and curriculum content must be explicit along with more novel aspects of an 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.

Wang, Nojan, Strom and Walberg (1984: 251) developed instruments to measure the degree of implementation of a programme. Two categories of critical programme dimensions were distinguished, namely an action domain and a structural domain. The action domain includes 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 related to resources such as space, facilities, teaching and learning materials and classroom rules and processes.

Procedures to determine the degree of implementation of a new programme were developed from performance indicators linked to the programme's action and structural domains. Six instruments were used to collect data on the degree of programme implementation: 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 static components of the programme (e.g. physical layout of the classroom), while the observations were concentrated on dynamic components (such as 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) state that:

> Successful implementation requires explicit information about the program's operating features and implementation conditions.

The *critical components* identified by Hall and associates, Leithwood's curriculum dimensions and innovation profile, and Wang and associates *critical programme dimensions* are all useful tools to provide teachers, as change agents, and administrators and trainers, as change facilitators, with clear information regarding an innovation and are useful means of determining to what extent a new curriculum is implemented or adapted.

2.4 Research literature

An examination of the Nexus database did not reveal any research directly related to this study. The investigation by Mkhabela (1999), Yende-Mtethwa (1999), and Stoffels (2000) is of relevance to this study in that it focuses on the implementation of C2005 in the foundation phase. Prins (1998) looked at how teachers experienced C2005 and Williams (2000) investigated how teachers responded to C2005, while Visser (1999) investigated the factors that influence teacher's attitudes to C2005. Diphofa's (1999) investigation of teachers' perceptions of their role in curriculum development also has some relevance to this study. A broad search of academic databases showed that much of the work related to curriculum adaptation by

teachers and curriculum innovation focuses on changing curricula to meet special needs of learners (Udvari-Solner, 1994:59; Alonso, 1999:80; Stodolsky and Grossman, 2000:125;). As such, it has little specific relevance to this investigation since this study is not limited to the adaptations that teachers make to accommodate learners' needs.

Various studies include use of innovation configurations in their investigation. A selection of these studies will be highlighted. The focus of the studies and their findings will be mentioned briefly.

Daodee (2001:1) examined the implementation of a cooperative learning teaching method used to improve the critical thinking skills of nurses in training. The CBAM was used as the basis for data collection. Structured interviews, observations, questionnaires and field notes were used to collect data. Daodee (2001:1) found that even though the same programme was implemented under the same training and support conditions, teachers used the innovation differently. Three out of the twenty-six teachers used the whole programme, most teachers used aspects of it and one teacher did not use the innovation at all. In general, however, most participants changed positively with respect to stages of concern, levels of use and innovation configurations.

Hall and George (2000:1) proposed the use of innovation configuration mapping as a means of evaluating the degree of implementation of a programme. In an paper titled *The use of innovation configuration maps in assessing implementation: The bridge between development and student outcomes*, delivered at a meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Hall and George indicate that the focal point of an IC map is on determining and outlining what should be seen when an innovation is used. They state that IC maps are useful in many different contexts including, self and peer assessment, staff development and staff evaluation. Hall and George (2000:1) note that IC maps do not indicate how to collect data, but are merely a way of recording data.

Craig and Kacer (2000*)* presented a paper at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association with a similar theme to that of Hall and George. In a presentation entitled *Using an innovation configuration component map to assess the relationship between student achievement and the degree of implementation of extended school services in a sample of Kentucky middle schools*, Craig and Kacer investigated whether an innovation configuration component map for Extended School Services (ESS) could be used to depict the extended school services used in Kentucky. They investigated the relationship between the level of implementation of extended school services and learner achievement. The sample used consisted of 10 middle schools at 5 levels of achievement. Craig and Kacer found that there was a positive relationship between the implementation of extended school services and improvement in learner results. Another finding of the study was the necessity of revising the IC map of ESS. The use of innovation configuration instruments thus provides data both about the innovation and about the measuring instrument, in this case, an IC map. In the next study information was also gleaned about a programme and the innovation configuration measuring tool.

Mills and Ragan (2000) developed a measurement instrument to assess the fidelity of implementation of a computer based integrated learning system curriculum. This study used the innovation configuration matrix of the CBAM to identify which teachers implemented the curriculum faithfully (Mills and Ragan, 2000: 5). These teachers were described as "high fidelity implementers". The measurement tool developed by Mills and Ragan was termed the Integrated Learning System Configuration Matrix (ILSCM) (Mills and Ragan, 2000: 5). The ILSCM was found to be an effective measurement instrument to assess which teachers and which practices demonstrated implementation fidelity. Of the fifteen components that they used for data collection, five were found to be those that primarily characterised implementation (2000:18). Mills and Ragan (2000:18) only used interviews as a means of collecting data for their study. They state that classroom observations used in addition to their measurement tool would provide a clearer picture of teacher use of the innovation. They contend that using the five primary components in follow-up studies would make the observation task more manageable. It is interesting to note that although fifteen components were identified initially as essential components of

the innovation, during the investigation five primary components emerged. This may indicate that some components that developers or evaluators see as essential, may in fact turn out to be "nice to haves" given the real contexts of implementation, while others components are fundamental or primary components without which the innovation could not exist.

Another investigation using an innovation configuration matrix was that of Meehan, Walsh, Swisher, Spring and Lewis (1999). They used an innovation configuration matrix (ICM) to describe and evaluate a literacy programme. The Even Start Family Literacy Program is a national initiative to address the educational and literacy needs of families. The programme focuses on teaching parenting skills and pre-school readiness skills. Data was collected over a two-year period from interviews, observations and programme documentation. An ICM was constructed with 8 programme components. The findings of the investigation show that the ICM is a valid representation of the programme. The programme was found to have a significant impact on adults' reading and mathematical literacy skills and parenting skills. Children's school readiness benefited immensely while there was only some improvement noted in children's auditory comprehension, and general language development. From this research recommendations were made about the refinement and further evaluation of the programme.

In the following study an innovation configuration measurement instrument was used in conjunction with another assessment instrument. Stefanich, Wills and Buss (1991) studied the use of interdisciplinary teaming and its influence on learner self-concept. Principals and teachers of eighteen middle schools were surveyed in order to assess the degree to which interdisciplinary teaming (IDT) was implemented and to determine the resulting impact on the learners' self concept. IDT was implemented in nine of the eighteen schools. The children's self concept was measured using the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale. The degree of IDT was determined using a interdisciplinary teaming innovation configuration checklist with components relating to stages of concern and level of use. The majority of teachers were found to be at the early stages of using IDT. About 20% of non-user teachers used some elements of IDT. Learners who attended middle schools with high levels of IDT were

found to have higher self-concepts than learners who attended middle schools with low levels of IDT. It is interesting to note that some teachers, classified as non-users in this study, were using aspects of IDT. Heck *et al* (1981:11) also found that some individuals who indicated that they were not using an innovation were in fact doing many of the same things as users of an innovation. Heck *et al* also found that individuals who described themselves as users were not always doing the same thing. These findings led to the development of minimum criteria for use of an innovation (Heck *et al,* 1981:11), which were refined to become innovation configurations.

Mitchell, S. (1988*)* analysed the use of the CBAM in the appraisal of three programmes. The programmes evaluated were an alternative language arts programme, Project READ, project management software for Evaluation Department planning, and a K-8 social studies in-service programme. The use of innovation configurations, stages of concern and levels of use for planning, monitoring and evaluating the three programmes was investigated. The CBAM was found to be a useful means of conducting formative assessment. Evaluators are able to define programme elements and then interpret teacher concerns and implementation. Recommendations concerning improved use of the innovation can be made and the outcomes of the innovation can be assessed.

The use of an innovation configuration assessment tool provides the opportunity to describe an innovation clearly and assess the implementation of the innovation. Given the South African context of varied conceptual understanding and practical competence in implementing Curriculum 2005, the use of an innovation configuration checklist based on the revised national curriculum statement could assist in more effective implementation of the curriculum. An innovation configuration checklist would firstly, clarify in operational terms what teachers and learners should be doing. Then, teacher customisation of the curriculum could be explored and recommendations made for further teacher support and education with respect to the implementation of the curriculum.

In this chapter relevant literature was reviewed concerning educational change, the process and nature of the implementation of a curriculum and operational components of a curriculum. In the next chapter an operational description of the foundation phase of Curriculum 2005 will be given.

CHAPTER THREE: AN OPERATIONAL DESCRIPTION OF THE FOUNDATION PHASE OF CURRICULUM 2005

In order to describe foundation phase teachers' use and adaptation of the curriculum, it was important to establish exactly what teachers should be doing when teaching the foundation phase of the revised curriculum. To this end, an operational description of Curriculum 2005 (C2005) had to be developed. This description needs to indicate the behaviours and processes that should be observed when C2005 is being implemented.

3.1 A procedure to identify critical components

The following procedure was used to identify the critical components of the foundation phase of Curriculum 2005 (Heck et al, 1981: 81):

ACTIVITIES	OUTCOMES	RESEARCH PROCEDURE
Review written materials describing the innovation	General familiarity with the innovation	Analyse foundation phase and other curriculum documents
Interview curriculum experts for innovation components and variations	Preliminary checklist of innovation components from curriculum experts' perspective with examples of variations; interview questions and probes for users at a local school	Interview foundation phase curriculum experts trained at national level for C2005 (1997)
Interview and observe a small number of users at a local school to verify curriculum experts' component checklist	Revised checklist with questions to ask curriculum experts (Department of Education officials responsible for the training of foundation phase teachers)	Interview and observe a grade1, grade 2 and a grade 3 teacher at a local primary school
Present checklist to DoE officials responsible for curriculum training to distinguish between critical and related components	Refinement of checklist.	Submit to DoE foundation phase curriculum trainers at Teachers' Centre
Interview and observe a small number of users at an exemplary site to verify curriculum trainers' component checklist	Further refinement of checklist.	Interview and observe a grade1, grade 2 and a grade 3 teacher at a local primary school

FIGURE 5: DEVELOPMENT OF IC CHECKLIST (Heck *et al*, 1981)

Nine critical components were identified, namely the role of the learners, the role of the teacher, teaching methods, integration, orientation of the curriculum, learning content, classroom arrangement, assessment, and an inclusive approach. Each of the components will be discussed briefly below in order to sketch a background for the processes of data collection and analysis.

3.2 Critical components of C2005 (foundation phase)

Role of learners

The first component deals with the role of the learners. Learners are expected to be actively involved in the teaching and learning process. The emphasis on "learner-centredness" in the curriculum can be traced back to one of the roots of the post-1994 curriculum, People's Education. Originally a political movement, it emerged as a reaction to "Bantu Education" in the late eighties (Kraak, 1999:22). This revolutionary, alternative view of education contributed to some extent to what finally emerged as Curriculum 2005. The pedagogy of People's Education was learner-centred according to Kraak (1999:23) and student-paced. Learner-centredness was one of the principles that was to inform curriculum design (Gultig *et al*, 2002:4). In the curriculum framework, as quoted by Gultig, it was suggested that, in developing a curriculum, the learners should be put first, "recognising and building on their knowledge and experience and responding to their needs".

Role of the teacher

The teacher is viewed as a facilitator of learning who helps learners to construct and develop their own knowledge. Killen (2000:xi) describes the changed role of the teacher as follows:

> One important historical change in the way we look at teaching is that we now emphasise that a teacher's main role is to facilitate learning rather than to be a source of all knowledge. This means that teachers have to help learners construct their own knowledge, rather than simply telling them things that they are expected to memorise.

This notion of the teacher as facilitator assumes that the teacher has an in-depth conceptual understanding of all of the learning areas of the curriculum, so that she is able to design appropriate learning activities. The *Norms and Standards for*

Educators (Department of Education, 2000b:13) describes seven roles that teachers are expected to perform. The role of the teacher as mediator of learning indicates that a teacher must have a profound knowledge of subject content.

Teaching methods

In the RNCS both competence and content focussed teaching methods are important. In this study competence refers to what learners should be able to *do.* The focus here is on methods that promote active learning. Content focussed 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 the knowledge from the teacher. Van der Horst and McDonald (1999:27) indicate that the Department of Education drew up a table comparing the "old" and the "new" curriculum. The comparisons included in the table are stereotypical rather than truly representative and according to Van der Horst and McDonald do not really reflect the good practice in some classrooms of the past.

OLD	NEW
Passive learners	Active learners
Rote learning	Critical thinking, reasoning, reflection and action
Teachers responsible for learning; motivation dependent on the personality of the teacher	Learners take responsibility for their own learning; pupils motivated by constant feedback and affirmation of their worth

FIGURE 6: OLD AND NEW TEACHER PRACTICE (Van der Horst and McDonald, 1999:27)

Although traditional education practice may be caricatured in the table above, many teachers do still favour "chalk and talk methods" where the learners participation in the teaching and learning process is limited. Killen looked at the literature concerning research on teaching. He indicates:

> These reviews contain many suggestions about what teachers can do to help their learners develop knowledge or skills. However, the reviewers all conclude that no single teaching strategy is effective all the time for all learners. The reason is that teaching and learning are very complex processes that are influenced by many different things (Killen, 2000:x).

