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ABSTRACT

This dissertation is a study of the impact of OBE (Outcomes-based Education) and C2005 (Curriculum 2005) on the professional lives and teaching of a select group of high school teachers.

The research was a combination of a case study approach and reflective professional practice. It sought to identify and explain the key aspects that had produced such a marked alteration in the position of the teachers within such a short period.

It is argued that there were four discernable features that, more than anything else, characterised what OBE had “done” to the teachers. They are the manner of its implementation, the teaching style demanded, the loss of the disciplines and introduction of learning areas, and unrealistic expectations and potential burnout. The study attempts to record and to understand these features. It concludes with reflections based on how the teachers see their futures.
CHAPTER 1

My own case

As will be explained in Chapter 2, this dissertation involves the cases of four teachers. To foreground it, I have chosen to present my own case as the first chapter.

I chose myself as a case because of the effect that Outcomes-based Education (OBE) and Curriculum 2005 (C2005) has had on my professional life, as I have been adversely affected by the change in the curriculum. C2005 replaced Accounting with Economic and Management Sciences, and the introduction of OBE caused me to change my tried and tested teaching practice (style) to one where I had to assist learners to achieve outcomes that were obscure to me. Not knowing what was expected of me, my feelings of inadequacy led me to begin the research, which made me realise that my experience was mirrored by the teachers in the study, and could be of value as a study.

My experience regarding Outcomes-based Education started in 1995. I was teaching at a school in Johannesburg, and our headmistress decided that she wanted to be at the forefront of this new education system that was being talked about, with much speculation and promise. She was sure that our school could become a pioneering school in this regard. As the youngest member of the Management Committee of the school, I was designated to attend meetings pertaining to OBE.

The first meeting, regarding the new curricula, was attended by many enthusiastic people who felt that the new system was going to revolutionise education in South Africa and that all the inequalities of the past would be eradicated. Subsequent meetings revealed much of the same enthusiasm, but did not reveal much about how this system was going to work, or how teachers were going to be expected to implement these changes. No references to formal documentation or documentation of any kind was issued, which may have helped us to understand what we, as teachers, would have been expected to do. The only thing I could
ascertain from those meetings was that my subject, Accounting, would be no more, and that I would be expected to teach Economic and Management Sciences, as decided by the DoE in 1996. Not only would I have to teach this new ‘learning area’, but I would also have to do so by means of ‘group work’. This was extremely alarming for me, the Accounting teacher who ran her class by the same discipline that would have been expected of someone doing Accounting as a profession. I could not imagine a classroom where learners were given the opportunity to have discussions that were not controlled. I could only begin to imagine the noise and chaos that would ensue. My fears for my future as a teacher were mounting and I decided it was time to leave teaching before my fears were realised.

I left the school at which I was teaching in June 1996 and joined the private sector, working for an educational institution, where I was responsible for testing and editing educational manuals, Academy of Learning: Head Office, a subsidiary of Educor. As I had not left education behind completely, I tried to keep up with the trends that were going on in education and read as many documents as were made available to Educor. (These documents were in connection with accreditation with South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA), and what was required.) The more I read the more convinced I was that I had made the right decision as I could not really ascertain exactly what I would have been required to do. Although the documents were clear about how accreditation would have been allocated, very little was written about the content of the syllabuses that were being accredited. I knew that by leaving teaching I would not have to teach Economic and Management Sciences as opposed to my beloved Accounting. I was relieved that I would not have to be involved in sorting out the sixty-six (66) outcomes that were published in documents and the media, as I could not see how I would have been able to implement them. I did not really understand how they would fit in with my subject (Accounting). The specific outcomes, shown in figure 1, were not related to Accounting. I would have had to engage in entrepreneurial activities, demonstrate my personal role in the economic environment, demonstrate managerial expertise and administrative proficiency, etc., all aspects that were almost impossible to apply to the principles of Accounting, as laid
Figure 1. Critical Outcomes and Phase Organisers (Sun Valley Primary School, 2001)
down in the existing syllabus. I felt that I had definitely made the right decision to leave teaching!

My life took a sudden turn and I returned to Cape Town in 1998. I had to make a very hasty decision as to whether to accept a position outside of the classroom, or accept a position at a school in order to ensure that my two sons could attend, what I believed to be, a school of excellence. My fears of OBE aside, I realised that it would be the best decision for my sons, especially as the youngest would have been one of the first group of learners to encounter OBE (or should I say, encounter what teachers believed OBE to be).

Returning to the teaching profession in October 1998 and being faced with the prospect of having to teach in an OBE fashion, I realised that I needed to do some research. Once again I was faced with the 66 outcomes. I bought every available textbook on Economic and Management Sciences (and there were many) in order to ascertain what it was that I was expected to do. All I could ascertain from these books was that I would be able to teach almost anything that related in some way to business, as long as I did it in a manner that was completely alien to me. I was expected to allow group work and learners running up to the front of the class in order to place their group’s ideas on the board for all to discuss at a later stage. I, as the teacher, would not be expected to actually teach, but would just have to facilitate, as the Activity in figure 2 shows.
Figure 2. Economic and Management Sciences Lesson (Human and Llewellyn 2000: 121)

My life, as a teacher, was going to be quite different. The learners were going to be expected to find the necessary information, bring it to class, spend time in groups discussing the information, and, as a group, make decisions and draw conclusions regarding the topic. I was relieved that at that stage I could still teach Accounting.

In 2001, my youngest son was enrolled at my school, and I had to teach him Economic and Management Sciences (EMS). Although the Grade 7 learners of 2000 had previously been exposed to EMS, I realised very early on in the year that they really knew very little, other than how to present pretty pictures, about business or the economy. Although this was not a particular problem as I felt confident that I could teach them what they needed to know, their behaviour in my classroom was a very worrying factor. My usual quiet, controlled and organised classroom was turned into a noisy arena of very confident boys who believed that they knew everything about everything, but generally their knowledge was based on childish cartoons that were televised by the South African Broadcasting Corporation. In classroom discussions, for example, they referred to programmes such as ‘Pinky and The Brain’, when discussing the effects of war and other conflict situations on the economy. I felt that I was dealing with confident semi-literates. They were quite able to read the words in the notes that I gave them, but very seldom did they understand what they meant. An example of this
was when we discussed the functions of money. One function was the criterion of value. For the majority of the learners this meant absolutely nothing as they were given money by their parents, and for this reason the items they purchased were of little value to them. This level of illiteracy was borne out by Brombacher, who reported that a failing of the introduction of OBE and C2005 was that learners were not ready for Grade 10, and the “declining levels of literacy” were “resulting in Grade 9 learners who [were] unable to read but [were] nevertheless passed into Grade 10” (Brombacher 2004: 21).

In a bid to ensure that these boys would be ready to leave OBE and C2005 and cope with the subjects required in order for them to obtain a University Endorsement, I had to change my teaching style, yet again, from a more relaxed discussion type lesson, back to a more structured style in which I taught them the principles of Accounting and how to interpret the questions posed to them, while still trying to adopt some of the OBE principles. It was at this stage that I realised that teachers could never just be facilitators. They would always have to instruct, but where before they could teach the subjects that they had specialised in at university, they would now be expected to have knowledge of a vast range of subjects. In my particular case, I would have to teach Business Economics related subjects, which I had hated at school, at university and had hated teaching previously to senior classes, and had made a decision not to teach ever again. My decision was based on the fact that at school I hated being ‘taught’ Business Economics as each lesson was spent reading the textbook and underlining the ‘important’ parts that would be asked in tests and examinations, and if they were not answered word perfectly from the textbook, poor marks were allocated. At university it was repetition of the same work that I had covered when I did my original teacher’s diploma, and I still found it very time consuming and uninteresting. As a teacher, having to teach Business Economics, I decided to make every effort to make the subject exciting and different. Unfortunately, I did not realise that at many schools, Business Economics was the subject that replaced Mathematics when the learner was not a mathematician. The result was that each class that I taught was made up of learners who were disinterested and believed themselves to be less able academically. As a teacher, this was very demoralising, hence my decision to never teach it again.
I was fortunate as I had studied commerce related subjects and had an academic knowledge of Economics that I was able to apply to EMS teaching. I soon realised that most economic topics were too complicated for Grade 8 learners to research themselves, and even with assistance from parents, the information they gathered was of a very poor standard. In a lesson where we discussed the effects of a rise or cut in interest rates on the disposable income of a family, I tasked the learners with discussing the situation with their parents and finding out how their parents were being affected by the changes in interest rates. The reports that were written showed a clear lack of research from appropriate sources, such as banks or shopkeepers, as I had suggested, and many had either not discussed the situation with their parents or had misunderstood what their parents had said. The textbooks that were available were of such a poor standard they could not have been used as a basis for further discussion and learning. I concluded that I would have to supply all the relevant information, obtained from many different sources, if I had hoped that all the learners would be learning the same things. Thus, my workload began to overwhelm me.

As the teacher, I was not only going to have to do the research beforehand, but I was also then going to have to evaluate all the work produced by the learners in new ways. The introduction of rubrics made assessment more time-consuming than it had been before. I was no longer marking work that was factual and relatively easy to ascertain correct from incorrect, but I also had to assess things on appearance and presentation as well as facts, based on a scale, which left room for interpretation and subjectivity, and took longer to mark. Figure 3 shows an example of a rubric as supplied by the Western Cape Education Department in their Continuous Assessment Guidelines for Economic and Management Sciences.
Figure 3. Assessment Rubric for a poster for Economic and Management Sciences (WCED: Continuous Assessment Guidelines, 2002: 22)

In order to alleviate some of the insecurity I felt about the work I was doing, I made sure that my Grade 8’s learnt the Grade 8 Accounting syllabus as well as the EMS syllabus. In their Grade 9 year, I continued their Accounting education and by Grade 10 they were able to move from EMS to Accounting without the high failure rate experienced by many other
learners throughout the country. Although teaching them Accounting was not part of the syllabus as laid down by the education department, my colleague and I, both Accounting teachers, decided that if we covered the outcomes of the EMS syllabus and continued to teach them Accounting, we would have a clear conscience as regards the new policy documents from the education department. As our headmaster trusted us to do the work required, he did not question what we were doing and this allowed us the freedom to teach Accounting, although this meant that we would have to do twice the amount of work.

During my son’s Grade 8 year, my first OBE year, I spent many hours attending meetings, study sessions and support groups with other teachers, presented by the Education Department and Sanlam, in a bid to understand exactly what I was supposed to do. I found those meetings to be a complete waste of time, as the only things ever discussed were how to set up rubrics, how to play games and how to use “ZOPP” cards.

The ZOPP cards were to be used in order to create discussion. A typical lesson required learners, in their various groups, to look at a set of words and decide which words were important to the topic being discussed. Once they had made their decision, those words would then be written on a card (ZOPP) and placed on the board or the wall in the classroom for all to see. Once each group had completed their list on the board, the class as a whole would then decide which words were the most important and from there a discussion of those words would follow. Figure 4 shows an example of a lesson using ZOPP cards, as supplied by the Cape College during one of the training sessions.
Figure 4. Example of a ZOPP card lesson (EMS Training Manual Grade 8: Sanlam & Cape College, 2001: 6)
I realised that I was never going to get any concrete assistance from these groups when at one “training” session we were expected to divide into two groups and play some form of soccer. The soccer ball was made out of paper and cello-taped together. I never did ascertain how this pertained to EMS, except possibly that teamwork was important in any business, but I realised that the presenters had no idea what they were supposed to be doing either. How could a class of thirty boys, in a classroom with thirty desks, still manage to play soccer?

Following my son’s Grade 9 year, I chose not to teach Grade 8 at all and decided to teach twice the amount of Grade 9 learners in order to ensure that they were ready to continue Accounting and not to suffer any drawbacks as reported nationally in 2003 about Grade 10 learners. The drawbacks could, arguably, have been attributed to the fact that teachers were not able to complete the relevant syllabus and that the learners were not ready “for the demands of Grade 10” (Bronbacher 2004: 14).

I adjusted my teaching of Accounting to include a little economic information in an attempt to at least appear to be trying to introduce OBE and C2005. My major prompt to do this was the introduction of the Common Tasks for Assessment (CTA). Although I had no idea what would be in the CTA, I still tried to cover some economic information that I felt was interesting. During this time my marking load became heavier as the marking of Accounting is much easier than marking short essay type questions, especially of learners who were semi-literate. (I say semi-literate as the language and spelling of the work handed in was of a very poor standard. In many cases I could not ascertain what the learner was trying to say.) Not only were there essay type questions, but the learners were expected to do research and present mini projects, do presentations, perform simulations, while all the time doing group work in order for the weaker learners to learn from the more academically sound learners.

As the amount of marking increased, the time I used to spend in class trying to help weaker learners was now spent trying to control a group of thirty-five learners all with different opinions and all believing that they were right. I found myself resorting to sarcasm and belittling the learners in an attempt to maintain control within the classroom. With the noise...
level increasing, the quality of the work produced by the learners decreasing and the marking load rising, I started turning down social invitations, even those from my family for family related special occasions. My days became a routine of going to school, doing extra murals or attending meetings in the afternoons, and then going home to do the regular home related activities that are associated with a family. Once dinner had been served and general chores taken care of, I would then begin marking and preparing whatever was needed for the next day. Anything that could not have been done on a particular day, was saved for weekends.

My sons soon realised that their mother was no longer the person she used to be. They started to expect a tired mother who no longer cooked the same quality meals as before OBE. Washing was not done quite as regularly as before and sometimes they would be left without the necessary attire, as it had not been washed. My mother would telephone me to make an appointment to see me during holiday time, until she realised that holiday time was used to prepare for the term that lay ahead in order to keep up. I started using holiday time to mark projects, as all grades were expected to produce a research project, as I did not have time to mark them during term time and still ensure that the learners were receiving the kind of education in my classroom that a school, like the one I teach at, was reputed to offer.

I was definitely not a facilitator. I was still the teacher. I had to do all the research before hand to ensure that it was available to them if I hoped that they would find the relevant information and not rely on some comic strip character to supply them with their answers. I was doing the preparation, the research, the marking and trying to teach learners so that they would be at an academic level conducive to coping with Grade 10.

My life as a teacher started to turn into a nightmare. Every waking hour was spent working and I was starting to feel that I was no longer capable of two thoughts in a row. I realised that the workload was starting to affect my life. Not only had I given up having a social life, but afternoons spent watching my sons play sport were nothing more than an opportunity for me to sit in my car and do some marking, while pretending to watch them play.
In an attempt to find some time to socialise with other adults, and not other teachers who were too tired to have a conversation or who spent their time complaining about the amount of work they were expected to do, I enrolled at the University of Cape Town to do a masters degree. I realised that the only way I could get the school to agree to give me time outside of school activities was to study further, as further studies are encouraged by the school. My studies helped me overcome my uncertainty as regards OBE and EMS and to structure my lessons more effectively. While this allowed me a little more time, the amount of work did not decrease. I began to understand that I would have had to spend time with each learner in order to ensure that while working at his own pace, the learner achieved the outcomes required in order for him to be promoted to the next grade.

My studies helped me to feel more confident about my role as an OBE teacher, and I believe that my school began to regard me as a successful teacher, as I was made Subject Head of Accounting and Economic and Management Sciences, although my personal life had yet to improve. I gained a better understanding of OBE and began to realise that, comparing it to a computer, it was the “operating system” for education in South Africa. I began to focus on outcomes while trying to implement C2005 as well as the basics of the Accounting syllabus. Teaching in 2004 did not become easier than teaching in 2000, but I do not feel as insecure as I did then. I began enjoying teaching again as I adopted some of the recommended teaching methods and rejected those, like group work, that I found to be stressful. The time I had available for my extended family or for my social life did not improve, however. My sons accepted my workload and tried to make life easier for me by assisting with chores at home, as they were older.