Bak (2000:3) stated that there is a need for a balance of teaching approaches,

echoing Killen's sentiment that one teaching approach should not be emphasised to the exclusion of others. When C2005 was first implemented many teachers were under the impression, for instance, that there had to be group work in every lesson. Many purposeless group work activities took place[1] because teachers had the idea that group work was "good" and teacher directed activity was "bad". Fortunately with the implementation of the revised curriculum the balance Bak calls for has been more evident and learning appears more meaningful and goal-directed.[2]

Integration

When planning, teachers are expected to focus on language outcomes in the Literacy learning programme and integrate with other learning areas where relevant; focus on mathematics in the Numeracy learning programme and integrate where relevant; focus on life orientation outcomes in Life Skills programme, but integrate all other learning areas. C2005 stressed the importance of integration:

> South Africa has embarked on transformational OBE. This involves the most radical form of an integrated curriculum. There are several forms of integration. This most radical form implies that not only are we integrating across disciplines into learning areas but we are integrating across all 8 Learning Areas in all educational activities. The number of learning programmes per phase is for management purposes only and should not be seen as varying degrees of integration. The outcome of this form of integration will be profound transferability of knowledge in real life.(Department of Education, 1997b: 7).

In classrooms much emphasis was placed on integration when C2005 was first implemented. Often learning content was organised into integrated themes, or programme organisers at the expense of developing concepts. Another aspect of integration that appeared was the combining of school and everyday knowledge in classrooms. The everyday knowledge that learners brought with them to school was often given undue prominence while school knowledge was neglected[3]. Darling – Hammond in Taylor and Vinjevold (1999:116) caution against allowing everyday knowledge to be the primary focus of learning. The fundamental purpose of education is to promote a deep understanding of school knowledge. Bak (2000:2)

---

[1] Practice teaching visits, by UPE foundation phase students, to schools from 1998 till 2003.
[2] Practice teaching visits, by UPE foundation phase students, to schools in 2004.
[3] Practice teaching visits, by UPE foundation phase students, to schools from 1998 till 2003.

points out:

> There is an important distinction between "school" or "formal" knowledge and "everyday" or indigenous knowledge. It was pointed out that the point of schooling is to learn *different* frameworks of thinking in order to make sense of the world, i.e. that school knowledge is the most important kind of knowledge at schools (with, of course, a relationship to everyday knowledge).

Because integration was given undue emphasis, the development of conceptual knowledge suffered (Cameron, Seleti and Ward, 2003:5). The revised curriculum addressed this issue. The assessment standards provide for conceptual progression (Cameron *et al*, 2003:5). Teachers are provided with more detailed guidance regarding what should be covered in each year of the foundation phase.

The fifth component refers to the orientation of the curriculum. Teachers are expected to emphasise progression, but integrate content with various learning areas where possible. Curriculum 2005 placed a great deal of emphasis on integration of knowledge (Department of Education, 1997(b): 7) and less emphasis on the progressive development of conceptual knowledge. No specific details were given describing what learners should be able to do at the end of each grade (Cameron *et al*, 2003: 16). The revised curriculum uses assessment standards to indicate what should be assessed in each grade (Cameron *et al*, 2003: 16).

> The original C2005 encourages teachers to combine knowledge from different Learning Areas. That is, it encourages integration. But it does not give enough guidance on what to teach, when to teach it and at what level to teach it. As a result, learners are often taught the same concepts, at the same level, over and over again. They don't learn the skills and knowledge that they should and there is no progression (Joshua, 2003:3).

When planning, teachers are now required to find the balance between integration and conceptual progression (Department of Education, 2003b: 6).

The sixth component relates to the learning content. There should be a focus on the teaching and learning of knowledge, skills and values rather than just on content. In adopting an outcomes-based approach to education, a paradigm shift was required in the approach to teaching and learning, according to Kraak (1999:43) One of the key elements of South African outcomes-based education, has been the emphasis

on learner-centredness. The shift mentioned by Kraak, in Jansen and Christie, necessitated a move from "the traditional syllabus- orientated, content-based transmission model of teaching and learning to one based on outcomes" (Kraak, 1999:43). In addition to knowledge, learners now had to learn skills and assessment had to take into account the competencies that learners had developed. The importance of the inclusion of knowledge and skills in the curriculum is highlighted by the following principle of the RNCS:

> A high level of skills and knowledge for all
>
> The Revised National Curriculum Statement aims at the development of a high level of knowledge and skills for all. It sets and holds up high expectations of what South African learners can achieve. Social justice requires that those sections of the population previously disempowered by the lack of knowledge and skills should now be empowered (Department of Education, 2002:12).

In addition to knowledge and skills, the curriculum also should develop values in learners. Education was tasked with assisting, not only in preparing citizens who would be able to compete in the global economic sector, but also in preparing citizens who could assist in transforming the nation. The RNCS overview document states:

> The promotion of values is important not only for the sake of personal development, but also to ensure that a national South African identity is built on values different from those that underpinned apartheid education. The kind of learner envisaged is one who will be imbued with the values and act in the interests of a society based on respect for democracy, equality, human dignity, life and social justice (Department of Education, 2002:8).

Classroom arrangement

The seating of learners should facilitate active learning, with the arrangement of furniture and facilities dependent on particular learning situation. Foundation phase teachers are encouraged to arrange their classrooms so that learners can work with each other in groups (Tiley, 1997:4). Tiley 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 foundation phase 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.

The assessment of learners is sub-divided into three sections, referring to different aspects of assessment. The three categories of assessment that were identified were purpose, method, and time.

Purposes of assessment

A number of purposes of assessment are included in the RNCS. Baseline, diagnostic, formative, summative, and systemic assessment are mentioned (Department of Education, 2002b: 126). In this study formative and summative assessment were included. Formative assessment is used to provide learners and teachers with information regarding the learners' progress in order to improve learning (Department of Education 2002b: 126). Assessment is thus used to inform teaching and also to determine whether the required outcomes have been achieved. Summative assessment supplies a general picture of a learner's competence at a particular time, for example, at the end of a term or year (Department of Education. 2002b:126).

Method of assessment

The second aspect of assessment has been termed *method.* Learners should be assessed using criterion-referenced assessment where learner 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 (Eastern Cape Department of Education, 2001: N-46). 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. Learners are assessed against criteria instead of being compared with each other, as in the case of norm-referenced assessment.

Time of assessment

The third aspect of assessment has been termed *time.* This aspect of assessment is addressed in component ten. Learners are expected to be 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 RNCS (Department of Education 2002b: 127). It takes place throughout the year. Summative assessment occurs at a given time, for instance at the end of a term or year. It supplies a general picture of learners' progress at a given time (Department of Education 2002b: 126).

Inclusive approach

The final component refers to the inclusive approach. Learners with special needs (LSEN) are expected to be accommodated and assisted within the classroom situation, but where possible, are also withdrawn from the classroom and given additional assistance. According to the National Education Policy Act (Brunton and associates, 2003:A-10) state schools are obliged to admit learners with special needs "where this is reasonably practical". Learners are expected to be accommodated in the classroom. In some schools learners with special needs are withdrawn from the classroom at times so that they can receive extra assistance from a remedial teacher or other professional. Teachers are expected to adapt their assessment practice to accommodate the needs of these learners.

> The new outcomes-based approach has taken the requirements of learners with special education needs (LSEN) into account in the process of developing learning programme guidelines. For learners who experience problems with the basic functions of reading, spelling, writing and calculations, alternative means of assessing will be provided to evaluate their true potential and level of knowledge. The focus on demonstrations and alternative assessment methods, varying from complete exemption from all reading and writing inputs, to partial exemption from all reading or writing inputs, to partial exemption by using tape recorders, amanuensis, etc., bears testimony to this paradigm shift (Department of Education, 1997(b):2.5)

It is obvious that a great deal is required of foundation phase teachers in terms of dealing with learners with special needs.

3.3 Concluding remarks

All of components outlined above provide a glimpse into the very demanding task of teachers who are attempting to implement the RNCS. Components one to three refer to the call for a different way of thinking about and making provision for learning and teaching. Components four and five reflect the requirement of balancing the demands of creating a curriculum that is integrated, but at the same time has carefully planned progression of learning. The sixth component represents the emphasis on the inclusion of knowledge, skills and values in the curriculum. The seventh component refers to the demand for a classroom arrangement to be conducive to active learning, notwithstanding the large learner numbers and poorly resourced classes found in much of the country, while the components related to assessment reflect the onerous assessment task that confronts teachers.

The research methodology used to investigate teacher adaptation of the foundation phase of C2005 with respect to these nine critical components is described in chapter four.

CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this chapter details of the research design will be given. Particulars of the sampling procedure and data collection will follow. The chapter will conclude with remarks about the reliability of the data.

4.1 Broad research design

The broad research design used in this study is a descriptive survey. Anderson classifies research into the following four broad research types: descriptive, explanatory, generalisation, and basic research (1990: 7). Using Anderson's (1990: 7) categorisation of research, the research type of this study is descriptive. He indicates that the methods associated with this research type include content analysis, observation, polling and survey research, among others (1990: 7). Anderson contends that many contemporary educational issues are not well understood because they have not been described sufficiently. One of the aspects of descriptive research according to Leedy is that it involves distinguishing the characteristics of something (2001:191). The phenomenon is described as it is. There is no attempt to change the phenomenon or to discover cause-and-effect relationships. Leedy (1989: 89) identified various research methodologies including the descriptive survey method. He 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 the 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 adaptations teachers make to a new curriculum during implementation. In order to obtain a picture of teacher practice when implementing the Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS), teachers throughout the Port Elizabeth district were surveyed by means of a checklist. In analysing the responses to the checklist a representation of teacher practice emerged. So as to provide a more intensive image, or richer description of teacher practice, teachers were also observed in situ.

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 was teachers in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa. The population was delimited in various ways. Only teachers in state schools were included in the population. Time and resources did not permit the inclusion of teachers at private and special schools and practitioners involved in home schooling. The population was also limited to foundation phase teachers, since teachers in the other phases had not yet received training in implementation of the RNCS.

The third characteristic emphasised by Leedy (1989: 142) concerns a negative aspect of survey research. Leedy (1989: 142) warns that data should be protected from the influence of bias. Classroom observation and interviews using the same categories as the checklist were also undertaken in order to provide for triangulation of data.

The last characteristic of descriptive surveys identified by Leedy (1989: 142) is that the data should be classified and presented in an ordered manner. An intensive process was followed to identify the observation categories used for the checklist and classroom observations. The method of developing an innovation configuration described by Heck *et al* (1981: 29) was followed. The report and analysis of data were also based on these categories.

4.2 Sample

The population involved in this study is foundation phase teachers in the Eastern Cape Province state schools. Constraints due to geography, time, finances and other considerations make it impossible to poll all foundation phase teachers in the province. A section, or 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 teachers to be polled (Mugo, 2004). The criteria selected were foundation phase teachers in state schools in the Port Elizabeth District. Although foundation phase teachers at private schools and teachers at special schools received RNCS training, these groups were excluded from the survey in the interests of delimiting this study. In

many instances the particular educational context at private schools and schools catering for learners with particular disabilities would necessitate adaptations to the curriculum that would not occur at a state school. These adaptations could be to include a particular religious perspective as at Alazhar, Theodor Herzl, or St. Dominic's Priory or a distinctive educational perspective as at the Montessori school. Teachers at special schools may have to adapt the curriculum to meet the specific needs of their learners as at Happydale, Cape Recife or Khanisa School for the Blind.

The Department of Education district office had established the numbers of foundation phase teachers at each school in the Port Elizabeth district prior to the RNCS orientation training (Smith, 2003). Using this list, checklists were posted to all 1 537 foundation phase teachers at the 192 state schools in the district. The size of the sample for this study was therefore 1537.

For convenience sake, it was decided to survey the local district teachers. The follow-up observations and interviews made it necessary to use schools within reasonable travelling distance. The figure below depicts the variety of schools used for the classroom observations. During November and December 2003 classroom observations were undertaken to coincide with the survey by means of checklist. The observation schedules [Appendix 4] were based on the critical components of the curriculum, as were the checklists [Appendix 2]. The data obtained from the classroom observation served to enrich the data obtained from the checklists.

SCHOOL NUMBER	INCOME OF SCHOOL COMMUNITY	LOCATION OF SCHOOL	TYPE OF SCHOOL
1	Middle to upper income	Town	Primary
2	Middle to upper income	Town	Primary
3	Low income	Farm	Primary
4	Low income	Town	Primary
5	Low income	Township	Primary
6	Low to middle income	Town	Preparatory
7	Middle to upper	Town	Pre-primary
8	Middle to upper	Town	Primary

FIGURE 7: SCHOOL VISITS

4.3 Data collection

Data were collected by means of content analysis, a checklist, observation and interviews. Provincial DoE curriculum experts, foundation phase teachers at an "exemplary" site, university lecturers familiar with C2005 and DoE in-service trainers were interviewed in order to establish a checklist, following the procedure outlined by Heck, *et al* (1981: 29).