Although I feel more confident about my role as a teacher, I remain constantly tired, my weekends are still being used for preparation and weekdays used for marking. School holidays are still used for the marking of projects and any other school related activities required of me. Being a Grade 12 teacher, with all that is required of Grade 12 teachers and the learners Continuous Assessment Portfolio’s (CASS), as well as being responsible for
Grade 9 CASS portfolio’s as regards EMS, I am still not able to foresee that my working life is going to become any easier unless I leave the teaching profession for good.

At first I thought that I was the only teacher who felt this way. I believed that it was my negative attitude towards EMS that was causing me to feel the way that I did, but through the study sessions, work groups and meetings that I have attended with other EMS teachers and particularly with the teachers in this study, I realised that other teachers were in the same situation. Many teachers, among them those who were positive about the transition, have been suffering from various ailments, such as tiredness, illness and other stress related issues. For some it was the lack of resources, the lack of interest and the lack of time, while for others it was the pressure from parents and the school to maintain standards as well as the lack of time. Based on these feelings expressed by various teachers at meetings, I began my research into how the introduction of OBE and C2005 had affected the working lives of teachers and why so many were, and still are, leaving the teaching profession.
CHAPTER 2

Research methodology

Focus of the research

An investigation of how four Cape Town secondary school teachers talk about their experiences, the effect on their professional lives and how they have coped with the introduction of Outcomes-based Education (OBE) and Curriculum 2005 (C2005).

Research design

The study required a research design that could generate descriptions of teachers’ experience of the introduction of OBE and C2005. The methodological approach that best suited this type of enquiry was a qualitative/interpretative one. Qualitative data with emphasis on teachers’ lived experiences was best suited for locating the meaning teachers placed on their lives. The qualitative research method best suited for this dissertation was a combination of a case study approach and reflective professional practice, as this method was appropriate for the investigation of both a particular phenomenon (the changing of the curriculum and teaching methods) and the context within which the phenomenon was occurring (the teacher’s working lives). The case study method was defined by Yin (1993: 23), as

an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, addresses a situation in which the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident, and uses multiple sources of evidence.

Case studies are preferable when “how” or “why” questions are posed, the investigator has little control over the events being discussed and when the phenomenon being discussed is within some real-life context.
Campbell and Stanley (1966) rejected case studies as having “almost no scientific value” (Bubbie & Mouton 2001), as it was regarded as nearly impossible to ascribe causation where there was no pre-test and few measurable variables at post-test. According to Yin (1993), case study investigators were regarded as having deviated from their academic disciplines, and that their investigations were lacking in quantification, objectivity and dogmatism. There were opponents who felt that there was too much subjectivity in the implementation, presentation and evaluation of the case study research. Personal interpretation of the data and inferences were the basis of the study. Relying on one or a few subjects for cognitive extrapolation may have resulted in too much being inferred from what might only have been circumstance. As the circumstances of the teachers in this study appear to be almost identical for most issues and the literature available from other studies correspond, the cognitive extrapolation is valid and not only circumstantial.

**Conceptualisation of the research**

The research is the culmination of a coursework masters degree in teaching. The taught degree is made up of four courses and an introduction to research. The first course, Teaching and the Modern Condition, gave me invaluable insight into the manner in which I had been taught at school and was perpetuating in my classroom. This allowed me an opportunity to reconsider my initial resistance to changing the way I managed my classes. The second course, Curriculum Design and Development, allowed me the opportunity to understand why the changes were necessary, from a political point of view. Although my view on Economic and Management Sciences did not change, I became aware that I was being tasked with forming my own content base and could, therefore, decide what to teach as long as I covered the outcomes required. The third course, Cognition and Technology, allowed me the opportunity to discover ways of learning. I became far more aware of the problems learners were experiencing in their quest to learn what I was trying to teach, and the time that it took them. In the fourth course, Re-Searching Teaching, I, as a teacher, had to do much introspection as to the reasons I was doing and saying the things I was in the classroom, which made me aware of my many shortcomings as a teacher. When I started the process of
introspection and tried to implement changes in my classroom, the relevance and value of the three previous courses became far more apparent. As my understanding grew, it became clearer to me why teachers were negative towards the new system and why so many wanted to leave the teaching profession, as they were finding it too stressful. This dissertation gave me the opportunity to consult with other teachers, to discuss various aspects that I found difficult or frustrating, and, most of all, an opportunity to regularly interact with other people who understood, and could relate to, what I was experiencing. Thus, the research became a combination of ‘teaching’ and ‘case study’, with each informing the other, but without a strict instructional approach, or a true case study approach.

My own story formed the base from which to begin. Three single teachers from the Cape Town area made up the other three cases. Although a single person with children, the other cases chosen were single teachers without children because they did not have the added workload, pressures and stresses of a family to care for, although they were participating in the world that they were to describe and uncover. By focusing on single teachers, it was hoped that they would indicate the additional stress placed on them by the system of education without the added stress of a family life involving a spouse and children. Although some schools may have had access to many different types of resource materials and the means to acquire them, the pressure placed on the teachers, by the school and the parent body, for the learners to achieve was great.

The teachers involved are all teachers with a minimum of ten years experience, who underwent the transition process. Not only were they teaching Grade 8 and 9, they also taught Grade 12 learners, as most secondary schools required teachers to teach from Grade 8 to Grade 12. The choice of Melt, Alta and Steve was because they met the above criteria and were willing to be involved in this research in the hope that their contribution would have a positive effect on all other teachers. They did not feel threatened by admitting their shortcomings or insecurities. Other teachers approached to be involved, were not prepared to be involved or to admit whether or not they were coping, or the circumstances at their schools.
Melt has a Master’s degree in Afrikaans and has been teaching for twenty years. He taught at schools in the Northern Cape before teaching in Grahamstown, where he also lectured at Rhodes University in their education faculty. It was while lecturing future teachers that he became aware of Outcomes-based Education. Although he was always positive about OBE, he found the workload to be overwhelming and has spent most nights working until midnight. He started writing a novel in 1998, but with the introduction of OBE and C2065 he has not had the time to complete it. He works very closely with the other teachers in his subject department in order to ensure that they do what is best for the learners at all times.

Alta, with a degree in Commerce and a teacher’s diploma, teaches Accounting and Economic and Management Sciences and has taught for ten years. A passionate Accounting teacher, she found the transition from Accounting to EMS difficult and the workload overwhelming. As the only Accounting and EMS teacher at her school, she is not only responsible for ensuring that all the work is covered, she has no one on the staff to share her concerns with. In an attempt to release some of the stress she has been feeling, she started taking singing lessons. As a result of this study, she will be working closely with me in future as regards Accounting and EMS.

Steve has a degree in Accounting and completed his Accounting articleship. He started teaching eleven years ago, and has spent the last nine years at the same school. He felt that the old Accounting syllabus was a little boring in the junior standards and was very pleased, initially, with the introduction of EMS, as he believed that it would still be Accounting with a little Economics and Business Economics added. However, as this is not the case, he has become quite disillusioned with EMS and would prefer to accept a half post, where he could only teach Accounting to senior classes, rather than teach juniors EMS. He is more determined than ever to start up his own consulting firm while teaching the seniors, so that he will be able to leave teaching once his practice is up and running.
In the dissertation the four cases (including my case) are often referred to jointly as ‘the teachers’.

Contextual detail

As regards the introduction of OBE and C2005, teachers were equally disadvantaged by the methods of introduction and training, as training was generic for all teachers, irrespective of levels of education or experience. As this study was on the effects on the teachers working lives, the variations as regards subjects/learning areas taught and the economic setting of the school was not of major concern or influence.

The data

The main data were interviews with the teachers. The interviews were audiotaped and transcribed. The first interview was unstructured (informal conversational interview) in order to give the teachers an opportunity to discuss frankly how they felt about OBE and C2005. By doing so they were given an opportunity to freely express any feelings or emotions they may have had, whether positive or negative, towards OBE and C2005. After the initial interview, a follow-up interview, which was a more structured interview (general interview guide approach, see Appendix A) in order to explore any threads that surfaced during the initial interview and to explore actual changes that the teachers had undergone in order to be OBE teachers.

Although qualitative interviews may appear similar to conversations, the interviewees meaning perspective was uncovered, and how they framed and structured their responses respected. The interviewee’s perspective on the phenomenon of interest unfolded the way they perceived it. Interviews allow for a large amount of data to be collected quickly with immediate follow-up and clarification where necessary. In conjunction with the observations made during the interview, the interviewer/researcher was able to understand the meanings people held for their everyday activities, as required for this study.
Interviews have definite limitations and weaknesses, such as the interviewees becoming unwilling to cooperate, or the interviewer may not properly have comprehended the responses of the interviewees. For this reason follow up discussions with the interviewees were held and they were given an opportunity to read the transcribed interviews and to comment on anything they felt was misinterpreted. In all cases the interviewees were happy with the transcriptions, and made additional comments where they felt that they had not been specific enough or that they had not portrayed themselves adequately. The interim between the two interviews was used for short informal meetings, e-mail messages and telephone conversations on a regular basis in order to note any relevant information that may have been overlooked during the interviews. This continued after the second interview in order for clarity to be obtained on certain points. The final communication between the interviewees was a lunchon at which all three interviewees were present.

Analysis

As a starting point, my own case identified experiences, which formed the basis of the investigation into the literature available and the interviews. The initial, unstructured, interview highlighted similar feelings of insecurity and the concerns that were evident in the original case study. In the follow-up, more structured interview, ten months later the threads that ran through each of the three stories were concentrated on. The threads matched my own experience and led to the interrogation of appropriate literature.

Analysis of my own case, and the interviews with the three other teachers, produced four key factors in which OBE and Curriculum 2005 had affected their working lives. A chapter has been devoted to identifying and explaining each key issue and it is for this reason that there is no separate ‘literature survey’ chapter. (Where direct quotes from the interviewees have been used, they have been recorded in a different font.) The chapters in this dissertation have been divided as follows:
Chapter 3, *A break with the past*, incorporates the change from the old apartheid education system to OBE, as well as the manner in which it was introduced into schools. The quality of the documentation issued by the education department is also addressed.

Chapter 4, *The changes in teaching style*, addresses the form of OBE introduced and the assessment measures put into place. As learners are to construct knowledge at their own pace, constructivism and Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development form part of the discussion of the theory that has informed the changes in teaching style.

Chapter 5, *The loss of discipline*, addresses the loss of the school subject Accounting and the introduction of an integrated learning area, Economic and Management Sciences. The literature refers to Bernstein’s pedagogic discourse, as regards the integration of subjects as well as the classification and framing of the learning areas. The degree to which the teacher is expected to be visible or invisible to the learners is referred to by the reclassification of teachers as facilitators.

Chapter 6, *Stress: Unrealistic expectations and the threat of burnout*, addresses the effects that these changes have had on the teachers working lives. In order for teachers to achieve all that is required of them by the new system and the curriculum, they have had to make use of personal time (after hours time) to prepare lessons and to assess learners’ work. The teachers felt they were approaching burnout as they had very little opportunity to replenish their emotional resources. The Conservation of Resources Theory (CRT) has been used to discuss this as it well describes the manner in which the teachers have been affected by the new educational system.

In Chapter 7, *Where are we now, and where would we like to be?*, has drawn some conclusions and made some suggestions for the way forward for teachers in order that they may be able to manage their time in such a manner as to overcome the problems they have experienced, while remaining in the teaching profession.
It’s hoped that this study, although of a small group of teachers, will highlight the additional workload and pressure placed upon teachers and that a reassessment of the requirements will be reconsidered and improved by modifying classroom practices and adapting organisational arrangements within schools to “support teaching and learning” (Hariparsad 2004).
CHAPTER 3

Manner of Imposition: Driving the car drunk

The problem for implementation then, is not only teachers “learning how to do it”, but teachers learning the theoretical project … absent knowledge about why they are doing what they’re doing; implementation will be superficial only, and teachers will lack the understanding they will need to deepen their practice or to sustain new practices in the face of changing context (Hariparsad, S.D. 2004: 34).

OBE was adopted as a clean break with the old apartheid, content driven curricula and associated with learner-centredness, where the teacher would be ‘freed’ and everyone would succeed. OBE fitted the post-apartheid emphasis on democratic participation and access. The regulative discourse of the classroom was affected by a system where learners were expected to do more of the work and the teacher was to play a facilitator role. For many teachers this was a break with old teaching methods and they felt very threatened by the new system. It became a new learning experience for many, which left them feeling very insecure and overworked. “very much so. It left me insecure. I am still not able to teach the way I think it should be taught” (Steve September 2004)¹.

OBE was regarded as the best way of addressing South Africa’s problems in education. Educational policies were very hasty to make changes, but neglected to consider the contextual changes needed to make the strategy effective. As education policies were part of the societies in which they operated, and in order for them to become effective, the history, political and social settings should have been considered. Achieving the changes required was a complex endeavour and presented a huge challenge for teachers, as they lacked the “deep understandings of Curriculum 2005 and struggle with issues of assessment” (Hariparsad 2004: 31).

¹ Refer to the interviews as noted in Appendix A.

1 spent many hours attending meetings, study sessions and support groups with other teachers, presented by the Education Department and Sanlam, in a bid to understand exactly what I was supposed to do (Besiré Chapter 2).
Introduction of Outcomes-based Education and Curriculum 2005

OBE and C2005 were formally launched in 1997, with the Grade ones and Grade sevens scheduled to begin the new system in 1998 (Chisholm 2004: 197). The plan was for pilot learning programmes to be in place by July 1997 and the retraining of educators to take place before implementation in January 1998. The time allocated created problems relating to the development of educational materials and the retraining of educators. Owing to these time constraints, provincial education departments did not have the time to develop the necessary materials, which resulted in materials being purchased, or recommended for schools to purchase, which were not based on merit, but on urgency. These inferior, or inappropriate, materials caused additional problems as money was spent on resources that did not serve any purpose. Many of the provinces were struggling with “such basics as providing textbooks and marking examinations so it’s doubtful that they have the capacity to implement curriculum 2005” (Hlaelele 2000: 28).

National Policy documents were written on the implementation of OBE and C2005, many were drawn up by non-teacher stakeholders, who can be divided into primary stakeholders who represented the provinces and the national department, the secondary stakeholders representing teachers’ organisations, and the third category of stakeholders who were from non-governmental organisations (Siebörger 1997: 45), in order to develop an education system that was seen to be democratic, and post-apartheid education. Criticism and comment on the documents have indicated that the implementation of OBE and C2005 was a political tool, which was implemented without consideration of how it would affect teachers, without the necessary training. As the original documents, which were given to the schools for implementation, were never intended to be read by teachers, they were inadequate for teachers to implement, which meant that they were trying to decipher the documents and achieve what they believed was expected of them (Snyman 2002: 8).

It was assumed by the Department of Education that teachers would have been willing and able to implement all the appropriate changes. This was not the case for many teachers, as
teachers respond differently to innovation depending on their professionalism. This was further hampered by their personal professional theories and beliefs. Curriculum 2005 represented an example of a bureaucratic-driven process of curriculum reform, which resulted in deficiencies such as too much alignment to socio-economic concerns at the expense of knowledge and pedagogical concerns; highly regulated frameworks, over-specification of outcomes, which de-skilled teachers by leaving little space for their discretion and creativity, under-specification of content and knowledge base, which limited the pedagogical authority of the teacher, limited teacher participation in the conceptualisation and design of the curriculum, and less attention was given to pedagogical concerns (Cross 2002). The Review Committee recognised that teachers required “greater guidance and support in content specification” (Ministry of Education 2000: 50). This could either have taken the form of improved guidance or through additional assistance with content requirements.

**OBE Documentation and DoE Policies**

The terminology was completely educator unfriendly. ... it was just done in such an overwhelming way that people just switched off and became negative, or then negativity, unfortunately, was like increased (Mat October 2003)

The documentation received from the different education departments, made it very difficult for teachers to determine what was required of them. The submissions made to the Review Committee commented on the “complex language and terminology” used. Curriculum documents generally transmitted multifaceted information, but the documentation on OBE and C2005 made use of “meaningless jargon and vague and ambiguous language, the unnecessary use of unfamiliar terms to replace familiar ones (Ministry of Education 2000: 50),” which resulted in uncertainty and dissatisfaction amongst teachers. “Departmental documents are difficult to understand. They take time to comprehend, and I am still not sure that I have fully understood them” (Alta October 2003).
As the vague policy proposals, including OBE, were given import by the new democratic government they were enclosed in technical discourse and multifaceted dictatorial structures (Christie 1999: 281). Dictatorial, as they were top down structures with little, or no room, for input or comment, from those having to implement the proposals. These policy framework proposals gave no consideration to the perspective of the implementation and how the vision could be put into place in the overwhelmingly unequal school contexts left behind by the old apartheid government. This approach unconditionally supposed the formulation of policy that would logically be separated from its implementation. The national DoE has, arguably, assumed very little, if any, responsibility or accountability for the delivery of these policies (De Clercq 1997: 281).

The disjointed relationship between power and accountability may well prove to be an eternal spring of tension within education. Although the proposals appeared commendable as regards their outlook and their formulation well designed, they were for the main part devoid of “detail and specificity” (De Clercq 1997: 286). There were no explicit provisions to address the inequalities of the past. No clear effort had been made towards deliberately preparing or investigating actual issues that existed, which required transformation. There were no clear, workable strategies in place for how policies were to be taken through official procedures and put into place in schools.

Question: Have any clear, workable strategies for how the policies laid down by the education department are to be put into place at your school?

Answer:
No. In the old days they had workshops in which they vaguely expressed their ideal situation. But still at this stage it seems to be impossible (Melt August 2004).

No. No. I think our principle does it without saying, or giving us the paperwork, if you want to say it. So, um, so, she’s putting the policies into a place, but you are not aware that she’s actually doing it (Alta August 2004).

I do believe documents have been given to the present headmaster, but these have not been discussed openly amongst the heads of each learning area. So, I believe
they are there but we don’t have in place at my school. We haven’t put in place a proper system (Steve September 2004).

DoE policy documents were impractical “texts in an essentially top-down policy process” that were not grounded in the realities of schools or sympathetic towards the actual conditions within schools (Greenstein 1997: 282). The new curriculum had been put into place in a similar top-down fashion as the old apartheid curriculum was imposed on schools and teachers.

Teachers were not consulted and, if they were, I don’t know about it. But it is general knowledge that people were not consulted. I think some union agreed to it, but teachers were never consulted (Melt August 2004).

This may be attributed to the inadequately planned and over-zealousness with which the new curriculum was foisted on schools, with teachers who had been inadequately trained for outcomes-based education and continuous assessment. The in-service training for teachers and schools was negligible and the resources provided completely inadequate (Greenstein 1997).

Not enough information has been given as to what needs to be covered. In the revised curriculum the educator is to draw up the syllabus, but the learners have to pass an external examination. We do not know what we are really supposed to do (Alta August 2004).

Documentation from the DoE and C2005 was accused of being “jargon ridden” and “inaccessible” in their discourse. The procedures laid down for planning and designing teaching/learning programmes were multifaceted and complicated to the point of obscurity. It was not possible, even for the best-organised policy makers, to determine the quality of teaching and learning by means of a government decree (Jarsen 1997). In order to have been able to work with the principles laid down, teachers needed to be very well prepared, and would probably be more easily found in the historically ex- ‘Model C’ schools as opposed to historically black/township schools.
Provincial budgets had to accommodate teachers’ salaries, which accounted for about 85% of their budgets, and resulted in a lack of funds to continue school building programmes, stationery and textbook purchases, and the provision of in-service training sessions for teachers to support the introduction of the new curriculum. The national government did not see this as a straightforward financial crisis, but rather as a result of mismanagement of funds by the provincial governments. The end result was that for the short term it was almost impossible for provincial education departments to have realised the necessary changes with the budget allocations that they had at the time (Henëveld 1994; 289).

In order to cut costs, the national government put a process of ‘right-sizing’ into place. The responsibility was delegated to schools and resulted in many experienced and skilled teachers, predominantly well-qualified white teachers, making use of the opportunity to leave the teaching profession. Temporary teachers, who were not as qualified or as expensive to employ, replaced these teachers in many instances. Additional conflict with teachers’ unions arose and disturbed many teachers and schools (Henëveld 1994). The possibility of redeployment will remain limited as long as the funds required for specific backlogs remain unavailable, the high failure and drop-out rates caused by unqualified teachers, the disrupted academic environment, poor or non-existent academic materials, and the inadequate physical infrastructure continue unchecked. There was no change to the situation where the more economically endowed communities, who were able to supplement state resources from their private means, had access to largely different levels of provision (Greenstein 1997). OBE and C2005 were “enormously resource dependent and learners at ‘poor’ schools” were being unfairly disadvantaged because of the school’s “inability to access the necessary resources” (Brombacher 2004: 16).
The school provides some newspapers and magazines. The learners do not supply anything themselves, mostly they cannot afford to. I have to ensure that the learners have everything that I require them to have for lessons. I have to budget for all items I require, but it depends on the cost whether it is okayed or not. (Alta October 2003).

The introduction of a curriculum change such as C2005 in conjunction with changes to teachers’ working conditions proved to be an impossible situation. Major difficulties arose because of the introduction of the new curriculum at a time when there were extreme shortages of resources for curriculum materials and under-developed teachers. As though the introduction of the new curriculum, without the necessary resources, and the right sizing of teachers were not enough, the government legislated the introduction of governing bodies to regulate and be responsible for financial matters at schools. Over and above these policy directives, there was also endorsement for schools to become self-managing and at the same time schools were to make provision for learners with special educational needs to be mainstreamed. It was, arguably, clear that most schools would have had problems implementing all these new policies, especially as they appeared uncoordinated and unmanaged. Schools that were better resourced, such as the historically white/’Model C’ schools, were in a better position to have managed these new policies than the historically disadvantaged schools, particularly the poor, rural and marginalised schools (Heneveld 1994: 290). Teachers in township schools appeared to think that the situations within these schools were not conducive for the successful implementation of OBE and C2005. The conditions were not conducive due to the legacy of the old apartheid system of education. This negativity may have been transformed into a ‘resistance to change’ from the teachers, even though the resistance may have taken on a different form to the one shown by teachers in the 1950’s when they resisted the introduction of Bantu education (Hlalele 2000: 11).

As the teachers were required to assess their learners continuously, while also planning and preparing all activities in order to acquire the prescribed outcomes, proper training was required. Alta, Steve and I felt disempowered by being told that the tried and tested methods that we had been using for many years were worthless. The new curriculum dictated that
learners had to be divided into small groups within the classroom situation with the teacher moving between the groups. This method had been criticised severely in America and Britain, where the class sizes were approximately twenty learners, as opposed to South African schools where it is not uncommon to have forty or more learners in a class. In larger classes the system was “likely to be unworkable” (Myburgh & Christianson 1997: 27).

Educators in this country were by and large not consulted on the design or implementation of the new education system. The government made use mainly of ‘expert opinion’, especially from other countries, when making design and implementation decisions. The conditions of township schools were not conducive to the successful implementation of OBE and C2005. Educators predicted that had OBE and C2005 been hastily implemented it would cause chaos in schools (Hlalele 2000: 99).

The learners cannot think for themselves outside of a group. They cannot work on their own. They have become more demanding, undisciplined, and lazy than ever before. They are not prepared to do any homework as they are not capable of working on their own. They appear to be apathetic, they have no will to achieve, no feeling of pride in achievement. They have no perseverance, they give up very quickly if they are not spoon-fed (Alta August 2004).

It was predicted that South Africa would not have the human resources (educators) or the financial resources (money) to introduce the new complicated system of teaching effectively as too many of the educators were not sufficiently qualified for the system, or even for the previous system, and many of the schools did not have the financial resources to acquire the new learning materials. The teachers not only felt unqualified to implement this system, but they were not given enough time to reflect on the goals of the curriculum (Hlalele 2000: 100).

To an extent I also blame leadership at schools for it. It was a political, it had a political dimension to it after 1994. And headmasters and their leadership structures at schools perceived it negatively and they passed it on negatively.
It was not only the educators who felt that the implementation and dissemination of OBE and C2005 was inadequately done, but school management teams shared their opinions. Management teams agreed that it would probably be more successful in historically white schools than in township schools, as they did not have the necessary physical educational resources needed for the proper design, dissemination and implementation of OBE and C2005 (Hlalele 2000: 101). The conditions in township schools, the insufficient training of teachers and the lack of physical educational resources, amongst others, were not conducive to the implementation of the new system of education and may have had a negative impact on the implementation of OBE and the new curriculum (Hlalele 2000: 106).

Teaching and learning always reach completion in the classrooms, as they are the focus of the schooling system where the purpose of schooling was to have taken place. The quality of the classroom work was dependent on the school itself, and the culture, which was critical to the quality. The teacher’s work was constrained and enabled by many influences emanating from all aspects of the structure that made up public schooling (Diphoza et al 1999: 9). In reality, policy choice has, and always will require a trade-off between the improved distribution of educational resources to the disadvantaged communities and the efficiency of the departments to “maximise the rates of return on educational investments” (Taylor 1999: 15).

A major stumbling block as regards the input of parents into the life of the school and in the governance of the schools was the low levels of literacy and apathy amongst parents (Taylor 1999: 23).

Question: How supportive are the parents?
Answer: Not at all. Children are like the parents, apathetic. They expect the school to produce the goods, but they are not supportive at all. They feel that as they pay school fees they do not have to be involved in their child’s education at all. (Alta October 2003).
In a situation where the school culture adversely affected learning and teaching there was a “breakdown of rhythmical, disciplined learning and teaching, formally structured in time and space” (Christie 1999: 289). This was characterised by poor physical and social amenities, problems regarding organisation, poor relationships between the school and the community as well as poor relationships between the education departments and the schools (Taylor 1999: 26).

The quality of curriculum design and implementation, as well as learner capability, could have been determined by assessing learner performance on a set of carefully designed tasks which covered the full range of learning goals (Vinjevold 1999: 66). A learner’s ability to learn has always been affected by factors such as their home background, individual ability, the culture of the school, the quality of the teachers at the school, and the availability of resources (Taylor 1999: 105). Teachers have had very little specific guidance on which to base their lessons, although there were many curriculum guides of various forms and standards, which were given to them from various non-departmental sources. Most of these guides were quite creative, and usually impractical, but still required teachers to supply high levels of subject knowledge and pedagogical expertise in interpreting the broad statements into meaningful learning activities (Taylor 1999: 127). The new curriculum allowed teachers wide latitude in the construction of learning programmes, on condition that the programme organised contained all the specific outcomes across all learning areas as prescribed for each phase of schooling (Taylor 1999: 117).

The schemes of work supplied for applying the curriculum in the classroom were confusing and difficult to interpret. In most cases only the “most dedicated, knowledgeable and skilled teachers [were] likely to achieve SAQA’s learning goals using this curriculum” (Taylor 1999: 128). There was a huge difference between the attitudes of teachers towards the new ideas and the ability to put them into practice in the classroom, especially amongst the poorly resourced schools. Not many teachers had the ability to translate the complex logic underlying the curriculum and the vaguely stated outcomes into effective and appropriate
learning programmes and to introduce learner-centred learning effectively (Taylor 1999: 160). "...very little was written about the content of the syllabuses that were being accredited" (Desiré Chapter 1).

Although teachers were required to cover specific academic syllabus material previously, they were not expected to work in collaboration with others to develop the learning resource materials. Notwithstanding the determined commitment to providing high quality, progressive learning materials, schools had still not received the necessary materials on which teachers were expected to base their learning programmes. Although reliable evidence amassed over the last twenty years supported the role of textbooks in the complex learning process, these did not seem to be advocated in the new educational process (Vinjevold 1999: 167). DoE documents have conveyed an expectation that teachers would have been able to develop their own learning materials, as opposed to them being supplied by the department. According to Vinjevold (1999) the Norms and Standards for Educators document identifies one of the six key roles for teachers as ‘Designer of learning programme’ (Vinjevold 1999: 178). The six competences teachers were expected to possess and practice in this role were:

- Understanding and interpreting learning programmes.
- Designing original learning programmes.
- Analysing ways in which barriers to learning may be overcome through the design and creation or selection of innovative learning programmes.
- Preparing lessons that take into account learners’ needs as well as new approaches to learning/teaching.
- Understanding how learning materials can be used to construct learning environments that are more flexible and individualised.
- Evaluating and adapting learning programmes and resources through learner assessment and feedback from learners (Vinjevold 1999: 178).

This process of developing their own resources was not an easy one and proved to be time-consuming and probably not sustainable. Even the development of worksheets proved difficult and time-consuming. Most teachers did not develop their own materials because of time and conceptual knowledge constraints (Taylor 1999: 233).
Conclusion

The study showed that the teachers had very different understandings of OBE, even when they came from the same school, as a result of the lack of coherence and focus in the way the policy on OBE and C2005 was communicated to and through schools. Teachers, despite years of experience and with institutional resources, showed considerable insecurity in the way they were trying to implement OBE and their classroom practices. The teachers felt that the preparation and training that they were exposed to before the implementation of OBE was inadequate and very much incomplete. Although the teachers tried to implement different methods within their classrooms, they admitted that they were, predominantly, following the same practices that they had been practicing since they first became teachers, before OBE was introduced. Teachers had different interpretations of the documentation issued and the training given, therefore, they understood and implemented OBE in very different ways both within and across the various resource contexts (Jansen 1999: 206 – 211).

The culture of learning and teaching within South African schools has always been weak, and the introduction of OBE has undermined this even more with the increasing administrative burden of change occurring at the same time as the “rationalisation further [limited] the human resource capacity for managing such change” (Jansen 1997: 285).

Teachers were not sufficiently included in the process of designing an OBE curriculum, as ‘experts’ designed the curriculum. Although provincial departments, teacher organisations and other concerned groups were informed as to what was being decided as regards learning areas, they were never given the mechanisms or the time for their comments to be considered by those developing the learning areas (Siebörger 1997). Although an attempt was made to include teachers in the process later, they were not given the time to equip themselves properly before they were required to become active participants in the process (Siebörger 1997: 46). Educators required time to experiment with the new programmes before trying to implement them. They needed to ponder the new goals and objectives, the learning contents needed to be considered and developed and new tasks should have been tried. Time was also
needed for educators to have reflected upon the mission and ethos of the schools at which they were teaching (Hlalele 2000: 32).

Teachers were calling for effective and more direct training in practical classroom activities and in the implementation of the new curriculum, with real lesson plans and assessment rubrics that were practical and usable, as opposed to the poor quality, generic training that was offered (Taylor 1999: 31).

They left the teachers with a lot of theoretical garbage, which they did not have a clue about, lots of lovely transparencies, but nothing practical in hand (Steve September 2004).

Another obstacle to instating the new curriculum in classrooms effectively was the inability of teachers to interpret the broad guidelines of the new curriculum and to ensure that the every-day approach prescribed resulted in learners developing sound conceptual frameworks (Taylor 1999: 230).