In order to address sub-problem one of the study, a document review was conducted initially and then the procedure outlined by Heck *et al* (1981) was followed in order to identify the critical components of the curriculum, namely:

- interview curriculum experts for innovation components and variations;
- observe and interview a grade 1, 2, and 3 teacher to verify curriculum experts' innovation components;
- return to curriculum experts to distinguish between critical and related components; and
- observe and interview several grade 1 – 3 teachers to verify curriculum experts' innovation components

The critical components that were identified were used to construct a checklist. This checklist was sent to teachers to obtain data to address sub-problem two. Sub-problem two focussed on eliciting a description of adaptations made by teachers when implementing the curriculum. Data collection by means of the checklist took place after teachers attended RNCS orientation workshops. Most of the grade one to three teachers were trained in the Port Elizabeth district between August and October 2003. In November 2003 pre-primary teachers were trained. Checklists with self-addressed envelopes were posted to teachers in mid November. In order to obtain a richer description of the adaptations made by teachers, class observations were also conducted during the time that the checklists were sent out. In February 2004 two teachers at an exemplary site were interviewed to reflect on their implementation of the RNCS. The interviews [Appendix 5] were also based on the critical components of the curriculum.

The figure below represents an innovation configuration matrix and portrays the critical components of the curriculum with the various dimensions that appeared on the checklist. The preferred responses in terms of fidelity of implementation have been highlighted below.

CRITICAL COMPONENTS	DIMENSIONS			
ROLE OF LEARNERS	**Learners active**	Learners usually active	Learners usually passive	Learners passive
ROLE OF TEACHER	**Teacher acts as facilitator**	Teacher usually facilitator	Teacher usually source of knowledge	Teacher sole transmitter of knowledge
TEACHING METHODS	**Both competence and content focussed**	Competence focussed	Content focussed	
INTEGRATION	**Focus on *core learning area* in each Learning Programme and integrate other learning areas where relevant**	Focus on Language, Mathematics and Life Orientation outcomes	Integrate all learning areas in each learning programme	
ORIENTATION OF CURRICULUM	**Emphasise progression, but integrate where possible**	Emphasise progression	Emphasise integration, but mindful of progression	Emphasise integration
LEARNING CONTENT	**Focus on teaching and learning of knowledge skills and values**	Focus on teaching and learning of knowledge and skills	Focus of teaching and learning of knowledge	
CLASSROOM ARRANGEMENT	**Dependant on particular learning situation**	Flexible groups	Fixed rows	
ASSESSMENT PURPOSE	**Used to inform teaching and to determine whether acquired outcomes achieved**	Used to inform teaching and learning	Used to determine to what extent required outcomes have been achieved	
ASSESSMENT METHOD	**Using criterion-referenced assessment**	Using norm-referenced assessment		

ASSESSMENT 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	**LSEN are accommodated and assisted within the classroom situation at all times**	LSEN are accommodated and assisted within the classroom situation, but are removed at times	LSEN are withdrawn from class to give assistance	

FIGURE 8: INNOVATION CONFIGURATION MATRIX

4.4 Reliability of data

There can be 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) 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 will provide for triangulation to corroborate findings. In this way a rich description of local foundation phase teacher implementation practice will also be developed.

Having described and motivated the research methodology used in the study, the following chapter will focus on the presentation of the data collected. Thereafter an interpretation of the data will be made.

CHAPTER 5: PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

In this chapter the following data will be presented and discussed: biographical data, data on teacher adaptation of the curriculum based on the checklist and observations, and data based on teacher comments. Of the 1 537 questionnaires that were sent out, 457 completed questionnaires were returned. This represents a return rate of 33,6%. A further 22 questionnaires were returned unanswered due to incorrect addresses.

The checklist consisted of three sections. The first section dealt with biographical particulars, the second section focussed on data about teaching practice related to critical components of the curriculum, and the third section was a comment section catering for open responses by teachers.

5.1 Biographical data

The overwhelming majority of responses, 93%, were from female teachers. This is in line with the trend that female teachers teach young learners. Typically, female teachers are found in foundation phase classes throughout the Eastern Cape Province.

More than half of the respondents (59%) had been teaching in the foundation phase in excess of fifteen years. This indicates that the respondents were mainly experienced teachers. There was a strong correlation between proportion of responses and years of experience, with 16% of teachers indicating that they had eleven to fifteen years of experience, 10% indicating that they had six to ten years of experience and 8% indicating that they had five or less years of experience.

90% of all respondents were teaching at primary schools, while 5% were employed at pre-primary schools. There were nine pre-primary schools included in the RNCS training, making up 5% of the total number of schools. Teachers of reception year classes, employed at primary schools attended RNCS training together with reception year teachers from the independent pre-primary schools.

Most of the respondents, 79%, were teaching at large schools with a staff of more than fifteen teachers. The RNCS planning model requires teachers to plan collaboratively, rather than individually. Data indicate that most teachers were teaching in schools with more than one teacher per grade, which could facilitate collegial co-operation and planning. 88% of teachers, indicated that they were teaching in schools in excess of 150 learners. While the number of learners in a school can impact on teaching conditions, in retrospect, it would have been better to inquire about the number of learners in the respondent's class and whether the class was a single grade or multi-grade class. Class size and composition is likely to have a more direct impact on curriculum decisions than the number of learners in the whole school.

In order to get a sense of the financial resources that might be available at schools, teachers were asked to indicate the amount charged for school fees per year. The school communities varied in terms of financial resources. More than a third of the respondents, taught at schools that charged school fees in excess of R2000 per annum. There were relatively few schools (8%) that had school fees in the middle range (more than R500 and less than R2 000). At the lower range of the scale almost 25% of the schools charged less than R500 a year, while nearly 20% of respondents taught at schools that served the poorest communities, charging less than R100 per year. Teachers were also asked to indicate the percentage of parents who pay school fees. 40% of respondents indicated that between 75% and 100% of parents paid school fees. A small percentage of respondents (4%) indicated that fee payment is poor, with between zero and 25% of parents paying school fees at their schools.

Language issues can impact on the implementation of a curriculum, particularly in a multi-lingual country like South Africa. Most of the respondents (36%) indicated that their home language was English, while 27% stated that their home language was isiXhosa, 25 % Afrikaans, and 7 % stated that both Afrikaans and English were used as home languages. The language of learning at schools can be divided into three categories based on the data collected. The teachers indicated that schools were either mono-lingual, bilingual or in a very small instance (2%) trilingual. In the

monolingual category, the majority of respondents (27%) indicated that English was the medium of instruction, with 21% indicating that isiXhosa was the language of learning in the school and 15 % indicating that Afrikaans was the medium of instruction. In the bilingual category, 25 % of the respondents indicated that both Afrikaans and English were used as the languages of learning, while only 5 % indicated that isiXhosa and English were both the languages of instruction. With reference to the language of curriculum documents, 63% of respondents indicated that they had received documents in their home language, while 30 % indicated that they had not received documents in their home language.

As regards teachers' preparedness to implement the revised curriculum, a very high proportion (92 %) indicated that they had attended the RNCS orientation training. The high proportion of training attendance can be seen as a positive factor in terms of possible curriculum implementation and a testimony to the hard work of district officials who organised the orientation training of foundation phase teachers.

5.2 Data on teacher adaptation of the curriculum

Heck *et al* (1981:51) contend that checklists completed by teachers, as the users of the curriculum, are useful descriptive tools that provide a general portrait of what the curriculum looks like in practice. Although there may be problems linked to self-report data, the use of a large number of checklists (over 400 responses) and accompanying classroom observations, provided a rich description of teacher use of the curriculum. The classroom observation schedules were based directly on the checklists and provided space to describe the critical components of the curriculum as observed in foundation phase classrooms.

The Port Elizabeth district is divided into twelve circuits. It was decided to use schools in one circuit for the school observations since these teachers would have been trained together by the same trainers and would thus have had a similar preparation for the implementation of the RNCS. One circuit was chosen, which had the most diverse types of schools including primary schools, a preparatory school and a preprimary school. The geography and economic status of the schools differed too, since there was a farm school as well as township, poor suburban schools and

affluent suburban schools. In some instances schools in the circuit were unwilling to allow observation in their classrooms, citing the fact that "the teachers are too busy" or "the teachers are still working through the RNCS and would prefer to be visited next year". In these instances, similar type schools from another circuit were used where possible.

The figure below summarises the school observation activities undertaken in the study. It is worth taking careful note of the kinds of activities taking place on the day of the school visits in 2004. While some schools (schools six and seven) were busy with constructive work in the last week of term, other schools had dismissed their learners before the end of the school term. School two was using the last week of term for curriculum planning and those children who chose to come to school were kept busy watching videos, making Christmas decorations etc. School three was visited in the second last week of term. On the day of the visit the teachers were busy with administrative tasks and the learners were gardening and cleaning. School four had dismissed all learners after the senior pupils finished writing exams, three weeks before the end of term. On the day of the visit, in the second last week of term, some teachers were busy preparing for the next year, while others who had completed their preparations, were chatting in the staff room.

NUMBER	INCOME OF SCHOOL COMMUNITY	LOCATION OF SCHOOL	TYPE OF SCHOOL	DATE OF VISIT	SCHOOL ACTIVITY ON DAY OF VISIT
1	Middle to upper income	Town	Primary	Nov 2001	All learners and teachers in class, constructive work evident
2	Middle to upper income	Town	Primary	Nov 2002 and Dec 2003	All learners and teachers in class, constructive work evident (Nov 2003) Majority of learners not at school, those at school being "kept busy" while teachers were involved in curriculum planning and preparation activities (Dec 2004)
3	Low income	Farm	Primary	Nov 2003	Learners cleaning and gardening while teachers completed mark schedules
4	Low income	Town	Primary	Nov 2003	No learners at school. Many teachers sitting in the staff room, some teachers in classrooms: busy with admin. and preparation activities
5	Low income	Township	Primary	Cancelled on morning of visit	Unknown
6	Low to middle income	Town	Preparatory	Dec 2003	All learners and teachers in class, constructive work evident
7	Middle to upper	Town	Pre-primary	Dec 2003	Usual activities happening e.g: music ring, outside play, educational games, etc.

FIGURE 9: ACTIVITY AT SCHOOL DURING VISITS

A key element in the implementation of a curriculum, is the amount of teaching time available. It would appear that for some schools teaching, or even school attendance, seems to stop in mid-November. Given the fact, that many teachers carry a heavy administrative burden and are unable to facilitate quality teaching and learning for the first week or two of the school year[4], learners may in fact be engaged in constructive learning activities for significantly fewer days than is catered for on the school calendar. Should this, in fact be the case, there could be serious implications for the effective delivery of the curriculum.

In the following section of the presentation and discussion of data, the results of the analysis of the checklists will be presented. In general the teachers' responses indicated that they were implementing the curriculum as required (See table 1). There was a discrepancy between what the teachers said they were doing and the required practice in three instances. The critical component relating to the **role of the teacher** was the first area where a majority of teachers (64%) indicated that in varying degrees they were doing something other than what was required. Most teachers stated that they were "usually" the facilitator of learning, while the required response would be that they act as a facilitator of learning, mediating the construction and production of knowledge. (Department of Education, 1997: 17). Teachers sometimes chose to relinquish the role of facilitator and assume more direct control of learning.

The second area where the majority of teacher response differed from the required response was for the critical component describing the **classroom arrangement.** Most respondents (68%) indicated that learners were seated in flexible groups. However the preferred response would be that the classroom arrangement was "dependent on the particular learning situation". The focus on learner-centered activity in the RNCS implies that the seating arrangements have to be able to accommodate a range of learning situations. Seating young learners in groups has been used extensively in the foundation phase, long before C2005 was implemented. This did not necessarily lead to the children being involved in many

---

[4] Student teacher observation reports: B.Ed 2, 3, 4: 2004

learner-centred activities. Learners would often have been seated in a group arrangement, but be engaged in mainly whole class activities. The practice of seating foundation phase 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 is mentioned in the RNCS Critical Outcomes (Department of Education, 2002:11).

The third area where most of the responses (70%) differed from the preferred response was for the critical component related to **purpose of assessment**. The majority of teachers indicated that assessment was used "to inform teaching and learning", while the ideal response would be 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 notion of the interconnectedness of teaching and learning. In the table below the teacher choices to disregard the preferred practice and adapt an aspect of the curriculum to suit their practice can be seen.

	Percentage of teacher response (n=457)			
Critical component	**Degree of implementation**			
	high			**low**
Role of learners	59,9	32,4	5,2	2,3
Role of teacher	35,9	39,4	18,4	1,5
Teaching methods	70,6	17,7	4,6	
Integration	50,5	12,7	27,3	
Orientation of the curriculum	42,2	41,3	11,1	4,6
Learning content	91,6	1,04	1,04	
Classroom arrangement	25,1	64,1	3,8	
Assessment purpose	23,4	62,6	7,5	
Assessment method	81,8	11,5		
Assessment time	90,8	2,1		
Inclusive approach	43,2	40,7	2,5	
Average	55,9	29,6	9	2,8

TABLE 1: DATA ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF C2005 (FOUNDATION PHASE)

Note: Certain respondents did not complete all items resulting in totals not adding up to 100%

Each of the critical components will be considered in turn. Areas were there was a difference between teacher self-report data and observation data will be emphasised. Teacher comments related to each of the critical components will also be taken into account.