One of the main problems with the introduction of the new educational process was the poor conceptual knowledge of teachers regarding the subjects that they were teaching, which resulted in basic restrictions as regards the quality of teaching and, therefore, learning activities, and the resulting poor quality of learning outcomes. Although teachers generally supported the intentions of the new curriculum they lacked the knowledge-resources required in order to put them into practice in the classroom (Taylor 1999: 230).
CHAPTER 4

Teaching style: A break with the past

The four cases highlighted the following aspects, which have been loosely termed ‘teaching style’, as factors that influenced and changed their classroom practice, namely the teaching to prescribed outcomes, the manner of assessment, and assisting the learner to construct knowledge at his/her own pace.

Teaching to prescribed outcomes

According to William Spady, OBE has three different forms. The most difficult form Spady called ‘Transformational OBE’ (Malcolm 1999: 86). It was Transformational, as it required the greatest change from previous pedagogic methods. It clarified the focus for educators and learners and successful learners would be able to take their place in society as responsible citizens and life-long learners. Spady’s (1994: 192) lowest form he called ‘Traditional OBE’, which had a broad base of knowledge and was more in keeping with previous pedagogy. Teachers may, arguably, have felt less insecure with a more traditional form of OBE initially, as they would still have been able to teach their subjects while trying to achieve subject related outcomes, instead of the obscure outcomes that were not connected to the subject content that they were comfortable with. It was unfortunate that the need for ‘transformation’ in South Africa led to a radical change and an adoption of transformational OBE on the misconception that it would have brought about transformation (Malcolm 1999: 86).

Teachers were required to be conversant with a variety of topics and were expected to be able to respond to learner interactions. Although OBE had an integrated code, it was still the responsibility of the teacher to ensure that education took place. Many teachers in South Africa have limited academic backgrounds, which may yet prove to be the downfall of
C2005, and, arguably, the Revised National Curriculum Statement in the future. While the issue of academic prowess was being addressed, it was not happening at the same rate at which teachers were expected to implement C2005. This resulted in a very poor implementation of the syllabus with many schools continuing with the old pedagogic methodologies but applying C2005 assessment requirements.

Where teachers questioned the policies it was seen as a sign of resistance and disloyalty towards the policy as a ‘public good’ (Jansen 1999: 211), but their questioning arose from various factors such as the involved and complicated policy documents that were produced regarding OBE and C2005, by the lack of a broad-based plan to implement OBE and C2005 before the announcement of the new curriculum, by the low level of resource commitment, where the few resources were made available to a few pilot schools and a short training period of five days were given to teachers quite late in the process instead of up front, by the lack of national monitoring and evaluation programmes within classrooms, and by the glaring absence of supervision and support strategies for teaching during the implementation process (Jansen 1999). A remarkable aspect of the introduction of the new education system was the extent of the investment in the new system at the exclusion of other considerations, such as the effect the policy may have had on marginalised schools and disempowered teachers. The short-term ‘legitimacy investment produces a long-term political crisis which engulfs the modern state’ (Jansen 1999: 211).

The developing model had not changed the isolation of the curriculum policy and planning processes from the wide-ranging and imbalanced contexts within which South African teachers work. There was no evidence to suggest that within the planning processes the wide-ranging and imbalanced contexts were analysed for curriculum implementation of the necessary resources for curriculum change. It was assumed that all teachers and classrooms were at the same level of understanding and worked in the same kinds of institutional contexts regarding the methods of curriculum implementation (Jansen 1999).
At the time of curriculum change, when teachers were at their most vulnerable, they were expected to declare themselves secondary within their own classrooms. This showed a serious degree of naivety about the conditions under which teachers were working and their levels of expertise within the South African context. The figurative image that teachers had of themselves, as consumers of policy discourse, remained one of marginal facilitator within their classrooms, and resulted in a powerful reshaping of their professional identities (Jansen 1999).

The vast majority of teachers have had very little insight into or substantive participation in the development of OBE, however, the official discourse was one of participation and consultation across the board. Very few, if any, teachers were asked about whether they thought OBE was ‘workable’ or could be constructive within their classrooms. The introduction of OBE into the education system in South Africa was abrupt and immediate. Teacher participation really only occurred during the training workshops, which were predominantly information dispensing workshops supposedly run by trained facilitators (Jansen 1999). “...unfortunately, the people who should implement this, or train teachers, they are not properly trained themselves” (Alta August 2004).

**Manner of assessment**

The key finding of this study is that neither the teacher training nor the guidelines documents for the CASS and CTA processes has been successful in preparing teachers to implement either effectively. In the main we have found that teachers are struggling to satisfy the technical requirements (real and/or imagined) of the processes without any significant understanding of what they are doing or why they are doing it (Brombacher 2004: 5).

A controversial issue surrounding OBE was assessment. The documentation regarding assessment and OBE from the DoE, made provision for each learner to be assessed by the teacher when the teacher felt that the learner was not succeeding. If the learner was not successful in the assessment, he/she was allowed to keep trying until success was obtained.
This was, and will continue to be, a problematic situation in the classroom (Hlalele 2000: 15).

There were very definite guidelines laid down by the DoE as regards the Continuous Assessment (CASS) requirements for individual subjects. Minimum numbers of projects, class tests, control tests and examinations were stipulated. Figure 5 shows the minimum CASS requirements for a learner’s portfolio for the learning area EMS. For the OBE phase, assessment methods such as simulation, case studies, projects, etc. were introduced, and they required very careful planning and preparation in order for them to have been carried out successfully.

3.2. Learners’ Portfolios

**MINIMUM CONTENTS OF THE LEARNER’S PORTFOLIO**
- Only the learner’s best work measured against her/his previous attempts should be included in the portfolio.
- The following are the minimum requirements for the EMS portfolio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORMS OF ASSESSMENT</th>
<th>MINIMUM NUMBER OF TASKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled tests</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional form of assessment (choice)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5 Minimum CASS requirements for EMS (Continuous Assessment Guidelines 2002: 5).

OBE made use of CASS to monitor a learner’s performance over a period of time. This was considered the best model to assess outcomes of learning throughout the system and would have enabled improvements to have been made in both the learning and the teaching processes. This may have been beneficial to learners, as they were able to master outcomes
at various times, but, arguably, it increased the load of the teachers, who were already overworked (Malcolm, 1999).

I was not only going to have to do the research beforehand, but I was also then going to have to evaluate all the work produced by the learners in new ways. The introduction of rubrics made assessment more time-consuming than it had been before (Desired Chapter 1).

Part of the assessment process required of teachers was to observe and probe the performance of the learners continuously, both in and out of the classroom. The teachers were required to ask questions of individual learners, assess the quality of the answers given by the learners, observe the learners interacting with each other, and the setting of practical, written and verbal assignments.

There is more marking, but its beneficial. It doesn’t mean you have to sit and mark more things. We actually do employ valuable evaluation strategies that we just, kind of, ignored in the past. Peer evaluation, etc. So, so. That’s what I do (Melt October 2003).

Each of these forms of assessment required the teachers to make hundreds of quick judgements during each lesson. This assessment was to be used not only to assess continuously, but also to use the results to diagnose strengths and weaknesses of individuals, while assessing the effectiveness of the teacher’s own classroom practices. All of this required expert judgement on the part of the teachers (Taylor 1999: 198). According to Brombacher, the principal reaction to the introduction of CASS and CTAs was that teachers became “overloaded and overworked”. There was not enough support from the department, yet they expected unreasonable demands. The feelings of “overload and overwork” were attributable to “a sincere effort by teachers and schools to satisfy the system’s ‘requirements’” (Brombacher 2004: 11).

Although I had no idea what would be in the CTA, I still tried to cover some economic information that I felt was interesting. During this time my marking load became heavier as the marking of Accounting was much easier than marking short essay type questions (Desired Chapter 1).
Assisting the learner to construct knowledge at his/her own pace

Moll explains that the Department of Education was clearly looking at constructivism to provide the teaching and learning solutions required by OBE in South African schools (Moll 2000). Constructivism had developmental significance for teaching in South Africa. Constructivism, as a theory about how learners learn, showed how learners’ constructed their own understanding and knowledge of the world, through experience and reflection on what was previously experienced. On encountering something new, the learner has to reconcile it with their previous knowledge and ideas, and then either accept the new information and change the previous knowledge and ideas, or reject the information as irrelevant. Irrespective of the decision taken, the learner is an active creator of their knowledge. In order to create knowledge the learner has to ask questions, explore and assess what they know.

In a constructivist classroom, the learner is encouraged to actively experiment with real-world problems in order to create more knowledge and then they are required to reflect on and talk about the new understandings that they acquired. The teacher has to ensure that he/she understands the learner’s pre-existing conceptions, before guiding the learners to address those conceptions and then to build on them. The constructivist teacher encourages the learners to continually assess in which ways the activities they are carrying out have assisted them in gaining understanding. They are to question themselves and their strategies, and in so doing become ‘expert learners’. In this way they are given ever-broadening tools to assist in their learning process. The learners learn how to learn in a well-structured classroom environment.

From an educational point of view many believed that a constructivist approach was best for learning, as learning began with life experiences of the learners, and for this reason classroom activities should be learner-centred, which would equip the learners to apply knowledge in real world situations and thereby solve problems. This progressive vision could only have been achieved in South Africa if teachers were proficient in a challenging
range of competences (Taylor 1999: 20). As regards the domain of knowledge, the goal that all learners should acquire high level content knowledge as well as high-order problem solving skills, could only have been achieved by teachers with a “depth and sophistication in teachers’ grasp of academic subjects” (Taylor 1999: 21), which is, arguably, beyond many South African teachers.

Active learning facilitates the aspiration of higher order learning goals in progressive curricula generally. These include analysing and applying knowledge, as well as acquiring simple information. Active learning usually takes place most effectively when learning activities are done in work groups, where discussions amongst learners take place, practical materials are made use of, and learners encouraged to consider their own life experiences in order to draw conclusions (Vinjewold 1999: 65). The teachers’ main role is to encourage this learning and reflection process. The more the learners reflect and adjust their experiences, the more their ideas gain in complexity and power, which also led to increasing abilities to integrate the new information acquired.

In a situation where a teacher is responsible for a class of 50 learners, it would have been almost impossible for each learner to be given an opportunity to keep trying for success. If learners who had not been successful were entitled to ask for a re-test, which would have been an individual test, then the teacher would have had numerous tests to set and mark at the same time. With different learners achieving different success levels at different times, it could have meant that some learners would have been on test two or three while others had only completed one test. If after two or three tests the learner had still not achieved success the process would have gone on infinitely until success was achieved, which is synonymous with Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development. This was expected to happen while more experienced and qualified teachers were being retrenched and a new curriculum introduced (Hlalele 2000).

Constructivism, while it encouraged a greater role for the learners in their own learning process, did not diminish the active role of the teacher or the value of the expert knowledge
held by the teachers. The role of the teacher was modified from one where the learners were expected to reproduce a series of facts given by the teacher, to helping the learners construct knowledge. The constructivist teacher did not just impart knowledge, but gave the learners the necessary tools in order to be able to do problem-solving and enquiry-based activities with which they were able to formulate and test their ideas, draw conclusions and inferences, and pool and convey their knowledge in a collaborative learning environment. The learner was to be transformed from a passive recipient of information to an active participant in the learning process. They were to become actively involved in the learning process by applying their existing knowledge and real-world experiences, hypothesizing, testing their hypotheses, and eventually drawing conclusions from their findings. These activities had to have been structured and guided by the teacher for learning to have taken place. If the learners were not given structure and guidance they would merely have passed the time with small talk and socialising, without actually engaging in any cognitive activities, which would have lead to high-level outcomes (Vinjevold 1999: 65).

The learners cannot think for themselves outside of a group. They cannot work on their own. They have become more demanding, undisciplined, and lazier than ever before. They are not prepared to do any homework, as they are not capable of working on their own. They appear to be apathetic, they have no will to achieve, no feeling of pride in achievement. They have no tolerance, they give up very quickly if they are not spoon-fed (Alta October 2008).

Although Switzerland and Japan have dissimilar education methods, they are both regarded as having successful education systems. This could be attributed to various factors, such as “interactive teaching”, where the teacher addresses the whole class and then asks questions of the pupils individually in order to ensure that the learners understand the learning content. In cases where individuals do not understand the learning content, they are given extra lessons in order for them to understand. This is in direct contrast to what was demanded in C2005 where learners were encouraged to participate in group work, which allowed them to fall behind and to develop at their own pace (Halele 2000: 13).
Cognitive development results from a dialectical process whereby a child learnt through problem-solving experiences shared with someone else, usually a parent or teacher but sometimes a sibling or peer (group work in OBE). Initially, the person interacting with the child would have taken responsibility for guiding the problem solving, but this responsibility would then have transferred back to the child gradually. There was a difference between what a child could do on his/her own and what could have been done with assistance. Vygotskians referred to this as the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). As each child had his/her own ZPD, OBE dictated that each child had to be accommodated until they reached the required levels of proficiency in a task or skill. By means of scaffolding, where the teacher continually adjusted the level of his/her assistance in response to the child’s level of proficiency, an effective form of teaching is achieved. Although this is an effective method if immediate results are required, it was almost impossible for teachers to supply scaffolding on a regular basis, as class sizes were too big and the differences in the cultures of the children too varied. Assessment, which played a major role in OBE and C2005, should have taken into account the ZPD and the different cultures represented in one class. As it was almost impossible for teachers to accommodate each pupil to reach their potential development, arguably, it added to the stress felt by teachers trying to assist each pupil to reach their potential development and to accommodate the requirements of OBE and C2005 as regards assessment.

No it is not possible. We have looked at that question already with the numbers of educator / learner ratio but it is not really possible to look at the individual unless one might take the learner for extra help after school (Steve September 2004).

For both Piaget and Vygotsky the concept of a constructivist classroom was one where learners actively constructed knowledge, by means of unifying and transforming both their innate (natural) and their environmental (socio-cultural) processes into new, personified forms of knowledge. For Vygotsky the mechanism for this construction was social rather than individual (Moll 2002: 17). Vygotsky was primarily interested in the idea of social construction as a means of explaining the ability of a child (learner) to construct new knowledge with the assistance of others who were more knowledgeable. His theory insisted
that learning was a methodical co-operation between the learners, or with other learners, and a teacher. This was also applicable to the classroom context where collaborative peer learning is a prevailing pedagogic approach. The teacher plays an active role in organising the frameworks of knowledge of the learners. The teacher is still an indispensable organiser of situations and constructs the beginnings of plans that create problems for the learners to solve, and thereby learn (Moll 2002: 18).

The emphasis on the learner’s developing understandings and their questions, which formed the basis for their cognitive structures and for their collaborative learning, were embedded in the Piaget-Vygotsky tradition and showed the current disputes between their theories as well as their issues of consensus (Moll 2002: 24). Constructivism could be seen as nothing more than a “cynical ideological construction on the part of the military-industrial complex”, imposing itself on the learners, the teachers and the schools in order to create and control them in order for them to become cogs of the system (Moll 2002: 26).

**Constructivism and the classroom**

You find it very noisy, and when you’re trying to teach – you’re to do different things with different groups. The noise level... it can be too high. Because then you can’t work with others on a quieter level. So you’ve got to control that some way. I find that quite difficult. It is a noisy OBE. And it is quite stressful not only for the teacher but also for the children (Janse 1999: 206).

Teachers had been using aspects of a constructivist approach for many years. They had been posing questions and problems and then guiding the learners through the process of finding answers, and during the teaching process teachers prompted learners to formulate answers, allowed the learners to offer different possible solutions and interpretations of the problem, and encouraged the use of peers as resources (group work).