Role of the learners

The majority of teachers (60%) indicated that learners were actively involved most of the time. The researcher found, however, that learners were **usually actively involved** in the learning activities, but **at times were passive listeners**. The ideal practice would be one where the learners were actively involved most of the time in constructing their own knowledge (Killen 2000: xi, Joshua, 2003:6). Some teacher-dominated activity was observed. Based on classroom observations teachers were inclined to be more directive in grade one than in grades two and three, in general. Grades two and three classes appeared to allow more opportunity for learners to construct their own knowledge than in grade one. The grade three learners were able to work independently of the teacher for long periods of time, whereas younger learners working in groups or on their own, turned to the teacher for assistance more frequently. The nature of the activity also determined how directive the teacher was, e.g. explaining a creative activity or remediating a mathematics 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. This may be what comment 412 is indicating:

> "I somehow feel that our learners are lacking the necessary communication skills to fully adhere to the RNCS of 2004."

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 strategies. 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) indicates that direct instruction can be used to help learners acquire the understanding and skills that will eventually enable them to control their own learning. Teachers in the reception year and grade one class at the same school made extensive use of direct instruction when starting

new work to ensure that learners understood what was required of them. In the reception year classes at the pre-primary school there was a very high degree of active learner participation. This particular school favours an informal approach to reception year work, based on the theory of developmentally appropriate practice. The teachers expressed their concern that the manner that the RNCS had been introduced to reception year teachers might lead to grade R merely becoming an introductory year for grade 1, rather than an end in itself. The pre-primary teachers at this school focussed on helping young learners both to discover and construct their own understanding. The fact that there was such a great deal of active learning on the part of the reception year children at this school, probably has more to do with the usual practice at the school of learning-by-doing, and less to do with teachers complying with the requirements of the RNCS. The possibility that indiscriminate implementation of the RNCS could lead to unacceptably formal teaching rather than presenting a developmentally appropriate grade R curriculum is referred to in teacher comment 449 and also comment 452:

> "RNCS has created a challenge regarding planning but all A S's are already accommodated. Concern is that A S's and L O's can be viewed in isolation causing unnecessary formal presentation of activities and refined assessing. We intend continuing with the informal presentation of activities giving children opportunities and exposure to all A S's so that they explore and discover on their own as far as is possible."

Some teacher comments alluded to a change in approach as regards the role of the learners. Comments 79 and 169 indicated that the teachers intended to involve learners more actively, while comment 241 indicated the intention to adapt practice quite radically: "Rote learning will not be applied in my class from now on".

Role of the teacher

Most teachers (39%) reported that they were usually the facilitators of learning, but sometimes supplied knowledge. During the classroom observations, however, the teachers appeared to facilitate learning **sometimes.** In other words, they were able to assist learners to construct their own knowledge at times. The following comment indicates a teacher's intention to adapt her teaching practice:

> "I intend to adapt my teaching context to RNCS in 2004. It is a more flexible style as it is a learner centred teaching and a teacher as a facilitator." (44)

Certain activities, 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 of the recommendations of the department will work at our school. " Many of her colleagues agreed. One stated, "Repetition is very important here at our school. We must do lots of drill work and revision." Another teacher indicated that many of their learners were not intrinsically motivated to learn. She said, "School is not valued. Education is not important in this community. There is gang influence: 'School is not cool'". The teachers at this school indicated that they usually transmitted knowledge and did not often act as facilitators of learning.

Teaching methods

In the RNCS both competence and content focussed 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 (71%) use competence and content focussed methods. Data from classroom observations corroborated this finding. Teachers often helped learners to acquire skills and thus become more competent in activities. They also helped learners to discover and construct knowledge or in certain instances revealed the content directly.

Integration

The majority of respondents (51%) indicated that they focussed on the core learning area in each learning programme and integrated other learning areas where relevant. Observation data supported this finding. A high degree of technical compliance with the planning procedure of the RNCS was evident. Teachers were given a five-day orientation training, where the planning of a curriculum was dealt with in detail. Teachers were then required to go back to their schools and plan their curriculum with their colleagues. Certain teacher comments indicate that the planning process was a positive experience:

> "We have planned our 1st cycle for next year and enjoyed getting all the information together. We are now ready to start with everything neatly planned." (248)

The following comment however, was less enthusiastic, mentioning that the time of year was not suitable for preparing for a new curriculum:

> "Still busy working on it. Unsuitable time of the year to work on a new curriculum." (125)

All schools were obliged to present their foundation phase planning to departmentally appointed assessors, as is referred to in comment 62:

> "Have adapted already! The new RNCS changes have been viewed, approved and in fact been seen as highly commended by Mr. Ronnie Harker (Teachers' Centre PE)."

Given this support, it is to be expected that schools would plan as required. Although there was abundant evidence of teachers following the required planning procedure faithfully, certain problems became evident when studying some of the teacher's planning carefully. At one school there was a strong focus on the learning areas of languages, mathematics and life orientation in the learning programmes. The arts and culture learning area was included in the curriculum planning usually as a discrete activity rather than being integrated in the literacy, numeracy and life skills learning programmes. The remaining learning areas of technology, natural science, social science and economic management science received less attention. This intentional adaptation of the planning procedure by this school will be referred to again in the section on orientation of the curriculum. In the case of another school there was a mismatch between the activities planned and the required teaching time. There were insufficient activities planned in all learning programmes in all grades. The formal teaching time in the foundation phase is intended to be used as follows: 40% for Literacy, 35% for Numeracy and 25% for Life Skills. It was particularly difficult to determine whether the required time is spent on Literacy and Numeracy related activities. In the case of the Numeracy learning programme, in the first three grades of the foundation phase this translates into 7,875 hours per week (Eastern Cape Department of Education, 2003:86) or approximately 1,5 hours a day. The sequencing of many of the activities was also problematic, particularly in the Numeracy learning programme. There was little evidence of a logical development of mathematical concepts. One school demonstrated a high degree of technical correctness in terms of the required planning procedure. However, another school did not have sufficient activities to fill the prescribed school time (Department of Education, 2002: 17). The teachers at the pre-primary school, had difficulty

reconciling what they had heard at the RNCS orientation training with their practice. The training was presented by trainers who had little understanding of reception year work. While trainers with a strong background and experience in foundation phase trained grade one to three teachers, this did not happen in the case of training for the reception year teachers. The approach of the teachers the pre-primary school was to plan as they had been doing and then tick off the learning outcomes and assessment standards they covered. Responses from reception year teachers referred to RNCS training that they attended previously (322). This training was focussed specifically on the reception year and was considered beneficial: "We enjoyed module 1 very much" (142). Reception year teachers indicate that they are awaiting further reception year specific training (138, 140, 141). Teacher comments indicate that there is a need for further support. There is a request for more workshops to guide teachers in their planning (271) because there is a great deal to be understood (264). Respondent 101 feels positive about the RNCS and is willing to attend courses "when necessary".

Orientation of the curriculum

Curriculum 2005 placed a great deal of emphasis on integration of knowledge and less emphasis on the progressive development of conceptual knowledge. Cameron *et al* (2003: 16) indicate that no specific details were given describing what learners should be able to do at the end of each grade. Joshua (2003:3) concurs, stating:

> The original C2005 encourages teachers to combine knowledge from different learning areas. That is, it encourages integration. But it does not give enough guidance on what to teach, when to teach it and at what level to teach it. As a result, learners are often taught the same concepts, at the same level, over and over again. They don't learn the skills and knowledge that they should and there is no progression.

Comment 57 indicates that the revised curriculum is an improvement on the original version of C2005:

> "With the specific assessment standards per grade – there seems to be a much clear picture of the level at which learners in each grade should demonstrate their achievements of the learning outcomes. I definitely now have a clear understanding of exactly what needs to be assessed for each learner in terms of knowledge, content and skills."

When planning in the RNCS, teachers are required to find the balance between integration and conceptual progression. Interestingly, 43% of the respondents indicated that they emphasise progression, but that they integrate where possible, while just 1% less, indicated that they emphasised progression. Clearly most teachers placed less emphasis on integration than on progression. Perhaps as a reaction to the lack of conceptual progression that occurred when C2005 was first implemented, many teachers (42%) have decided to focus on progression, even though integrated learning is an essential element of outcomes-based curriculum (Department of Education, 2002:13). During the school observations, it was obvious that teachers intended to focus on progression and only integrate learning when it was meaningful. A teacher at school 2 indicated, "We don't integrate for the sake of integration. We plan what we have to do and look for meaningful links between learning areas". Another teacher at the same school indicated, "If work correlates with other learning areas then it is incorporated". All the planning observed during visits showed an emphasis on progression while integrating where possible, as is required in the official planning procedure.

Learning content

The vast majority of respondents (92%) indicated that they included the teaching and learning of knowledge, skills and values in their curriculum. During the school observation there was plentiful evidence of the teaching of knowledge. The teaching of skills was also emphasised. Fine and gross motor skills as well as auditory and visual perceptual skills were emphasised in the reception year classes. The development of social skills was also seen as important and was usually integrated in the daily activities. In the grade one classes there was an emphasis on the development of handwriting, phonics and dictionary skills evident during the observation periods. In grades two and three co-operative group work skills and independent work skills were encouraged. In one of the grade three classes, learners demonstrated good organisational and presentation skills when sharing their portfolio of work with their classmates. Values were not taught overtly in any of the classes during the observation visits. The importance of a good work ethic was emphasised in a number of classrooms as well as the importance of being considerate of others and exercising self-control. There was no easily discernible

emphasis on the transformative values espoused by the RNCS in the teaching and learning activities carried out during the school observations. The values of social justice, democracy and equity (Department of Education, 2002: 8) were not prominent in teacher planning either. Christian values were evident from posters in classrooms and Bible Education lessons mentioned in teacher planning. Teacher comment (75), however alludes to developing the type of learner envisaged by the RNCS:

> "I will involve lots of activities in order the learners to be clear about the content and gain skills and the learners to be competent citizens. The involvement of the learners in teaching and learning process will be more vital."

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%) of respondents indicated that learners were seated in flexible groups. This kind of classroom arrangement was evident in most cases, during class observations. 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 was 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 five children out of a class of twenty- 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 the class visits, many teachers indicated that seating arrangements depended on the particular activity undertaken. In all the classes observed, learners were seated in mixed ability groups. Many teachers indicated that they preferred to use homogeneous groups for most reading and mathematics activities and mixed

ability groups for project work. Teacher comments 39 and 170 mention changing their classroom arrangement to be more flexible in the future.

Assessment purpose

A number of purposes of assessment are included in the RNCS. Baseline, diagnostic, formative, summative and systemic assessment are mentioned (Department of Education, 2002b:126). In this study formative and summative assessment were included. 63% of respondents indicated that assessment is used to inform teaching and learning. Only 23% of respondents gave the preferred response of using assessment to inform teaching and learning and determine whether the acquired outcomes have been achieved. According to the assessment policy, assessment should be "integrated with teaching and learning" (Department of Education, 2002b: 126). In the report of the Review Committee on Curriculum 2005, the lack of alignment of curriculum and assessment policy is mentioned (Department of Education, 2000: vii). 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. The RNCS is said to align the curriculum with the assessment policy of 1998 (Department of Education, 2002:19).

Assessment method

C2005 required teachers to move away from an input-based, norm-referenced summative approach to an approach that is outcomes-based, criterion-referenced and formative (Lubisi 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 process. 82% of respondents stated that they used criterion-referenced assessment and 12% indicated that they used norm-referenced assessment. From the observation visits, it was apparent that teachers were committed to using a criterion-based approach. There was also a call from two schools for clearer guidelines from the Department of Education on exactly how assessment should be carried out in the foundation phase. All the schools involved

in this study have attempted to put in place an assessment practice that conforms to official policy. 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 (91%) indicated that learners are assessed continuously and at the end of a learning sequence. The practice of assessing foundation phase learners continuously was standard practice even before the implementation of C2005 and therefore it was not surprising to find that all the schools visited for observation used continuous assessment. Teachers did however, indicate that they use a broader range of assessment strategies since the inception of C2005. A concern of all the teachers observed, was that the current assessment practice is far too time consuming. This may have been what teacher response 126 is referring to with the comment: "also far too much paper-work and recording". Teachers indicate that the assessment procedures that they are obliged to use take up too much teaching time. A teacher at one school indicated that "We have much less teaching time now. Assessment is so time consuming!". This sentiment was echoed by some of the teachers at another school as is evident from the following comments, "Too much time is spent on assessing and this does not leave enough time for teaching" and "OBE (assessment) is too much paperwork".

Inclusive approach

Data indicate that 43% of learners with special needs (LSEN) are accommodated in the classroom. A similar percentage of respondents (41%) indicated that LSEN are assisted in class and also removed at times. During the school visits a number of learners with special needs were observed. Learners with attention deficit problems, perceptual problems, social and emotional problems, and language and

mathematics problems were accommodated in the classrooms. Teachers and peers assisted these learners. Although extra assistance was available at some of the schools visited, no learners left the classrooms during the observation visits. Teacher comments indicate that learners with special needs are accommodated in the classroom in some cases (229, 232, and 234), in special classes (177, 178, 181, 182,183,184,185,186) or receive assistance from other professionals:

> "We have never had a child with LSEN. Children with problems get help from a Occupational therapist and speech therapist at the school – I do not believe that children with severe problems would be able to cope in our class of 28 children. They need specialized care and attention. I believe it could be done provided one has the help and adequate facilities. It is done in England and Israel – they have good results." (414)

5.3 Discussion

In the discussion below findings based on the data collected by means of the checklist and observations are referred to. Additional data based on interviews with two teachers are also taken into account to inform further aspects of teacher adaptation of the curriculum. The general picture sketched by the averages of the table is that there is some degree of fidelity of implementation (See table 1). The average of the first column is 55,9%. This column represents the preferred response. The second column has an average 29,6%, denoting adaptation of almost a third. The third column has an average of only 9% and the last column 2,8%. These averages sketch a healthy picture. The fact that the majority of responses occur in the first two columns is a positive indicator. 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. Teachers are not implementing the curriculum slavishly, but appear to be adapting the curriculum to suit their context. Based on the adaptations observed in classrooms there was a strong trend to make thoughtful adaptations for the benefit of the learners. Less adaptation appeared to be as a result of cooptation, where teachers change the curriculum to fit in with their existing practice.

The statistics arising from this study are problematic in one sense. They might give an exaggerated image of foundation phase teacher's competence to implement the curriculum. We need to balance these results against the call by teachers for more training and support. The call for support in the open-ended responses has been grouped in two categories, termed, 'More information and workshops required' and 'Syllabi required'.

More information and workshops required

Teachers are requesting further help and support. They ask for more information, training and workshops. Information is needed to obtain clarity in general (276 and 278) and to understand technical aspects of the curriculum planning process:

> "I need some more information in clustering and integration within and across." (272)

There is a request for training because there is a great deal to be understood (264) and to assist with technical issues related to planning (265). Respondent 101 feels positive about the innovation and is willing to attend courses "when necessary".

Workshops are needed to help teachers gain a deeper understanding (77 and 240) and to "empower" themselves (270). Workshops could also be used to support teachers in the early, uncertain stages of curriculum implementation:

> "What I would like to say is that I prefer the follow up workshop can start in April so that you can know whether you are d*(o)*ing the right planning." (326)

Trainers should be available to support teachers while they are planning:

> "More workshops for training teachers in RNCS is needed. Trainers must be available to teachers at schools who have problems during planning and not wait till all planning is done." (271)

It should be noted that the majority of the respondents in this category came from the same school. (Envelope 31; questionnaires 264 –278)

Syllabi required

Two comments referred to a need for syllabi :

> "I so wish the RNCS to give us well planned syllabi for all grades. I think this will help us to suit our teaching and learning context in 2004." (273) and

"I wish RNCS would give us a ready planned syllabus so that we know what is expected from us." (274)

Again, it is worth noting that the respondents came from the same school as in the previous category. (Envelope 31; questionnaires 264 –278)

The teacher comments above indicate that many teachers feel that they need assistance. In the class observations it was obvious that many teachers need support to improve their pedagogical content knowledge. The planning in Numeracy learning programmes in particular, is of concern. There was evidence of a lack of deep understanding of the mathematical concepts underpinning the Numeracy learning programme.

The other area of concern is that teachers indicated on the checklists that they are including knowledge, skills and values in their teaching. The question arises:
Which values are being taught and learnt?
In the class observations it was obvious that Christian values were taught. There were posters and children's drawings depicting a strong Christian tradition. Many classes were given activities linked to the nativity for instance, irrespective of the faiths of learners. There was scant evidence of developing learners for a society founded on a respect for democracy, equality, human dignity and social justice (Department of Education, 2002:8). The RNCS provides opportunities to address values in every learning area. In order to consider fidelity of implementation with respect to values, examples have been taken from two learning areas, namely Life Orientation and Social Science.

The following is an extract from the RNCS:

Life Orientation	Life Orientation
Grade 2	Grade 3
LO2: Social development	LO2: Social development
Identifies values and morals from diverse South African cultures	Tells stories of female and male role models from a variety of local cultures

FIGURE 10: LIFE ORIENTATION IN THE RNCS

If, for example, a teacher in the grade 2 class is a member of a fundamentalist Christian church and a homophobic and the teacher in the grade 3 class is a lesbian who lives with a female advocate and they are in the process of adopting a child, it is possible that the grade 2 and 3 learners will learn very different things about local cultures. Further questions arise: Who is implementing the curriculum faithfully? And What does fidelity of implementation mean in the case of values? Teachers often adapt a curriculum as they implement it. The adaptations may be of such a nature that they no longer implementing the curriculum as required. This raises yet another question: May teachers adapt what curriculum policy requires to match the world view in their community, or their personal world view?

Moving from the Life Orientation learning area to the learning area of Social Science, with respect to the aspect of Historical Enquiry, the question arises whether fidelity of implementation requires a "standard" or "official" version about stories of the past.

Social Sciences	Social Sciences
Grade R	Grade 1
LO1: Historical Enquiry	LO1: Historical Enquiry
Retells stories about the past and draws pictures illustrating these stories [communicates the answer]	Retells stories about the past, with guidance writes short sentences about the past, draws pictures, makes models, and acts [communicates the answer]

FIGURE 11: SOCIAL SCIENCE IN THE RNCS

Would adaptation reflecting a story from a particular point of view be acceptable?

In addition to data obtained from the checklists and classroom observations conducted at the end of 2003, two foundation phase teachers were interviewed a month after school commenced in 2004. The teachers taught at a well-resourced middle class school. The school had been identified as a "exemplary site" in terms of RNCS implementation by curriculum experts. Both teachers upheld and taught Christian values and dogma and there was no evidence of the recognition of any other religion although there were children from a variety of religious backgrounds at the school. One of the teachers indicated, when talking about values in the curriculum:

> "It 's my job to teach these kids to read and write and do maths. I don't have time for that political stuff like social justice."

Although the teachers resisted the "spirit of the law" in terms of their implementation of the values of the RNCS, they complied with the "letter of the law" to a great extent. There was evidence of a clear understanding of technical aspects of the RNCS.

With reference to the critical components of role of learners, role of teacher, and teaching methods, both teachers indicated that they were using more teacher-directed methods than usual. They were still busy establishing routines and once the learners were familiar with what was expected of them, there would be more scope for learner-centred activity.

With regard to integration, the teachers had decided to focus on the teaching of languages, mathematics and life orientation in 2004. They felt that they need time to come to terms with the revised curriculum and had decided to "focus on the basics" for a year. The school principal was happy with this arrangement. The planning of these teachers showed a high level of technical correctness. There was abundant evidence of "integrating within" where aspects of languages for instance would be integrated. Thus a language activity might include listening, speaking, reading and writing opportunities. There was limited evidence of integrating across learning areas. In terms of the orientation of the curriculum, progression was emphasised rather than integration. Thus, the teachers showed evidence of adapting the requirements of the curriculum to suit their particular context in the first six critical components. The remaining components related to classroom arrangement, assessment, and inclusive approach, however were not adapted.

It was obvious that both teachers' confidence in implementing the curriculum was growing. The teachers were constantly reflecting on their teaching with colleagues and making improvements. Based on the findings from the checklist, classroom observations and interviews there was acceptable technical fidelity of implementation. Adaptations made by teachers were made to meet the needs of their learners. Certain adaptations were also made to assist the teachers themselves as first time implementers of the RNCS. The emancipatory ideal of the curriculum,

may however may still be neglected. It is obvious that teachers see themselves as being part of an evolving curriculum process. The implementation of the RNCS is not viewed as an event that has occurred. This augurs well for further progress in the implementation of the RNCS in the foundation phase. Conclusions are drawn and recommendations made for future investigation and development in the next section.

CHAPTER 6:CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate teachers' adaptation of a curriculum during implementation. To this end, two problems were posed, namely:

- What are the critical components of C2005 (Foundation Phase)?
- What are the adaptations teachers have made in teaching this curriculum?

Conclusions with respect to each of these problems are presented below. The significance of the results for a larger context will also be explored. General recommendations linked to both sub-problems will then be made.

6.1 Conclusions

Critical components of the curriculum

When C2005 was first implemented many foundation phase teachers were confused about what was expected of them. Both in-service teachers and pre-service student teachers appeared to be unsure of exactly how to go about planning and teaching the new curriculum.[5] Research conducted on the early implementation of C2005 indicated that teachers were struggling to implement the curriculum effectively. Potenza states:

> Another disturbing observation made by the Foundation Phase Team during class visits is the tendency of less confident teachers to focus on designing activities that relate to the Programme Organiser (Theme) at the expense of teaching basic reading, writing and mathematical skills. Teachers repeatedly ask questions like, 'Do we still have to teach reading and writing?' and 'What do we do about reading if the readers we have don't fit in with the Programme Organiser?' (1999:242).

In order to assist teachers to teach more purposefully, they would have to have a clearer picture of what was expected of them. The first sub-problem of this study is focussed on developing a precise image of what C2005 should look like in practice.

A procedure was undertaken to identify the essential aspects of C2005. Rutherford, Hall and Huling (1983) had developed a means of defining and then developing an overall picture of an innovation. They termed this measurement tool an Innovation

Configuration (IC) checklist. The process of defining what an innovation looked like in practice, the development of the IC checklist, was followed in order to develop the critical components of C2005. The procedure for identifying innovation components, variations and configurations is described by Heck *et al* (1981:31). Using the steps outline in Heck *et al,* the following activities were undertaken:

- foundation phase and other relevant documents were analysed;
- foundation phase curriculum experts were interviewed [Addendum];
- grade 1 – 3 teachers were interviewed and observed at a local primary school;
- foundation phase curriculum trainers' refined draft checklist; and
- grade 1 – 3 teachers at an exemplary site were interviewed and observed to verify curriculum trainers' version of checklist.

The following nine critical components of the foundation phase curriculum were identified with accompanying descriptors: role of the learners, role of the teacher, teaching methods, integration, orientation of the curriculum, learning content, classroom management, assessment and inclusive approach.

Teacher adaptation of the curriculum

The conclusions related to sub-problem 2 are given below. Reference will be made to one text in particular. This text presents a challenge to the RNCS and those attempting to implement it. *Why Outcomes-based Education Will Fail: An Elaboration* was written by Jansen in 1999 with reference to the original version of C2005. Since the curriculum has been revised, it seemed appropriate to use Jansen's predictions as a means of reflecting on the implementation of the RNCS.

In order to establish what adaptations teachers were making when implementing the curriculum, teachers in the Port Elizabeth district were surveyed by means of a checklist that was developed. School observations took place at the same time, also based on the critical dimensions to provide triangulation of data. Two teachers were interviewed a month after school had commenced in 2004 to obtain a fuller picture of initial implementation of the RNCS. Again the interviews were focussed on the critical components of the RNCS.

---

[5] Practice teaching visits, by UPE foundation phase students, to schools from 1998 till 2003

The following conclusions are drawn: As regards teachers' adaptations of the critical components of *role of the learners* and *role of the teacher*, learners were less active and teachers more directive than would be preferred when implementing the RNCS. From the class observations, it was obvious that sound pedagogical reasons underpinned many of the decisions to adapt rather than comply fully with the requirements of the curriculum. The critical component linked to *teaching methods* required teachers to use competence and content focussed methods. A high proportion of teachers indicated that they did so. Classroom observations indicated that perhaps this did not occur as frequently as the checklist data indicated. The levels of use data also revealed that teachers may see their practice as being in line with the preferred practice, but that they might be over estimating their fidelity of implementation.

Regarding *integration*, there is evidence of technical compliance with the curriculum planning requirements. Classroom observation and the teachers' responses in the open-ended section of the checklist indicate that teachers need further assistance both with technical aspects of planning and also in the development of their pedagogical content knowledge. The success of the RNCS was evident in the *orientation of the curriculum*. The original version of C2005 led to much confused and directionless practice. With the advent of the RNCS teachers had much clearer guidelines as to what to teach. Classroom observations indicated a more focussed and pedagogically sound practice than had been the case with the original version of C2005. A word of caution is necessary here. The emphasis on technical compliance with the curriculum planning procedure of the RNCS could pose a danger for the type of curriculum that eventually emerges in most foundation phase classrooms. Jansen (1999:150) states that:

> What started off as an enlightened model of 'transformational competencies' *will* become a mechanical model of behaviourism in the majority of South African schools and classrooms.

Although the RNCS has brought more systematic teaching and learning in many classrooms, teachers are often overwhelmed by assessment procedures. They try to cover every assessment standard in every learning area and then record learners

attainment of all assessment standards. Even in the best-resourced classrooms with a class of 20 learners, it is an almost impossible task to account for all these assessment standards. Teachers tend to make the assessment standards a checklist rather than a guideline helping them to achieve the learning outcomes.