Not only would I have to teach this new ‘learning area’, but I would also have to do so by means of ‘group work’. This was extremely alarming for me, the Accounting teacher who ran her class by the same discipline that would have been expected of
C2005 borrowed from different teaching methods to achieve the goal of helping learners to learn ‘how to learn’ in a constructivist way. In the constructivist classroom learning was constructed. The learners were not blank slates upon which knowledge was imprinted. They had knowledge, ideas and understandings from previous knowledge and experience. This knowledge and experience became the raw material for the new knowledge that they would have been creating. The learner was the person creating a new understanding for him/herself, and the teacher was the coach, moderator, who offered suggestions in order to allow the learner to ask questions, experiment and try to work things out for themselves. The learner would have had to engage fully with the process, reflect on the activities and findings, and then have been able to discuss the activities learnt. The learners would be able to set their own goals and the means of assessment. This, arguably, became very demanding for teachers as regards their “skills, commitment and attention to the detailed characteristics of individual pupils” (Taylor 1999: 117). Teachers had to create activities that would lead learners to reflect upon their prior knowledge and experiences. As the learners led the way by reflecting on their experiences, they would be able to control their own learning process, which made them experts in their learning process. The teachers would create a ‘safe’ environment for the learners to learn in, either individually or in groups. Collaboration among learners is paramount in a constructivist classroom. The reason for this is that learners learn about learning, not only from themselves, but also from their peers.

The main activity in a constructivist classroom is solving problems. Inquiry methods are used to ask questions, investigate situations/problems, and use different resources to arrive at a solution. As they explore the problems, they are able to draw conclusions, and reassess their conclusions as their exploration continues. As they explore further, new questions and possible solutions are found. Although learners may have ideas that are invalid, incorrect, or insufficient to explain the new experiences, these are provisional steps in the integration of knowledge. The constructivist classroom takes into account the learner’s previous
knowledge and builds on it. When the learner acquires new knowledge or information, the new knowledge is compared with the knowledge the learner already has. During this process the new information may match their previous knowledge, in which case they include it in their understanding. Or, if the new information is contrary, a change in the previous understanding is required, which is much harder to do or the information is ignored if it does not resonate with previous knowledge.

Conclusion

By means of the outcome statements, an outcomes-based education curriculum allows for different routes for different learners in different contexts, such as adults, out-of-school children, youths and in-school children, to follow different curricular contents, and even assessment methods (Christie 1999: 280). Research results (Taylor 1999: 204) have indicated that the more sophisticated forms of assessment required by the new curriculum are far beyond the ability of the majority of South African teachers. Teachers needed specific guidelines and assistance in assessing even simple levels of competence. Without a secure knowledge base on which to build, freestanding in-service courses on assessment could be of no use within the classroom situation.

The transfer of responsibility to the various provinces and schools of the high-skill curriculum goals was directed towards promoting excellence. But at that time schools were grappling with changes in funding policies, the application of strict new staff:pupil ratio's and new language policies. According to Munslow et al., in Taylor 1999 it was clear that some of the provincial systems were "being reconciled to gross inefficiency, maladministration and chaos" (Taylor 1999: 32). Within the chaos of the classroom situation teachers became "little more than crowd-controllers" (Vinjevold 1999: 222).

It would be going a bit far if I would say it is chaos, but I should imagine that with an educator who was inexperienced or who also does not have very good discipline within his other classes, then it could lead to chaos. There is a very good chance that it is possibly happening given the inexperienced, as I said, also where classes
are bigger than what I have, being 30-35 in a class or being more than 40. Once
you have more than 40, chaos could reign (Steve September 2004).

Look, when you start doing more practical work, you’ll find some people are
extremely interested, you’ll find some people are extremely interested in what you
are now going to do, and other people will just be tag-alongers. And, what I then
find is, where OBE doesn’t succeed, is, you would like the whole class to be
actually interested in what you’re doing. And in the end you lose half of them
because they are thinking of the social event when going to do some practical work
(Alta August 2004).

A number of features of a ‘constructivist classroom’ were advocated to form the basis of the
‘paradigm shift’ from the previous old style, apartheid education classroom approach to the
new learner-centred approach associated with transformational OBE (Moll 2002: 5).
The focus was almost exclusively on the learners in learner-centred education (Pines &
Aronson 1988: 88). The DoE’s understanding of the differences between a ‘traditional
classroom’ and a ‘constructivist classroom’ appeared to be limited. The many
misunderstandings of a constructivist classroom were evident in the way that C2005 was
implemented. These misunderstandings have had serious consequences for the development
of the teachers, who were expected to implement the new system, and as a result, the
learners, if these misconceptions were not rectified (Moll 2002: 9).

From an educational point of view it was agreed that a constructivist idea was best for
learning as learning began with life experiences of the learners, and for this reason classroom
activities should have been learner-centred, which would have equipped the learners to apply
knowledge in real world situations and thereby solve problems, which was a change from the
old system of education. This progressive vision could only have been achieved if teachers
were proficient in a challenging range of competences (Taylor 1999: 20), as expected in the
change from the subject disciplines to the integration of learning areas in the General
Education and Training phase (grades R – 9).
CHAPTER 5

Loss of disciplines: Integration of learning areas

Teachers were informed by the Department of Education, through their schools, that they had to teach the new learning areas in the C2005 policy documents. They were never consulted as to whether they wanted subjects to, “disappear completely, as they [did] in Curriculum 2005, or whether they should be integrated within the learning areas” (Siebörger 1997). As many had not been trained or educated in the new learning area curriculum, it required them to do additional study to become proficient teachers in the integrated style of teaching. For many teachers the C2005 curriculum not only required them to cover new and different work, it was contrary to what they knew was expected of the pupils when they reached the senior phase of their schooling.

Change from subjects to Learning Areas

I have actually been driven away from my subject of choice. I am first and foremost an accountant but I am seemingly more an economist these days, within the CBE style, and, so, I would like to see my subject introduced within my learning area (Steve September 2004).

The Review Committee on Curriculum 2005 commented that the design structure of C2005 was “strong on integration and weak on conceptual coherence”. The ‘integration’ of subjects was supported by different design features, which “related within and across learning areas” in order to integrate learning with everyday life (Ministry of Education 2000: 50). In most cases subject experts were excluded from participation in the establishment of the curriculum, and those who were involved had limited curriculum experience and often changed from one meeting to the next (Review Committee 2000: 33). The learning areas, which were made up of “non-content specific” outcomes that were “integrated with other outcomes within or outside of a learning area” (Siebörger 1997: 47), replaced traditional subjects. Languages were integrated into Language, Literacy and Communication; Art, Design and Music into Arts and Culture; Accounting, Business Economics and Economics into Economic and Management Sciences; Guidance into Life Orientation; Mathematics...
into Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences; History and Geography into Social Sciences; Science and Biology into Natural Sciences and Metalwork and Technical Drawing into Technology. In many cases teachers, who had specialised in specific subjects (disciplines), had to adapt to one of the Learning Areas.

The only thing I could ascertain from those meetings was that my subject, Accounting, would be no more, and that I would be expected to teach Economic and Management Sciences, as decided by the DoE in 1996 (see Chapter 1).

The choice of curriculum was dependant on what the constructors perceived to be the goals of society, and as such curriculum design also had as one of its aims the reformation, transformation or deformation of society. At a pedagogical level, Bernstein wrote, “if the underlying theory of pedagogy under collection is didactic, then under integration the underlying pedagogic theory is likely to be self-regulatory” (Bernstein 1975: 83). He made the point that the integrated type of curriculum would most likely have seen a more social relationship between educators and learners, due to the relative absence of hierarchy. Bernstein contended that once one had decided what to include in a curriculum, in itself a social or political decision, the choice of curriculum impacted directly upon the pedagogy, and both the styles of curriculum and pedagogy would have social outcomes.

Bernstein commented on the relationship between the type of curriculum code and classification and framing, saying that a collection code had to have strong classification in order to uphold the boundaries between contents, whereas an integrated code would have much weaker classification.

The collection code is capable of working when staffed by mediocre teachers, whereas integrated codes call for much greater powers of synthesis, analogy and for more ability to both tolerate and enjoy ambiguity at the level of knowledge and social relationships (Bernstein 1975: 108).

The reason a collection code did not require such outstanding teachers, as with an integrated code, was that the teacher was firmly supported by the strong boundaries and classification
that existed. Teachers were then supported by their syllabus. The educator within an integrated code had to be conversant with various contents and had to be able to respond to a variety of topics raised by the learners in the more informal environment. Although the environment appeared to be informal, the responsibility still remained on the teacher to maintain control within the classroom and to ensure that education was taking place. Arguably, the efforts needed to maintain this code have been extremely stressful for teachers.

Bernstein (1990) described two separate types of approaches to the curriculum, namely competence and performance models. Competence models were linked to the learner-centred movement that OBE and C2005 encouraged. This learner-centred approach was based on a vision that enfranchised learners to take control of their personal learning processes. They were encouraged to be active and creative in their learning and to be self-regulating. Any direct arbitration by the teacher was regarded as questionable and was seen as an interruption in a natural process. The teacher therefore played a covert role in the learning process and was seen rather as a facilitator or guide (Taylor 1999: 108).

In competence models the emphasis was on what the learner knew and would be able to do at the end of the learning process. The focus was on the destination and not on a specific prescribed path, which allowed learners to achieve the specified outcomes in a variety of ways. There was no possibility of failure in this method. The competence could have been achieved over a longer or a shorter period, depending on the individual learner and the extent of the external obstacles in the path of that learner (Taylor 1999: 108). Performance models, on the other hand, focused on specific learning contents and their texts. The teacher had to be more visible to the learner and had to offer intervention whenever necessary. Evaluation of the learner’s performance was based on any deficits displayed by the learner, such as a lack of terms of specific knowledge and skills and a well-defined criteria for right and wrong (Taylor 1999: 102).

The higher order skills that learners acquired had to go beyond “recall, recognition and reproduction of information, to the evaluation, analysis, synthesis, production and application
of ideas” (Taylor 1999: 109). Although the unequal distribution of learning resources and good quality teachers had a major effect on learners’ ability to learn, the greatest barrier to equal education systems was the disparity of the access of formal knowledge available to learners in different social classes (Taylor 1999: 112). The culture of the dominant class was given the status of ‘absolute truth’, under the pretext of propagating universal truths that arose above individual differences, which was a main criticism of the performance model approach (Taylor 1999: 113).

In all variances of the competence model approach the value of everyday knowledge, because it was central to defining the identity of the individual, which led to increased self-confidence amongst people who not only valued their own heritage, but that of others as well, was recognised. The joint relationship between everyday knowledge and school knowledge provided a vital educational tool for learners to have been introduced to formal discourse, and for teaching them how to practically apply formal knowledge to problem solving in the real world (Taylor 1999: 115). Although competence pedagogies required teachers to play a facilitator role, and be less visible, than the role played by teachers in a teacher-centred performance model, the competence model made far greater demands on teachers. In progressive models, teachers were supposed to be familiar with the difficult relations between everyday knowledge and formal knowledge, and were expected to be able to have guided and encouraged learners through these difficult issues. These extreme demands that were placed on teachers have been regarded as main obstacles for the successful implementation of progressive education (Taylor 1999: 116). The teachers have a very superficial knowledge of the everyday lives of the learners, which makes it very difficult for them to integrate everyday knowledge with formal knowledge, as Steve said,

I am limited in the knowledge of the different cultures, within my educational field. I have been limited in being able to understand the cultures, I have tried to understand for my own interest sake, but I actually know that I am nowhere near to be in the position to utilize the various cultures in the classrooms. If anything, I tread very carefully so as not to upset any cultures (Steve September 2004).
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As a complicated theoretical base of competence pedagogies was required for competence curriculum, Bernstein, (1990) predicted that the costs involved in teacher training would have been high. Besides all the direct costs, there was a range of hidden costs involved in the successful execution of any competence model. These hidden costs were predominantly time-based costs, such as the time required for preparing and constructing classroom resources, evaluating and tracking the progress of each learner, conferring with other teachers and the time required to discuss projects with the learners concerned. Although these hidden costs were seldom openly acknowledged or budgeted for, they were usually paid for in terms of the commitment of the teachers (Taylor 1999: 116), as Alta and Steve said,

... everyday I'm working my school hours, which is about nine hours. Then I have to get home and I usually work for another two to three hours at night (Alta August 2004).

I don't think it is productive of me to spend hours and hours preparing lessons for learners. It is not really going to be that beneficial, so the amount of effort is not necessary (Steve September 2004).

As the teachers have had to use the time that they would have used for recreational purposes to prepare lessons and other administrative duties, without appearing to be reaping any personal benefits, they are questioning the validity of their commitment to teaching and to their learners.

**Move from subject curricula to Learning Area curricula**

A collection type curriculum is one where the high status contents stood in a “closed relation” to each other, meaning that they were clearly “bounded and separated”. In such a situation the learner has to collect prescribed contents in order to comply with the requirements of some external force, such as a national examination, as with Grade 12 learners. The collection of contents has some fundamental idea as its base, such as that of “gentleman, the educated man, the skilled man, and the non-vocational man” (Bernstein 1975: 80). In the case where the various contents are connected in some way, and do not
stand apart from each other, but are open to each other, an integrated type of curriculum is achieved. In a completely integrated curriculum there would be no set periods of time. The opposite is, where the contents are not open and all time periods are fixed, which is referred to as a collection type curriculum.

In an integrated curriculum, the different contents are secondary to a particular idea, which minimises their isolation from each other and the various parts become part of a greater whole, with each content’s function made clear within the whole. With a collection code, the underlying concept does not minimise the independence of the separate contents as the syllabus is in the hands of the teachers teaching the content and those who evaluate it. With integration the syllabus is secondary to the general idea, which can also change. Within the collection code there is scope for different teaching methods and methods of evaluation. Teachers, within prescribed recommendations, can have set their own path. Within an integrated code there is more likelihood that a common pedagogy will be used, a communal evaluation method and a common teaching practice followed (Bernstein 1975: 80).

In a specialised form of collection, learners know more and more about less as they grow older. This meant that as time went by, the learners became more different from each other, which revealed the differences between learners, as opposed to the similarities. Each learners’ educational identity and specific skills were “clearly marked and bounded”, and their “educational category [was] pure” (Bernstein 1975: 81). In any form of collection, especially the specialised form of collection, the hierarchy involves the ultimate mystery of the subject being revealed to the learner very late in the educational life. The education has a very long initiation into the mystery, which increases the importance of the subject and those who acknowledged it, and is known as ‘discipline’. As the educational relationship is regarded as ranked and traditional, the learner is seen as ignorant and carries very little importance and, therefore, has very few rights (Bernstein 1975: 81).

In an integrated curricula type, there is a shift away from depth towards breadth in education, which means that there is a shift from content closure to content openness. In order for
integration to be achieved, there has to be a move away from the concept that the content was important, and the focus has to be placed upon general principles, which has implications for the pedagogical methods. The emphasis shifts from 'states of knowledge' to 'ways of knowing'. The pedagogical method required for a collection code is inductive, but under an integrated code the pedagogical theory is more self-regulated. This method would probably change the teacher-pupil relationship from an authority relationship, to one that increases the status of the learners, and therefore, the rights of the learners. The move from a collection code to an integrated code should see a change in the organisation of teaching groups, from more rigid groups to more flexible groups. Once these changes have taken place, there would be an increased call for the introduction of new forms of evaluation and examination, which are more suitable to the new curriculum and pedagogy (Bernstein 1975: 83).

Once the principle of integration have been introduced, there will be a change in staff relationships. As the borders between the various contents are now open, the separate hierarchies of specialised education weaken. Teachers engage in new social relationships, which not only happens in their leisure time activities, but also professionally as they share joint educational tasks. As there is a more common venture between teachers, they would become less divided and insulated by their commitment to their small subject related hierarchies (Bernstein 1975: 83). However, this has not been the case, as new social relationships and shared educational tasks have not become a reality. For the teachers, finding the time to meet with other teachers of one of the other learning areas in order to integrate the teaching of a particular topic has proved fruitless. Although the desire to do so has been strong, the time needed to meet in order to formulate a plan of action that would suit both learning areas and the requirements as set out by the education department, proved too much, as Steve commented,

I was very enthusiastic with the educator within Design Tech. We were keen and enthusiastic about doing something about it but time constraints were too huge.
We simply could not find the time to simply put this in place. We really would like to have done that. (Steve September 2004).