Learning content seems to be an area of concern. Knowledge, skills and values were certainly being taught and learnt in the classroom as indicated by the checklist data. However, classroom observations indicate that little of the human rights orientated focus of the RNCS is emerging in foundation phase classrooms at present. The values associated with Christian dogma are most evident. Again, Jansen offers a warning that we should engage with seriously. He indicates that OBE allows policy makers to sidestep a primary question in South African transition: "What is education for?" Jansen, 1999:151).   The revised curriculum addressed this issue. Human rights, social justice and inclusivity are now mentioned in all learning areas (Joshua, 2003:10). It would seem however that many teachers are at present not choosing to emphasise the values underpinning the RNCS. The situation in foundation phase classrooms might be described as one where much change is taking place, but little transformation is happening.

As regards *classroom arrangement*, teachers aimed for a physical arrangement that supported group work and learner collaboration, but in practice real collaboration between learners did not always take place. Like the situation found with the role of the learners and teachers, there may be sound reasons for not complying with the requirements of the curriculum. Although the emphasis on learner centered activity is laudable, it is difficult to imagine teachers in poorly resourced classrooms, teaching in excess of 60 learners, managing to cope with learner centered practice[6].

As regards *assessment* (assessment purpose, method and time), data indicate that teachers comply with the requirements, apart from not understanding clearly the purpose of assessment. Teachers, however, need help in the management of assessment. At present assessment takes up too much teaching time and is too

---

[6] UPE NPDE classroom visits August 2003 in the eastern part of the Eastern Cape Province estimated an average of 60 learners per foundation phase class.

burdensome from an administrative perspective. Jansen (1999:151) warns about the adminstrative burden that will be experienced by teachers. He makes a strong argument that the system of assessment needs attention. Unfortunately, although the curriculum was revised, the assessment system was not.

> The Revised National Curriculum Statement aligns the curriculum with assessment policy contained in the Assessment Policy (Government Gazette No 19640 of 1998) (Department of Education:2002:19).

Most learners were accommodated in the classroom as policy on *inclusivity* requires. Classroom observations revealed that only the more affluent schools could afford the services of specialist remedial teachers and that classroom teachers were not always able to cater to the diverse needs of learners, despite their best intentions. With reference to the inclusive approach it may be appropriate to borrow from Jansen. He states that:

> OBE is destined to fail in the South African education system because it is based on flawed assumptions about what happens in schools, how classrooms are organised and what kinds of teachers exist within the system (1999:149).

If LSEN policy is not more carefully aligned with classroom reality, one might say of the inclusive approach:

> LSEN is destined to fail in the South African education system because it is based on flawed assumptions about what happens in schools, how classrooms are organised and what kinds of teachers exist within the system (borrowed from Jansen 1999:149).

This study seems to indicate that we may have cause to be more optimistic than Jansen was in 1999. We can be cautiously optimistic about the initial implementation of the RNCS in the foundation phase. In time we may be able to discuss "Why the RNCS may succeed. " and focus less on "Why OBE will fail."

6.2 Recommendations

The critical components identified in this study provide a guideline as to what teachers and learners should be doing when the RNCS is implemented and may alleviate some of the ambiguity related to the curriculum. Both pre-service and in-

69

service teacher education programmes could make use of the critical components when training, supporting or assessing teachers with respect to the implementation of the RNCS.

The pedagogical content knowledge of in-service teachers needs to be addressed. This could take place both informally via district cluster groups and workshops and also formally via upgrading teacher education programmes. The aforementioned teacher support mechanisms could also be used to assist teachers to address the values espoused by the RNCS in their classrooms.

The problems identified in relation to assessment and the inclusive approach to education need to be addressed at a systemic level. At present policies related to assessment and inclusive education are at odds with the classroom reality of even the best resourced classrooms. With regards to assessment a less cumbersome system that takes into account the emancipatory intention of the curriculum is needed. The approach to inclusive education needs to be refined with input from classroom practitioners considered closely.

Possible future areas of research could be focussed on the activities of cluster groups. Areas of concern such as the teaching and learning of the values of the RNCS could be addressed. The CBAM model could again be used as a basis for a research project, using the Stages of Concern and Levels of Use to further investigate foundation phase teachers' implementation of the RNCS. This particular study could also be replicated in a district in the eastern section of the Eastern Cape Province to provide a more comprehensive picture of implementation of the RNCS in the province.

6.3 Concluding remarks

It remains to congratulate the foundation phase teachers who are striving to implement the Revised National Curriculum Statement despite difficult educational circumstances. The adaptations that they make to meet the needs of learners in diverse contexts need to be acknowledged. Foundation phase teachers are continually refining and adapting their practice as they implement the RNCS and are exploring ways to improve the curriculum. The insights gained these by teachers will benefit young learners and all those that work with them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alonso, J.A. 1999. A differentiated program: significant curriculum adaptations. *Gifted Education International.* 14(1): 80-85.

Anderson, G. 1990. *Fundamentals of educational research.* London: The Falmer Press.

Anderson, S.E. 1997. Understanding teacher change: Revisiting the concerns based adoption model. *Curriculum Inquiry* 27(3): 331-367.

Bak, N. (ed.) 2000. *Making OBE Work? 13, 14 & 15 December 1999. Conference proceedings.* Western Cape Education Department.

Bailey, B. 2000. The impact of mandated change on teachers. *The sharp edge of educational change. Teaching, leading and the realities of reform.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Bascia, N. and Hargreaves (eds.) 2000. *The sharp edge of educational change. Teaching, leading and the realities of reform.* RoutledgeFalmer. London

Baxen, J. and Soudien, C. 1999. Outcomes-based education: Teacher identity and the politics of participation. In J. Jansen and P. Christie (Eds), *Changing curriculum. Studies on outcomes-based education in South Africa.* Cape Town: Juta and Co and Co.

Beard, P.N.G. and Morrow, W. 1981. *Problems of pedagogics: Pedagogics and the study of education in South Africa.* Durban: Butterworths.

Berman, P. and Mc Laughlin, M. 1976. Implementation of educational innovation. *Educational Forum,* 1976, XL (3):347 –370.

Berman, P. 1978.The study of macro- and micro-implementation. *Public Policy* 26(2), Spring: 157 -184

Berman, P. 1980.Thinking about programmed and adaptive implementation: Matching strategies to situations. In H.M. Ingram (ed.) *Why policies succeed or fail.* Sage Publications.

Berman, P. 1981. Educational change. Lehming, R & Kane, M. (Eds) *Improving schools. Using what we know.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Brodie, K. 2000. Constraints in learner-centred teaching: A case study*. Journal of Education.* 25:131 – 160.

Brunton, C & Associates (Eds.) 2003. Education Labour Relations Council *Policy handbook for educators.* Universal print group.

Buckland, P. 2002. Curriculum and reality in South African schools. In J. Gultig, U. Hoadley and J. Jansen. *Curriculum: From Plans to Practices. Reader.* Cape Town: South African Institute for Distance Education and Oxford University Press.

Cameron,L. Seleti, J. and Ward, J. 2003. *Explaining the revised national curriculum statement.* Eastern Cape Department of Education and Media in Education Trust.

Carl, A.E. 2002. *Teacher empowerment through curriculum development.* Cape Town: Juta and Co and Co.

Chisholm, L. 2000. *A South African curriculum for the twenty first century. Report of the review committee.* Retrieved on 15 March 2004 from the World Wide Web: http://www.education.upe.ac.za/staff.

Chisholm, L. 2003. *The politics of curriculum review and revision in South Africa.* Oxford International conference on education and development.

Cox, K. 1999. Persuading colleagues to change: fifteen lessons learned from more than 20 years of trying. *Education for health: Change in learning and practice.* November, 12 (3). Retrieved on 12 December 2002 from the World Wide Web: http://web21.epnet.com.citation.

Craig, J.R. & Kacer, B.A. 2000. *Using an innovation configuration component map to assess the relationship between student achievement and the degree of implementation of extended school services in a sample of Kentucky middle schools.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting if the Mid-South Educational Research Association (28th, Bowling Green, KY 15 – 17 November. ERIC number: ED448168. Retrieved on 13 November 2004 from the World Wide Web: http://web3.epnet.com/citation.

Dalziel, M.M. and Schoonover, S.C. 1988. *Changing ways. A practical tool for implementing change within organizations.* New York: Amacom.

Daodee, M.S. 2001. *The implementation of teaching strategy for critical thinking development in nursing education in Thailand: A concerns-based approach.* Unpublished doctoral thesis. Retrieved on 12 November 2004 from the World Wide Web: www.psy.kluven.ac.be/cobv/Engels/doctorats/2001e-doc-daodee.PDF.

Department of Education. 1997. *Building a brighter future. Curriculum 2005. Questions and answers for learners, educators, parents and governing bodies.* Pretoria.

Department of Education. 1997(b). *Foundation Phase (Grades R to 3) policy document.* Pretoria:Government Printers.

Department of Education. 2000. *A South African curriculum for the twenty first century. Report of the review committee on curriculum 2005.* Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. 2000b. *Norms and standards for educators. Government Gazette 20844.* 4 February 2000. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. 2002. *Revised National Curriculum Statement grades R to 9 (Schools) policy. Overview.* Department of Education. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. 2002(b). *Revised National Curriculum Statement grades R to 9 (Schools) policy. Languages.English – Home Language.* Department of Education. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. 2003. *Revised National Curriculum Statement Grades R – 9 (Schools): Teachers' Guide for the development of learning programmes. Foundation Phase.* Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education. 2003 (b) *Revised National Curriculum Statement Grades R – 9 (Schools). Teacher's guide for the development of learning programmes. Foundation Phase.* Department of Education. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Diphofa, M.J. 1999. *Teachers' perceptions about their role in curriculum development: a comparative study of two Soweto senior primary schools.* Unpublished masters thesis. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.

Earl, L. and Katz, S. in Bascia, N. and Hargreaves (eds.) (2000) *The sharp edge of educational change. Teaching, leading and the realities of reform.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Eastern Cape Department of Education. 2001. *Outcomes-based assessment in the GET band. Extracted from the manual for school management (Section O: chapter 5).*

Eastern Cape Department of Education. 2003. *Numeracy. Module 3. Teacher's orientation course. Exploring the RNCS in foundation phase (grades R – 3).* Imbewu Programme.

Edwards, B.S., Dunham,P.H., Dick, T. 2000. The challenges of implementing innovation. *Mathematics Teacher.* 93(9). Retrieved on 12 December 2002 from the World Wide Web. http://web21.epnet.com/citation.

Enslin, P. A. 1981. The notion of 'validity' and 'truth' in Fundamental Pedagogics. In P.N.G. Beard and W.E. Morrow (Eds), *Problems of pedagogics: Pedagogics and the study of education in South Africa.* Durban: Butterworths:149-152.

Farrel, J.P. 2000. Why is educational reform so difficult? Similar descriptions, different prescriptions, failed explanations. *Curriculum Inquiry,* 30(1): 78-85.

Fullan, M. 1982. Research into educational innovation. Gray, H.L.
 The management of educational institutions. Theory, research and consultancy. Lewes, Sussex: The Falmer Press.

Fullan,M. 2001. *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. 2002. The change leader. *Educational Leadership*, 59(8):17-20.

Fullan, M. 2003. *Change forces with a vengeance*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Fullan,M. and Pomfret, A. 1977. Research on curriculum and instruction implementation. *Review of educational research,* 47 (1): 335 – 397

Fullan,M. and Stiegelbauer,S. 1991. *The new meaning of educational change*. London: Cassel Educational Limited.

Gallager, J.G. 1995. Technical adequacy and social validity of innovation configurations for problem-solving. *Dissertation abstracts international. Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences.* 56(4-A). October*.*

Gultig, J. (ed). 1997. *Understanding outcomes-based education. Knowledge, curriculum and assessment in South Africa.* South African Institute for Distance Education and the National Department of Education.

Gultig,J. and Adendorff (Eds.) 2002. *Curriculum from plans to practices. Learning guide.* Cape Town: South African Institute for Distance Education and Oxford University Press.

Gultig,J. Hodley, U and Jansen, J. (Eds.) 2002. *Curriculum from plans to practices. Reader.* Cape Town: South African Institute for Distance Education and Oxford University Press.

Graham-Jolly, M. 2002. The nature of curriculum*.* In J. Gultig, U. Hodley and J. Jansen (Eds.) *Curriculum from plans to practices.* Cape Town: South African Institute for Distance Education and Oxford University Press.

Hall, G.E. & George, A.A. 2000. *The use of innovation configuration maps in assessing implementation: The bridge between development and student outcomes.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24 –28). ERIC number ED445099. Retrieved on 13 November 2004 from the World Wide Web: http://web3.epnet.com/citation.

Hall, G.E. & Hord, S.M. 1984. Analysing what change facilitators do. The Intervention Taxonomy. *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization.* 5(3):275-292

Hall, G.E., Loucks, S.F. 1978. *Innovation Configurations: Analysing the adaptations of innovations.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association. Toronto.

Hall, G.E., Loucks, S.F. 1981. *The conceptualization of innovation configurations.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association. Los Angeles.

Hall, G.E., Loucks, S.F., Rutherford, W.L. and Newlove, B.N. 1975. Levels of use of the innovation: A framework for analysing innovation adoption. *The Journal of Teacher Education.* (26)1: 52 – 56.

Hall, G.E. and Rutherford,W.R. 1976. Concerns of teachers about implementing team teaching. *Educational Leadership.* December, 34(3): 226 – 233.

Hall, G.E. Zigarami, P. and Hord, S.M. 1979. A taxonomy of Interventions: The prototype and initial testing. Austin: Research and Development Centre for Teacher education, The University of Texas at Austin.

Heck, S., Stiegelbauer, S.M., Hall, G.E. and Loucks, S.F. 1981. *Measuring innovation configurations: Procedures and applications.* Austin: Research and Development Centre for Teacher Education. The University of Texas at Austin.

Herald. 2004. *Bhisho's poor spending record continues.* 3 November. (12).

Huberman, A.M. & Miles, B.M. 1984 *Innovation up close. How school improvement works.* New York: Plenum Press.

Jansen, J and Christie, P. 1999. (eds.) *Changing curriculum. Studies on outcomes-based education in South Africa.* Cape Town: Juta and Co and Co.

Jansen, J. 1999. *Why OBE will fail.* .Unpublished paper: Durban: University of Durban- Westville.

Jansen, J. 1999. Why Outcomes – based education will fail: An elaboration. *Changing curriculum. Studies on outcomes-based education in South Africa.* Cape Town: Juta and Co and Co.

Joshua, J. 2003. *Revised National Curriculum Statement. Frequently asked questions.* Eastern Cape Department of Education and Media in Education Trust.

Killen, R. 2000. *Teaching strategies for outcomes-based education.* Cape Town: Juta and Co and Co.

Koekemoer, L and Olivier, T. (2002). Changing the attitudes and beliefs of prospective teachers. *Perspectives in education,* 20 (3): 33 – 48.

Kraak, A. in Jansen, J and Christie, P. (eds.)1999. Changing curriculum. Studies on outcomes-based education in South Africa. *Competing education and training policy discourses: A 'systemic' versus 'unit standards' debate.* Cape Town: Juta and Co and Co.

Kritek, W.J. 1976. Lessons from the literature on implementation. *EducationalAdministration Quarterly 12(3)* Fall: 86 –102.

Leedy, P.D. 1989. *Practical research. Planning and design.* Fourth edition. New York. Macmillan Publishing Company.

Leedy, P.D and Ormond, J.E. 2001. *Practical research. Planning and design.* Seventh edition. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Leithwood, K.A. 1981. The dimensions of curriculum innovation. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 13(1): 25-36.

Loucks, S. and Hall, G. 1979. *Implementing innovations in schools: A concerns-based approach.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting.

Loucks, S.F., Newlove, B.W. and Hall, G. E. 1976. *Measuring levels of use of the innovation: A manual for trainers, interviewers and raters.* Austin: Research and Development Centre for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin.

Lubisi, C. in Gultig (ed). 1997. *Understanding Outcomes-based education. Knowledge, Curriculum and Assessment in South Africa.* South African Institute for Distance Education and the National Department of Education.

Lubisi, C., Parker, B. and Wedekind, V. 1998. *Understanding outcomes-based education. Teaching and assessment in South Africa.* Cape Town: South African Institute for Distance Education.

Macmillan, R.B. 2000. Leadership succesion, cultures of teaching and educational change. Bascia, N. and Hargreaves (eds.) (2000) *The sharp edge of educational change. Teaching, leading and the realities of reform.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

McLaughlin, M. 2002. Implementation as mutual adaptation: Change in classroom organization. In J. Gultig, U. Hoadley and J. Jansen. *Curriculum: From Plans to Practices. Reader.* Cape Town: South African Institute for Distance Education and Oxford University Press.

Mail and Guardian. 2004. *An inspired choice.* August 27 to September 2. 20(5):1.

Mail and Guardian. 2004 (b). *The future ain't bright.* August 27 to September 2. 20 (5):4.

Malcolm, C. in Jansen, J. and Christie, P. eds. 1999. *Changing curriculum. Studies on outcomes-based education in South Africa.* Cape Town: Juta and Co.

Marsh, C.J. and Willis, G. 1999. Curriculum alternative approaches, ongoing issues. 2nd edition. Upper Saddle River, New York: Prentice Hall.

Meehan, M. L., Walsh, S., Swisher, A. Spring, J., Lewis, H.1999. *Process and outcomes evaluation of an Even Start programme. .* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 26 - 30). ERIC number ED436333. Retrieved on 13 November 2004 from the World Wide Web: http://web3.epnet.com/citation.

Mills, S.C. and Ragan, T.J. 2000. A tool for analysing implementation fidelity of an integrated learning system. *Educational Technology research and development.* 48(4). Retrieved on 13 November 2004 from the World Wide Web: http://media.lsi.ku.edu.

Mitchell, S. 1988. *Applications of the Concerns-Based Adoption model in programme evaluation.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9). ERIC number ED301940. Retrieved on 13 November 2004 from the World Wide Web: http://web3.epnet.com/citation.

Mkhabela, T.L. 1999. *An investigation into foundation phase educators' attitudes and classroom practice in relation to curriculum 2005.* Unpublished M.A. research report. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.

Morrow, W.E. 2000. Scripture and practices. In N. Bak (Ed) *Making OBE Work? 13, 14 & 15 December 1999. Conference proceedings.* Western Cape Education Department.

Mugo, F.W. 2004. Sampling in research.
Retrieved on 23 November 2004 from the World Wide Web:
http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/tutorial/Mugo/tutorial.htm.

Muir, R. The teacher-pupil relationship: open or closed? In P.N.G. Beard and W.E. Morrow (Eds), *Problems of pedagogics: Pedagogics and the study of education in South Africa* (pp. 136 - 145). Durban. Butterworths.

Olson, D.R. and Bruner, J.S. (1996) Folk psychology and folk pedagogy. In D.R. Olson and N. Torrance (eds.), *The handbook of education and human development,* pp. 9-27. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Peters, P. F. 2003. *Why is it that training courses aimed at preparing teachers for curriculum change are not more successful in underwriting sustained change?* Unpublished doctoral thesis. Port Elizabeth: University of Port Elizabeth.

Posner, G.J. 1995. *Analysing the curriculum.Second edition.* New York: Retrieved on 13 November 2004 from the World Wide Web: http://web3.epnet.com/citation McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Potenza,E. and Monyokolo, M. 1999. A destination without a map: Premature implementation of Curriculum 2005? Jansen, J. and Christie, P.(eds.) *Changing curriculum. Studies on outcomes-based education in South Africa.* Cape Town: Juta and Co:231-246.

Prins, A. 1998. Kurrikulum 2005: Hoe ervaar onderwysers dit? *Karring.* 14(4-6).

Rutherford, W.L., Hall, G.E. and Huling, L.L. 1983. Implementing instructional change: The Concerns-Based perspective. *Teacher Inquiry,* January: 133-143.

Shaw, K. and Jakubowski, E.H. 1991. Teachers changing for changing times*. Focus on learning problems in mathematics.*13 (Fall): 13 – 20.

Smith, A.C. 2003. *Foundation phase data update October 2003.* Province of the Eastern Cape. Deapartment of Education.

Stefanich, G.P, Wills, F.A. and Buss, R.A. 1991. The use of interdisciplinary teaming and its influence on student self concept in middle schools. *Journal of Early Adolesence.* Voll 11(4): 404-419. Retrieved on 13 November 2004 from the World Wide Web: http://web3.epnet.com/citation.

Stenhouse, L. 2002. A process model of curriculum. In J. Gultig, U. Hoadley and J. Jansen. *Curriculum: From Plans to Practices. Reader.* Cape Town: South African Institute for Distance Education and Oxford University Press.

Steyn, P. and Wilkinson, A. 1998. Understanding the theoretical assumptions of outcomes-based education as a condition for meaningful implementation. *South African Journal of Education.* 18(4):203 –208.

Stodolsky, S.S. and Grossman, P.L. 2000. Changing students, changing teaching. *Teachers College Record.* 102(1): 125.

Stoffels, N.T. 2000. *An evaluation of teacher support during the implementation of curriculum 2005 in grade 1.* Unpublished masters thesis. Port Elizabeth: University of Port Elizabeth.

Taylor, N. and Vinjevold, P. 1999. *Getting learning right. Report of the president's education initiative research project.* Joint Education Trust. Johannesburg.

Taylor, N. and Joint Education Trust 1999. *Getting learning right. Report of the president's education initiative research project.* Presentation to the conference: Teacher development – connecting policy and practice. Department of Education. Riverside Sun. 18 – 20 May 1999.

Taylor, C.A. 2000. *M. Phil in curriculum policy, development and management. Module 4: Implementing a curriculum (PND 545).*

The Herald. 2004. *Bhisho in bold bid to reduce massive debt.* November 3:3.

Tiley, J. 1997. *Implementing Curriculum 2005. Some suggestions on classroom practice for grade 1, 2 and 3 teachers.* Johannesburg: Heinemann Publishers.

Udvari-Solner, A. 1994. "A decision-making model for curricular adaptations in cooperative groups" in Thousand, J.S. (ed), Villa, R. (ed), et al. *Creativity and collaborative learning. A practical guide to empowering students and teachers.* Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Company.

Van den Horst, H. and McDonald, J (1999) *Outcomes-based education. A teacher's manual.* Cape Town: Kagiso.

Visser, M.I.1999. *Faktore wat onderwysers se houding teenoor kurrikulum 2005 beinvloed.* Unpublished M.Ed. Johannesburg: Rand Afrikaans University.

Wang, M.C., Nojan, M., Strom, C.D. Walberg, H.J. 1984. The utility of degree of implementation measures in program implementation and evaluation research. *Curriculum Inquiry* 14(3).

Weekend Post. 2004. *Debt row sparks teaching crisis.* July 31:1.

Williams, M. 2000. *Outcomes –based education: How have selected teachers responded to curriculum 2005?* Unpublished M.Ed.research report. Johannesburg. University of the Witwatersrand.

Yende-Mthethwa, J.A. 1999. *Perceptions of curriculum 2005: Grade one primary teachers in twenty eight Cape Town schools.* Unpublished M.Ed. Cape Town: University of Cape Town.

www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/survsel.htm. accessed on 24 September 2004

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Structured interviews to determine critical components

RESEARCH PROJECT: **TEACHER ADAPTATION OF A NEW CURRICULUM DURING IMPLEMENTATION**[7]
RESEARCHER: MARGIE CHILDS
DATA COLLECTION: STRUCTURED INTERVIEW
RESPONDENTS:
DATE:

1.   PLEASE DESCRIBE CURRICULUM 2005 BRIEFLY

2.   WHAT SHOULD C2005 LOOK LIKE IN THE CLASSROOM?

3.   WHAT SHOULD TEACHERS BE DOING?

4.   WHAT SHOULD LEARNERS BE DOING?

5.   HOW SHOULD LEARNERS AND TEACHERS BE INTERACTING?

6.   WHAT WOULD I SEE IN A CLASSROOM WHERE C2005 WAS BEING IMPLEMENTED?

7.   WHAT WOULD YOU CONSIDER THE MOST IMPORTANT COMPONENTS (essential elements) OF C2005?

8.   WHAT IF ………………(COMPONENT x) WAS NOT EXACTLY LIKE …………….. (DESCRIPTION ABOVE)?
     CAN YOU GIVE ME A DESCRIPTION OF …………………(COMPONENT x) THAT WOULD BE UNACCEPTABLE TO YOU?
     HOW SHOULD THIS COMPONENT BE USED IN THE CLASSROOM?
     HOW IS IT MOST TYPICALLY USED?

---

[7] Heck *et al* (1981:29)

Appendix 2: Checklist

Dear educators

You are kindly requested to complete the following questionnaire to assist us in:

- Determining the adaptations made by teachers in terms of the curriculum

- Planning appropriate pre-service and in-service programmes to support teachers in the process of curriculum implementation

Please take a few minutes to complete this questionnaire

Please be as honest as you can – all responses will be treated in the strictest confidence.

Thank you for your assistance in enabling us to improve teacher education curricula

Kind regards

Margie Childs
Faculty of Education
University of Port Elizabeth
November 2003

Biographical data

[Please tick the appropriate block]

1) Female or male:

F	M	

2) Number of years teaching experience in the Foundation Phase:

1 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 15	> 15

3) Number of educators in your school:

1 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 15	>15

4) Number of learners in your school:

1 to 50	51 - 100	101 - 150	>150

5) Estimated family income of learners:

< R500	R501 – R5 000	R5 001 – R10 000	> R10 000

6) Language of learning in the school:

Xhosa	Afrikaans	English	Other

7) Your home language:

Xhosa	Afrikaans	English	Other

8) Do you teach more than one grade in the same classroom?

Yes	No	

9) Did you attend the Department of Education RNCS training?