According to Bernstein the only way that integrated codes have been successful is if they comply with the following five conditions:

1. There must be some consensus about the integrating idea if it is to work at all.
2. The idea must be made very explicit.
3. The nature of the linkage between the idea and the several contents must be systematically and coherently worked out.
4. A committee system of staff and pupils has to be set up in order to develop a sensitive control on the whole endeavour.
5. Of greatest importance, very clear criteria of evaluation must be worked out (Bernstein 1975: 84).

If the five conditions are not met, the openness of learning in the integrated code would create an "environment in which neither staff nor pupils have a sense of place, time or purpose" (Bernstein 1975: 84).

Order, under the collection code, arose from the hierarchical natures of the authority relationships, the methodical structure of the separate subject contents, and an exact and relatively objective assessment system. However, under an integrated code, order has to be developed and planned (Bernstein 1975: 84). For the teachers this was problematic as they had to develop and plan their lessons carefully to be able to maintain a degree of order as regards the content being covered and the outcomes achieved by the learners. The outside would infiltrate the schools in new ways as they moved from collection to an integrated code, and schools went from being closed to open. At the same time the move would cause the moral basis of educational choices to become more unambiguous and it could be expected that there would be a sizeable conflict of morals (Bernstein 1975: 84). This could prove to be a difficult situation within a classroom, but teachers will have to adopt a more open-minded approach to influences infiltrating the school. As Melt says,
I don’t think it is my job to have complete knowledge but to accommodate them. You get different religions. I see it as a journey. But I don’t pretend to know everything (Melt August 2004).

**Blurring of the boundaries and the changes in ways of teaching**

Classification refers to the extent of the boundary preservation between the contents of the various subjects. Classification gives the essential construction of the message system, namely the curriculum (Bernstein 1975: 88). Framing refers to the concept that is used to establish the structure of the message system, namely the pedagogy. It is the form of the context in which the knowledge is to be transmitted and received, the specific educational relationship between the teacher and the learners. The strength of the boundary between what may or may not be transmitted in the pedagogical relationship is dependent on framing. Where the boundary between what may or may not be transmitted is clear, the framing is strong, and when it is blurred, the framing is weak. The variety of options that teachers and learners have in the control of what is being taught and learnt in the context of the pedagogical relationship is referred to as framing. Where the framing is strong, there are fewer options and where the framing is weak there is a larger variety of options. This then refers to the extent that the teacher and learner have control over the choice, arrangement, pacing and timing of the knowledge being taught and learnt in the pedagogical relationship (Bernstein 1975: 88).

Another consideration in respect of the boundary relationship between what may or may not be taught is another aspect of framing, namely the relationship between the non-school everyday community knowledge of the teacher and the learners, and the educational knowledge taught in the pedagogical relationship. The degree to which the everyday community knowledge and the educational knowledge are insulated from each other and the strength of the boundary also has to be considered (Bernstein 1975: 89). If the classification is strong, the boundaries between the different subject contents are clearly defined, in which case there has to be strong boundary maintainers, as when teaching Accounting. Strong classification gives a sense of belonging in a particular class and with it a specific identity,
where this identity forms a base for the style of teaching adopted. Strong frames limit the control the learner has over what, when and how knowledge is received, and increases the teacher’s control over the pedagogical process. Where the classification is strong the control of the teacher over what is to be taught is reduced, as the teacher is not allowed to surpass the boundaries of the contents, and this reduces the control of the teacher as regards the boundary maintainers, which allows for a sense of security (Bernstein 1975: 89).

There are strong rules of exclusion within strong classification and weak rules of exclusion within weak classification. Strong boundary maintainers can be found when there are sharp spaces between boundaries, and the boundaries are well marked. Where things are kept apart there needs to be a strong hierarchy to ensure that things are kept apart. The criteria for capable usage of the space are both clear and exact (Bernstein 1975: 30). Classification refers to the structure of relationships in space, while framing refers to the structure of relationships in time. Framing refers to interaction, to the power of relationships of interaction, namely communication. The move from strongly classified to weakly classified, despite potential insulation between the inside and the outside, results in a refutation in the strength of frame (Bernstein 1975: 30). At the stage of classification the contamination is ‘keeping things apart’; and at the level of framing the pollution is ‘withholding’, not offering or making the self visible (Bernstein 1975: 32).

**Teacher versus Facilitator**

Bernstein wrote, “if all children left school at 14 there would be no invisible pedagogies” (Bernstein 1990: 81). An invisible pedagogy presupposes a long pedagogic life, as advocated by OBE and C2005 in lifelong learning. In a visible pedagogy, an ‘objective’ grid is available for the evaluation of the learners, with “clear criteria and a delicate measurement procedure” (Bernstein 1975: 140). The learner is graded for any performance that is valued. With visible pedagogy, the forms of assessment are probably of a standardised nature, which allows schools the direct ability to compare their successes and failures. With invisible pedagogies there is no such grid and the evaluation procedures are
numerous, dispersed and not easily subjected to precise measurement. Invisible pedagogy does not allow groups to progress as a whole, but is based upon the success of individuals to progress. There would be large differences between groups within the general form of the pedagogy (Bernstein 1975). Although rubrics and minimum assessment requirements have been made available to teachers, the content of the work being assessed is not standardised. At moderation meetings a ‘check list’ is completed as to whether assessment requirements have been met, but the content of the work being assessed is not moderated. An example of this is that the moderator will tick off ‘case study’ as a form of assessment completed, but will not assess the actual case study completed and whether it is of an acceptable standard or not.

The focus of the learner in a visible pedagogy is on the teacher, and for this reason the learner is attentive and co-operative, with the teacher being a relevant part of the learners’ education. More of the child is made available in the case of invisible pedagogy. As the interpretation, diagnosis and the evaluation were relevant to the individual, different acts and dispositions of the learner became relevant. For visible pedagogies the teacher is focused on the teacher, but for invisible pedagogies the teacher focuses on the whole child (Bernstein 1975: 19). This is not always possible or successful, as Alta and Steve say,

Sometimes you have the opportunities and you’re not as under such strain to finish work. That you can actually think of the child itself, but I think you don’t always have all the facts. I mean, if you think about it, some kids have got dismal background, emotional things, home circumstances are abysmal, and we’re not even aware of it. So, if possible, you do it, but it’s few and far between. (Alta August 2004).

So, yes it is possible but generally with the large size maybe a lot of learners will be lost within the system (Steve September 2004).

The behaviour of the learner is focused on the teacher, and for this reason attentiveness to and co-operation with the teacher become relevant, and the teacher, in the case of visible pedagogies, values perseverance and caution. In invisible pedagogy, a different set of acts and dispositions of the learner become relevant, as the child is more available, because of the
theory that guides interpretation, diagnosis and evaluation. The attention of the teacher is focused on the whole child, in its “total doing and ‘not doing’” (Bernstein 1975: 141).

“Unfortunately I have to look at the group dynamics. I cannot look at the individual’s potential, not in the way we are to assess them” (Steve September 2004).

Invisible pedagogies are realised through weak classification and framing, while visible pedagogies are realised through strong classification and framing. The actual difference between visible and invisible pedagogies is in the way that the criteria are taught and the degree of specificity of the criteria. The more inherent the manner of teaching and the more dispersed the criteria, the more invisible the pedagogy, while the more exact the criteria and the more clear the manner of teaching, the more visible the pedagogy (Bernstein 1975: 6).

The point of the relation in any teaching situation is to evaluate the level of competence achieved by the learner. What is being evaluated is whether the learners have achieved the criteria that are made available to them, whether they are criteria relating to conduct, character and manner or discursive (instructional) criteria that they are evaluated on, or whether they are able to solve a problem, write an essay, etc. (Bernstein 1990). For visible pedagogy the emphasis is on the performance of the learner, the text being created and the extent that the text meets the criteria set. The learner is therefore assessed on the criteria that have been met, and the emphasis is on the external product of the learner and not the individual learner (Bernstein 1990). In an invisible pedagogy the discursive rules are known only to the teacher, and are therefore invisible to the learner, as the learner tends to close the pedagogic space, and not the teacher. The actual ‘present’ of the learner is obvious as opposed to the abstract or abstracted past of the controlling discourse (Bernstein 1990).

With visible pedagogy the evaluation processes are clear and often of a standardised nature. Should the learner have to leave the school and be transferred to another school, it would be easy for the new school to assess the learners’ work and to place the learner in the correct slot according to their academic profile (Bernstein 1975: 18). In an invisible pedagogy, without clear evaluation processes and standardised testing, the evaluation process is multiple, diffuse
and subjective. This makes comparisons with other learners and between schools very complex. As the invisible pedagogy does not give rise to the progression of a group, but to individuals, there is considerable variation between groups and individuals within the general form of the pedagogy (Bernstein 1975: 19). This will pose a problem for teachers, as they will expect learners to have achieved particular outcomes at primary school before they are promoted to high school, as Steve says,

I'm getting learners coming into the high school, well they come from some various junior schools, with different backgrounds, because of the curriculum's being different from one school to another they don't have a similar curriculum. So they come in, kids are coming in with varied skills into the EMS class in Grade 8. So that needs to be addressed (Steve September 2004).

Conclusion

The change from subjects to learning areas has proved to be a major change for teachers, as so much more is expected of them. With the integration and blurring of content knowledge teachers have struggled to continue to be the best that they can be. They have had to acquire knowledge and skills to be used in the classroom to the benefit of the pupils, which has resulted in time, that was already in short supply, being challenged even further. The pilot phase for Curriculum 2005 had “very poorly defined learning programmes” (Siebörger 1997: 50), while the integration of subjects into learning areas was summarised by Joe Muller as follows:

One is left with the impression that the architects of Curriculum 2005, perhaps because they see disciplines as oppressive and wish to flatten disciplinary hierarchies, have decided to ignore or at least blur them when it comes to specifying outcomes. It would seem that they have tried to construct, in the learning architecture, a position which commits itself to no discipline and position, a view from nowhere. Yet everything we have learnt from curriculum theory and development over the past 50 years tells us that such a view does not exist (Taylor & Muller 1997: 5).
For teachers, such as the Accounting teachers in this study, this has been a revolutionary change. They have had to give up teaching a discipline that has very definite specialised classification and framing, a collection type curriculum that is ‘bounded and separate’ and requires a teacher to ‘teach’ while encouraging learners to explore the content, which is the primary focus of the discipline that encourages evaluation, analysis, synthesis, production and the application of ideas. They are now required to teach Economic and Management Sciences, which has a broad, integrated curriculum without specialised classification. This has required a paradigm shift, not only of their style of teaching and discipline, but also the degree to which they are required to be invisible, which has implications not only for teaching/facilitating, but also for assessment. These factors, as well as the lack of time required to assimilate these changes, are some of the factors that have contributed to the stress experienced by them, and their desire to find alternative employment.
CHAPTER 6

Stress: Unrealistic expectations and the threat of burnout

The implementation of C2005, with the new teaching styles and learning areas took place in a very short period of time (August 2000 to January 2001), with little regard for how teachers were going to manage the new educational system and curriculum. Although affected differently, the four teachers all experienced insecurity, uncertainty and feelings of inadequacy to varying degrees, which put them in danger of experiencing burnout and emotional exhaustion as a result of having to give so much of themselves in order to be good teachers/facilitators. The following quotes from the interviewees illustrate this well:

"My life as a teacher started to turn into a nightmare. Every waking hour was spent working and I was starting to feel that I was no longer capable of two thoughts in a row. I realised that the workload was starting to affect my life. Not only had I given up having a social life, but afternoons spent watching my sons play sport were nothing more than an opportunity for me to sit in my car and do some marking, while pretending to watch them play (Desiré Chapter 1)."

"I do feel exhausted, and sometimes it's very, very difficult. I get very short tempered. I do tend to lose my temper there, and start screaming. You try not to do it, but it's very difficult (Alta August 2004)."

"I am emotionally exhausted. Far more than I used to be. Why? Because of the extra burden of the administration attached to it all. The putting together of the learner portfolio or ensuring that the learner portfolios are in place or my educator portfolio. We are continuously asked to moderate each other's portfolios. We are having to attend these cluster moderation meetings, which are not helpful (Steve September 2004)."

"I am exhausted the next day. I try very hard. I was lucky to have therapy earlier on in life and there are some basic ways I deal with it. It is very important to express your tiredness (Melt August 2004)."

The teachers are all suffering from exhaustion as they are expected to use their personal time, time that would have been used to relax, contemplate the day, or to socialise with other
people, to ensure that all that is required of them has been completed, while still trying to maintain standards and to be the best teachers that they can be. Not only is it exhausting, but also stressful, as they are not always sure that what they are doing is correct.

Studies have been undertaken in many countries on the stress felt by teachers, the nature of the stress, the reasons why teachers were leaving the teaching profession, the psychological state and the lifestyle variables. Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1977) identified stress as a state of negative effects experienced by the teachers due to their perceptions of their work, and that teaching has been viewed as a stressful profession with teachers reporting that their rewards were diminishing. Teachers leaving the profession cited poor potential for advancement, salary conditions, less time for personal interests because of the time taken for lesson preparation and difficulties involved in managing learners as reasons for leaving (Macdonald, 1995). Teachers are not only exposed to the same life stressors as the general population, but they also have to deal with their profession-based set of stressors. The most common sources of stress were learner misbehaviour, time spent teaching, relations with staff, children and parents, and work conditions. Successful teachers were likely to be people who enjoyed a high level of social interaction, but if positive social interaction was not forthcoming, many became demoralised. This could have led to depression, which could have resulted in more absences from work, lack of interest in teaching-related activities and poor lessons. Poor lessons often resulted in disruptive behaviour by the learners (Mintz 1992).

With the noise level increasing, the quality of the work produced decreasing and the marking load rising, I started turning down social invitations, even those from my family for family related special occasions (Desire Chapter 1).

The teachers found that as they were being expected to relinquish control in their classrooms and cope with the administrative duties required of them, while still ensuring that the learners achieved the outcomes required, they were feeling symptoms of burnout. Studies (Sakharove & Farber, 1983) have documented causes of teacher burnout as difficulties in managing disruptive children, incompetent administrators, lack of administrative support, poor salaries, lack of mobility, demanding parents, excessive paperwork and excessive testing. Managing
disruptive students was identified as the best predictor of teacher burnout, followed by administrative insensitivity and lack of support, bureaucratic incompetence and lack of voice in organisational decision-making, as with the introduction of OBE and C2005 (Friedman & Lotan 1985). When a teacher was unable to achieve his/her self-defined goals for teaching, because of an inability to deal effectively with the pressures, feelings of frustration, failure and low self-evaluation were generated. As the dissatisfaction grew it eventually resulted in burnout, which presented as a state of physical, emotional and mental exhaustion (Pines & Aronson, 1988). These feelings of dissatisfaction caused teachers to believe that they were insignificant in the organisational scheme of things. The overload caused by the excessive paperwork and testing/assessment made the teachers feel that they were spending their time satisfying administrative demands as opposed to teaching. Two key sources of overload experienced by the teachers was the workload, which was seen as unmanageable, and the amount of assessing and marking, which was impacting negatively on the quality of their personal lives (Brombacher 2004: 12). The teachers all found that they had to spend what should have been their personal time on work related issues, as borne out by Alta when she said,

"Personal time has to be used in order for teachers to be prepared and to cope with the amount of work required. There is no time at school to do preparation (huge classes in the lower grades and extramural activities), so this has to be done at home. The demands are affecting my social life. I am too tired to engage in a social life. I need to sleep whenever I have some free time (Alta August 2004)."

In order to explain what was happening to the teachers, I attempted to interpret their experiences by referencing the Conservation of Resources theory as it shows that continuous stress from being in emotionally demanding situations causes burnout in teachers. Pines and her colleagues defined burnout as "the state of physical, emotional and mental exhaustion caused by long-term involvement in emotionally demanding situations." (Pines & Aronson 1988: 9) They viewed burnout as a syndrome of co-occurring symptoms that included helplessness, hopelessness, entrapment, decreased enthusiasm, irritability, and a sense of lowered self-esteem (Pines & Aronson, 1993). Burnout is viewed as an affective state
characterised by one's feelings of being depleted of one's physical, emotional, and cognitive energies.

**Conservation of Resources Theory**

The basic tenet of the COR theory is that people have a basic drive to obtain, retain, and protect that which they value. The things that people value are called resources, of which there are several types, including material, social, and energetic resources. The conceptualisation of burnout formulated by Shirom (1989) on the basis of the COR theory (Hobfoll & Shirom 1993) related to energetic resources only, and covered physical, emotional, and cognitive energies. Burnout represented a combination of physical fatigue, emotional exhaustion, and cognitive weariness. COR further postulates that (Hobfoll 1998) stress at work occurred when individuals were either threatened with resource loss, lost resources, or failed to regain resources following resource investment. Stress does not occur as a single event, but rather represents an unfolding process, wherein those lacking a strong resource pool are more likely to experience cycles of resource loss. The affective state of burnout is likely to exist when people experience a cycle of resource loss over a period of time (Hobfoll & Freedy 1993). For example, Alta, who came to work every morning to face yet another class of learners, lacking opportunities to replenish her resources, as she had spent the previous afternoon/evening assessing and preparing for the day, was likely to feel a spiral of resource loss and, as a result, feel burned out at work.

COR theory postulates that when individuals experience loss of resources, they respond by attempting to limit the loss and maximise the gain of resources by using other resources (Hobfoll 1998). When circumstances at work, or otherwise, threaten a person's obtaining or maintaining resources, stress ensues. COR theory (Hobfoll 1998) further states that because individuals strive to protect themselves from resource loss, they are more aware of loss than of gain, and more sensitive to workplace stresses that threatened their resources. For the teachers, the demand to discipline learners, and facing negative feedback would have had more of an effect on them, than any rewards that they may have received. The stress of
interpersonal conflict has been shown to be particularly prevalent in the burnout phenomenon (Leiter & Maslach 1988).

With OBE and C2005, group work was encouraged. Many group-work situations resulted in teachers having to discipline children as they often lacked the discipline to work in a group environment, as Alta said, the learners saw group-work as an opportunity to socialise and not to work. (See Chapter 5) Applying these notions to burnout, the teachers felt burned out when they perceived a continuous net loss, which could not have been replenished, of the physical, emotional, or cognitive energy that they possessed. These feelings of ongoing net loss of any combination of a teacher’s physical vigoroussness, emotional robustness, and cognitive agility represented an emotional response to the experienced stresses. Expanding other resources could not compensate for this net loss. Burned-out teachers may have intensified their losses by entering an escalating spiral of losses (Hobfoll & Shirom 1993). This may have led to an advanced stage of burnout, at which time symptoms of depression may have become the predominant emotions (Melt attended therapy sessions), or may have reached advanced stages of burnout that manifested themselves in symptoms of psychological withdrawal, like acting with cynicism towards and dehumanising learners (Alta screaming at the learners, and Desiré belittling them.). As noted by Schaufeli and Enzmann (1998), longitudinal studies to date have not supported the notion that there was a time lag between the stress experienced and the feelings of burnout. It could have been that stress and burnout changed simultaneously.

COR theory states that during the early stages of burnout energy resources directed at coping with threatening demands became depleted, with associated work-related stresses. During this stage of coping, burnout may occur concurrently with a high level of anxiety, due to the direct and active coping behaviours that usually entail a high level of excitement. When, and if, these coping behaviours prove ineffective, the teacher may give up, and engage in emotional detachment and defensive behaviours that may result in depressive symptoms (Shirom & Ezrahi, 2001). In analysing moments from my teaching during the Re-Searching Teaching course, I realised that I used sarcasm and the belittling of learners as a defensive
mechanism in my classroom to control the learners. In later stages of burnout, individuals behave defensively and display cynicism toward learners, withdrawal, and emotional detachment. These attempts at coping have limited effectiveness and often increased burnout and problems for both the individuals and the organisations in which they work. When faced with overload and interpersonal stress at work on an ongoing basis, a key issue is the amount of emotional energy needed to meet the demands. When feeling emotionally exhausted, direct or problem-focused coping is no longer a viable option, as it usually requires investing emotional energy. Emotion-focused coping is used in an effort to improve feelings of emotional exhaustion, and in an attempt to distance oneself from the learners, psychologically withdrawing from job tasks, or limiting exposure to the learners, which may explain the link between emotional exhaustion and cynicism (Lee & Ashforth 1996).

One of the predictions of the COR theory is that individuals who lack strong resources are more likely to experience cycles of resource losses. When not replenished, such cycles are likely to result in chronic depletion of energy, namely progressive burnout. The advancement of burnout seems to depend on a person’s level of self-efficacy. Lower levels of burnout would be expected in work situations that allow employees to experience success and therefore feel useful. This will happen under work conditions that allow for opportunities to experience challenge, control, feedback of results, and support from supervisors and co-workers. As Alta works on her own as regards EMS, she does not receive positive feedback the way that Steve, Melt and I do within our learning area departments, although we have very little control over what the education department demands of us.

In a longitudinal research of burnout amongst teachers, Brouwers and Tomic (2000) found that emotional exhaustion had a negative effect on self-efficacy beliefs and that this effect occurred simultaneously rather than over time. They (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000) reasoned that interventions that incorporated enactive mastery experiences, the most important source of self-efficacy beliefs, were likely to improve the effect on teachers’ emotional exhaustion, such as having teachers learn and experiment with skills to cope with disruptive students behaviour. Environmental sense of control was an important stress management resource.
The teachers who experienced a high sense of control tended to use their resources sensibly, relying on themselves when this was deemed most appropriate and using available social support when this was the more effective coping route.

As more and more was required of teachers, many wanted to leave the teaching profession as they felt that they were not coping within the classroom situation and they were certainly not being appreciated. It was becoming more and more difficult to control a classroom of learners, although according to OBE it was the responsibility of the learner to control him/herself, and to be an effective teacher required additional effort. Three of the four teachers in this study, namely Alta, Steve and Melt, felt very strongly that if they were given the right opportunity, they would leave the teaching profession. Although none of the teachers have discipline problems in their classrooms, they still felt that it was becoming more and more difficult to keep order in the classroom, especially if, in the lesson prior to theirs, the learners were given free reign.

The COR theory, arguably, is representative of what teachers have been feeling and experiencing on a daily basis, as learners come from different socio-economic settings, different cultures, different home circumstances, and have troubles of their own, which they bring into the classroom. They often acted out these problems within the classroom situation because of their level of immaturity and their frustrations (Cherniss 1995: 64). In a professional setting that was supportive, there was a greater chance that teachers would have found it more rewarding to work with difficult learners. The more demanding and difficult the learners become, the more supportive the work environment needs to be. No matter how supportive the work environment, the more a teacher spends time with difficult learners, the more likely their chances of burnout (Cherniss 1995). As the teachers’ self-confidence grew, so did their self-tolerance, which helped them to become more tolerant and compassionate towards the learners in their care. As soon as teachers started doubting themselves, it became a painful process, which resulted in self-doubt when they had to deal with difficult learners. At the same time, as the teachers concern about their ability to perform their duties increased,
their ability to care for and be compassionate towards their learners decreased (Cherniss 1995: 69).

As income was a concrete way of determining status, success and self-worth, as teachers compared their earnings to those of their peers, who were not involved in the education service, they developed feelings of shame. As these feelings of shame increased, their self-esteem suffered because of their meagre earnings. The teachers were aware that they needed to have more of a balance between the time they spent on work related activities and on non-work related activities. Although there were rewards for work well done, teachers were becoming aware that more and more of their leisure time was being used for work related activities. It would have been far less stressful if work related activities played a less major role in their lives. By identifying personally with their work, and the institution for which they work, to such an extent that each success or failure was regarded as their own, the stress that they were encountering increased (Pines & Aronson 1988).

The teachers used to be more satisfied and committed when they were given more scope to be autonomous in their work situations, such as determining the type of assessment needed at particular times and determining when it was important for the learners and teachers to take time out to just relax within the classroom environment, without being expected to produce particular types of assessment, which would be ‘policed’ at moderation meetings. They were allowed to determine their own way forward. They designed their professional lives in such a way as to be able to make use of their skills at every opportunity to do more interesting and valuable work. With the introduction of the new education system, the reformers gave teachers more opportunities to develop curriculum content, although this was within the strict guidelines laid down by the education department, they reduced the opportunities for teachers to learn from each other or from their own experiments (Cherniss 1995: 179). As the teachers were spending more of their leisure time on work related issues, their enjoyment derived from their work and from other people diminished and was replaced by isolation, discouragement, and disillusionment (Pines & Aronson 1988: 13).
The postulation that teachers were responsible for learners to the extent that if the learner failed to learn the teacher was at fault was a major cause for concern for teachers, as parents expect teachers to ensure that the learners pass with minimal input from them, as Alta and Steve said,

You’ll find many of the times the parents are standing behind their children, and actually not taking your side and how can their little darling be such a problem at school (Steve: September 2004)?

They feel that as they pay school fees they do not have to be involved in their child’s education at all. They work and expect the educators to prepare and help their children get through school (Alta: October 2003).

This caused teachers to feel frustration, guilt and, ultimately, a sense of failure (Pines & Aronson 1988: 85). Another serious cause of stress amongst teachers was maintaining discipline within the classroom situation. Teachers had to face indifferent and apathetic learners at all levels of the education system. Without the support of parents or the leadership of the schools, the teachers may have felt alone in their struggle to achieve and maintain discipline levels that were conducive to education. Teachers who felt very strongly that the work they did was of importance could have become disillusioned when they perceived their major role to be one of “policing, testing, and physically managing their students” (Pines & Aronson 1988: 85). As a result of physical, emotional and/or mental exhaustion, workers (teachers) were often late for work, took extended breaks (were late for class), and were often absent from work (school) without a real explanation (Pines & Aronson 1988: 92). Steve, who was afflicted with a viral infection that took three prescriptions of penicillin to clear, and Alta appear to have been more adversely affected health wise than Melt and myself, as Alta said,

The extreme stress placed on the educators has had severe effects on their health. I have been more ill this year than ever before (suffering from severe migraines) (Alta October 2003).
Sidney Cobb, MD, of Brown University, defined social support as “information leading subjects to believe that they are cared for and loved, esteemed, and valued, and that they belong to a network of communication and mutual obligation” (Pines & Aronson 1988: 159). These social support systems were lasting interpersonal ties between groups of people who could have been relied upon to offer emotional replenishment, help and resources when there was a need. They also gave feedback and shared the same standards and values of the person needing the support. When teachers found a person able to offer this type of support within their environment, they became well protected against burnout as this support would have gone a long way towards reducing the stress they were experiencing both in their work and in their private lives (Pines & Aronson 1988: 160). In order to offer this type of emotional support it was not necessary for the person to have technical expertise, they only needed to care for the individual requiring the assistance as a human being, irrespective of any positions the individual may have been supporting at that particular time. The support had to have been offered despite any work done, or not done, the frame of mind the individual was in or any other positions the individual may have been taking (Pines & Aronson 1988: 163). For the teachers, our informal communications were very helpful as they have gave each of us opportunities, on an ongoing basis for a period of a year, to express our feelings and concerns.

When I started teaching, at my second school, I had 47 kids in my classroom of Afrikaans first language. I coped, it was fine. I don’t know how I coped. But I also know, when I look back, I never, in terms of literature, did half of the work (Melt, August 2004).

In situations where teachers were given smaller groups of learners to work with, they were able to develop more meaningful and deeper relationships with them. As there were fewer learners in the group it was easier for the teacher to be aware of each learners location, activity, as well as the learners emotional state. With a feeling that they were aware of where their learners were and what they were doing, the teacher was able to feel less distracted, confused or drained at the end of a session. As the class size was smaller teachers were able to connect with the learners, which allowed them to feel more in control. As they were
feeling more in control the more able they were to deal with the emotional development of each learner in their care (Pines & Aronson 1988: 185).

Conclusion

The teachers perceived change and its consequences as a psychological threat to their level of competence and also their self-esteem. They were often fearful that they would not master the new behaviour and skills required by the changed situation. It was for this reason that they may have resisted the change to OBE and C2005, as it nullified their years of training and the skills acquired over the years (Hlalele 2000). The more concerned they became with economic success, or trying to make ends meet, the more intolerant they became towards others with intractable problems. A way to avoid teachers feeling that they were being forced to teach in a new way without becoming too stressed was to involve them in the process of change. The idea was for them to take ownership of the idea. This would have reduced the amount of cynicism and they may have been more willing to adopt the new system. Teachers, had they been involved in the developmental process, may have been more willing to try the new system. As the reforms in the current education system were formulated by administrators, politicians and other academics, and then imposed on the teaching profession, many teachers had not adopted the idea as their own. Had they been involved to a greater degree in the transformation process, there may have been more meaningful reform amongst teachers, and much less stress. The teachers who were thrust into their new facilitator roles required more support and guidance in order for them to manage their stress effectively. As the stress levels increased, so the entrenchment in the previous system and their resistance to change increased (Cherniss 1995).

As much of the sense of overload experienced by teachers was as a result of them trying to meet the requirements as laid down by the education department, even though they may not fully have understood the requirements correctly, caused extra work. As the teachers were trying to ensure that they met the requirements and that the learners were prepared for the next phase of their education, teachers may have been doing twice the amount of work that
was required of them and this may have been the real cause of their stress and not OBE per se (Brombacher 2004).

Hlalele felt that in order for C2005 to have been truly successful the conditions within the schools should have offered more support to the teachers. There should have been a positive atmosphere of learning and teaching if the new curriculum was to have functioned properly. In developing a revitalised climate within schools a positive atmosphere should have been ensured. This could only have happened if teachers were given the necessary support and information required in order for them to institute the new curriculum (Hlalele 2000: 18).
CHAPTER 7

Conclusion: Where are we now, and where would we like to be?

Where are we now?

All four teachers are still teaching and trying to be the best teachers that they can possibly be. Alta has realised that she will not get the support from the education department or from her colleagues that she needs, so she has approached me to moderate her work and for collaboration on examination papers, test papers and other forms of assessment (an unintended product of the contact through the research study). Steve has asked to be included in this collaboration as the experienced teacher who taught with him has left teaching and has been replaced by an inexperienced teacher. He is finding it even more difficult than before, as now he has to teach the new teacher about EMS and how to teach it, while still not being totally confident about the work that he has been doing. Melt has taken to having regular discussions with another member of staff, although in a different learning area, who also understands the frustrations and limitations that many teachers have been experiencing.

The new education system’s mission was to unite all citizens as equal in a democratic and prosperous South Africa. The change that was made in the form of C2005 was of a “scale arguably un paralleled in the history of curriculum change” (Chisholm 2004: 195). Heneveld pointed out that in most cases “the results in terms of effective implementation, the classroom use of new materials, changes in teacher behaviour, and improvements in academic achievement have been disappointing” (Heneveld 1994: 287). Although OBE, with the new curriculum, was introduced as it was regarded as the only way to address the inequalities of the past, it appears that this has not been the case. The commitment of the government to their vision of ‘what should be’ appears to have clouded their judgement as to how things really are. The good intentions of the ‘social reconstructionism’ appeared to have
more influence on policy agenda than on social and school realities (Harley & Wedekind 2003: 5; 9).

Although the C2005 Review stated that: “Former ‘Model C’ schools appear to have been able to implement Curriculum 2005 with greater ease than the majority of schools largely because of being better resourced” (DoE 2000: 25), it appears that one of the major resources, namely the teachers, were depleted rapidly, as they were finding it very difficult to know what to teach or how to teach, which resulted in teachers not following the principles of OBE or C2005 (Harley & Wedekind 2003: 5). Of the four teachers in this study only Melt appears to have been able to adopt the principles of OBE and group work successfully. As a language teacher, he did not feel that the introduction of OBE made a huge difference to his teaching style or the content of what he was teaching. For the other three, Accounting teachers who had to give up their subject and change their teaching style, the transition was very difficult, and not always successful, as they adapted their teaching to incorporate EMS, but still continued to teach Accounting in the old style.

The Education Department set the norms and standards but left the implementation to the various provinces, which reflected “a structural representation of the classic divide between policy and practice” (Chisholm 2004: 196). C2005 was launched in March 1997, with the focus shifted from content and on to assessment, and the introduction of continuous assessment (CASS). In shifting away from content, school subjects were discarded and eight ‘learning areas’ were introduced for Grades 1 to 9, and they had to be facilitated through a learner-centred pedagogy. For many teachers their identity was closely connected to their discipline and what was unique to that discipline. There was a high degree of insulation between the different subjects, as there was between the ‘academic’ and the ‘OBE’ programmes. The only connection to everyday knowledge would have been an illustration used to explain a disciplinary point. The progression and sequencing of topics were drawn from the structure of the discipline (Chisholm 2004: 197, 205). Although the new learning curriculum was to foster “a culture of human rights, multilingualism and multi-culturalism and a sensitivity to the values of reconciliation and nation building”, for the teachers it meant
a new curriculum world. This new curriculum world has been responded to in very different and uneven ways by different schools and teachers within schools. For Alta and Steve, their schools did not require them to adopt OBE while at the same time incorporating the old system and curriculum, but for Melt and me, our school expected us to run both systems.

The difficulties surrounding the resources necessary for C2005 and the lack of resources in schools, was fairly easy to predict, but the reactions of teachers was complex and inconsistent. The introduction of C2005 took teachers into a new and unfamiliar curriculum world, which caused uncertainty amongst them, and, as a result, implementation failures of OBE and C2005 (Chisholm 2004: 198, 207).

The ‘training’ that the teachers received was very problematic as it was of a very poor and uninformative nature. The training was cascaded down through the system, but there was a severe lack of capable trainers, and training was subcontracted to a range of consultants and NGO’s, which resulted in poor quality training. The teachers who were at the top of the cascade were not able to replicate the training within their districts or schools. Brombacher reported that the “trainers (subject advisors) did not know enough of what they were meant to know to be able to help the teachers”(Brombacher 2004: 8).

Learner-centred teaching was independent of OBE, but was closely linked to the general discourse on human rights, and in particular, children’s rights (Chisholm 2004: 197). Group work was regarded as the major symbolic identifier of the new curriculum, and this became one of the main issues during ‘training’ sessions (Chisholm 2004), but for the teachers, this was not practical as some of the classes, especially grade eight and nine classes, had too many learners for the size of the classroom, which made it almost impossible to implement successfully. In the historically advantaged schools, where there was still a measure of control and discipline, C2005 appeared to be relatively successfully implemented, as opposed to historically disadvantaged schools, which appeared to be floundering. Christie felt that the gap between the historically advantaged and disadvantaged schools appeared to be widening (Chisholm 2004: 205).
Teachers showed signs of implementing ‘superficial trappings of the new curriculum’ (Chisholm 2004: 201).

Although teaching them Accounting was not part of the syllabus as laid down by the education department, my colleague and I, both Accounting teachers, decided that if we covered the outcomes of the EMS syllabus and continued to teach them Accounting, we would have a clear conscience as regards the new policy documents from the education department (Désiré Chapter 1).

This was as a result of a very superficial understanding of the principles of OBE and C2005 as the teachers did not know the difference between the two, because of the “complex and turgid terminology” used in documents, as well as their shortcomings as regards subject knowledge. Where schools were able to meet specific imperatives it had been because they had strong resources, such as physical and human capital, and because they had reached agreement within the school community as to what they were supposed to be doing (Chisholm 2004: 203, 207).

Teachers and their pedagogy were displaced. They became ‘facilitators’ and the content they used to teach was replaced by outcomes and competencies. Although the teachers in this study were not lacking in professional confidence and subject knowledge and general competence, they were unable to make the transition to facilitator, with the possible exception of Melt who seems to be able to swop between the two roles as he feels it necessary. They were required to give up their space in the classroom, all forms of instruments of control, the content of their subjects as well as the textbooks used to teach their subjects, in order to be a facilitator, which resulted in feelings of inadequacy and uncertainty. As Brombacher reported, the inconsistent interpretation between learning areas resulted in feelings of inadequacy amongst teachers and that they were finding the system to be unfair as the rules seemed to change from one education department metropole to another. Learners learnt how to manipulate the system to ensure that they ‘passed’, which resulted in a lowering of standards, a lack of discipline in classrooms and “learners who have a false
impression about themselves, which explains the high failure rate in Grade 10” (Brombacher 2004: 7).

In an attempt to overcome the past and to introduce a new education system to eradicate the inequalities of the past, the Department of Education overlooked the reality of the schools in South Africa. The social commitment to the new vision had disastrous consequences for the C2005 plan, for the administrators implementing it, for the teachers who had to carry it out and for the learners who were to learn from and through it. The DoE embarked on, what Malcom (1999) described as a ‘voyage of faith’ that they would be able to implement the system successfully in an “under-resourced system with inadequate support” (Chisholm 2004: 212). The teachers, although very dedicated and willing, found it very difficult to implement the new system of education and, especially in the case of EMS, did not believe that the outcomes prescribed, would achieve the ideology of the new system.

C2005 was a political project and had been successful in the “ideological domain”, as a teaching and learning project it was not successful (Chisholm 2004: 213). Although C2005 has not been successful, the state invested far too much money and effort to rethink or revise the vision, even though there is little hope for the political project it was intended to serve, as, according to Education 2000+, Grade 9 learners were noted as semi-illiterate – there was a huge gap between Grades 8 and 9 who had been OBE educated and Grades 10, 11 and 12 who had not been (Chisholm 2004: 214).
Where would we like to be?

Try to take ... what suits you best ... and see now you can combine it with the results or the outcomes they want you to reach. We reach our outcomes anyway. But is it administrative, the new structure of things. We should stop clinging unconditionally to the old forms. We are creating double the amount of work for ourselves with the grade 9’s (Melt August 2004).

Melt’s words capture the feelings of the teachers, that by taking the parts of OBE that they feel most comfortable with, and by implementing the syllabus using these methods, they will all feel more secure about teaching in an OBE fashion. The forms of assessment that are required can be adapted to suit the content that the teachers choose to teach, thereby alleviating any additional pressure placed on teachers at moderation meetings. This will not only alleviate some of the pressure placed on teachers by subject advisors, but will also alleviate the amount of work teachers have to do after hours.

In order for teachers to adopt the changes necessary for OBE and C2005, and the New National Curriculum in 2006, to be successful in addressing the educational needs of South Africa, a more collaborative approach between educators and the education departments, both nationally and provincially, should be adopted. This would allow all educators implementing the system to give feedback and feel part of the process. Teachers, such as those in this study, have much to offer and their advice could, arguably, be invaluable to the success of OBE.

The teachers felt that subject advisors were not trained well enough to assist them fully, and for this reason it would be beneficial if they were fully trained and well versed in what educators were expected to do in a classroom situation, while at the same time understanding the dynamics of classrooms in South Africa. As Alta said,

I wish that my curriculum advisor would go back to teaching for one month. So that they just can come back and experience what we are experiencing. Some of
them say, “Ja, I’ve been there”, but it’s five or six years ago, and that’s not the same situation any more (Alta August 2004).

This would then eliminate subject advisors responding to teachers with “it is national policy” instead of giving the correct advice, as teachers seem to know more than the advisors do (Brombacher 2004: 19).

Education departments, nationally and provincially, should find a means of communicating the philosophy underpinning OBE and C2005 in as “explicit, honest and transparent a manner as possible” to teachers and subject advisors alike, and accept that the previous training and publications issued were inefficient, as this would provide “substantial support at a practical classroom level” (Brombacher 2004: 26). The teachers feel that OBE has many positive aspects that could be implemented successfully in classrooms, although this has only become apparent to them as they have spent time discussing OBE and reading some of the reviews that have been made available. The education department could further recognise those teachers who have successfully implemented OBE and use them for training sessions, whereby they could give practical, hands-on advice to other teachers and subject advisors. Although the teachers are not experts on OBE, they feel that they have much to offer as regards the insights they have gained over the last four years of trying to teach OBE and the research that they have done.

I am able to consult on a constructive basis with the education department. Take us educators, who have been out there for some time, tapping into our knowledge and expertise. Utilise us and free us of the administration that is becoming too much of a burden (Steve September 2004).

As most teachers have created their own resources or have developed a resource base from which to work, it may be beneficial to all teachers if these resources were made available to learning area teachers, as they would then have a resource base from which to work, as opposed to finding their own resources with limited funds, time and energy, as this would, arguably, help to standardise the work being done and, thereby alleviate some of the
insecurity and stress experienced by many teachers. Although this will require extensive co-operation and funding from the department, the end result should be better-equipped teachers and learners and, ultimately, address some of the education problems experienced by many schools.

If learning is to improve in our schools, then most educators require more attention and consideration than they have been receiving (Diphola 1999: 10). The teachers all agreed that more money needs to be made available for the proper training and development of teachers, and for supplying the correct resources necessary to implement OBE successfully. Without more money being spent on improving the situation that most teachers find themselves in, the cost in terms of the teachers themselves will be great, as the more experienced teachers will continue to leave the teaching profession and they will be replaced by less experienced teachers, and, arguably, the continued failure of the implementation of OBE.

Until such time as the education department begins to address the issues raised above, teachers will have to look at their own practices and make adjustments in order for them to alleviate some of the stresses that they have been facing. Teachers have a better idea of what is expected for Grade 9s and the CTAs, and are now able to make better judgements as to what is required in the portfolios.

Teaching in 2004 did not become easier than teaching in 2000, but I do not feel as insecure as I did then. I began enjoying teaching again as I adopted some of the recommended teaching methods and rejected those, like group work, that I found to be stressful (Besire Chapter 2).

As regards the teachers themselves, the two gentlemen, Melt and Steve, appeared to have coped a little better emotionally than the two ladies, Alka and myself. This could, arguably, have been attributed to the fact that Melt, living in the school’s hostel, and Steve, having his main meal at the hostel daily, were exposed to other teachers in a more social setting whereby they could discuss their situations with other teachers who may have listened and possibly even sympathised. Teachers need to have contact with other people in order to
alleviate some of their stresses. They will have to re-assess their priorities in the near future. and realise that they are not defined by their work, but that they define their work. By allowing their teaching workload to overwhelm them, they have lost sight of who they are and need to do some introspection and find themselves, and redefine their lives. The teachers in these cases realised this and made the following changes: Alta took up singing lessons, Steve took up cycling and golf, Melt limited the hours he was working and started having regular discussions with a colleague, while I will be taking drawing lessons in the new year (2005). By doing these things, we hope to once again find ourselves and live our lives, of which only a part is our jobs: teaching!

The question has been asked why we continue to teach? This could best be answered in the words of Dr. Maturana (1997) in his paper “Moral’s and Ethics in Education” as quoted by Hocking, Haskell and Linds 2001:

To educate in the biology of love is basically simple, we just have to be in the biology of love. We have to be with the children under our charge in education as we are with our friends, accepting them in their legitimacy even if we do not agree with them. All that our friends do is legitimate even when we object to their doings or are in serious discrepancy with them in that respect. ... Finally, there is total mutual trust and openness for collaboration in friendship because we are with our friends and do things with them out of pleasure, not from obligation. Friendship is a word in our culture that, most the time without our awareness, connotes the biology of love. (Hocking, Haskell, Linds 2001: 159)
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APPENDIX A

INTERVIEWS

Alta: October 2003 and August 2004
Steve: October 2003 and September 2004
Melt: October 2003 and August 2004

Informal communications, telephonic communications and e-mail communications continued throughout the period October 2003 to December 2004.

The informal communications, after the initial interview, and the research undertaken, allowed me to connect the threads that ran through the interviews, which informed the questions for the second, formal, interview. It is for this reason that there is a period of twelve months from the first interview until the last interview. The questions were designed to interrogate the four key aspects that had produced the marked alteration in the position of the teachers. The following are some of the questions posed:

1. To what extent did you find the Department of Education policy documents on OBE helpful? Were they specific, direct and easy to understand?

2. Invisible pedagogy, as advocated in the new system, requires the teacher to focus on the “whole child”, his/her total doing or not doing. Do you find that you are able to concentrate on the whole child, as regards each child you teach?

3. Have you been given any clear, workable strategies for how the policies laid down by the Department of Education are to be put in place at your school?

4. It has been said that the New Curriculum has been imposed on schools in a top-down policy process. Do you feel this is true? Explain.

5. The ‘old’ assessment measures no longer are the only means of assessing learners. They have been reduced to a small percentage of the total assessment of a learner. A larger part is the assessment of learners in groups, where teachers are required to move between the learners and assess their role within a group. Is this a ‘workable’ option for you? To what extent do you find you are able to carry out this form of assessment?

6. The new education system allows learners to develop at their own pace. They do not have to keep up with the bulk of the class. Do you find this applicable to your classes? How do you cope with learners who fall behind?
7. When preparing lessons, do you find it easy or difficult to ensure that all specific outcomes are addressed? To what extent are you able to implement learner-centred lessons, while still enabling learners to achieve all the necessary outcomes?

8. Teachers are now tasked with developing their own learning materials. This is over and above teaching, assessment and general duties expected of teachers. How has this affected your working hours?

9. An aspect of the form of OBE adopted by the education department is that teachers are expected to be conversant with a variety of topics and be able to respond to learner interaction/questions. To what extent do you feel comfortable with this? Are you able to do this regularly and successfully?

10. One aspect of the new system is integrated code. This is when the ‘subject’ areas are connected and they lose their boundaries that separate one subject from another. To what extent has this affected your teaching? Are you still teaching your subject of choice?

11. What a learner knows, his everyday knowledge, is regarded as an essential tool for the introduction of formal teaching. Considering the cultural dynamics in the classes you teach, how do you manage to incorporate the different learners everyday knowledge in your formal teaching?

12. Constructivism, as a means of cognition, is advocated by the Department of Education. This means, partly, that the child learns his/her own culture at home and brings this to the classroom. Anything learnt in the classroom adds to this culture. To what extent do you feel confident in your knowledge of the different cultures amongst the learners in your class?

13. Learners initially need assistance in the learning process. There is a difference between what they can do on their own and what they can do with assistance, as they all learn at their own pace. You as a teacher have to put various means in place in order for all learners to achieve the necessary outcomes. Is it possible for you to be assisting each child individually on a regular basis (ZPD)?

14. Do you have any feelings that this is getting too much for you and you should be looking for alternative employment?

15. If you could pinpoint one thing that you would like to change about teaching, what would it be?

16. In your opinion, how do we go forward from here?