Yes	No	

Checklist:

Think about your present teaching practice.
<u>Please tick one choice, for each of the 11 categories listed below that is most descriptive of your teaching.</u>

ROLE OF LEARNERS
- ❑ Learners are actively involved in 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
- ❑ Competence focussed teaching methods are used (focus on what the learners should be able to DO)
- ❑ Both competence and content focussed teaching methods are used
- ❑ Content focussed teaching methods are used (focus on what the learners should KNOW)

INTEGRATION
- ❑ Focus on language outcomes in the Literacy Learning Programme and integrate with other learning areas where relevant; Focus on mathematics in the Numeracy Learning Programme and integrate where relevant; Focus on life orientation outcomes in Life Skills Programme, but integrate all other learning areas.
- ❑ Focus on language, mathematics and life orientation outcomes
- ❑ Integrate all learning areas in each of the Learning Programmes

ORIENTATION OF THE CURRICULUM
- ❑ Emphasize progression (learning is structured in such a way that it becomes progressively more challenging)
- ❑ Emphasise progression, but integrate where possible
- ❑ Emphasise integration, but remain mindful of progression
- ❑ Emphasise integration

LEARNING CONTENT
- ❑ The focus is on the teaching and learning of knowledge, skills and values
- ❑ The focus is on the teaching and learning of knowledge and skills
- ❑ The focus is on the teaching and learning of knowledge

CLASSROOM ARRANGEMENT
- ❑ Learners are seated in flexible groups, but may move around the class for particular activities
- ❑ Classroom arrangement is dependant on particular learning situation
- ❑ Learners are seated in fixed rows and keep to their seats most of the time

ASSESSMENT
- PURPOSE
  - ❑ Assessment is used to inform learning and teaching (i.e. to assess the extent to which progress is being made in achieving outcomes, to identify which outcomes need further teaching attention)
  - ❑ Assessment is used to inform teaching and also to determine whether the required outcomes have been achieved
  - ❑ Assessment is used to determine to what extent required outcomes have been achieved
- 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 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 the classroom and given assistance
  - ❑ LSEN are withdrawn from the classroom to give them assistance

COMMENTS
If you wish, you may indicate how you have / intend to adapt the RNCS to suit your teaching context in 2004:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Appendix 3: Teacher responses to open-ended questions

Q. #	Comment
13	We are currently planning according to the RNCS. We have adapted our activities, no range and phonics lists to include RNCS specifications as well as extension activities. We have also changed themes so as to achieve outcomes and consolidate.
17	My vision includes helping each learner to realize his potential through being flexible and to follow-up continuously, meet individual needs(i.e. remediate) when arising and to encourage each learner to meet the required outcomes – extend further where possible, resulting in a well-adjusted, confident learner who will look back at his/her Grade 1 year as an enjoyable, happy experience filled with challenging learning experiences through which they've grown, developed and become more enriched as well as having learnt to become caring, sympathetic, tolerant, positive and sense their need to trust and have faith in God.
35	I will take it one day at a time and learn from my mistakes.
39	I intend to adapt the RNCS: to seat learners in flexible groups, method of assessing and to assess learners continuously.
44	I intend to adapt my teaching context to RNCS in 2004. It is a more flexible style as it is a learner centred teaching and a teacher as a facilitator.
57	With the specific assessment standards per grade – there seems to be a much clear picture of the level at which learners in each grade should demonstrate their achievements of the learning outcomes. I definitely now have a clear understanding of exactly what needs to be assessed for each learner in terms of knowledge, content and skills.
62	Have adapted already! The new RNCS changes have been viewed, approved and in fact been seen as highly commended by Mr. Ronnie Harker (Teachers' Centre PE)
71	We have implemented the RNCS to the best of our ability, without compromising the tried and tested methods of the past.
72	(see questionnaire) We have done a year worth of user-friendly RNCS planning, but we'll take it as it comes and change what we need to. I'm sure we will really have the "show on the road" by 2005!!
75	I will involve lots of activities in order the learners to be clear about the content and gain skills and the learners to be competent citizens. The involvement of the learners in teaching and learning process will be more vital.
77	I still need time of workshops – otherwise I'm still confused.
79	I will involve lots of activities in teaching and learning process in order for the learners to be clear about what the content convey and to gain knowledge, skills and attitude. The learners will be competent citizen for the community. The active involvement of learners in teaching and learning will be of vital importance.
82	Lots of activities will do in order for the learners to be clear and gain skills.
86	To change the mindset of those who are against the new curriculum.
87	To change the mindset of those who are against the new curriculum.
89	To suit my teaching for 2004. I really have to do a drastically change. Educate parents so that they can understand the RNCS. Change the minds of those who are so negative towards curriculum 2005 and the RNCS.
90	To change the mindset of those who are against the new curriculum.
91	To suit my teaching for 2004. to change the mindset of those who are against the new curriculum.
95	I am not sure yet.
101	I wish to apply it in my teaching and attend courses when necessary.

103	I intend to use the RNCS effectively in my teaching in 2004. RNCS is going to help me a lot.
104	I will always use the RNCS to assist my teaching in every learning area.
125	Still busy working on it. Unsuitable time of the year to work on a new curriculum.
126	Good ideas – more overall uniformity globally, however I feel very much for teachers whose mother tongue is not English, struggle with the language and have to try and understand the new terminology also far too much paper-work and recording.
128	My knowledge from the RNCS I intend to assess at the end of each learning sequence so that I could focus on those who need to be more motivated at the end of each theme.
138	Once we have attended the course, we will know what is going on.
140	We have not attended the course and once training has been received informed opinions can be given.
141	Once we have attended the course we will have the necessary knowledge.
142	Once we have attended the RNCS course we will know what is going on. We enjoyed module 1 very much.
145	More integration within L A and across L A.
169	By using more peer assessment activities and involving pupils more.
170	I am more aware that I need to be more flexible as far as classroom arrangement goes. The assessment of all the A S is also and area I will have to work closely on next year. Integration has always been done but I am now more aware of it.
171	We have worked on an L P for Gr.3 based around our theme and have started putting our lesson plans together working from our L P. We have clustered and integrated in all L A and should cover all A S by the end of the year.
173	We intend using all our previous planning and slotting it into the various areas and making sure that by the end of the year all assessment standards have been covered and assessed.
177	We have classes which accommodate the LSEN learners. (Esp. partially hearing and special classes.)
178	We have classes which accommodate the LSEN learners. (Esp. partially hearing and special classes.)
181	We have classes which accommodate the LSEN learners. (Esp. partially hearing and special classes.)
182	We have classes which accommodate the LSEN learners. (Esp. partially hearing and special classes.)
183	We have classes which accommodate the LSEN learners. (Esp. partially hearing and special classes.)
184	We have classes which accommodate the LSEN learners. (Esp. partially hearing and special classes.)
185	We have classes which accommodate the LSEN learners. (Esp. partially hearing and special classes.)
186	We have classes which accommodate the LSEN learners. (Esp. partially hearing and special classes.)
227	I think RNCS will suit my teaching especially there are resources.
229	I would do activities that will cater their different abilities.
230	I think the RNCS suit our teaching because it has different skills and values.
232	I will give the learners different activities so as to accommodate all learners with different needs.
233	As a teacher who has attended the RNCS workshop the RNCS will guide me as to how I will implement the L P to my learners, how I will integrate the L P so that every learner is accommodated and attended to according to his individual needs.
234	I'll manage different activities in the classroom to accommodate all the learners e.g. slow learners and higher achievers.

239	I have gained a lot and I like the RNCS.
240	I need more workshops to master the RNCS.
241	The course I attended extended more knowledge to me as an educator on how these L O's in the RNCS are to be planned and the way in which they are to be integrated. They also helped me to be able to plan activities and how and when assessment has to take place. This also helped me on how to get resources from what one has without having any expenses. Rote learning will not be applied in my class from now on.
242	I enjoyed and gained a lot.
243	I enjoyed it very well.
247	We have worked on the cycle 1 planning, trying to incorporate, naturally, the required/necessary information, skills and vocabulary to meet our children's needs. We will be working on the rest of the years' planning, gradually at first on the 2nd cycle.
248	We have planned our 1st cycle for next year and enjoyed getting all the information together. We are now ready to start with everything neatly planned.
264	The RNCS is seen to be helpful but the training needs to be done more than once because it is quite a wide phenomenon.
265	I think RNCS is better than OBE but we need more training and explanation in planning. E.g. clustering, integration within and across, and how we should do our activities.
270	I wish to attend more workshops so as to empower ourselves.
271	More workshops for training teachers in RNCS is needed. Trainers must be available to teachers at schools who have problems during planning and not wait till all planning is done.
272	I need some more information in clustering and integration within and across.
273	I so wish the RNCS to give us well planned syllabi for all grades. I think this will help us to suit our teaching and learning context in 2004. (see questionnaire)
274	I wish RNCS would give us a ready planned syllabus so that we know what is expected from us.
275	I wish the Xhosa speaking people to be given the documents written in Xhosa so as to underlie and understand well what is expected from them. I.e. their home language. RNCS workshop should be done quarterly as to facilitate certain things as it is new to us.
276	I need more information because I am not clear and I want to know all about this RNCS.
277	Supply us with documents that are written in Xhosa so that we can understand what is taking place as well as English.
278	I am not very much clear about RNCS. I need more information or courses.
291	By ensuring that there is a link between L A's. Linking the knowledge with everyday life. Ensuring that the environment where the learner comes from is considered when taught.
303	When I plan I will put all the RNCS document in front of me so that I cannot deviate from the RNCS policies. RNCS is new it will take time for us to get acquainted to it. We need to plan as a big group then a small group and then as an individual educator.
322	Learners in Gr. R were introduced to OBE at the beginning of 2003. Assessment was done continuously throughout the year according to benchmarks by the teachers and not according to L O, as we (Gr. R teachers) have not been trained to assess accordingly. In 2004 we will introduce assessment according to the RNCS.
326	What I would like to say is that I prefer the follow up workshop can start in April so that you can know whether you are ding the right planning.

342	Yes I have adapted RNCS to suit my teaching context because it has changed my teaching methods.
363	Thank you.
365	Thank you.
389	(See questionnaire) worked out 14 L P's fully, in detail, used my previous knowledge and skills and "old" works.
412	I somehow feel that our learners are lacking the necessary communication skills to fully adhere to the RNCS of 2004.
414	We have never had a child with LSEN. Children with problems get help from a Occupational therapist and speech therapist at the school – I do not believe that children with severe problems would be able to cope in our class of 28 children. They need specialized care and attention. I believe it could be done provided one has the help and adequate facilities. It is done in England and Israel – they have good results.
449	A S's have worked easily with clustering and integrating into the Programme and as an addition to theme/discussions and as a natural pare of the schools daily Programme. A S's are abused and the Programme becomes too formal in an effort to accommodate learner individual assessments, etc.
452	RNCS has created a challenge regarding planning but all A S's are already accommodated. Concern is that A S's and L O's can be viewed in isolation causing unnecessary formal presentation of activities and refined assessing. We intend continuing with the informal presentation of activities giving children opportunities and exposure to all A S's so that they explore and discover on their own as far as is possible.

Appendix 4: Classroom observation schedules November/ December 2003

SCHOOL: CLASS:	DATE:
OBSERVATION ITEM	**COMMENT**
ROLE OF LEARNERS	
ROLE OF TEACHER	
TEACHING METHODS	
INTEGRATION	
ORIENTATION OF CURRICULUM	

LEARNING CONTENT	
CLASSROOM ARRANGEMENT	
ASSESSMENT: PURPOSE	
ASSESSMENT: METHOD	
ASSESSMENT: TIME	
INCLUSIVE APPROACH	

Appendix 5: Teacher interviews February 2004

Kindly indicate which of the following descriptors best describes your practice:

CRITICAL COMPONENTS	DESCRIPTOR	DESCRIPTOR	DESCRIPTOR	DESCRIPTOR
ROLE OF LEARNERS ✓	Learners active	Learners usually active	Learners usually passive	Learners passive
ROLE OF TEACHER ✓	Teacher facilitator	Teacher usually facilitator	Teacher usually source of knowledge	Teacher sole transmitter of knowledge
TEACHING METHODS ✓	Competence focussed	Both competence and content focussed	Content focussed	
INTEGRATION ✓	Focus on *core learning area* in each Learning Programme and integrate other learning areas where relevant	Focus on Language, Mathematics and Life Orientation outcomes	Integrate all learning areas in each learning programme	
ORIENTATION OF CURRICULUM ✓	Emphasise progression	Emphasise progression, but integrate where possible	Emphasise integration, but mindful of progression	Emphasise integration
LEARNING CONTENT ✓	Focus on teaching and learning of knowledge skills and values	Focus on teaching and learning of knowledge and skills	Focus of teaching and learning of knowledge	
CLASSROOM ARRANGEMENT ✓	Flexible groups	Dependant on particular learning situation	Fixed rows	
ASSESSMENT PURPOSE ✓	Used to inform teaching and learning	Used to inform teaching and to determine whether acquired outcomes achieved	Used to determine to what extent required outcomes have been achieved	
ASSESSMENT METHOD ✓	Using criterion referenced assessment	Using norm referenced assessment		
ASSESSMENT 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 ✓	LSEN are accommodated and assisted within the classroom situation at all times	LSEN are accommodated and assisted within the classroom situation, but are removed at times	LSEN are withdrawn from class to give assistance	

Comments: